New Frameworks to Build and Sustain Programs

Paul Stein

National Symposium:
Connecting Leaders, Impacting Communities & Sustaining Programs:
Strengthening the National Torture Treatment Network
Assumption:
For significant numbers of survivors of torture, challenges with integrating in the United States are as much a presenting concern in treatment as is the trauma associated with torture in their country of origin. Equally important, for significant numbers of torture treatment programs, diversification of funding and developing mainstream partnerships are the key to program sustainability.

Learning Objectives:
1. Understanding the interaction and initial quantification of integration domains
2. Understanding the potential for new program designs and funding partnerships by using an anchor institution framework
“Greater Consultation With Community Stakeholders Could Strengthen Program”

- “Little is known about the **extent** of refugee integration, but studies offer a **framework** for assessing integration.” Eight domains identified by GAO.
- “Federal agencies **promote** but do not currently **measure** refugee integration.”
- Only 13 studies identified that met the criteria of: 1) integration of refugees into US communities; 2) published after 1995 and in English; 3) scholarly (peer reviewed, rigorous methodology, reliable data). But, none of the 13 were quantitative (scaled scoring) or longitudinal.
By focusing on the civic, economic, and linguistic integration of new Americans, we can help immigrants and refugees in the United States contribute fully to our economy and their communities.

...establishing a White House Task Force on New Americans, an interagency effort to identify and support State and local efforts at integration that are working and to consider how to expand and replicate successful models.
(i) review the policies and programs of all relevant executive departments and agencies to ensure they are responsive to the needs of new Americans and the receiving communities in which they reside, and identify ways in which such programs can be used to increase meaningful engagement between new Americans and the receiving community; 
(ii) identify and disseminate best practices at the State and local level; 
(iii) provide technical assistance, training, or other support to existing Federal grantees to increase their coordination and capacity to improve long-term integration and foster welcoming community climates;
(iv) collect and disseminate immigrant integration data, policies, and programs that affect numerous executive departments and agencies, as well as State and local governments and nongovernmental actors; (v) conduct outreach to representatives of nonprofit organizations, State and local government agencies, elected officials, and other interested persons that can assist with the Task Force's development of recommendations;
(vi) work with Federal, State, and local entities to measure and strengthen equitable access to services and programs for new Americans, consistent with applicable law; and
(vii) share information with and communicate to the American public regarding the benefits that result from integrating new Americans into communities.
What Is Integration?

“What Immigrant integration is a dynamic, two-way process in which newcomers and the receiving society work together to build secure, vibrant, and cohesive communities. As an intentional effort, integration engages and transforms all community members, reaping shared benefits and creating a new whole that is greater than the sum of its parts.”

Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees
2006 Immigrant Integration Toolkit (six domains identified)
The Refugee Integration Survey and Evaluation (RISE)

Gary Lichtenstein, Ed.D., QED Principal & Lead Evaluator
Jini Puma, Ph.D.
Laurie Bennett, J.D., Ph.D.
Martin L. Tombari, Ph.D.
Maggie Miller, M.S., QED Project Manager
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RISE Overview: What It Is

- Five year project with four years of data collection and analysis.
- Longitudinal—same participants each year (only effort we are aware of involving a longitudinal sample of refugees in the U.S.).
- Mixed-methods: survey + interviews.
- Participants: All (consenting) adult refugees from Bhutan, Burma, Somalia and Iraq who arrived in Denver in FY 2011.
- Baseline survey and data analysis through FY 2012 (N=467).
- Retention rate through FY 2013 (Baseline to +1 Year): 78.6% (367).
- Retention rate through FY 2014 (Baseline to +2 Year): 72.8% (340).
- Retention rate FY 2013 through FY 2014 (+1 through +2): 92.6%.
- Focus groups and cognitive interviews enrich the findings and improve the RISE survey.
RISE Overview: What It Is

