

Investing in Social Infrastructure in Canadian Communities to Benefit Children and Families

For the National Children's Alliance

**Louise Hanvey
October, 2004**

Introduction

In Canada, and internationally, there is a growing recognition of the important impact that neighbourhoods and communities have on the development of children and youth. This is coupled with a growing concern about the social infrastructure of Canadian communities. A number of municipalities, non-profit organizations, governments, foundations and private corporations have been calling for attention to the life circumstances of children, youth and families in our communities. This paper examines the current thinking about the influence of community or neighbourhood on children and youth; examples of the concerns being articulated in Canada regarding cities and communities; and some of the infrastructure investment initiatives that are underway in other jurisdictions. The paper is not intended to be the final word – rather it is intended to stimulate thought and discussion about the importance of social infrastructure for Canadian children, so that we can move forward towards communities that support their healthy development.

Canadian Children – What Matters?

Research is clear that an adequate family income, while important, is not sufficient to ensure that children have an opportunity to reach their potential. Findings from the National Longitudinal Survey on Children and Youth indicate that while poor children are at higher risk of having emotional, physical and social difficulties, there are increasing numbers of vulnerable children across all socio-economic groups. In fact, there are more children living in middle class families that are at risk than there are children living in poor families (Willms, 2002). The research findings are unequivocal that the determinants of health for children and youth are largely dependent upon the social context in which they grow up.

The Importance of Neighbourhoods and Communities for Children and Families

Beginning in the 1980's, the emerging consensus in the literature has been that neighbourhoods “matter” for children (Wilson, 1987; Gephardt, 1997; Brooks-Gunn et al, 1997). It is becoming increasingly understood that the healthy development of children depends in large part on the social context in which they grow up. Neighbourhoods with high levels of social capital relationships, networks and associations tend to be good places to raise children (Putnam, 2000). Individuals who live in communities and societies with strong social capital tend to be more prosperous, healthier and experience less crime (Helliwell, 2001). Family-enabling environments are required in order to provide much-needed support for parents and children, ensure positive and nurturing experiences to children and help parents cope with the stresses of raising children (Torjman, 2004a).

Researchers are increasingly documenting the evidence that emotional problems are linked to community disadvantage, crowded living conditions, single-parent households, low-income neighbours, exposure to violence and less perceived social cohesion (Boyle and Lipman, 1998; Chase-Lansdale and Gordon, 1996; Shumoa et. al., 1998; Tremblay et. al., 2001). The NLSCY has provided the opportunity for Canadian researchers to investigate the influence of neighbourhoods on children's well being. Soubhi et. al.,

(2001) found that among school-aged children, neighbourhood disadvantage and concentration of low-income families in the neighbourhood increased the children's risks of suffering from injuries.

Public health researchers have clearly established that social connectedness is one of the most powerful determinants of well-being. Although the evidence does not point to definitive conclusions as to why social capital matters for health, there are several plausible theories. Social networks furnish tangible assistance, such as money, convalescent care and transportation, which reduce psychological and physical stress, and provide a safety net. Social networks also tend to reinforce healthy norms; socially isolated people are more likely to smoke, drink, overeat and engage in other health-damaging behaviours. Through the network of bonds and trust that it creates, social capital contributes to social cohesion and to the general health of neighbourhoods (Torjman, 2004a).

Social Infrastructure – Essential for our Children

The ecological model of human development emphasizes the importance of taking into account the rich and inter-connected influences of parent, family, neighbourhood, community, public services and public policies. Inclusion of all children, irrespective of ability, cultural group, socio-economic status or geography, is dependent upon vibrant communities that ensure that each child has the opportunity to participate as an active member of society. Only then can each and every child reach her or his developmental potential.

It is commonly understood that communities need physical infrastructure to enable economic development. In a knowledge-based economy, social infrastructure is essential to human development and therefore a necessary condition for economic growth. ***Social infrastructure encompasses the inter-dependent mix of places and spaces, programs and networks at all levels.*** Emergent research indicates that creating the environment for healthy child development involves a profound degree of inter-sectoral collaboration, multi-disciplinary approaches, co-ordination of programs and services and vibrant community support networks. Canadian experience and research has been increasingly contributing to this understanding. Here are some specific examples.

