

Vancouver Centre of Excellence



Research on Immigration and
Integration in the Metropolis

Commentary Series

No. 07-01

Report of RIIM Activities, April 2005 – March 2006

Daniel Hiebert

January 2007

RIIM

Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis

The Vancouver Centre is funded in 2006 by grants from the federal funding partners of Metropolis, which include:

- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada
- Canadian Heritage,
- Human Resources and Social Development Canada
- Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
- Status of Women Canada
- Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.
- Statistics Canada provides in-kind support.

In addition, the Centre receives grants from Simon Fraser University, the University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria.

Views expressed in this manuscript are those of the author(s) alone. For more information, contact the Co-directors of the Centre, Dr. Don DeVoretz, Department of Economics, SFU (devoretz@sfu.ca) and Dr. Daniel Hiebert, Department of Geography, UBC (dhiebert@geog.ubc.ca).

REPORT OF RIIM ACTIVITIES: April 2005 – March 2006

June 30, 2006

Daniel Hiebert
Co-Director, RIIM
Department of Geography, UBC

I. INTRODUCTION

The procedures of RIIM dictate that the Lead Co-Director writes the annual report of the centre, meaning that each individual Co-Director does so every second year. I am struck by how much has changed since I wrote the 2003-04 report of activities. At that time, I concentrated on the theme of restructuring, how RIIM transformed itself from one basic model of operation to another. New rules and procedures had recently been set in motion and the Centre was still adjusting to them. This past year was the fourth of the five-year current mandate of RIIM and the administrative procedures that I discussed in the report two years ago are now so completely implemented as to seem natural. The basic cycle of operations follows a clear rhythm, starting with the establishment of a new set of projects at the outset of the fiscal year (based on a Call for Proposals issued near the end of the previous fiscal year). In the summer, the Centre holds a retreat that reflects on research priorities and adjusts them, setting in motion the Call for Proposals that will be issued later. In the Fall, selected members of RIIM attend the International Metropolis conference, which was held in Toronto this year and therefore was more accessible than usual (meaning a larger number of RIIM researchers participated). The year culminates in the most important venue for disseminating the new findings of RIIM research, the National Metropolis conference, and also a new CFP. Along the way, there are a number of smaller workshops, policy seminars, conferences, meetings of the Management Board, and of course the production of Working Papers outlining the detailed findings of research.

As this set of activities has become fully institutionalized, there has been an intensification in the communication within and between the core networks of researchers, policy analysts, and practitioners that are affiliated with RIIM. As in the past, this transfer of knowledge is based on the generation of new findings across a wide range of research projects funded by the centre. The unprecedented 30 Working Papers posted by RIIM authors in 2005 demonstrates this commitment to the generation of new knowledge very well. Above all it is important to understand that the production of these Working Papers is built on the fact that researchers appreciate their value; that is, researchers are willing to dedicate considerable energy to authoring Working Papers because they are uniquely positioned to reach a varied audience of readers. The success of RIIM in disseminating the findings of research is amply illustrated by statistics on website usage. In 2004-05 there were approximately 830,000 “hits” on RIIM’s website; in 2005-06 this figure nearly doubled

In addition to all of these elements that are at the heart of the annual operations of the Centre, two activities that were undertaken in the past year have been particularly important, and have also consumed a large share of RIIM's administrative resources: hosting the National Metropolis conference in March, 2006, and participating in major reviews of the current phase of Metropolis, by SSHRC and CIC. Above all, these reviews have required a great deal of thought about the successes and continuing challenges of RIIM in particular, but also the Metropolis Project writ large.

The remainder of this report will be organized into the following broad sections, each concentrating on activities in the 2005-06 period: The development of partnerships; The National Metropolis conference; The general scope of RIIM research; Research across the domains; and Concluding thoughts. A number of appendices provide further documentation on the issues covered in the report.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARTNERSHIPS

The basic mission of RIIM, and the other Metropolis centres, is to produce new policy-relevant knowledge, and to spread this new knowledge to relevant people and institutions. Partnerships are vital for both of these functions. On the research side, partners help define the scope of research carried out at the centre and are central to the actual research process. For example, government ministries provide information about policy, administrative data, and access to other information, and are at times co-investigators in research projects. Representatives of NGOs play an equally varied set of roles, which include consultation on research projects, helping researchers gain access to subjects, sharing expertise on the settlement and integration process, and in some cases acting as co-investigators.

These partnerships are built and maintained by individuals, of course, but RIIM has also developed institutional practices to foster them. The annual Research Retreat is probably the most direct of these. Held annually (in the case of the period in question, in July 2005; see Appendix A), the Retreats bring together people and institutions interested in immigrant selection, settlement, and integration. As in the past few years, the 2005 Retreat was organized around four sessions that each featured a panel followed by open discussion. In the recent past, these were focused around orders of government, but this year a more thematic strategy was adopted. The first panel concentrated on the economic side of settlement and included presenters from the national and provincial governments. The second was devoted to the broad issue of social equity/inclusion, and the third to settlement challenges. The final panel was mainly made up of representatives of NGOs but also included a provincial program manager. This combination is actually highly significant and bears consideration. The year of record of this report was characterized by a period of friction between the provincial government and the non-profit settlement services sector, which followed the implementation of a new process of distributing funds to settlement organizations. This is not the place to rehearse the causes of this tension, but the important point to highlight is that a provincial official who administered the transformation of the funding system, and representatives of NGOs that have been publicly critical of the new policy direction, participated in the same panel. This speaks to a high level of maturity among participants and also, I would argue, to the potential for RIIM to provide a relatively neutral space for the

important kind of debate that occurred in the session. RIIM can act in this capacity because it has a relationship of mutual respect with both the provincial ministries responsible for immigration and also the NGO community.

The final panel of the day brought the Domain Leaders of RIIM together to summarize the most salient points made during the day. These were later assembled as a set of new research priorities for RIIM and were used in the subsequent Call For Proposals that was issued early in 2006. While it is tempting to describe these as *local* research priorities, given the fact that they were established in Vancouver, that would be something of a misnomer. RIIM's research priorities are of course unique to the centre, but they are built from a conversation that includes representatives of several federal ministries as well as the provincial government and other relevant stakeholders. They therefore reflect local, regional *and national* sensibilities.

* * *

Over the past few years, RIIM has established two other events that help build a broad network of support for research in general and the centre in particular. Our annual Policy Forum and semi-annual Policy Research Symposia have been described in detail in previous reports and I will not do so here. In fact, it would be irrelevant to discuss these events further since we put them on hold in the past year. Given the intense focus of institutional activities on conference preparation, there was simply no capacity to stage either of these other events.

Before turning to the conference, I summarize a range of other activities that were used to foster partnerships. In terms of federal ministries, highlights of the year's partnership activities would be:

- According to the annual reports provided by researchers (Appendix B), 11 special presentations to policy audiences were given in 2005-06. Several of these were made in Ottawa as part of the Metropolis Brown Bag seminar series. This included two presentations by one of the Co-Directors of RIIM, on international students in Canada, focusing on Koreans, and one the economic outcomes of immigration in BC.
- A Co-Director of RIIM gave testimony to the Standing Parliamentary Committee on Citizenship and Immigration in 2005-06. This important contribution to policy arose out of his sustained research project on the economics of citizenship in Canada, compared with countries in the EU.
- In 2005-06, a senior RIIM researcher acted as PI in a new project, funded by a combination of CMHC and HRSDC, on the housing situation of newcomers in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver. This project will generate four CMHC Working Papers in 2006.
- In 2005-06, RIIM took the lead in assembling researchers from all five Metropolis Centres to engage in background research on the implementation of the Legislated Employment Equity Program. This work was collected in a special national report and was presented at the Vancouver Metropolis conference.
- A senior RIIM researcher is currently working with the Housing and Homelessness Branch of HRSDC to establish a new national project on immigration and homelessness.

Similarly, a number of events, activities, and initiatives fostered partnerships between RIIM and the non-profit sector.

- There are NGO representatives on both the Management Board and Research Program Committee of RIIM, the two bodies that govern the Centre. This means that NGOs have direct input into decisions about research projects and the overall direction of RIIM.
- NGOs have been full participants at RIIM Research Retreats. Typically, this has been facilitated by organizing a special panel of NGO representatives at these events. In this way, the research needs of NGOs are presented to the full RIIM community of stakeholders and NGO priorities are included in the background documents released during annual CFPs.
- RIIM provides funds for NGO attendance at Metropolis conferences. In the 2005-06 year, this has enabled 5 NGO representatives from BC to attend the International Metropolis conference in Toronto, and approximately 35 to the National Metropolis conference in Vancouver.
- Members of NGOs have been active in shaping actual RIIM research projects. Several projects have been undertaken at the request of NGOs, for example. Moreover, NGO representatives are occasionally Co-Investigators in RIIM projects. For example, a member of ISS-BC assumed this role in a 2004-05 project examining the settlement outcomes of refugees from Aceh.
- RIIM responded to a request from AMSSA, the umbrella organization of BC NGOs, to provide a summary of RIIM research related to settlement services. This was completed and published as a Special Working Paper in 2005 (#05-S1) and has been warmly received by the community. Some 100 regular Working Papers are summarized in this document in an easily accessible format, emphasizing the issue of settlement.
- A majority of RIIM research projects are conducted with some form of NGO partnership. This is the case for 9 of the 15 projects that will receive funds in 2006-07, for example. The extent of NGO involvement varies across these projects, including helping researchers recruit subjects, membership on research advisory committees, and participating in the actual research process.
- Over the past decade, a number of RIIM projects studied the activities of NGOs directly, in particular noting their contribution to immigrant settlement. This is the case for three projects that will receive funds in 2006-07.
- NGO representatives are invited to RIIM's Policy Research Symposia, and have a "front row seat" during the discussion of new findings. In these meetings, NGO personnel frequently make comments that help shape the way that final results are disseminated.
- Two RIIM researchers currently sit on the Management Boards of NGOs that specialize in settlement services.

The lines of communication between RIIM and a wide variety of stakeholders are therefore, most definitely, open. I should also add that, as Co-Director, I am also a member of the Mayor of Vancouver's Working Group on Immigration, and also the Joint Federal Provincial Immigration Advisory Council (For BC). The latter group is co-organized and co-chaired by

the Regional Director General of CIC and the Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for immigration policy in the Government of British Columbia. The Mayor's group and the Advisory Council are both important mechanisms to engage in dialogue about the research priorities of these orders of government, on the one hand, and transfer knowledge about RIIM's research activities on the other.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The activities of RIIM were largely dominated by the efforts required to host the eighth national Metropolis conference, so much so that it seems appropriate to provide a brief account of the planning and execution of the event in this report. It is worth signaling at the outset that planning the conference engaged the major constituent stakeholder groups that make up the Metropolis "community", which reinforces the aforementioned comment about open communication between RIIM and other institutions. The composition of the conference steering committee illustrates this point forcefully:

- Don DeVoretz, Professor of Economics, SFU, and Co-Director, RIIM
- Carolyn Glover, BC/Yukon Region, Citizenship and Immigration Canada
- Barry Halliday, Metropolis Project Team, Ottawa
- Daniel Hiebert, Professor of Geography, UBC, and Co-Director, RIIM
- Steven Morris, Metropolis Project Team, Ottawa
- Mahdvi Russell, Canadian Heritage, Western Canada region
- Zool Suleman, Lawyer, Vancouver
- Timothy Welsh, Program Director, AMSSA
- Baldwin Wong, Social Planner, City of Vancouver
- Deb Zehr, Ministry of the Attorney General, Province of British Columbia.

So, too, is the list of institutions that provided financial assistance. From government these were: The Government of British Columbia; Citizenship and Immigration Canada (three separate units); Canadian Heritage; SSHRC; Department of Justice; Social Development Canada; and Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (note that these were the names of the federal departments when they agreed to assist the conference and several have subsequently been changed)

There were several pre-conference events in the two days leading up to the meeting. Statistics Canada and CIC presented a special workshop on the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada; Canadian Heritage held a Round Table on the measurement of racism in Canada; there were study tours of the downtown area and the residential areas of Greater Vancouver that are associated with major immigrant settlement (the contribution of tour guides by the City of Vancouver is gratefully acknowledged); and there was a day-long Graduate Student Development Workshop.

The Graduate Student Professional Development Workshop added a new element to the activities of national Metropolis conferences. It is worth providing a brief outline of the event to provide an illustration of the value of the conference to this constituent group. In the morning there were individual presentations by: a leading academic specializing in public

policy, from New Zealand; a senior representative of ISS-BC, one of the largest NGOs that provides settlement services to immigrants, who spoke about research partnerships between academics and practitioners; a senior researcher from CIC who spoke about research partnerships with government; and the editor of the *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. There were two panels in the afternoon, one on the transition from graduate school to working in government and the other on the transition to an academic job (there were three speakers on each panel).

Graduate students were centrally involved in the organization of the pre-conference, day-long Graduate Student Professional Development Workshop. Also, graduate students organized (fully, including calls for proposals, selecting presenters, etc.) approximately 10 percent of the workshops included in the conference. Many graduate students also presented their research and received feedback in the workshops.

