PERRY WORLD HOUSE
University of Pennsylvania

Prospects for Institutional and Policy Reform on International Migration and Refugees

POST-COLLOQUIUM REPORT

APRIL 2018 GLOBAL SHIFTS COLLOQUIUM

Prospects for Institutional and Policy Reform on International Migration and Refugees

Perry World House 2018 Global Shifts Colloquium

Introduction

The Perry World House inaugural research theme, *Global Shifts: Urbanization, Migration, and Demography*, examines key policy questions at the intersection of these three trends that are collectively transforming the world in profound ways. Within these broader shifts, the 2018 Global Shifts Colloquium focused on the prospects for institutional and policy reform on international migration and refugees.

This report recaps and distills the discussions, findings, and recommendations of two days of collaboration among policy-makers, practitioners, and academics. The colloquium lifted and advanced policy implications centered on five issues:

- Prospects for institutional, legal, and policy reforms;
- Evidence-based national immigration policies;
- Tools and techniques for shaping and evaluating policy and practice;
- Media's role in shaping the public's view of refugees and migrants; and
- Policy reform in practice.

Perry World House convened the colloquium in response to overwhelming evidence that typical solutions are not working. Our goal was to bring an interdisciplinary group together, to bridge the academia-policy divide and think deeply and collectively about innovative ideas and solutions. The discussions focused on longer-term planning, looking ahead five to ten years. Governments' responses to the current state of migration have been chaotic, ill-planned, uneven, and inconsistent. While institutions have failed to deal with the challenge, domestic politics have become further entrenched and xenophobic. Simultaneously, local organizations lack the support and capacity to fully respond, and are further hindered by coordination gaps among international, national, and local actors. The 2018 Global Shifts Colloquium aimed to advance policy insights addressing various aspects of these challenges as they pertain to international migration and refugees. The sections below highlight the results.

Panel 1: Evaluating Prospects for Institutional, Legal, and Policy Reforms on International Migration and Refugees

- **Rey Koslowski,** Associate Professor and Director of the Master of International Affairs Program, Rockefeller College of Public Affairs & Policy, SUNY Albany
- **Jaya Ramji-Nogales,** I. Herman Stern Research Professor and Co-Director, Institute for International Law and Public Policy, Temple University
- **Barbara Rijks,** Head of Mission Coordination Unit in Baghdad, International Organization for Migration
- **Sarah Paoletti,** Practice Professor of Law and Director of the Transnational Legal Clinic, University of Pennsylvania Law School (*Moderator*)

Approximately 250 million people are currently international migrants, 65 million of whom have been forcibly displaced from their homes. These numbers are the largest in history and are stretching the capacity of institutions designed for a different era and context. While there are debates about the effectiveness of the current migration and refugee systems, most scholars, policy-makers, and practitioners agree that the status quo is inadequate. The panel

addressed the prospects for institutional, legal, and policy reforms regarding international migration and refugees, specifically the following questions:

- How do these institutions increase their capacity (both human and financial) to manage an ever-increasing caseload of people on the move—many fleeing protracted crises—while holding on to their central aim of protection (both legal and material)?
- How does the international community transform a system designed to respond to short-term crises into one which addresses the long-term, protracted emergencies that are increasingly the norm?
- How should actors operate within structures that require contributions from states (financial, material, resettlement) in a global environment of compassion fatigue? And in which sovereignty claims take precedence over legal obligations?
- How should growing crises be managed when the political incentives for states to participate in and contribute to international responses are absent or drastically reduced?

Three themes emerged from the discussion of how to tackle these difficult questions, including the need to:

- Accept migrants as the human face of globalization in the reality of our interconnected world;
- Shift from the national to the sub-national level in addressing refugee and migrant challenges; and,
- View refugees and migrants as community resources rather than simply persons with protection and labor needs.

Migration as the Human Face of Globalization

Through the process of globalization, the flow of goods and services became easier and more widespread, technology facilitated communication to people and places throughout the world, and the movement of persons expanded dramatically as costs reduced and interests and opportunities expanded. In the 1990s, the idea of a "borderless world" became the dominant discourse, and transnational communities such as the European Union (EU) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) were heralded as globalized political systems. However, following the September 11th attacks, the 2008 economic crash, and the recent resurgence of populism, the free flow of goods and people has begun to be questioned. While trade protectionism is gaining traction in some parts of the world, most have accepted that at least some international trade will persist and is beneficial. However, the flow of people is often seen as something that can (and for some, should) be stopped.

