

Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership Project Update, September 2013

David Hulchanski, PI

1. Updates

- 1.1. **Board Meeting #3.** The project's Board of Directors held its third meeting by teleconference on 23 April 2013. After updates from CMA teams and partners, a proposal was approved to enlarge the Board to 17 seats, in order to include one partner representative from every CMA and one national partner (FCM). New Board members will be nominated by local teams in Halifax, Montreal, Winnipeg and Calgary (the four CMAs which do not already have a partner on the Board). The meeting summary can be viewed on the website.
- 1.2. **Board Meeting #4.** The fourth Board meeting is scheduled for September 25 at noon ET. An email notice with agenda will be sent out. All members of the team are welcome to join the teleconference if they wish.
- 1.3. **New Partners and Co-Investigators.** The following new members have joined the NCRP team:
 - Heather Block, United Way Winnipeg
 - Shauna Brail, Urban Studies, U of T
 - Derek Cook, Calgary Poverty Reduction Initiative
 - Rosemary Gartner, Criminology, U of T
 - Richard Harris, Geography, McMaster
 - Lance McCready, Education, U of T
 - Howard Ramos, Sociology & Social Anthropology, Dalhousie
 - Malcolm Shookner, Nova Scotia Department of Finance and Community Counts
 - Daniyal Zuberi, Social Work and Public Policy, U of T
- 1.4. **Design Rationale and Data Inventory.** Richard Maaranen, our data analyst, has updated both these documents. The design rationale document explains the design decisions made in preparing the CMA census tract income maps. The data inventory lists our available data and the data sources. Both documents are periodically updated and posted on the website.
- 1.5. **Statistics Canada Research Data Centres Program of Research.** Our NCRP application has been approved under the new SSHRC-RDC "Program of Research" designation. This allows a simplified RDC access procedure for NCRP projects. The Program of Research lists CMA coordinators and some community partners as co-investigators, enabling them to act as investigators on project applications for RDC access under the NCRP. For further details contact our project manager, Emily Paradis.

2. Submission of key required reports to SSHRC

- 2.1. **Partner contributions report.** At the end of April we submitted a Partner Contribution Report to SSHRC outlining the cash and in-kind contributions to the NCRP from partners and others in year one of the project.

A total of \$240,100 was contributed to the NCRP in 2012-2013, including almost \$61,000 in in-kind contributions of staff time and data from partners and others. These contributions are critical for the NCRP to meet SSHRC's minimum requirement of 35% matching contributions (\$875,000).

Partner Contribution Reports are submitted annually to SSHRC. The 2012-2013 report is available on our website under the *About* tab, submenu "Documents for Research Team."

- 2.2. **Milestone report.** In July we submitted our Milestone Report to SSHRC. It
- describes how the Expert Panel's review comments on our proposal have been integrated into our project's plans,
 - provides a review of progress thus far, and
 - sets project goals and objectives that will form the basis of the mid-term evaluation.

Our next major narrative report to SSHRC will be a mid-term report in year four.

The Milestone Report is posted on the "Documents for Research Team" webpage.

3. Our NCRP Year 1 Expenditures: Below budget by \$63,500

- 3.1. **Year 1, budgeted \$362,000, spent \$299,500.** Our year 1 projection was very close to the actual. We also correctly anticipated most year 1 expenditures.
- 3.2. **Budget update and explanation of Year 1 expenditures.** Posted on our website is an updated budget for the project showing the year one projection and the actual, together with a two page explanation of how the money was spent. Any budget lines under or over spent have an explanation as to where the excess money was allocated (future years in that budget line) or drawn from (usually future years in that budget line).
- 3.3. **Year 1 NCRP Expenditures vs actual spending of the SSHRC funds.** A major portion of our annual NCRP expenditures is on funding specific research initiatives. Our one page budget sheet records money that is "out the door" in terms of our SSHRC grant. The money we allocate for research initiatives, in most cases, is in the form of a sub-grant to the PI of that project. Thus the money allocated may be off our books but it is not necessarily spent by the individual PIs. They, through their institutions, will account for those funds to SSHRC through our UofT research services (the home of our SSHRC grant). The entire team will be updated as the projects are completed.
- 3.4. **The UofT cash contribution received.** As a sign to SSHRC that the UofT supported our proposal (something many universities do now and SSHRC likes to see happen) it promised \$100,000 cash to support our research if we were funded (half from our Provost, half from our home faculty, social work). This money has now been received and is in our account. This explains why our budget all along has been \$2.6 million rather than the \$2.5 million from SSHRC.

