

Strategic Interviews
on the
Metropolis Project
and on
Transferring Knowledge to Policy Makers

Final Text

Richard Clippingdale
RTC Services
May 30, 2006

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This report is a not-for-attribution synthesis of detailed interviews on the Metropolis Project with fourteen Deputy Ministers or equivalent senior policy makers and nine leaders of think tanks and research institutes working on immigration and diversity
- Most senior policy makers saw **Immigration and Diversity** as of **critical and growing importance** for Canada's future and for their own work, but felt that **departments** all too often were **too operationally focused** to be on top of policy research needs
- Policy makers worried that **difficult and sensitive national policy challenges** on Immigration and Diversity were **not being faced up to by governments and citizens**
- Metropolis is generally considered by senior policy makers and think tank leaders as **an undoubted success** in its decade of development and activity **in stimulating immigration/diversity research and its transfer to policy making**, with a **high international reputation**
- Some **critics** were **unaware or unconvinced of specific identifiable policy results**, wanted **more innovative and persistent approaches to demonstrate benefits** of Metropolis-stimulated research to senior policy makers and politicians and believed that there was **too little outreach beyond academe and government to business, media and municipalities**
- **There was no consensus on where a continuing Metropolis should be situated. Significant support was expressed for it staying at CIC, building on success to date. Little enthusiasm was voiced for a central agency (e.g., PCO) location. Significant discernible interest was found in the Project "graduating" to become a more arm's-length independent or semi-independent organisation**, but only if continued receptivity to federal policy needs and provision of adequate funding could be assured

(1) INTRODUCTION

On March 2, 2006, the Metropolis Project at Citizenship and Immigration Canada approached me to undertake a series of interviews with Deputy Ministers and the heads of key think tanks. It was specified that “Metropolis is nearing the end of the second five year phase of funding. While many evaluations of various aspects of the program have been undertaken, there has yet to be a forum for senior policy makers to express their opinions. In order to ascertain the value of the project to senior policy makers a series of interviews will be undertaken and a short summary report prepared in advance of internal discussions at CIC. Similarly, in order to ensure that the full range of options are considered for the planning for phase III, a series of interviews will be conducted with other research institutions to ascertain best practices in transferring knowledge to policy makers.”

In pursuing this inquiry, I was instructed to “conduct face-to-face interviews with no more than a dozen senior policy makers agreed upon in consultation with the Metropolis Project team” and “no more than half a dozen interviews...with key think tanks working in the broad areas of immigration and diversity.” The interviews were to be “semi-structured, using an interview guide prepared by the Metropolis Project Team in consultation with the consultant.” When it became clear that it would not be possible for many of the interviews to be scheduled by the original deadline of March 31st the final date for the contract was amended to the end of May.

Additional informal background discussions took place with Meyer Burstein, past Executive Head of the Metropolis Project, and Demetri Papademetriou of the Migration Policy Institute, Washington, D.C.

Interviews were sought and conducted with the persons listed in ANNEX A. Where it was not possible to interview the head or principal person of the organization concerned the name and title of the person actually interviewed is indicated.

A short bio on my own background is appended as ANNEX B

Initial questions posed to interviewees are appended as ANNEX C

Overall, more interviews were sought from the list supplied by Metropolis than the eighteen (with twelve senior policy makers and six key think tank and research institution leaders) it was anticipated likely would take place. Astonishingly, twenty-three (fourteen and nine) in the end proved possible. This clearly reflected a very wide interest in

immigration and diversity issues, a generally positive view of the performance to date of the Metropolis Project and an evidently engaged concern in seeing its future success and positive evolution on sensible bases. Interviewees were informed that reporting to Metropolis would be “on a not-for-attribution basis and cumulatively form the foundation for a report on consensus observations and points of difference.” In the interest of clear and logical presentation of ideas and themes of comment, contributions from both categories of persons and organizations have been woven together, with the different kinds of sources (senior policymakers or leaders of think tanks and research institutions) specified as necessary and/or appropriate.

