

NCRP Team Meeting May 2015 Summary of Discussions

David Hulchanski & Emily Paradis May 7-8, 2015

The Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership met on May 7 and 8 in Toronto:

- Research Day, May 7, to share findings from NCRP research, and
- Team Meeting, May 8, to assess the NCRP's progress, plan thematic and cross-CMA projects, and plan knowledge mobilization and scholarly publications, May 8.

Presentations, papers, and documents can be found in the Research Team Documents area of the NCRP website.

Attendance (* = Research Day only)

Board Members

Barb Besner (United Way Winnipeg)
Kathleen Gallagher (OISE/UT)
Scott Graham (SPARC BC)
Leanne Holt (Fed. of Cdn. Municipalities)
David Hulchanski (PI, UofT)
Jill Grant (Dalhousie)
David Ley (UBC)

Bob Murdie (York)
Valerie Preston* (York)
Damaris Rose (INRS)
Paul Shakotko (United Way Halifax)
Ivan Townshend (Lethbridge)
Alan Walks (UofT)

Research Advisory Board Members

Larry Bourne (UofT)
Tom Carter (U Winnipeg)

Duncan MacLennan (U of St. Andrew's, Scotland)
Bill Michelson* (UofT)

Partners & Guests

Mohammad Araf* (Social Planning Toronto)
Taslima Begum* (WoodGreen)
Geordie Dent* (Fed. of Metro Tenants Associations)
Sharon Chisholm* (formerly CHRA)
Mihaela Dinca-Panaitescu (United Way Toronto)
Andrea Dort* (Peel Region)
Bodil Dronkers (United Way Calgary)
Julia Drydyk* (United Way Toronto)
Diane Dyson (WoodGreen)
Rick Eagan* (West Neighbourhood House)
Nathan Edelson (42nd St. Consulting, Vancouver)
Dan Godin (Fed. of Calgary Communities)
S. Gopikrishna* (Housing Help Centre, Scarborough)

Rob Howarth (Toronto Neighbourhood Centres)
Natalie Hui* (York Region)
Melanie Johnston* (United Way Toronto)
Kuni Kamizaki* (Parkdale Activities & Rec. Centre)
Valentyn Kliuchnyk* (York Region)
Norma-Jean McLaren (42nd St Consulting, Vancouver)
Sean Meagher* (Public Interest Research)
Stephanie Procyk* (United Way Toronto)
Jane Wedlock* (United Way York Region)
Biljana Zuvela* (United Way Toronto)

Academic Co-Investigators & Collaborators

Yale Belanger (U of Lethbridge) Shauna Brail* (UofT) Caroline Fusco* (UofT) Sutama Ghosh* (Ryerson) Xavier Leloup (INRS) Wayne Lewchuk* (McMaster) Sheila Neysmith (UofT) Howard Ramos (Dalhousie) Shalini Sharma* (UofT) Mariana Valverde* (Uof T)

Staff & Students

Jessica Carriere (PhD Candidate, UofT)
Emily Hawes (UBC)
Dan Irvine* (McMaster)
Andrew Kaufman (Research Associate, Institute for Urban Studies, U Winnipeg)
Kathleen Kinsella* (PhD Candidate, McMaster)
Scott Leon (NCRP rental housing researcher)

Richard Maaranen (NCRP data analyst)
Emily Paradis (NCRP project manager)
Paul Pritchard (Undergraduate student, Dalhousie)
Roxanne Ramjattan* (PhD Candidate, Toronto)
Dylan Simone* (PhD Candidate, UofT)
Greg Suttor (NCRP rental housing researcher)
Glynis Tabor* (Undergraduate student, UofT)

1. SUMMARY: Decisions, Action Items, Next Steps

Next NCRP team meeting and research day

The next NCRP meeting has been scheduled for May 18 to 20, 2016 in Toronto. It will include a longer Research Day (perhaps 1.5 days) and time for the team to discuss and develop cross-CMA research initiatives and publications. Future NCRP meetings will be planned around one- or two-day research symposia and workshops focused on specific themes, building on the Research Day model.

NCRP's Mid-point & SSHRC Mid-term review (due 1 March 2016)

The NCRP is approaching its mid-point in our 7-year grant, which is September 2015.

