

**MAJOR COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH INITIATIVES (MCRI)
GRAND TRAVAUX DE RECHERCHE CONCERTÉE (GTRC)**

**MID-TERM SITE VISIT REPORT
RAPPORT DE VISITE À MI-MANDAT**

THE CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL LABOUR NETWORK (CILN)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: STEPHEN JONES

**REPORT PREPARED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE MID-TERM SITE VISIT
PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Dr. Kevin Lang (Chair)

Professor
Department of Economics
Boston University

Dr. Lorne Carmichael

Professor
Department of Economics
Queen's University

Dr. Michael Howlett

Professor
Department of Political Science
Simon Fraser University

April, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1) Report on the mid-term site visit of the Canadian International Labour Network
- 2) Agenda for the mid-term site visit of April 26, 2000
- 3) List of mid-term site visit participants
- 4) List of the CILN student presentations

Section 1: Introduction

The Major Collaborative Research Initiatives program provides support over a five-year period for unique, large-scale research initiatives. The objectives of the program are to promote collaborative research in the social sciences and humanities, provide opportunities for training young researchers in a collaborative research environment, strengthen collaborative research activity within and between disciplines, and foster opportunities to collaborate in international research activities. In accordance with the program's guidelines, a mid-term review of each MCRI grant is conducted based on a report prepared by the Project Director and a site visit by a committee of peers appointed by the Council. The mid-term review, which normally takes place during the third year of the funding cycle, evaluates the progress achieved by the project using the following criteria:

- the effectiveness of the collaboration
- the overall quality and progress of the research
- the effectiveness of the project management
- the diversity and out-reach of the dissemination activities.

The Canadian International Labour Network (CILN), under the direction of Peter Kuhn, was awarded a grant of \$1,240,000 in 1995. The main objective of CILN is to produce high-quality, cross-national research on the effects of labour market institutions on the level and distribution of wages across working individuals, the level and distribution of unemployment and the distribution of economic well-being within households. The Project Director for CILN during its first 3.5 years, Peter Kuhn, moved to the University of California-Santa Barbara in July 1999 and, subsequently, Stephen Jones replaced him. Although this change did not affect the timing of the site visit, because of administrative changes at Council, the mid-term evaluation did not take place until April 26, 2000.

During a teleconference held April 12, the Site Visit Committee requested additional information on several points including the outcomes that would not have been attained without the MCRI grant, project management, and the major accomplishments and challenges of the project. These issues, among others, were addressed during the site visit at McMaster University. During the site visit, the Committee heard presentations from the Project Director, Research Theme Project Directors, a CILN co-investigator from the University of Toronto, as well as University representatives, a Post-doctoral Fellow and four doctoral students involved in CILN. Each session included a question period. During the day, the Committee also spoke with CILN's Data Librarian.

Section 2: The Effectiveness of the Collaboration and Exchange

Project Director's Ability to Create A Collaborative Milieu for the Research Activities

The Site Review Committee found ample evidence of successful collaborative efforts. This is demonstrated by the large number of co-authored articles produced by the Network. Students have produced not only independent work but also joint work with established scholars. The first two conferences were well attended. Moreover, the seminar series seems and other activities have facilitated the exchange of ideas.

Student Training

Student training is a very important component of the CILN project. Therefore the Site Review Committee addressed this component of the evaluation with particular attention. Overall, despite concerns discussed below, it found this aspect of the program to be exemplary.

The clearest evidence that the training program has been successful is that students have found good jobs in academia, government and the private sector. Students have produced good independent academic research. Six students have gone on (or will be shortly) to academic jobs, including three in Canada. One student won second prize in SSHRC's McConnell Awards for Excellence in Public Communication of Research.

The students with whom the committee met felt that the financial and other resources they received had been well targeted towards enhancing their educational experience and facilitating the completion of their degree. The approach to student support varied among the various universities participating in the collaboration. At McMaster, where the largest number of students is supported, students begin as research assistants, but are required to move to independent research to receive continued support. As one student put it, "Students begin by working for faculty and end up working with them." Students expressed considerable appreciation for the supportive environment created by the faculty.

Students also indicated that participation in CILN had helped them in other ways. Both the students and the Post-doctoral Fellow with whom the Site Review Committee met, indicated that the conferences had allowed them to make valuable contacts with faculty at other universities in Canada and elsewhere. The Post-doctoral Fellow and at least one of the more advanced graduate students had been invited to present their work at a number of Ontario universities. Some students had also presented their work at the last CILN conference.