The conference itself took place over four days, with pre-conference study tours and workshops during the first day and a reception that evening. The main three days of activities were comprised of plenary sessions and workshops. Five major plenary sessions were offered, focusing on areas that reflected the overall theme of the conference, *Immigration and Canada's Place in the Changing World*:

- Canada as a competitor in the global market for immigrants
- Racism-free workplace integration (in partnership with HRSDC)
- The changing dynamics of asylum
- Governance approaches to immigration: Sharing Influence and Impact
- Citizenship and Social Inclusion

Most plenaries were Chaired by senior officials in the federal government. All included speakers who were both widely respected and provocative. There was an approximately even split between policy analysts in government and NGOs on the one hand, and academics on the other, in terms of the number of plenary speakers.

There were also four brief plenary sessions scheduled, which concentrated on policy issues. The first saw representatives of HRSDC/SDC speak about the research priorities of that ministry. The second was held in partnership with the Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada and dealt with the issue of the overseas Canadian diaspora (largely made up of returned immigrants). The third and fourth were addresses by the Minister of CIC and the Parliamentary Secretary for Canadian Heritage. The BC Minister of Economic Development (which is responsible for several areas of immigration policy and administration in the province) offered closing remarks at the conference.

There were approximately 70 workshops held over the three-day period of the conference, typically a dozen at a time. Each was mandated to include presenters from all three of the core constituencies served by Metropolis, academia, policy, and NGO practitioners. Substantial effort was made to avoid duplication in workshop scheduling (i.e., workshops on similar topics were held at different times, enabling delegates of the conference to attend all those in their topical area). The organizational activities of the Ottawa Project Team on this front are gratefully acknowledged. The Project Team has developed expertise in conference management, especially in the area of workshops.

It is actually impossible to pinpoint the exact number of delegates at the conference, since a relatively large number were granted complimentary registrations, such as undergraduate students who volunteered to distribute translation receivers during the plenary sessions. In any case, there were at least 589 delegates at the event. The total budget of the conference exceeded \$400,000. About 40 percent of this figure was generated through registration fees and the remainder through contributions by various government ministries (as already noted). There were also two private donations to the conference and one private-sector contribution (the Software Human Resources Council). The long accounting trail is finally coming to a close and it is now clear that conference revenues will be slightly larger than expenditures, and the initial investment in the conference that was made by RIIM will be repaid. Significantly, this means that the conference was revenue-neutral for the centre, despite its rather large budget and the many uncertainties along the way.

I mentioned the fact that many delegates received complimentary registrations. It is worth enumerating the broad categories included in this list. As would be expected, the expenses of plenary speakers were covered by the conference. This was also true of the keynote speakers at the Graduate Student Professional Development Workshop. Beyond that, SFU and UBC contributed funds that enabled the participation of approximately 40 local graduate students. Most of these individuals also acted as volunteers, monitoring workshops and managing the RIIM display table. Funds for more than 20 graduate students from other Metropolis centres were also made available. The Integration Branch of CIC also contributed a significant amount of money to support the attendance of NGO representatives. This was also true of HRSDC. Between these sources, about 25 members of BC NGOs were able to attend the conference as well as about 30 nominated by other Metropolis centres. All told, some 125 delegates received some form of assistance to attend the conference. This figure speaks eloquently to the power of the Metropolis network to include people from a wide variety of institutional contexts. It also demonstrates the will to support the emerging generation of scholars, graduate students.

The Ottawa Project Team has taken on the responsibility of analyzing the evaluation forms generated by conference delegates. At the time I write this report, a preliminary analysis of about 40 of these forms has been done and the results are favourable. On the whole, there was a high level of satisfaction among those delegates who filled in a form.

In a separate report to SSHRC, I listed the following items as the key accomplishments of the conference:

- Maintaining and enhancing the network of researchers, policy analysts, and practitioners associated with immigration and diversity in Canada. All three groups were well represented at the conference. The interest of policy makers was demonstrated in several tangible ways, notably in the financial support given to the conference from the federal departments of Social Development, Human Resources and Skills Development, Citizenship and Immigration, and Justice, as well as the BC provincial government; the agreement of government official to act as plenary speakers, or Chairs of plenary sessions (CIC, Heritage, HRCDS, SDC, BC government, Nova Scotia government, Québec government, Mayor of Vancouver); and the large number of policy analysts who participated in workshops. Practitioners

were also well represented, in the form of three plenary speakers and a large number of workshop participants. The conference brought research, policy, and practice together, and in the process enhanced communication and mutual understanding between these sectors.

- Disseminating new research by Canadian and international scholars. Eleven of the plenary speakers were academics (5 Canadian and 6 international), ensuring that scholarly activities were at the core of the conference. There was also at least one Canadian academic presenter in each of the workshops of the conference (this was a requirement). Our collective knowledge of immigration and diversity was expanded by the conference.
- Graduate student development (already covered in this report).
- The conference occurred at a time of widespread reflection on Canadian immigration policy. The fact that that recently appointed Minister Monte Solberg of CIC addressed the conference illustrates the central place that Metropolis, and the national conference, occupies in policy discussion and development. Conference participants heard about new policy developments directly from the highest office, and were given a chance to debate these issues. For example, the Deputy Minister of CIC held a special Round Table event during the conference, which brought eight of Canada's leading academics together to offer advice on current issues and possible policy changes. Similar events were also held with Canadian Heritage (a pre-conference workshop on measuring the effects of anti-racism initiatives) and HRSDC (on housing and homelessness research), which in both cases included Assistant Deputy Ministers.
- The plenary sessions addressed questions that are at the leading edge of policy and academic research. In particular, three topics that have not been discussed at previous Metropolis conferences were highlighted: the growing degree of return migration to Asia; impacts in Canada of changing international patterns and practices of asylum; and changing international regimes of immigrant incorporation. These discussions will echo through policy and research debates for the next few years.
- Building on the previous point, the conference helped put Canadian practices of immigration and diversity into an international context. Doing so, participants were encouraged to pay close attention to the similarities between Canadian policies and those enacted elsewhere, as well as the differences that set Canada apart. In my opinion, this type of knowledge is sorely lacking in Canadian discourse on immigration and diversity, which tends to ignore practices in other countries despite their obvious relevance.

A final note: the financial contribution of SSHRC for the conference is gratefully acknowledged. This arose out of the application to SSHRC's competitive program called *Aid to Research Workshops and Conferences in Canada*.

RIIM RESEARCH IN 2005-2006: THE GENERAL PICTURE

There were already a number of research projects in motion at the outset of the 2005-06 year. For many of these, the funding phase ended as the previous fiscal year came to a close. Typically, this is the time when researchers have collected all of their information and have

conducted their analysis—meaning that their need for assistance and therefore research funds has ended. But the writing process continues and of course this involves the production of Working Papers and other publications (I will return to this issue below). Some projects continue, however. In fact, seven of the applications that were successful in the Calls for Proposals (CFP) held in 2004-05 were approved for two years of support. These were (the number in brackets indicates the funding for 2005-06):

- Gillian Creese, UBC, Integration and belonging (\$9,100)
- Neil Guppy, UBC, Canadian public opinion about immigration, 1975-2005 (\$17,500)
- Jennifer Hyndman, SFU, Achenese refugees in BC (\$7,480)
- David Ley, UBC, Concentrated immigrant settlement (\$18,550)
- David Ley, UBC, Where is home? (\$22,360)
- Krishna Pendakur, SFU, Is there a glass ceiling (\$9,750)
- Miu Yan, UBC, The role of neighbourhood houses in integrating newcomers (\$7,300)

Following a Call for Proposals released in early 2005, the Research Program Committee (RPC) met in mid-April to assess the proposals that were submitted. Under normal circumstances one of the Co-Directors of RIIM Chairs this committee, but in this case both had submitted applications. Therefore the adjudication process was organized and conducted by the Domain Leaders of the Centre. As always, the RPC was approximately half made up of academics and half a mix of government and NGO representatives. Again, as always, an effort was made to ensure that the RPC included voices from a number of ministries at the federal level, as well as the relevant Provincial ministry.

The new projects approved by the RPC and the Management Board for 2005-06 were (for two-year projects, the first number provided is for 2005-06, the second for 2006-07):

- Don DeVoretz, SFU, A model of foreign-born transfers: Evidence from Canadian micro data (\$18,800)
- Don DeVoretz, SFU, Skilled Chinese return migration: Boon or bust for Canada? (\$20,000)
- Parin Dossa, SFU, Raising new policy questions through narratives of trauma: Case study of Afghan refugees (\$15,000 + \$15,000)
- Jane Friesen, SFU, Mobility, diversity and access for ESL students in BC (\$15,202 + \$6,600)
- Daniel Hiebert, UBC, Immigration, entrepreneurship and the new economy (\$25,000)
- Diana Lary, UBC, The linkages of migration & security in Canada and France: Origins and consequences (\$14,441)
- Marianne Jacquet, SFU, Mapping and assessing African students' educational needs and expectations (\$15,000 + \$15,000)
- Geraldine Pratt, UBC, A multidimensional analysis of separated children asylum seekers in BC (\$15,000 + \$15,000)
- Charles Ungerleider, UBC, Examining equality of opportunities and outcomes in the academic trajectories of ESL youth: Implications for policy and practice (\$13,000)

Altogether, therefore, RIIM provided funding for 16 projects in 2005-06, with (\$92,000 plus \$151,400) \$243,400 spent on research during the fiscal year of record. This figure is a little below the \$257,700 that was anticipated for research spending when the budget for 2005-06 was passed at the start of the year (Appendix C). It is actually an extraordinary number when seen in context. RIIM received a special injection of \$43,000 at the very end of the 2004-05 fiscal year, which was available for spending in 2005-06. In addition the base grant of the Centre for 2005-06 was just over \$325,000. In other words, RIIM dedicated \$243,400 out of its global budget of \$368,000 to the core function of research (66 percent).¹ This implies, of course, that administrative expenditures were held to a minimum. The remaining funds were used to hire support staff, manage the website, support conference travel, produce Working Papers, and engage in other forms of dissemination. A point that has been made before bears repeating here: The contribution made by SFU and UBC, especially in terms of secretarial salaries, and Research Time Stipends for the Co-Directors and Domain Leaders, enables RIIM to devote most of the money it receives towards basic research. Without this contribution, the Centre would have to spend a much larger share of its budget on administration.

The research output of RIIM in 2005-06 was impressive. Twenty-five researchers provided annual reports for the year. This is a relatively small number compared with the 91 who are affiliated with the centre, but RIIM has always concentrated its efforts on tracking the outcomes of the funds that have been directly provided to researchers by the Centre. Therefore, the figures provided in Appendix B should be interpreted as direct contributions that have been made by RIIM to our knowledge base. During the year of record this group of researchers gave over 100 presentations, to a variety of audiences, an extensive form of dissemination in itself. These were mainly provided in academic settings, especially at Metropolis conferences. As noted earlier, though, 11 presentations were given to specialized groups of policy makers, a particularly important accomplishment for a Centre dedicated to policy-based research.

The dissemination of results in the form of Working Papers is also vital for the transfer of knowledge from research to the policy system, as well as the NGOs that specialize in settlement service provision. Twenty-four Working Papers were published on the RIIM website in the period of record (Appendix D, which includes all of the papers published between January 2005 and March 2006).² One of these was a special WP, produced in collaboration with the settlement service sector (explained in a previous section).

Of course RIIM is a *centre of excellence*, which implies that the work of researchers must achieve a high level of scholarship. This is demonstrated by the extensive output of peer-reviewed publications produced by affiliated researchers in the form of books, book chapters,

¹ Note that there was a carry-over of about \$70,000 from the previous year, which was also available for administrative functions of the centre. However, at the end of the 2005-06 year, the Centre was able to carry \$40,000 into the following year, despite the fact that it hosted a national conference.

² The discrepancy between the number noted here (24) and the one provided in Appendix B (14) is related to the way RIIM collects information in annual reports from researchers. Only those who are receiving funds in a given year are required to produce a report, although a small number of other researchers affiliated with the Centre also do so. The difference between these numbers therefore means that researchers who did not receive funds from RIIM in 2005-06 provided at least 10 Working Papers. Many of these were written by researchers who held grants in previous years.

and journal articles. The vast majority of these would have begun their publication cycle as a RIIM Working Paper.

The statistics provided at the bottom of Appendix B also tell an important story. The funds provided by RIIM to scholars supported 28 graduate students, who are an essential component of the research process in their own right—and of course indicate the investment in the future that is associated with the Metropolis Project. Finally, note that six of the studies conducted in 2005-06 included some form of partnership between researchers and either government policy analysts or members of NGOs; and five of the projects generated media attention.

RIIM RESEARCH IN 2005-2006: ACROSS THE DOMAINS

Citizenship Domain

Active projects, 2005-06

- Neil Guppy, UBC, Canadian public opinion about immigration, 1975-2005
- Diana Lary, UBC, The linkages of migration & Security in Canada and France: Origins and consequences
- David Ley, UBC, Where is home?

Working papers, 2005 and 2006:

- 05-09, David Ley, and Audrey Kobayashi, *Back to Hong Kong: Return Migration or Transnational Sojourn?*
- 05-18, David Ley, *Post-Multiculturalism?*
- 05-23, Katharyne Mitchell and Walter Parker, *I Pledge Allegiance to... Flexible Citizenship and Shifting Scales of Belonging*
- 05-25, Shibao Guo, *Toward Minority Group Rights and Inclusive Citizenship for Immigrants: The Role of a Voluntary Organization in Vancouver*
- 06-05, Pieter Bevelander, and Justus Veenman, *Naturalisation and Socioeconomic Integration: The Case of the Netherlands*

The Citizenship Domain was established by RIIM in 2002, as the Centre entered its second phase. It has brought a new focus to RIIM, on issues of long-term integration and social cohesion. In the recent past, researchers have studied the meaning of citizenship, in the broadest sense, for newcomers and visible minorities in Canada. This has included, for example, a project on redress as a means of fostering social inclusion—which is highly topical now in light of the current interest in compensation for the Chinese Head Tax.