- About \$800,000 has been spent or allocated (as of Dec 2014), leaving about \$1.8 million in the project's budget. Twenty project sub-grants have been funded through the internal NCRP approval process.
- SSHRC has recently confirmed that we will receive the instructions and templates for our midterm report in August 2015. We will have about six months to complete the mid-term report. It is due on 1 March 2016.
- In late 2015 we will be in contact with all members of the team with forms to fill in summarizing activities in various categories, as input for drafting the mid-term report.

Thematic, cross-CMA, and international comparative research

Plans are in place to launch or continue work beyond the local CMA level in a number of thematic areas.

• **Private sector rental housing:** A cross-CMA working group led by David Hulchanski and Greg Suttor (NCRP) has launched a number of local and cross-CMA studies in this area. This will continue to be a major focus for the NCRP.

- **Urban Aboriginal issues:** Emily Paradis and David Hulchanski will contact key team members and others to explore what the NCRP can contribute on this theme.
- **Income and access to jobs:** This theme is crucial but not an area of strength within the current NCRP team. Wayne Lewchuk (McMaster) has joined the NCRP as co-investigator and is doing preliminary research on labour market trends. We will continue to seek co-investigators and partners with expertise in this area.
- **Aging in the city:** Ivan Townshend will develop and share an analysis of older adult segregation for all NCRP CMAs. Co-investigators and partners who wish to pursue data analysis and qualitative case studies in their CMAs are invited to contact Sheila Neysmith (UofT).
- **Urban youth, schooling and criminalization:** A Toronto-based working group led by Kathleen Gallagher (OISE/UT) is exploring options for developing an index of neighbourhood opportunities / dispossession for youth. This model will be shared with other CMA teams who may wish to use it.
- **Neighbourhood collective efficacy:** A Toronto-based working group led by Rob Howarth (Canadian Association of Neighbourhood Services) will soon publish a literature review and a report that defines collective efficacy, examines the role of community-based organizations in fostering it, and provides tools for studying efficacy at the neighbourhood level. Emily Paradis and Rob Howarth will convene a teleconference of interested team members from Halifax, Calgary and Vancouver to share the report and plan cross-CMA research on this theme.
- International comparative studies: The Chicago Three Cities analysis and a Chicago-Toronto comparison will soon to be published. The Chicago team led by Janet Smith (U of Illinois at Chicago) will also organize data for other US cities, to be mapped and analyzed. David Hulchanski is working with EU colleagues to identify potential cities for comparative analyses. The group agreed to begin investigating potential comparative studies with Australian colleagues and partners.

Three-Cities synthesis and methodology papers

Jill Grant (Dalhousie) is leading a working group to develop an article on the Three Cities methodology, with the input of Richard Maaranen, Alan Walks, Damaris Rose and Larry Bourne. Larry Bourne (UofT) will take the lead on developing a synthesis of the Three Cities analyses from the six CMAs.

Events & scholarly meetings

David Hulchanski is working with EU colleagues to plan a public forum and workshop on inequality and diversity in the inner suburbs of Toronto, London and Paris, to take place in Toronto in October 2015. The central project team will begin planning for two major events: a culminating NCRP conference to take place in 2018-2019; and a colloquium on building a national policy agenda on inequality, to take place in about two years.

Social media

The NCRP blog will soon launch on the updated website. All team members are invited to contribute blog entries, and major NCRP publications and events will be featured on the blog.

David Hulchanski is using Twitter to share NCRP findings and maps (@Hulchanski and #NeighbourhoodChange). Team members who are active on social media are invited to share their handles, follow each other, and create an NCRP list on their feed.

2. Research Day, 7 May 2015, List of Presentations

Presentations, papers, and documents from May 7 can be found in the Research Team Documents area of the NCRP website.

Rental Housing: Trends and Policies

- 1. Rental Housing Disadvantage Index, David Hulchanski
- 2. Rental Housing Trends and Policy Context in Montréal, Toronto & Vancouver, Greg Suttor
- 3. Rental Buildings in Toronto's South Parkdale: Recent Trends, Scott Leon
- 4. Winnipeg's Vanishing Rooming Houses, Andrew Kaufman

The Working Poor and the Urban Debtscape

- 5. The Working Poor in Montréal, Xavier Leloup
- 6. Metro Vancouver's Shifting Debtscape, Scott Graham & Emily Hawes

