

**METROPOLIS PHASE III (2007-2012)
ANNEXES A-L
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL
AND
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION CANADA**

ANNEXES

4	Preamble
5	Annex A: Governance Structures and Institutions
10	Annex B: Role of Centre Directors
12	Annex C: Role of Priority Leaders
14	Annex D: Role of Domain Leaders
16	Annex E: Role of Metropolis Secretariat
18	Annex F: Role of Federal Partners
20	Annex G: Conferences and Annual Policy–Research Symposia
22	Annex H: Communications and Knowledge Transfer/Mobilization
25	Annex I : Other Participants
27	Annex J : Federal Policy–Research Priorities
37	Annex K: Research Processes and Data
39	Annex L : Reporting, Evaluations and Assessments

PREAMBLE

The Metropolis Project is a partnership of policy-makers, researchers and practitioners that is both national and international in scope. These annexes and the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) they accompany pertain to the National Project; the International Project receives no funding through this MoU. The National portion of the Project comprises five university-based Centres of Excellence and a Secretariat based at Citizenship and Immigration Canada that manages the Project on behalf of the federal funding consortium. Each Centre of Excellence has developed an extensive local network of policy-makers, researchers, NGOs and other partners, as well as significant linkages across the country and with the international components of the Metropolis Project. Annexes A through L prescribe activities that the Metropolis Centres of Excellence and the members of the federal consortium that provide core funding to the Metropolis Project are expected to conduct. Many of these activities are already being carried out by Metropolis partners. However, a number of important new activities have been added. They reflect the collective experience of the Project's research and policy stakeholders, and it is expected that they will significantly improve the manner in which research is planned, communicated and integrated into policy and program development. In particular, significantly heightened emphasis has been placed on developing work that cuts across the Centres of Excellence with a strong focus on

transmitting it effectively to the federal partners for use in their policy functions.

Based on the experiences of Phase II of the Metropolis Project, it is clear that these key objectives can only be successfully met by creating infrastructure and aligning resources. As a result, a National Metropolis Committee will be created, which will manage an annual national research competition, as well as guide and support knowledge transfer/mobilization into federal policy processes. In addition, leaders within the Centres will be identified to ensure that the focused policy-research priority areas will be more visible across Metropolis events and activities. These Priority Leaders will also be tasked with working with the Secretariat and Federal Partners to transfer findings to federal policy-makers more regularly and effectively.

Although the annexes deal with required activities, they are by no means intended to restrict other ideas and applications from emerging and being implemented. In fact, the Centres are encouraged to use the new measures contained in this MoU to improve their dealings with other stakeholders. Throughout, it is recognized that the Centres are not all structured in the same way. However, after a decade of operation, it is clear that best practices that have developed should be implemented in all Centres while retaining some flexibility required in order to meet local conditions, and it is expected that all parties to the MoU will respond to the prescriptions set out in the annexes in a flexible and innovative manner.

ANNEX A

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND INSTITUTIONS

Overall coordination and governance of the Metropolis Project is achieved through a set of institutions and practices that, in most instances, require representation from policy-makers, researchers and practitioners. The most significant of these institutions are described below.

(i) University-Based Centres of Excellence

The University-Based Centres of Excellence (located in Vancouver, Edmonton, Toronto, Montréal and Halifax/Moncton) are the most fundamental institutions of the Metropolis Project. Each Centre comprises a local network of researchers, policy-makers from different orders of government, and practitioners. They are managed by Centre Management Committees and Governance Boards (described in section ii below); led by Centre Directors (Annex B); and are divided into research areas described as “domains” (Annex D). All research undertaken under the aegis of the National Project occurs through the Centres of Excellence (Annex K). This work is guided by the research domains and the more specific policy-research priorities identified by the federal funders (Annex J), through interactions with stakeholders and partners, and through the new national research competition described in section iii below.

(ii) Centre Management Committees or Governance Boards

Within each Centre there exists a management committee structure responsible for two key objectives: the development and approval of research agendas (Annex K), and providing strategic direction and stewardship for the Centre’s operations to ensure that it functions as an institution. The management structure may be composed of a number of committees with specific responsibilities which, together, ensure that the highest standards of governance are maintained and that the research undertaken at the Centres meets accepted academic standards and corresponds to the research domains (Annex D) which are structured by the specific federal policy-research priorities (Annex J). Centre Directors are empowered to manage the daily operations of the Centres, possibly with the assistance of an executive committee drawn from the larger Centre management structure.

The mandate and composition of these management committees is unique to each Centre. However, each committee should have a publicly available Terms of Reference which clearly states its roles and responsibilities, as well as its decision-making powers and processes. They must meet at least twice a year. The management

structure should comprise a mixture of policy-makers, researchers, practitioners and community partners (Annex I). To facilitate the exchange of information between the Centres and the federal stakeholders and to improve coordination, SSHRC and the Metropolis Project Secretariat will hold *ex officio* membership on the Centre management committees at each Centre. To ensure responsiveness to federal funders, a minimum of one place on each Centre's management committee or governance board will be made available to a representative from each primary federal partner¹. This should include the Regional Director General from CIC as CIC's representative. In keeping with the nature of Metropolis as a federally funded policy-research initiative, in all cases a plurality of members is to be drawn from a combination of university-based researchers and federal policy-makers. Terms for management committee or governance board positions should be staggered and should not exceed five years. Members can be renewed.

The Centre management committee or governance board also plays an oversight role on data and website issues (see sections vi and viii below).

(iii) National Metropolis Committee (NMC)

Evaluations of Metropolis over the last decade have demonstrated a need for significant infrastructure in order to ensure the development of cross-Centre research and the effective dissemination of these results to federal policy-makers. Accordingly, a National Metropolis Committee will be created. The NMC will be tasked with working at a supra-Centre level to ensure that Project activities and research effectively meet the expectations of federal funders. In effect, the NMC will act as a national Board of Directors to guide the Project.

The NMC will be mandated to manage five specific tasks: 1) an annual Metropolis National Research Competition (which could include more than one project per year depending upon funding); 2) the identification of Centre-funded research deemed to be the most useful to federal

policy development, which will guide knowledge transfer/mobilization efforts of the Metropolis Secretariat and the Centres; 3) the approval of knowledge transfer/mobilization plans for each of the six priority policy-research areas (Annex J); 4) input into the knowledge transfer/mobilization plan to guide the Metropolis Secretariat's annual knowledge transfer/mobilization activities; and 5) the on-going assessment of knowledge transfer/mobilization activities to ascertain their efficacy at reaching the core audiences within the federal policy community, which are identified in Annex F.

In addition, where issues cannot be resolved at the Metropolis Interdepartmental Committee (IDC) (section iv below) or the Joint Committee (section v below), they will be addressed by the NMC.

The NMC will meet quarterly, with three meetings held in Ottawa and the fourth on-site at the National Metropolis Conference. This committee will be co-chaired by the Executive Head of the Metropolis Project and a Director General from one of the primary federal funding departments. This co-chair position will rotate bi-annually, commencing with the Director General of Research and Evaluation at Citizenship and Immigration Canada, followed by the relevant Directors General nominated as the project leads by primary federal funders.

Membership of the NMC will comprise of one Director General-level representative from each primary federal funding organization, one Centre Director from each Centre (Annex B), the policy-research Priority Leaders (Annex C), and two national civil society umbrella organizations annually nominated by the primary federal funding departments. SSHRC will have an *ex-officio* member on the committee. The Executive Head of the Metropolis Secretariat, and the member of the Metropolis Secretariat who chairs the Interdepartmental Committee (see iv below), will also be members of the committee. The Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E) will provide secretariat services to the NMC. As this committee is designed to ensure responsiveness to federal priorities, federal representatives must constitute the majority of the members on the NMC. If necessary, the number of Priority Leaders that are members may be decreased with the others accorded observer status.

The NMC will have three pools of funds at its disposal (a fourth pool of funds will continue to be leveraged by the Metropolis Secretariat

¹ Primary federal funders for this funding period will be defined as those federal funders, other than SSHRC, that contribute a minimum of \$85,000 for the core funding of the Centres for each year of the funding period. In the case of coalitions of interest (e.g. justice/policing/security, and regionalization) the coalition will be collectively accorded the same opportunities as a single primary funder.

annually and will guide the development of the knowledge transfer/mobilization activities of the Secretariat, which will be reported to the NMC each year). These three pools of funds will be drawn from core Metropolis funding raised in excess of \$1.5 million/year.

The first pool of funds will be a minimum of \$125,000 per national research competition. The NMC will manage more than one annual call if federal funders are prepared to provide \$125,000 per additional call. The specific policy question to be addressed by each call will be developed by the NMC.

Funds allocated to the call will be made available to the successful research team(s) (comprised of multidisciplinary researchers drawn from at least three of the Centres) to undertake the research, to purchase data where necessary, to disseminate the results widely through a range of knowledge transfer/mobilization activities targeting policy-makers and the research community, and to participate in the first National Metropolis Conference (Annex G) to take place following the completion of their research. Some members of the research team, although not the principal investigators, can be drawn from outside the Metropolis Centres, but as a requirement of funding, all members of the research team must seek affiliation with a Centre (Annex I).

The adjudication of the research call will be undertaken by a peer review committee established by the NMC. It will include a balance of researchers and policy-makers (drawn from the primary federal funders) as well as one NGO representative. SSHRC will sit on the peer review committee in an *ex officio* capacity. The peer review committee will be co-chaired by the two directors general (or their designates) who chair the NMC at the time of adjudication.

The second pool of funds to be allocated by the NMC will be allocated to Priority Leaders (Annex C) for knowledge transfer/mobilization activities targeting federal policy-makers. Activities in this category could include policy-area seminars held in Ottawa;² research summaries; policy briefs; Metropolis Conversations; Ottawa-based brown bag seminars; participation in IDC meetings; research syntheses; as well as other activities that the NMC may suggest following results from on-going knowledge transfer/mobilization assessments. In addition, release time not to exceed \$7,500/year per Priority Leader is an eligible expense to be dispensed

from this pool subject to approval of the knowledge transfer/mobilization plan.

The third pool of funds will be allocated to specific projects proposed by Domain Leaders (Annex D) for meta-analyses and cross-Centre work including knowledge transfer/mobilization activities related to those research projects funded by the Centres deemed by the NMC to have the highest utility for federal policy development. This could include the development of publications that bring together multiple research projects on the same topic in a fashion accessible to policy-makers such as research summaries, policy briefs, Metropolis Conversations, Ottawa-based brown bag seminars, participation in IDC meetings, or targeted research syntheses, as well as other activities that the NMC may suggest following results from on-going knowledge transfer/mobilization assessments.

The travel costs of Centre Directors, Priority Leaders and umbrella organizations for the four annual meetings will be covered by NMC.

(iv) Metropolis Interdepartmental Committee (IDC)

The IDC provides a forum for discussing Metropolis' horizontal research priorities and strategic directions. It is the primary federal mechanism for communicating information about all Project activities and developments to a broad cross section of federal officials.³ It is also the principal body tasked with developing partnerships among stakeholders as well as developing the content of the national conferences. The IDC will make recommendations to the NMC on knowledge transfer/mobilization plans provided by Domain Leaders and Priority Leaders.

It is composed of Director-level or designated representatives of all of the federal departments and agencies that fund the Metropolis Project along with other key federal ministries, including at least one policy unit and one research unit representative. Quebec's ministère de l'Immigration et des Communautés culturelles (MICC)⁴ and the Metropolis Centres have observer status on the IDC. Where possible, participation will also include researchers from the Centres and regionally based federal policy-makers.