The Community Asset Mapping Project: Vancouver

Dr. Clyde Hertzman is demonstrating that the composition of children's neighbourhoods is very important. Through his 'Community Asset Mapping Project' he has been able to describe the climate of neighbourhoods – looking at their stability, safety, degree of socio-economic mixing and segregation, and the level of 'social capital', or social trust, community participation, and trust in government. This research is suggesting that relatively high levels of social capital are a resource for Vancouver's inner city and working class neighbourhoods. When social capital is combined with neighbourhood climate – stability, safety, and the degree of socio-economic mixing – the prospects for the children's development are enhanced (Hertzman et al., 2002). This points directly to the need for inter-sectoral collaboration in order to influence healthy child development.

The programs, services, and environmental influences on children's development involve all three levels of government as well as philanthropic, business, neighbourhood, and family activities.

The findings of this research present two important challenges for Canadian communities. The first is neighbourhood socioeconomic mix. Neighbourhoods are becoming more economically stratified. Hertzman reflects that this trend, if unabated, would likely have negative long-term consequences for child development. The second is residential transiency – this is disruptive to both the community cohesion and community development strategies critical to the cognitive and social development of children (Hertzman, 2002).

Better Beginnings, Better Futures

Better Beginnings, Better Futures is a comprehensive, community-based, research demonstration project for young children and their families living in eight disadvantaged communities in Ontario. Research from the Better Beginnings sites has demonstrated the importance of community for children and families (Peters et al, 2004).

The Better Beginnings' sites engage in locally developed and operated networks of programs and services for families and children. They have found this to be an effective and affordable strategy to help counter the negative effects on child development of family poverty in communities. The projects have challenged and supported neighbourhoods to build their own organizations. This has resulted in the development of a wide range of programs for young children and families that are locally appropriate and accepted; partnership-building among service agencies; the engagement of the communities in ways that build neighbourhood leadership capacity and cohesion; and ultimately, positive outcomes for children and their families. At all of the project sites, residents felt there had been some improvement in the quality of life in their neighbourhoods – and at several sites, residents saw substantial neighbourhood improvements (Peters et al, 2004).

One of the keys to success in the local communities was local participation. This was not easy – however – and the research demonstrated that it is essential to allow enough time to build trust and develop programs; provide support for planning and organizational development within communities; and allow considerable local control and flexibility so that organizations and programs are tailored to local needs (Peters et al, 2004).

Understanding the Early Years

Understanding the Early Years Community (UEY) is a national initiative developed to increase understanding of the first six years of child development and learning. UEY assists communities across Canada to achieve their goal of improving child development by providing them with the necessary information to enhance community resources and services (Connor and Brink, 1999).

UEY has identified ten family and community indicators that are essential for successful child development. These indicators all meet two criteria – there is evidence that they are

related to children's developmental outcomes; and they are amenable to change through the efforts and actions of families and communities, through the support of community and volunteer agencies, and through social policy at the local, provincial and national levels. Six of these ten are community indicators:

- **Social support:** Measures the level of support available to parents, and describes how much support that person receives from a community of friends and family members.
- **Social capital:** A measure of the level of support available collectively to groups within a community. Thus, it comprises information about the ability of neighbours to work together to solve problems, help each other, watch out for one another's children, and provide children with role models outside their immediate families.
- **Neighbourhood quality:** Gauges the parents' perception of their neighbourhood as a place to raise children. It measures features such as cleanliness, safety, quality of schools and nursery schools, adequacy of facilities for children (such as pools and playgrounds), health facilities, and the level of involvement of residents.
- **Neighbourhood safety:** Assesses the level of the parents' concern for children's safety in their neighbourhood. For example, the safety of parks and other play-spaces, crime rates, problems with older children in the neighbourhood, and whether children are safe playing outside during the day.
- **Use of resources:** Measures the use of recreational facilities, including parks, trails, play-spaces, skating rinks, pools, camping areas, skiing facilities, amusement parks, and community centres; educational services, such as libraries, science centres, family resource centres, and drop-in programs; and cultural resources, such as art museums, plays, musical performances, sports events, and movies.
- **Residential stability:** Assesses the degree of transience of the local population (KSI Research International Inc, 2003).