Socio-Spatial Polarization: Trends, Perceptions, and Opportunities

- 7. The Opportunity Equation: Building Opportunity in the Face of Growing Inequality, Mihaela Dinca-Panaitescu & Stephanie Procyk, United Way Toronto
- 8. Perceptions of Neighbourhood Change in Halifax, Howard Ramos & Paul Pritchard

Aging in the City

- 9. Aging in the City: Does Neighbourhood Matter? Sheila Neysmith & Taslima Begum, Woodgreen
- 10. Residential Segregation of Seniors in Calgary 1981-2006: Links to Three Cities Model, Ivan Townshend

Producing & Communicating Policy Implications (panel discussion)

3. Team Meeting, 8 May 2015

Agenda Item 1. Welcome; agenda review

Assessment of NCRP Research Day

The May 7 Research Day was considered a success. The ten presentations were of very high quality, discussion was productive, and the event drew 61 invited participants including scholars, students, and community partners. Partners in attendance expressed eagerness to make use of some of the data and methods featured in the presentations. All presentations will be posted on the public area of the NCRP website.

Future Research Day events will be thematically focused, and are likely to require more than one day. The model of a smaller size event, with NCRP team members and some invited local participants, is effective and should be maintained.

Agenda Item 2. Project Mid-Point: Resources & Evaluation

NCRP Revised Budget

David Hulchanski presented a revised budget that was approved by the NCRP Board of Directors at its April 1 2015 meeting. As of 31 December 2014, \$763,000 of the NCRP budget had been spent or allocated to sub-grants, with just under \$1.9 million remaining. The revised budget represents a projected estimate of spending for the remaining years of the grant. Estimates and allocations may change as determined by the Board. Discussion: No concerns were raised about the budget. It was suggested that we set a date beyond which new research sub-grants will not be funded.

Our Mid-Term Report to SSHRC, Due 1 March 2016

Update: *After the team meeting* we learned that the NCRP mid-term report to SSHRC is due on 1 March 2016. In August 2015 we will receive the instructions and templates from SSHRC. We understand the requirements are modest: a five-to-ten page report, and a template with tables to be filled in. We also understand that there will be no interview or site visit component, though the expert panel of reviewers may have follow-up questions. The report's appendix will include complete listings of publications and knowledge mobilization activities.

Most team members will not be involved in preparing the report, except to provide information about their publications, knowledge mobilization, and student training activities. We will collect this information in late 2015. The draft report will be reviewed and will need to be approved by the Board of Directors before submission to SSHRC. All team members are welcome to participate in this (and all) Board discussions.

NCRP: What are we doing well? What needs to change? What are our objectives?

David Hulchanski reviewed the questions and themes from our SSHRC proposal. Question #1 has been a major focus in the income trend "Three Cities" reports from each CMA, as well as in a number of the CMA-focused sub-grant projects.

Questions 2 and 3 are beginning to be explored.

- There is an active working group in the rental housing theme area.
- Cross-CMA work is being developed on the age-friendly neighbourhoods theme.
- Some early work on youth, criminal justice and urban schooling is underway.
- Although there is no thematic working group on immigrant settlement, this theme is integrated into most of the research, including the neighbourhood typologies, the income trend analysis, and the rental housing and aging themes.

Urban Aboriginal Issues

This thematic area requires leadership. NCRP team members Yale Belanger (Lethbridge) and Evelyn Peters (Winnipeg) are leading scholarly and community work in this area. Federation of Canadian Municipalities is also working with a cross-Canada network that may be a source for potential NCRP partners on this topic. In Winnipeg, there is another SSHRC partnership grant focused on this area. The group discussed potential topics and approaches for local and cross-CMA studies, including:

- the emergence of an Aboriginal middle class in Winnipeg
- displacements of various populations, including urban Aboriginal people, from City #1
- analysis and mapping of census data across NCRP CMAs
- community-driven, bottom-up focus on municipal and provincial trends and policies
- comparative analysis with the Australian urban context.

It was agreed that David Hulchanski and Emily Paradis will follow up with interested co-investigators and partners.