The colloquium panelists challenged this notion and proposed reframing the debate as accepting migration as a reality of our interconnected world and a natural corollary to globalization, rather than approaching migration as a problem with a solution involving limiting the quantity of migrants. Though this may seem like a simple issue of framing, accepting migration as a natural human condition shifts the dialogue from that of developing solutions to a problem, to that of developing a new approach to an existing reality.

The panel suggested a new holistic, nuanced, and interdisciplinary approach that understands the complexity of factors that give rise to migration. The current institutional framework attempts to manage

and protect rights by viewing migration as the central issue, although a host of other issues lead to and result from migration. Not surprisingly, this is unproductive. By approaching migration holistically, these issues can be strategically addressed through considering the interests of those with various perspectives and interests and shifting the focus and unit of analysis and action for research and policy-making.

Shifting from the National to the Sub-National

While the state persists as the hegemonic unit of analysis for international politics and law, addressing the challenges of migration requires a shift in focus beyond the national to the sub-national level. One way to do this is to think about the transnational movement of people more broadly, looking at all levels of the law: international, national, sub-national, and regional/local. The law should be conceptualized as a legal ecosystem, designed to facilitate an alignment of the diverse interests outlined above. For example, much of the current focus is on entry of migrants, rather than the full range of movements. Expanding the lens beyond who gets in and how, to outflows, cycles through, and other forms of movement would be fruitful.

In addition, due to the national focus of migration challenges, state policies are under the most scrutiny. Regulating migration is framed as one of the last bastions of sovereignty. One response to this is shifting our gaze from the state and national policies to the sub-national level, particularly municipalities. The voice of municipalities is missing in these discussions, despite some of the most innovative, productive solutions originating at the city level. Not only are municipalities pioneering new strategies for refugee and migrant integration, but also they are able to advocate from the bottom up with national governments. Rather than top-down international negotiations that liaise directly with states, perhaps a bottom-up municipality-centric strategy is the answer.

Refugees and Migrants as Resources

Rather than try to regulate migration, we need to think about human mobility more broadly, as well as human capacity. This could help bridge the unproductive divide between migrant and refugee advocates—a rift so serious that two separate Global Compacts were created (among other reasons). The panelists often collapsed or minimized the divide between the two groups: refugees need work and labor migrants need protection, for example. Thus, migrants should be seen as whole persons with multifaceted, complex needs, but also multifaceted capabilities. The conversation is often "how to deal with" or "help" migrants and refugees, but little emphasis is placed on what they can contribute. Approaching migration as an opportunity to redistribute human capital more effectively could improve the dialogue about safe and lawful movement for all persons. Finally, and perhaps most glaringly, the voices of migrants themselves are often absent in these conversations. They must be included as key stakeholders driving the discussion in the new global reality of a more interconnected world.

Recommendations

Three policy recommendations originated from this panel:

- Shift the dialogue around migrants and refugees from a problem that needs to be solved to a new reality that needs to be accepted;
- Bring municipalities to the center of policy discussions on refugees and migration: cities have taken the lead in responding to these new residents, and their strategies and approaches should be analyzed and shared; and,

- Include migrants as key stakeholders in policies that affect them and their communities; programs should not be developed for them but in collaboration with them.

Panel 2: Using Standardized Mechanisms and Criteria to Establish National Immigration and Refugee Policies: Opportunities and Challenges

- **Michael Fix,** Senior Fellow, Migration Policy Institute
- **Randall Hansen,** Professor of Political Science and Interim Director, Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto
- **Michael Jones-Correa,** Professor of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania
- **Loren Landau,** Professor and Director, African Center for Migration and Society, University of the Witwatersrand
- **Beth Simmons,** Andrea Mitchell University Professor of Law and Political Science, University of Pennsylvania (*Moderator*)

Over the past two decades, immigration—particularly asylum—policy has become one of the most salient issues in global politics. Increasing refugee arrivals to Europe have intensified the impact of immigration and refugee policy on global politics, with shifts in the scale and scope of refugee protection and support challenges over the past few years. Moreover, the duration of conflicts leading to displacement have lengthened, and the domestic and international politics around refugees have become more contentious. Refugee policy thus became a highly politicized issue during several European elections, from the anti-immigrant and anti-refugee political messaging of the Brexit campaign (Kaufmann, 2016), to Italy's 2018 presidential election and Hungary's 2016 election (Than, 2018). Similarly, the United States of America's 2016 presidential election saw the success of Donald Trump, who strongly emphasized a tough stance on immigration, justified as "absolutely appropriate for... protecting citizens" (Sarah Huckabee Sanders, January 22, 2018). In light of these developments, panelists discussed the mechanisms through which evidence-based policy can help to depoliticize immigration and refugee issues. They were called upon to reflect on the following questions:

- What criteria should be considered when establishing a national immigration or refugee policy? What type of process would lead to a more objective, informed policy on immigration and refugees?
- Is there proof that use of a more evidence-based approache to migration and refugee policies yields different/better outcomes?
- Is there reason to believe such evidence-based policies could depoliticize the issues and make them more acceptable/less threatening to key audiences?
- Are there ways that academic expertise, ranging from labor economics to humanitarian crisis prediction, can help inform or engage in such evidence-based processes?

Throughout the discussion, three themes emerged regarding the possibilities for evidence-based policy to curb the politicization of refugee policy, including the need to:

- Define what policy-makers consider evidence, and what indicators of refugee resettlement and integration are valued;

- Determine how evidence-based approaches may best overcome the securitization of the refugee issue and invigorate civil society engagement with refugee policy and integration; and,
- Undertake qualitative research that is mindful of concerns for social cohesion and stability, which often undermine the potential of evidence to positively influence policy.

Defining Evidence

Panelists highlighted several difficulties in defining evidence pertinent to immigration policy in their discussion. Namely, they observed that policy-makers express exasperation with how academics voice their expertise in written and oral communication. As such, it is crucial to define reliable objective evidence that is both useful to policy-makers and replicable across academic studies of forced migration. This includes opening avenues of communication between policy-makers and academics regarding the indicators of refugee resettlement that are relevant and valued, including economic indicators of employment, income, taxation, and return on investment of resettlement assistance. Qualitative indicators should include measures of language acquisition; cultural integration; and contribution to the local culture through music, art, food, and other forms of cultural participation.

Civil Society Participation

Panelists emphasized the need to incorporate the input of stakeholders within civil society in the refugee policy-making and resettlement processes. Large-scale indicators that inform macro-policies (such as allocating refugees according to responsibility-sharing criteria among states) often overlook the complexities of individual host states. Thus, panelists suggested that involving community leaders and political party representatives at the local level would reinforce policy with an understanding of the local context in ways that would help address potential obstacles to integration. Ultimately, the inclusion and maintenance of vibrant civil society participation will draw a wider range of stakeholders to support refugee integration in host states.

Evidence is Necessary, but Not Sufficient

Panelists also pointed out that the assumption that more evidence can help overcome political volatility is erroneous. While evidence that points to economic contributions of migrants and refugees is useful, such evidence does not address concerns prevalent in public opinion that perceive refugees as representing a “threat to their way of life.” As such, a definition of evidence should include the linguistic and cultural integration of refugees, with measures of their educational attainment, language skills, and cultural contributions to their host states.

Recommendations

The invited panelists reflected on the difficulty of evidence-based immigration policy-making and data collection, but provided the following recommendations:

- There is a need to provide evidence that addresses the cultural and linguistic concerns of the public as well as socio-economic indicators that measure the impact of refugees on the economy;
- Effective migration evidence needs to employ complementary quantitative measures of economic, demographic, and linguistic integration with qualitative data that provide a holistic view of the impact of migration, particularly refugee resettlement, on society;

- The technocratic mode of resettlement has some unsettling implications if applied without allowing opportunities for local and regional engagement and accountability local context and resources; and,
- Evidence-based policy must always be practiced with a recognition of the limitations of data statisticians and the pitfalls of algorithms that measure refugee integration.

Panel 3: Looking Over the Horizon: Tools for Informing and Evaluating Policies to Prepare for the Crises of 2050

- **Chenoa Flippen,** Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania
- **Ammar Malik,** Senior Research Associate, Urban Institute
- **Graeme Rodgers,** Research Technical Advisor, International Rescue Committee
- **Emilio Parrado,** Dorothy Swaine Thomas Professor of Sociology; Chair, Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania (*Moderator*)

In looking to the future of migration, technological solutions and improved data collection are crucial to preparing for the crises of 2050. The first objective outlined in the UN Global Compact for Migration is to: "collect and utilize accurate and disaggregated data as a basis for evidence-based policies." Although a commitment to an objective is not the same as its delivery, the prominent placement of data and evidence (in both the Compact for Migration and on Refugees) highlights a top-level commitment to obtaining the information necessary to inform and evaluate refugee and migrant policies. The questions posed to this panel included how data practices need to change to better inform and evaluate policies on refugees and migration, thirty years from now:

- How do we improve data collection within and across states while keeping refugee and migrant information safe and secure?
- Will improved evidence about effective refugee and migrant programming increase resources from, and responsibility sharing by, states?
- How can states' labor needs be balanced or matched with high levels of emigration from other states?
- How can climate change be proactively tackled rather than reacting to its consequences?