- Refugee Integration Survey, based on Ager & Strang (2004 and 2008), assessing 10 integration domains (first effort to develop a survey instrument based on this integration framework).
- Project to understand and measure refugee integration progress overall and within each of multiple domains, yielding an Overall Integration score of low, medium, and high integration.
- Refugee centric, based on their self-reporting within a pre-defined framework.
- Relies on Community Connectors, a network of embedded community members who track refugee participants and administer the survey.
- Based on understanding that refugee integration is long-term, with no established metrics for outcomes.
RISE Overview: What It Is Not

- Not program or performance evaluation (NOT about PRM or ORR).
- Not about establishing metrics for initial refugee resettlement services that are front loaded and focus on self-sufficiency in the short term after initial reception and placement.
- Not a measure of benefits to receiving community
- Not a measure about shared benefits for community of refugee resettlement (premature for force multipliers).
- Not Likert Scale scoring.
RISE Questions

1. Assuming that the term “integration” is operationally defined as a refugee’s progress [holistic, asymmetrical and incremental] over time along ten pathways or domains, to what extent have refugees become integrated into Colorado during their first four years here?

2. How do demographic factors such as gender, age, and country of origin, relate to integration?

3. How does integration relate to refugees’ level of self-sufficiency by the end of their first four years in Colorado?

4. How does integration relate to refugees’ sense of well-being by the end of their first four years in Colorado?
RISE is Community-Based Research

- RISE arises from issues shared by Colorado Refugee Services Program (CRSP) and the arriving refugee community.
- The RISE survey was developed in collaboration with CRSP, Volags, and Community Connectors.
- CRSP, Volags, and Community Connectors advise on data collection.
- Results are shared with CRSP, Community Connectors, and refugee service organizations.
### The RISE Survey

#### 10 Integration Pathways Assessed

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Employment &amp; Economic Sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Education &amp; Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Children’s Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Well-Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Social Bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Social Bridging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Language &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Safety and Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Integration Score**

QED interviews suggest that no one is more concerned about successful integration than refugees themselves.
RISE Survey: Sample items

Employment & Economic Self-Sufficiency
- Are you currently employed for pay?
- What is the total number of hours you work each week?
- What is your average monthly net income (all sources)?
- What is your family’s average monthly net income?
- Is your family’s monthly net income sufficient to cover rent, food, and other expenses necessary for daily living?

Language & Cultural Knowledge
- Which of the following best describes your (spoken) English skill?
- Do you listen to English language radio or watch English language TV?
- What is the city where the White House and Congress are located?
- Have you visited any famous places in Colorado or the United States? (If yes, name 1 place.)
- Do you know how to use the internet? If yes, approximately how many hours per week?
The RISE Survey: Features

- 82 items total, distributed in ten domains, each domain comprises 4-16 items (mean=8).
- Average 25 minutes to administer orally in respondent’s language through Community Connectors.
- Domains have 2 types of items: core and auxiliary. Core items (at least three per domain) contribute to a domain-level score. Auxiliary items gather supplemental information, but are not scored.
- Each question represents a touch point for potential mainstream engagement and integration.
- Core item scoring: no = 0 and yes = 1.
- Average vs. mean scoring gives extra weight to some domains.
- Because integration is holistic, asymmetrical and incremental, the overall score is more reliable than any single domain.
Survey Administrations

Administration Year, # Respondents, and % Response from Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration Year</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>% Response from Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline 2011-12</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+1 2012-13</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+2 2013-14</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+3 2014-15</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents

• All 2011, newly arrived adult, consenting refugees from the following countries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>% of Sample at Baseline (N=467)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>58% (271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>33% (154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>4% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5% (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The same respondents take the survey each year.
• Beginning 2014-15, QED is no longer collecting data from Iraqi and Somali respondents, due to low sample sizes.
The RISE Survey: Tweaking

Some items have been revised or dropped each year based on...:

- A back-translation study using a different company than the one that created the original survey.
- Feedback from Community Connectors, CRSP professionals, and Volag Case Managers.
- Interviews with respondents (in respondent’s language, using interpreters).
- Cognitive interviews: 1-on-1 speak-aloud protocols with refugee respondents on selected items that produced questionable or anomalous results.
Cognitive Interviews: Examples

Original Survey Item:
38. Have you visited a doctor for a routine physical exam within the past year?

