

NCRP Board of Directors Meeting #2 Summary

21 January 2013

via teleconference, noon ET

Participants: David Hulchanski (Chair), David Ley, Ivan Townshend, Jino Distasio, Damaris Rose, Annick Germain, Bob Murdie, Michelynn Laflèche, Alan Walks, John Stapleton (guest), Emily Paradis (minutes).

Regrets: Jill Grant, Leanne Holt, Valerie Preston, Kathleen Gallagher

Updates

1. PI's Project update (David H.) See document: *PI's Project Update, January 2013*

- No questions or comments.

2. Data committee and joint analysis update (Bob M.) See *Joint Analysis Jan. 19*

- Bob Murdie has been working on the joint analysis with research assistant Jennifer Logan. A document summarizing the work so far was circulated to the NCRP team in advance of this meeting. A Principal Components Analysis has been completed for 8 CMAs (the original six, plus Ottawa and Hamilton). Factor scores are available. Bob will be on vacation until late February so the analysis will be on hold until then.
- Ivan T. requests that output and data files be shared with the team.
- David L. noted that mapping factor scores can assist in communicating findings to partners. It was also noted that this would mean the production of 40 new maps (8 CMAs x 5 factors). Data analyst Richard Maaranen's availability is currently limited due to family health issues.
- Jino D. has co-authored a report on measuring community distress that may be relevant to the joint analysis. It is an internal document that the funder has not released.

→ Output from the analysis will be sent to the Board of Directors, and any other team members who request it, for review.

→ SPSS data files will be sent to the data group. Anyone else who would like to have access to the data can request it as well.

→ David H. and Bob M. will ask Richard M. to make factor score maps a priority.

→ A teleconference for the data committee will be scheduled for after Bob's return.

→ Jino D. will forward the report on community distress to Bob M. For now, it is not for circulation or citation. Jino D. will follow up with the funder to clarify.

3. CMA & Partner updates (CMA leaders & partners)

- **Vancouver:** Another team meeting is planned for February; expecting a subgrant proposal to be presented at that meeting.
- **Calgary:** Is working with partner Federation of Calgary Communities, and looking at other possible partners such as Calgary Poverty Reduction Network; considering a weekend workshop.
- **Winnipeg:** The team has identified strong case studies, and important areas of focus for Winnipeg such as slow growth and policy shifts; putting together a 2-pager to describe trends.
- **Toronto:** Has a number of thematic working groups that are meeting regularly to plan possible projects; expecting proposals in the near future from the working groups on Youth, Crime, and Schooling (Scot Wortley) and Age-Friendly Neighbourhoods (Sheila Neysmith).
- **Montréal:** The partnership with Centraide (Montréal's United Way) is now official. Centraide now has a statistician on staff and will undertake an analysis of the Working Poor data for Montreal with co-investigators from INRS. Damaris Rose will be on sabbatical Feb 1 to July 31; Annick Germain will step in as Montreal leader during this period.
- **United Way Toronto:** Is developing a paper on income inequality. The paper has been reviewed with internal UWT committees and its Board, and the team is currently redrafting it. They will soon to meet with David Hulchanski and other Toronto NCRP advisers to review the new draft.
- **John Stapleton.** Has "working poor" data for NCRP CMAs. It will be updated to 2011 using tax filer data.

4. Funded project: Family Homelessness in Toronto's Inner Suburbs (David H. & Emily P.)

- This \$80,000 project will be led by Emily Paradis. The budget includes funds to second Emily's time; the full \$80,000 counts as matching funds for the NCRP. No questions or discussion.

Issues for Discussion

5. Analysis of individual CMAs by the local teams

- CMA leaders agreed to meet by teleconference to discuss the CMA census data analysis.
- Emily P. will circulate a Doodle poll for dates in February.

6. Filling the remaining seat on Board of Directors

- The Board is currently composed of 13 seats: the PI, six CMA leaders, three activity leaders, and three partners. One seat remains open on the Board for a partner organization.
- David H. proposed to offer the open partner seat to Mamie Hutt-Temoana of the Association of Neighbourhood Houses of BC. She is very experienced and has broad, international networks in the settlement house sector. ANHBC will host the 2014 conference of the

International Federation of Settlements in Vancouver and David H. has already discussed with her the possibility of some joint activity with the NCRP at that conference.