The research in UEY is demonstrating that the quality and safety of neighbourhoods is important – but social factors also play a role. The degree of social support available to parents, and the extent to which parents have access to information and support through a strong network of friends and colleagues - factors embodied in the social capital of the community – is critical. Furthermore, families' access to educational, cultural and recreational resources, is key (KSI Research International Inc, 2003).

Analysis of the first seven communities in the UEY initiative has demonstrated that community factors are influencing development. Two community factors had statistically significant relationships with the cognitive domain: social support and use of community resources. Children in families with high social support were less likely to be at cognitive risk than those in families with low social support. Children in families that make use of various recreation, educational, and leisure facilities, such as pools, play-spaces, libraries, drop-in programs, art museums, and movies, had better cognitive scores. Social capital had statistically significant and positive effects for children's behaviour. (KSI Research International Inc, 2003).

The Current Context for Canadian Communities

There are a number of factors that are influencing our communities today.

There are pressures on many community services – for example, education, early childhood care and education, post-secondary education and recreation and the arts. There are funding pressures on public schools. Weiner, 2003 claims that this has resulted in reduced access to critical early intervention and child development programs as well as to the most basic resources, such as textbooks and school supplies, required for a quality education. There is a lack of universal high quality early childhood care and education (ECEC). Only a small minority of families and children have access to the ECEC programs that they need and want (Freiler, Rothman & Barrata, 2004). In fact, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has recently pointed out that Canada has a “patchwork of uneconomic, fragmented services, within which a small ‘child care’ sector is seen as a labour market support, often without a focused child development and education role” (OECD, 2004). Reduced government funding for post-secondary education has put a strain on institutional resources and left students to bear the brunt of escalating tuition fees (Campaign 2000, 2003). Increasing strain on resources for recreation and the arts has resulted in lack of access for many children and families. Access to any after school programs, sports and recreation is simply not available for between 10 and 15% of Canadian children (CCSD, 2002).

The ‘downloading’ phenomenon experienced in most Canadian jurisdictions in recent years has had a major impact. Bradford, 2004, reports that for nearly two decades, upper level governments have passed down responsibility to municipal authorities for significant aspects of the country’s physical infrastructure and social services (Bradford, 2004). He identifies a mismatch between municipal responsibilities and the policy resources available to act on their own problems – or even the opportunity to contribute ideas to the actions of upper level governments. “City/community problems are resistant to traditional monosectoral interventions designed from above by insulated, distant bureaucracies. Instead, they demand place sensitive, holistic approaches – strategies built from the ‘ground or street up’, on the basis of local knowledge, and delivered through networked relations crossing program silos, even jurisdictional turfs” (Bradford, 2004). And, the OECD confirms this – a recent OECD study found that Canada has a disjointed approach to urban policy, and a lagging national engagement with the problems of cities. (OECD, 2002).

A number of Canadian researchers and leaders are identifying another worrisome phenomenon in Canadian communities – especially cities – one that Campaign 2000 calls ‘community polarization’. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities has stated that “the income gap between the wealthiest and poorest citizens was more pronounced in Canada’s cities than in the country as a whole” (FCM, 2003). The United Way of Greater Toronto and the Canadian Council on Social Development confirmed this when their research found that there has been a substantial rise in the rate of poverty among Toronto’s families over the last two decades – with almost one in every five families in

2001 living in poverty – and that Toronto’s ‘poor’ families are much more concentrated in neighbourhoods where there is a high proportion of families living in poverty compared to twenty years ago. In 1981, just 18% of ‘poor’ families lived in such neighbourhoods compared to 43% in 2001. This trend toward concentration has resulted in a dramatic rise in the number of higher poverty neighbourhoods in the City of Toronto in the last two decades, approximately doubling every ten years, from 30 in 1981, to 66 in 1991, to 120 in 2001 (United Way of Greater Toronto and the Canadian Council on Social Development, 2004).

In order to address this, The United Way of Greater Toronto and the Canadian Council on Social Development recommend putting neighbourhoods on the public policy agenda in order to create a broader understanding of the importance of healthy neighbourhoods as essential building blocks for achieving a high quality of life. They state that “governments at all levels must make a commitment to reverse the spiral of growing neighbourhood distress and disadvantage by delivering improved economic prospects and jobs, safer neighbourhoods, decent and affordable housing, accessible community programs and services, and by fostering a renewed involvement and commitment in community among residents” (United Way of Greater Toronto and the Canadian Council on Social Development, 2004). As well, they recommend investing in social infrastructure. They state that, “Community funders and government at all levels must work together to build long-term, multi-pronged solutions for stronger neighbourhoods in Toronto. This includes investments in new social infrastructure in high needs neighbourhoods, sustainable funding for existing and new social service organizations, and new investments to help local citizens and community groups develop ownership of their communities and become active participants in the development of solutions to local community problems” (United Way of Greater Toronto and the Canadian Council on Social Development, 2004).