Income and Access to Jobs

Though income is key to the NCRP analysis, the team does not include much labour market expertise. Wayne Lewchuk (McMaster) has joined NCRP as a co-investigator, and has seed funding to review labour market data that can help explain the trends NCRP is documenting. This analysis may form the basis of a proposal. The group discussed sources of data about place of work by location of employer, including Dunn and Bradstreet, city studies of businesses, tax data, and Canadian Business Patterns (available only at CSD level). The City of Montréal has purchased data from the province that can be analyzed by CT or even DA. Canadian Urban Transit Association has data for the "cut my commute" project that shows commuters' workplace destinations.

The group agreed that this is an area where NCRP needs to focus. We will continue to identify potential sources of data and co-investigators who specialize in the area.

International Comparative Studies

The NCRP team in Chicago, led by Janet Smith, has completed a Three Cities analysis using US census data. The Toronto-Chicago comparison reveals that, while Chicago has higher levels of inequality, the growth of inequality in Toronto outstrips that in Chicago. The Chicago team is preparing to organize US data for five or six US comparator cities, which will be analyzed by the Toronto team. The group agreed to proceed with this work.

David Hulchanski is working with EU colleagues to identify cities for which there is data to enable a Three Cities analysis. Unfortunately the UK census does not include income data, and while there is very detailed local data in many countries it is not comparable with Canada's. It would be interesting to compare cities in strong welfare states with Canadian patterns. Education and

occupation may serve as proxies for income. Would internationally-standardized occupational categories assist with comparison?

Australia is comparable to Canada geographically and its cities are similar. Some Australian colleagues are interested in an NCRP partnership. AHURI does high-quality applied social research but is concerned about its lack of international comparisons. Carolyn Whitzman (Melbourne) is developing a comparative project on rental housing in Sydney, Melbourne, Montreal and Toronto. The group agreed to look into Australian partnerships.

Cross-CMA Comparisons

Team members noted that we need to compare and synthesize the Three Cities analyses of Canadian CMAs before embarking on international comparisons. One option is to hold a workshop to assist research teams from other jurisdictions in developing Three Cities and comparative analyses.

Strong research teams are moving the work forward in each NCRP city and thematic area, but we also need a forum for making sense of this work across the CMAs, particularly with reference to consequences and policy options. The Research Day model could be useful here: a workshop focused on linking invited thematic or CMA-specific papers into a cross-CMA comparison.

Improving NCRP Publications: Synthesis and Method Papers

Team members noted the need for a synthesis of the six CMAs' Three Cities analysis. It was suggested that a post-doc could be given this task; however, there was an early decision not to engage a post-doc due to concerns about fit and productivity. Another option is for a few team members to collaborate on a synthesis, with funds for graduate assistance. Larry Bourne agreed to lead a working group to develop a comparative analysis paper.

Also needed is a peer-reviewed paper about the Three Cities method, examining the process of developing and testing this model in Canadian CMAs. The paper could demonstrate the effects of using different variables and cut-off points. It should be published in a major international journal to get the model out into the international literature.

Some team members expressed a general concern that NCRP is short on scholarly publications. But this will not be a concern if each of the funded research initiatives yields an article: there will soon be twenty such sub-grants, with many more to come.

Frequency of Meetings

The team has met every six to nine months during our initial three years. After some discussion, it was agreed that the frequency of team meetings could decrease to about once every twelve months. Most of the more detailed decisions on themes, focus, and project co-ordination have been decided upon. The last half of the project will continue to fine-tune these but the main purpose of meeting is to share research findings, discuss policy implications, and further develop innovative and effective modes of knowledge mobilization.

London-Paris-Toronto Forum, October 2015

NCRP co-investigator Ronald van Kempen is leading DIVERCITIES, a large EU project examining the governance of diversity in 14 cities. Toronto is the only non-EU case study. In October 2015, the team leading the Toronto component will come to present their findings. This may provide an opportunity to invite scholars from London and Paris for a forum on inner suburbs in major cities.

The Board will be informed as plans develop. Other CMA teams should also take up local opportunities for public forums.

Updates

Andrew Kaufman (Winnipeg) distributed the Winnipeg Three Cities report, which will be launched May 20. The report includes thirteen papers from Winnipeg NCRP team members, as well as original and archival photographs. It is featured on the NCRP homepage at http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/documents/2015/05/winnipeg-the-divided-prairie-city-1970-2010.pdf . In addition to the full report, the team has produced a four-page summary and will host a public event.