4. Research Funded in Year 1

- 4.1. **Research funding process.** Our *NCRP Governance Document* explains the process for preparing research proposals internal to our NCRP and the internal peer review (the Research Advisory Committee is given an opportunity to offer advice; then the Board reviews the proposal and makes a decision). This takes about two weeks. The proposal form and instructions are posted on the “Documents for Research Team” webpage.
- 4.2. **Projects are posted on our website.** All funded projects are posted on the website. The first three:
 - The Emerging Skytrain Poverty Corridor in Vancouver
 - Neighbourhood Change in Greater Halifax, 1970 to 2010: Exploring Relevant Data & Analyzing Trends
 - Neighbourhood Change in the City of Winnipeg, 1970 to 2010

5. Comparative analysis using combined census data for eight CMAs

- 5.1. **A Neighbourhood Typology of Eight CMAs.** Bob Murdie, with the assistance of Jennifer Logan and Richard Maaranen, has developed a typology of neighbourhoods for eight CMAs: Calgary, Halifax, Hamilton, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Vancouver, and Winnipeg. The report was published a few weeks ago by the Cities Centre, UofT, on behalf of our NCRP. It is posted on the “Documents for Research Team” webpage. A summary will be printed for widespread distribution.
- 5.2. ***Eight Canadian Metropolitan Areas: Who Lived Where in 2006?*** by Robert Murdie, Jennifer Logan and Richard Maaranen, UofT Cities Centre Research Paper 229, September 2013, vi, 44 pp., ISSN 0316-0068, ISBN-13 978-0-7727-1492-3.
- 5.3. **15 Neighbourhood Clusters in 6 groups.** Bob, Jennifer and Richard created the typology using 2006 census data for 3,139 census tracts in the eight CMAs. They focused on 30 variables related to economic status, age, family, and household status, immigrant and ethnic status, migrant status, and housing status. By analysing the relationships among these variables using component analysis and undertaking a cluster analysis of the component scores they were able to identify 15 clusters of census tracts that characterize distinct urban neighbourhoods. They organized these 15 clusters into six larger groups: Older Working Class, Urban/Suburban Homeowner, Old City Establishment, Disadvantaged Groups, and Family Ethnoburbs. Not all clusters appear in all CMAs. Toronto includes all 15 clusters, while Halifax (the smallest city in the study) has only nine. Larger and more socially complex CMAs exhibit the largest number of clusters.

6. The NCRP’s family homelessness in Toronto’s inner suburbs project – an update

- 6.1. **Risk of Homelessness Index.** This NCRP project is funded by HRSDC (\$80,000, to March 2014). Lead investigator Emily Paradis, data analyst Jennifer Logan and PhD fellow Ruth Wilson have completed an analysis of survey data collected by United Way Toronto from

1566 families with children in rental apartments in Toronto's inner suburbs. Using the survey questions, the team devised a Risk of Homelessness Index consisting of six indicators of severe housing inadequacy: unaffordability, overcrowding, inadequate condition of the unit, inadequate condition of the building, unsafe housing, and insecure tenure / risk of eviction. Results show that 90% of families are facing at least one major problem with their housing, and that 80% of respondents are immigrants, members of racialized communities, and living below the Low-Income Cut-Off. One in three families are facing multiple serious housing problems and are at risk of homelessness. Neighbourhoods differ in the prevalence, type, and severity of housing problems, but the vast majority of families in all neighbourhoods are inadequately housed.

- 6.2. **Knowledge mobilization and qualitative data-gathering.** The findings have been presented to more than 100 service providers at focus groups conducted in each of the study neighbourhoods. A poster was presented at an international conference on homelessness in June, and a research bulletin is in preparation. In partnership with community organizations and peer researchers, the team is now conducting focus groups in each neighbourhood with families facing housing problems and homelessness.