Respondents’ interpretations:
At Baseline, some respondents included the initial arrival screening and others did not.

Item Change:
No change. Respondents understood the item but varied as to whether the initial screening was a routine physical exam. Recode Baseline data—all arriving refugees were screened. Keep item as-is for following administrations.
Cognitive Interviews: Examples

Original Survey Item:
12. Have you obtained a license or certificate that qualifies you for a specific kind of job in the United States?

Respondents’ interpretations:
Interpreter: Certificate is something she [respondent] gets when she goes thru some kind of training but understands license as something like a driver’s license. They are different.”

Item Change:
Remove “license or” because most respondents associated the word “license” with a “driver’s license” and not a job certificate.
Cognitive Interviews: Examples

Original Survey Item:
74. Do you trust your neighbors?

Respondents’ interpretations:
• **Interpreter:** He said his neighbor is on either side of his apartment. He said he wouldn’t trust his neighbors with his keys.
• **Interpreter:** She said if it is a Nepali neighbor she would trust them to even pick up their children or watch them. She said no—that question is difficult to answer.

Item Change:
Remove question from survey; not a good question; Most people interpreted the meaning of “neighbor” differently and they questioned “trust with what?...my kids, the keys to my apartment?”
RISE Analyses

So far, we’re trying to learn as much as we can about the survey, which will inform what we learn about integration.

- Is it reliable?
- Is it accurate?
- Is it meaningful?
- Is it relevant?
- Do respondents understand the questions the way we intend them to?
- Overall, does the survey work?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISE Analyses So Far</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Study the profile of responses within and across domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Check Cronbach’s alpha reliability (consistency of responses) within each domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Assess adequacy of response options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Experiment with scoring metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some RISE Findings: Survey

1. Survey items translated as expected into each target language.

- The survey was drafted in a formal register, above the education level of most respondents. If we were starting over, we would use an informal register. This issue is mitigated by oral administration by trained CC’s.
2. As we begin our fourth year of data collection, we believe that survey items are working well.

- Advice from CRSP professionals, Community Connectors, professional translators, and our own analyses of the data enabled us to refine items that were problematic, and/or eliminate items that weren’t working well.
Some RISE Findings: Survey

3. Domain-level scores seem to be working well.

- Having just completed analyses of Baseline and +2 Yr data, we are optimistic that the domain scoring is effective. We will be experimenting with using a total sum vs. average of all items in a domain.
Some RISE Findings: Survey

4. The Overall Integration Score seems to be effective statistically.

- The summed Overall Integration Score seems to be capturing growth. Patterns of results are as would be expected. Refugees are beginning to “fan out” along an integration continuum from Low, Medium, and High Integrators.
- Qualitative data (in the current year) will help us understand the meaning of these categories.
The RISE Survey: Scoring

• Core items provide domain-level scores
• Domain-level scores can be summed into an
  Overall Integration Score

Employment + Education + Children’s Education
  + Health + Housing + Social Bonding + Social Bridging
  + Language & Culture + Safety + Civic Engagement

= Overall Integration Score
RISE Findings: Survey

- Low Integration = 0-16
- Medium Integration = 17-24
- High Integration = 25-44

Mean Integration Scores

Baseline          | B+1    | B+2    
------------------|--------|--------
Low Integration   | 14.6   |        
Medium Integration|        | 22.4   
High Integration  |        | 24.8   

RISE Findings: Survey

The sample as a whole has steadily progressed from low integration at Baseline, to medium integration at Baseline +1, to high integration at Baseline +2.
As expected, integration improves from Baseline to 2-Year Follow-Up

Distribution of Low, Medium, and High Integrators at Baseline, B+1, and B+2
Factors That Affect Integration: Demographics