Jennifer Logan, a research assistant on several Toronto-based NCRP projects and a colleague of some Winnipeg team members, passed away suddenly in January 2015. A tribute to her life can be found at http://www.macleans.ca/society/life/jennifer-joy-logan-1982-2015/. The Winnipeg report is dedicated to Jennifer's memory. *A memorial scholarship fund* for refugee students is being set up at University of Winnipeg through WUSC; team members can donate at https://donate.uwinnipeg.ca (specify that it is for the Jennifer Logan Memorial Scholarship).

Agenda Item 3. NCRP Cross-CMA Research Working Groups: New Ones?

Four thematic working groups presented their current activities and invited the involvement of other NCRP team members.

Private Sector Rental Housing, David Hulchanski

At the May 2014 meeting, the NCRP team decided to focus on private sector rental housing. There has been much activity in this area in the past year: a cross-Canada working group has met by teleconference, and several projects have been funded. Current active projects for this theme area fall into six categories:

- 1. Rental Housing Disadvantage Index (individual CMA analyses, and 8-CMA comparison)
- 2. Statistics Canada 1970-2006 cross tabs (individual CMA analyses, and 8-CMA comparison)
- 3. Qualitative analysis of case study neighbourhoods (to be selected with reference to RHDI)
- 4. Rental stock studies (conventional and non-conventional stock)
- 5. Tenant demographic studies (specific groups such as recent immigrants, single parents)
- 6. Policy and program studies (such as the Research Day paper presented by Greg Suttor)

Discussion

Concerns were raised about the current policy relevance of the RHDI and Statistics Canada analyses based on 2006 data. In spite of the problems with the 2011 NHS, there is power in NCRP's 40-year trend analysis. Canada has better and more recent data than most countries: policy decisions are often made on the basis of 10-year-old data. It was suggested that NCRP have a brief statement about our decision not to use the NHS that can be included on all relevant research products, along with a link to the NHS analysis on our website.

Other sources of data include CMHC data on average rents from 1995 by building type and age; eviction data from the Landlord and Tenant Board; and complaints to municipal licensing and standards. The CMHC data is costly but may be worth obtaining. Local qualitative case studies can also provide a current picture to update the older data.

The group recommended two additions to the work plan:

- add Aboriginal tenants to the areas of focus for tenant demographic studies, and
- add tenant organizing to policy and program studies.

Aging in the City, Sheila Neysmith

Ongoing work on this theme was featured in two Research Day presentations.

The group agreed that the analysis of older adult segregation presented by Ivan Townshend offers a promising approach to comparative cross-CMA studies. He will continue to develop this analysis with NCRP funding for a student assistant.

Sheila Neysmith partnered with local community partners on the two qualitative case studies she presented. In turn, partners drew on NCRP data analysis capacity, maps, and information on income and other trends to supplement their studies. Other CMA teams are encouraged to identify similar partnership opportunities for local qualitative studies of aging.

Discussion

It was suggested that cross-CMA studies be based on Ivan Townshend's model for comparative quantitative work, and a parallel model for qualitative case studies. Having this plan in place would allow team members to recruit MA students to carry out the design.

Gina Sylvestre (Winnipeg) is developing a proposal on aging. She is in touch with Sheila Neysmith.

Urban Youth, Schooling and Criminalization, Kathleen Gallagher

A Toronto-based interdisciplinary working group has been developing a proposal focused on how socio-spatial polarization, inequality and segregation are producing an uneven terrain of opportunity and risk for youth. The group is interested in examining the unequal distribution of "neighbourhood life-chances" for youth, and how these relate to intersecting policy fields of policing, schooling, recreation, employment and child welfare.

Activities so far have included the development of "policy primers" on the key policies and programs affecting youth in Toronto neighbourhoods in the areas of policing, schooling, recreation, employment, and child welfare; an environmental scan of data sources and other current and recent research in Toronto; and a brief literature review focused on qualitative studies of youth perceptions. Working group members have also met with the Toronto District School Board to discuss the possibility of using data from the TDSB's Student Census.

Discussion

The group discussed other resources and networks:

- Kirwan Institute http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/opportunity-communities/mapping/ has done similar research using "opportunity" as a framework.
- Julie-Anne Boudreau at INRS has a current SSHRC project examining youth experiences in inner-suburban neighbourhoods in Montréal and Paris http://mapcollab.org/.

One option for initial cross-CMA comparative work would be to reproduce the Toronto District School Board's Learning Opportunities Index. The LOI is based on census data, but has not been reproduced in other cities.

