



Pan-Canadian Community Development Learning Network Profile of Effective Practice:



The Learning Enrichment Foundation (LEF)

Context

Cities are the home to the majority of Canadians. In 2001, 80 percent of the population lived in an urban centre, up from just under 78 percent in 1996. Cities are also the primary settlement areas for new Canadians. Statistics Canada reports that in 1996, 85% of all immigrants lived in a census metropolitan area, with nearly three-quarters of recent immigrants residing in Toronto, Montreal or Vancouver. From a human capital perspective, these new Canadians bring a wealth of knowledge and skills to the labour market. Immigrants of all categories, including independents, family class and refugees, have a substantially higher proportion of university graduates than among Canadians in the same core working age group.

This Profile of Effective Practice is one of fifteen stories examining how innovative, community-based initiatives are using comprehensive approaches to improve social and economic conditions on a local level.

The profiles were prepared as part of a 2.5-year project of the Canadian CED Network looking at the links between social inclusion and community economic development.

For other profiles, more information on the project and additional resources on social inclusion and CED, see the notes at the end of this document.

However, while cities contain some of the most prosperous communities in Canada, they also contain areas of marginalization, exclusion and poverty. The former city of York in Toronto, where the Learning Enrichment Foundation (LEF) is located, is one such example. Compared with the other cities in pre-amalgamated Toronto, York has the lowest percentage of population over age 25 with a university education, the lowest average total income, the highest unemployment rate, highest percentage of lone-parent families, and the highest percentage of population over age 25 with less than grade 9 education. This is the grim reality of

Canada's cities. The pockets of poverty and exclusion surrounded by areas of prosperity in our urban centres represent fundamental flaws in our economic and social policies.

While it is recognized that "cities, with their high rates of immigration and cultural diversity are ripe for this growth that fosters innovation," the reality is that in 1998, poverty among recent immigrants was double the Canadian rate, and they earned one third less than other Canadians in annual wages.

These problems extend far beyond the plight of immigrants. Canada's urban centres have larger ranges of income inequality, higher incidences of poverty, are struggling with issues of affordable housing, urban crime and youth and adult unemployment. Declining labour force participation is one of the most serious problems facing cities today. The Toronto Training Board notes, "Toronto still suffers from decreases in labour force participation since the last recession. In September 1999, the labour force participation rate in Toronto (i.e. the proportion of working age population that is employed or looking for work) has dropped by roughly 5% since 1991."¹

Toronto, Ontario

History – Toronto, on the north shore of Lake Ontario, is the largest of Canada's vibrant urban centres, and is the capital of the Province of Ontario. People have lived here since shortly after the last ice age, although the urban community only dates to 1793 when British colonial officials founded the 'Town of York' on what then was the Upper Canadian frontier. That backwoods village grew to become the 'City of Toronto' in 1834, and through its subsequent evolution and expansion Toronto has emerged as one of the most liveable and multicultural urban places in the world today.

Economy – Toronto is Canada's biggest city. With a population of more than 2.5 million people, the city represents \$33 billion or 14 percent of total Canadian retail sales annually and more than 76,000 business generate a gross domestic product of \$98 billion and employ over 1.3 million people.

Social Need – While cities contain some of the most prosperous communities in Canada, they also contain areas of marginalization, exclusion and poverty. The former city of York in Toronto, where LEF is located is one such example. Compared with the other cities in pre-amalgamated Toronto, York has the lowest percentage of population over age 25 with a university education, the lowest average total income, the highest unemployment rate, highest percentage of lone parent families, and the highest percentage of population over age 25 with less than grade 9 education.

Claim to Fame – Toronto is home to the world's tallest building, the CN Tower and the world's longest street starts at the city's lakeshore.