Several Citizenship projects that have been supported in previous years came to fruition in 2005-06, most notably a study of Collingwood Neighbourhood House (by Leonie Sandercock), which has resulted in a new documentary film. The film, *Where Strangers Become Neighbours* has received attention both locally and internationally and has already been screened in three countries. It deals with the day-to-day approach to cultural diversity that has been developed by the neighbourhood house, which emphasizes cross-cultural engagement. Sandercock will also be featured in a CBC documentary on her recent book

(*Mongrel Cities...*, which includes three chapters that arose out of her RIIM-funded work), and presented the *Laurier Lecture* on multiculturalism this year. Two other Working Papers published in 2005-06 are also based on earlier projects, by Guo and Ley.

The new projects supported in this domain have seen much activity. A project on border security, by Diana Lary, is a new departure for RIIM, and has already generated presentations by the principal investigator in Canada, the US, and Italy. Ley and Teo's study of return migration to China is also generating attention. Teo received an award from the *Ethnic Geography* specialty group of the Association of American Geographers, for the best thesis proposal by a PhD student, based on this topic. Ley and Teo have also given a large number of presentations, including one to staff at the Canadian Embassy in Beijing, which represents a significant way to transfer research knowledge to officials of CIC. Teo was also invited to present this work at an international workshop on migration held in Prato, Italy, where she was the only graduate student so honoured. This research project has also been featured in the media. Finally, the new project on Canadian public opinion, by Neil Guppy and Rima Wilkes, has generated three presentations and a Working Paper draft.

Economics Domain

Active projects, 2005-06:

- Krishna Pendakur, SFU, Is there a glass ceiling
- Don DeVoretz, SFU, A model of foreign-born transfers: Evidence from Canadian micro data
- Don DeVoretz, SFU, Skilled Chinese return migration: Boon or bust for Canada?
- Jane Friesen, SFU, Mobility, diversity and access for ESL students in BC

Working papers, 2005 and 2006:

- 05-07, Don J. DeVoretz and Sergiy Pivnenko, *Self-Selection, Immigrant Public Finance Performance and Canadian Citizenship*
- 05-10, Krishna Pendakur, and Ravi Pendakur, *Ethnic Identity and the Labour Market*
- 05-11, Krishna Pendakur, *Visible Minorities in Canada's Workplaces: A Perspective on the 2017 Projection*
- 05-12, Krishna Pendakur, *Visible Minorities and Aboriginals in Vancouver's Labour Market*
- 05-17, Don J. DeVoretz, and Florin Vadean, *A Model of Foreign-Born Transfers: Evidence from Canadian Micro Data - Updated February 2006*
- 05-19, Chen Bo, *A Model of the Brain Drain and Circulation*
- 05-20, Shibao Guo, and Don J. DeVoretz, *Chinese Immigrants in Vancouver: Quo Vadis? - Updated February 2006*
- 05-24, Herbert J. Schuetze, *The Self-Employment Experience of Immigrants to Canada*
- 05-27, Krishna Pendakur, and Ravi Pendakur, *Glass Ceilings for Ethnic Minorities*

- 05-28, Heather Antecol, Claremont McKenna College; Peter Kuhn, Stephen J. Trejo, *Assimilation via Prices or Quantities? Sources of Immigrant Earnings Growth in Australia, Canada, and the United States*
- 05-29, Don J. DeVoretz, *The Economics of Citizenship: A Common Intellectual Ground for Social Scientists?*
- 06-01, Tian Fangmeng and Ma Zhongdong, *Explaining Socio-economic Well-being of Immigrants and Returned Migrants: An Econometric Analysis of the Hong Kong and Canadian 2001 Censuse*
- 06-06, Kirk Scott, *The Economics of Citizenship: Is There a Naturalization Effect?*

The economics domain has always been of fundamental importance to RIIM. It deals with questions that are at the forefront of policy and also public debate on immigration, especially the issue of economic integration of first-generation immigrants and their children. RIIM has supported a large number of economics research projects in the past, and continued this tradition in the year of record, with four active grants, which collectively supported 8 graduate students. Scholars working in this field are perhaps the most attuned to the policy system and have placed a great emphasis on the production of Working Papers, with 13 new manuscripts added to an already impressive stock from previous years. There were also five new publications—four of them in peer-reviewed journals—in this subject area in 2005-06. Researchers in this field also gave 30 presentations over the year, and were highly visible in the media, both local and national.

There were three core elements in economics research conducted by RIIM scholars in the past year. First, the economic achievements of immigrants and their children, including an analysis of the glass-ceiling effect, has been a central theme. This is particularly relevant to the group of Working Papers published by Krishna and Ravi Pendakur, which represents an important addition to their body of work that now spans ten years. Pendakur and Pendakur also submitted three papers to top peer-reviewed journals during the year of record. Jane Friesen's new project on immigrant children in the ESL system—which provides a link between the economics and education domains of research—can be included in this broad theme of work.

Secondly, as is the case with scholars discussed under the Citizenship category, economists at RIIM have also developed a strong interest in return/circular migration. In the year of record, Don DeVoretz and Flora Vadean added a new dimension to this general topic, by exploring the extent and implications of remittances sent by immigrants to their source countries.

Thirdly, the issue of citizenship has come under scrutiny by economists, which complements work done in the Citizenship domain. This topic is particularly relevant, given the fact that the Canadian government is contemplating new citizenship legislation. In light of these discussions, Don DeVoretz was called as a witness to the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration of the Canadian Parliament.

In general, the projects that are being conducted in the economics domain include both econometric modeling and the analysis of large data sets. They speak to practical issues but

also ethical concerns, such as the potential marginalization of immigrants and visible minorities in Canada, and the consequences of immigration on the global south.

Education Domain

Active projects, 2005-06:

- Jane Friesen, SFU, Mobility, diversity and access for ESL students in BC
- Marianne Jacquet, SFU, Mapping and assessing African students' educational needs and expectations
- Charles Ungerleider, UBC, Examining equality of opportunities and outcomes in the academic trajectories of ESL youth: Implications for policy and practice

Working papers, 2005 and 2006:

- 05-02, Diane Dagenais, and Patricia Lamarre, *Representations of Language among Multilingual Youth in Two Canadian Cities*
- 05-03, Kelleen Toohey and Natalia Gajdamaschko, *Communities of Practice, Figured Worlds and Learning Initiatives in the Second Language Education of Immigrant Students*
- 05-04, Kelleen Toohey, *Assigning Marginality: The Case of an "ESL/Learning Disabled" Student*
- 05-16, June Beynon, Linda Larocque, Roumiana Ilieva and Diane Dagenais, *A Sociocultural and Critical Analysis of Educational Policies and Programs for Minority Youth in British Columbia*

RIIM has devoted a considerable amount of its resources to research on education over the past decade. Earlier projects that have received funding have yielded four Working Papers in 2005 and 2006, which mainly concentrate on the issues of language education, and the relationship between language and identity. These are, without doubt, both central elements to our understanding of the immigrant experience. Diane Dagenais and her colleagues are also in the process of converting their earlier research into a series of publications that includes two submitted journal articles and two books in the early stage of preparation.

Meanwhile, new projects are under way. The three listed above generated six presentations over the year of record and a number of Working Papers and other publications are under way.

Housing & Neighbourhoods Domain

Active projects, 2005-06:

- Jennifer Hyndman, SFU, Achenese refugees in BC
- David Ley, UBC, Concentrated immigrant settlement
- Daniel Hiebert, UBC, Immigration, entrepreneurship and the new economy

Working papers, 2005 and 2006:

- 05-01, David Ley, *Indicators of Entrepreneurial Success among Business Immigrants in Canada*

- 05-05, Loren B. Landau, *Urbanization, Nativism and the Rule of Law in South Africa's 'Forbidden' Cities*
- 05-13, Harald Bauder, *Immigrants' Attitudes towards Self-Employment: The Significance of Ethnic Origin, Rural and Urban Background and Labour Market Context*
- 05-14, Daniel Hiebert, *Migration and the Demographic Transformation of Canadian Cities: The Social Geography of Canada's Major Metropolitan Centres in 2017*
- 05-21, Dan Swanton, *Iranians in Vancouver: 'Legible People'/Irredeemable Others/Migrant Stories*

Over the past three years, RIIM scholars working in this domain have paid special attention to two related issues: the implications of concentrated immigrant settlement in metropolitan areas, and the settlement of immigrants in second-tier cities and other non-metropolitan areas (also known as regionalization). The latter of these themes came to fruition this year with the collection of papers from across Canada on regionalization for a special issue of *Canadian Ethnic Studies* (the journal had not yet been released at the end of the reporting period and is not included in the output statistics provided in Appendix B). Margaret Walton-Roberts, who was a PhD student at RIIM in the early years, and held a grant as a Senior Scholar more recently, co-edited the volume. She also has articles on the nature of policy research, and the issue of gender in non-metropolitan immigrant settlement, which will appear in the coming year.

A second success story of note is the fact that Harald Bauder, who was a PDF at RIIM some years ago, and has held several grants as a Senior Researcher since then, published a book based on his RIIM work, as well as three articles in peer-reviewed journals. He has also made a considerable effort to inform the public about immigration issues through commentaries in national newspapers, both in Canada and Germany.

David Ley and Heather Smith have continued their influential work on concentrated immigrant settlement, updating a story that they began investigating with figures from the 1991 census, in this case using the 2001 census. They conclude that, although the American concept of an underclass does not generally apply to immigrants in Canada, we have seen a worrying rise in the relationship between areas of high immigrant concentration and poverty. In addition to a number of academic publications deriving from this project, Heather Smith was interviewed for an article on the suburbanization of immigrant settlement, for the *New York Times*.

Jennifer Hyndman and Chris Friesen's study of Achenese refugees in Vancouver is especially important in the context of Canadian policy. In that case, the federal government decided, for the first time, to settle the entire group of refugees from a particular conflict in one city. Hyndman and Friesen have examined the outcomes of this decision, and have already produced a draft Working Paper from this research. Hyndman has also been active in publishing results from her earlier RIIM projects.

Finally, Daniel Hiebert's work fits within the broad category of Housing & Neighbourhoods. He organized a workshop in 2003 that brought scholars from around the world to discuss the comparative political economy of immigration. This event generated a special issue of the

Dutch journal *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* (in English), in early 2006, which brought a selection of these papers together. Hiebert also published another journal article and has several others in process (two submitted). He also gave presentations in five countries during the year of record, including two at the Canadian Embassies in Seoul and Beijing.

Society & Health Domain

Active projects, 2005-06:

- Gillian Creese, UBC, Integration and belonging
- David Ley, UBC, Where is home?
- Miu Yan, UBC, The role of neighbourhood houses in integrating newcomers
- Parin Dossa, SFU, Raising new policy questions through narratives of trauma: Case study of Afghan refugees
- Geraldine Pratt, UBC, A multidimensional analysis of separated children asylum seekers in BC

Working papers, 2005 and 2006:

- 05-06, Gillian Creese, *Negotiating Belonging: Bordered Spaces and Imagined Communities in Vancouver, Canada*
- 05-08, Shibao Guo and Don J. DeVoretz, *The Changing Faces of Chinese Immigrants in Canada*
- 05-15, Zheng Wu and Christoph M. Schimmele, *Health Care Utilization of Later-Stage Immigrants in British Columbia*
- 05-S1, Jamie Doucette, *An Annotated Bibliography of RIIM Publications Related to the Settlement Services Sector of Greater Vancouver, 1996-2004*
- 05-20, Shibao Guo, University of Calgary, and Don J.DeVoretz, *Chinese Immigrants in Vancouver: Quo Vadis? - Updated February 2006*
- 05-22, Amanda Aizlewood, Pieter Bevelander, and Ravi Pendakur, *Recreational Participation among Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants in Canada and the Netherlands*
- 05-25, Shibao Guo, *Toward Minority Group Rights and Inclusive Citizenship for Immigrants: The Role of a Voluntary Organization in Vancouver*
- 06-02, Parin Dossa, *Creating Politicized Spaces: "Here" and "There": Lives of Elderly Afghan Women in Metropolitan Vancouver*
- 06-03, Parin Dossa, *"Witnessing" Social Suffering: Migratory Tales of Women from Afghanistan*
- 06-04, Shibao Guo, *Bridging the Gap in Social Services for Immigrants: A Community-Based Holistic Approach*

This domain has been renamed (from the Social Domain) in the past year, to more accurately describe the types of projects that are supported within it. Within the larger Metropolis Project, the focus on health was compromised when Health Canada dropped out of the federal funding consortium in 2002. RIIM continued to accept health-oriented proposals, though, and a small number have succeeded in securing funds each year. Two of these were approved in 2002-03 but have been in hiatus since then. Both, by Anne George, are based on

the National Canadian Children and Youth Survey, a multi-million-dollar project, which has taken longer than expected to become operational. The large and innovative data set was sufficiently in place for analysis to begin in the past year, and George and her colleagues have investigated the relationship between neighbourhood and the health of immigrants, and the relationship between discrimination and health, also for immigrants. Papers are forthcoming next year.

