

# DIGNITY & RESPECT FOR ALL FRAMEWORK

## Local Criteria for Successful Poverty Reduction Outcomes

Outcome	Description	Possible Outcome/Measurement
<b>Criteria 1: Adequate assistance levels to support well-being and health</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All essential needs are met beyond bare sustenance – adequate social assistance rates</li> <li>Adequate minimum wage to lift working people out of poverty</li> <li>Social assistance rates and minimum wage indexed at inflation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short term \$100/month increase to all single adult social assistance recipients</li> <li>Social Assistance Rates raised to 80% of Low Income Measure (LIM)</li> <li>Minimum wage raised to 20% above the LIM &amp; support to a living wage</li> </ul>
<b>Criteria 2: Support to all low-income people and for a range of needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essential supports to allow people to access services</li> <li>Improvement and introduction of health related benefits and affordable and supportive housing</li> <li>Funding for free or low-cost services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation, communication, health benefits, childcare subsidies, legal aid</li> <li>Dental and drug coverage for all low income people, people in stable and livable housing, by-law enforcement of low-cost housing</li> <li>Supports for libraries, community centres, computer access points, parks and recreation</li> </ul>
<b>Criteria 3: Human Rights are respected in service delivery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discrete, caring, equal and fair service delivery based on relationship building that does not punish or blame, stressing that everyone has a role to play in society</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feeling heard before applying for assistance</li> <li>Being supported when applying assistance</li> <li>Treated as a partner when receiving assistance</li> <li>Feeling safe when leaving assistance</li> </ul>
<b>Criteria 4: Greater accessibility to and navigation of the system</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information &amp; referral are meaningful</li> <li>Application process is simple and understandable</li> <li>Improved communication e.g. drop-ins, accessible locations, translation, transparent, advocates allowed, system navigation in collaboration with external partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate resources for service delivery</li> <li>Client centred relationship and trust building</li> <li>System navigation and advocacy supports</li> <li>Improvement of the appeal process</li> </ul>
<b>Criteria 5: Employment support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Labour standards enforced</li> <li>Jobs not forced on people</li> <li>Adequate employer support</li> <li>Recognition and compensation for volunteer/civic work</li> <li>Allow recipients to retain more earnings</li> <li>Support in job retention; entrepreneurship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AODA standards within Labour standards</li> <li>Affordable advocacy for non-unionized workers</li> <li>Policies allowing for non-monetary economic citizen contribution</li> <li>Increase in work-related benefits for social assistance recipients</li> <li>Access to training and education</li> </ul>
<b>Criteria 6: Integrated systems and appropriate investment by all orders of government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harmonization of allocations from different levels of government</li> <li>Consistent supports through provincial and municipal funding of programs</li> <li>Collaboration among players in service delivery</li> <li>Standardization of information, communication</li> <li>Consistent eligibility criteria</li> <li>Fair taxation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External review of policies, programs, budgets</li> <li>Integrated plans – cross ministry and governments harmonization</li> <li>No cuts to existing services, reverse cuts to essential supports</li> <li>Adequate funding levels based on local needs</li> <li>Reduced income inequality after government transfer income</li> </ul>
<b>Criteria 7: Underlying assumptions and philosophy of system plans and reforms are not blaming or punitive</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative and judgemental attitudes e.g. stereotypes of lazy welfare bums</li> <li>No emphasis on fraud prevention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External review of key documents, policies, plans and program requirements</li> <li>Adequate support focused on long term gains not short-term costs</li> </ul>
<b>Criteria 8: There are accessible and meaningful ways to participate in the planning, decision making and assessment process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those with lived experience are being heard</li> <li>Looking beyond formal input structures</li> <li>Not assuming technologies and Internet connections are available to people</li> <li>Involving people in decision making, action planning, implementation and evaluation of plans and strategies for poverty reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Importance of an issue</li> <li>Accessible format for deliberation</li> <li>Providing accessible information</li> <li>Ensuring diverse participation</li> <li>Shared leadership</li> <li>Clear future action</li> </ul>

