NCRP Board of Directors Meeting #7

19 September 2014, 2pm EDT via teleconference
(3pm Halifax; 1pm Winnipeg; noon Calgary; 11am Vancouver)


Board membership: Barb Bresner, Jino Distasio, Leslie Evans, Kathleen Gallagher, Scott Graham, Jill Grant, Leanne Holt, David Hulchanski, Michelynn Laflèche, David Ley, Robert Murdie, Valerie Preston, Damaris Rose, Paul Shakotko, Ivan Townshend, Alan Walks.

Updates

1. Review summary and report-back on action items from March meeting. Document: 
   *NCRP Board Meeting #6 Summary* (attached)

2. CMA & Partner Updates: anything new, significant the Board should know?

3. PI Update follow-up: Any questions/comments about NCRP in general based on the Sept 2014 PI Update?

4. Rental housing research initiative — brief update.

Budget: After 28 months

5. Budget update: See *attached* document “NCRP Budget Update, August 2014”
   a) $600,000 spent (about 23%) of our $2,625 million after 28 months.
   b) Row 4: CMA level research initiatives: only $226,000 (21%) of the $600,000 allocated thus far.
   c) Row 5: Comparative CMA & International; almost nothing allocated so far ($4,000 for Chicago comparative analysis)
   d) Row 10: Use of the initial $15,000 per CMA for general management: Is it being used?

Other Business

6. Agenda for the October 16-17 team meeting in Toronto.

7. Other business?

8. Next Board meetings: 18 December 2014, 2pm EST; 19 March 2015, noon EST; 18 June 2015, noon EST

9.

Documents are available under: ABOUT / Research Team Documents
http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/about/research-team-documents/
NCRP Board of Directors Meeting #6

26 March 2014, 2pm EDT via teleconference
(3pm Halifax; 1pm Winnipeg; noon Calgary; 11am Vancouver)


Participants: David Hulchanski (chair), Emily Paradis (minutes), Heather Block, Leslie Evans, Kathleen Gallagher, Jill Grant, Andrew Kaufman (for Jino Distasio), Michelynn Lafièche, David Ley, Xavier Leloup (for Damaris Rose), Bob Murdie, Greg Suttor (guest, U of T), Ivan Townshend, Alan Walks.

Regrets: Jino Distasio, Leanne Holt, Valerie Preston, Damaris Rose, Paul Shakotko.

Updates

1. **Review summary and report-back on action items from February meeting.** Document: NCRP Board Meeting #5 Summary
   - Changes to the website home page allow for easier posting. Soon each CMA will appear as a key link on the front page.
   - The Joint Analysis report on trends and change is almost complete; errors in the initial analysis caused delays.
   - The importance of keeping the “Documents for Team Members” section up-to-date was noted.
   - The board agreed that the NCRP needs an email newsletter that will be public. Emily Paradis and David Hulchanski will review potential formats and bring suggestions to the Board. The project will also continue to produce PI Updates for internal use. Once local CMA teams have more activities, each CMA should also produce periodic updates similar to the Toronto CMA updates.

2. **CMA & partner updates**
   - **Vancouver:** A project proposal on household debt initiated by partner SPARC was approved by the local team and has been forwarded for Board approval. The *Skytrain Poverty Corridor* project is wrapping up data collection and a report is expected over summer. Michelynn Lafièche noted that United Way Toronto is working on a national project to develop a debt vulnerability index with CCSD and CEDI; she will connect the Vancouver team with this project’s partners. Alan Walks is interested to be involved in the SPARC project.
- **Calgary:** Local work has been focused on the deteriorating rental neighbourhoods theme. The local team and partners have decided to conduct analysis at the DA level and have identified 9 or 10 neighbourhoods of interest. Leslie Evans has invited a new partner, César Cala from United Way Calgary, to join the local NCRP team.

- **Winnipeg:** The team is using Bob Murdie’s cluster analysis method to produce a neighbourhood typology of four central Canadian cities: Thunder Bay, Winnipeg, Saskatoon & Regina. A report on rooming house change, developed in partnership with the rooming house task force, will be released at a forum on May 27.

