

Participant Handouts

Here, you'll find the handouts used in each of the presentations:

WORKSHOP HANDOUTS

1. Personal Experiences, Public Issues: Refugees, Immigrants, and You
 - Challenges & Opportunities Chart
2. Uncovering [Im]migrant Voices: Exploring the Narratives of the Uprooted
 - [Im]migrant Distinctions
 - Journey of a Refugee
 - Art Samples (separate PDF file, we encourage facilitators to find their own art to use)
3. "To Legalize or Not to Legalize?": Refugee and Immigrant Political Debates
 - Myths and Facts Sheet
 - [Im]migration Timeline
4. Your Service Toolkit: A Roundtable Discussion on the Essential Skills for Working with Refugees and Immigrants
 - Organizational Flow Chart
5. La Plaza Comunitaria: A Model for Empowering Migrant Workers
 - (Organization's materials not included)
6. "What Now?" Panel: Making an IMPACT for Refugees and Immigrants
 - N/A

Challenges & Opportunities Chart

To frame our goals throughout the track, let's think about the challenges and opportunities for each of these groups. We'll come back to this chart throughout the track.

WORKSHOP I

	CHALLENGES	OPPORTUNITIES
<i>Refugees & Immigrants</i>		
<i>Volunteers</i>		
<i>Support Agencies</i>		

[Im]migrant Distinctions

Before entering into deeper discussions of the issues, let's get informed about the terms.

WORKSHOP 2

Immigrant

a person who comes to a country to permanently settle from another country.

Refugee

a person outside of the United States who seeks protection on the grounds that he or she fears persecution in his or her homeland. To attain refugee status, the person must prove that he or she has a "well-founded fear of persecution" on the basis of at least one of five internationally-recognized grounds: race, religion, membership in a social group, political opinion, or national origin.

Exile

a person who is voluntarily absent from their home country, or a person who has been expelled from their home country.

Asylum Seeker

a person in the United States or at a port of entry who seeks protection on the grounds of persecution or a "well-founded fear of persecution."

Internally Displaced Person (IDP)

a person who has been forced to flee his/her home because of war or fear of persecution, but remains in their home country.

Myths v. Facts

This resource is produced by the Immigrant Rights' Project and counteracts some of the common misconceptions about refugee and immigrant groups. To view the full resource and its citations, go to: http://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/immigrants/myths_facts_jan2008.pdf#page=1.

WORKSHOP 3

MYTH: Immigrants are a drain on our social services.

FACT: By paying taxes and Social Security, immigrants contribute far more to government coffers than they use in social services.

In its landmark report published in 1997—arguably the most thorough national study to date of immigration's fiscal impacts—the National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences concluded that on average, immigrants generate public revenue that exceeds their public costs over time—approximately \$80,000 more in taxes than they receive in state, federal and local benefits over their life times.¹ This same conclusion was reached in 2007 by the Council of Economic Advisers in their report to the Executive Office of the President where they state that “the long-run impact of immigration on public budgets is likely to be positive,” and agree with the NRC report's view that “only a forward-looking projection of taxes and government spending can offer an accurate picture of the long-run fiscal consequences of admitting new immigrants.”²

Indeed, most non-citizens are not even eligible for the majority of welfare programs unless they are legal permanent residents and have resided in the United States legally for at least five years. This includes benefits such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), SSI, Medicaid, and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP).

Moreover, according to government reports, noncitizens are much less likely than citizens to use the benefits for which they are eligible. For example, immigrants, especially the undocumented, tend to use medical services much less than the average American.³ In fact, the average immigrant uses less than half the dollar amount of health care services as the average native-born citizen.⁴ Moreover, the claim that immigrants account for high rates of emergency room (ER) visits is refuted by research; in fact, communities with high rates of ER usage tend to have relatively small percentages of immigrant residents.