(2) THEMES FROM THE CONVERSATIONS

Interviews inevitably are conversations. In that spirit, each meeting in this project inevitably took on a life of its own, with particular proportions of time devoted to different aspects, and with interesting “tangents” and related side issues demanding and deserving due attention. Discussion could and did take surprising directions and led to valuable insights which need to be reported in a balanced and honest fashion. Also, many of the interviewees unavoidably offered *impressions* or *opinions* about both immigration and diversity issues and the role and significance of Metropolis rather than hard verifiable evidence. What is presented here is a general thematic and systematic account of these impressions and opinions expressed in a manner not designed to identify or isolate particular individuals or interests. The sheer number of lengthy conversations with generally senior officials and leaders of high reputation and evident thoughtfulness who so willingly and enthusiastically participated in the process have made it possible to record a number of clear consensus conclusions as well as noted differences of viewpoint.

(A) Impact of Immigration and Diversity

Almost all senior policy makers or their key colleagues/who were interviewed acknowledged the critical importance in their work of issues related to immigration and diversity. Their policy branches and regional offices regularly reported on implications for departmental (organizational) programs and there often was much interaction and exchange of information with provincial counterparts. At the same time, in a number of cases, there was acknowledgement that immediate operational priorities often limited or precluded concentration on long term and/or underlying issues needing systematic and developmental research. At the same time, the sheer volume and detail of research work often made it difficult for internal policy units to digest its significance for particular organizations with mandates related to only some aspects of the subject areas. Nevertheless, there was very clear consensus on the importance for Canada of “getting it right,” of seizing the high ground in key policy areas touched by immigration and diversity issues.

In that regard, concern was expressed repeatedly that key national objectives in such areas as labour force upgrading, immigrant settlement and integration and citizenship

promotion needed the very best research and thinking, to ensure rational policy development and effective implementation. Senior DMs stressed that Canada could not be immune from emerging global challenges relating to demographic and religious/secularist issues, with increasingly difficult major policy issues demanding attention. A number cited an emerging literacy gap among immigrants, growing doubts about the wisdom of current selection procedures, persistent frustration with the slowness of finding solutions to professional credentials issues and widespread disappointment in recent years with the success of settlement policies.

Overall, many senior policymakers worried that they did not have anything like enough in-house policy capacity or effective interdepartmental mechanisms for policy coordination in areas related to immigration and diversity issues directly affecting their organizational responsibilities. They asserted that neither politicians' priorities nor the dictates of "political correctness" helped much to enable or permit intelligent policy focusing on these issues. There was even concern expressed in some quarters that, with immigration now flowing so much more disproportionately than in the past to a few cities, especially Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal, there could be a worrying division of experience and viewpoint about immigration and immigrants settling in and at risk of becoming hardened among Canadians.

(B) Impressions of the Metropolis Project

Overall Views

Obviously, the policy makers and think tank/research institute leaders interviewed were with departments and organizations with some claim to have significant interest in immigration and diversity issues and a degree of consciousness concerning the Metropolis Project. Some top people had direct personal experience with Metropolis, but others pretty much only knew what their staffers with direct knowledge had reported to them. Among the former category of the well informed there were generally favourable, but very diverse views on what Metropolis had achieved and what ought to be the next steps in its development or evolution. In the latter category there was evident good will, but also a degree of confusion as to what the Project actually did and how its work was pursued.

The predominant impression of most of the senior policymakers with significant knowledge about Metropolis was that it had been an undoubted success in its decade of development and activity. Generally, tribute was paid to its leadership figures from its earliest times to the present for how they had managed to win a deserved excellent reputation for its successes nationally and regionally in helping to expand quality research generation and improve the translation and conversion of research into policy products.