- **Toronto:** A new suburban “905” region working group has met twice, and a meeting last week with specific group from York region. Alan Walks is preparing a project proposal on condominiums with a Canadian and international focus. A report recently released by Emily Paradis on inadequate housing and homelessness among families received broad media attention including the front page of the Toronto Star. United Way Toronto’s Building Opportunity project on neighbourhood inequality will soon conduct a phone and online poll with a large sample. Research Data Centre research for this project is also about to begin.

- **Montréal:** The local team is developing a proposal building on John Stapleton’s Working Poor analysis, to be led by Xavier Leloup. This will be sent to the Board soon. The team has also reviewed the discussion document on deteriorating rental neighbourhoods. Lead partner Centraide has not yet identified a new contact person since Cécile Poirier moved to City of Montréal, but collaboration should continue without problems. The team plans to invite some scholars from English universities to join the NCRP. The City of Montréal will be approached as a partner on the deteriorating rental project once it is better defined.

- **Halifax:** The 3-Cities report is generating interest and discussion. Associated events have included a public forum and two other presentations. The team is developing articles out of the report, and considering qualitative work to build on the quantitative analysis. The team has submitted a proposal, led by Howard Ramos, Board consideration.

### Issues for Discussion

#### 3. May 2-3 team meeting agenda & attendance

- The Board reviewed a proposed draft agenda for the upcoming team meeting in Toronto.
- Many partners are not able to attend this meeting. The option to teleconference in for specific discussions will be made available once the agenda is better-defined.
- Updates from each CMA will be presented on May 2. Board members noted an interest in hearing the results of the 3-Cities analysis from Calgary and Winnipeg.
• The York University's Knowledge Mobilization Unit will present a workshop on Knowledge Mobilization on May 3. A needs assessment will be sent to Board members to help shape the workshop.
• The May meeting will be focused on developing the cross-CMA project on deteriorating rental neighbourhoods, as well as other major projects.
• The meeting will not include time for detailed presentations on local projects. NCRP will plan a seminar / conference in Year 3 or 4 where projects can be presented. To be discussed further on May 2-3.

4. The major initiative on researching rental housing in troubled neighbourhoods: further discussion
• In response to comments on the discussion document, David Hulchanski proposed a new title for this project: Under Pressure? Canada’s rental housing neighbourhoods and their residents. The Board approved the title.
• Richard Maaranen has calculated and mapped a new Rental Housing Disadvantage Index. Materials on this will be sent around soon.
• It was noted that this project will investigate a sensitive area. Introductory discussions with key people such as City officials are recommended.

5. Other potential major initiatives
• Other major initiatives for discussion in May.
• Collective efficacy – examining why some neighbourhoods fare better than others in addressing the effects of socio-spatial inequality and polarization? And, what is role of community-based organizations in this?
• Aging and age-friendly neighbourhoods – led by Sheila Neysmith.
• Youth, education, criminalization – need more expertise on the team on this.

6. SSHRC reporting updates: Partner contributions report due in April; Mid-Term report at end of Year 3.
• Emily Paradis is collecting contribution reports from partners, CMA teams, and funded projects for the annual NCRP contribution report to SSHRC.
• The Mid-Term Report to SSHRC will be due in September 2015. It will include updates on the targets and indicators identified in the Milestone Report.

7. Partnerships: How can the NCRP better include partners
• Partnership development had been proposed as a topic for the upcoming May meeting; however, few partners can attend.
• Local CMA teams are expected to bring on new partners and ensure active involvement of partners in establishing the local research agenda. Some teams have been more successful than others in reaching out to new partners. Teams are invited to share what has worked well for them.

• At the October meeting it was suggested that local partners take the lead in identifying potential new partners for the local CMA team. Partners who wish to do so can become members of the SSHRC grant. It was noted that the opportunity to be involved in a national project would have impact for many organizations.