Although the training provided by CILN is in many ways exemplary, students did express the view that the absence of a large peer group detracted in some respects from their education. Relative to most major U.S. programs, Canadian Ph.D. programs in economics are small. At McMaster and elsewhere, this benefits students by encouraging greater interaction with faculty, but students miss some of the opportunities to learn from their peers. It seems to the site review committee that CILN could be used to offset some of the disadvantages of small program size by facilitating contacts among students at different universities.

Integration of Team Members and Research

CILN's research activity is focused on three relatively independent areas of labour economics. This was explicit in the proposal, and there was never any real expectation that the work in the areas would be integrated, although there has been interaction among participants in the different themes.

Within each theme, CILN's importance in promoting interaction has varied. For the work on the allocation of consumption within the family (an important element of the research on family welfare), CILN has provided the primary means for bringing most of the leading researchers together on a regular basis. The Director of this theme, Martin Browning, expressed the view that in the absence of CILN, there was no regular meeting at which researchers in this area would meet.

In other areas, CILN has not been the sole means for bringing researchers together. Nevertheless, it has permitted team members to meet regularly. Conferences are well attended although the

Project Director expressed some disappointment at the lower attendance rates of the non-economist members of the team.

Additional workshops and meetings have allowed subsets of the team to interact as well as to give students access to leading scholars from outside Canada.

The degree of integration of research also varies across themes. The Committee views the volume comparing the experience of displaced workers in different countries as being exemplary. In other areas, the team has produced large numbers of related papers, but there has been no integration of the research. The Committee believes that in most cases this is justified. The research programs are in core areas of labour economics that will not be “resolved” in a single grant. Most scientific progress will occur in small increments and will be reflected in individual articles that relate to the previous literature. Nevertheless, the Committee believes that in some cases, the model developed for the analysis of displaced workers could have been imitated successfully.

As might be expected, participation of international members has been more varied and on average somewhat lower than that of the Canadian members. Nevertheless, there has been continued and significant participation by outstanding labour economists in Europe, Australia and the United States. One of the goals of CILN was to increase interaction between labour economists in Canada and those in other countries. CILN has clearly been successful in this respect. Not only are individual Canadian researchers well known internationally, but CILN has a significant international presence. The participation of international researchers has facilitated the recruitment of two post-doctoral fellows. Students reported that they had benefited from international contacts.

Value-Added from Collaboration

Both the Committee and the Project Director find it difficult to define precisely the impact of the collaboration on the research. There are clearly some projects that are unlikely to have been undertaken in the absence of CILN. The displaced worker project would not have been possible without a network in place and an organization with resources to encourage researchers to collaborate on that topic. In other cases, such as the work by Martin Browning and some of his international co-authors, the collaboration would probably have occurred anyway, but has been greatly facilitated by CILN.

Inter/Multi-Disciplinary Research

The original MCRI Committee that recommended funding for CILN believed that the study of labour markets required the input of researchers not only from economics but also from other disciplines. At the Letter of Intent stage, the Project Director was encouraged to add representatives from the other social sciences to his team.

This attempt at stimulating inter- or multidisciplinary research has not been as successful as might have been hoped, although it may have been as successful as could reasonably be expected. CILN has funded students in political science and sociology. There has been some attendance and participation of researchers from other disciplines in conferences and workshops. The Steering Committee has at times invited members of different disciplines to discuss each other’s work. CILN affiliate Miles Corak, an economist, in collaboration with Susan Mayer (a sociologist at the Northwestern/University of Chicago Institute for Research on Poverty) is trying to organize a major interdisciplinary conference on intergenerational income dynamics. CILN is using part of its next major conference to facilitate this project. Still, CILN has not produced any significant collaboration between or among researchers from different disciplines.

The Site Review Committee recognizes that there are significant barriers to collaboration among researchers from different disciplines. It is precisely these barriers that help to define these disciplines as being distinct. Thus, while disappointing, the limited level of multi/interdisciplinarity is not surprising. Nevertheless, in the final section of the report, we provide some suggestions for encouraging greater interaction among researchers from different disciplines during the remaining period of the grant.

Section 3: Quality and Progress of the Research

The Site Review Committee did not have an official milestones report, but there is a clear statement of the research objectives of the project in the original application and in the mid-term report. The goal of the project was to generate a “broad body of high quality, cross national research” focused on the role of labour market institutions on the level and distribution of wages, the level and distribution of unemployment, and the distribution of economic well-being within households. This research was to be conducted by economists, but informed by “leading researchers” in sociology and political science. Finally, it was intended that there be an ongoing dialogue with the policy community.