² National headquarters of federal funders are a core audience for Metropolis regardless of location (e.g. ACOA's Moncton-based NHQ).

³ The primary audiences of Metropolis are those with policy and research functions, but program and regional staff are also target audiences for Metropolis research.

Each member of the IDC will provide an annual knowledge transfer/mobilization plan that details their organizational structure, the key audiences and opportunities for making use of Metropolis within their own organization, as well as proposed knowledge transfer/mobilization activities they would like to undertake within their organization. This will assist the Secretariat in developing an annual knowledge transfer/mobilization report on Secretariat activities that will be submitted to the National Metropolis Committee every December of the funding period.

Meetings are held at the call of the Chair (appointed by the Metropolis Secretariat), generally every three months for a minimum of four meetings a year. When possible, meetings will be hosted by members of the IDC to facilitate participation by a wider range of policy-makers.

(v) Joint Metropolis Secretariat-SSHRC/Centres Directors Committee (Joint Committee)

The Joint Committee is designed to promote an exchange of information between the Centres and the Metropolis Secretariat; to provide a venue for the discussion of the Project's strategic orientations as they apply to the Centres; to facilitate coordination and joint planning; and to implement this Memorandum of Understanding. As the body comprised of those who are best positioned to gauge the knowledge transfer/mobilization strengths of Centre researchers, this body will select the Centre-based Priority Leaders (Annex C). Note that the Secretariat will discuss potential Priority Leaders with relevant federal funders.

The committee will be co-chaired by the Executive Head of the Metropolis Secretariat and by the Vice-President, Partnerships of SSHRC (or their designates). The Secretariat will fund the travel and accommodation of a maximum of two persons per Centre to attend one of the two meetings each year.

The Joint Committee will meet a minimum of two times per year, once in proximity to the National Conference (Annex G) and once at a

mutually convenient time to be arranged by the Metropolis Secretariat, ideally in conjunction with one of the Ottawa-based NMC meetings (section iii above).

(vi) National Data Committee

The National Data Committee's mandate is to discuss data needs and to provide statistical support and coordination to the Centres. With the renewal of the Metropolis Project, one of the Committee's main activities will be to build capacity in data usage. As well, the Committee is a venue to resolve issues related to the data provided to the Centres and to facilitate the acquisition and development of policy-relevant data and information for use by the Centres.

The National Data Committee is chaired by Statistics Canada with representation from the data coordinator of each of the Centres, the Metropolis Secretariat and Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Should the other federal partners make available their administrative data to support the research from the Metropolis Centres of Excellence (Annex F), the National Data Committee could serve as a venue for coordination. As such, other federal partners participate in the Committee as required. For example, a representative of Canadian Heritage participates in the National Data Committee meetings as the Department shares its custom census tables with the Metropolis Project through special license agreement.

The Committee meets at least once per year usually during the annual Metropolis National Conference (Annex G). Travel costs of Centre representatives are covered by the Centres. Minutes of this meeting will be provided by Statistics Canada to the Joint Committee (section v above).

(vii) Centre Data Committees

In addition to the National Data Committee, every Centre has its own data committee, which serves as a data focal point, organizes the Centre's data acquisitions and data holdings, and offers a venue for discussion on data needs and related issues. In particular, the Centre Data Committee is responsible for the use of data and compliance with privacy and confidentiality regulations as well as data sharing licensing agreements under the Metropolis Project. The Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E) assists the National Data Committee in working with these committees to resolve issues as they arise.

⁴ The MICC has participated on the IDC since the outset of the Metropolis Project, in recognition of the role that the Government of Quebec plays in immigration issues. Other provincial governments participate in the governance structures of the local Centres and occasionally by video-conference in the IDC meetings. In this phase of Metropolis, all provincial governments may request observer status.

(viii) National Web Committee

Since the network of websites is the most important component of knowledge transfer/mobilization infrastructure within the Metropolis Project, there is a committee specifically designed to ensure effective and coherent approaches to the maintenance of the network of Metropolis websites.

In addition to maintaining and enhancing the critical knowledge transfer/mobilization elements and content, the National Web Committee is responsible for technical management of the network of websites and for developing recommendations pertaining to website governance, technical development and network configuration.

It is chaired by the Metropolis Project Secretariat (Annex E) and has representatives from each of the Centres. Note that the Centres' management boards (section ii above) exercise an oversight function for their Centre's membership on this Committee and thus, for the selection of Centre representatives on the committee, as well as for approval and implementation of decisions of the web committee.

The Committee meets at least once per year during the annual Metropolis National Conference (Annex G). Costs of Centre representation are borne by the Centres. Minutes of this meeting, prepared by the Metropolis Secretariat, will be provided to the Joint Committee (section v above).

(ix) International Steering Committee and International Secretariat

The International Steering Committee (ISC) provides overall strategic direction to the

international component of the Metropolis Project. The Committee has elaborated the rights and responsibilities of international Metropolis membership and these are available upon request. Among the major functions of the Committee is the approval of the site and content of the annual International Conference.

The Committee is co-chaired by the Executive Head of the Metropolis Secretariat and by a European representative. The International Metropolis Secretariat, which has a North American and a European arm, provides secretariat services to the ISC. The head of the North American Secretariat is the Director of International Projects of the Metropolis Secretariat at CIC. The International Secretariat is responsible for proposing strategies, directions and activities to the ISC.

The Canadian Centres are entitled to place one member on the Steering Committee with the costs associated with the appointment to be borne by the Centres. Strategic Policy Branch at Citizenship and Immigration Canada also has a seat on the ISC. Quebec's ministère de l'Immigration et des Communautés culturelles (MICC)⁵ has observer status.

(x) Evaluation Committee

An Evaluation Committee will report annually to the National Metropolis Committee (section iii above). It will be co-chaired by the evaluation groups at SSHRC and CIC. Membership will include representation from other primary funders. It will meet as necessary to implement the evaluation and assessment components of Annex L. It will consult with the Secretariat (Annex E) as appropriate.

⁵ The MICC has participated as an observer on the ISC since the outset of the Metropolis Project, in recognition of the role that the Government of Quebec plays in immigration issues.

ANNEX B

ROLE OF CENTRE DIRECTORS

The Centre Directors are appointed by the relevant Vice-Presidents of participating universities. In the spirit of Metropolis it is expected that these appointments will reflect both academic excellence and a demonstrated ability to communicate effectively with policy-makers and other stakeholders.

They are the primary leaders and representatives of the Metropolis Centres of Excellence. Accordingly, they must be knowledgeable about the full range of research underway at their Centre. They are the principal liaisons between their Centres, the federal funders, other orders of government and local stakeholders. As such, they must have a demonstrated ability to communicate effectively with government officials and other stakeholders. Given the time required to fulfill this role, their home institutions agree to provide them with course release time or similar compensation.

The Centre Directors manage the daily operations of the Centres including administrative staff and technical staff responsible for the Centre's website. They are responsible for managing Centre funds with integrity. In addition, they are responsible for managing the production of the annual report for SSHRC as well as any documentation requested as part of other reporting, evaluation and assessment activities described in Annex L. They work extensively with the Metropolis Secretariat on an on-going basis.

The Centre Directors are responsible for organizing the annual Policy-Research Symposia (Annex G) and the calls for research proposals at each Centre (Annex K). They also are responsible for, along with the Domain Leaders (Annex D), recruiting new affiliates to join their Centres.

The Centre Director(s) of the Centre hosting the annual National Metropolis Conference (Annex G) will take the principal role in managing the organization of the conference. This will include working with their colleagues, the Metropolis Secretariat, the National Metropolis Committee, and the Interdepartmental Committee to determine content, raise the necessary funds, and handle logistics. In addition, they will work with Priority Leaders (Annex C) and Domain Leaders (Annex D) to ensure that the Federal Policy-Research Priorities (Annex J) and cross-Centre work is showcased.

The Centre Directors will take a coordinating role in communications and knowledge transfer/mobilization at their Centre. This includes meeting with the local CIC Regional Directors General at least twice a year as well as acting as a focal point for media enquiries, and overseeing the knowledge transfer/mobilization activities described in Annex H.

The Centre Directors represent their Centres on a range of governance structures described in Annex A. Their responsibilities in this regard include:

- Sitting on the management committees or governance boards and Executive Committees (Annex A) of their Centre;
- Attending each International Metropolis Conference (Annex G) (at least one Director per Centre);
- Attending, where practicable, the annual National Metropolis Conference (Annex G);
- Participating in the quarterly meetings of the National Metropolis Committee (Annex A) (one Director per Centre);
- Participating, where practicable, in the bi-annual Joint Metropolis Secretariat-SSHRC/ Centre Directors Committee meetings (Annex A);
- Participating, whenever possible, in the Interdepartmental Committee meetings (Annex A) either in person or via video-conference (or be represented by a designated Centre member).

The term for Centre Directors is for the duration of this MoU.

The powers of the Centre Director(s) should be specified and made publicly available. Where necessary, multiple Centre Directors may be appointed. In this case, their relationship to one another, especially in terms of decision-making authority, conflict-resolution mechanisms, and other good governance concerns should be addressed explicitly in terms of reference developed by the management committee or governance board of the Centre (section ii above). Further, to ensure consistency, where there is more than one Centre Director, all Centre Directors must be concurrently and equivalently involved in fulfilling the role of Centre Director.

ANNEX C

ROLE OF PRIORITY LEADERS

To ensure that the Federal Policy-Research Priorities detailed in Annex J are effectively addressed, a new position will be created: Priority Leaders. A Priority Leader will be selected for each of the Federal Policy-Research Priorities. They will be selected by the Joint Metropolis Secretariat-SSHRC/Centre Directors Committee (Annex A) based on discussions with federal funders, demonstrated research excellence, and a proven ability to interact effectively with federal partners. They will be university-based researchers and where necessary, or desirable, they may concurrently hold positions as Centre Directors (Annex B) or Domain Leaders (Annex D).

Note that the creation of Priority Leaders is designed to enhance the value of Metropolis research and activities to the federal funding partnership. Their role is NOT designed to undertake research in the policy areas, but to coordinate those who do, and to make those research results accessible to federal policy-makers in a manner most conducive to enhancing their utilization. However, this role would not preclude undertaking research in the priority area.

Their initial term will run from July 1, 2007 to March 31, 2009. Following the Mid-Term Review detailed in Annex L and possible changes to Federal Policy-Research Priorities detailed in Annex J, a second wave of Priority Leaders will be appointed for the rest of the funding period. It is possible that the original Priority Leaders

may be reappointed for this additional term (April 1, 2009 to March 31, 2012).

Given the time commitment that will be required, release time will be made available as part of the knowledge transfer/mobilization funds available to the Priority Leaders. Funding for activities of these Priority Leaders can be accessed through the National Metropolis Committee (Annex A). This will include, where necessary, media training.

Although the Priority Leaders will be based at individual Centres, their responsibilities include coordinating work on their policy-research priority across the entire National Project, including work at all five Centres. They will also create and maintain connections with the federal funders most interested in the policy-research priority for which they are responsible.