Those with less knowledge of Metropolis were more varied in their comments. Some were under the impression that the Project wasn't designed simply to ensure that policymakers had research and evidence to inform their decisions, but that it was intended to produce policy. They were thus uncertain that Metropolis had produced truly concrete results in terms of identifiable policy products of note which could be traced to or identified with it directly. Others, even if they were not sure of specifics, thought Metropolis deserved praise for raising awareness of emerging issues.

It was evident as well that the very special organizational and institutional situation of Metropolis – located in one department of one level of government but seeking to stimulate research and policy excellence across a broad spectrum of government activities, levels and jurisdictions as well as in academe, NGOs and think tanks, left it exposed to a complex mix of reactions and attitudes in certain quarters. Within government one sensed traces of confusion about the Program's purposes in more operationally driven departments and organizations. And there could be detected at least some envy that it had enjoyed high-level sponsorship and support for semi-independence from Public Service leaders and a reputation for consistent excellence not enjoyed in some other places within government which claimed key roles concerning diversity promotion and management.

Positive comments from senior policymakers included praise for its global reputation, with the Canadian components of Metropolis continuing to be central to international collaboration on immigration and diversity themes. Some commentators within government lauded conference themes and “Conversation” topics as reliably thoughtfully chosen. But one senior official observed that while the Project was excellent at “contaminating as many people as possible” in terms of generating research activity and interest, it was “much more difficult to appreciate or measure impact” for that research and for the conferences and other products or activities generated. This knowledge brokering role clearly was difficult to appreciate for some observers, much less assess. [*The recent Metropolis newsletter on knowledge transfer, and letters from partners as well as the CIC internal evaluation, seek to shed some light on this all too common issue for endeavours like Metropolis*].

Interaction Aspects

Concerning interaction with Metropolis, varying experiences were reported across the range of federal government departments and agencies. Secretariat staff generally were praised for their spirit of outreach, but a few policy makers wanted to see enhanced “pre-event” influencing of research strategies, conference agendas and “conversations” subject areas from their own specialized perspectives such as gender. There was some comment that the Project could be more innovative and persistent in demonstrating the benefits of its research directions on key issues to senior officials outside CIC. Some favorably inclined senior officials had difficulty recalling what really policy-useful research “results” actually had come through to them via Metropolis even though they said they

were very open to a closer relationship in future. Others expressed doubts that, while undeniably good on “broad brush” subjects, Metropolis seemed not generally linked meaningfully to the Memorandum to Cabinet and government agenda processes. Some policy analysts in at least one prestigious organization briefed their superiors that, notwithstanding the undoubted and welcome positive impact of Metropolis on the growth of important research, they preferred their own longstanding vehicles of choice for professional speaking and publishing purposes over those of the Project.

From a senior spokesperson for professional strategic research encouragement and funding, however, came a detailed summary of the very many ways in which the Project had proved exemplary in its overall outreach to very many diverse interested “players” in and out of government and across the country. This senior leader asserted that the local environments in the regions were a very different theatre of operations and influence than the Ottawa “cocoon,” and that it was there, through the stimulation and encouragement of the various Centres of Excellence, where Metropolis truly had shone. Indicators of that performance were cited as: publications of journal articles and books; multiplying contacts from provincial and municipal officials; funding levered by Centre researchers; and the numbers and placements of training graduates.

A number of knowledgeable policy making commentators mixed praise and blame regarding interaction successes and shortcomings. A generally favourable and knowledgeable senior policy maker judged that Metropolis deserved a “mid grade” overall for what it had achieved over its decade of growth and outreach, with its work commendably professional and measured in judgment. But there was an accompanying caveat that above all the Project needed much greater visibility beyond specialized researchers and bureaucratic policy analysts – with the public, the media and now with the new federal government.

From the think tank and research community came a wide range of mostly positive comments on interaction with the Project. For the most part, appreciation was expressed on how well Metropolis ran its conferences, with a “sheer array” of largely wisely chosen interesting themes. Some think tanks reported co-sponsoring of specific events and discussions. Positive mention was made of the Metropolis contribution to cultivating and strengthening an international network linkage of immigration/diversity scholars and to drawing NGOs into national discussion through conferences and the work of the of Excellence. There was general praise for valuable work done by a number of the Centres in examining local and regional issues in which certain of the more regionally based think tanks were enthusiastically involved.