The Committee’s opinion is that these goals have been largely realized. A very large body of research has been generated; the best of which is truly outstanding. Some of this work has had direct policy impact. The character of the research has been less multidisciplinary than was originally planned, but the Committee is satisfied that this is not through any lack of effort on the part of the research team.

Three projects in particular stand out. The work led by Steve Jones and Craig Riddell on the measurement of labour force attachment has had an impact on the profession (with a publication in *Econometrica*) and has also led to changes in the measures that Statistics Canada uses to measure unemployment in Canada. This work was covered by the press in a column written by Bruce Little in the *Globe and Mail*.

A second body of work on Worker Displacement was led by Peter Kuhn. This effort had a unique structure, in that ten experts on the experience of individual countries were paired up and asked to produce papers that compared the experiences of two different countries. At first, this format was treated with some skepticism by the participants, but they discovered in the end that this methodology led to a great deal of new insights about the role of institutions in moulding the experiences of workers. Five papers will be published in a forthcoming volume from the Upjohn Institute.

A final example of the research supported by this grant investigates models of family decision-making. This work, led by Martin Browning, has been well received by the profession with publications in many journals including *Econometrica* and the *Journal of Political Economy*.

The overall productivity of the researchers associated with this project has been remarkable, as can be seen from the Annual Reports. The Committee engaged in some discussion with the principals as to the amount that could reasonably be attributed to the grant itself – i.e., what would have been done had the grant not been awarded? In the end we came to no resolution. All of the principal researchers are accomplished scholars, and would surely have produced good work without this grant. Perhaps more to the point, they would likely have managed to secure

other support. Nonetheless, the team did do the work under this grant, and the Committee feels that the MCRI program should take full credit.

The only area in which the outcomes of the project have not met the goals is that of interdisciplinarity. International comparisons are plagued by the problem that the institutions extant in a country are themselves the product of that country's history, and cannot be treated as exogenous to labour market outcomes. It was hoped that the research could be informed by work done or being done in this area by Sociologists or Political Scientists. This hope has not been realized, perhaps because it was false in the first place. Nonetheless, it is clear to the Committee that sincere attempts have been made to involve non-economists in the discussion of these and other issues.

While much has been accomplished during the first part of this grant, it is clear that the research program is ongoing. The original proposal did not aim for a particular achievement to be realized by the end of the funding period. For this reason, other than a third major conference, there is no schedule for completion of the work, as in a sense it will never be complete. It is more appropriate to look at the pace of work and the flow of results as they come out each year. In this regard, progress has been entirely satisfactory.

Section 4: The Effectiveness of the Project Management

Project Activities

The project was originally approved for the period 1996-2001 but has been extended to December 2002. This, of course, has altered the schedule for project activities although the original milestones described in the application (see Section 3 above) are still in place, as are the major structural elements of the project. The third and final of the planned conferences is now in the late planning stages, and follows on two successful earlier meetings. No additional major events or activities appear to be planned for the period of extension, which appears to be primarily designed to allow for completion of projects currently underway as well as a continuation of student funding.

With respect to budgetary matters, the budget for 1996-2000 was underspent, primarily due to a lack of requests and applications for graduate student support. These funds will be rolled-over to the extension period where it is anticipated that they will be fully spent.

Our conclusion with respect to project activities and budgetary matters, therefore, is that the project appears to be essentially on-time and on-schedule with its original proposed research and management plan, given that the expected student application rate was somewhat below that originally anticipated.

The Delivery of Promised Institutional Support

The original budget contained a modest and reasonable set of promises for institutional support from the participating universities, totalling approximately \$750,000 over the initial five-year period. These included (Part C: Section 4 of the Application) items for release time for the Project Directors; graduate research fellowships; a post-doctoral fellowship; half-time secretarial support; and support for institutional seminars and public lectures. These commitments and obligations have all been met in a timely fashion by the participating institutions, which have also provided space and other in-kind services at no valuation, thereby substantially under-estimating the extent of institutional support which the project and its program of activities have received.

An unanticipated additional item arose during the course of the project, with respect to the Data Library and the position of the Data Librarian. Although the original budget did not provide an estimate or costing for this facility and its support, space in the Department of Economics was provided by McMaster University and a half-time support position established. However, this was subsequently upgraded to a full-time position by the current Project Director. While this might have posed a difficulty if other funds had been fully allocated, this was not the case as funding was available from unallocated components of the budget. This expenditure item may also be taken over by the University as a by-product of its current (unrelated) efforts to establish a Statistics Canada regional data library.