History

In 1978, what was then called the Borough of York started to go through economic decline. Once home to names like Dominion Bridge, CCM, Bauhaus and Ferranti-Packard, the community became abundant with empty factories, environmentally damaged properties and decaying spaces. As the industrial tax base dropped, income levels also dropped in adjoining residential areas, and rental rates dropped, thus making the community more affordable for waves of recent immigrants. In a few short years, the Borough of York saw its need for social, education and employment-related settlement services increase, while the tax base that would allow it to provide some of those services declined significantly.²

The acute need was first recognized, and acted upon, by people associated with the Board of Education. While poverty was evident in the schools, the low tax base in the local municipality made it difficult to address critical needs. A charitable organization was founded, the board of which was made up of community stakeholders. The newly incorporated Learning Enrichment

Foundation became aware that the needs were in large part employment related.

The services offered were targeted at the needs of York residents but, in time, the clients served by the foundation began to come from every part of Metropolitan Toronto and beyond. LEF's services still, however, reflect the needs of the local population and services are still offered locally.³

Early programs, starting in 1980, included adult skill training and multicultural theatre in schools. Today, LEF is considered a leading CED organization, providing a complex web of inter-woven services that includes childcare, job search, training, job placement and work-related supports. Within this spectrum of activities, the program offers customized training in computer applications, industrial skills, childcare and language skills, among other areas of training required by employers. Furthermore, the Learning Enrichment Foundation serves thousands of individuals a year, most of whom are ineligible for assistance through either EI or welfare. LEF has implemented a loan fund for those without access to subsidized training, thereby ensuring universal accessibility to its employment training programs.

Activities

The breadth and range of programs offered by LEF is extensive. The following are examples of just a few of them.

Early Childhood Education – LEF currently operates 13 licensed childcare centres and 15 before- and after-school programs, providing a safe and nurturing environment for over one thousand children every day. LEF remains an active member of the York South Weston Family Service Network, a committee of non-profit health, education and social service providers that work collaboratively to ensure that young children have access to integrated support systems of prevention and early intervention services in the community. In 2004, LEF was involved with “Learning Language and Loving It”, a pilot project in conjunction the Hanen Centre and the City of Toronto. LEF also provides childcare consulting services to both the private and non-profit sector, and hosts an annual LINC child minding conference.

Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) – The Learning Enrichment Foundation has offered language training since 1992, and currently offers LINC

Learning Enrichment Foundation (LEF)

Year Incorporated – 1978

Activities

- Childcare Centres and After-school programs
- Language Instruction for New Canadians
- Skills Training including: Industrial skills, Early Childhood Assistant training, Cooks training, Budgeting workshops, IT Project Management and Enhanced Language Training, Basic Construction and Renovation training, Woodworks
- LEF Food Services

Annual Impact

- LINC Language Instruction helps 350 people per year
- 300 graduates per year through skills training programs
- 1000 meals daily to LEF Childcare centres
- 800 meals daily distributed to the Homeless

Priorities – Providing community responsive programs and services which enable individuals to become valued contributors to their community's social and economic development through programs that are employment focused and based on the development of human capital.

programs at levels 1 to 5, serving nearly 350 clients in 2004. LINC is designed for adults (over 17 years) who are newcomers to Canada and are either permanent residents or convention refugees (refugees whose claims have been accepted). LEF also offers the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), which is used to evaluate the English proficiency of individuals whose native language is not English.

Finally, LEF offers literacy and numeracy classes for adults who need help in reading, writing and basic mathematics. Classes are available for English as a first language learners and English as a second language learners with advanced listening and speaking skills.

Skills Training – Each year LEF provides over 300 graduates with the skills and practical experience employers are looking for. LEF offers courses targeted to a variety of occupations, and in 2004 LEF expanded training options by adding budgeting workshops and project management with enhanced language training for internationally trained technology professionals. Other courses include:

Industrial Skills This 9-week course is designed to help clients find employment in a warehouse / logistics environment. Each participant has the opportunity to receive certification in 9 areas that are required by employers. By the end of this course, clients have a well-designed resume with a good portfolio of transferable skills through integrated job search workshops.

Early Childhood Assistant This course is 14 weeks and combines a comprehensive child care curriculum with two placements in the child care field. Participants explore a variety of topics including the Day Nurseries Act, behaviour guidance, health and safety, nutrition, curriculum planning and special needs childcare. In addition, the course assists graduates with their employment search.