Strengths

Among senior policymakers there was almost universal praise for the stimulation of interest and research across the country on immigration and diversity and a generally shared conviction that it had done much creative work, especially in helping to “bridge” the research and policymaking communities. Above all, suggested one very experienced

DM, Metropolis had championed the very importance of policy over that of operations. There was praise for the Metropolis contribution to issues regarding employment equity, homelessness, immigrant workers' experiences and skills shortages. Another commentator pointed to the "considerable success" of Metropolis in "getting academics to be more policy conscious." Another added that Metropolis was making a very positive contribution to moving at least some bureaucrats in the policy world from policy *development* to policy *research*. Satisfaction was expressed as well about the Project's steady progress in linking CIC with other departments and organizations in areas of common interest.

From leaders in think tanks and interested research institutes there was much positive comment as well. Several thought Metropolis had done amazingly well in facing creatively the considerable obstacles confronting an inside-government policy research group as to how freely it could dare challenge existing policy and conventional political directions. Praise was expressed especially by one commentator for the Project's work in examining how second generation immigrants are faring economically and socially. Satisfaction was expressed too about the steady encouragement of the involvement of provincial governments. There was a largely shared sense as well that Metropolis had made a remarkable contribution to creating and strengthening a number of important "shared pathways" globally in research on immigration and diversity and that this success was insufficiently appreciated in Canada.

Weaknesses and Gaps

Not surprisingly, given the complexity of the partnership relationships inherent in Metropolis, there were observations as well on weaknesses and gaps in the work of Metropolis, both concerning the Secretariat in Ottawa and out in the Centres of Excellence. Viewpoints were strongly varied, no doubt reflecting differing vantage points and experiences. It is encouraging that most comment in this vein appeared to be offered constructively, looking towards future strengthening and finding the best ways for the Project to move forward creatively and effectively to meet emerging challenges.

Among senior policy makers there was a somewhat vague sense that Metropolis needed in future to make a greater contribution to confronting difficult core major issues facing Canadians in planning immigration and managing integration in diversity. One asked: "Are there necessary limits to diversity?" Another remarked that the Project largely had focused on examining what is and "making it work" rather than looking forward. A third lamented a failure to date to interest politicians more than episodically. There was some comment as well that, with all the successes in probing local and regional specifics, there had been a lack of systematic attempts to bring analytical syntheses on overall national trends "usably" to the attention of senior officials. Hope was expressed that more could be done to win broader "buy-in" participation of more federal government senior leaders and key aides in setting the agenda of Metropolis and to achieve more effective and timely transmission of insights to them.

Some think tank leaders claimed that there was too little involvement in the activities of Metropolis by business, the media, younger and more outspoken researchers, municipalities and student organizations. One wanted a closer relationship with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, with the Project operating like a research theme within the Council. Another wished for a sharper government-think tank focus on a few priority issues.

Whither Metropolis?

Inevitably, discussion in most cases turned to what the future destiny, shape, placement, structural relationships and mandate of Metropolis should be. Viewpoints among both senior policy makers and think tank/research institute leaders were very diverse. Within government there was little support for winding the Project up, as there was strong conviction expressed that the issues and challenges on which it had been encouraging research exploration were only going to become more fundamentally important for Canada and Canadians.

There was no consensus as to just where a continuing Metropolis should be. A number of policy makers firmly supported its retention at CIC as by far the best place in government for assuring stability of its purpose based on earned departmental reputation for leadership in diversity-related issues in both immigration and broader citizenship aspects. A few thought that a more “shared” participation among the several interested government departments and organizations might be achieved if it would be located “more at the center of government,” possibly through integration into the PCO Policy Research Initiative. But others expressed strong doubts that PCO, with its inevitable focus on shorter-term mandate-limited government concerns and agendas, was the right place for the kind of hybrid research-policy conversion, translation and brokering role that Metropolis had to play to be handled with real effectiveness and long-term impact. [*One notes the recent decision to move the Policy Research Initiative out of PCO as being in this spirit*].