What do Canadian Communities Need?

It has been recommended that communities need to have both ‘magnets and glue’ to compete successfully. ‘Magnets’ are the forces that attract a flow of external resources – new people or new companies. The flow might involve customers, outside investors, foreign companies, students, business travelers, or immigrants. Communities also need social ‘glue’ – the social infrastructure that contributes to social cohesion and promotes the economic and social well-being of all members of the community. Many of the community’s magnets, especially social and cultural infrastructure, are also the glue (Cook, 2004).

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) has identified that the social health and vibrancy of communities depends on more than a strong economy. “People need safe, enjoyable communities with adequate housing, recreational and developmental opportunities, and especially, a supportive environment for their children. They need all citizens to be included, to share the wealth of the community” (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2003b). FCM proposes the beginning of a ‘whole community’ approach

to social needs. They recommend that municipal governments, faced with providing much of this fabric, need stable funding for “social infrastructure” – the material fabric of the community.

They acknowledge that while the responsibilities and needs of the municipal governments vary from province to province and place to place, it is evident that most share the need for ‘children’s infrastructure’ providing universal access to an environment free from social, physical, cultural and economic barriers to participation. They also recommend that there is a need for more assistance to communities for affordable housing and to help house and support homeless Canadians. They stress that there is a need to ensure that the many potential partners in government, the non-profit and private sectors in providing the social infrastructure for cities are aware of each other in order to share their approaches and coordinate their work (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2003b).

The Inclusive Cities Canada Project of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities has identified five dimensions that define the ‘inclusivity’ of a city:

1. **Diversity** – How well do public institutions, such as local government, the police and justice system, and public education, provide valued recognition and respond to diverse groups in the population?
2. **Human Development** – What opportunities exist for children and youth to develop their talents, skills and capacities to contribute to the community?
3. **Civic Engagement** – What are cities and communities doing to promote active participation in local government, community organizations and civic life?
4. **Living Conditions** – Are there significant differences in levels of income, decent jobs, safe neighbourhoods and the availability of affordable housing among city residents?
5. **Community Services** – How well is your city served by important public services such as health care, crisis, and transportation services?

There is an opportunity now for federal leadership in developing social infrastructure in Canadian communities. The federal government has a long recognized role in creating enabling environments. Municipal and local governments are particularly sensitive to the social needs of their communities. The federal government could show leadership through the ‘Cities/Communities Initiative’ by expanding the dialogue and the policy platform of the Initiative’s agenda to include social infrastructure. This would allow the federal government to address pressing social issues. It would also provide a platform to build local multi-sectoral partnerships with all levels of government, the charitable non-profit sector and business.

Investing in local social infrastructure could be achieved through a funded federal program, such as a ‘Community Social Infrastructure Initiatives Program’. Funding for social infrastructure would include not only ‘bricks and mortar’ but programs, services and network-building. Local leadership with citizen involvement in identifying and addressing solutions to urgent community needs would be a key component for success. The role of the charitable non-profit sector as a broker and catalyst for community

development is undisputed. Partnerships and multi-sectoral approaches that promoted a high degree of coordination could form the basis of criteria for funding.

Public Spaces – Family Places

“Public Spaces – Family Places” is an example of an initiative that could be funded through a “Community Social Infrastructure Fund”. Over the past two years the National Children’s Alliance has been working with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities out of a shared understanding of the importance of quality, safe and accessible recreation opportunities for children and youth. More than twenty-five percent of our children are not active enough to promote healthy growth and development. Access to recreation is not available for too many Canadian children – and becoming less so (Canadian Council on Social Development, 2001).

Public parks and community centres do not just benefit children, they also promote vibrant neighbourhoods. “Public Spaces – Family Places” would support development and maintenance of inclusive community play spaces, recreation opportunities and family-oriented community centres. It would also be important to include funding for pilot programs that engage citizens in service delivery through multi-sectoral partnerships. It provides a way to support distressed neighbourhoods and communities and to address revitalization of urban cores.