The responsibilities of Priority Leaders include:

- Working closely with the related Domain Leaders (Annex D) and the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E) on an on-going basis;
- Attending the quarterly meetings of the National Metropolis Committee (Annex A);
- Preparing an annual knowledge transfer/mobilization plan and presenting it to the National Metropolis Committee (as described in Annex A);
- Creating knowledge transfer/mobilization mechanisms with the Metropolis Secretariat

to reach both a policy and an academic audience (must include publication and face-to-face interactions such as research summaries, targeted research syntheses, policy briefs, and Ottawa-based brown bag seminars);

- Organizing, in collaboration with the Metropolis Secretariat, a thematic half-day seminar on their policy-research priority area in Ottawa once in their tenure;
- Acting as media focal points on their priority area;
- Providing an annual summary of activities on their policy-research priority to the Metropolis Secretariat for inclusion in the National Metropolis Annual Report (Annex L);

- Ensuring that their policy-research priority is well covered at the National Metropolis Conference (Annex G) in workshops, and where possible, in plenary topics;
- Participating in an annual meeting with the Secretariat, relevant federal funders and related Domain Leaders, possibly at the Metropolis National Conference.

Note that the Priority Leader for “Justice, Policing, and Security” as detailed in Annex J will also be tasked with working with the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E) and the relevant federal funders (Annex F) to develop a larger cadre of researchers working on immigration and diversity in the justice, policing and security fields.

ANNEX D

ROLE OF DOMAIN LEADERS

(i) Domains

Research domains (areas of research) are the principal organizing structure of the networks of stakeholders within each Metropolis Centre. Over the preceding decade, a range of domains have developed across the Centres, partly as a reflection of expertise, but also in large measure as artifacts of the initial call for proposals to create the Centres. The result has been a structure that has frequently impeded cross-Centre collaboration. Accordingly, in this funding period, cross-Centre domains will be created, with the option of developing/maintaining an additional domain to address expertise or interest at each Centre. The additional domain will be subject to approval by the National Metropolis Committee (Annex A). Each Centre will have between four and six domains.

The cross-Centre research domains will be:

- 1) Citizenship and Social, Cultural and Civic Integration
- 2) Economic and Labour Market Integration
- 3) Family, Children and Youth
- 4) Housing and Neighbourhoods
- 5) Justice, Policing, and Security

- 6) Welcoming Communities: The Role of Host Communities in Attracting, Integrating and Retaining Newcomers and Minorities

Each of the cross-Centre domains must be addressed by a minimum of three Centres. Centres will affiliate researchers working on these topics from Centres that do not have a given cross-Centre domain (Annex I).

The contours of the cross-Centre domains are defined by the Federal Policy-Research Priorities described in Annex J. The contours of the additional domains should be developed in discussion with relevant federal funders.

All research undertaken at the Centres must fall within the domain structure of the Centres.

(ii) Domain Leaders

While Priority Leaders (Annex C) are tasked with ensuring knowledge transfer/mobilization to the federal partners on policy priorities, Domain Leaders are tasked with coordinating the research efforts of researchers within each Centre.

Domain leaders are appointed by the management committee or governance board of the Centre (Annex A), upon recommendation of the Centre Directors (Annex C). In the spirit of Metropolis it is expected that these appointments will reflect both academic excellence and a demonstrated ability to communicate effectively with policy-makers and other stakeholders.

The responsibilities of Domain Leaders include:

- Taking the lead in developing research capacity and output of their domain by encouraging domain researchers to apply for funding from their Centre and from various other pools of funding available during this funding period, as well as by actively seeking out new researchers, including graduate students, to join and actively participate in the domain;
- Taking the lead within the Centre in organizing domain meetings and coordinating domain activities including participating in the annual Annual Centre Policy-Research Symposia (Annex G), planning workshops at Metropolis conferences, seminars and other knowledge transfer/mobilization activities;
- Serving as a point of contact between domains at other Centres or stakeholders and researchers in the domain including responding to inquiries for information from the federal partners and other stakeholders about the domain (detailed research inquiries will continue to be addressed by the principal investigators);
- Meeting annually with the Secretariat (Annex E), relevant federal funders and the related Priority Leader, possibly at the National Conference (Annex G);
- Promoting comparative research studies with researchers from other Centres, including representing the Centre at annual meetings with counterpart Domain Leaders from other Centres in order to develop plans for comparative and pan-Canadian research;
- Working with members of their domain and the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E) on the development of knowledge transfer/mobilization strategies for the research undertaken in their domain;
- Reporting on and providing annual summaries of the Centre's research initiatives in the domain (for input to the Centres' annual reports to SSHRC);
- Informing affiliated researchers of sources of research funding to supplement or extend funding by the Centre;
- Maintaining strong communication links with the Director(s) of the Centre (Annex B);
- Ensuring that workshops involving Metropolis researchers, and identified as Metropolis sessions, are held at the annual Congrès de l'Acfas and/or the Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Terms for domain leaders should not exceed three years, with the possibility of one renewal. Emphasis should be placed on providing, where possible, newer scholars with the opportunity to lead domains.

Recognizing the time demands of this position, release time is provided to domain leaders by their host institutions. They may apply to their Centres for matching funds for release time, although in accordance with SSHRC regulations, this is not to exceed \$25,000 per domain leader position over the funding period.

ANNEX E

ROLE OF METROPOLIS SECRETARIAT

The Metropolis Secretariat exercises stewardship over the Metropolis Project as a whole. The Secretariat has two main functions: 1) leadership, strategic direction setting, and overall coordination; and 2) knowledge transfer/mobilization. In addition, the Metropolis Secretariat handles planning and partner relations; resourcing key activities and infrastructure development (both fundraising and financing); partnership and project development; and Metropolis promotion.

These responsibilities require extensive contact between the Secretariat and the Project's academic and policy partners; the construction of opportunities to allow for coalitions and relationships to develop; the maintenance and further development of a planning and communications infrastructure; the promotion of the Project and Project activities; and the interpretation of Metropolis to participants and users in a manner that promotes a cohesive partnership. The Metropolis Secretariat serves as the primary point of contact for the Centres on all matters addressed by the MoU with the exception of specific activities required by SSHRC as well as the primary liaison between the federal funders and the Centres.

The Secretariat provides leadership and strategic directions as well as overall coordination by participating in the following governance activities:

- Co-chairing and providing secretariat services to the National Metropolis Committee (NMC); including the preparation of a National Metropolis Annual Report and dispensing NMC funds (Annex A);
- Chairing and providing secretariat services to the Metropolis Interdepartmental Committee (IDC); including working with IDC members to ensure knowledge transfer/mobilization to federal partners identified in Annex F and planning the national conference (Annex G) with the host Centre;
- *Ex officio* membership in the governing body, management committee or governance board of each Centre (Annex A);
- Co-chairing the Metropolis International Steering Committee and co-managing the Metropolis International Secretariat (Annex A);
- Working with the Centres in the planning of the Centres' annual Policy-Research Symposia (Annex G);
- Organizing annual meetings of the Secretariat with Domain Leaders, Priority Leaders and relevant federal partners on each Federal Policy-Research Priority (Annex J).

The Secretariat has the overall lead for the Metropolis Project on knowledge transfer/mobilization. Activities in this regard include:

- Working with Priority Leaders (Annex C), Domain Leaders (Annex D), Centre Directors (Annex B), the NMC and IDC (Annex A) in the funding, development, implementation, and assessment of knowledge transfer/mobilization initiatives;
- Web management;
- Working with the Centres, the NMC and IDC (Annex A) to plan and secure funding for the National Metropolis Conferences (Annex G);
- Working with the ISC (Annex A) to ensure that Canadian policy interests are well represented in the International Metropolis Conferences;
- Working with Centre researchers to ensure that Metropolis-funded research continues to influence the wider academic discourse.

In carrying out its mission, the Secretariat must respond to the legitimate needs and expectations of the Project's principal stakeholders, including those of the funding federal departments and agencies, the Centres, provincial and municipal stakeholders, NGOs, and members of the Metropolis International Steering Committee. The scope of the Metropolis Secretariat's activities is both national and international.

ANNEX F

ROLE OF FEDERAL PARTNERS

Assessments of Phase II make clear that federal funders will only be able to fully capitalize on their investments in Metropolis by actively engaging with the Project partners, activities, and products. Accordingly, members of the federal Metropolis consortium accept certain responsibilities and agree to implement a set of practices as described below. The Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E) will be available to assist departments in planning their participation and in transferring best practices from one department to another.

(i) Knowledge Transfer/Mobilization to Key Internal Audiences

Federal partners are jointly responsible (with the Secretariat) for transferring/mobilizing knowledge within their organization. Federal departments need to develop and provide an annual update to the Metropolis IDC on their departmental/agency structure, the key audiences within that structure that could make use of Metropolis research, and the key infrastructure that could be used in this regard (i.e. department-wide policy committees).

(ii) Participation in Governance of the Metropolis Project

Since Metropolis is a policy-research project, representatives from both policy and research divisions/branches within each federal partner will actively participate in the Project. Level of

participation will vary among primary funders and other federal funders (see Annex A, footnote #1).

All federal departments will be represented at the quarterly meetings of the Metropolis IDC at the Director level (Annex A).

Primary federal funders will be represented at the Director General-level at the quarterly meetings of the NMC (Annex A).

Primary federal funders (via regional offices if appropriate) will participate on the management committees or governance boards (Annex A) at each Centre of Excellence. Note that these boards meet at least twice a year.

Primary federal funders will participate on the Evaluation Committee (Annex A) where they wish to do so. Note that this committee meets as necessary.

Statistics Canada, Canadian Heritage and Citizenship and Immigration Canada will participate on the National Data Committee (Annex A). Other federal funders may also participate if they wish to do so. Note that this committee meets annually.

(iii) Participation in Centre activities

Primary federal funders will be represented at each of the Centres' annual Policy-Research Symposia (Annex G). Other federal funders will work with the Secretariat (Annex A) to ascertain which Policy-Research Symposia will be of the most use to them.

The aim in all cases will be to ensure that federal funders participate actively and effectively in those meetings and are able to fully represent their department's policy-research interests to Centre researchers. Departments will also make a best effort to participate in domain meetings and in other workshops organized by the Centres, as appropriate to their field of activity. Additionally, regional staff of federal funders will be encouraged to partake in the brown bag seminars (Annex H) organized at each Centre.

(iv) Participation in Conferences and Workshops

Departments will make a best effort to participate actively in national and international Metropolis Conferences (Annex G). Given that all workshops require participation by policy-makers, researchers and NGOs, the federal partners will participate actively in workshops on areas of policy interest. Wherever possible, federal departments will organize workshops on key policy topics designed to engage other stakeholders in discussions. Departmental participation should include senior policy and research staff as well as program staff. Regional staff will be encouraged to participate when the National Metropolis Conference takes place in their region.

Given the significant cost savings that can be attained from organizing events in conjunction with the national conferences, wherever possible, federal partners will organize meetings of key stakeholders in conjunction with the national conferences.

(v) Consultation and Dissemination

Departments will consider creating internal committees (or adapting existing committees) for the purpose of identifying and coordinating their department's interests in Metropolis policy-research and communicating those interests to the Centres. Ideally these committees will serve as vehicles for disseminating research throughout the organization including to representatives from the policy and research sectors and, where appropriate, regional and operations personnel.

(vi) Information and Data Availability

Federal departments shall endeavour to inform Centres, in a timely, efficient and readily

understood manner, of significant policy and program changes. Where possible, federal departments will make available relevant information from their administrative data holdings, subject to confidentiality and privacy legislation. The Metropolis National Data Committee (Annex A) could be used to facilitate the establishment of protocols for the Centres to use the data products provided.