Other Items

In addition to the aforementioned general items, five other areas of the management of the project warrant additional comment. These are: (a) evaluation criteria; (b) the role of the Program Advisory Council; (3) the decision-making structure; (4) the Data Library and (5) turnover in senior management, notably the Project Director.

Evaluation Criteria

A project of this type, which involves the creation and operation of a research network, poses difficulties for the evaluation of project outputs. It was apparent in the course of interviews with Steering Committee members that the sole evaluative criterion used internally was the number of refereed journal articles published by Network members over the project period. However, Steering Committee members were also aware that this measure was inadequate given the fact that many publications by researchers already working in the project areas would have occurred without any CILN funding. Research Theme Project Directors could not suggest any practical means of overcoming difficulties associated with assessing whether (a) any additional publications would have occurred and (b) whether research orientations among investigators had changed as a result of project funding.

Somewhat surprisingly, given an awareness of these difficulties, little effort or thought appears to have been given to the development of alternate measures and evaluative criteria. Such measures would include, but would certainly not be limited to such items as:

1. Measures on data archive requests and access
2. An analysis of website hits and sources
3. An analysis of numbers and sources of requests for papers
4. An analysis of newsletter requests and distribution patterns
5. Reports from any public or professional Advisory Boards
6. An analysis of media coverage
7. A systematic survey of investigator activity in the pre- and mid- project periods
8. A systematic analysis of student applications and recruitment responses.

Although a variety of measures appear to have been readily at hand, only anecdotal data were provided to the Committee. Even this anecdotal evidence, however, raised some concerns with claims for project success. The apparent fact that only 20 requests had been received over a four-year period for access to data from the Data Library, for example, raises questions about the success of the project in amassing information of use to the Canadian community. Moreover, the failure to collect data or develop alternate measures of project success suggests a lack of self-inspection and self-analysis in the overall project management structure.

The Role of the Program Advisory Council

The Program Advisory Council established for the project appears to have met only twice, to have been consulted only during the initial phases of the project, and to never have issued any kind of written report. As a result, it was never a major, or even a peripheral, force in the management of the project.

Although opinion on the utility and role of advisory committees in projects such as this is divided, the Final Application (p. 17) indicated that “the Steering Committee will have access to a Program Advisory Council drawn from members of the research team. This Council will have responsibility for policy and planning the course of the project, above the operational level managed by the Program Steering Committee”. This role was not met in practice, as the Council appears to have not had any impact on project management at any level.

More effective use of the Program Advisory Council, however, might have been able to offset or overcome several problems and concerns raised by project members in the course of interviews. Its membership, for example, could have been structured on a multi-disciplinary basis and been asked to provide input into the selection of program projects, conference and workshop themes, and Network membership. Such a structure and set of activities could have alleviated some of the Project Director’s concerns with a lack of interdisciplinarity in the overall program of research. Similarly, an enhanced public and policy profile might have been attained by the project through the appointment of additional outside 'stakeholders' (e.g. Statistics Canada). The Program Advisory Council was also the only body associated with the project to have official student representation and could have been used to facilitate inter-university student interaction through the appointment of representatives from the various participating universities.

Combined with any of the above options, or even if left as actually constituted, the Program Advisory Council should also have been asked to provide written reports on the progress and quality of Network activities. Such an evaluative function which would have been of use to both the project managers and Site Review Committee.

Decision-Making Structure

The decision-making structure for the various activities undertaken by the Network (such as student awards, dataset acquisition, conference and workshop arrangements, and Network management) was described in detail by the Project Director. In most cases, it appears that key decisions were taken by a very small Program Steering Committee, often by e-mail, on the basis of recommendations made by the Project Director. There appears to have been little distinction made with respect to operational and policy decisions and the role of the Steering Committee itself is unclear, as this group was in transition throughout the course of the project – with turn-over in the position of Project Director, transfer of one member to another continent, and elevation of a third member to the Decanal level with the university. As such, it appears that most decisions were in fact taken by the Project Director. While this is certainly understandable in terms of day-to-day operational decisions, a set procedure for Steering Committee consultations on major policy decisions would probably have enhanced the effectiveness of project management and contributed to the effective self-analysis required in this type of diffuse, on-going, self-directed research network.