## APPLYING THE LOCAL CRITERIA: HIGHLIGHTS

### More than 20 submissions, presentations and consultations

#### RESPONSE TO THE 2<sup>ND</sup> ONTARIO POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY: Online submission

##### Poverty Free KW Action Group Review – September 2014

<p><b>Criteria 1:</b> Adequate income to support well-being and health</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is imperative to increase the base rate of social assistance to bring all the recipients out of deep poverty and their income above 80% mark of the Low Income Measure</li> <li>• Increase of rates has to be achieved without further cuts or elimination of existing services</li> <li>• Minimum wage should not be considered ‘adequate’ merely because it has reached a set number, but only when it reflects the required purchasing power in an actual geographic area where people live</li> </ul>
<p><b>Criteria 7:</b> Underlying assumptions of system plans and reforms are not blaming or punitive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The emphasis made in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Poverty Reduction Strategy was made on the right of all Ontarians to realize their potential</li> <li>• The language used implies that poverty is a failing of society to provide adequately for its members, rather than being an individual’s fault. It refers to people as “experiencing” or “living” in poverty.</li> <li>• There are still problematic assumptions and language used to present the role of employment and jobs, e.g. on page 4, employment is described as “key to reducing poverty”.</li> </ul>

#### ELECTION ONTARIO 2014 - ANALYSIS OF THE PARTY PLATFORMS: All-candidates sessions in Kitchener

##### Social Planning Council of Kitchener Waterloo Resource Documents – September 2014

<p><b>All the Criteria have been applied to the platforms of the Ontario Liberal Party, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario, Ontario NDP &amp; Ontario Green Party</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Party platforms were assessed if they address policies and plans for poverty reduction</li> <li>• The stated policies and plans were assessed against the specific outcomes for each criteria, for example, when parties were proposing minimum wage increase, the actual increase would be assessed in comparison the locally supported measure of adequacy to lift all working people out of poverty, being an increase that will ensure all full time workers earnings 20% over the Low Income Measure</li> <li>• Party platforms were additionally reviewed in order to identify measures and plans that would indirectly have positive impact on eliminating poverty or improving lives of people living in poverty</li> </ul> <p>Read the analysis of the party platforms at <a href="http://www.waterlooregion.org/ontario-election-2014">http://www.waterlooregion.org/ontario-election-2014</a></p>
--	---

#### SOCIAL JUSTICE TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO (SJTO): New Common Rules of Procedure and Practice Directions, Consultation

##### Poverty Free KW Action Group Submission – June 14, 2013

<p><b>Criteria 8:</b> Accessible and meaningful ways to participate in the planning, decision making and assessment process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commitment to being “responsive to stakeholder needs by engaging in meaningful outreach and consultation” was not practiced</li> <li>• Not getting feedback from service recipients, the SJTO was disrespectful and missed out on valuable feedback</li> <li>• Materials written in less technical language would enable wider participation amongst the general community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited promotion of the SJTO’s consultation suggests input was expected only from the legal community</li> <li>• Limited time frame made it difficult to give meaningful input – with more time and support, local service providers and advocacy groups could have taken steps to facilitate wider inclusion</li> </ul>
---	--	--

#### CASINO CONSULTATION IN KITCHENER: Presentation to the Kitchener City Council

##### Poverty Free KW Action Group Presentation – April 23, 2013

<p><b>Criteria 5:</b> Fair labour market, practices and policies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many jobs associated with casinos are construction jobs (temporary) and mostly for male, relatively low wage and low skill (e.g., cleaning, hospitality), precarious (limited social benefits, insecure, low wages, high risks of ill health)</li> <li>• Staff in casinos have three times higher risk of problem gambling</li> </ul>
<p><b>Criteria 6:</b> Integrated systems and appropriate investment by all orders of government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A casino in Kitchener may increase revenues for the city but will also result in increased expenditures on social problems in the community for individuals, community as a whole, public services – this is not a fair trade off when those who are most vulnerable are the most affected</li> </ul>
<p><b>Criteria 7:</b> Underlying assumptions of system plans and reforms are not blaming or punitive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all populations are at equal risk of problem gambling – this is NOT a moral issue nor matter of personal choices and behavior</li> <li>• High risk populations include: People living in poverty, New Canadians, seniors, those on fixed incomes, young people</li> </ul>