Likewise, according to Department of Agriculture reports, noncitizens who are eligible for food stamps are significantly less likely to use them than are all other individuals who are eligible for the program. For example, about 45 percent of eligible noncitizens received food stamps in 2002, compared to almost 60 percent of eligible individuals overall.⁵

Most of the fiscal impact from immigration is felt at the state and local levels. The Council of Economic Advisors points out in its report to the Executive Office of the President that “the positive fiscal impact tends to accrue at the federal level, but the net costs tend to be concentrated at the state and local level,” which bear primary responsibility for providing not only health care but education.⁶

Still, according to recent studies from a number of cities and states—including the states of Arizona, Texas, Minnesota, California, New York, North Carolina and Arkansas, and cities or counties of Chicago and Santa Clara—while the cost of educating the children of immigrants may be high, the overall economic benefits of immigrants to the states remain positive.⁷ A University of Illinois study found that undocumented immigrants in the Chicago metropolitan area alone spent \$2.89 billion in 2001, stimulating an additional \$5.45 billion in total local spending and sustaining 31,908 jobs in the local economy.⁸

The Udall Center at the University of Arizona found that the fiscal costs of immigrants, starting with education, totaled \$1.41 billion in 2004, which, balanced against \$1.64 billion in state tax revenue attributable to immigrants as workers, resulted in a fiscal gain of \$222.6 million.⁹ Similarly, in its Special Report about undocumented immigrants in Texas, the Comptroller of

Public Accounts found that in 2005, even counting the costs associated with education, “the state revenues collected from undocumented immigrants exceed what the state spent on services, with the difference being \$424.7 million.”¹⁰

MYTH: Immigrants have a negative impact on the economy and the wages of citizens and take jobs away from citizens.

FACT: Immigration has a positive effect on the American economy as a whole and on the income of native-born workers.

In June 2007, the President’s Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) issued a report on “Immigration’s Economic Impact.” Based on a thorough review of the literature, the Council concluded that “immigrants not only help fuel the Nation’s economic growth, but also have an overall positive effect on the American economy as a whole and on the income of native-born American workers.”¹¹ Among the report’s key findings were that, on average, U.S. natives benefit from immigration in that immigrants tend to complement natives, not substitute for them. Immigrants have different skills, which allow higher-skilled native workers to increase productivity and thus increase their incomes. Also, as the native-born U.S. population becomes older and better educated, young immigrant workers fill gaps in the low-skilled labor markets.¹²

With respect to wages, in a 1997 study, the National Research Council estimated the annual wage gain due to immigration for U.S. workers to be \$10 billion each year.¹³ In 2007 CEA estimated the gain at over \$30 billion per year.¹⁴ The CEA acknowledges that an increase in immigrant workers is likely to have some negative impact on the wages of low-skilled native workers, but they found this impact to be relatively small and went on to conclude that reducing immigration “would be a poorly-targeted and inefficient way to assist low-wage Americans.”¹⁵

In addition to having an overall positive effect on the average wages of American workers, an increase in immigrant workers also tends to increase employment rates among the native-born. According to a Pew Hispanic Center study, between 2000 and 2004 “there was a positive correlation between the increase in the foreign-born population and the employment of native-born workers in 27 states and the District of Columbia.” These states included all the major destination states for immigrants and together they accounted for 67% of all native-born workers.¹⁶ California, for example, saw an increase in wages of natives by about four percent from 1990 to 2004—a period of large influx of immigrants to the state—due to the complementary skills of immigrant workers and an increase in the demand for tasks performed by native workers.¹⁷

MYTH: Immigrants—particularly Latino immigrants—don’t want to learn English.

FACT: Immigrants, including Latino immigrants, believe they need to learn English in order to succeed in the United States, and the majority uses at least some English at work.

Throughout our country’s history, critics of immigration have accused new immigrants of refusing to learn English and to otherwise assimilate. These charges are no truer today than they were then. As with prior waves of immigrants, there is a marked increase in English-language skills from one immigrant generation to the next.¹⁸ In the first ever major longitudinal study of the children of immigrants, in 1992 Rambaut and Portes found that “the pattern of linguistic assimilation prevails across nationalities.” The authors go on to report that “the linguistic outcomes for the third generation—the grandchildren of the present wave of immigrants—will be little different than what has been the age-old pattern in American immigration history.”¹⁹

While many first-generation Latino immigrants are unable to speak English, 88 percent of their U.S.-born adult children report that they speak English very well. ²⁰ And studies show that the number rises dramatically for each subsequent generation. Furthermore, similar to other immigrants, Latinos believe that they need to learn English in order to succeed in the United States, and believe they will be discriminated against if they don’t.²¹ Most Latino immigrants (67%) report that they use at least some English at work.²²

California's second-generation immigrants experience a large drop in "low levels of English proficiency" compared to first generation immigrants, from 27% to 6%, and the proportion of immigrants with high levels of English proficiency rises from 49% in the first generation to 79% in the second generation. The proportion of both Asian and Latino immigrants, who speak English exclusively rises from 10% in the first generation to 29% in the second and 94% in the third.²³

Notwithstanding the current levels of English language acquisition for the newest wave of immigrants, there is a demand for English language classes that far exceeds the supply and which, if met, would greatly advance immigrants' integration into American social and cultural life.