- Gender
- Country of Origin
- Age

Take Away #1: The RISE survey is a psychometrically sound instrument that can be used for data-driven decision-making. Refugee integration can be assessed by key demographics, such as country of origin, English language skills, gender, and age.
Factors That Affect Integration: **GENDER**

Although men have higher integration scores than women, men and women are progressing towards integration at the same rate.
Factors That Affect Integration:
Country of Origin

Refugees from Bhutan progress towards integration faster than those from Burma.
Refugees who are 55 and older progress at significantly slower rates than younger refugees.
RISE Identified 4 Patterns of Integration

**High Integration**
- Average age 28, high scores on Employment & Economic Sufficiency, no children.
- Average age 36, high score on Social Bridging, with children.

**Low Integration**
- Access health care and have high score on Safety & Stability.
- Do not engage any integration pathway and have extremely low score on Safety & Stability.

Although age is a statistically significant factor in low integration, the fact is that low integrators span the age spectrum.
Take Away #2: The RISE survey can identify patterns of successful and unsuccessful integration, leading to more efficient targeting of refugee funds and services.
2 Patterns of HIGH Integration

Cluster 1: High Integrators with No Children
Cluster 2: High Integrators with Children (n = 58)
Two Patterns of LOW Integration

Cluster 3: Low Integrators Who Access Health Care and Feel Safe (n = 101)
Cluster 4: Very Low Integrators Who do Not Engage in Any Pathway (n = 30)
Transportation Affects Integration

• 15% of respondents report that transportation is a barrier to taking English Language classes.
• 36% of respondents reported that transportation was their biggest barrier to finding and keeping jobs.
These two pathways had the highest correlations with other Integration pathways.

- Every respondent with whom we spoke commented on the importance of learning English.
- At B+2, 48% of refugees report that they can speak English fluently or in most social and work situations, compared to 42% at B+1 and 13% at Baseline.

- **Language & Cultural Knowledge**: When I new arrived here I don't understand anything...It was really hard for me to understand English language. It has been 3 years now I understand and my speaking has become better. The best for me. Even before when have a phone rings I could not answer right away because if someone speak English, and I cannot respond right away and I do not know how to speak to them. Now it is easy.

- **Social Bridging**: It helps to meet people through your kids. If we go to the park with kids and see their friend with parent we meet them....Different people, people from here and from Somali and people who speak Spanish.
Pathways That Predict Integration

**Safety & Stability**
- Safety & Stability has low to moderate—but significant—correlations with most other pathways. High integrators feel safe. Low integrators are distinguished by those who feel safe vs. those who don’t.

**Health & Physical Well-Being**
- Although Health & Physical Well-Being is a pathway for some, across the entire sample, accessing health care is negatively correlated with Overall Integration.
• In B+2, 83% of refugees report being employed >30 hrs/wk, compared to 82% at B+1 and 69% at Baseline.

• Employment & Economic Sufficiency is correlated with Overall Integration for many, but not all refugees. The variable does not explain Overall Integration among women and those over 55 years old.

• QED has identified four distinct integration patterns across the refugee sample. Each has distinct supports and challenges, which cannot be captured by any single indicator.

Take Away #3: An Integration framework provides a fuller picture of refugee resettlement than focusing on jobs and income alone.
Conclusion: Talking Points

a. The RISE survey reliably and validly assesses integration progress of refugees from arrival through year 4.

b. RISE is the first of its kind longitudinal study of refugees, made possible by embedded community members who administer the instrument in respondents’ home language.

c. RISE shows that men and women integrate at the same pace, but men start out higher than women do.

d. RISE shows that Bhutanese refugees are integrating more quickly than those from Burma.

e. RISE shows that refugees 55 and older provide critical financial and home-based support to younger family members, but face difficult challenges in terms of finding work, negotiating health care, and learning English.
Conclusion: Talking Points (cont’d)

f. RISE analyses identifies four distinct patterns of refugee integration:

1) High integrators who score high on Employment & Economic Sufficiency and Education and Training with a mean age of 28 years old who have no children.