Examples of Infrastructure Investment Approaches and Projects

There are a number of infrastructure investment approaches and projects in other jurisdictions that provide examples. While a number of them are targeted towards distressed or disadvantaged neighbourhoods only, their lessons are relevant to many communities.

Investing in Infrastructure: Principles of Governance Relationships

Bradford, (2003), reviewed the literature regarding urban innovation and studied innovative practices in eleven cities in Canada, Europe and the United States. While he found that there is no single model to making change, certain key ingredients were identified. He found seven building blocks in successful community-based innovation:

1. The emergence of local champions
2. The formation of institutional intermediaries
3. A commitment to equitable participation
4. A civic culture of creativity
5. The provision of financial and technical resources
6. Robust accountability mechanisms
7. Development of indicators to benchmark progress.

The general dynamics of innovation were the same, combining bottom-up strategies with top-down support from higher levels of governments. Further, the mechanism or vehicle

for planning and implementing change took a similar form: public-private partnerships that supplied an infrastructure for collaboration, learning and investment. Such partnerships were typically anchored institutionally in dedicated agencies or bodies with the visibility and legitimacy to coordinate input from the public, private and voluntary sectors (Bradford, 2003).

Bradford found lessons for policy actors at all levels of government. The goal should be *multi-level governance* that allocates roles and responsibilities in relation to the comparative advantage of each government in contributing to community-based innovation. Municipalities are best able to convene the actors for partnerships, to undertake land use and development planning for inclusive urban and metropolitan spaces, and to work with other local authorities – school boards, band councils, social service agencies, and so on – to secure upper level policy support and ensure its fit with local conditions. Provincial and federal are variously equipped to supply resources to local actors for building the infrastructure. They can also facilitate inter-local sharing of experiences by sponsoring the “scaling-up” of community demonstration projects and by transferring best practice lessons from one locale to another.

Lessons Learned from Launching Large-Scale Community Revitalization Initiatives: Voices from the Empowerment Zones

The Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community Initiative, launched by the federal government in the US in collaboration with local communities, was designed to help revitalize deeply distressed urban and rural areas. In 1994, over 100 communities received a ten-year designation as either an Empowerment Zone or an Enterprise Community – both of which involved significant funding. For communities to become Empowerment Zones or Enterprise Communities, they had to involve a broad range of stakeholders, including community residents, to develop plans and structure governance and management. Beyond this mandate for broad-based inclusion, federal directions regarding the expected content of the plans were remarkably few, reflecting the conviction that each community would be in the best position to assess its own assets and needs and to select the most appropriate priorities and strategies. Each community was encouraged to consider comprehensive approaches that would address simultaneously economic development, human development and strengthening of the social infrastructure. There was great variation among the applications and among the designated sites – with the result that the EZ/EC Initiative is not a single undertaking but over 100 different efforts.

The Annie E. Casey foundation, known for encouraging those with firsthand experience in community revitalization to speak openly about the challenges and achievements of their endeavours, commissioned a “Voices” project to capture the experiences from the perspective of managers and community stakeholders. They found that in spite of the diversity of the sites, a number of common themes and experiences emerged (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2002).

- A genuinely inclusive process harnesses the respective strengths of a wide variety of stakeholders, so that all are pulling together to achieve the desired outcomes. An important part of an inclusive process is capacity-building to enhance the knowledge and skills of stakeholders.
- Sustainability is derived both from the way in which resources are invested and from the relationships and capacity that are built among key leaders, institutions, and organizations within a community. To have a sustainable impact, funding should not be viewed as new grants, but as investment capital to seed change and provide a renewable resource for the community. Identifying and building the capacity of key partner organizations that will continue in existence beyond the specific revitalization effort create a foundation for supporting the long-term vitality of the community. This foundation is strengthened by the development of “community intelligence,” or residents’ expertise on subjects like the nuts and bolts of economic development, and by the opportunity for residents and other stakeholders to get to know one another and to work together effectively.
- Discretion in how resources can be used is empowering, but it also can bring challenges in establishing clear priorities and appropriate processes. It is important to provide adequate time and resources for the planning phase of an endeavour, if communities are to be able to take full advantage of flexibility to develop their own solutions.
- The high level of need in many communities, competition from multiple constituencies for funding, and the need to show results make strategic choices about the use of funding is especially important. Even though a comprehensive perspective is key to effective community revitalization, implementers must be careful not to spread their efforts too thinly.
- It is important to change “business as usual” so that local government works in a more inclusive way with distressed communities – this requires both vision and political will inside government and strong community-based capacity outside government.