MYTH: Immigrants don't want to become citizens.

FACT: Many immigrants to the United States seek citizenship, even in the face of difficult requirements and huge backlogs that can delay the process for years.

Most immigrants are ineligible to apply for citizenship until they have resided in the U.S. with lawful permanent resident status for five years, have passed background checks, have shown that they have paid their taxes, are of "good moral character, demonstrate knowledge of U.S. history and civics, and have the ability to understand, speak and write English." In addition, people applying for naturalization have to pay a fee, which increased by 69% in 2007 from \$400 to \$675, making it much harder for low-income immigrants to reach their dream of becoming Americans.²⁴

Despite these barriers, The Pew Hispanic Center's report on U.S. Census data shows that the proportion of eligible immigrants who have acquired citizenship rose to 52% in 2005, "the highest level in a quarter of a century."¹⁵ In the 2007 fiscal year, DHS received 1.4 million citizenship applications—nearly double from last fiscal year²⁶—and between June and July of 2007, naturalization applications increased 350% compared to last year.²⁷ In his testimony to Congress, US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Director, Emilio Gonzalez, referred to this increase as "unprecedented in the history of immigration services in our nation."²⁸

Yet, despite the promise by USCIS that backlogs would be eliminated, applications for naturalization can take a year and half to adjudicate and of the 1.4 applications it received in 2007, less than 660,000 have been decided.²⁹

MYTH: Immigrants don't pay taxes.

FACT: Almost all immigrants pay income taxes even though they can't benefit from most federal and state local assistance programs and all immigrants pay sales and property taxes.

According to the 2005 Economic Report of the President, "more than half of all undocumented immigrants are believed to be working 'on the books'...[and]... contribute to the tax rolls but are ineligible for almost all Federal public assistance programs and most major Federal-state programs." According to the report, undocumented immigrants also "contribute money to public coffers by paying sales and property taxes (the latter are implicit in apartment rentals)."³⁰

All immigrants (legal and undocumented) pay the same real estate taxes and the same sales and other consumption taxes as everyone else. The University of Illinois at Chicago found in 2002 that undocumented immigrants in the Chicago metro area spent \$2.89 billion annually from their earnings and these expenditures generated \$2.56 billion additional spending for the local economy.³¹

Legal immigrants pay income taxes and indeed many undocumented immigrants also pay income taxes or have taxes automatically withheld from their paychecks—even though they are unable to claim a tax refund, Social Security benefits or other welfare benefits that these taxes support. In the Chicago metro area for example, approximately seventy percent of undocumented workers paid payroll taxes, according to the University of Illinois study from 2002.³² In the Washington Metro Region, immigrants paid the same share of the region's overall taxes (18 percent)

as the rest of the population (17.4 percent), according to a 2006 Urban Institute study.³³ This study also points to the fact that immigrants' tax payments support both local and state services in addition to the federal government.

The Social Security Administration (SSA) holds that undocumented immigrants "account for a major portion" of the billions of dollars paid into the Social Security system—an estimated \$520 billion as of October 2005.³⁴ The SSA keeps a file called the "earnings suspense file" on all earnings with incorrect or fictitious Social Security numbers and the SSA's chief actuary stated in 2005 that "three quarters of other-than-legal immigrants pay payroll taxes."³⁵ Their figures show that the suspense file is growing by more than \$50 billion a year, generating \$6 to 7 billion in Social Security tax revenue and about \$1.5 billion in Medicare taxes.

MYTH: Immigrants send all their money back to their home countries instead of spending money here.

FACT: Immigrants do send money to family members, making it possible for more people to stay in their home countries rather than migrating to the United States. Importantly, sending remittances home does not keep immigrants from spending money in the United States.