A second project on health was conducted by Mike Buzzelli, which also examines the health of immigrants in relation to their place of residence. A draft Working Paper was submitted in the past year and will soon be published on the RIIM website. Similarly, Karen Kobayashi's project on immigrant health, related to their economic well-being, was completed over the year, and has yielded three journal articles, with a fourth in press. Finally, on the subject of health, Zheng Wu's study of the health care utilization by immigrants was completed, with a Working Paper published, in the year of record.

The issue of integration has been particularly important to the Society & Health Domain. Much of this work concentrates on immigrants themselves, including projects by Parin Dossa and Arlene McLaren, and Gillian Creese. Both have been highly productive in the year of record, each generating several Working Papers and journal articles, with more forthcoming next year. Projects by Shibao Guo (following his appointment as a RIIM PDF in the past), and Miu Yan and Sean Lauer, examine issues of integration from an institutional perspective; the former has focused on NGOs while the latter on neighbourhood houses and their role in the settlement and integration process of newcomers.

The Society & Health Domain encompasses a large range of topics. In addition to the two clusters of work already examined, researchers in this domain have specialized in the issue of social capital (Ravi Pendakur and Amande Aizlewood), return migration (David Ley), and youth who have initiated asylum claims (Geraldine Pratt). Also, the effort to provide a summary of all of RIIM's previous work on settlement services (discussed above) was conducted in this domain.

Overall, researchers affiliated with this domain have had a stellar year in terms of publication, with nearly 30 presentations to a variety of audiences, 10 Working Papers, 12 peer-reviewed journal articles and one book chapter appearing in print, and a large number of manuscripts in the development stage.

CONCLUSION: COMPLETING THE SECOND PHASE AND CONTEMPLATING A THIRD

This report has detailed the activities and outcomes of the fourth year of RIIM's five-year current mandate. To gain a more complete picture of the operations of the centre in the whole of this phase, I have included a report written for SSHRC's midterm review of the Metropolis Project, which summarizes the 2002-03 to 2004-05 period (Appendix E). This report was part of a much larger set of initiatives to lobby for a third phase of the Metropolis Project which, if approved, would be established for 2007-2012. On the one hand, this initiative has included no less than four separate reviews of Metropolis: a SSHRC review of all of its larger

research programs; a SSHRC review of Metropolis, specifically (which generated a report that was released in May, 2006); a CIC review of its research system in general; and a CIC review of Metropolis, specifically (which has yet to yield a final report).

The SSHRC report was released after the year of record that is the basis of this report. However, since it speaks about both the past performance of Metropolis and RIIM, as well as the potential future of the project, I will discuss it here. The SSHRC review was on the whole positive, with the following statement prominently placed in the executive summary: “The committee was unanimous in concluding that, overall, the centres had produced significant outputs and were successful in reaching their objectives.” But the review also identified a number of weaknesses of the project generally and RIIM specifically. On the Canadian Metropolis Project as a whole, which encompasses five Centres of Excellence and the Ottawa Secretariat, these main criticisms were raised:

- The review committee believes that the regional centres tend to support regionally-based research, and that this detracts from research at the national scale that would be more easily appreciated by national policy makers.
- A related point: the review committee believes that there is not enough research conducted in collaboration between the centres.
- The review committee wished to see more international comparative and collaborative research (it is worth noting that most of the members of the review committee were non-Canadian researchers).
- The review committee encouraged the funding consortium to be more direct in transmitting its needs for policy-relevant research. In short, what does the policy system want and need from the Centres of Excellence?
- The review committee would like to see a more coordinated approach to the reports of individual centres or their activities and accomplishments.

In the main, the Directors of the Metropolis Centres appreciated the report, though we believed that the first—and most significant—criticism was overstated. Actually, scholars at the centres frequently work on issues of national concern, and a survey of RIIM research corroborates this point easily. Accordingly, the Directors submitted a collective memorandum to SSHRC outlining the substantial volume of national-scale research under way.

The SSHRC report devotes a few pages to RIIM, and concluded that “the strongest aspect of the centre were the training outputs and the international component of its network”; and that “[t]he centre has produced research of very high quality.” The report commented favourably on many aspects of the Centre, including:

- The format and execution of RIIM’s annual research retreat
- The extent of dissemination of research findings
- The international reach of the centre, as indicated by formal partnerships and also the large number of presentations made abroad by RIIM researchers
- the policy relevance of RIIM’s research

- The Working Paper series³
- The Policy Research Symposia conducted by RIIM in collaboration with the BC Ministry of the Attorney General
- Systems of collaboration between RIIM researchers and the NGO community; and
- The extensive network fostered by RIIM, including researchers, policy makers, and NGOs

The report also noted several weaknesses of, or challenges for, the Centre:

- The quantity and quality of outputs across the research domains was seen as uneven
- The reviewers concluded that RIIM researchers have been motivated to conduct their work on the local and international scales, and less so at the national scale (“The committee suggests that the Vancouver Centre could improve and expand collaboration with Canadian scholars and centres outside British Columbia.”)
- The committee would like to see more participation from researchers at the University of Victoria; and
- The committee believes that a disproportional share of administrative work is done by the Co-Directors of RIIM, and that the Centre should consider giving more responsibility to Domain Leaders.

In the coming year, RIIM should face, squarely, the weaknesses/challenges that have been identified. However, in my opinion, the reviewers did not pay sufficient attention to the amount of national-scale work that is being conducted by RIIM researchers. On the question of the evenness across domains, it is helpful to note that research outputs tend to occur in a “lumpy” way. For example, the report identified the Social Domain as less productive than some of the others, and yet in the fourth year of operations, members of this Domain produced the highest number of peer-reviewed articles and book chapters. This criticism will therefore have to be examined carefully. These details aside, the report encourages RIIM to consider ways to intensify its collaboration with the other centres across the country, work to better include researchers at universities beyond the SFU/UBC pair that house the Centre, and examine the Centre’s administrative structure.

Overall, in my view, the positive elements of the SSHRC review considerably outweigh the more critical ones, and that the general impression is that the reviewers were impressed by the quality and quantity of work conducted by RIIM.

One part of the CIC review has also been released, a report based on interviews with high-level officials (Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers) across a number of federal ministries. This study was conducted³ by an independent consultant to see if individuals in the most influential positions in government were aware of Metropolis and, if so, their thoughts on the project. There was no effort in this review to examine specific centres, so there is no mention of RIIM, particularly, in the report. The broad conclusions of the report are:

- The awareness of Metropolis varies widely across different ministries

³ “...the committee commended the work undertaken prior to the publication of the working papers, since it ensured a rigorous review of potential publications.”

- Senior officials who have the most knowledge of the project see it in favourable terms
- They see potential for greater engagement between researchers and policy makers
- They believe that researchers have avoided some of the “tough questions” associated with immigration
- All of the individuals who were interviewed believe that Metropolis should continue (i.e., to a third term).

As we enter the final year of the second phase of RIIM, the prospects for continuing funding, beyond 2007, are quite good. Both SFU and UBC have committed support for RIIM should this occur. The coming year will be dominated by three large questions: will there be a third phase (this should be known by October, 2006)?; how will the “new” Metropolis Project be structured nationally?; and, how will RIIM be transformed if it continues to operate in a third phase? Clearly, there is much to discuss.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the capable staff of RIIM for their work during the past year: Nicky des Ormeaux and Linda Sheldon. Thanks also to Diane Coulombe and Sydney Preston for their successful efforts to ensure efficient communication between the members of RIIM, and between RIIM and its many partners, through the listserve and the website.

I am grateful to the many individuals who donated their time and energy to the Management Board, Research Program Committee, and Conference Steering Committee.

In this “year of the conference” I also thank UBC Conferences and Accommodation Services, especially Mariela McIlwraith and Karen Stefanson, for their extremely professional support for the conference.

Finally, the Ottawa Metropolis Secretariat, particularly Barry Halliday, put in hundreds of hours of work to make the conference a success, for which I am most grateful.

APPENDIX A

RIIM Research Retreat

July 15, 2005

Harbour Centre

Report of the event

By Daniel Hiebert

Introduction

This, the fourth annual research retreat, was attended by over 50 participants. As in the past, there were representatives of all levels of government, non-government organizations and, of course, academic researchers. The retreat was built around three full panel discussions and a final summary panel. These were arranged thematically, with the first focusing on more economic issues, the second on social equity, and the third on settlement challenges. In these panels, presenters were given 10 minutes each, followed by general discussion.

The day began, though, with a statement acknowledging the significance of Lillian To, CEO of SUCCESS, who passed away on July 2nd. Lillian's first job in the sector, over 30 years ago, included the role of research coordinator for SUCCESS. Over the past three decades she has been a prominent voice in all aspects of immigration and multiculturalism locally, and also nationally. Her commitment to the lives of immigrants, principled vision, and insight, will all be missed.

In this report, I provide a brief summary of the presentations made in each panel. These form a basis for the set of research priorities that follows. As in the past, the new research priorities will be an integral element of the next Call for Proposals that will be released by RIIM, anticipating research in the 2006-07 fiscal year.

Panel 1: Selection, labour market issues, and economic outcomes

Chair: Steven Morris, Ottawa Metropolis Project Team

Participants: Marc Wills (CIC, Ottawa), Chona Iturralde (CIC, Ottawa); Eden Thompson (HRSDC); Asha Bhat (BC-Attorney General's Office)

Marc Wills began by speaking about the context of immigration policy and raised the following points:

- Among CIC's current priorities are: to improve immigrant outcomes; modernize citizenship; and assert Canada's role in international migration and refugee protection.
- The 2005 immigration plan is built on the now familiar ratio of 60% of immigrants in the economic categories of the program compared with 40% in the non-economic categories (notably, the Family and Refugee classes). This ratio has been altered slightly with recent announcements, such as the initiative to increase the number of

sponsored parents and grandparents landed in 2005 and 2006 to 18,000 people per year.

- There have been a number of announcements of subtle policy changes in the past few months. In addition to the new sponsorship targets mentioned above, selected rules concerning the employment of international students have been liberalized, and CIC is enhancing its *Welcoming Communities* strategy as part of the National Action Plan Against Racism. With other federal departments, CIC is also a partner in the Internationally-Trained Workers Initiative (ITWI) intended to: simplify the recognition of foreign credentials; enhance work-specific language training; promote bridge to work programs; and provide better labour market information to immigrants.

In terms of research priorities, Marc emphasized the need to:

- Assess the impacts of the new immigrant selection grid that was introduced in the revision of policy associated with the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act of 2002.
- Understand Canadian immigration in the context of international demographic trends that will yield more competition for highly-qualified immigrants among a greater number of countries.
- And, to consider the role of immigration in all aspects of the labour market, including the full skill range.

Chona Iturralde spoke about the Strategic Research and Statistics division of CIC's 2005-06 research plan. Its priorities can be loosely categorized under the following groups:

- The economic outcomes of immigration (earnings mobility; earnings progression; the economic circumstances of elderly immigrants; immigrants' utilization of income assistance; understanding the official language ability of immigrants; the dynamics of family sponsorship; and the process of immigrant integration as revealed in the LSIC).
- Support for horizontal policy development initiatives (the planning of immigration levels, and the Internationally Trained Workers Initiative).
- Targeted research to meet the needs of specific branches, programs or policy priorities of CIC (citizenship take-up; the health care utilization of immigrants; foreign students and their potential to become permanent immigrants; support for reforming the refugee system; and the nature of public opinion and tolerance towards immigration).
- Enhancing the administrative databases of CIC to enable research (linking administrative databases; developing new tools for database analysis; addressing privacy issues; and the provision of data to Provincial and Territorial governments).

Chona also encouraged researchers to use the publications of the Strategic Research and Statistics division, especially the *Citizenship and Immigration Monitor* and *Facts and Figures*.

Eden Thompson began by describing HRSDC's National Human Capital Agenda to promote a highly skilled and mobile labour force and an efficient and inclusive labour market. The three practical pillars that emerge from this strategy are: promoting lifelong learning; modernizing the employment programs of HRSDC; and establishing a workplace skills strategy to ensure that the skills and education Canadians receive reflect the skills and

education that employers need. This strategy and its goals imply a number of research needs, including:

- Understanding the position of immigrants in the labour market, and especially the declining outcomes of immigrants. Why has the increase in education among recent immigrants not led to their better labour market performance? What are the similarities and/or differences across countries? What policies and programs would improve this situation?
- Understanding the labour market's ability to absorb in the integration of immigrants. Do labour market conditions at time of entry have some scarring effects on immigrant economic integration? How important is the 'first job' match for all new labour market entrants? What is the role of employers in the labour market's ability to absorb immigrant workers?
- Labour mobility is a critical ingredient in the overall efficiency of the labour market by permitting a better match between employers' needs and workers' skills. What role does immigration play in domestic labour mobility?
- Understanding the dynamic between temporary and permanent immigration. What is the current and potential role of temporary immigrants in the labour market? What are the labour market outcomes of skilled workers with previous work and educational experience in Canada?