8. Next meeting
   • Emily Paradis will circulate potential meeting dates for July.
### NCRP Budget Update, August 2014

| ROW | RESEARCH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1   | RESEARCH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2   | Projects focused on 6 CMAs (100K each) | 50,000 | 32,380 | 17,620 | 142,620 | 91,200 | 51,420 | 175,000 | 226,420 | 175,000 | 75,000 | 0 | 476,420 | 79% | $ 600,000 | 23% |
| 3   | Comparative CMA & international projects | 50,000 | 9,860 | 40,140 | 215,140 | 13,800 | 201,340 | 250,000 | 451,340 | 200,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 751,340 | 97% | $ 775,000 | 30% |
| 4   | Data Analyst 50% (First 50% UofT) | 35,000 | 32,850 | -2,150 | 37,150 | 45,000 | -7,850 | 35,000 | 27,150 | 35,000 | 0 | 62,150 | 44% | $ 140,000 | 5% |
| 5   | Data Purchase | 0 | 8,900 | -8,900 | 17,000 | 2,500 | 14,500 | 17,000 | 31,500 | 17,100 | 0 | 48,600 | 81% | $ 60,000 | 2% |
| 6   | MANAGEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7   | 6 CMA Mgmt, events, dissemination ($5 + 6) | 90,000 | 90,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,000 | 21% | $ 114,000 | 4% |
| 8   | Project meetings (travel, teleconferences) | 20,000 | 15,860 | 4,140 | 19,140 | 38,000 | -18,860 | 15,000 | -3,860 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 41,140 | 43% | $ 95,000 | 4% |
| 9   | Project Management (staff) | 88,000 | 93,750 | -5,750 | 82,250 | 71,900 | 10,350 | 88,000 | 98,350 | 88,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 276,350 | 63% | $ 442,000 | 17% |
| 10  | Equipment, supplies | 12,000 | 9,940 | 2,060 | 4,060 | 5,900 | -1,840 | 2,000 | 160 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 6,160 | 28% | $ 22,000 | 1% |
| 11  | KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12  | Conference travel (research team; students) | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 7,800 | 2,200 | 15,000 | 17,200 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 10,000 | 57,200 | 88% | $ 65,000 | 3% |
| 13  | Special public events (in any of the 6 CMAs) | 5,000 | 1,200 | 3,800 | 8,800 | 2,500 | 6,300 | 5,000 | 11,300 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 26,300 | 88% | $ 30,000 | 1% |
| 14  | Online e-book & 2018 Conference | 0 | 0 | 7,000 | 0 | 7,000 | 10,000 | 17,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 50,000 | 73,000 | 100% | $ 73,000 | 3% |
| 15  | U Press edited books from project research | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 5,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 25,000 | 100% | $ 25,000 | 1% |
| 16  | KM services (website, editing, translation) | 10,000 | 10,500 | -500 | 11,500 | 8,900 | 2,600 | 12,000 | 14,600 | 12,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 56,600 | 74% | $ 76,000 | 3% |
| 17  | Printing | 3,000 | 0 | 3,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 5,000 | 13,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 43,000 | 100% | $ 43,000 | 2% |
| 18  | CONTINGENCY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19  | Toronto HSRDC cash reimbursement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20  | TOTAL PER YEAR | $ 363,000 | $ 305,240 | $ 57,760 | $ 562,660 | $ 287,500 | $ 300,160 | $ 629,000 | $ 929,160 | $ 990,100 | $ 311,000 | $ 162,000 | $ 1,992,260 | 76% | $ 2,625,000 | 100% |

Notes: This is a summary document for internal budget planning purposes. In year one we made an annual allocation of the entire budget as a starting exercise (Column 15). We initially budgetted for 6 years rather than the 7 years -- to help move the project along more quickly if possible. In year four (2015) a detailed budget allocation review will take place reallocating remaining funds.

Remaining funds as of late July 2014 = $2 million (Column 13): In years 1, 2 and part of year 3 (28 months, March 2012 to July 2014) we spent or allocated (to research sub-grants) about $600,000. We have about $2 million remaining as of late July 2014.

Source of funds (cash): SSHRC grant $2.5 million; UofT supporting grant $100,000; a Toronto area federal government project linked to our NCRP that reimbursed our NCRP for the part-time secondment of our Project Manager, $25,000 (Row 19). Initial total available funds: $2,625,000. Half of our full-time data analyst’s salary and benefits (Row 4) is paid by the UofT Faculty-Inwrentash Faculty of Social Work as a contribution to the NCRP and is not included in this planning budget because it is paid directly to the staff person as a UofT employee rather than through this NCRP budget. It is an in-kind contribution to our NCRP.
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