2) High integrators with a mean age of 36 who have children and score high on Social Bridging.

3) Low integrators (all ages) who access health care and score high on Safety & Stability.

4) Low integrators (all ages) who access health care, do not engage any pathway, and who score extremely low on Safety & Stability.
Summary & Conclusions: The RISE Evaluation

1. The RISE survey is a psychometrically sound instrument that can be used for data-driven decision-making. Refugee integration can be assessed by key demographics, such as country of origin, English language skills, gender, and age.

2. The RISE survey can identify patterns of successful and unsuccessful integration, leading to more efficient targeting of refugee funds and services.

3. An Integration framework provides a fuller picture of refugee resettlement than focusing on jobs and income alone.
6 Facts You Can Share with Stakeholders About the RISE Survey

1. The RISE Survey is a strong instrument, conforming to high standards of effectiveness in academic and evaluation research.
2. The survey effectively measures 10 integration pathways.
3. Scoring effectively identifies the integration level of groups and individuals. Results are more precise for groups than for individuals.
4. Overall Integration score is a stronger measure than any specific pathway score.
5. In order to yield effective results, the survey must be administered orally and conform to QED’s scoring process.
6. The survey continues to strengthen: items are added, revised or removed to improve information.
Next Steps:
Some Evaluation Questions

- Analyzing survey results, can we further streamline the instrument by trimming core and auxiliary items that are not explanatory?
- Through interviews and focus groups, can we get a picture of what Low, Medium, and High Integration “look like” in the lives of refugees in our sample?
- Using survey data, can we identify domains that are early indicators of Low, Medium and High Integration?
- Through survey analyses and interviews, can we determine which is the more effective method of creating Overall Integration Scores: domain means or summed scores?
GREETINGS from the NEW ECONOMY
Making the New Economy Real: How do you do it?

Three key goals:
- Restoring equitable distribution
- Restoring ecological balance
- Restoring democratic community

Three key strategies:
- Decentralization (subsidiarity)
- Democratic planning (especially at regional and local levels)
- Democratization of Wealth (pre-distribution) *(Community Wealth Building)*
Key Principles for Building Community

• Start with values
• Develop productive assets
• Grow enterprises
• Lead with demand
• Strengthen support networks
• Anchor ownership in community
• Keep wealth local
Democratization of Wealth
Community Wealth Building

- Promotes common ownership of productive assets
- Anchors capital and jobs locally
- Stops the leakage of dollars from communities
- Supports individual and family wealth building
- Generates revenues to finance public services
- Leverages anchor institutions for community benefit
- Contributes to local economic stability
# Continuum of Wealth-Building Strategies

**Broadening Ownership over Assets and Capital**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Wealth Building</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>Community/Worker Ownership</th>
<th>Public Ownership or Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Development Accounts</td>
<td>Community Land Trusts</td>
<td>Anchor institutions (eds, meds, churches, museums, libraries)</td>
<td>Municipal enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microenterprise</td>
<td>Limited Equity Housing Cooperatives</td>
<td>ESOPs or worker cooperatives</td>
<td>State &amp; local venture investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self-Sufficiency Program</td>
<td>Deed restriction (inclusionary zoning)</td>
<td>Consumer, producer, or purchasing co-ops</td>
<td>Public pension fund ETIs (economically targeted investments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Baby Bonds” &amp; child savings accounts</td>
<td>Mixed ownership (Market Creek)</td>
<td>Credit unions</td>
<td>Public leases: land &amp; transit development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income Tax Credit volunteer assistance programs</td>
<td>Program-Related Investments</td>
<td>Community corporations</td>
<td>Stock warrants in exchange for granting tax breaks (fair exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to predatory lending</td>
<td>CDC/CDFI equity investments or joint ventures</td>
<td>CDC or CDFI direct ownership</td>
<td>Trustee ownership (e.g., Alaska Permanent Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit financial education programs</td>
<td>Community benefits agreements</td>
<td>Social enterprises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Commons-based enterprises (e.g., Wikipedia, Creative Commons licenses)

An Integrated Community Wealth Approach

Key Components

- Individual wealth building
- Community ownership
- Anchor Institutions

Putting the Pieces Together

- Create culture of wealth building and ownership at the individual level
- Create community owned enterprises that provide living wage jobs and anchor business in low-income communities
- Link community businesses with anchor procurement needs
What is an Anchor Institution?