Neighbourhood Renewal in the UK

The Government of the UK has set out a National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (NSNR) Action Plan. The Government’s vision is “to narrow the gap between poor neighbourhoods and the rest of the country, so that within 10 to 20 years, no one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live. People on low incomes should not have to suffer conditions and services that are failing, and so different from what the rest of the population receives.” The vision is reflected in two long-term goals: in all the poorest neighbourhoods, to have common goals of lower worklessness and crime, and better health, skills, housing and physical environment; and to narrow the gap on these measures between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country. There are three key dimensions to what they call a ‘more comprehensive approach’: new policies, funding and targets; better local coordination and community empowerment; and national and regional support. The Strategy puts in place Neighbourhood Management and Local Strategic Partnerships for empowering residents and getting public, private and voluntary organizations to work in partnership.

Extended Schools will be used to provide a range of services of benefit to young people, their parents and other members of the community. The services will include study support, childcare, family and adult learning, and health and social services and will be provided on, or near, the school site on a “dawn to dusk” basis. Schools will choose to provide one or more of the services in response to local needs and preferences and depending on the facilities it can make available. Evidence suggests that learning and other family support services offered through extended schools can have a positive impact on children’s achievements. This initiative will make a significant impact in Neighbourhood Renewal areas where the school can be a major focal point for the community. Local Strategic Partnerships will have an important role to play in helping to articulate and broker needs and service provision.

Investing in Communities: Making Connections

Based on Annie E Casey Foundation’s research which has shown that children do better when their families are strong, and families do better when they live in communities that help them to succeed, the Foundation has launched Making Connections (MC). It is a ten-year investment by the Annie E. Casey Foundation to improve the outcomes for families and children in tough or isolated neighbourhoods.

Each Making Connections site works with a team to help promote family neighbourhood strengthening in a variety of ways, from a targeted effort toward one particular challenge to engaging in a full array of strategies all at once. It is up to those involved to decide how to proceed in their community. Efforts are concentrated around three premises that the Foundation believes are essential to successful outcomes for these families: creating the opportunity to earn a decent living and build assets; building close ties with family, neighbours, kin, faith communities and civic groups; and having reliable services close to home. What is particularly noteworthy about this initiative is that the Foundation has a set of six Core Results – measurable improvements in child and family well-being. In the next several years they will be tracking their progress toward – and holding themselves accountable to – the following outcomes:

- Families have increased earnings and income
- Families have increased levels of assets
- Children are healthy and ready to succeed in school
- Families, youth and neighbourhoods increase their civic participation.
- Families and neighbourhoods have strong informal supports and networks.
- Families have access to quality services and supports that work for them.

MC sites are located in a number of cities across the country. With support and guidance provided through this initiative, MC sites share their experience, know-how and ideas with each other about what works. The Casey Foundation claims that this grassroots upswelling is what is defining and helping neighbourhoods rebuild and revitalize as vibrant communities. Here are some examples of what the sites are engaged in:

- *Making Connections Indianapolis* has helped advance the community school model across the city. For the past several years, Making Connections has

worked with residents, parents, teachers, principals and school system officials to develop Washington Community School, a formerly shuttered high school on the city's near west side that now offers more than 30 health, recreation, adult education and social services to the neighbourhood from its campus, and has enlisted a broad range of community partners in school improvement and community revitalization efforts.

- *Making Connections Detroit* is engaging community leaders and families in innovative school reform strategies. Making Connections Detroit is helping local public schools and community groups blend community-building efforts with those focused on improving school performance. Recent efforts have focused on creating a network of 13 community-based learning centers to provide after school and other programs.
- *Making Connections San Diego* has formed the Bronze Triangle Community Development Corporation which has opened family resource center, led neighbourhood beautification efforts, and convened a series of community meetings to help residents of San Diego's Logan, Grant Hill and Stockton neighbourhoods chart a course for local revitalization.