It's true that remittances are the biggest sources of foreign currency for most Latin American countries and surpass any amount of foreign aid sent by the U.S. The money sent by immigrants to their family members allows many people to stay in their home countries who might otherwise feel compelled to migrate to the U.S.

And while 51 percent of Latino immigrants send remittances home,³⁶ they are spending their money in the United States as well. In fact, a 1998 study found that immigrants become net economic contributors after 10 to 15 years in the U.S.³⁷

In addition to paying taxes and Social Security, immigrants spend money on goods and services in the United States. A study of Latino immigrants in California found significant gains in home ownership between those who had been in this country for ten years (16.4 percent are homeowners) and those who had been here for over thirty years (64.6 percent).³⁸ Furthermore, a 2002 Harvard University study of U.S. Census data found that there were more than 5.7 million foreign-born homeowners in the United States.³⁹ The study found that foreign-born new homeowners are buying their homes by saving more than native-born homebuyers and stretching their incomes more.

While homeownership nationally was approximately 69% in 2006, it was 60% for Asians and 50% for Latinos—each group with large immigrant populations and therefore greater impediments to obtaining bank loans.⁴⁰ Although homeownership is largely correlated with legal status in the U.S., undocumented immigrants are also buying into the "American Dream" of homeownership in some of the most expensive housing markets in the country.⁴¹

MYTH: Immigrants bring crime to our cities and towns.

FACT: Immigrants are actually far less likely to commit crimes than their native-born counterparts. Even as the undocumented population has increased in the United States, crime rates have decreased significantly.

According to a 2000 report prepared for the U.S. Department of Justice, immigrants maintain low crime rates even when faced with adverse social conditions such as low income and low levels of education.⁴²

Although incarceration rates are highest among young low-income men and many immigrants arriving in the U.S. are young men with low levels of education, incarceration rates among young men are invariably lower for immigrants than for their native-born counterparts. This is true across every ethnic group but the differences are especially noticeable among Mexicans, Salvadorans and Guatemalans, who constitute the majority of undocumented immigrants in the United States. Even in cities with the largest immigrant populations, such as New York, Los Angeles, Chicago and Miami, violent and non-violent crime rates have continued to decline.⁴³

Even after taking into account higher deportation rates since the mid 1990's, and reviewing the 1980 and 1990 censuses, the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) ascertained that, "18-40 year-old male immigrants have lower institutionalization rates than the native born each year...and by 2000, immigrants have institutionalization rates that are one-fifth those of the native born."⁴⁴ In fact, according to the NBER study, the newly arrived immigrants are particularly unlikely to be involved in crime.

Cities like Hazleton, Pennsylvania have tried to blame a new wave of immigrants for a supposed rise in crime. Yet, Hazleton's own crime statistics taken from the Pennsylvania State Police show that overall crime in the city has decreased and is now less than half of the national average.⁴⁵

MYTH: Most immigrants are undocumented and have crossed the border illegally.

FACT: Two thirds of immigrants are here lawfully—either as naturalized citizens or in some other lawful status. Moreover, almost half of all undocumented immigrants entered the United States legally.

According to the Pew Hispanic Center, one third of all immigrants are undocumented, one third have some form of legal status and one third are naturalized citizens. This applies to immigrants from Latin America as well as others.⁴⁶

Almost half of all undocumented immigrants entered the United States on visas that allowed them to reside here temporarily—either as tourists, students, or temporary workers. This means they were subject to inspection by immigration officials before entering the country,⁴⁷ and became undocumented only when their visas expired and they didn't leave the country.

MYTH: Weak border enforcement has led to high rates of undocumented immigration. We should increase enforcement and build a wall around our border.

FACT: Increased border security and the construction of border fences have done little to curb the flow of immigrants across the United States border. Instead, these policies have only succeeded in pushing border crossers into dangerous and less-patrolled regions, and increased the undocumented population by creating an incentive for immigrants not to leave.