Asha Bhat explained that the recent restructuring of the BC cabinet has led to a new context for immigration in BC. Whereas it was previously included in the CAWS ministry, it is now split, with a number of economic elements (e.g., the Provincial Nominee Program; business immigration; BC Skills Connect; and the International Qualifications Program) in the Ministry of Economic Development, and other elements in the Attorney General's office. The latter includes multiculturalism, anti-racism, immigration policy, and settlement services. Asha also presented some recent statistics on landings that show BC may be gaining a larger share of immigrant arrivals relative to the rest of Canada. In terms of research priorities, she concentrated on:

- International students. How well are they faring in BC; what factors lead to their retention (and possible permanent immigration); and how does international education connect with the desire for a more geographically distributed settlement system?
- Regionalization of immigrant settlement. What impact does immigration have on regional development in BC? What is the capacity of smaller places to receive immigrants?

Asha also reminded researchers that studies are particularly welcome when they include analysis of implications for different age groups, cultural groups, and gender issues, and when they probe the relationship between immigration and competitiveness.

Panel 2: Social equity (including the National Action Plan Against Racism)

Chair: Eyob Naizghi (MOSAIC)

Participants: Jodey Derouin (Canadian Heritage); Ravi Pendakur (Social Development); Meharoona Ghani (BC-Attorney General's Office); Baldwin Wong (City of Vancouver); Zool Suleman (Mayor's Working Group on Immigration)

Jodey Derouin opened the panel by stating that social equity has long been a guiding principle of Canadian Heritage. In terms of immigration, it is important to understand that social cohesion will be more likely to arise in a society that has adopted anti-racism as a guiding value. This also means that the principle of multiculturalism should be a core element across government, and not just limited to one or two ministries. Jodey then turned to outline the basic elements of the National Action Plan Against Racism, which involves the ministries of Heritage, Justice, CIC, and HRSDC. Within this group, Canadian Heritage is particularly dedicated to educating other parts of government and also the general public on the changing nature of Canadian society (e.g., the recent 2017 conference). In terms of research, he identified the following as priorities:

- Generating efficient ways to identify excluded groups, and also understanding how best to help them build capacity for positive change.
- Creating inclusive institutions. We need to know the success stories, and understand how they came about.
- Developing better social indicators (e.g., of racism and of social exclusion).

Jodey encouraged researchers to use already-existing data, and to write their work in ways that are accessible to policy makers and the general public.

Ravi Pendakur explained that Social Development Canada, a relatively new ministry based on a portion of what used to be HRDC, is working on a research plan that will itemize core themes for the next 3-5 years. The first step has been to define broad areas, and the three that probably intersect most fully with the work of Metropolis are:

- Inclusive communities, the voluntary sector, and the social economy. How do these work to enhance well-being? How is community capacity fostered?
- Social and economic inclusion. We need better measures of social inclusion, and also to understand it as both a process and an outcome. We also need more information about groups at risk. This should include a geographical sensibility that pays attention to the relationship between place and poverty.
- Family issues and child care. (this area is managed by another person in SDC)

There will be a workshop later this year on each of these areas, followed by a more clearly defined set of research objectives.

Meharoon Ghani began by noting that the activities of her unit are framed by the 1993 BC Multiculturalism Act, which led to the establishment of a Multicultural Advisory Council in British Columbia and the requirement for annual reports on multicultural initiatives. Among these, the BC Anti-Racism and Multicultural Program (BCAMP) is particularly important in generating public awareness, partnership, response and understanding. The BC government has also developed a Critical Incident Response Model, which fosters cross-cultural dialogue as well as community-led sanctions against racist incidents. In terms of research, she suggested that these topics would be especially welcome:

- What factors /policies help groups achieve equity, especially groups that are defined in terms of race?
- More generally, how is social capacity built?

Meharoon also stressed the importance of presenting accessible research findings, and exploring the connection of gender and power relations (among other factors) in social equity.

Zool Suleman spoke about the Mayor's Working Group on Immigration (MWGI) and its recent attempt to identify the responsibilities of the municipal level of government in the broad field of immigrant settlement. The initial mandate of the MWGI is to produce a report by October but this is increasingly seen as the first stage of its work, and that there will be a recommendation for a continuing role. The key issues that are coming into focus in these discussions are:

- What is the vision of the City of Vancouver with respect to immigration and immigrants?
- What services do newcomers need, and which of these are missing or inadequate?
- All levels of government need to understand that needs of newcomer groups are variegated, and that, for example, refugees and business-class immigrants might want quite different programs and services.
- Fostering a sense of social welcome requires heightened vigilance against racism. The National Action Plan Against Racism, and the BC Critical Incident Response Model may need a municipal counterpart.

All of these initiatives are linked to a broader question of the appropriate role and responsibility of municipal governments with regard to immigration.

Baldwin Wong provided the background story of the MWGI by speaking about the demographic profile of the City of Vancouver: 46 percent of its residents were born outside Canada, and nearly 53,000 immigrants settled in the city between 1996 and 2001. The city sees its mandate as ensuring a welcoming environment for these newcomers, ensuring that services are accessible to all residents, and responding to community needs through relevant programs. Baldwin then concentrated on these points:

- Given its broad mandate, the city plays these roles that intersect with immigrant settlement: providing access to information and programs; social and cultural development; facilities development; providing operating and capital grants to selected groups; and providing strategic input to other levels of government. In essence, with nearly half of its population born in other countries, all of the activities of the city connect in one way or another with immigration.
- One of the most important ways of reaching the immigrant population has been the *Newcomers' Guide*, produced by the City of Vancouver. It is worth noting that the guide was made available to participants of the 2000 International Metropolis conference held in Vancouver and has been emulated by a number of cities around the world.
- In terms of social and cultural development, Baldwin listed several research needs, including: community needs assessment, especially for smaller cultural groups; using the census to develop social indicators; and investigating the relationship between settlement services and community development.
- Finally, Baldwin spoke about the City's role in providing information and strategic input to the provincial and federal governments.

Panel 3: Settlement challenges

Chair: Asha Bhat (BC-Attorney General's Office)

Participants: Sherman Chan (MOSAIC); Ansar Cheung (SUCCESS); Lynn Moran (AMSSA); Patricia Woroch (ISS-BC); Bill Walters (BC-Attorney General's Office)

Sherman Chan opened the panel by describing the history of MOSAIC, which now has an 11 million dollar budget and some 120 employees. He note that, as a community-based organization, it is centrally focused on issues of multiculturalism and social justice. In addition to its service role, MOSAIC is involved in 11 research projects that are taking place at six different universities. He then turned to the issue of research ethics and outlined a set of guiding principles that should come into force when researchers work with NGOs: the research should be linked to a goal to improve the lives of immigrants; the NGO should be acknowledged as a fully functioning partner; and the contribution of the NGO and its clients should be valued /validated in the end report. Sherman emphasized several research needs:

The host context, in Vancouver but also in other centres experiencing immigrant settlement.

Further investigation of the key needs of immigrants – employment, housing, health, and education – and how they are, or are not, being met.

Work on the intersection between poverty and immigration, especially research that documents “exit strategies” from poverty.

Sherman also noted that there has been a positive relationship between MOSAIC and RIIM, which has been evident in two collaborative projects over the past year, on housing /homelessness, and on social networks and the job finding process.

Ansar Cheung explained that SUCCESS has been severely impacted by the unexpected death of Lillian To, and noted that T.N Foo has stepped in as Acting CEO while the organization searches for a new leader. She concentrated on the issue of entrepreneurship in the remainder of her remarks, starting with a brief description of the Business and Economic Development Centre of SUCCESS. In the past year it has collaborated with Western Economic Diversification to develop the *Gateway to Asia* project, organized an exporters' showcase, and has established a *Business Link* program. These activities generate several important research questions:

- How do the small businesses established by immigrants contribute to the BC economy?
- How can mentorship programs be created, so that experienced immigrant entrepreneurs pass their knowledge to newcomers?

She also mentioned two additional issues:

- How can we facilitate the retention in Canada of young immigrants (first and second generation) and international students?
- As an increasing number of PRC immigrants join Christian churches in Canada, how is this changing the immigrant experience?

Patricia Woroch commented on the special role of ISS-BC in refugee settlement, and noted how much more complicated this issue has become since IRPA shifted emphasis towards admitting a much higher proportion of refugees who have special needs (such as physical challenges, or emotional trauma). There has also been a trend in BC towards receiving

specific groups, such as the Acehnese refugees a year ago and the anticipated arrival of a new community from Somalia. She hopes that researchers will study:

- The impact of destining new groups to an area without a “foundation community” that can help them settle.
- The efficacy of bloc settlement, as in the case of the Acehnese, who were all brought to Vancouver.
- The transition of refugees into the regular health system following their use of the Bridge Health Clinic in the period immediately after their arrival.
- How are schools coping with the arrival of a larger number of refugee children who have special needs?
- Are the rules of HRSDC flexible enough to assist refugee and immigrant groups’ entry into the labour market?

Echoing the remarks of Sherman Chan, Patricia stressed the ethical responsibility of researchers who work with community organizations and who rely on the input of refugees and immigrants in the research process.

Lynn Moran outlined the scope of AMSSA, with 85 member agencies that represent the broad areas of multiculturalism and immigrant settlement services. AMSSA’s activities can be loosely classified into three types: immigrant coordination; multiculturalism and anti-racism; and multicultural health. AMSSA works with its member agencies to build their capacity and, of course, the more general capacity of the groups that are being served. In the past year, AMSSA has coordinated special campaigns on *Advantage Diversity* and *Racism Sucks*. The latter title was defined by the young people to whom the campaign was directed. Lynn then spoke about three collaborative ventures between AMSSA and RIIM researchers: the special Working Paper (just released) that summarizes all of RIIM work to date that addresses settlement concerns; a new project that is establishing an inventory of settlement service needs; and the mapping of health needs that is associated with the activities of the multicultural health committee. She also spoke about the recent AMSSA report on *Barriers to Accessing Health Care*. In terms of research needs, Lynn mentioned:

- Older immigrants and their role in integrating families.
- Visible minority adolescents and the settlement /integration process.
- The long-term outcomes of settlement service programs.
- Meta-analysis of the many projects that have been conducted on immigrant health and health care utilization.
- Studies of the health status of specific groups.

Bill Walters began with an outline of the mandate and core programs of the Settlement and Multicultural Division of the Attorney General’s Office, within the BC Settlement and Adaptation Program that includes: settlement services ; community bridging; and language training. For the most part, the actual services are delivered by third-party institutions, mainly NGOs. Bill noted several settlement challenges and research interests:

- Ensuring that immigrants find work that is commensurate with their skills.
- Understanding the role of information networks in the job search process. What do immigrants know, and how do they find out about the labour market?

- The housing situation of immigrants. To what extent are they finding affordable housing?
- Do immigrants carry unrealistic expectations about their prospects in Canada and, if so, how can this be changed?
- What are the best ways to help refugees deal with the cultural shock that is often associated with settling in Canada?
- Evaluation of the anti-racism programs already in place.
- The development of methods to identify and help individuals who face multiple barriers, particularly GARs.
- Longitudinal analysis of immigrant outcomes using the LSIC database.
- Alternative service delivery models, particularly for rural areas with small numbers of immigrants, widely dispersed.
- Continued development of definable, measurable performance outcomes for settlement.

Bill stressed the need for research that shows the value of existing programs and also justifies the introduction of new ones. With increasing federal and provincial Treasury Board requirements to demonstrate accountability for government expenditures, money will only be spent on initiatives that are shown to be effective.

APPENDIX A (continued)

RESEARCH PRIORITIES DERIVED FROM THE RETREAT

A. Citizenship Domain (Dan Hiebert, acting coordinator)

1. How can we better understand the emerging complexity of migration, whereby individuals may shift between temporary and permanent status over relatively short periods of time (e.g., students or workers who come to Canada under temporary visas but decide to apply for permanent status)? Should we foster this?
2. Research that is linked with the National Action Plan Against Racism would be valuable. For example, we need to know more about the factors that shape public attitudes about immigration and, more generally, lead to a sense of welcome (or exclusion) for newcomers.
3. What is the relationship between economic and social inclusion /exclusion, particularly for those who come to Canada through family sponsorship or as refugees?
4. What lessons can we learn from institutions that have developed positive practices related to the diversity of their work forces and /or clients?

B. Economics Domain (Steeve Mongrain)

1. How is human capital actually utilized in the labour market? When is human capital general vs. when is it specific to firms? Are there country-specific forms of human capital and, if so, what does that imply about immigrant participation in the Canadian labour market?
2. There is a need for more detailed research that links the selection process of economic immigrants to their outcomes in the labour market.
3. How can we identify processes of discrimination in the labour market, and their consequences?
4. There is a need for equity indices that help us measure social exclusion.

C. Education Domain (Diane Dagenais)

1. What are the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in education? What indicators are available for understanding racist and discriminatory barriers to inclusion of all students? How are exemplary inclusive practices initiated and implemented in schools?
2. What are the linkages or gaps between inclusive educational policies (formed by schools, districts, or the Ministry of Education) and actual educational initiatives (in pre-school, K-12, post secondary, and community education programs)?
3. What are the trajectories of students of diverse origins through various educational institutions and into the workforce? How do foreign or international students fare in educational institutions?
4. How do students perform in official and heritage language programs and how does this vary by language, age, gender and ethnicity? How accessible, relevant and responsive to students are these services?
5. How are the personnel in schools (teachers, administrators, counsellors, staff) prepared to work with diverse linguistic, ethnic, religious communities?
6. What re-credentializing support is available for foreign-trained educators?