Another important area for cross-CMA work is jurisdictional differences. For example, Winnipeg school boards collect property taxes directly from the neighbourhoods they serve, leading to stark inequalities like those found in US schooling.

The London-Paris-Toronto event may be focused on urban youth, schooling and criminalization.

Neighbourhood Collective Efficacy, Rob Howarth & Jessica Carrière

A Toronto-based working group initiated by community partners has met regularly since the beginning of the NCRP to examine neighbourhood-level responses to inequality trends, and the ways in which community-based organizations can support effective advocacy on issues of inequality.

Partner Rob Howarth (Canadian Association of Neighbourhood Services) and NCRP research assistant Jessica Carrière presented a draft report on "neighbourhood collective efficacy," which the investigators define as "residents' desire and capacity to work together to improve daily life and promote equity and social justice in their neighbourhood." The report is based on focus groups and key informant interviews conducted in three neighbourhood organizations, and it examines how organizations' practices can enhance collective efficacy. The next task will be an NCRP proposal to examine collective efficacy at the neighbourhood level.

Discussion

Members of several CMA teams expressed interest in this topic and shared related examples from their own cities:

- Members of the Calgary team are concerned about disparities in participation among neighbourhood residents, and how to foster greater inclusion of low-income people, immigrants, and other groups in neighbourhood change efforts.
- In Montréal, NCRP co-investigator Annick Germain has documented similar issues of exclusion in the neighbourhood Tables de concertation, which tend to reflect the interests of middle-class, educated residents.
- Members of the Halifax team have conducted surveys on social capital, sense of belonging, and other indicators of collective efficacy. This data could be useful to this project.
- In Vancouver, there is a lot of research on divisions and alliances among residents and organizations in the Downtown Eastside. Another example is Falls Creek South, a planned mixed-income community that has developed a community plan.

Agenda Item 4. Report-Back: Cross-CMA Research Agenda

During lunch, meeting attendees broke into groups to plan further project-wide initiatives. Each group provided a brief report on plans and next steps for moving forward.

Aging in the City

Ivan Townshend will continue to develop the analysis and maps on segregation of older adults and provide this information to other CMA teams.

Urban Youth

Kathleen Gallagher reported that the Toronto working group will experiment with the development of an "opportunity index," and with mapping available data in a range of areas such as recreation, police stops, and school achievement against NCRP data such as the Three Cities and Rental Housing Disadvantage Index. Other CMA team members who are interested in this area are invited to contact Kathleen.

Neighbourhood Collective Efficacy

A large group participated in the lunchtime discussion, and have agreed to continue to work together on a shared methodology to study collective efficacy in neighbourhoods. Members of the Halifax and Calgary teams will share relevant documents from their organizations' work. Emily Paradis, Rob Howarth and Jessica Carrière will plan a teleconference to discuss ongoing cross-CMA work in this area.

Three Cities Methodology Paper

Jill Grant will lead the development of a paper focused on the Three Cities methodology. Richard Maaranen, Damaris Rose, Alan Walks and Larry Bourne will contribute.

Knowledge Mobilization

Team members interested in joining a cross-CMA Knowledge Mobilization Working Group are invited to contact David Hulchanski and Howard Ramos. Each CMA team is asked to name a representative to this group. A teleconference will be held to discuss the activities and objectives of this group.

The Working Group will contribute to the development and implementation of an NCRP communications strategy. Elements could include:

- tools such as templates for press releases, email lists of various networks
- protocols for local and national promotion of new reports
- shared messages
- identification of upcoming policy opportunities at the local, provincial and national level
- identification of audiences and stakeholders, and development of targeted strategies for reaching them.

Local CMA teams will take the lead in identifying audiences and communication strategies for local studies. The central NCRP team, with the help of the knowledge mobilization working group, will assist in moving information to a broader audience.

Agenda Item 5. Publications & Knowledge Mobilization

Audiences for our work, and how to reach them

The NCRP is conducting research of national and international relevance. We have and are further developing a talented national network of scholars and community partners through which to disseminate findings and recommendations. The combination of national, high-level trend data with local qualitative information is powerful and compelling. Applied human geography is very influential in terms of persuasion and impact. We have had success with attracting media attention, shaping policy discussions, and translating research findings to the practice level.