Cooks Training For individuals interested in a career in large-quantity cooking, LEF offers Cooks Training, a 16-week course that teaches participants essential aspects of food handling and food preparation through small classes with individual attention and practical experience. Graduates receive certification as Cooks Assistants and job search assistance.

Budgeting Workshops Through this workshop participants improve their ability to successfully manage their financial affairs, and in doing so, move towards financial stability and self-sufficiency to the benefit of themselves and their communities. Topics covered include budgeting, debt strategies, goal setting, and effective use of a credit card. Ongoing individual counselling is also available to participants.

IT Project Management / Enhanced Language Training This 12-week course provides classroom instruction and on-the-job supervision during a voluntary sector practicum to prepare for certification with the Project Management Institute, including language training specific to the IT sector.

Basic Construction and Renovation Training This course provides 16 weeks of training that combines classroom learning with practical experience. Participants learn the skills essential to securing employment in construction and renovations and will have the opportunity to receive certification in First Aid, WHMIS, Occupational Health and Safety. In addition, participants access a full range of client-centred employment supports that are tailored to individual needs.

WoodWorks serves at-risk youth between the ages of 16 and 30. Participants work closely with an instructor in the LEF woodworking shop where they help to create specialty order furniture, the sale of which helps to pay the cost of the program. In addition to learning the marketing, design, and craftsmanship involved in custom woodworking, participants receive life skills and employability training. Young people are often referred by schools, due to a zero tolerance policy, or by the courts.

LEF Food Services prepares over 1,000 meals for LEF childcare centres and another 800 meals for homeless shelters every day. In addition, LEF's on-site kitchen offers nutritious and affordable meals for staff and clients through a fee-for-service cafeteria. LEF also operates a catering service.

The Learning Enrichment Foundation runs a free Help Desk service for voluntary organizations. This service, offered in conjunction with ITAC (Information Technology Association of Canada) and Ajilon, provides free technical support and expert advice. The LEF Help Desk is also the first point of contact for the IM/IT Ontario program, a network of non-profit organizations providing technology support to the voluntary sector.



Each year the Learning Enrichment Foundation provides over 300 graduates with the skills and practical experience employers are looking for.

Participatory and Comprehensive Analysis

LEF's mission is to provide community-responsive programs and services which enable individuals to become valued contributors to their community's social and economic development. LEF achieves its mission primarily through programs that are employment focused and based on the development of human capital. Essentially "the sum of knowledge and skills that people use to pursue their livelihoods", human capital can be a university degree, forklift certification, the ability to speak a new language or learning job-search skills. LEF believes that with the appropriate skills and knowledge, marginalized individuals can become valued, contributing members of their communities, and the organization works to deliver employment-related services in an innovative fashion that will allow those individuals to reach their full potential.

In human capital development, labour force participation and labour market inclusion are crucial ingredients, not only to a competitive and innovative economy, but also to a healthy and

equitable society. Juan Somavia, Director General of the International Labour Organization articulates the importance of meaningful work as "a defining feature of human existence. It is the means of sustaining life and meeting basic needs. But it is also the activity through which individuals affirm their own identity, both to themselves and to those around them. It is crucial to individual choice, to the welfare of families and to the stability of societies."

From a human capital perspective, New Canadians bring a wealth of knowledge and skills to the labour market. According to LEF, immigrants of all categories, including independents, family class and refugees, have a substantially higher proportion of university graduates than Canadians in the same core working age group. Canada's Innovation Strategy highlights the importance of a university education, stating: "Highly qualified people - defined as people having completed a post-secondary degree or its equivalent - are indispensable to an innovative economy and society." This concentration of human capital and industry are the reason urban centres are the economic engines of the country and are "establishing patterns of social, cultural and economic relationships that will play a major role in defining Canadian society in the 21st century."

Communities have been forging innovative solutions to human capital development and labour market marginalization issues for years. These strategies have been focused on local realities; they change in response to the needs of the community and have been successful despite fragmented or reduced support from government. Non-profit organizations, community-based trainers, and community economic development practitioners have all had to find innovative strategies to fulfil their mandates in a rapidly changing economic and political environment.