The Data Library

A number of issues were raised by project members with respect to the management, staffing and operation of the Data Library. Some issues were related to difficulties in determining access to data collections which are tied to somewhat opaque Statistics Canada regulations which restrict access to specific datasets and are largely beyond the control of Project Directors and

participants. Other issues, however, were raised with respect to the difficulties encountered in attracting and retaining qualified staff for this facility. Although the Project Director and Steering Committee members appear to be fully aware of this difficulty, it appears to have taken several years to deal with this issue – which remains an item of concern at the time of writing. Given the apparent significance attributed by project participants to the data collection and dissemination activities associated with the program of research, this issue should probably have been identified and addressed earlier in the project life cycle than appears to have been the case.

Turnover in Senior Management

This MCRI project is somewhat unique in the circumstance of the departure of the original Project Director to another institution in another country. The current Project Director should be commended for his willingness to step into the breach left by the departure of the originating Project Director. University officials also stressed the lack of transitional problems caused by this departure. However, given the significance of the Project Director to MCRI projects generally, and especially given the Project Director-centred management structure of this project in particular, additional efforts should be made in future by SSHRC to ensure that programs and projects are on-track and all reporting requirements are completed, in such circumstances.

Section 5: Dissemination Activities

This project has produced two kinds of output. The first is the standard stream of research results that need to be communicated to the profession, the policy community, and the world at large. The second is the collection of data files contained in a Data Library set up at McMaster University in order to facilitate the empirical work being done by CILN researchers.

The research output has been disseminated in several ways. One conference volume is forthcoming from the Upjohn Institute, but the researchers clearly believe that the most effective channel is through publication in peer reviewed journals. To this end they have not attempted to publish conference volumes associated with the two major conferences held so far, and have no plans to do this for the third one. Their argument, which the Committee supports, is that presenters want their best work to be published in peer reviewed journals and will not bring it to a conference that has published proceedings. These conference papers, and other working papers, are made available on the CILN website. The CILN conferences have been well attended by policy-makers, and some of the work has made it into the popular press.

The Data Library at McMaster is an important resource that has been created by this grant, partly through the work of researchers and students, and partly through the employment of a full time data resource person. It consists of several data sets that have been purchased from different sources. Subsequently, these data have been cleaned up and in some cases linked together to form a much more useful resource. To date, these files have been used exclusively by CILN researchers or research fellows.

The Committee is of the opinion that these data should be quickly made available to the wider community. While we are sensitive to the work that is necessary to bring a data set to a useful form, the work is publicly funded and the benefits should be public as well. Discussion with the principals moved toward consensus, but some disagreement remains. The Committee felt that the data should be made available by the time a working paper using this data had been produced. The Project Director thought a better time would be once a paper using the data had been accepted for publication. SSHRCC guidelines require only that the data be made available at the end of funding.

In any case, these data will eventually become an important and useful resource for the profession, and should be counted as an accomplishment of the project.

Section 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

On balance, the Site Review Committee's evaluation of the project is clearly favourable. Were this a true "mid-term evaluation," the Committee would recommend continued funding while asking that the concerns raised in this review be addressed. In terms of the factors that originally motivated the MCRI Committee to support funding of the project, CILN has been almost entirely successful. It has also achieved many of its other objectives.

Most of the CILN budget is dedicated to two areas:

- Student training has been highly successful. Although the number of students trained per year is less than originally planned, the quality of the training has been excellent as measured by job placement, research quality and student reports.
- Conferences have been well attended by team members, researchers who are not members of the team and federal policy-makers.

The CILN team of researchers has made substantial intellectual progress. We find three areas to be particularly significant:

- The comparative analysis of worker displacement
- The study of the distribution of consumption within the household
- The comparative analysis of measure of employment, unemployment and non-employment.

CILN team members have played a significant role in informing policy debates related to labour economics in Canada. In particular, decision-makers at Statistics Canada and Human Resources Development Canada have participated in CILN and been responsive to the input of CILN members.

In addition, the data centre developed by CILN could become a valuable asset to the research community in Canada and elsewhere.

Recommendations to the Project Director

Despite a favourable overall evaluation of the project, the Site Review Committee has a number of suggestions that it believes would strengthen the project and which it believes should be considered if the team wishes to submit a further proposal to SSHRC.

Students

- CILN could be used more aggressively to recruit students to the participating departments and to labour economics within those departments.
- The balance of the grant and any future grant should devote resources to encouraging interaction among students participating in the project but located at different universities.