In both the governmental and think tank/research communities there was discernable support for some kind of “graduation” or evolution of Metropolis from being a subordinate part of a department into a more “arm’s length,” independent or semi-independent organization. After ten years, it was submitted by some, it was time for the Project to “grow up,” to build on its undoubted success in ensuring that the federal government’s policy needs and requirements were not lost sight of. Now, they argued, it needed to reach outwards more credibly to gain the fullest participation of other government jurisdictions, business and the media. This really would only be possible, they maintained, if some kind of “arm’s length” arrangement could come into effect, perhaps on a step-by-step basis. One opportunity with such a phased approach, in this scenario, was that it could permit the assurance of executive leadership and linkages at the most senior nationally and internationally credible levels.

It was clear to all commentators that any move to such a new status would have to ensure continuing receptivity for the federal government's policy research needs, and that it would be very important to welcome and secure the direct participation of the highest quality policy minds from the fullest possible range of federal departments and organizations in Metropolis. As well, it was evident to all thoughtful observers that reliable long term funding, whether through one-time federal endowment, partnerships with independent think tanks and foundations or some combination of both, would have to be assured for the option to be viable.

(C) Communication of Research Results to Policy Makers (more generally in all research/policy areas)

Many of the observations and concerns expressed about Metropolis as to the difficulties and challenges of connecting research and policy apply more generally across government. Indeed, it was fascinating to hear the varying perspectives on this area. Some senior leaders in both the government and think tank worlds who might not have been entirely *au courant* about Metropolis specifically had very interesting perspectives on the more general challenge.

Among both senior policy makers and leading research/think tank leaders there was clear agreement that the extraordinary volume of information, comment and research in all the policy fields with which they were concerned had multiplied exponentially in recent years with the electronic enhancement of information flow. More than one DM despaired of ever being able to keep up with even minimal "essential reading" in his/her fields of responsibility.

For the research community seeking to engage with the policymaking world, the key essentials were to capture relevant data effectively and succinctly and then identify efficient ways of imparting the insights gained to the appropriate decision-makers and those who supported them. It was evident that highly reputed DMs and other senior policymakers known for creative policy leadership performance insisted on personal leadership by example in both demanding high standards in policy and demonstrating receptivity to boldness and creativity in policy staff.

The senior policy makers strongly agreed that the communication of research results to their organizations needed to be on an effective multi-level basis, and the research/think tank leaders concurred. That meant separate carefully targeted efforts for ministerial/political leaders; leading public servants; and, working-level policy specialists. There was much expression of on-going frustrations among policy makers with what they often saw as irrelevant research directions outside government insufficiently connected to identifiable policymaking priorities.

Some senior policy makers repeatedly complained that the professional research community, especially in the universities, too often was focused on publishing pretty

much anything, however irrelevant or of secondary importance for government's policy needs. They wished to see more effective encouragement of specific research priorities which they and granting councils could help to identify. One model, it was noted, could be the eleven federal policy priorities in the MOU between SSHRC and the five Metropolis Centres.

Think tank leaders and some key figures in academe of a more strategic bent agreed with that critique and were anxious to see enhanced and more effective means and channels developed so that researchers would be able better to understand and appreciate the priorities and needs of the real world of policymaking. Many of them doubted, however, if most senior policymakers really knew what they wanted! Furthermore, they saw much to criticize in a policymaking world that they viewed as too often and too severely operationally focused on the public servant side and too undernourished intellectually and contextually on the ministerial/political side.