References

- Andrew C, Graham K and Phillips S. *Urban Affairs: Back on the Policy Agenda*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.
- Annie E. Casey Foundation. *Voices From the Empowerment Zones*. Baltimore: The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2002.
- Beauvais C. *Learning through Recreation: Literature Review*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks, 2001.
- Boyle MH and Lipman EL. *Do Places Matter: A Multilevel Analysis of Geographic Variations in Child Behaviour in Canada*. Hull: Applied Research Branch of Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada, 1998.
- Bradford N. *Cities and Communities that Work: Innovative Practices, Enabling Policies*. Ottawa: CPRN Discussion Paper F/32, 2003.
- Bradford N. *Place Matters and Multi-level Governance: Perspectives on a New Urban Policy Paradigm*. Ottawa: CPRN, 2004.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., Aber, J. L. (Editors) (1997). *Neighbourhood Poverty: Context and Consequences for Children*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Browne G, Byrne C, Roberts J, Gafni A, Watt S, Ewart B, Schuster M, Underwood J, Flynn Kingston S, Rennick K, Thomas I and Haldane S. *When the Bough Breaks: Provider-Initiated Comprehensive Care is More Effective and Less Expensive For Sole Support Parents on Social Assistance*. Hamilton: McMaster University, 1998a.
- Browne G, Byrne C, Roberts J, Gafni A, Watt S, Haldane S, Thomas I, Ewart B, Schuster M, Underwood J, Flynn Kingston S, Rennick K. *Benefiting All the Beneficiaries of Social Assistance is "Within Our Reach": A RCT of the Two-Year Effects and Expense of Subsidized versus Non-subsidized Quality Child Care/Recreation for Children on Social Assistance*. Hamilton: McMaster University, 1998b.
- Canadian Coalition on the Rights of Children (CCRC). *The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child: How Does Canada Measure Up?* Ottawa: Canadian Coalition on the Rights of Children, 1999.
- Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD). *The Progress of Canada's Children: 2001*. Ottawa: CCSD, 2001.
- Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD). *The Progress of Canada's Children: 2002*. Ottawa: CCSD, 2002.

Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute. *Physical Activity Monitor*. Ottawa: Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute, 2000.

Chase-Lansdale PL and Gordon RA. Economic hardship and the development of five- and six-year-olds: Neighbourhood and regional perspectives. *Child Development*, 67:3338-67, 1996.

Connor S and Brink S. *Understanding the Early Years - Community Impacts on Child Development*. Ottawa: Applied Research Branch, Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada, August 1999.

Cook D. A World of Cities: New Urban Roles in a Global Village. *Perspectives: The City of Calgary Community Strategies*. Winter, 2004.

Dreier P, Mollenkopf J and Swanstrom T. *Place Matters: Metropolitcs for the Twenty-First Century*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the National Children's Alliance and the Canadian Parks and Recreation Association. *Public Spaces, Family Places – Essential to Canada's Children and Youth*. Ottawa: The Authors, December 2002.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Policy Statement on Municipal Infrastructure*. Federation of Canadian Municipalities, June 2003a.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Proposal for Community Social Infrastructure: Draft for Discussion*. Ottawa: FCM, 2003b.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Early Warning: Will Canadian Cities Compete? A Comparative Overview of Municipal Government in Canada, the United States and Europe*. Ottawa: Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2001.

Freiler C, Rothman L and Barata P. Campaign 2000. *Pathways to Progress: Structural Solutions to Address Child Poverty*. Toronto: Campaign 2000, 2004.

Gelphart M. Neighbourhoods and communities as contexts for development. In J Brooks-Gunn, GJ Duncan and JL Aber, Eds., *Neighborhood Poverty, Vol. 1. Context and Consequences for Children*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 1-43, 1997.

Glouberman S, Campsie P, Gemar M and Miller G. *A Toolbox for Improving Health in Cities: A Discussion Paper*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2003.

Hanvey L. Access to recreation programs in Canada. *Perception*. (24)4: 9-12, 2001.

Helliwell J. Social capital: Editorial. *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research* 2(1): Spring, 6-10, 2001.

Hertzman C, McLean S, Kohen D, Dunn J and Evans T. *Early Development in Vancouver: Report of the Community Asset Mapping Project*. Vancouver: Human Early Learning Partnership, 2002.