7. NCRP report on the measurement of income inequality and polarization in Canada

- 7.1. Alan Walks has published an important report that discusses the various ways to measure income inequality and polarization. It is in part a methodological paper and in part provides new analysis and mapping of inequality and polarization for many Canadian CMAs.
- 7.2. ***Income Inequality and Polarization in Canada's Cities: An Examination and New Form of Measurement***, by Alan Walks, UofT Cities Centre Research Paper 227, August 2013, 116pp., ISSN 0316-0068, ISBN-13 978-0-7727-1486-2. Available on the "Documents for Research Team" webpage. It will soon be featured on the homepage of our website.
- 7.3. In the paper Alan makes clear the ways in which inequality and polarization are distinct concepts, and why they require their own indices. To deal with the limitations involved in calculating established indices of polarization using census tracts as the units of analysis, he proposes a new index – the coefficient of polarization (COP). The nonspatial analysis conducted using households as the unit of analysis shows that this new form of measurement tracks very closely other established indices of income polarization, making it suitable for use in analyzing polarization trends when data are aggregated into ranges (making some other indices unworkable), and into spatial units such as census tracts and municipalities.

8. NCRP Chronology

- 8.1. We will keep a chronological list of major project events and publications. The start on the chronology is attached (below). Eventually this will be on our website.

NCRP Chronology

2013

- January** **NCRP Board of Directors Meeting #2, January 21**
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).

Report published: *A City-Region Growing Apart? Taking stock of income disparity in Greater Montréal, 1970-2005.* Damaris Rose and Amy Twigge-Molecey. (Also published in French)
- April** **NCRP Board of Directors Meeting #3, April 23**
Participants: David Hulchanski (Chair), David Ley, Mamie Hutt-Temoana, Ivan Townshend, Annick Germain, Bob Murdie, Michelynn Laflèche, Jill Grant, Alan Walks, Kathleen Gallagher, Emily Paradis (minutes).
- August** **NCRP Report published:** *Income inequality and polarization in Canada's cities: An examination and new form of measurement.* Alan Walks.
- September** **NCRP Report published:** *Eight Canadian metropolitan areas: Who lived where in 2006?* Robert Murdie, Jennifer Logan and Richard Maaranen.

2012

- March** **SSHRC awards a 7-year \$2.5 million Partnership Grant**
to the Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership
- July** **NCRP Public Forum, Toronto, July 4, Innis Town Hall, 200 participants.**
Addressing Urban Injustice: The Growing Gap and What to Do about it.
Panel: David Ley, Damaris Rose, Janet L. Smith, Maarten van Ham. Discussants: Ken Greenberg, Armine Yalnizyan. Moderator: David Hulchanski

NCRP team meeting in Toronto, July 5-6.
- August** **NCRP Policy Brief publication series launched**
Policy Briefs provide succinct and timely commentary on policy issues based on research carried out by members of the NCRP. The views expressed are those of the individual authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of the research team, the university, or the funder. David Hulchanski and Philippa Campsie, General Editors.
 - Policy Brief #1: *In a State of Good Repair? The City of Toronto's Public Housing*, by Robert Murdie
 - Policy Brief #2: *Anything But Scattered: The Proposed Sale of Toronto Community Housing's Scattered-Site Housing & Implications for Building an Inclusive Toronto*, by Alan Walks
- September** **NCRP Report published:** *The financing and economics of affordable housing development: Incentives and disincentives to private-sector participation.* Jill Black.

October **NCRP Board of Directors Meeting #1, October 19**
Participants: David Hulchanski (Chair), Caroline Andrews, Jino Distasio, Kathleen Gallagher, Jill Grant, Leanne Holt, Michelynn Laflèche, Richard Maaranen, Bob Murdie, Emily Paradis, Damaris Rose, Janet Smith, Ivan Townshend, Alan Walks

NCRP Report published: *Divisions and disparities in lotus-land: Socio-spatial income polarization in Greater Vancouver, 1970-2005.* David Ley and Nicholas Lynch.

2011

April SSHRC approves the Letter of Intent submitted in January for the neighbourhood change research initiative, allowing submission of a full proposal by Nov. 1, 2011. A \$20,000 grant is provided to finance the cost of developing the proposal.

June Two-day research team meeting in Toronto discusses and further develops the full proposal

November Full proposal submitted to SSHRC