A comprehensive human capital development strategy must also address early childhood development. Proper supports and attention to the needs of both children and families are the foundation for achieving future economic and social goals.

In the "Early Years Study," Frazer Mustard reiterates the importance of early childhood development from a human capital development perspective. "The entrants to the workforce of 2025 will be born next year. From this generation will come a key factor in determining the wealth base of Ontario in 25 years. They will be Ontario's community leaders and innovators in the next century. Brain development in the period from conception to six years sets a base for learning behaviour and health over the life cycle. Ensuring that our future citizens are able to develop their full potential has to be a high priority for everyone."⁴

Comprehensive Approach

- Multi-faceted programming: creating flexibility and capacity by combining programs and services
- Encouraging human capital development, labour force participation and labor market inclusion
- Commitment to early childhood education
- Providing universal access to programs and services
- Watching/Monitoring trends within clientele to have programs and services evolve and respond to clients' evolving needs
- A flexible structure that isn't disrupted by programming changes imposed upon LEF by funders
- Using an innovations committee, along with department managers and the executive director, that evaluates programs, sets long-term goals and suggests innovative solutions every 3 months

A commitment to early childhood education is an investment that will pay significant dividends in the future. In John Godfrey and Rob McLean's book, "The Canada We Want", the authors make the point that "If we could say that Canada had the best prenatal programs, the lowest child poverty rates, the best parenting centres and parenting courses, the lowest rates of child abuse, and the best early childhood care and education programs, all of which culminated in the best rates of school readiness by age six, the positive consequences for Canada would be enormous." They also explain, "If we produce six year olds with the best coping and learning skills in the world, this will eventually translate into improved adult health status (and hence reduce the need for health care). And fewer of these same six-year-olds will subsequently drop out, become delinquent, or commit crimes as they grow older."⁵

Another important point is that quality early childhood education, universally accessible, would free the present workforce to reach their potential. Lifelong learning means nothing if you have no option but to stay home with your children because you can't afford care. Worse, leaving your child in unsafe, unstructured care can put the parent in a stressful situation not conducive to his or her full potential.

The LEF framework also includes a race, gender and ethnicity analysis. According to Joe Valvasori, Program Manager at LEF, "*Analysis might be too strong a word. In LEF's registration form, we ask clients to voluntarily disclose gender. As for ethnicity, we don't ask for it directly, but for HRSDC we are required to ask our clients if they identify themselves as a visible minority, as well as country of origin or education.*

"The data around the ethnicity of our clients comes out under our Citizenship and Immigration Canada LINC program, since they collect information on ethnicity and race. As far as analysis goes, LEF is always watching out for the trends within our clientele. For example, gender may come into the analysis if the number of single moms using our services is going up, as this could have implications for child care. In the LINC program, the composition of language instruction classes changes along with world events. For example in the late nineties and early part of 2000 a lot of Eastern Europeans came as a result of turmoil there; so we see an impact on our client populations as a result of world events.

"LEF works in partnership with organizations that represent ethnic communities but that partnership is mostly around provision of legal or settlement services. Some have business collectives, and so we work with them around employment issues, mostly referrals back and forth."

By combining services and programs and trying to build on its assets, LEF has created a level of flexibility and capacity that allows the organization as a whole to deliver results much greater than the sum of its parts. The advantage is that this approach can accommodate a diverse range of community needs. However, it can also be problematic, particularly with government restrictions which tend to emphasize program development in the other direction; these do not transfer well to integrated approaches. LEF builds on its programs to address a variety of different challenges and different needs, and they have found this to be the best way to respond to their community. But a comprehensive initiative has to change and evolve as well, to continuously respond to those evolving needs. As an organization, there is always a need to tweak the services, which are constantly growing and changing.