(vii) Access to Contract Research Opportunities

The federal funding partners will establish active outreach processes to ensure that the Centres' researchers are informed of and are given ample opportunity to bid for federal contract research. In addition, departments will consider unsolicited proposals from Domain Leaders (Annex D) regarding contract research.

(viii) General Support

Members of the federal Metropolis consortium will make a best effort, subject to the availability of financial and in-kind resources, to support core Project activities including such things as sponsoring the participation of affiliates with less resources available to them like NGOs and graduate students. Also included in this category is active participation by member departments (including secondments) in the planning and developmental work that is conducted by the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E).

(ix) Website support

Federal departments will endeavour to maintain and keep up-to-date a page hosted on their departmental websites addressing their engagement in Metropolis describing their policy-research interest in the Project and providing links to sections where policy and program changes, data sources, departmental research, calls for research proposals and other key departmental documents can be found.

(x) New Federal Funders

Note that new partners who are joining the Metropolis Project for the first time, or those that are rejoining, will likely need to initially engage and invest on a project-by-project basis more actively at the outset of the funding phase. This is particularly true where a new cadre of researchers is being trained, like those in the areas of regionalization or policing/justice/security.

ANNEX G

CONFERENCES AND ANNUAL POLICY-RESEARCH SYMPOSIA

While significant knowledge transfer/mobilization can occur on-line or in print format, there is no replacement for face-to-face interaction. In the types of events described here, participants are immersed in knowledge-rich environments essential to the development of broad perspectives and comprehensive understandings of regional differences.

(i) National Conferences

The National Metropolis Conferences are the principal venue for national stakeholders to come together and have become the largest annual conferences in Canada on immigration and diversity issues. As such they are an important opportunity to inform thinking on key policy questions. All Metropolis participants are encouraged to participate as frequently as possible at these events. By moving the conferences around the country, greater access is provided to those with fewer resources available to support travel. In addition, this allows a more nuanced understanding of regional differences to be developed among Metropolis participants.

Each Centre shall host a national conference once over the period of funding, commencing with the Atlantic Metropolis Centre in April 2008. The sequencing and scheduling of these events

shall be approved by the Joint Committee (Annex A). Fund raising will be undertaken by the hosting Centre in partnership with the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E).

Commencing with the 10th National Conference, the conferences will continue to evolve towards more directly addressing themes of national interest. For example, plenary topics will be agreed upon by the National Metropolis Committee and research from the annual national research competitions (Annex A), will be prominently showcased.

In addition, while the nature of the conference workshops will remain that of a knowledge fair (e.g. an open call for workshop proposals), the Federal Policy-Research Priorities (Annex J) and cross-Centre initiatives will receive greater attention through knowledge transfer/mobilization initiatives funded by the National Metropolis Committee. Workshops funded through these initiatives will receive priority in the adjudication of workshop proposals.

All workshops will continue to require the active participation of policy-makers, researchers and NGOs. To facilitate the development of cross-Centre research teams, priority in this funding period will be accorded to those workshops that also include affiliates from more than one Centre.

These conferences also provide an opportunity to economically organize other meetings such as federal stakeholders' meetings as described in Annex F, or specific policy-themed seminars. Accordingly, all Metropolis participants are encouraged to plan meetings in conjunction with the National Metropolis Conferences whenever possible.

(ii) Annual Centre Policy-Research Symposia

The majority of research funded by the Centres is funded through each Centre's annual competitive calls for research proposals (RFPs) (see Annex K). The annual Centre Policy-Research Symposia are an opportunity to hear results from projects funded in previous years, and to influence the priorities for the coming year. They are also the principal fora where the local networks connected to each Centre have the opportunity to connect with federal policy-makers and where areas of mutual concern can be identified in order to guide the work of the Centres.

Each Centre will annually organize a Centre Policy-Research Symposium that offers the federal funding partners a substantive opportunity to review and to discuss the previous year's research as well as current and future policy concerns. The thematic panels at these meetings will be developed in consultation with the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E) and must include federal funding partners whenever possible. The Centres will endeavour to assemble the maximum number of researchers to participate in this review and discussion. In particular, time will need to be set aside for the review and planning of research associated with the federal Policy-Research Priorities (see Annex J).

Each Centre will develop its annual call for research proposals following its annual Centre Policy-Research Symposia. The Centre Directors who sit on the National Metropolis Committee will table a copy of their call for research proposals with the NMC at the earliest meeting following the launch of the call. Similarly, the results of the call will also be presented to the NMC at the first possible opportunity.

In order to ensure that the federal partners have an adequate opportunity to plan for, to attend and to input into the annual policy-

research symposia, the IDC (Annex A) should be advised well in advance. The Centres will need to coordinate the scheduling of their planning meetings among themselves, and with the involvement of the Metropolis Secretariat, so as to ensure that there are no concurrent meetings.

(iii) International Conferences

The International Metropolis Conferences are the principal venue where international comparisons and past practices from other countries can be used to inform Canadian policy-research. Over the past decade they have grown to be the largest regularly scheduled gatherings of global experts on immigration and diversity.

To extract value from these conferences, and to ensure that Centre-based research is connected to global knowledge networks, where possible, one Centre Director (Annex B) from each Centre of Excellence will attend each International Metropolis Conference.

Similarly, where possible, Centre research affiliates are encouraged to propose workshops or participate in these conferences to strengthen the internationally comparative component of their work.

Once in this funding cycle the conference will be hosted in Canada, subject to approval by the International Steering Committee (Annex A). The Centres, the federal partners, and other Metropolis stakeholders are strongly encouraged to take advantage of the proximity of this conference and to participate actively. Centres are also encouraged to take steps to facilitate participation of their research affiliates at the Canadian-hosted International Metropolis Conference.

These conferences also provide an opportunity to economically organize other meetings such as bilateral or multilateral meetings designed to explore particular policy priorities and the approaches adopted in other jurisdictions. Accordingly, all Metropolis participants are encouraged to plan meetings in conjunction with the International Metropolis Conferences whenever possible.

The Metropolis Secretariat will work with the hosts of the International Metropolis Conferences to address Canadian policy concerns and to showcase Canadian research where appropriate.

ANNEX H

COMMUNICATIONS AND KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER/MOBILIZATION

While Metropolis research has reached a broad audience nationally and internationally, experience has demonstrated that targeted communications and knowledge transfer/mobilization are necessary to effectively reach key audiences. Naturally, to be effective, knowledge transfer/mobilization must engage the end user (in this case primarily federal policy-makers) and producers (in this case primarily the Centres). Annex F lays out some of the activities federal funders agree to undertake, while this annex describes the activities expected of the Centres to promote knowledge transfer/mobilization.

Notwithstanding the activities funded through the National Metropolis Committee (Annex A) or by the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E), the Centres are expected to pursue a wide range of innovative approaches to knowledge transfer/mobilization, with every effort made to provide research findings in formats amenable to policy-makers within all orders of government, to practitioners, and to research audiences.

This annex is comprised of a number of sections that provide examples of knowledge transfer/mobilization tools and products that aim to make research findings more accessible to Metropolis stakeholders. It is not intended to be exhaustive.

(i) Production of Final Reports and Working Papers

Researchers must produce a final report and/or working paper for each research project for which financial support is provided by Metropolis. Papers submitted to journals (in the case of joint ventures), reports produced by partners and copies of theses are all acceptable. A copy of the final report is to be forwarded by the researcher or Centre to the Metropolis Secretariat within three months of completion.

Along with the full report, researchers are required to produce a maximum three-page summary which is to include key findings and policy implications. The report and summaries are to describe not only the research findings, conclusions and methodology, but also – and in a substantive manner – the policy-relevant issue addressed by the research and the implications of the report for policy and/or practice. These requirements will be explicitly stated in each Centre's RFP (Annex K).

The summaries will be shared with the IDC (Annex A) for feedback on the section pertaining to implications for policy and/or practice. This feedback will be advisory in nature only. The Metropolis Secretariat will then be responsible for translating all summaries of interest to the

IDC into English or French and posting them on the national Metropolis website. The foregoing requirement for the researchers to share the summaries with IDC for feedback is not a precondition to the right of the researchers to publish the results of a research project.

Researchers must also work with Priority Leaders (Annex C) to disseminate their findings through knowledge transfer/mobilization mechanisms such as policy briefs, Metropolis Conversations, Ottawa-based brown bag seminars, participation in IDC meetings, and targeted research syntheses.

(ii) Brown Bag Seminars

Centre-based brown bag seminars have proven to be a very effective means for transferring research findings to communities, other local stakeholders and the regional offices of the federal funders. Accordingly, researchers receiving Metropolis funding must present their findings at a minimum of one of the following types of events: Centre-organized brown bag seminars, the annual Centre Policy-Research Symposia (Annex G), or events organized in conjunction with regional federal partners. These requirements will be explicitly stated in each Centre's RFP (Annex K).

(iii) Metropolis Website

All Centres of Excellence shall have and maintain a Metropolis website which is to be used as a key vehicle for knowledge transfer/mobilization. The objectives of the Centres' websites shall be to promote awareness and understanding of the Centre, its activities, and the broader activities of the Metropolis Project. This means providing fast, efficient, and clear access to the various knowledge products produced by the Centres, including working papers, conference and/or seminar presentations, research summaries, research interests and the contact information of affiliated researchers, commentaries/editorials, and other knowledge products unique to each Centre. This also includes background information on Centre governance structure, terms of reference for the key committees, and contact information for the key management staff. Centre websites are responsible for providing current information regarding upcoming events, including both those at the regional level, as well as national and international conferences. As Metropolis is a network, all websites should have clearly visible

hyperlinks on their main page to the main Metropolis website www.canada.metropolis.net.

The appearance and structure of Centre websites will replicate the national site in the essential details required to maintain a common "look and feel" in order to maintain the overall coherence and unity of the Metropolis network. The website's address shall contain "metropolis.net."

The Centres are responsible for staffing and supervising the technical and programming functions of their local sites. Sites will be managed in such a way as to ensure that the information they contain is current, comprehensive, and properly portrays the Centre, its activities, and its role within the larger Metropolis Project. All Centres will participate in the necessary technical liaison and collective policy elaboration required for the proper functioning of the Metropolis websites, appointing staff or volunteer representatives to such functions, as required.

Information contained on the websites will be classified and indexed in accordance with the national standards that have been developed with the goal of facilitating common and effective search and retrieval mechanisms, making maximum possible use of the programming developed during earlier phases of Metropolis.

All final reports and summaries are to be posted on the funding Centre's website no later than three months after completion.

Decisions regarding whether to post documents and/or other materials based on their appropriateness, their scientific quality and ethical considerations are the sole responsibility of the Centre Director(s) (Annex B), as are the links on the Centres' websites, other than links to the other Centres and to the national and international Metropolis websites. Aside from the design and content requirements specified above (in both letter and spirit), Centres are free to innovate and to modify their sites.

Centres are responsible for converting and posting reports and for associated costs.

(iv) Our Diverse Cities

Each year, in conjunction with hosting the National Conference, the host Centre will co-produce with the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E), a special issue of the publication *Our Diverse Cities* featuring short articles by their researchers and other stakeholders focused on the

geographic area covered by the Centre. Funding for this enterprise is to be considered as an integral cost of the Conference and will therefore be covered through conference fundraising activities undertaken by the Centre and the Secretariat.