Building a wall along the entire 2000-mile southern U.S. border would be prohibitively expensive. According to a study by the Cato Institute, rather than acting as a deterrent to those attempting to cross the border, increased enforcement has only succeeded in pushing immigration flows into more remote, less patrolled regions, resulting in a tripling of the death rate at the border and decreased apprehensions, and creating a dramatic increase in taxpayer money spent on making arrests along the border (from \$300 per arrest in 1992 to \$1,200 per arrest in 2002).⁴⁸

Furthermore, increased border enforcement has actually increased the number of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. at any one time. The increased risk and cost to immigrants of crossing the border has resulted in fewer undocumented immigrants returning to their home countries for periods of time as part of the decades-long circular migration patterns that characterize undocumented immigration from Mexico up until the 1990s. Instead, immigrants stay in the United States for longer periods of time, often choosing to immigrate their families to avoid longer periods of separation.⁴⁹

The Secure Fence Act of 2006 directed the Department of Homeland Security to construct 850 miles of additional border fencing. According to a report by Congressional Research Services, the San Diego fence, combined with increased border patrol agents in the area, succeeded in decreasing border crossing in that region, but at the same time there is considerable evidence that the flow of illegal immigration has shifted to the more remote areas of the Arizona desert, decreasing the number of apprehensions and increasing the cost.⁵⁰

[Im]migration Timeline

Gathered below is a timeline of the major migration policies enacted in the US since 1790.

WORKSHOP 3

1790 - Congress adopts uniform rules so that any free white person could apply for citizenship after two years of residency.

1798 - Alien and Sedition Acts required 14 years of residency before citizenship and provided for the deportation of "dangerous" aliens. Changed to five-year residency in 1800.

1819 - First significant federal legislation on immigration. Includes reporting of immigration and rules for passengers from US ports bound for Europe

1846 - Irish of all classes emigrate to the United States as a result of the potato famine.

1857 - Dred Scott decision declared free Africans non-citizens.

1864 - Contract Labor Law allowed recruiting of foreign labor.

1868 - African Americans gained citizenship with 13th Amendment.

1875 - Henderson v. Mayor of New York decision declared all state laws governing immigration unconstitutional; Congress must regulate "foreign commerce." Charity workers, burdened with helping immigrants, petition Congress to exercise authority and regulate immigration. Congress prohibits convicts and prostitutes from entering the country.

1880 - The U.S. population is 50,155,783. More than 5.2 million immigrants enter the country between 1880 and 1890.

1882 - Chinese Exclusion Act. First federal immigration law suspended Chinese immigration for 10 years and barred Chinese in U.S. from citizenship. Also barred convicts, lunatics, and others unable to care for themselves from entering. Head tax placed on immigrants.

1885 - Contract Labor Law. Unlawful to import unskilled aliens from overseas as laborers. Regulations did not pertain to those crossing land borders.

1888 - For the first time since 1798, provisions are adopted for expulsion of aliens.

1889 - Jane Addams founds Hull-House on Chicago's Near West Side.

1890 - Foreign-born in US were 15% of population (14% in Vermont); more arriving from southern and eastern Europe ("new immigrants") than northern and western ("old immigrants"). Jacob Riis publishes "How the Other Half Lives."

1891 - Bureau of Immigration established under the Treasury Department. More classes of aliens restricted including those who were monetarily assisted by others for their passage. Steamship companies were ordered to return ineligible immigrants to countries of origin.

1892 - Ellis Island opened to screen immigrants entering on east coast. (Angel Island screened those on west coast.) Ellis Island officials reported that women traveling alone must be met by a man, or they were immediately deported.

1902 - Chinese Exclusion Act renewed indefinitely.

1903 - Anarchists, epileptics, polygamists, and beggars ruled inadmissible.

1905 - Construction of Angel Island Immigration Station began in the area known as China Cove. Surrounded by public controversy from its inception, the station was finally put into operation in 1910. Although it was billed as the "Ellis Island of the West", within the Immigration Service it was known as "The Guardian of the Western Gate" and was designed control the flow of Chinese into the country, who were officially not welcome with the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

1906 - Procedural safeguards enacted for naturalization. Knowledge of English becomes a basic requirement.

1907 - Head tax is raised. People with physical or mental defects, tuberculosis, and children unaccompanied by a parent are added to the exclusion list. Japan agreed to limit emigrants to US in return for elimination of segregating Japanese students in San Francisco schools.

1910 - Dillingham Report from Congress assumed inferiority of "new immigrants" from southern and eastern Europe and suggested a literacy test to restrict their entry. (William P. Dillingham was a Senator from Vermont.)