In the Research Day discussion about policy implications, several potential audiences and knowledge mobilization strategies were identified:

• *Policy makers, media and elected officials* need brief communications, while civil servants need evidence. Use the 1-3-25 rule: every report needs a 1-page brief for media and elected officials, a 3-page summary for deputy ministers, and a 25-page article or report for civil servants and policy advocates.

- *Community leaders and social movements* are important audiences. Policy is often made through public hearings and public interest groups. Local teams can ensure that findings are shared with local campaigns, as in the example of the Skytrain Poverty Corridor project.
- Evidence-based policy and program options for elected officials and civil servants. In our
 communications with them, we need to lead with solution-oriented recommendations and
 provide the research evidence as background. There are many mechanisms for
 communicating with municipal and provincial officials, including consultations,
 deputations, and committees.
- Many NCRP partners are experts and leaders in policy advocacy; academics don't
 necessarily have to take on this role. Findings from NCRP research can be incorporated into
 partners' policy recommendations, and partners can invite an academic team member into
 meetings with officials.
- Politicians respond to future-oriented and positive messages: articulate how they can have positive impact in the next five years.
- At the federal level there is less interest in evidence, and federal officials tend to rely on internal sources of information such as CMHC. SSHRC can help us leverage our research into this level.
- The CMHC National Housing Research Council is a good forum to reach federal, provincial and territorial bureaucrats; any NCRP research on housing would be relevant to present there.
- Federal and provincial policy proposals need cross-ministry reach, and must answer the need for an economic case. In the Metropolis project, the team learned the importance of getting evidence into the elite ministries that move policy, such as finance.
- Senior civil servants are most influenced by peer-reviewed journal articles.
- Knowledge mobilization products should be tailored to the specific needs of their intended audiences, such as accessible formats and translations.
- The upcoming federal election presents an opportunity to share policy-relevant findings and propose new solutions.
- Creative strategies can reach a wider audience. Examples include SPARC BC's music video on child poverty in BC https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HALzrqE7l4k and CHRA's recent animate video to get housing on the federal election agenda http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fxNIM6eyVNA&sns=em.

In terms of more traditional scholarly outputs, SSHRC has recently implemented an open-access policy for newly-funded projects. Though it does not apply to NCRP, we will put funds towards ensuring open access when NCRP team members publish journal articles and book chapters. Most of our publications will be provided online, but we will print reports and summaries if we believe there is a demand for hard copies.

NCRP Research Summaries

David Hulchanski is developing a template for a three- to four-page research summary, which will soon be distributed. An editor working with NCRP will edit summaries provided by NCRP projects.

Blogging and Twitter

The updated NCRP website now has a fully-functioning blog feature. NCRP editor Philippa Campsie has produced a brief guide on writing a blog; this was distributed to the team and will be available in the team documents area of the website. All NCRP team members are invited to contribute blogs on ongoing and completed research. Each report launch should include a blog entry. Chris Leo at University of Winnipeg provides a good example of an award-winning research-based blog http://christopherleo.com.

David Hulchanski is now active on Twitter and uses it for sharing NCRP maps and findings, tying NCRP research to current news and events, and retweeting related reports. NCRP team members are invited to share their Twitter handles and can create a list on their Twitter feeds to aggregate other NCRP feeds.

Edited Volumes

Team members are needed to edit the planned Oxford University Press volumes. The planned collection of Three Cities analyses requires a table of contents and a parallel outline for each CMA section. A thematic collection, such as a book on rooming houses, would be simpler to assemble.

An edited collection could be distributed online, with chapters available as PDFs. Xavier Leloup recommends a recent book by John Logan as an example https://www.russellsage.org/publications/diversity-and-disparities.

Another option for a collection is a special issue of a journal. Duncan MacLennan will contact journal editors to gauge their interest.

Conferences, Colloquia, Events

The group discussed a number of possibilities for NCRP scholarly meetings:

- A major conference to close the project, with submitted papers;
- A series of shorter thematic symposia, similar to the Research Day model;
- A conference on advancing a federal policy agenda; this could be held two years from now, with planning to begin now;
- Local events to raise the profile of the project in all NCRP CMAs, and to focus on local and provincial policy agendas.

A good example is the upcoming SSHRC funded Vancouver colloquium on public housing in the Western world, which includes both public and invitational events.