D. Housing and Neighbourhoods Domain (Jennifer Hyndman)

1. What can we learn from longitudinal research on skilled workers and business class immigrants who settle in smaller BC centres, and what does this tell us about the viability of regionalization policies? What is the status of settlement services for immigrants in non-metropolitan places, and is this affecting the viability of regionalization?
2. How can the policies of various levels of government (municipal, provincial, federal) be brought into alignment in ways that will benefit both host populations and immigrants?
3. What can we learn from comparing the various approaches of different provincial governments to regionalization, and their associated outcomes?
4. How well has the policy of resettling an entire group or community of new immigrants (refugees in particular) in one city or region worked? This approach was taken with the Acehnese refugees to Canada, all of whom were “destined” for Greater Vancouver, and we are likely to see similar decisions in the future.
5. How are immigrants faring in the housing market, especially those who are economically vulnerable? What are the long-term impacts of shared housing and other forms of crowding?

E. Society and Health Domain (Gillian Creese)

1. What are the broader social consequences of immigrant experiences in the labour market? How are these social consequences shaped by gender, age, ethnicity, family status, and regional differences?
2. What are the indicators of long-term processes of inclusion/exclusion in Canada? What are the indicators of racism? How can we assess dimensions of social equity?
3. What is the state of access to municipal and other government services among different immigrant and refugee communities? How is access to services connected to community development? What are the long-term effects of providing settlement services?
4. How welcoming are B.C. communities for immigrants and refugees? What are the specific challenges faced by immigrant/refugee youth, second-generation youth, and older immigrants? What are the challenges for new immigrants who do not have a pre-existing (ethnic/linguistic) community already present in B.C.?
5. What is the state of access to health care among immigrants and refugees? Are there specific mental health concerns facing immigrants and refugees? How do these vary by gender, age, and ethnicity?
6. What is the role of religion, and religious institutions, in helping immigrants and refugees integrate into Canadian society?

APPENDIX B

Summary of RIIM Research Activities and Outputs

RIIM Research Outputs, 2005-06

	Citizenship	Economics	Education	Hous&Nbhd	Soc&Health	Total
Number reports	2	5	4	6	8	25
Presentations						
National Metro. conf.	2	3	2	4	4	15
Internat. Metro. conf.	1		1	3	3	8
Other academic	4	12	4	9	19	48
Policy audience	1	2	0	8	0	11
Other	2	8	0	3	1	14
Publications						
RIIM Working Paper	0	9	1	2	3	15
RIIM WP submitted	0	0	0	3	3	6
Journal article	0	4	0	9	12	25
Book chapter	3	0	0	1	1	5
Book	0	0	0	1	0	1
Other	2	1	0	1	0	4
Graduate students						
Masters	1	3	2	5	4	15
Doctorate	1	5	1	3	3	13
PDF	0	0	0	0	1	1
Partnership	1	0	1	3	1	6
Media impact	1	1	0	3	0	5

APPENDIX C

RIIM working budget, 2005-06

Approved 5 April, 2005

	Projected spending		
	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Administrative Activities			
P. Wei	26,520	27,938	27,454
L. Sheldon (RIIM share)	24,000	24,000	24,000
Webmaster	18,000	18,000	18,000
Librarian	5,000	5,000	5,000
Media services			5,000
Materials	9,500	10,000	10,000
SFU general office expenses	4,000	4,500	5,000
UBC administration	5,000	5,000	5,000
Total	92,020	94,438	99,454
NOTE: salaries for Wei and Sheldon may be adjusted			
Dissemination			
Printing and copying	12,000	12,500	12,500
JIMI contribution	3,750	3,750	3,750
National conference	5,000		5,000
International conference	5,000	9,000	13,000
Public forum	5,000	5,000	5,000
Research Policy Seminars		5,000	5,000
China-Canada dialogue			5,000
NGO study summarizing RIIM WPs		5,000	
Total	30,750	40,250	49,250
Research			
Commitments carried from previous year (7 projects)	81,770	61,135	92,072
New research (latest CFP)	78,147	167,317	160,000
Additional research funds	112,938	59,331	649
Total	272,855	287,783	252,721
Grand total: expenses	395,625	422,471	401,425
Revenues			
Base grant from Metropolis/SSHRC	323,125	325,425	325,425
Extra addition to base budget (from previous year-end)	22,500	43,046	
Carry over, Master account (research)			64,000

Funds in Administrative account, carried over		44,000	6,000
Clawback of unspent research funds	50,000	10,000	6,000
Grant total: revenues	395,625	422,471	401,425

APPENDIX D

2005 and 2006 Working Papers

WP #	Title of the paper
05-01	<i>Indicators of Entrepreneurial Success among Business Immigrants in Canada</i> AUTHOR: David Ley, University of British Columbia
05-02	<i>Representations of Language among Multilingual Youth in Two Canadian Cities</i> AUTHORS: Diane Dagenais, Simon Fraser University, and Patricia Lamarre, Université de Montréal
05-03	<i>Communities of Practice, Figured Worlds and Learning Initiatives in the Second Language Education of Immigrant Students</i> AUTHORS: Kelleen Toohey and Natalia Gajdamaschko, Simon Fraser University
05-04	<i>Assigning Marginality: The Case of an "ESL/Learning Disabled" Student</i> AUTHOR: Kelleen Toohey, Simon Fraser University
05-05	<i>Urbanization, Nativism and the Rule of Law in South Africa's 'Forbidden' Cities</i> AUTHOR: Loren B. Landau, University of the Witwatersrand
05-06	<i>Negotiating Belonging: Bordered Spaces and Imagined Communities in Vancouver, Canada</i> AUTHOR: Gillian Creese, University of British Columbia
05-07	<i>Self-Selection, Immigrant Public Finance Performance and Canadian Citizenship</i> AUTHORS: Don J. DeVoretz and Sergiy Pivnenko, RIIM, Simon Fraser University
05-08	<i>The Changing Faces of Chinese Immigrants in Canada</i> AUTHORS: Shibao Guo, University of Alberta, and Don J. DeVoretz, RIIM, Simon Fraser University
05-09	<i>Back to Hong Kong: Return Migration or Transnational Sojourn?</i> AUTHORS: David Ley, University of British Columbia, and Audrey Kobayashi, Queen's University
05-10	<i>Ethnic Identity and the Labour Market</i> AUTHORS: Krishna Pendakur, Simon Fraser University, and Ravi Pendakur, Strategic Directions Branch, Social Development Canada
05-11	<i>Visible Minorities in Canada's Workplaces: A Perspective on the 2017 Projection</i> AUTHOR: Krishna Pendakur, Simon Fraser University

05-12	<i>Visible Minorities and Aboriginals in Vancouver's Labour Market</i>
	AUTHOR: Krishna Pendakur, Simon Fraser University
05-13	<i>Immigrants' Attitudes towards Self-Employment: The Significance of Ethnic Origin, Rural and Urban Background and Labour Market Context</i>
	AUTHOR: Harald Bauder, University of Guelph
05-14	<i>Migration and the Demographic Transformation of Canadian Cities: The Social Geography of Canada's Major Metropolitan Centres in 2017</i>
	AUTHOR: Daniel Hiebert, University of British Columbia
05-15	<i>Health Care Utilization of Later-Stage Immigrants in British Columbia</i>
	AUTHORS: Zheng Wu and Christoph M. Schimmele, University of Victoria
05-16	<i>A Sociocultural and Critical Analysis of Educational Policies and Programs for Minority Youth in British Columbia</i>
	AUTHORS: June Beynon, Linda Larocque, Roumiana Ilieva and Diane Dagenais, Simon Fraser University
05-S1	<i>An Annotated Bibliography of RIIM Publications Related to the Settlement Services Sector of Greater Vancouver, 1996-2004</i>
	AUTHOR: Jamie Doucette, University of British Columbia
05-17	<i>A Model of Foreign-Born Transfers: Evidence from Canadian Micro Data - Updated February 2006</i>
	AUTHORS: Don J. DeVoretz, Simon Fraser University, and Florin Vadean, Migration Research Group - HWWA Hamburg
05-18	<i>Post-Multiculturalism?</i>
	AUTHOR: David Ley, University of British Columbia
05-19	<i>A Model of the Brain Drain and Circulation</i>
	AUTHOR: Chen Bo, Simon Fraser University
05-20	<i>Chinese Immigrants in Vancouver: Quo Vadis? - Updated February 2006</i>
	AUTHORS: Shibao Guo, University of Calgary, and Don J.DeVoretz, Simon Fraser University
05-21	<i>Iranians in Vancouver: 'Legible People'/Irredeemable Others/Migrant Stories</i>
	AUTHOR: Dan Swanton, University of Durham
05-22	<i>Recreational Participation among Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants in Canada and the Netherlands</i>
	AUTHORS: Amanda Aizlewood, Social Development Canada, Pieter Bevelander, IMER, Malmö University, and Ravi Pendakur, Social Development

	Canada
05-23	<i>I Pledge Allegiance to... Flexible Citizenship and Shifting Scales of Belonging</i> AUTHORS: Katharyne Mitchell and Walter Parker, University of Washington
05-24	<i>The Self-Employment Experience of Immigrants to Canada</i> AUTHOR: Herbert J. Schuetze, University of Victoria
05-25	<i>Toward Minority Group Rights and Inclusive Citizenship for Immigrants: The Role of a Voluntary Organization in Vancouver</i> AUTHOR: Shibao Guo, University of Calgary
05-26	<i>Family Class and Immigration in Canada: Implications for Sponsored Elderly Women</i> AUTHORS: Arlene Tigar McLaren, Simon Fraser University; and Tracey Lou Black, community-based researcher
05-27	<i>Glass Ceilings for Ethnic Minorities</i> AUTHORS: Krishna Pendakur, Simon Fraser University; and Ravi Pendakur, Social Development Canada
05-28	<i>Assimilation via Prices or Quantities? Sources of Immigrant Earnings Growth in Australia, Canada, and the United States</i> AUTHORS: Heather Antecol, Claremont McKenna College; Peter Kuhn, U.C. Santa Barbara; Stephen J. Trejo, University of Texas
05-29	<i>The Economics of Citizenship: A Common Intellectual Ground for Social Scientists?</i> AUTHOR: Don J. DeVoretz

WP #	Title of the paper
06-01	<i>Explaining Socio-economic Well-being of Immigrants and Returned Migrants: An Econometric Analysis of the Hong Kong and Canadian 2001 Censuses</i> AUTHORS: TIAN Fangmeng and MA Zhongdong, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
06-02	<i>Creating Politicized Spaces: "Here" and "There": Lives of Elderly Afghan Women in Metropolitan Vancouver</i> AUTHOR: Parin Dossa, Simon Fraser University
06-03	<i>"Witnessing" Social Suffering: Migratory Tales of Women from Afghanistan</i> AUTHOR: Parin Dossa, Simon Fraser University

06-04	<p><i>Bridging the Gap in Social Services for Immigrants: A Community-Based Holistic Approach</i></p> <p>AUTHOR: Shibao Guo, University of Calgary</p>
06-05	<p><i>Naturalisation and Socioeconomic Integration: The Case of the Netherlands</i></p> <p>AUTHORS: Pieter Bevelander, IMER, Malmö University, and Justus Veenman, Erasmus University Rotterdam</p>
06-06	<p><i>The Economics of Citizenship: Is There a Naturalization Effect?</i></p> <p>AUTHOR: Kirk Scott, Lund University, Sweden</p>

APPENDIX E

**Vancouver Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and
Integration in the Metropolis (RIIM)**

Summary of Activities and Outcomes, April 2002 – March 2005

Daniel Hiebert
Co-Director, RIIM

Submitted: 12 January 2006

The Mission and Structure of RIIM

The overall mission of RIIM has been dynamic, evolving over a 10-year period. From the outset, there was an expectation that research would focus on the two most significant aspects of immigration policy and practice: selection and integration. These are, of course, the key ingredients in a successful immigration system. The original intent of RIIM was to highlight the metropolitan scale, and therefore to concentrate on Greater Vancouver. There were a few early projects conducted at the national scale, but the bulk of the first round of research was targeted at Vancouver. Over time, the topical core of RIIM has remained intact (selection and integration), but the geographical reach of our research has expanded greatly, and now much of the work of the centre is national and international in scope. This has occurred in two ways: the actual individual projects supported by RIIM funds have increasingly gone “upscale” (particularly to the national level); and RIIM researchers have increasingly connected their local work to projects being conducted by researchers in other parts of Canada and/or abroad.

Secondly, the extent and depth of links with the policy and NGO communities has greatly intensified over time. These links are most elaborate at the local and national scales. Many RIIM research projects are conducted either with the help of NGOs or in full collaboration with them. One of the CO-Directors of RIIM is also on the City of Vancouver Mayor’s Working Group on Immigration. Nationally, RIIM researchers are involved with a variety of ministries in a variety of capacities. Perhaps foremost among these are memberships on advisory committees and councils, but this is only the tip of the proverbial iceberg. The degree of engagement with the policy and NGO communities was much upgraded in the second phase of RIIM, and is now an integral aspect of the way the centre functions.

RIIM was radically restructured in 2002, as we entered a new phase of funding. The core of research during the first 6-year cycle of RIIM was mapped out in the original funding proposal submitted in 1995, which specified a complete set of projects, PIs, etc., over the full cycle. In the second phase RIIM adopted (enthusiastically) the set of policy priorities supplied in the new MOU, and generated a new structure to shape the research process. The structure of the centre since 2002 has had three core elements: the Management Board, which makes all key decisions; the Research Program Committee, which advises the board; and the annual research retreats, where policy directions are discussed and priorities set.