One of the benefits of multifaceted programming and of the capacity that that creates, and one of the things that LEF is most proud of, is that clients can't tell when there are programmatic

changes imposed upon LEF by funders. The services are still universally accessible. A big part of being comprehensive is that LEF can meet their contract requirements, and still avoid having to impose the rigid structures that often come with them. LEF doesn't have target groups, nor do they claim to serve specific geographic communities. One of the things they're good at is providing access to all kinds of groups, who can all find what they need there, whether it be through LEF or through their network of partners.

However, leveraging capacity against other resources within an organization can be risky, because the margin as far as resources and capacity is concerned is sometimes very thin. Changes like those imposed in 2004-2005 by HRSDC hit organizations hard, and they don't just affect one program with three staff. If those programs are leveraged and built into an integrated model and are part of a whole, and then they are taken out, the impact is felt across a range of programs.

LEF does its long-term planning on a number of levels. An "Innovations Committee" evaluates programs, sets long term goals and suggests innovative solutions. One such solution is a new interest in affordable housing. LEF holds meetings with department managers and the executive director to address organizational goals. During those planning meetings, they will look at specific community needs such as housing, child care, etc. Within individual departments, they also set goals during staff evaluations. Often their goals and targets are set by the funders, or LEF sets goals as a result of feedback through workshops. Some of the targets that they set are internal to what LEF strives for. This is an ongoing process which is revisited about every three months.

Over the past few years, there have been significant changes to the way that government contracts with non-profit organizations, which has made it difficult for LEF to do longer-term planning. One of the drawbacks from the changes at HRSDC for example, aside from programs that were lost, has been the disarray in the system. Organizations don't have the security to do long-term planning, and have to make an effort to get on track in terms of setting long-term goals. Those changes have created an environment where there is no incentive for partnering. In the case of LEF which participates in community planning sessions, there has been a lot of work and effort required to get people in a room and to set goals for community planning purposes. LEF is committed to this, and would like to put more time into these processes, but has not been able to because it hasn't been sustainable under the new HRSDC guidelines.

Outcomes and Evaluation

According to Joe Valvasori, "the fact that LEF has universal access for a variety of our programs, and that we have always tried to keep our doors open to anyone who wants to come in, is a major accomplishment. Not only do we provide integrated services, and fulfil our contractual obligations well, but we also provide services to people who do not fall under those contractual obligations. The Community Skills Development Fund (CSDF) is a good example. All of our clients receive a counselling session, but if they don't have Ontario Works funding or HRSDC funding, or can't pay for skill training on their own, LEF can use that fund. We developed it internally so that we could have access to resources that would allow us that flexibility. Half of the people that go to LEF don't qualify for EI or other sources of government assistance, but they are under-employed, or they can't get into the labour market without training, or they are women entering the labour force after a long time."

As the number of people able to access funding through HRSDC or Ontario Works diminishes, the need for an internally managed fund, for which LEF is not accountable to any funder, has really started to grow. So through its own fundraising efforts LEF developed this fund – and thus is responding to a need which no one else can address.

Another important outcome for LEF is the success rate of their clients in accessing employment. For example, 70% of their Ontario Works clients are employed within 16 weeks of initiating a job search. Another 70% of their Job Search clients are employed within 12 weeks.

Outcomes are evaluated by setting benchmarks and following up. There's an annual review that takes place, against established benchmarks, and LEF tracks progress that way. Individual programs each have feedback mechanisms and a participatory evaluation component, and program participants evaluate each program, but that doesn't build in directly to long term outcomes. What LEF has struggled with is that long-term outcomes have to be pretty broad, so they build participant feedback into existing curriculum for a particular program, which in turn gets built into longer term or organizational outcomes (ie, universal access to all programs). In an integrated model such as LEF's, each program has its own evaluation and feedback benchmarks, and then the organization has a larger scale framework to attempt to measure impact on community or broader-based benchmarks or goals.

There are a number of LEF clients who wouldn't have had access to training elsewhere if it wasn't for LEF's mission to provide universal access to their programs; the Community Skills Development Fund clients are a good example of that. Furthermore, and as the inclusion and human capital development literature indicates, employment is a vital means by which to integrate people into society. At least 50% of LEF staff are people that they have trained. LEF makes a conscious effort to provide employment opportunities to their clients.