1917 - Immigration Act provided for literacy tests for those over 16 and established an "Asiatic Barred Zone," which barred all immigrants from Asia.

1921 - Quota Act of 1921 limited immigrants to 3% of each nationality present in the US in 1910. This cut southern and eastern European immigrants to less than 1/4 of those in US before WW I. Asians still barred; no limits on western hemisphere. Non-quota category established: wives, children of citizens, learned professionals, and domestic servants not counted in quotas.

1922 - Japanese made ineligible for citizenship.

1924 - Quotas changed to 2% of each nationality based on numbers in US in 1890. Based on surnames (many anglicized at Ellis Island) and not the census figures, 82% of all immigrants allowed in the country came from western and northern Europe, 16% from southern and eastern Europe, 2% from the rest of the world. As no distinctions were made between refugees and immigrants, this limited Jewish emigres during 1930s and 40s. Despite protests from many native people, Native Americans made citizens of the United States. Border Patrol established.

1929 - The annual quotas of the 1924 Act are made permanent.

1940 - Provided for finger printing and registering of all aliens.

1943 - In the name of unity among the Allies, the Chinese Exclusion Laws were repealed, and China's quota was set at a token 105 immigrants annually. Basis of the Bracero Program established with importation of agricultural workers from North, South, and Central America.

1946 - Procedures adopted to facilitate immigration of foreign-born wives, fiancé(e)s, husbands, and children of US armed forces personnel.

1948 - Displaced Persons Act allowed 205,000 refugees over two years; gave priority to Baltic States refugees; admitted as quota immigrants. Technical provisions discriminated against Catholics and Jews; those were dropped in 1953, and 205,000 refugees were accepted as non-quota immigrants.

1950 - The grounds for exclusion and deportation are expanded. All aliens required to report their addresses annually.

1952 - Immigration and Nationality Act eliminated race as a bar to immigration or citizenship. Japan's quota was set at 185 annually. China's stayed at 105; other Asian countries were given 100 a piece. Northern and western Europe's quota was placed at 85% of all immigrants. Tighter restrictions were placed on immigrants coming from British colonies in order to stem the tide of black West Indians entering under Britain's generous quota. Non-quota class enlarged to include husbands of American women.

1953 - The 1948 refugee law expanded to admit 200,000 above the existing limit

1965 - Hart-Celler Act abolished national origins quotas, establishing separate ceilings for the eastern (170,000) and western (120,000) hemispheres (combined in 1978). Categories of preference based on family ties, critical skills, artistic excellence, and refugee status.

1978 - Separate ceilings for Western and Eastern hemispheric immigration combined into a worldwide limit of 290,000.

1980 - The Refugee Act removes refugees as a preference category; reduces worldwide ceiling for immigration to 270,000.

1986 - Immigration Reform and Control Act provided for amnesty for many illegal aliens and sanctions for employers hiring illegals.

1989 - A bill gives permanent status to non-immigrant registered nurses who have lived in US for at least three years and met established certification standards.

1990 - Immigration Act of 1990 limited unskilled workers to 10,000/year; skilled labor requirements and immediate family reunification major goals. Continued to promote nuclear family model. Foreign-born in US was 7%.

1996 - Immigration Act. In an effort to curb illegal immigration, Congress votes to double the U.S. Border Patrol to 10,000 agents over five years and mandates the construction of fences at the most heavily trafficked areas of the U.S.- Mexico border. Congress also approves a pilot program to check the immigration status of job applicants.

2001 - USA Patriot Act amended the Immigration and Nationality Act to broaden the scope of aliens ineligible for admission or deportable due to terrorist activities to include an alien who: (1) is a representative of a political, social, or similar group whose political endorsement of terrorist acts undermines U.S. antiterrorist efforts; (2) has used a position of prominence to endorse terrorist activity, or to persuade others to support such activity in a way that undermines U.S. antiterrorist efforts (or the child or spouse of such an alien under specified circumstances); or (3) has been associated with a terrorist organization and intends to engage in threatening activities while in the United States. The act is currently set to expire May 29, 2011 (after a 90 day extension from February 28, 2011 from Congress).

Organizational Chart

Below you'll find an organizational flow chart for a typical multidimensional refugee/immigrant support agency.

WORKSHOP 4

Refugee Resettlement Flow Chart

Our Goal: Family/Individual Self-Sufficiency