(v) Attribution

All Metropolis Centres of Excellence shall clearly and prominently identify themselves as members of the Metropolis Project. This will include the use of the word “Metropolis” in the official names of the Centres (e.g., RIIM: The Vancouver/British Columbia Metropolis Centre; PCERII: The Prairie Metropolis Centre; CERIS: The Toronto/Ontario

Metropolis Centre; IM: The Montréal/Quebec Metropolis Centre; AMC: The Atlantic Metropolis Centre).

All reports, publications, products and events that receive support from a Metropolis Centre shall acknowledge the support of the Metropolis Project. The foregoing is not intended to exclude other acknowledgements.

(vi) Promotion

All parties to the agreement undertake to promote Metropolis through the use of the Metropolis title, logo and network of websites. This applies as far as possible in communications involving news media.

ANNEX I

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

While Metropolis is a policy-research project designed to provide high quality policy-research to the federal funders and, as such, is principally concerned with the connections between Centre researchers and federal policy-makers, there are other key participants in Metropolis, including graduate students and community partners. (Note that relationships with provincial and municipal governments, while encouraged, fall outside of the scope of this MoU and its related annexes and are maintained directly by the Centres.) These other participants are vital to the development of policy-relevant research.

(i) Graduate Student Participation

The involvement of graduate students is essential if Metropolis is to successfully build a forward-looking research capacity.

(A) Student Theses

Copies of all theses produced by students emanating from research funded by the Metropolis Centres should be forwarded to the Metropolis Secretariat for compilation and distribution to a wider audience. Distribution will be subject to embargoes arising from university thesis regulations and copyrights. Where possible, links to the theses and dissertations available electronically from the National Library's website will be posted on Centre websites.

(B) Student Participation

An effort shall be made by all parties to ensure significant involvement by students in all Centre activities, in Metropolis conferences, seminars and workshops, and where possible in publications. This will include, where possible, discounted registration fees for students.

(C) Training

In addition to the training made available through participation in research projects, a graduate student training component will be held in conjunction with the annual National Metropolis Conference (Annex G). This will be organized by the host Centre each year.

(D) Students as the Workforce of the Future

Wherever possible all partners in Metropolis will consider hiring students for short-term projects or for other employment opportunities.

(ii) Community Partners

The significant involvement of community partners is essential if Metropolis is to successfully focus research on, and contribute to improvements in, important policy and program issues. Community partners are to be understood as practitioners who work in the non-governmental, voluntary or private sectors.

The management structure of each Centre (Annex A) should include community partner

representation. Annual Centre Policy-Research Symposia (Annex G) will include the participation of additional community partners.

A best effort shall be made by all parties to ensure significant involvement by community partners in Metropolis conferences, seminars and workshops. This will include the requirement for community partner inclusion in workshops at national and international conferences (Annex G) and, where possible, discounted registration fees.

Other areas of participation may include contributions to the development of Centre research agendas, dissemination of research findings and, as appropriate, involvement in the conduct of research.

(iii) External Researchers

The Centres are comprised of networks of researchers working on immigration, integration and diversity. To receive funding from the Centre, researchers must be affiliated with the Centre. All of the Centres will have an open and on-going affiliation policy, clearly described on the Centres' websites (Annex H). This policy will allow new researchers to join the Centres subject to approval by the Centres' management committees or governance boards (Annex A). The Centres will make every effort to engage new researchers as well as the best researchers not currently affiliated with a Metropolis Centre. Issues surrounding affiliation will be addressed by the Joint Committee (Annex A).

ANNEX J

FEDERAL POLICY-RESEARCH PRIORITIES

Preamble

Annex J identifies six Federal Policy-Research Priorities and associated policy-research questions. In this funding period, extending from July 1, 2007 to March 31, 2012, the Federal Policy-Research Priorities define the contours of the cross-Centre research domains (Annex D). The remainder of the research will fall under the elective research domains specified in Annex D.

The six Federal Policy-Research Priorities will be revisited at the mid-way point of Phase III, and amendments to the priorities may be made at this time. Results from the joint evaluation of Phase II (expected in 2007), the Mid-Term Review of Phase III (expected in 2009), and other related evaluations may be used to inform amendments to the Federal Policy-Research Priorities by March 31, 2009. The National Metropolis Committee (Annex A) will recommend amendments to Annex J to CIC. CIC will then seek to amend the MoU with SSHRC on behalf of the federal funding partnership.

The Federal Policy-Research Priorities and related policy-research questions outlined below are not intended to completely displace the policy concerns and local and regional research that the Centres conduct. These continue to be

legitimate subjects for Centre study, and it is expected that such research will continue, either as a result of interactions and relationship-building with stakeholders – federal and otherwise – or on the basis of contract research when specific or urgent advice is sought.

The six Federal Policy-Research Priorities are intended to focus the Centres' research on areas of particular importance to federal policy-making. Each priority description includes illustrative policy-research questions that could be undertaken in the area.

There are a number of general principles that should guide all research undertaken by the Centres. These principles include:

- “Good science” is at the heart of all research and must never be compromised;
- Research that looks at instrumental policy and program interventions is needed, as is research that promotes a deeper understanding of critical issues;
- Migrants and the societies they enter are both legitimate objects of study;
- Research should analyze the different ways in which women and men act, the differential effects of social, economic and other phenomena,

and the differential effects of policies, programs and legislation on women and men;

- Whenever possible, domestic and international best practices should be identified;
- Wherever possible, an interdisciplinary perspective should be adopted;
- Wherever possible, an exploration of the impact of immigrant category or refugee status should be included in the analysis;
- For the research to be useful to federal policy and program developers, a balance must be struck between aggregated, small-scale qualitative studies and large-scale quantitative work;
- Improving receptor capacity (Annex L) within the federal partnership is crucial to realizing the value of the Metropolis Project, especially where quantitative work is concerned.

Major Statistics Canada data sources for each Federal Policy-Research Priority will be provided in the data guide referred to in Annex K. Researchers are expected to make use of these data wherever possible.

Federal Policy-Research Priorities (in alphabetical order)

1) Citizenship and Social, Cultural and Civic Integration

Canada's immigration program, like its multicultural approach to inclusion, is designed to bring benefits to Canadian society as well as an offer of a better life to immigrants, refugees, and their immediate families. It is not only the Canadian economy that feels the effects of immigration. Accordingly, this policy-research priority will look at the social and cultural effects of immigration and diversity on Canada and will determine the extent to which there are risks to societal well-being, to full participation of the members of these groups as citizens, and to the cohesion of Canadian society overall and in its regions.

Policy-research questions could include:

- What are the major social, cultural and civic components of the two-way street approach to integration and multicultural inclusion? What should be considered successful outcomes on each side of the street and what

indicators and benchmarks should be used to measure these? Are these outcomes uniform across all elements of society, or are they differentiated?

- How do various factors affect immigrants' language acquisition? Potential factors may include mother tongue, gender, age at immigration, level of education, occupation, length of time in Canada, immigrant class or refugee status and availability and type of language instruction. Is there a social or economic "return" to language acquisition? What can be done to encourage language acquisition?
- How does the presence or absence of social capital contribute to the integration or inclusion of newcomers and minorities? Are there critical junctures in the life course of newcomers and minorities where they are most at risk of exclusion? What role do adult citizenship courses play in helping newcomers to integrate?
- What is the relationship between attachment and belonging and Canada's broad shared citizenship approach? What indicators can we use to better understand sense of attachment, belonging and citizenship? What factors are important to increasing attachment, belonging and citizenship? Does civic or political participation play a role? What role should Canadian "values" play and what are the ramifications of religious pluralism on "values" discourse? How do immigration-related enforcement activities affect attachment and belonging? What factors lead immigrant youth to develop either positive or negative attitudes towards the host society?
- What is the relationship between naturalization, dual or multiple citizenships, and one's sense of attachment and belonging to Canada? To what extent does official multiculturalism influence the feelings of attachment and belonging for newcomers and minorities? What role can the Government of Canada play in fostering a broad citizenship approach?
- What are the most effective means for delivering services to newcomers and minorities (government, immigrant service provider organizations, ethnospecific organizations, "universal" organizations, or religiously affiliated organizations? How can

this efficacy be measured? How effective are settlement agencies' homework clubs, educational brokers, counseling for survivors of trauma, parenting programs, and so on? Should settlement agencies be offering programming that is available elsewhere (ESL/FSL)? Are ethnocultural specific agencies preferable to multicultural agencies or vice versa? Who, among immigrant groups, uses settlement agencies? Who isn't being served?

- What are the major health-related issues facing immigrants to Canada in the short, medium and longer term? What are the differential health outcomes related to: immigrant status; age; gender; education; language fluency; length of residence in Canada; availability of like-ethnic or other community supports? What are the major challenges and stresses that coincide with migration to Canada, taking into account the heterogeneity of immigrants, that have or are likely to have negative impacts on health? What are the protective factors and their effects?
- What evidence exists on the key determinants of immigrant health, and to what extent do they help elucidate the convergence in health status between Canadian-born and foreign-born populations over time? How does the health status of first- and second- generation immigrants change over time considering such factors as language, gender, age and health status at immigration, level of education, occupation, length of time in Canada, nature of family environment, immigrant class and sense of attachment and belonging to Canada? What are the consequences of mandatory waiting periods for immigrants to qualify for health care, and what are their effects on decisions regarding preventive health care?
- What are the current and potential implications for the public health "system" given the planned expected growth in the number of immigrants Canada? What policy and program interventions might most effectively address/reduce these issues and/or mitigate the health impacts? How can they take into account temporal influences on risk and resilience? How can policy, program and/or community interventions strengthen personal and social resources of immigrants, especially those not attached to like-ethnic

communities (e.g., those not in the large metropolitan centres)?

- How does the assimilation of language and culture influence access to and use of public health services in Canada, especially prevention and health promotion services and activities? How are prevention and promotion programs planned and delivered for new arrivals, and how long does it take immigrants, especially older persons, to become engaged in prevention or health promotion activity? Related as well to language and integration, how well attuned are occupational health services and information to the needs of immigrants, and what are the implications for food services and other key areas? What are the long-term effects of acculturation on immigrants and refugees and their levels of social support?
- How does Canada compare with other similar countries in terms of the health status of immigrants over time? What are the key differences? Are there societal factors, policy approaches or other practices that could account for these differences? What could Canada learn from and potentially adapt from successful experiences in other countries or regions?
- How are immigrants and minorities participating in Canada's cultural life? How are these groups reflected in our cultural products? What cultural products are newcomers and minorities consuming and what impact is this having on their own identity or Canadian identity? What public policy tools are being used or could be used to ensure that cultural products and performances contribute to building an inclusive and cohesive society?

2) Economic and Labour Market Integration

At least since the early 1990s, the economic well-being of recent immigrants to Canada has declined and we have seen evidence of a continuation of comparative economic disadvantage for members of minorities. This policy-research priority will continue the examination of these phenomena with special attention to the economic impact of immigration and to the changes that a larger and more structured immigrant and minority population has made to the economic consequences of immigration and diversity in their destination

communities (including major cities, second- and third-tier cities, and rural areas).