Unique Success Factors

Organizational resilience The term “organizational resilience” fits LEF well. As described above, one of its accomplishments is the fact that its clients can access the same range, level and quality of service even when LEF suffers funding cutbacks. It has been successful in ensuring its stability despite the uncertainty of the current funding environment.

Leverage programs against other programs This takes practice and experience. It's not something that comes very easily. It's an approach to doing things, there's no formula to it.

Be willing to take risks It's much safer to develop a series of stand-alone programs. But LEF would not be able to build the kind of capacity they have and serve all the clients they serve if it weren't for their willingness to experiment.

Management style The management style of the organization has to be very enabling, open to ideas, and willing to facilitate change. LEF is a very flat organization, so there are not a lot of levels between decision making and implementation. The management is very close to the delivery of programs which allows information to flow readily throughout the organization. Change can happen very quickly because of LEF's flat structure. That style of running a flexible organization and keeping LEF community-based is a big part of why they are able to do what they do.

Committed staff Three-quarters of the staff in the LEF's Skills Training and Employment Services have been around for 10 years. According to Joe Valvasori, *"we have staff that thrive in a fast-paced, multidimensional environment. In a comprehensive model, the learning curve for staff is much more complex, we need to be aware of much more, because we're involved in all kinds of things. There's always going to be the focus on community, constant feedback, it would be very easy to fall into cycle of doing what funders tell you to do. What keeps people here is the environment. It's exciting, innovative, you're doing something different, you know that you have the flexibility to recommend change, to question what's going on, you can pursue your own interests as long as it fits with vision and mission of the organization. Staff are very engaged in the work of our organization. That kind of creativity is absolutely essential in comprehensive initiatives. You need people to constantly challenge the process."*

Policies and Lessons

LEF has learned that comprehensive strategies and inclusion are incredibly important in their community. When people are not included through traditional means of program development, the best way to deal with inclusion is to be innovative, creative and take risks to accommodate and include those groups. LEF has also learned that you can take existing programs and money, and to some degree build in capacity that allows you to be more inclusive. The trend right now as far as government goes is to be more structured and rigid, and that doesn't fit well with a comprehensive model.

Lessons Learned

- Be innovative, creative and take risks to accommodate and include groups
- You can take existing programs and money and be able to build in capacity
- Keep staff engaged – creativity is essential in comprehensive initiatives and you need people to constantly challenge the process

According to Joe Valvasori, *"with a little creativity you can take the same money and programs and do a lot more with them. It's not complicated, but you need the pieces or strong networks. Developing a comprehensive model is a work in progress, it's ongoing, it doesn't stop. And it's hard work. You've got to be willing to commit to this approach rather than saying you're going to build it and then stop. What I find really amazing is how we manage to cobble together stand-alone programs, or what exists elsewhere as stand-alone, into a comprehensive whole. I think LEF is innovative in that it can combine a variety of programs, and the whole becomes more*

than the sum of its parts. It becomes very flexible, very inclusive, and it builds community and organizational capacity. It provides the material to build something new out of stuff that already exists. It's not innovative like there's this miraculous program and no one's ever done it before, but it's more like finding ways of working with existing programs and rules and creating something that wasn't there before. And also to tailor programs to community needs. That's what I think is innovative about LEF."

There are governmental and other programs and policies that have been enabling of the work of LEF such as:

- Industry Canada Community Access Program (CAP): a funding mechanism that is very clean and outcome-oriented.

Learning Enrichment Foundation

- The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has been very helpful in LEF's process to explore housing services
- The Voluntary Sector Initiative (VSI) has been very helpful, especially around technology issues. The VSI has been involved with LEF's Step Program and the IM/IT Ontario program, a network of non-profit organizations providing technology support to the voluntary sector.