The annual retreats provide a clear illustration of the collaborative and responsive nature of RIIM. While they have varied in detail, in general they bring together a series of panels over a full day. One is typically devoted to presentations from federal partners; another to the provincial and municipal scale, a third to NGOs, and a fourth to the research coordinators (Domain Leaders) of RIIM. The Co-Directors of the centre work with the Domain Leaders and other members of the Management Board to crystallize the conversation that occurs at the retreats into formal research priorities. When RIIM issues a Call for Proposals, the website includes a page that lists both the federal priorities defined in the 2002 MOU and another page that lists the annual local priorities. The first set have been constant, while the second has varied, responding to the evolving needs of the various stakeholders that make up the RIIM research and policy community.

Research proposals submitted to the centre are evaluated by the Research Program Committee (RPC), half of which is comprised of academics, and the other half of policy analysts and

representatives of NGOs. The RPC is guided by the aforementioned priorities but also exercises its own discretion when judging proposals. The criteria that are employed in this process are: academic excellence, as demonstrated by the track record of the researcher(s) and the proposal itself; and the policy relevance of the proposed research. The RPC is ideally constructed to evaluate both of these items.

Before turning to the issue of the outputs of RIIM research, it is important to outline the key ways in which RIIM maintains dialogue between the different stakeholders involved in immigration and cultural diversity. As noted, this conversation is at the forefront of our retreats. But it is also fostered through other institutional mechanisms. I will not address the international level in any detail here, but it is worth noting that RIIM researchers have been involved in an impressive series of policy interventions with the immigration ministries of several governments, notably in Germany and Australia in the past two years. Over the past five years, consultations have also been solicited from RIIM by the United Nations initiative on global perspectives, the International Labour Organization on remittances, the Australian ministry responsible for immigration, the Summit on Progressive Governance, and the European Union on citizenship issues.

Engagement has been extensive at the federal level in Canada, as was hoped when Metropolis was established. RIIM researchers have participated in organized events, including Metropolis Presents, Metropolis Conversations, and of course the national Metropolis conferences which bring all of the stakeholders together. Beyond this there has been extensive, less formal interaction between RIIM researchers and individual policy analysts across many ministries in Ottawa. One interesting indication of the ongoing dialogue that occurs between RIIM researchers and policy analysts is the fact that there are RIIM “alumni” (former graduate students supervised by RIIM researchers) now employed in research positions in CIC (e.g., Chona Iturralde), Canadian Heritage (e.g., Kareem Sadiq), and HRSDC (e.g., Eden Thompson). Another indication is the fact that a number of RIIM projects include Ottawa policy analysts as Co-Investigators (e.g., the important work on immigrant integration in the labour market conducted by Krishna and Ravi Pendakur who are affiliated, respectively, with SFU-Economics, and Social Development Canada). Finally, RIIM routinely calls upon representatives of regional offices of federal ministries to participate in our Management Board and RPC.

Since 2002, RIIM has made great efforts to forge meaningful, ongoing links with the provincial government, municipal governments, school boards, and local NGOs. As noted, one of the Co-Directors of RIIM was appointed to the Vancouver Mayor’s Working Group on Immigration, and a Co-Director of RIIM also sits on joint Advisory Council of the BC/Yukon region of CIC and the BC Attorney General’s Office branch that deals with immigration. RIIM personnel are also routinely consulted by the provincial government on policy development in the areas of immigration and multiculturalism. RIIM also organizes an annual forum, which concentrates on a topic of high public interest. In 2003 we discussed the new Canada-US Safe Third Country agreement, and in 2004 we focused on the issue of international education (we did not hold a forum in 2005 as we are gearing up for the national conference). RIIM researchers also participate in events held by other institutions, such as the Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada, the Vancouver Board of Trade, and the Laurier Institution, among others, and are active in the media. In 2002 we developed a new means to formalize and deepen our efforts to work with provincial and local stakeholders. Together with the BC government, RIIM sponsors two Policy Research Symposia each year. At these events, researchers present work that they are currently

writing, a point when feedback can directly impact the way that results are presented in final reports and other publications.

Documenting RIIM's Activities, Outputs, and Impacts

There are two points that need to be strongly emphasized when assessing all of the annual reports of RIIM as well as this document. The first is the general orientation of RIIM. From the outset we have chosen to devote as high a proportion of our base grant to research as possible. The 2003-04 preliminary budget statement, provided as Appendix B to the annual report of that year, illustrates this point perfectly. In that fiscal year, RIIM received around \$373,000 in grants from SSHRC and our other federal partners. Just over \$250,000 of this amount (67%) was dedicated to research and therefore allocated to establish individual grants for researchers who succeeded in our CFPs that year. In other words, all of the administrative side of RIIM, including staff, research dissemination, and conference travel, was conducted for under \$125,000. In this bureaucratically lean environment, we have not channeled many resources into monitoring the activities of RIIM researchers. Above all, we have stressed the research process itself, and have relied upon the production of Working Papers as our “gold standard” demonstrating the flowthrough of financial resources into research projects and ultimately research findings. We are therefore proud of the fact that we published a new record of 29 WPs in the 2005 calendar year. In the life of RIIM, we have published over 200 WPs which, collectively, include well over 6,000 pages, and which now represent a major resource of comprehensive, detailed knowledge about immigration and integration in Canada. In addition to the 29 “regular” WPs published in 2005, we also published a special WP that is a 48 page summary of 1996-2004 WPs that deal with issues associated with immigrant settlement services. Again, this shows both the extent and value of RIIM research over the life of the centre.

Secondly, evaluators should be aware of reporting method used at RIIM. Before making this point it is important to note that any centre that supports research will have both direct and indirect impacts. We define direct impacts as those that arise *directly from the support that the centre provides to researchers*. Centres also stimulate research less directly. For example, RIIM is the recipient of special data from the federal government. When a researcher applies for a RIIM grant to use these data, and is financially supported by the centre, we would describe the output of that research as a direct impact of RIIM. On the other hand, if a researcher was supported by some other source, such as a Standard SSHRC grant, and uses the data held by the centre, we would describe that as an indirect impact of the centre.

We have a simple requirement for researchers affiliated with RIIM: those who receive grants must submit annual reports *while they hold grants*. They are welcome to submit reports at other times, particularly in the year or two following the completion of their research project, but they are only required to submit reports while they hold grants. Therefore, our accounting system is structured to monitor the direct impact of our project and largely ignores indirect impacts. In fact, we do not even capture all of the direct impacts, since researchers are almost certain to continue publishing the outcomes of their projects after they submit their final annual report to RIIM. We have not developed a means to trace this long-term impact of our research.

Adding these points together, we request that the evaluation panel assess the remainder of this report as a relatively complete record of the *direct* impact of RIIM, but as an incomplete record

of the indirect contributions made by the centre. This difference is perhaps best understood by looking at the statistics on WP production. During the period of record for this report, RIIM published about 65 WPs. Yet the collected number included in the annual reports submitted by researchers to the centre was 34. The discrepancy can be explained by the fact that the remaining WPs were written by: researchers after they completed their required annual reports (a direct but unrecorded impact of RIIM); researchers affiliated with the centre working on non-funded projects (indirect impact); and visiting scholars who presented material while at the centre and later revised this into a WP (indirect impact).

The achievements of RIIM, 2002-2005 (see Table 1)

Training outputs. In a typical year, RIIM researchers holding active grants support about 30 graduate students. This is an extraordinary number given the scale of funding of the centre. It arises out of our dedication to the objective that at least half of all moneys transferred to researchers be allocated to Research Assistantships. RA money is spread out over a large number of students, which may not be ideal from the point of view of their financial solvency, but at the same time links a large number of students directly to the activities of the centre. Of course, many researchers augment RIIM funds with those derived from other sources, and students therefore receive considerably more support than our records would show.

The nature of graduate student involvement in the research process varies across a wide spectrum. In 2003-04, for example, in the Education domain, this included: compiling and writing literature reviews, data gathering and statistical analysis, transcription and encoding of recorded interviews, curriculum development for in-school projects, program development for schools with culturally diverse students, presentation of research papers at conferences, and contributions (co-authorship) to reports and journal articles. In addition, graduate students participate in their own monthly workshop to report their thesis progress to other graduate students and RIIM faculty members. We have acknowledged this role at RIIM by seeking outside funds to support the Chris Taylor Prize of \$2,500 for the most significant contribution by a graduate student to the centre each year (this money has been generously supplied by Industry Canada). Our reporting structure does not allow me to be more detailed on the number of students interacting with NGOs and policy analysts, but one indication of the sophisticated role played by students at the centre is the fact that they are currently organizing four workshops for the March 2006 national Metropolis conference.

Academic research outputs. As noted, the Co-Directors and Management Board of RIIM have steadfastly emphasized the conversion of research supported by the centre into Working Papers. We believe that these are a major current resource and will also be a tangible legacy of the centre. During the period of record, RIIM published 23 WPs in 2002, 20 in 2003, 22 in 2004, and 29 in 2005. These figures are for calendar years and we have not kept track of the number of papers in each fiscal year. But the output of the centre on this item would be approximately 65, in print, during the three-year period of record. The standard vetting system for these papers is by the Domain Leader and the most relevant Co-Director, who act as reviewers and editors. When it is deemed appropriate (about one in five papers), additional reviewers are brought into the process. All papers go through a revision process, in many cases twice. Each year, a small number of papers is rejected, despite the fact that they are based on RIIM-funded research.

The results of research supported by RIIM grants is brought into wide circulation through scholarly presentations made in a variety of settings. First and foremost, Metropolis conferences have been significant in disseminating these results, with over 50 presentations made in these venues over the period of record. Approximately 70 additional presentations were made at other academic conferences, and another 89 in other academic settings (such as departmental colloquia). The individual annual reports submitted by researchers show that these have been given throughout Canada and also in many other countries. In 2003-04 this list included: Australia, Austria, Belgium, China, Germany, Hong Kong, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, Singapore, Sweden, the UK, and the USA.

In the period of record, and based on the reports that we have received, RIIM-funded grants directly contributed to the production of 5 books (in print and in press), 40 journal articles (in print), and 21 book chapters (in print). All of these were in peer-reviewed outlets, with a good balance between Canadian and international publications. I have used the “other” category in the table for non-peer-reviewed publications, of which there were 17 indicated in the reports submitted by researchers. Of course the indirect impacts of RIIM on the research output of all those affiliated with the centre would have been much larger.

Policy knowledge outputs. RIIM itself organizes a number of policy-oriented seminars each year. There are approximately 10 special seminars at UBC and SFU per year that are essentially academically oriented. More significantly, RIIM jointly with the BC Attorney General’s Office stages two Policy Research Symposia per year (described above). These are invitation-only events and the participant list is structured to include equal numbers of academics, federal government policy analysts, provincial government policy analysts, and NGO representatives. RIIM also holds an annual public forum on an issue of pressing concern, such as our seminar on the Safe Third Country agreement between Canada and the US in 2002. These are open events and attract a wide and varied audience. In conjunction with the Asia Pacific Foundation, RIIM also stages an annual Canada-China Roundtable (alternating in location between Vancouver and Beijing) where researchers and policy analysts discuss emerging links between the two countries and the way that these are related to migration dynamics. Finally, RIIM researchers have initiated a number of special seminars and workshops that exist outside the structure of the centre, but arise out of RIIM-funded research. This is true of the Education domain, for example, which has staged special meetings of stakeholders in education to discuss the particular circumstances of immigrant students. Also, for example, in 2004 one of the Co-Directors organized a special workshop, funded by the Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies (UBC) and External Affairs Canada, on the political economy of immigration, with participants drawn from 10 countries. I would estimate that there have been two such special events per year during the period of record, and that they have been across all of the research domains.

The most sustained mechanisms of policy knowledge outputs, though, would be our Working Paper series and the participation of RIIM researchers at Metropolis and other conferences. Both have been discussed in the previous section. I have had difficulty obtaining statistics on website usage in time for this report, and will acquire them before the interview on January 20th.

To my knowledge, during the period of record, the following RIIM-funded researchers have participated in Metropolis Conversations and Metropolis Presents, in Ottawa: Sandercock (Citizenship domain), DeVoretz (2), Pendakur (Economics domain); Hiebert (2), Ley (Housing and Neighbourhoods Domain); Hiebert (Social Domain). In addition, Sandercock has addressed

a group of MPs at a special breakfast meeting in Ottawa, and DeVoretz has testified to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

Community and NGO capacity outputs. Perhaps the best indication of this issue is the Special Working Paper published by RIIM in early 2005, which documents the substantial number of studies that have been conducted at RIIM (using WPs as the resource). Nearly 100 WPs were found to contain information that is relevant to the NGO sector, and the document was enthusiastically received by the sector. Further, many of these studies have either benefited by the input of NGOs or through their active involvement. Over the past three years, an average of 6 projects per year have been conducted in active partnership with either government policy analysts or NGOs (about half of each).

