Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership

Project Update, October 2012

David Hulchanski, PI

1. July 2012 initial team meeting follow-up

1.1. **Governance Agreement**. The initial draft was revised based on discussion at the July meeting and the revised copy circulated in mid-August to the team. The Board will review the revised document at its next meeting.

1.2. **First Board meeting scheduled**. The Board of Directors will hold its first meeting via teleconference on Friday **October 19 at 1pm ET**. All team members are welcome to join the meeting. An email will provide a draft agenda and phone access information.

1.3. **Two fulltime project staff**. The University of Toronto paperwork for the project's two fulltime staff has been completed. Emily Paradis, Project Manager, began fulltime on 20 July 2012. Richard Maaranen began full-time on 1 August 2012. He had previously been half-time funded by the University of Toronto. The University will continue funding his position half-time with our project funding the other half. In addition, the cash contribution of $100,000 by the University of Toronto (the Provost's office and Faculty of Social Work) in support of the project is allocated to the project manager's salary. Both Emily and Richard served in similar capacities for the prior grant, a SSHRC Public Outreach Grant focused on Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver, and prior to that, the Toronto Neighbourhood Change CURA with St Christopher House.

1.4. **Six sub-grants issued by our project**. As agreed at the July meeting, a $15,000 start-up, administration, and partnership development budget was allocated to each of the six CMA research teams. The SSHRC sub-grant was issued from our project's budget by the University of Toronto to the local CMA team coordinator. The financial administration of the sub-grant is managed through his/her home university (not the University of Toronto) with the local coordinator serving as the PI of the sub-grant (thereby responsible for its use according to SSHRC regulations.

1.5. **Data group**. An informal small group (professors Bourne, Hulchanski, Murdie, Townshend, Walks) has been directing the work of our Data Analyst. The key activities are described below.

1.6. **Cost of the July 5-6 initial team meeting**: Total cost was near $20,000. Less than we expected. At the July meeting many team members felt the need for more frequent meetings than proposed in the initial draft budget.

2. Census CMA database 1971-2006 – now 11 CMAs

2.1. **Halifax, Winnipeg, and Calgary**. Richard has completed the collection and organization of 35 years of census data for our project's three additional CMA's: Halifax, Winnipeg, and Calgary.

2.2. **Québec City, Ottawa and Edmonton**. Richard also collected the same data for these three additional CMAs. We will provide the data and some limited assistance to research teams if established in any of these CMAs. They will not formally be part of our project and we have no budget to support them. But we do want to encourage similar research elsewhere.

2.3. **Thirty-five year eleven CMA database**. We already had five CMA's in the database when the project began thanks to the two previous related SSHRC grants: Montréal, Toronto, Oshawa, Hamilton, and Vancouver. Though our project is focused on six CMAs, we now have the data available for in-depth comparative analysis of 11 CMAs.

3. Vancouver and Montreal reports -- CMA income trend analysis

3.1. **Vancouver**. The analysis of income trends in the Vancouver CMA, initiated under the SSHRC Public Outreach Grant, is now published together with a summary version. The two reports, together with the key maps and graphs, are available for download on the Vancouver page of the Neighbourhood Change website: http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/cities/vancouver/

3.2. **Montréal**. A full report analyzing income trends in the Montréal CMA will be published shortly.

4. Core set of CMA income trend maps and graphs -- soon

4.1. **A project-wide series of comparable CMA maps and graphs**. Based on the experience with the analysis of trends in Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver, a standardized set of income trend maps and graphs (1970 to 2006) for each of the six CMA's along with a design rationale document is being prepared by Richard. We will also have graphs comparing trends across the six CMAs. This work will be finished in another two or three weeks. After comment on the initial set is received and any adjustments made (measures used, clarity of the design/layout/explanations, etc.), more variables will be graphically compared.

4.2. **Local decisions about additional maps and graphs**. In addition to the project's core set of standardized maps and graphs, as each of the six CMA's carries out its initial or further analysis of trends, the local research teams can request maps and graphs using measures they deem most appropriate. The project is not imposing one particular set of measures or designs on CMA teams or on individual research projects. It will, however, maintain a standardized, comparable set for the project as a whole. These will be available on the website.

5. Quantitative comparative analysis using combined census data for all six CMAs

5.1. As agreed at the July meeting, Bob Murdie will lead a small team that will begin the comparative analysis of neighbourhood level trends in all six CMAs. The purpose is to identify trends and develop a neighbourhood typology across all six CMAs. This will assist all other research initiatives within our project.

5.2. With the data now assembled for the 1971-2006 period, Bob will prepare a brief overview of the proposed methodology and a suggested list of variables for inclusion in the analysis. The core set of CMA income maps and graphs produced by Richard will assist the process of developing an appropriate methodology for the analysis. The intention is to collaborate with a small working group, including members of the data group noted above, a representative from each CMA that is not part of the data group (Halifax, Montréal, Winnipeg, and Vancouver) and from relevant community agencies who share an interest in this quantitative analysis (e.g., United Way of Greater Toronto). Initially a cross-sectional analysis of the 2006 data will be undertaken followed by an analysis of trends from 1971 (or 1981) to 2006. The cross-sectional analysis is relatively straightforward whereas the trend analysis is more complex and requires additional thought about a number of important operational decisions.