The two worlds had no evident consensus on how best to bridge the gaps. There were concerns expressed that the Canadian think tank community of an independent philanthropic nature was too thin and weakly supported to offer, much less impose, research/policy agendas and insights for the policymaking world. This contrasted with the US, some claimed, where both executive and legislative branches were bombarded with new and professionally targeted research ideas on every pending policy issue. Canadian political party policy research capacity of a significant calibre, it was claimed by several leaders in both the research and policy worlds, was at the lowest ebb they could remember. Others despaired that the inside-government policy world was showing few signs of recovery from the decapitation of corporate memory and the discouragement of innovative tendencies that had occurred in the downsizing and program review period of the 1990s.

Enterprising think tank leaders knew that they needed constantly to renew and reinforce their contacts at all levels – with the politicians, with senior mandarins and with the working public servant policy analysts. With a change in government or a shuffle of leading officials came the need to build new networking connections; and there was an ongoing requirement to keep up and constantly strengthen working level contacts and interchanges. Some of the senior think tank leaders reported that to impact seriously on senior policymakers in a given area, necessarily subject to a wide and diverse range of routine priorities, they needed to “create a buzz” that could not be ignored. They pointed out that doing that meant getting through to their targets in times, places and ways that fitted their practical world, not the academic ivory tower. A number commented on the key role of selected journalists/columnists in creating such a “buzz.”

Largely unlike academic researchers, think tank leaders generally did not see the publishing of academic papers or appearances at conferences as necessarily the route of choice to policymakers' consciousness. Leading academic policy researchers continued to maintain that long term substantive impact and credibility came from properly written evidence-based research and from peer review and debate in conferences. But some of them conceded that even excellent research needs to be called attention to, and that some

of the best research needs to be appropriately showcased. And think tank leaders, while recognizing the continuing utility of such traditional approaches, claimed that they needed constantly to experiment with new methods and strategies for “getting through.”

In that regard, they often favoured specially designed “op ed” pieces, electronic circulation of well timed “highlight” briefing notes on new and arresting policy research to select lists of target “players” and the arrangement of conveniently timed lunches, dinners and small roundtables. They believed that such “niche” policy marketing was usually more useful than simple broad dissemination of bulk research products. As to federal government “targets”, it was stressed by all think tank leaders that consistent success in arranging and following through on such activities put a premium on significant institutional “presence” in Ottawa. At the same time, they expressed more than a little annoyance at the Ottawa “cocooning” habits of senior federal policy makers.

There was definite enthusiasm for a regular cross-fertilization of talent and insights between the research and policy making communities, but it was recognized by leaders in both worlds that this was easier said than done. It was more readily pursued by the hiring of younger persons of talent by one side or the other after earlier experience on the other side. Occasional notable executive interchanges were seen as all to the good but very difficult to arrange and sustain at optimal levels of ability and leadership potential.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEWEES

Senior Policymakers

Peter Harder (DM, Foreign Affairs)

Munir Sheikh (DM, Labour)

Judith Larocque (DM, Canadian Heritage) joined by Diane Fulford, ADM Citizenship and Heritage

Margaret Bloodworth (DM, Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada) joined by Mark Whittingham, ADM, Portfolio Research and Public Affairs

Jean-Pierre Voyer (Executive Director, Policy Research Initiative, PCO)

Ivan P. Fellegi (Chief Statistician, Statistics Canada)

Janice Charette (DM, Citizenship and Immigration Canada)

Janet Halliwell (Executive Vice-President and A/President, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council)

Karen Kinsley (President, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation) – *actually with Leigh Howell, Director, Socio-Economic Research*

Alan Nymark (DM, Human Resources and Skills Development) – *actually with Andrew Treusch, ADM, Strategic Policy and Planning*

Florence Ivers (Coordinator, Status of Women Canada – *actually with Zeynep Karman, Director, Research*

Morris Rosenberg (DM, Health Canada) – *actually with Marian Campbell Jarvis, Director of Horizontal Policy*

John Sims (DM, Justice Canada) – *actually with Stan Lepinski, Deputy Director General, Policy Integration and Coordination and Kuan Li, Research Analyst*