However, there have been some governmental policies and programs that have hindered the work of LEF, for example:

- In 2004 and 2005, the Learning Enrichment Foundation played a lead role in representing non-profit organizations that have suffered or completely shut down as a result of program changes at HRSDC which have led to a shift or compartmentalization of programs with a lot of rigidity. LEF has had 5 different contracts (the structure, outcomes, guidelines) in 5 years, and 6 different project officers, just with HRDC's Job Search Program. As a result, there's no relationship with program staff, and every year LEF has to start over in explaining how everything works so that their program officer can present that information to their regional office. The program officers can no longer speak to the benefits of the organizations, simply because they do not know them well enough. As a result, organizations find it hard to build momentum, or community trust, or capacity to develop comprehensive programming, as is LEF's expertise, because they don't have a long-term funding arrangement that allows them to do that. According to Joe Valvasori, "There seems to be a real fixation on budget lines rather than outcomes, and it really handcuffs an organization as to what kind of service they can provide."
- Ontario Works Program: There is a clear lack of direction and flexibility on the provincial front, especially in the Ontario Works Program. Also, the structure of the Job Search and Welfare to Work programs hasn't changed at all since 1997. Social assistance guidelines are really full of holes. It is not a helpful model, not client-centred. The focus seems to be about funding programs that are easy to cost. By doing this, programs have become much more expensive, changes have nothing to do with saving money, but being able to show where money is going. For all the talk of evaluation and micro-management, there's no money or real thought put into evaluation of programs.
- Funders, particularly government, don't put an emphasis on community research or program evaluation. They don't take advantage of the information that is collected at the community level and there's not a lot of emphasis on that for applied research.

Monique Beaudoin

Monique Beaudoin is the Ontario regional coordinator for the Canadian CED Network. She can be reached at tel: (705) 671-9983, email: mbeaudoin@ccednet-rcdec.ca

Sincere thanks to Joe Valvasori for the time he has committed to this research, both as a case study participant, as well as a member of our Project Advisory Committee. Thanks also to Eunice Grayson for reviewing the case study and Irene Mankovsky for layout assistance.

For more information on the Learning Enrichment Foundation, visit their website at <http://www.lefca.org>

Notes

1. Excerpt from a submission by Learning Enrichment Foundation to Canada's Innovation Strategy, 2002
2. LEF Workshop notes, May, 2002
3. Ibid.
4. Excerpt from a submission by Learning Enrichment Foundation to Canada's Innovation Strategy, 2002
5. Ibid.

References

Two interviews with Joe Valvasori, Learning Enrichment Foundation, November 8th, 2004 and July 25th, 2005.

Building Human Capital: A 21st Century Priority. Canadian CED Network Submission to Canada's Innovation Strategy, Government of Canada, 2002. On-line: <http://www.innovation.gc.ca/gol/innovation/site.nsf/en/in02265.html>

Learning Enrichment Foundation, Submission to Canada's Innovation Strategy, Government of Canada, 2002. On-line: <http://www.innovation.gc.ca/gol/innovation/site.nsf/en/in02347.html>

LEF Workshop notes located on website of ARUC-Économie sociale, Université du Québec à Montréal: May, 2002. On-line: <http://www.aruc-es.uqam.ca/aruces/rvm2002/fr/Torontoweb.htm>

Learning Enrichment Foundation website: <http://www.lefca.org>

Michael Lewis, *From Public Nuisance to Public Wrecking Ball: HRSDC Attacks Leading Community Sector Initiative*. On-line: <http://www.cedworks.com/hrsd-2.html>

Joe Valvasori, Learning Enrichment Foundation. "Targeted Training, An Integrated Initiative" Natcon Papers 2000. Toronto, Ontario Canada, 2000

More Profiles of Effective Practice and other resources on social inclusion are available at: <http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/pages/learningnetwork.asp>

This project is funded by the Community Development and Partnerships Directorate of Social Development Canada. The opinions and interpretations in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of Social Development Canada.

Published by:

© 2005 The Canadian CED Network
211-620 View St., Victoria, BC V8W 1J6
Telephone: (250) 386-9980
Toll free: (877) 202-2268
Fax: (250) 386-9984
Website: <http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca>

*Ce document est aussi
disponible en français.*

An electronic copy of this document
is available on our website