While not all of these questions were answered in the colloquium, particularly the last two, responses to the first two questions were discussed in detail. Four themes emerged from the panel:

- The need for a longer-term focus;
- The difficulties of data collection;
- The need for migrant inclusion; and
- The politicization of data.

Longer-Term Tracking and Analysis

While migration data is often used to confirm or reject various migration policies, researchers of immigrant integration are more interested in the long-term results. They investigate not only how the migrants themselves are doing but how their children and grandchildren are faring. By 2050, these researchers want to know how well the current policies have worked, and what has helped or hindered immigrant inclusion. One

of the best metrics for this is the success of second-generation immigrants. However, in order to capture this, higher quality data, consistently tracked over a longer period of time, are necessary to fully evaluate success or failure. This is hard to do given short political and funding lifecycles and the challenges outlined below. However, extending the temporal lens of data collection is essential to fully understanding the migrant story.

Challenges of Data Collection

"Collecting data on immigrants is one of the most challenging things we can do." There are multiple reasons for this, including: lack of separate data on immigrants and refugees; most data coming from small-scale policy surveys; non-continuous measurement during data collection; and the complication of assessing groups over time due to people entering and exiting the system. In addition, current surveys do a poor job identifying second-generation migrants and refugees because many successful second-generation migrants opt out of various ethnic or other labels. While there is the potential for big data to help overcome some of these challenges, permissions, incentives, and institutionalization must be critically assessed. In the wake of the Cambridge Analytica scandal, data security must be at the core of any data collection initiative. Particularly given the monetization of data by the private sector, questions of data ownership and protection (especially of sensitive information on refugees and migrants) must be considered.

Migrant Inclusion

One way to improve current data collection practices is to incorporate refugees and migrants into the process of designing and conducting surveys. The high-level technocratic experts leading many of these initiatives may not fully understand the refugee experience, while refugee voices are often silenced due to limited opportunities for their engagement. This leads to a misrepresentation or lack of consideration of their experiences. Further, refugees should play a part in larger, overall policy discussions on how to more effectively engage refugee communities in data collection practices.

Politicization of Data

Demographic data has become increasingly politicized and polarizing. This not only undermines the credibility of reputable data and survey institutes that specialize in data collection, but also discredits the safety and security of the data collection itself and discourages responses from the target communities. The 2020 U.S. Census debates illustrate these challenges, with more work needed to ensure data can be collected without bias and findings can be presented and understood as important facts.

Recommendations

While this panel focused on the role of data in responding to migration challenges, additional work remains on how to balance or match labor needs to immigration and emigration flows, as well as how data can be used to proactively plan for and tackle climate change and climate-induced migration. Some of the recommendations from the discussion included:

- Donors should fund multi-year, longitudinal research grants to track migrants over the course of twenty to thirty years, to fully capture data from subsequent generations;
- Immigrants and refugees should be included in policy discussions on how to improve data collection within their communities, and in the design and conduct of surveys; and,

- The essential apolitical nature of demographic data collection, especially the census, must be preserved, as well as that of findings from credible academic researchers.

Panel 4: How Media Portrayals of Migrants and Refugees Influence Public Opinion and Prospects for Policy Reform

- **Sumita Chakravarty,** Associate Professor of Media Studies, The New School
- **Diana C. Mutz,** Samuel A. Stouffer Professor of Political Science and Communication; Director, Institute for the Study of Citizens and Politics, University of Pennsylvania
- **Bill Orme,** UN Representative, Global Forum for Media Development; Advisor, Ethical Journalism Network
- **Emily Wilson,** Professor of Classical Studies, University of Pennsylvania
- **Graeme Wood,** National Correspondent, The Atlantic; PWH Visiting Fellow
- **Marwan Kraidy,** Professor of Communication; Director, Center for Advanced Research in Global Communication, University of Pennsylvania (*Moderator*)

Editors, newsroom staff, journalists, and broadcasters play an important role in shaping political reality by choosing and displaying what news is covered (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Moreover, in framing the refugee debate within a particular set of thematic issues—such as national security, humanitarian concerns, economic opportunity, or labor market competition—media coverage contributes to how an issue is publicly viewed and discussed by policy-makers. To interrogate this framing, this panel explored the consequences of the language and perspectives disseminated through media coverage while reflecting on the following questions:

- What is the relationship between the language and imagery used by the media to describe migrants and refugees, and public opinion?
- How does the portrayal of migrants and refugees differ across media platforms and across states?
- What is the relationship between the political discourse on migrants and refugees and how the media covers the issue?
- How do the varying portrayals of refugees and migrants influence policy-making and the potential for policy reform, both in the United States of America and internationally?
- How does the media balance accurate reporting and political tensions?