Suzanne Hurtubise (DM, Industry Canada) – *actually with Ron Parker, Visiting Senior Assistant DM, Strategic Policy Branch and Lois Stevenson, Director, Economic Framework Policies Directorate*

Think Tanks and Research Institutions

Anne Golden (President and CEO, Conference Board of Canada – joined by Michael Bloom, Executive Director, Strategic Projects and Initiatives and Education and Learning

Jodi White (President, Public Policy Forum)

Ratna Omidvar (Executive Director, Maytree Foundation)

Roger Gibbins (President and CEO, Canada West Foundation)

Hugh Segal (President, Institute for Research on Public policy)

Arthur Sweetman (Director, School of Policy Studies, Queen’s University) – joined by *colleagues Audrey Kobayashi and Naomi Alboim*

Caroline Andrew (Director, School of Governance, University of Ottawa)

Sharon Manson Singer (President, Canadian Policy Research Network) – *actually with Judy Varga-Toth Assistant Director, Family Network*

Mark Mullins (Executive Director, Fraser Institute) – *actually with Martin Collacott, Senior Fellow, as their expert on immigration and diversity*

APPENDIX B

RICHARD CLIPPINGDALE, Ph.D

Richard Clippingdale is President of RTC Services, a consulting firm specializing in policy analysis, civil service management and international development. He is Fellow of the School of Canadian Studies, Carleton University, of which he is a former Director. He has served in the Government of Canada as Assistant Under Secretary of State (ADM), Corporate Policy and Public Affairs in the Department of the Secretary of State, with particular involvement in multiculturalism, citizenship and diversity issues, and as Head of the Advanced Management Program at CCMD. He has been as well a Fellow of the School of Governance at the University of Ottawa.

Major consulting missions in recent years have included: CIDA and the World Bank on accelerating progress towards Summit Millennium Development Goals relating to health, nutrition and population; UNESCO (Paris HQ) on clarifying its results objectives across all its constituent areas; CIDA, the World Bank and the Government of Ethiopia on enhancing civil service capacity building in that country; and, Treasury Board Secretariat on “The Role of Evaluation in the Federal Government” (strategic interviews with senior decision makers across the federal government).

APPENDIX C

Questions Asked

As agreed with Metropolis, each interviewee received in advance a list of a series of major question areas which would be discussed. The ones for senior policymakers were under three headings:

IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION AND DIVERSITY ON YOUR ORGANIZATION

- How do you and your department (organization) ascertain the knowledge required, then acquire, process and retain it?
- On horizontal immigration and diversity issues, how do you engage with CIC and other departments?

YOUR IMPRESSION OF THE METROPOLIS PROJECT

- What do you know about it?
- Do you and your department (organization) interact and proactively engage with it? How?
- Are there significant gaps in its work? What use is the work of the Centres of Excellence to you?
- Has your department (organization) seconded staff to the Project secretariat or the broader Metropolis network of activities?
- Has your department (organization) recruited graduate students from the network?

COMMUNICATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS TO POLICY MAKERS (more generally)

- How is this most effectively done?
- What are significant obstacles to achieving that communication?
- How can long term impact be assured?

In the case of the leaders of think tanks and research institutions, the question areas covered only the latter two categories and questions were slightly revised to read:

YOUR IMPRESSION OF THE METROPOLIS PROJECT

- What do you know about it?
- Do you interact and proactively engage with it? How? How might interaction be approved?
- Are there significant gaps in its work?
- What use is the work of the Centres of Excellence to you generally and with reference to their specialized local environments?
- Do the Centres provide you opportunities to engage governmental, NGO, employer, media and other think tank contacts/partners?
- Have you recruited graduate students from the network?

COMMUNICATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS TO POLICY MAKERS (more generally)

- How is this most effectively done?
- How would your role and impact compare/contrast with that of universities?
- What are significant obstacles to achieving that communication?
- How can long term impact be assured?