Data availability

- CILN should increase its efforts to make the broader research community aware of data housed at CILN. For data acquired or produced with SSHRC funds, researchers should be informed that, to the extent permitted by external restrictions on further dissemination, the data must be made available through CILN within a reasonable period after it has been collected, cleaned, or processed.
- Since the Project Director believes that the development of the data library is one of the four main achievements of the project, he should make reasonable efforts to ensure that the data continue to be available after the end of this funding period.

Interdisciplinary research

- The Project Director suggested a number of mechanisms that might have encouraged more interdisciplinary research. The Site Review Committee urges the Project Director to put these in place during the balance of the grant. Such measures would also strengthen a future proposal. In particular, the Committee supports the suggestion to include younger researchers with a clearer shared interest in a more narrowly focused topic that is of interest to researchers in other disciplines.
- The Committee also believes that a more widely circulated call for papers (perhaps on a narrower range of topics) might have elicited interest from researchers outside of economics. Participation by such researchers at the conferences might ultimately have broadened the team.

Advisory board

- The role of the Program Advisory Council in the project has been very limited. It seems to have served largely to give the appearance of participation of distinguished researchers from outside economics. Any new proposal should either drop the Program Advisory Council as unnecessary “window-dressing” or establish a clear role for the Council and mechanisms for ensuring its effectiveness.

Designing self-evaluation

- The research team has considerable expertise in program evaluation. While recognising the great difficulty of assessing the effectiveness of research funding whether in academia or the private sector, the Committee believes that the research team should give thought to developing mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of its own programs.

CILN MID-TERM REVIEW
APRIL 26, 2000
ROOM 334 KENNETH TAYLOR HALL
MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON ON

AGENDA

- 9:00-9:20** **1. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS/COMMITTEE CHAIR-KEVIN LANG**
 -introduction of Committee members
 -purpose of visit
 -procedures to be followed
- 9:20-10:00** **2. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS/PROJECT DIRECTOR-STEPHEN JONES**
 -presentation of team members
 -overview of MCRI grant (major objectives and team structure)
 -response to matters raised by Committee at time of teleconference
 -brief summary of mid-term report (major issues /achievements)

QUESTION PERIOD

10:00-10:15 *COFFEE BREAK*

- 10:15-12:15** **3. TEAM MEMBER PRESENTATIONS**
 Stephen Jones (McMaster): Wages and Job Quality/Unemployment
 Martin Browning/Martin Dooley (McMaster): Family Welfare
 Dwayne Benjamin (University of Toronto): Research at University of Toronto led by Michael Baker and Benjamin

12:15-1:15 *LUNCH*

- 1:15-2:15** **4. MEETING WITH THE POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWS AND STUDENTS**
 Post-doctoral Fellow-Issac Rischall
 Graduate Students-Susan Johnson/Emmanuelle Pierard/Adrienne ten Cate/Mikal Studerud

- 2:15-2:45** **5. MEETING WITH UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATIVES**
 Gerhard Gerber (VP Research)/Alan Harrison (Dean of Faculty of Social Sciences)/
 Fred Hall (Dean of Graduate School)/Stuart Mestelman (Chair, Department of Economics)/
 Emmi Morwald (Director, Research Services)

2:45-3:00 *COFFEE BREAK*

- 3:00-4:00** **6. IN-CAMERA MEETING OF COMMITTEE**

- 4:00-5:00** **7. MEETING WITH PROJECT DIRECTOR**

- 5:00-6:00** **8. IN-CAMERA MEETING OF COMMITTEE**

LIST OF MID-TERM SITE VISIT PARTICIPANTS

CILN

Stephen Jones	Project Director/Research Theme Project Director, Economic Institutions and Unemployment-McMaster University
Martin Browning	Research Theme Project Director, Economic Institutions and Family Welfare-McMaster University
Martin Dooley	Co-investigator/Steering Committee member-McMaster University
Dwayne Benjamin	Co-investigator-University of Toronto

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY

Gerhard Gerber	Vice-President Research
Alan Harrison	Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Fred Hall	Dean, Graduate School
Stuart Mestelman	Chair, Department of Economics
Emmi Morwald	Director, Research Services

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mid-term Site Visit Committee Members

Kevin Lang (Chair)	Department of Economics, Boston University Member, MCRI Committee-1995
Lorne Carmichael	Department of Economics, Queen's University
Michael Howlett	Department of Political Science, Simon Fraser University Current Member, MCRI Committee

SSHRC Staff

Yves Mougeot	Director, Research and Dissemination Grants Division
Gail Cook	Officer, Research and Dissemination Grants Division