Three themes emerged from these questions:

- The ethical importance of defining terminology in addressing refugee issues;
- The interaction of news media with fictional and cultural artifacts in framing the debate on immigration; and,
- Strategies for journalists to avoid stereotypes and overcome distrust in mainstream media coverage.

Terminology

Reflecting on the Charter of Rome—a code of ethics drafted by an alliance of journalists and media professionals on the media coverage of forced migration—panelists argued that indeed there is a need to actively discuss

terminology used in the media and work toward language that promotes awareness and avoids incendiary portrayals. Thus, they pointed to the need for media coverage to discuss forced migration in terms that elucidate the legal complexity of migrants' status, differentiating between asylum seekers, refugees, undocumented immigrants, and other legal categories among migrants. This in turn avoids promoting misunderstandings of the situation of forced migrants. Panelists argued that the adoption of accurate and humanizing terminology could spread from one news outlet and media organization to another, using the example of the transition from the term "illegal alien" to "undocumented immigrant" by multiple news organizations in succession to point to that trend.

Journalistic Pitfalls

Panelists also cautioned journalists and media professionals from falling into common pitfalls of storytelling: either in delivering stereotypical stories that perpetuate negative stances toward immigrants, or in providing compelling but unrepresentative examples that champion refugees. The former contributes to the demonization of immigrants and refugees, while the latter positions journalists as advocates for refugees. Instead, panelists stressed that media representation should strive for complex stories that illustrate the broader systematic problems governing forced migration. They also drew on evidence that suggests that stories with named individuals have a positive impact on public opinion, as well as coverage that emphasizes the efforts refugees are making to learn and speak the language of their adopted countries.

A Changing Media Landscape

Finally, panelists outlined that the current news media environment has also transformed the ways in which journalists publish stories on refugee issues, reflecting the dramatic decline in trust in news media; rise of far- and alt-right news sources that distribute negative and false representations of the refugee crisis; and finally resurgence of anti-immigrant, anti-Semitic, and racist populist political movements throughout the world that influence the refugee debate in the media and public discourse. Thus, they recommended that media professionals engage with the far- and alt-right to expose the fallacies they propagate. They also suggested that the most effective response to the current media landscape is to provide complex journalistic storytelling that pulls readers into the story and allows them to empathize with the refugees in order to overcome the impact of hateful rhetoric on the one hand and compassion fatigue on the other.

Recommendations

- Media coverage provides the terminology to address forced migration, making critical linguistic choices in how to portray the issue of refugees. Thus, as panelists discussed media portrayals, they emphasized the importance of the choices made by media professionals in their language and the need for fact-based terminology that addresses refugees without othering them.
- Journalists must avoid common pitfalls of the profession, such as stereotypical stories that either portray refugees as a problematic community or champion them by selecting unrepresentative examples.
- Media professionals must negotiate ways to navigate crucial changes to the media landscape that undermine media credibility and public trust in the information media provide, as issues of credibility directly impact media discourse on refugees.

Panel 5: Policy Reform in Practice: Next Steps

- **Edward Kallon,** UN Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator, Nigeria
- **Kemal Kirisci,** TÜSİAD Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe
- **Saskia Sassen,** Robert S. Lynd Professor of Sociology, Columbia University
- **LaShawn R. Jefferson,** Deputy Director, Perry World House (*Moderator*)

The final panel of the colloquium reflected on the four previous discussions and provided insights into the prospects for reform on migration and refugee policy. More specifically, this panel focused on how to take the ideas presented during the two days and turn them into action.

The following four themes emerged from the concluding panel:

- The need to address the root causes of displacement to prevent crises and their subsequent migration flows;
- The need for policies that bring together all relevant actors, particularly cities and the private sector;
- Using the Global Compacts for Migrants and on Refugees to "work better together"; and,
- The role of development-induced displacement in the broader migration conversation.