Policy-research questions could include:

- How do economic outcomes differ as a result of various socio-demographic factors, immigrant or refugee category, or micro- and macro-economic conditions? Why are immigrants and refugees living increasingly in poverty? Is there evidence of economic success among some? What do the experiences of this population suggest with respect to successful strategies for transition out of poverty? Does spatial distribution contribute to levels of poverty, or to successful pathways out of it? Are there differences in poverty levels experienced in larger cities, second- and third-tier cities, and rural areas? What accounts for these? What is the effect of poverty on educational attainment?
- What differential problems, issues and health impacts are experienced by the various immigrant classes related to earnings and employment? What specific relationships between income, socio-economic status and health exist throughout the pre-migration, resettlement and post-migration stages? What integrated policy approaches can be taken to immigrant and refugee health to support increased income security and positive labour market integration?
- What policies are needed to ensure that factors such as the non-recognition (both nationally and interprovincially) of foreign credentials, prior learning and work experience, along with discrimination and other factors, are not adversely affecting the economic outcomes of immigrants, refugees and minorities? How does downward mobility of the family affect the education of children and youth?
- Are language ability, education, work experience, age and adaptability the best predictors of economic success, or should the selection system for skilled workers include other factors? Are there factors or means for selecting immigrants that might make the immigration system more responsive to labour market needs?
- What infrastructures currently exist in universities to assist students recruited from abroad? What aspects of current programs and practices have helped foreign students to make the transition to employment in Canadian labour markets? What barriers hinder their success? What factors encourage them to remain in Canada upon completion of their studies?
- What kinds of barriers are faced by newcomers and minorities in integrating into Canadian labour markets? What kinds of barriers do employers encounter in hiring newcomers or supporting their integration into Canadian labour markets? How effective has employment equity been in addressing discrimination? What other strategies have proven to be effective?
- What programs or initiatives exist within Canada to help immigrants acquire Canadian work experience? What impacts are they having on improving labour market outcomes? How can employers be more effectively engaged? What sorts of mentorship/internship programs (school and industry-based) are most effective in assisting immigrant and minority youth in their transition to the labour market? Are there ways in which ESL/FSL courses for adults could be more effective in preparing them for the workplace?
- What factors affect national/regional/local labour market needs, and how might immigration policy best respond? What role might temporary workers, provincial nominees, and other types of migration play in addressing the changing demands of employers and the economy? What are the societal and educational implications of converting temporary workers in smaller communities into permanent residents?
- Are immigrants acting as substitutes or complements to the current pool of Canadian-born workers? Is this consistent in all communities or does it vary in differently sized communities? What impacts does regional economic dependence on foreign-trained highly qualified workers have on these regions?
- What impact does immigration have on the earnings, productivity and employment levels of the Canadian-born, Canadian housing prices, and on the Canadian economy in general?
- To what extent are frustrations with the Canadian labour market prompting immigrants to leave Canada? To what extent are economic opportunities in countries of origin encouraging reverse migration?

3) Family, Children and Youth

Immigration is a decision that is often taken not simply by an individual but by families. It is an investment in the future, both for the immigrant and for the host society, and often it is the outcomes of the children of immigrants and refugees or newcomer children themselves that are considered to be the best indicators of the success of an immigration or refugee program. Similarly, the outcomes achieved by all minorities – whether children, youth, families or individuals – are strong indicators of broad societal inclusion. This policy-research priority will examine the consequences of migration to Canada for families, children and youth and will develop proposals for enhancing their success in the future.

Policy-research questions could include:

- What factors influence the migration decisions of individuals and families? Do these factors change depending on one's life course? What role do children and youth play in the decision-making process? What are the means through which migrants assemble information upon which to make their migration decisions? How is this done with respect to questions surrounding the recognition of foreign credentials, family reunification, refugee claims and naturalization, among others? Does the Government of Canada, through its policies and programs (e.g., Canadian Orientation Abroad, Immigration Portal), have the ability to significantly alter the migration decisions of migrants?
- What is the sense of identity, attachment and belonging to Canada, as well as to their heritage, among immigrant and refugee children and youth? How are these multiple attachments and belongings reflected in their identities? How are these identities negotiated in various social contexts? Do foreign-born and Canadian-born minority children and youth negotiate these complex identities in the same fashion? If not, what explains the differences? What indicators can be used to ascertain levels of identity, attachment and belonging, whether these levels change over time, and what factors account for this change? How does the education system's accommodation of religious practices and/or celebrations affect feelings of belonging among young people?
- What views do children and youth have of both their culture of origin and their host society in respect to identity? How do children and youth construct an identity for themselves, a sense of home and belonging, and a sense of origin and descent in both contexts? How and what kind of relationship is maintained with the place of origin of children and youth during the migration process, and does such a relationship influence the social interactions among children, between children and parents, and between children and their social environment? Are there gender-specific differences concerning the construction of identity by children and youth in the course of migration?
- What is the role of educational policies and school practices in the formation of multiple and trans-nationalist citizenships among immigrant children and youth, and in their formation of a sense of belonging to Canada?
- What is the role of schools in both official language acquisition, and heritage language maintenance? What is the role of both school-based and non-school-based heritage language programs (i.e. church- and community-based language programs for children) for immigrant children and youth development of multilingual/multicultural belongings and identities? What is the role that "language gap" both in official and heritage languages plays in the change of family dynamics?
- Are there differential outcomes for immigrant, refugee and minority children and youth? What accounts for differential educational aspirations, rates of early school leaving and/or higher levels of educational attainment for some? Are there differences in outcomes for first-, 1.5-, and second-generation children and youth? Are there inter-group differences in immigrant, refugee and minority children and how are these addressed in schools? How does the interplay between the particular cultural background of their society of origin and the integration strategies and practices in a particular host society affect the integration and/or educational achievement of children and youth? To what extent and how do children experience xenophobia, and how do they cope with hostility and lack of acceptance? How do they create social niches where they can feel at home?

- Does participation in school and/or civil society vary among the Canadian-born, immigrant, refugee and minority children and youth? Are there differences in school readiness, in rates of voluntarism, or in rates of civic participation? Are there inter-group differences in immigrant, refugee and minority children and youth in school and/or civil society participation and what accounts for these differences? What is the role of citizenship education in nurturing civic and public engagement in immigrant children and youth?
- What are the key determinants of the mental and emotional well-being of newcomer, second-generation, and/or minority children and youth in Canada? Are there mental and emotional stresses that coincide with migration to Canada, and if so, does this vary by immigration category (e.g., family class, refugee), and/or by length of residence in Canada? How effective are public health interventions and prevention messages at reaching immigrant children and youth? How does the efficacy of programs for marginalized youth in Canada differ for immigrant youth? What pre-migratory conditions and experiences influence post-migratory health across the life course?
- Are there differential mental and physical health effects across the life course on women and men of immigration to Canada? If differences are evident, what are the factors that lead to these disparities?
- What are the implications of the different cultural and religious backgrounds and values of immigrants to Canada for public health services and programs such as immunization, healthy sexuality, etc.
- What services are available for immigrant and minority children and youth and what is the impact of these services on these groups? What role do families – both extended and nuclear – play in facilitating integration? Do immigrants who are accepted through family reunification appear to face fewer, greater or different integration challenges than immigrants and refugees who enter through other streams? What are the service gaps and how should these gaps be addressed? Are immigrant and minority children effectively integrated into daycare services?
- What is the role of both school-based and non-school based creative opportunities in enhancing and nurturing creativity in immigrant and minority children and youth? What non-school based learning opportunities, recreational/sports and creative/artistic programs are available for immigrant, refugee, and minority children and youth. Do they influence their integration into larger communities and into the larger society? What other models of learning and job training (i.e. apprenticeship) are available for them and how can such models be made available in communities, and neighbourhoods where they live?
- How do family dynamics change in the process of integration to the host society? What are the principal intergenerational conflicts faced by immigrant and minority youth? How does their immigration and integration experience differ from that of their parents? How do interactions and tensions between peer group environments and home socialization affect children? What policy and program interventions might most effectively mitigate these impacts?
- Do seniors experience more integration difficulties than other newcomers and/or minorities? Are there mental health problems related to the social isolation of seniors? If so, what factors can help mitigate this risk? What is the role of language acquisition in seniors' integration? What lifelong learning opportunities are provided to immigrant seniors?

4) Housing and Neighbourhoods

The relationship between access to affordable housing and residential concentrations of newcomers and minorities on the one hand, and successful integration and inclusion on the other has become more pronounced in recent years. Housing, and the neighbourhood in which it is found, impacts upon and helps to shape our social networks, access to employment opportunities, participation in and access to public social spaces, the nature and availability of social services, as well as general feelings of safety and security, among others. In this policy priority, we will seek to better understand the relationships between housing, neighbourhoods and integration into Canadian society.

Policy-research questions could include:

- What are the key features of the “housing careers” of immigrants, refugees and refugee-claimants? What are the strategies employed by these groups to gain and maintain access to housing in markets across Canada? Are experiences in the private or public housing sector similar? What types of barriers and/or discrimination in housing do newcomers and minorities encounter? Where housing search is unsuccessful, to what extent are individuals able to engage with available services and social networks in order to improve their housing search? If immigrants and refugees experience homelessness, what are the trends and patterns of such episodes? Knowing that some immigrants and refugees are more likely to be in situations of core housing need, what impacts is this having on overall issues related to homelessness?
- What are the key intersections between immigration and minority populations and the availability of affordable housing across the range of Canadian housing markets? Is it different for the rental and private purchase markets? How do immigrants affect these markets? In what ways are immigrants affected by these markets, particularly in terms of the location in specific cities/regions they choose to settle? Are there public policy tools available to positively affect the availability of and access to affordable housing for immigrants and minorities? Could this involve changes to the regulatory structure to create incentives for the private market to build affordable housing? What changes in federal, provincial, territorial and municipal policies would improve the housing careers of immigrants and minorities?
- What are the coping strategies that immigrants are employing to gain access to housing? What are the trends and patterns of newcomer and minority housing affordability problems due to low income? How does this vary across housing markets, immigration categories, minority communities? Do the coping strategies produce desirable results? Is there a relationship between social networks and immigrant and minority settlement patterns? If so, are the economic and social outcomes for members of specific social networks consistent with public policy objectives such as integration/inclusion, etc.? What are the societal outcomes of being (in)adequately housed in such areas as physical and mental health?
- Are there methods/approaches through which we can better understand community-readiness/preparedness to integrate immigrants and minorities in the housing market? How would you determine such readiness? What would be the important components of this concept, particularly as it relates to potential variance in needs between immigration categories and/or minority groups? Is there a set of indicators that could be developed to assess readiness? Would it include access to specific housing-related services such as financial literacy training and other such services?
- To what extent does information regarding housing markets and housing services figure into pre-migration decisions of immigrants? Is adequate and accurate pre-arrival information available with respect to housing services? How does this information differ across immigration categories, and through which means is it being transmitted? Would more accurate information regarding housing markets and available services alter the immigration decisions and/or location choices of immigrants? Similarly, would an improved information base alter the settlement patterns of immigrants?
- How are Canadian neighbourhoods changing and adapting in response to the entry of newcomers and minorities into the housing market? Is spatial concentration evident, and if so, which economic and social indicators can also be seen to be similarly spatially concentrated? What are the ramifications for social integration or for service delivery?
- What are the roles of schools and sites of worship as potential hubs for neighbourhood life? What are the impacts of homelessness and the risks associated with homelessness on educational achievement in particular, and school careers in general, for immigrant and minority children and youth?
- To what extent are immigrant enclaves a factor in the economic outcomes of immigrants? Are we seeing trends whereby enclaves are increasingly able to offer a level of employment

that is competitive with the “mainstream” economy? Do enclaves make immigration-related enforcement activities more difficult? What are the impacts of enclaves on intercultural contact?