- Education, medical, municipal, philanthropic, cultural, religious, financial institutions
- “Sticky capital” that doesn’t get up and leave
- Typically among the largest employers in most major metropolitan areas
- Local economic engines: employ large numbers of people; purchase large amounts of goods & services
- Vested interest in surrounding communities
- Increasingly concerned with sustainability
- Typically public or non-profit “social mission”
- Largely untapped potential
Anchor strategies that are effective and transformative have a common framework that includes being:

- Place-based – geography and demography brokered by a trusted intermediary
- Institutionally embedded – across all functions and framings of the anchor institution
- Comprehensive – strategies that address:
  - Placemaking
  - Personnel
  - Procurement
  - Policy
  - Planning
Anchor Institutions: Hospitals

Section 501(r), added to the IRS Code by the ACA, imposes four new requirements on 501(c)(3) organizations that operate one or more hospital facilities on a facility-by-facility basis:

• Establish written financial assistance and emergency medical care policies.
• Limit amounts charged for emergency or other medically necessary care to individuals eligible for assistance under the hospital's financial assistance policy.
• Make reasonable efforts to determine whether an individual is eligible for assistance under the hospital’s financial assistance policy before engaging in extraordinary collection actions against the individual.
• Conduct a **Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA)** and adopt an implementation strategy at least once every three years. The ACA also added new section 4959, which imposes an excise tax for failure to meet the CHNA requirements, and added reporting requirements under section 6033(b) related to sections 501(r) and 4959.
Anchor Institutions: Financial Institutions

- Philanthropic Impact Investment: the other 95%  
  (Doing well and doing good)
- Financial Inclusion: the missing 28%  
  (Public and private efforts aimed at bringing underserved consumers into the financial mainstream)
- The New Markets Tax Credit Program (NMTC Program): the angel investors for 39%  
  (“Community capitalism = for-profit, business-driven expansion of investment, job creation, and economic opportunities in distressed communities, with government and the community sectors playing key supportive roles.”)
Braided Funding (Collective Impact)

• Braids (combines / leverages) between organizations:
  o Funding streams
  o Funding Strategies
  o Funding Outcomes
• Balances deficits and assets
  (one person’s ceiling is another person’s floor)
Volunteers of America
Visiting Nurses Association
As needed older adult programs available through AAA partners

AAA COMMUNITY
• Coordinate outreach to ethnic communities through trusted navigators
• Link older refugees through navigators to mainstream services that promote health, independence and naturalization

RESOURCE SPECIALIST
• Adapt existing mainstream and refugee resources to link with older refugees
• Coordinate access to specific programs through Aurora Center for Active Adults
• Document and report project activities and outcomes

Classes and Services: exercise, nutrition, healthy movement, massage, counseling, cooking, computers, sewing and quilting, literacy, naturalization, ESL, peer mentoring, taxes, day trips, etc.

COLORADO AFRICAN ORGANIZATION (CAO)

Voluntary Agencies
Spring Institute for Intercultural Learning

COMMUNITY NAVIGATOR COORDINATOR

Bhutanese Navigators And Communities
Burmesse Navigators And Communities
African Navigators And Communities

AURORA CENTER for ACTIVE ADULTS (ACAA)
Did We Succeed?
Qualitative Measure of Success with Receiving Communities

http://vimeo.com/53238186
Contact Information

www.gcjfcs.org
E: partnership@gcjfcs.org    T: 305-275-1930