Focus on Prevention and Preparedness

As discussed in the first panel, migration is a symptom, not a cause. While many organizations have mandates to respond to the effects of man-made and natural disasters, the panel suggested more attention is needed on prevention and preparedness. Conflict resolution should become a strategy to reduce displacement and migration and to return refugees and migrants home—voluntarily, safely, and as soon as possible. However, while prevention and preparedness merit increased attention, existing humanitarian and development institutions need to be better integrated and donors should adopt multi-year timeframes. Many programs are implemented on twelve-to-eighteen month timelines, which do not allow for longer term planning and create inefficiencies in staffing and program implementation. Thus, donors should provide multi-year funding with multi-year outcome metrics, and should task implementing organizations to focus on both prevention and response.

Expand the Table of Policy-Makers

This panel echoed a theme heard throughout the day about the important role municipalities and urban centers are playing in refugee and migrant responses. However, despite their efforts, they are not currently included in the Global Compacts for Migration and on Refugees. They deserve a seat at the policy-making table. There is a tension between national authorities focused on their borders and elections, and municipal authorities focused on addressing the immediate needs in their jurisdictions. This often results in municipal voices being left out of national-level policy discussions on migration. In addition, national governments may favor municipalities run by the ruling political party to the exclusion of other cities. The disproportionate burden that municipalities are already bearing needs to be recognized; their experiences are invaluable resources for policy-makers at the national and international levels.

Global Compacts as a Launching Pad

While there was much critical discussion about the Global Compacts for Migration and on Refugees, the panel was optimistic about the New York Declaration and subsequent Compacts as a launching pad to "working together better." Although many refugee and migrant host countries in the Global South decry complaints from the Global North about hosting a few thousand refugees while they accommodate hundreds of thousands, the panelists noted that "we might not have had the Global Compacts if the migration crisis has not reached Europe." This experience should be leveraged in order to make a change. Arguably the most important aspect of the Global Compacts that needs to be emphasized is the "responsibility sharing" component. The current asymmetries in refugee and migrant hosting are vast, and this gap must be narrowed if sustainable solutions are to be found.

Development-Induced Displacement

The "push-factors" most closely associated with refugees and migrants are conflict, natural disaster, and lack of economic opportunities. However, the panel identified another migration situation not codified in law: the victims of economic development. Development-induced displacement is a theme in the forced migration literature but one that often falls to the bottom of the list as it usually results in internal displacement, which is already neglected—internal displacement is not addressed by either of the new Global Compacts. Large-scale government development projects often push small-scale or subsistence farmers off their land and into cities with no jobs or opportunities. Many of these people do not cross borders and thus do not register on the international radar. This discussion highlighted the broader importance of internally displaced persons in policy conversations about migration. Over sixty percent of the sixty-five million forcibly displaced persons in the world are internally displaced, and they deserve greater attention from the international community.

Recommendations

- Current refugee and migrant financing is inadequate. We need more diverse and sophisticated financing mechanisms that are flexible, predictable, and consistent—a World Bank program in Jordan was presented as a possible model.
- We need more investment for both displaced populations and refugee host countries. Refugees and migrants cannot be assisted in isolation; policy conversations must be had with host countries about access to skills and labor migration.
- Coordination between national and international actors, as well as national and municipal actors, must be improved. This could be done, in part, through private sector engagement and the opening of markets.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the 2018 Global Shifts Colloquium convened a diverse cohort of academics, policy-makers, and practitioners in the refugee, migration, and media realms to consider the possibilities for evidence-based policy-making to overcome existing challenges. It considered the promise of the proposed reforms in the Global Compacts for Migration and on Refugees, as well as the factors that must be taken into consideration throughout that process. Participants also reflected on the role that media coverage plays in representing migrants and refugees to the public and in influencing debates surrounding immigration and refugee policy. Throughout these discussions, panelists emphasized the need to respond to growing

humanitarian crises with sensitivity and empathy, but also to consider remedies for the systematic issues that have given rise to the protracted flows of forced migrants of the past few decades. They stressed that preventive measures should be adopted to stabilize countries of origin and curb tensions that drive migrant flows. While extreme challenges remain, the Global Shifts Colloquium participants took a first step in tackling some of the barriers to change.

This publication was made possible (in part) by a grant from Carnegie Corporation of New York. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Thank you to Meghan Garrity, a Penn Ph.D. student in Comparative Politics, and Nour Halabi, who received her Ph.D. from Penn's Annenberg School for Communication, for drafting this report.