5) Justice, Policing and Security

Concerns over social cohesion and national security, especially the contemporary preoccupation with terrorism, have raised the public profile of debate surrounding how Canada and its justice and security systems can ensure a balanced and fair approach to an increasingly diverse population – to maintain order, public safety and national security while preserving civil liberties and the Canadian multicultural model of an open, diverse society.

In adopting this policy-research priority, the Metropolis Project is signalling the government’s expectation that the Centres will collectively develop a new capacity to address these issues by creating and analyzing an evidence base, offering analyses of current trends and conditions, and providing a basis upon which security policy, policing policy and practice, emergency management, crime prevention, justice policy and integration policy can be enhanced.

Note that the Priority Leader (Annex C) for this priority will be encouraged to work with interested federal funders to organize a seminar early in the funding period designed to bring interested researchers and policy-makers together. This seminar will encourage researchers with expertise in justice, policing and security issues, but little familiarity with immigration and diversity, to work with their counterparts with expertise in immigration and diversity issues, but little familiarity with justice, policing and security research. The end result should, over time, be a broader pool of scholars with expertise in both areas.

Policy-research questions could include:

- What are the relationships among immigration, foreign policy, terrorism, global events and domestic security? What roles do diasporas and transnational communities play? What are the factors that can promote radicalization? Are marginalization and radicalization connected, and which groups are most vulnerable to them? How do communications technologies, and especially the Internet, factor into this process? To what extent are there similarities between

marginalization and/or radicalization occurring among the foreign-born and the Canadian-born? How can security, policing and justice organizations work better with communities to promote social integration? To what extent is official language knowledge a factor in the integration process?

- What perceptions of each other exist between newcomers and minorities on the one hand, and police and security forces on the other? How does the experience of, and attitudes towards, the Canadian justice system vary between minority groups? Do these perceptions change over time? Why? How? How and to what extent do perceptions of police and security forces in newcomer communities differ from among the Canadian-born? Do such perceptions affect crime prevention and emergency management efforts and if so, how? How can various components of the justice system promote dialogue and a shared understanding of security and justice goals with newcomers and minority groups?
- What are the factors that can promote the emergence of newcomer and/or minority-aligned youth gangs and/or organized crime in Canada? Are public and/or police perceptions of their prevalence and/or extent of criminal activity warranted? What are the best practices for crime prevention focused on youth in newcomer and minority communities? What role do (in)formal networks play in perpetuating illegal activities? To what extent are high dropout rates and subsequent involvement in criminal activities related to limited second language acquisition and peer pressure? What practices in schools might encourage immigrant youth to join gangs? How effective are bridging programs for youth who have been obliged to leave school because of their age? What approaches to professional development for police are effective in helping them deal with immigrant youth?
- How are various minority groups represented in the Canadian criminal justice system? What factors contribute most strongly to under/over-representation? What can we learn from the differences in under/over-representation of different minority groups? Are systematic changes needed for one or more elements of the criminal justice system?

- Are minority communities adequately represented in the various organizations of the Canadian justice system? How adequately do police services in Canada reflect the diversity of the populations they serve? What measures are, or should be, in place to ensure that police services and other organizations that are part of the justice system (including private policing) are able to respond to incidents involving visible, ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities, as well as newcomers who may be less familiar with Canada's justice system? How are police services and other justice system players addressing issues related to racial profiling and cultural sensitivity? What role do language barriers play?
 - What is the role of school-based police officers and how effective is this approach in forging healthy relationships between police and minority and newcomer children and youth?
 - What are the main "channels" and methods through which irregular migrants, including trafficked persons and asylum seekers enter Canada? Are there formal and/or informal networks in Canadian communities that knowingly receive and integrate irregular migrants, trafficked persons and/or undocumented workers? Does circumventing the Canadian legal system for entry to Canada correlate with a propensity to further circumvent Canadian laws? What impact does their status have on educational outcomes of illegal migrant children? To what degree is the exploitation of immigrant labour in sectors other than the sex trade prevalent in Canada? What additional measures could be taken to reduce the chances that high-risk and illegal migrants enter the country?
 - What is the community experience and impact of hate crime and bias activity amongst minority communities in Canada? How under-reported are hate crimes and bias activities in Canada amongst different minority communities? Is there a difference between the experience of hate crime and bias activity and the fear of it? What are the roles of teacher, school administration, and school policies in preventing discriminatory behaviours in schools, including cyberbullying? What are the legal considerations concerning cyberbullying? What are the legally defensible policy standards for educators concerning safety, equality and citizenship?
 - What are the links between security at the border and social trends in migrant communities, including prosperity, marginalization and radicalization? How does security policy and enforcement at the border affect migrants' decisions to enter Canada?
 - Focusing on infectious disease issues, what are the needs of migrants and mobile populations in terms of travel medicine advice and intervention? What kinds of programs are needed to mitigate the risks related to travel-related diseases in migrant populations (malaria, parasites, HIV, TB, etc.)? What international disease control practices are needed in the age of dual citizenship? Is the appropriate regulatory capacity available worldwide to deal with risk management in this area?
 - What are the health implications of the movement of humanitarian and refugee populations, many of who originate in areas of significant public health risk? Is there a need for international coordination for migrant receiving nations to manage this more effectively rather than have each do it on their own? Is there a need for international collaboration to develop standards for managing destination-related public health risks in those being selected for immigration/resettlement?
 - What are the global health security issues related to the migration of physicians? How might the movement of recently trained health professionals, skilled in management of new health threats, from developing countries impact health risk in Canada and other receiving nations?
- 6) Welcoming Communities:
The Role of Host Communities in Attracting, Integrating and Retaining Newcomers and Minorities
- The extent to which a society is able to integrate/include immigrants, refugees and minorities depends on a number of societal conditions, some of which can be effectively altered by government policy. This policy-research priority will examine what public policy instruments can enhance the capacity of Canada, its cities and communities to receive and integrate

immigrants, refugees, and minorities and will seek empirically determined best practices that can be adapted for use in other contexts.

Policy-research questions could include:

- What factors determine a host community's "absorptive capacity?" How susceptible to policy interventions is this capacity? How do employment opportunities, the availability of appropriate housing, schooling and social services affect a community's ability to attract, integrate and retain newcomers and minorities? How can policy respond to the diverse needs of newcomers, including those of women, children and youth, seniors and refugees? Can we use this information to establish an "ideal" level of immigration? How can progress be defined with respect to integration/inclusion? What are the best indicators of how this could be measured in the social, economic, cultural and political spheres?
- What are the basic requirements and necessary conditions in order for a community or region, particularly in non-traditional areas (second- or third-tier cities, rural and remote regions) to attract immigrants? What are the advantages for non-traditional regions to attract immigrants? How can governments build on this to develop regional immigration attraction strategies? Internationally, what have other governments done? What are some of the barriers or challenges for non-traditional regions in attracting immigrants? What will be the consequences for non-traditional regions if they are unsuccessful in attracting immigrants? Are the same push and pull factors at play with brain circulation and return migration?
- From a national policy perspective, what can be done to attract more immigrants to settle in the regions? What are the implications of a continuation or amplification of the current patterns of immigrant settlement for national cohesion and for possible rural-urban and regional divides? What public policy instruments or strategies should be used to assist the Government of Canada in meeting its objectives linked to Canada's linguistic duality and regional development? What tools could be used to increase the capacity of communities to recruit, welcome and integrate immigrants and minorities in both linguistic minority communities and in rural areas? What factors have been successful in attracting immigrant entrepreneurs? What indicators could be used to measure the success of these initiatives?
- Do interactions between newcomers and minorities, and dominant majority Canadians lead to increased acceptance and inclusion? What is the role of school in working with newcomers, minorities and the dominant majority in making mutual adaptation both desirable and possible? Is this most effectively accomplished through diverse neighbourhoods, workplaces, schools, public spaces, specific government-supported activities like the Host Program and/or the Privately Sponsored Refugee Program?
- Can the creation and enhancement of healthy cities and communities (including such characteristics as active urban parks, safe walking and bicycle paths, culturally sensitive physical activity programs and services, etc.) contribute to the attraction and retention of immigrants in both traditional and non-traditional areas such as second- and third-tier cities? If so, what government policies are needed to facilitate and support the development of such healthy conditions and services?
- What is the role of schools in creating a sense of community? To what extent are immigrant families likely to stay or move away based on educational opportunities for their children? How can schools improve the experiences of refugee and immigrant children?
- How do immigration-related enforcement activities affect settlement and integration patterns of new migrants or the ability of host communities to attract, integrate and retain newcomers?
- How do racism and discrimination manifest themselves in communities across the country, especially those communities outside of Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver? How is it measured? What effective strategies have been developed to counter racism and discrimination? What role can the Government of Canada play in eliminating racism and discrimination?

ANNEX K

RESEARCH PROCESSES AND DATA

(i) Funding

In this funding period, research resources within Metropolis are allocated through two principal mechanisms. First, research is funded by each Centre through Centre-based competitive calls for research proposals. The topics of these calls are guided equally by the Federal Policy-Research Priorities described in Annex J and by stakeholders (including federal departments) at the annual Centre Policy-Research Symposia described in Annex G. All research funds expended by the Centres will address work within the domain structures of the Centres as described in Annex D.

Second, the annual National Research Competition managed by the National Metropolis Committee (NMC) (Annex A) will have a topic developed by the NMC, or if there is more than one call, by the funding department(s), subject to review by the NMC. Research teams applying should be multidisciplinary and multi-centre, and the principal investigators must already be Centre affiliates. Proposals will be adjudicated by a sub-committee of the NMC involving policy-makers, researchers and at least one NGO.

(ii) Peer Review

Centre peer review must conform to the regular practices of SSHRC, with the addition of at least one federal member on each committee to assure the policy relevance of the proposals. Some

members of the committee should be drawn from outside of the Centre for which the call is being held, and no member of a peer review committee should be eligible to apply for funding at that Centre. Terms for members of peer review committees should be no longer than two years.

Where research proposals plan to make use of federal data sets, the appropriate federal department or agency must also be consulted by the peer review committee before a decision is made on recommendations for funding. The department's or agency's opinion will be provided to the peer review committee in writing within one week. Subsequently, the recommendation on the appropriateness of a data source must either be a condition of funding, or in those cases where it is set aside by the peer review committee, a condition of funding will be the inclusion of an explicit reference to the concern and a response to it, made in all subsequent research publications flowing from this project.

(iii) Data and Statistical Coordination

(A) Statistics Canada

Statistics Canada is an important contributor to the Metropolis Project. As a partner in the Metropolis Project, Statistics Canada's goal is to facilitate the linkage of policy and research by the development, collection and dissemination of policy-relevant data and information on immigration. Its contribution-in-kind includes:

- Chairing the National Data Committee (Annex A);
- Providing data to the Metropolis Centres. Data provision includes:
 - Custom Census tables (pre-defined sets through extensive consultation between Statistics Canada and the five Centres). Statistics Canada provided a set of core 1996 and 2001 Census tables to the Centres during Phases I and II of the Metropolis Project and will provide another set of the tables from the 2006 Census;
 - Compendium tables from the Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB);
 - Micro-data files from Statistics Canada, particularly the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada (LSIC) and the Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS) through the Research Data Centres (RDCs);
 - Public use micro-data files (via the Data Liberation Initiative provision);
- Facilitating data-sharing arrangements for the Centres in regard to licensing issues on Statistics Canada data;
- Providing expert technical advice and managerial assistance (participation on the Centres' data committees, chairing the National Data Committee (Annex A);
- Providing, when necessary, in-kind assistance to the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E);
- Attending the Metropolis Interdepartmental Committee (Annex A) and participating in Metropolis Conferences and events (Annex G).