- David H. further proposed that we enlarge the Board to include one partner from each CMA, for better regional representation.
- The question of enlarging the Board will be kept open. It was noted that partners on the Board must have meaningful roles to play, and that enlarging the Board has financial implications for in-person meetings.

→ It was agreed that the remaining seat be offered to ANHBC.

→ It was agreed that options for joining the IFS conference in May 2014 will be explored.

→ David H. and Emily P. will develop a proposal to enlarge the Board for discussion at the next meeting.

7. Reporting partner in-kind and cash contributions

- In late January SSHRC is expected to provide forms for annual reporting of partners' cash and in-kind contributions. Emily P. will send these out to CMA leaders as soon as they are available.
- Partner contributions to the NCRP mainly take the form of in-kind involvement of senior staff in the planning, implementation and dissemination of research (for example, sitting on the Board and project working groups). Contributions might also include providing space for NCRP events, staff time allocated to NCRP projects (for example, recruiting participants, or data analysis), or partner staff travel to NCRP meetings.
- Not all partner involvement must be a contribution. The NCRP budget also allows for reimbursement of partners from the grant when front-line staff are directly involved in research activities.
- CMA leaders are encouraged to bring on other partners as work in the CMAs expands. All in-kind and cash contributions from partners counts toward the 35% the NCRP must raise over the life of the grant.
- The process for adding partners as "official" members of the NCRP is simple: partners complete a SSHRC partnership form and provide a letter of support. Contact Emily P. to receive these documents.

8. Graduate student funding

- The NCRP budget does not currently include any special allocation for funding graduate student theses or other direct student funding.
- Student assistantships should be included in the budget for subgrant proposals.
- It was suggested that the project could consider offering a small amount of funding for the write-up stage only, on a competitive basis, for theses directly related to the NCRP.
- Any proposal to add student funding to the NCRP budget can be brought to a Board meeting.

9. Post-doc positions & the research part of our budget (David H.) see *Memo proposing NCRP offer postdocs*

- David H. circulated the above document to the Board in advance of the meeting. He reviewed the issue and questions it raised, and sought agreement from the Board to go forward with consideration of a potential post-doc candidate, Ben Roth from University of Chicago.
- The group discussed three questions:
 1. Should the NCRP offer post-docs?
 2. If so, should be the process for filling them be by competition or opportunity?
 3. Should the NCRP proceed to consider Ben Roth, and if so, by what process?
- Some noted the advantages to having post-docs, including: a post-doc would be dedicated full-time to advancing a scholarly project within the NCRP; post-docs have an interest in producing and publishing in a short time frame.
- Some also noted disadvantages, including: concerns about role in the NCRP and the fit between a post-docs' project and the goals of the NCRP; high cost that might be better dedicated to research assistants carrying out NCRP projects under co-investigator supervision.
- The group was undecided about selection process. A full search can be very time-consuming, while an opportunity-based process has implications for equity. Members indicated the NCRP should remain open to either, depending on context and timing, with due consideration of equity.
- With regards to the current opportunity, some questioned whether this was the right time to bring on a post-doc, but members expressed interest in learning more about the candidate.
 - The group agreed that David H. would invite Ben Roth to complete the NCRP subgrant proposal form, describing his proposed project and its fit with the NCRP.
 - If he agrees to submit a proposal, it will be reviewed at the next meeting. This review will take into consideration some of the questions raised above, including equity, budget, role in project, timing in overall project, etc.
 - Post-meeting update: Ben Roth accepted a tenure-track position elsewhere. David H. will stay in contact and explore the possibility of him becoming an NCRP co-investigator.

10. Governance Document – see *Governance Agreement revised draft, January 2013*

- Jill Grant identified questions and changes to the Governance Document that require Board discussion.
 - This item deferred to the next meeting.

11. Next in-person meeting

- The group agreed that the NCRP should plan an in-person meeting early in Year Two to share results of the joint analysis and CMA census analysis, and to plan the project's next steps.
 - It was agreed that October 2013 would be preferable to July. It would have to be on a weekend because of teaching obligations.
- Emily P. to circulate a poll.

Next Board teleconference to take place in mid-April. Emily to circulate a poll.

Documents are available under: ABOUT / Documents for Research Team
<http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/about/documents-for-research-team/>