Inclusive Cities Canada: A Cross-Canada Civic Initiative. *Project Overview*. 2004.
www.socialplanningtoronto.org

Jackson A, Roberts P and Harman S. *Learning through Recreation: Data Analysis and Review*. Canadian Council on Social Development. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, 2001.

Jenson J and Mahon R. *Bringing Cities to the Table: Child Care and Intergovernmental Relations*. Ottawa: CPRN Discussion Paper F/26, 2002.

Kremarik F. A family affair: Children's participation in sports. *Canadian Social Trends*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Autumn 2000.

KSI Research International Inc. *Understanding the Early Years: Early Childhood Development in Hampton/Sussex, New Brunswick*. Applied Research Branch, Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada, April, 2003.

Lee K. *Urban Poverty in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, 2000.

Mahon R and Beauvais C. *School-aged Children across Canada: A Patchwork of Public Policies*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks, 2001.

National Children's Alliance. *Brief to the Standing Committee on Finance*. Ottawa: National Children's Alliance, October, 2002.

National Children's Alliance. *Brief to the Standing Committee on Finance*. Ottawa: National Children's Alliance, October, 2003.

OECD. *Local Partnerships for Better Governance*. Paris: OECD, 2001.

OECD. *Territorial Review: Canada*. Paris: OECD, 2002.

OECD. *Early Childhood Education and Care Policy: Canada Country Note*. Paris: OECD, 2004.

Offord DR, Lipman E and Duku, E. *Sports, the Arts and Community Programs: Rates and Correlates of Participation*. Workshop Paper for: Investing in Children: A National Research Conference, 1998.

Offord D, Lipman E, and Duku E. *Poverty, civic communities and children's participation in supervised sports*. *Applied Research Bulletin*, Fall, 1999.

Peters R.DeV., Arnold R, Petrunka K, Angus DE, Belanger J-M, Boyce W, Brophy K, Burke SO, Cameron G, Craig W, Evers S, Herry Y, Mamatis D, Nelson G, Pancer SM, Roberts-Fiati G, Russell CC and Towson S. *Better Beginnings, Better Futures: A comprehensive, community-based project for early childhood development. Highlights of Lessons Learned*. Kingston, Ontario: Better Beginnings, Better Futures Research Coordination Unit Technical Report, 2004.

Putnam R. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.

Save the Children Canada. *A Canada Fit for Children*, July, 2001.

Shumoa L, Vandell DL and Posnter J. Perceptions of danger: A psychological mediator of neighborhood demographic characteristics. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 68:468-78, 1998.

Soubhi H, Raina P and Kohen D. *Effects of Neighbourhood, Family and Child Behaviour on Childhood Injury in Canada*. Working Paper W-01-1-6E. Ottawa: Applied Research Branch, Human Resources Development Canada, 2001.

Statistics Canada. National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth: Participation in activities. *The Daily*, May 30, 2001d.

TD Economics. A Choice Between Investing in Canada's Cities or Disinvesting Canada's Future. 2002.

Torjman S. *Community Renewal*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2004a.

Torjman S, Levite-Reid E and Cabaj M. Who Does What in Comprehensive Community Initiatives? Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2004a.

Torjman S. Culture and Recreation: Links to Well-Being. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2004b.

Torjman S and Leviten-Reid E. *Comprehensive Community Initiatives*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2003.

Tremblay RE, Boulerice B, Foster H, Romano E, Hagan J and Swisher R. *Multi-Level Effects on Behaviour Outcomes in Canadian Children*. Working Paper W-01-2E. Ottawa: Applied Research Branch, Human Resources Development Canada, 2001.

Tremblay MS and Willms JD. Secular trends in the body mass index of Canadian children. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 163(11):1429-1433, 2000.

United Way of Greater Toronto and the Canadian Council on Social Development.
Poverty by Postal Code: The Geography of Neighbourhood Poverty: 1981-2001.
Toronto: United Way of Greater Toronto, 2004.

Vander Ploeg C. *A Capital Question: Infrastructure in Western Canada's Big Six.*
Canada West Foundation, 2003.

Willms JD. Editor. *Vulnerable Children.* Edmonton: University of Alberta Press and
Applied Research Branch, Human Resources Development Canada, 2002.

Wilson WJ. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public
Policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.