Statistics Canada will prepare an overview document to outline the availability of data sources and where applicable, highlight the various data sources that could be used to address the Federal Policy-Research Priorities (Annex J). The overview will also outline the license arrangement about the use and access of data provided to the Centres, and contact person at Statistics Canada and RDCs.

As part of statistical coordination and support, Statistics Canada through the National Data Committee will develop a work plan to build capacity in data use and provide information sessions to the Centres of Excellence.

(B) Citizenship and Immigration Canada

CIC will provide access to the landings data in the Facts and Figures database pursuant to a separate MoU on information sharing between CIC and each Centre.

(C) Data Usage by Centres

Centres will make use, where appropriate, of major data sets provided by Statistics Canada and/or other federal partners. In addition to these data provided directly to them, the Centres will encourage their research affiliates to make use of the RDCs.

The RDCs will consider recipients of grants from the Metropolis Centres of Excellence as recipients of SSHRC grants provided the applications were evaluated in conformity with the SSHRC-Statistics Canada peer review process which is published on SSHRC's website.

ANNEX L

REPORTING, EVALUATIONS AND ASSESSMENTS

On-going reporting, evaluation and assessment has been critical to the success of Metropolis. This commitment will be continued for this funding period. Specific activities are outlined below, but do not preclude others. In recognition of the extraordinary amount of time necessary for the Centres to produce materials for reports, assessments and evaluations, Centre Directors will be informed of any activities requiring Centre input in a timely manner through the Joint Metropolis Secretariat-SSHRC/Centres Directors Committee (Annex A). Additionally, in order to minimize pressures, reporting, evaluation and assessment activities will build upon one another. For example, the Centre Annual Reports submitted during the summer of 2009 will form the basis for the Mid-Term Review. The specific elements gathered in the Annual Reports described below will be used in the joint evaluations as well.

(i) Reporting

(A) Centre Annual Reports

The vehicle for the Centres annual reporting activities will continue to be the Annual Report required by SSHRC. The Annual Reports will include a summary of activities undertaken by

the Centres. These summaries will be broken down into the following six categories: 1) Training Activities; 2) Academic Research Activities; 3) Knowledge Transfer/Mobilization Activities; 4) Communities and NGO Capacity; 5) Network Activities; and 6) Budget. Centres will capture this information in the tabular form required for the Mid-Term Review (see below). Importantly, the data collected must, wherever possible, be grouped by Federal Policy-Research Priority (Annex J).

1) Training Activities

- Students trained within Centres
- Experience gained by students in NGO and policy settings

2) Academic Research

- High quality research papers, reports and presentations on critical policy questions, options and program delivery mechanisms

3) Knowledge Transfer/Mobilization Activities

- Conferences and seminars organized and held
- Knowledge transfer/mobilization products communicating research results to

government and NGO audiences produced and distributed

- Policy-makers' participation in Centres knowledge transfer/mobilization activities

4) Communities and NGO Capacity Activities

- High-quality research papers, reports and presentations relevant to activities and practices
- NGO participation in Metropolis knowledge transfer/mobilization activities

5) Network Activities

- Robust networks of researchers, NGO and policy communities in Canada and internationally

6) Budget

- Core funds
- Leveraged funds

Definitions for these performance measures will be developed and applied consistently across all Centres.

It is expected that Centres will be able to meet many of these requirements for the Annual Report by drawing extensively on the reports that are required of the Domain Leaders (Annex D) and Priority Leaders (Annex C).

Beyond these specific reports, Centres will be required to include a strategic assessment specifying the adjustments and changes they anticipate making in the forthcoming year in reaction to the annual Policy-Research Symposia and domain meetings and the implications for the Centres' partners.

(B) National Metropolis Annual Report

A National Metropolis Annual Report will be prepared by the Metropolis Secretariat. It will be written by the Metropolis Secretariat (Annex E) in collaboration with the IDC and the Joint Committee described in Annex A. This report will compile and summarize the outcomes of the activities undertaken by the Centres as well as the outcomes of the activities supported by the National Metropolis Committee (annual National Research Competition, and knowledge transfer/mobilization activities undertaken by Priority Leaders and Domain Leaders) and those knowledge transfer/mobilization initiatives undertaken jointly with members of the IDC.

(ii) Evaluations and Assessments

These activities will be managed by CIC and SSHRC with the assistance of the Evaluation Committee (Annex A). The Secretariat (Annex E) will be consulted on both the frameworks and final reports of these activities.

(A) Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF)

The evaluation requirements are derived from the 2004 Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF). This RMAF, including the logic model, should be revised in the first year of Phase III to reflect any changes in the goals, operation and/or activities of Metropolis.

(B) Outcomes

Activities supported by the National Metropolis Committee and activities undertaken by the Centres should contribute to the immediate and intermediate outcomes of the Metropolis Project, and are expected to be measurable after 5 to 10 years of the program operation. Activities should also contribute to the long-term impacts of the project.

Immediate and Intermediate Outcomes

Research Capacity

- More researchers (academic, government, NGO) working on diversity and migration issues;
- More researchers working on critical policy questions, options and program delivery mechanisms (approaching the objective of focusing academic research on these);
- More researchers, having acquired experience in working with policy-makers and their environments, able to position themselves to influence policy-making, through how they frame and present their research results and the communication channels they use;
- More NGOs/community organizations involved in research, developing their own research capacity, their capacity to work with academic researchers, and their capacity as consumers of research results;
- A reciprocal influence of knowledge transfer/mobilization, where feedback from the knowledge transfer/mobilization activities to government and NGO/community environments

helps to shape the research agendas of the Metropolis Centres and academic and non-academic researchers.

Policy

This is a critical outcome for the Metropolis Project, but the hardest to conceptualize and measure.

- More policy-makers in federal, provincial and municipal governments with the capacity to access and use research in their decision making. This is “receptor capacity”: it refers not only to the awareness and understanding of individual policy-makers, but also to the organization and resources within government departments to facilitate access to research and its communication within the department;
- Knowledge transferred from Metropolis increasingly informs and influences government policy development. The processes through which research knowledge informs and influences policy are indirect, accretive, and long-term, and so make it very difficult, if not impossible, to make definitive attributional statements about the influences of particular research on particular policies. This outcome is, however, central to the Metropolis Project, and an informed, evidence-based approach to measuring it is needed.

Practice

While not an explicit focus of the program in its official documentation, subsequent consultations with stakeholders have identified the need to assess whether Metropolis benefits the practice of organizations working directly with Canadians on immigration and diversity-related issues. These desired outcomes include:

- More NGO/community organizations accessing and using research in their decision making about their practices, to ensure that they are responsive to the changing needs of the diverse populations they serve;

- Knowledge transferred from the Metropolis research results increasingly informs and influences NGO/community activities and practices.

Long-term Impacts

The long-term impacts of Metropolis directly reflect the Project’s objectives:

- Enhanced academic research capacity on migration and diversity;
- Contribution of Metropolis research to decision making leading to improved policies for managing migration and cultural diversity in Canada;
- Improved practice and research in the community and NGO sector in migration and diversity.

(C) Planned Assessment Activities

Mid-Term Review (Phase III)

This Mid-Term Review will provide an opportunity for an early course correction in the first two years of the funding period (by March 2009). This review will be led by SSHRC in consultation with CIC and the Evaluation Committee (Annex A). The Mid-Term Review will make extensive use of the Centre Annual Reports. Centres will also be required to complete the tables found below as part of this review. The Joint Committee will be tasked with presenting a response to the NMC recommending any necessary actions.

CIC-SSHRC Joint Evaluation (Phase III)

The objective of the Joint Evaluation of Phase III will be to measure the longer-term impact of the Metropolis Project. This evaluation will be finalized one year prior to the end of the funding period (by March 2011), and it will include a report presented to the funding partners. It will be undertaken by CIC and SSHRC with the Evaluation Committee (Annex A). It will focus on recommendations for future possibilities for the Metropolis Project.

(iii) Mid-Term Review Tables

(A) Publications

POLICY PRIORITY		1 Citizenship and Social, Cultural and Civic Integration	2 Economic and Labour Market Integration	3 Family, Children and Youth	4 Housing and Neighbourhoods	5 Justice, Policing, and Security	6 Welcoming Communities The Role of Host Communities in Attracting and Retaining Newcomers and Minorities
BOOKS							
Submitted	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
Accepted for publication	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
Published	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
BOOK CHAPTERS							
Submitted	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
Accepted for publication	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
Published	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
ARTICLES IN RESEARCH JOURNALS							
Submitted	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
Accepted for publication	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
Published	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
OTHER PUBLICATIONS							
Submitted	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
Accepted for publication	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						
Published	Refereed						
	Non-refereed						

NUMBERS

(B) Knowledge Dissemination

Use the table below to indicate the type and the number of knowledge-dissemination events that have already been held (H) or that you plan to hold (P). Also indicate whether the events are aimed at primarily academic audiences or primarily non-academic audiences, or both.

EVENT TYPE	# Aimed at academic audiences		# Aimed at non-academic audiences		# Aimed at academic and non-academic audiences	
	H	P	H	P	H	P
Workshop						
Conference						
Congress						
Symposium						
Brown Bag Seminar						
Meeting						
Other(s) – please specify: _____						

(C) Research Outputs

Describe projects undertaken (repeat for each project).

Domain	
Project title	
Principal investigator, Affiliation	
Co-investigators, Affiliation	
Specific project-level research objectives	
Expected deliverables, Project start date	
Policy Priority addressed	<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Citizenship and Social, Cultural and Civic Integration <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Economic and Labour Market Integration <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Family, Children and Youth <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Housing and Neighbourhoods <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Justice, Policing, and Security <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Welcoming Communities: The Role of Host Communities in Attracting, Integrating and Retaining Newcomers and Minorities
Specify how this priority was addressed	
Projected delivery date	
Projected expenditures (\$)	

(D) Partners

Provincial Government	Municipal Government	NGO	Academic	Private Sector	Total

(E) Leveraged Funds

Please indicate funds raised from external sources.

2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	Total

(F) Staff

Please indicate the number of staff members that have been be hired by the Centre. The student and non-student totals should equal total staff.

ROLE	Students			Non-students		
	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
Technician						
Professional Research Associate						
Consultant						
Administrative support staff						
Other(s) – please specify: _____						

(G) Students

Please indicate the number of students and postdoctoral researchers that have participated in the Centre since the beginning of the grant. Please note that many students work on multiple projects in multiple roles. The next Table will address these roles. In this Table, the only time a person should be counted twice would be when they are working on their M.A. or Ph.D. and have other responsibilities in the Centre as well.

	Policy Priority	Citizenship		M.A. Thesis		Ph.D.		Own Project	Other Projects	Other Responsibilities
		Canadian	Foreign	In Progress	Complete	In Progress	Complete			
Undergraduate	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
Master's	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
Doctoral	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
Postdoctoral	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									

Students and Postdoctoral Researchers

Indicate the total number of students and postdoctoral researchers (both paid and unpaid) that have been participating in Metropolis to date (please note that total figures will be required in your Final Research Report).

Paid	Policy Priority	# Canadian	# Foreign
Undergraduate	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
Master's	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
Doctoral	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
Postdoctoral	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		

Unpaid	Policy Priority	# Canadian	# Foreign
Undergraduate	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
Master's	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
Doctoral	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
Postdoctoral	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		