I will take this opportunity to illustrate the depth of research-government-NGO interaction by describing one recent project, which was conducted by Jennifer Hyndman. Jennifer was approached by a local NGO (ISS-BC) to seek her support for an investigation of the settlement outcomes of Government Sponsored Refugees from Kosovo, who were deliberately sent to non-Metropolitan centres as an experiment in regionally distributed immigration. Much of the research for this project was carried out by Kathy Sherrell, an MA student. The researchers worked closely with ISS and one of the WPs that arose from this project is co-authored by Hyndman, Sherrell, and the NGO representative. The results of the project were warmly received by both the provincial and federal governments. Also, the researchers linked their work on immigrant settlement in non-metropolitan centres with similar projects in other Metropolis centres and this eventually generated a special journal issue on this topic.

Network outputs. This is the most elusive item to document. Across the domains, interaction between academics, government researchers/policy analysts, representatives of NGOs, and other relevant stakeholders occurs routinely, probably every day, in one form or another. For example, education researchers work with teachers on their projects, and the integration between the research process and pedagogical practice is almost seamless. Perhaps the clearest indication of the evolving network effects of RIIM can be seen in the annual research retreat, which is typically attended by about 50 participants. In organizing the last three of these events I can say that every single organization or person that I approached to speak at the retreat agreed to do so. There is a widespread understanding that RIIM research intersects with the concerns of this wide and varied stakeholder community. The testimonials that have been sent to SSHRC on RIIM's behalf also make this point quite eloquently.

Table 1: Statistical summary of RIIM research activities, 2002-03 - 2004-05

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Domain	Total	Total	Total
Ongoing projects		10	5
New projects	17	9	11
Number of reports	20	25	22
Presentations			
Academic			
Metropolis			
International	2	6	3
National	15	19	7
Other academic conference	17	32	19
Other academic	20	43	26
Professional group	5	8	3
General public	2	8	2
Policy group	1	12	16
Total	62	128	76
Publications			
RIIM Working Papers			
Posted	7	17	10
Submitted		7	3
Books			
In print		1	1
In press		3	
Journal articles			
In print	3	21	16
In press	2	9	
Book chapters			
In print	1	7	13
In press	2	5	3
Other	6	4	7
Graduate students			
Masters	17	28	20
Doctoral	11	15	9
Projects with media contact	5	6	6
NGO/govt partner	5	6	8

APPENDIX F

SENIOR RESEARCHERS AFFILIATED WITH RIIM

(Note: the Domain Leader is shown in boldface font)

Citizenship and Culture Domain

Dan Hiebert (Geography, UBC)

Irene Bloemraad (Dept. of Sociology, UC Berkeley)
 James D. Cameron (Dept. of History, St. Francis Xavier)
 Wendy Chan (School of Criminology, SFU)
 Xiaobei Chen (Social Work, UVic)
 Christian Joppke (Dept. of Anthropology and Sociology, UBC)
 Diana Lary (History, UBC)
 Minelle Mahtani (Dept. of Geography, UBC)
 Catherine Nolin (Geography, UNBC)
 Leonie Sandercock (SCARP, UBC)
 Yuko Shibata (Institute of Asian Research, UBC)
 Margaret Walton-Roberts (Geography, U. Waterloo)

Economics Domain

Steve Mongrain, (Economics, SFU)

Ather H. Akbari (Economics, Saint Mary's University)
 Heather Antecol (Economics, Claremont McKenna College, CA)
 Jasmina Arifovic (Economics, SFU)
 Pieter Bevelander, (School of Migration and Ethnic Relations, Malmö University)
 Amelie Constant (Deputy Program Director: Migration, IZA)
 Barry Chiswick (Economics, U. of Illinois, USA)
 Diane Coulombe (RIIM, SFU)
 James Dean (Economics, SFU)
 Don DeVoretz (Economics, SFU)
 Barry Edmonston (Sociology, UVic)
 Jane Friesen (Economics, SFU)
 Steve Globerman (Education, Western Washington University)
 Alan Green (Economics, Queen's U.)
 Dominique M. Gross (Graduate Public Policy Program, SFU)
 Keith Head (Commerce, UBC)
 Daniel Hiebert (Geography, UBC)
 Thomas Hutton (Planning, UBC)
 Roumi Ilieva (Education, SFU)
 Alexander Karaivanov (Economics, SFU)
 Brian Krauth (Economics, SFU)
 Fernando Mata (Canadian Heritage)
 Arti Nanavati (Economics, M.S. University of Baroda, India)
 Kris Olds (Geography, U. Wisconsin)
 Krishna Pendakur (Economics, SFU)

Ravi Pendakur (Social Development Canada)
 David Prescott (Economics, U. of Guelph)
 John Ries (Commerce, UBC)
 Nicolas Schmitt (Economics, SFU)
 Herbert J. Schuetze (Economics, UVic)
 Abul Shamsuddin (Economics, The University of Newcastle, Australia)
 Arthur Sweetman (School of Policy Studies, Queen's)
 David Wilton (Economics, U. of Waterloo)
 Vivek H. Dehejia (Economics, Carleton)
 Florin-Petru Vadean (Migration Research Group - HWWA, Hamburg)
 Chris Worswick (Carlton University)

Education Domain

Kelleen Toohey (Education, SFU)

Lesley Andres (Education, UBC)
 June Beynon (Education, SFU)
 Barry Chiswick (Economics, U. of Illinois, USA)
 Diane Dagenais (Education, SFU)
 Natalia Gajdamaschko (Education, SFU)
 Marianne Jacquet (Education, SFU)
 Yali Li (Education, UVic)
 Danièle Moore (Education, SFU)
 Linda LaRocque (Education, SFU)
 Cecile Sabatier (Education, SFU)
 Michele Schmidt (Education, SFU)
 Peter Seixas (Director, Ctr. for Study of Historical Consciousness, UBC)
 Pierre Walter (Education, UBC)

Housing and Neighbourhoods Domain

Jennifer Hyndman (Geography, SFU)

Harald Bauder (Geography, University of Guelph)
 David Edgington (Geography, UBC)
 Penny Gurstein (Planning, UBC)
 Thomas Hutton (Planning, UBC)
 Wei Li (Asian Pacific American Studies Program, Arizona State U.)
 Eugene McCann (Geography, SFU)
 Geraldine Pratt (Geography, UBC)
 Leonie Sandercock (Planning, UBC)
 Heather Smith (Geography & Earth Sciences, UNNC. Charlotte)
 Nadine Schurrman (Geography, SFU)
 Carlos Teixeira (Geography, OUC)
 Elvin Wyly (Geography, UBC)

Society and Health Domain

Gillian Creese (Sociology, UBC)

Joan Anderson (Nursing, UBC)

Maria Cristina Barroetavena (Fac. of Medicine, UBC)

Habib Chaudury (Gerontology, SFU)

Lyren Chiu (School of Nursing, UBC)

Catherine Dauvergne (Faculty of Law, UBC)

Parin Dossa (Anthropology, SFU)

Karl Froschauer (Sociology & Anthropology, SFU)

Donald Galloway (Law, UVic)

Bruce Guenther (TWU)

Neil Guppy (Sociology, UBC)

Edwin Hui (Theology, Regent College, UBC)

Patricia Janssen (Health Care & Epidemiology, UBC)

Phyllis Johnson (Social Work & Family Studies, UBC)

Joseph Kess (Linguistics, UVic)

David Ley (Geography, UBC)

Arlene McLaren (Sociology, SFU)

Anand Paranjpe (Psychology, SFU)

Ravi Pendakur (Strategic Directions Branch, Social Development Canada)

Margaret Walton-Roberts (Geography, U. Waterloo)

Habiba Zaman (Women's Studies, SFU)

Zheng Wu (Sociology, UVic)

Commentary Series

Number	Author (s)	Title	Date
96-01	Don J. DeVoretz	SFU-UBC Centre for Excellence for the Study of Immigration and Integration: Some Remarks	04/96
96-02	Don J. DeVoretz	The Political Economy of Canadian Immigration Debate: A Crumbling Consensus?	04/96
96-03	Don J. DeVoretz	Immigration to Vancouver: Economic Windfall or Downfall?	11/96
97-01	Don J. DeVoretz	RIIM: Research, Structure and Dissemination in 1996-97	03/97
97-01F	Don J. DeVoretz	RIIM: recherche, structure et dissémination en 1996-97	03/97
97-02	Don J. DeVoretz	Ethics, Economics and Canada's Immigration Policy	03/97
97-03	David Ley	Annual Report of the Vancouver Centre of Excellence	03/97
97-04	Alec McGillivray	Canada in the Asia Pacific Economy: The People Dimension. Report on RIIM Conference, 21-23 August.	06/97
97-05	Don J. DeVoretz	Canada's Independent Immigrant Selection Procedure: Quo Vadis?	10/97
97-06	Don J. DeVoretz & Samuel Laryea	Canadian Immigration Experience: Any Lessons for Europe?	11/97
98-01	Don J. DeVoretz & Samuel Laryea	<i>Canada's Immigration-Labour Market Experience</i> . OECD Seminar on Migration, Free Trade and Regional Integration in North America.	01/98
98-02	Fernando Mata & Ravi Pendakur	Patterns of Ethnic Identity and the "Canadian" Response	03/98
98-03	David Ley	RIIM Annual Report, 1997-1998	04/98
98-03F	David Ley	Rapport annuel du RIIM, 1997-1998	04/98
98-04	Heather A. Smith	Spatial Concentration: Residential Patterns and Marginalization	07/98
98-05	Samuel A. Laryea	Economic Participation: Unemployment and Labour Displacement	07/98
98-06	Don J. DeVoretz	The Brain Drain or Gain?	10/98
98-07	Don J. DeVoretz	International Metropolis Seminar on Barriers to Employment: Some Conclusions	11/98
99-01	Don J. DeVoretz	Canada's Brain Drain: Gain or Exchange? Policy Options	07/99
99-02	Klaus F. Zimmermann	Ethnic German Migration after 1989: Balance and Perspectives	07/99
00-01	David Ley	RIIM Annual Report, 1999-2000	03/00
00-01F	David Ley	Rapport annuel du RIIM, 1999-2000	03/00
00-02	Don J. DeVoretz	<i>A Canadian Evaluation Model for Unskilled Temporary Immigration</i> . Roundtable sponsored by HRDC, Ottawa, 16 June 2000.	06/00

Number	Author (s)	Title	Date
00-02F	Don J. DeVoretz	Un modèle canadien d'évaluation de l'immigration des travailleurs temporaires non qualifiés. (Aperçu)	06/00
01-01	Don J. DeVoretz and Chona Iturralde	Why Do Highly Skilled Canadians Stay in Canada?	01/01
02-01	Don J. DeVoretz	RIIM Summary of Activities 2000-2001	03/02
02-02	David Ley	RIIM Annual Report, 2001-2002	04/02
02-03	Carl Mosk	Economic Assimilation of Japanese Immigrants in North America: The Importance of Country of Origin as well as Country of Destination	09/02
02-04	Don J. DeVoretz	A Model of Optimal Canadian Temporary Immigration	10/02
03-01	Don J. DeVoretz	Canadian Regional Immigration Initiatives in the 21 st Century: A Candle in the Wind?	01/03
03-02	Don J. DeVoretz	RIIM Summary of Activities: 2002-03. One Year after Renewal: A Critical Retrospective	05/03
03-03	Daniel Hiebert	RIIM 2003 Research Consultation Research July 11, 2003: Summary of Proceedings	07/03
03-04	Don J. DeVoretz	NAFTA's Labour Market Integration Experience: Lessons for the EU?	09/03
03-05	David Matas	Safe at Third?	09/03
03-06	Don J. DeVoretz and Philip Hanson	Sourcing Out Canada's Refugee Policy: The Safe Third Country Agreement	11/03
04-01	Daniel Hiebert	Report of RIIM Activities: 2003-2004	06/04
04-02	Daniel Hiebert	RIIM Public Consultation Retreat July 8, 2004: Summary of Proceedings	07/04
05-01	Don J. DeVoretz	Brief to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration	02/05
05-02	Don J. DeVoretz	Deflection at the Border: Immigration and Security after 9/11	05/05
05-03	Don J. DeVoretz	2005 Annual Report: "Ten Years After"	05/05
05-04	Daniel Hiebert	RIIM Research Consultation Retreat 15 July 2005: Summary of Proceedings	09/05
05-05	Don J. DeVoretz	How Much is Too Much?	11/05

Number	Author (s)	Title	Date
05-06	Don J. DeVoretz	Policy Issues Surrounding Canada's Diaspora	11/05
06-01	Meyer Burstein	Banquet Speech – 10 th National Metropolis Conference – Vancouver, March 25, 2006	03/06
06-02	Diane Coulombe	RIIM Research Consultation Retreat, September 7, 2006	09/06
06-03	Don J. DeVoretz and Yuen Pau Woo	Dual Citizenship and Canada's New Diaspora	09/06
06-04	Leonie Sandercock	Mongrel Cities of the 21 st Century: In Defense of Multiculturalism	10/06
06-05	Don J. DeVoretz	Profiling at the Canadian Border: An Economist's Viewpoint	12/06
07-01	Daniel Hiebert	Report of RIIM Activities, April 2005 – March 2006	01/07

Back issues of Commentary papers are available for \$5 from
Vancouver Centre of Excellence: Immigration, WMX4653, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University
Drive, Burnaby, B.C, Canada V5A 1S6. Tel: (604) 291-4575 Fax: (604) 291-5336

E-mail: riimlib@sfu.ca
<http://www.riim.metropolis.net/>