

Consensus Workbook

ANALYTIC SUMMARY





CANADIAN FORUM ON INNOVATION & SOCIETAL IMPACT

SKILLS + KNOWLEDGE



the **COLLABORATIVE**

RESEARCH
IMPACT
CANADA

TURNING
RESEARCH
INTO ACTION



Fonds de recherche
Société et culture
Québec



SSHRC CRSH



This document was compiled by Sandra Lapointe, using discussion notes gathered during 12 workshops held on 12-13 October 2022 at the Canadian Forum on Innovation and Societal Impact McMaster University. The notes were collected by Marie-Hélène Hardy, Jessica Hider, Catherine Klausen, Shahdah Mahhouk, Dan Marianovic, Kyle Morrison, Brent Odland, Akacia Propst, Sid Rahman, Stephen Ross, Afroza Sultana and Erica Thomson.

Table of Contents

OBJECTIVES AND GUIDELINES	7
<i>HOW AND WHY THE CONSENSUS WORKBOOK CAME ABOUT</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>PARTICIPANTS</i>	<i>7</i>
COMMUNITY	7
INNOVATION AND SCIENCE POLICY STAKEHOLDERS (by organisation)	8
ACADEMIA.....	11
<i>ACTION REQUIRED.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>NEXT STEPS</i>	<i>13</i>
BACKGROUND.....	14
CANADA'S SOCIAL SECTOR.....	14
UNIVERSITIES' CIVIC MISSION AND THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES, AND ARTS	14
SHARED TERMINOLOGY.....	15
WORKBOOK	18
THEME 1. UNLOCKING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ALL SECTORS.....	18
<i>THE ROLE OF INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGES AND DECOLONIAL APPROACHES IN SOCIAL INNOVATION.....</i>	<i>18</i>
How much are we as experts, policy leaders and practitioners privileging one form of knowledge? What would a failsafe against settler bias look like?	19
Are we clear on what it means to recognize and cede space for traditional knowledges? Creating and opening new spaces to share across knowledges could be a better metaphor.	19
How are we as experts, policy leaders and practitioners in the social sector prepared to make space for decolonialization and true engagement/recognition with/of other ways of knowing.....	20
What are the processes that have had success in bringing Indigenous knowledge and decolonial perspectives to bear in academia, policy and/or the social sector?	21
<i>INNOVATION IN THE SOCIAL SECTOR VS INNOVATION IN THE OTHER SECTORS.....</i>	<i>21</i>
How is innovation for societal impact different from other innovation concepts and what do universities have to learn about those ways of doing and working?	21
How can university and municipalities best support/amplify the innovative work of the social sector? Can they work together on that?	22
What do we know about the capacity of the social sector to absorb knowledge and innovation? What would help drive up the capacity to absorb innovation?.....	23

Why/How is innovation still regarded as the domain of business and tech R&D in post-secondary?	24
What is missing from knowledge mobilization strategies when people don't use the knowledge? When they don't understand its benefits?	24
Plenty of social programs die from lack of uptake due to poor design, execution and lack of ongoing engagement of clients/beneficiaries. What best practices can be deployed to mitigate the problem?	26
What else besides research capacity can academic institutions and/or individual experts contribute to support innovation in the social sector?	27
How are researchers approaching community partners and for what purpose? What barriers come from research culture and expert attitudes?	28

THEME 2. FOSTERING AND ENABLING CIVIC ENVIRONMENTS FOR SOCIAL CHANGE30

<i>HOW DO WE BEST SUPPORT SCIENTIFIC ADVICE IN MUNICIPAL POLICY AND DECISION-MAKING?</i>	30
What are the different needs of municipalities around evidence support?	30
The municipality network is heterogenous and this is a challenge: how do we mutualise needs to create shared pools of expertise? What else could help?	31
What are the biggest challenges facing municipalities and what governance models do we need to support scientific advice to tackle these challenges?	31
What other factors beyond the availability of advice affect the capacity of a municipality to make policy and decisions supported by adequate knowledge and evidence.....	32
<i>WHAT WOULD NEED TO CHANGE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO SUPPORT INCLUSIVE SOCIAL INNOVATION INTERNALLY AND IN THE COMMUNITY?</i>	33
How do current bureaucratic structures hold back the potential of municipalities to contribute to social change?	33
Municipal staff have opportunities to create new initiatives and exercise leadership independently of policy - and decision makers. What are the skills they need and what is the best way to build them. What are the opportunities to pursue innovation at the administrative level, through staff leadership, rather than the political level?	34
What are the shared and/or mutual needs of municipalities and social sector organisations when it comes to capacity?	35
<i>WHAT IS KEY TO BUILDING KNOWLEDGE PARTNERSHIPS FOR A STRONG, INCLUSIVE SOCIAL INNOVATION ECO-SYSTEM?</i>	36
What barriers, formal or informal come in the way of knowledge partnership in the social innovation ecosystem	36
How can trust be fostered to meet the challenges of power and inherited assumptions? .	37
Fostering a culture of collaboration and partnership is easier said than done. What systems are in place, and what is good and bad about them?	38
What should a social sector organization expect from a university partner? What can a university expect from a social partner?	39

THEME 3. OPENING UP THE ACADEMY.....40

<i>HOW IS THE IMPACT OF SSHA IN COMMUNITIES BEST MEASURED AND ASSESSED?</i>	40
---	----

What do we mean by 'impact', what aspects of impact is valued more and by whom?	40
Who measures the impact of SSHA on society and for what purpose?	41
In what ways can community-integrated teaching and engagement be recognized and its impact measured?	43
Are social and human sciences researchers attuned to the needs of their communities, and if not, why?	44
<i>WHAT WOULD ACADEMIC AND COMMUNITY FUNDERS NEED TO CHANGE TO CREATE BETTER CONDITIONS FOR IMPACT-DRIVEN RESEARCH AND PRACTICES IN THE SOCIAL INNOVATION ECOSYSTEM?</i>	45
Current funding models support partnered academic research. Do they also fund innovation in the social sector? What holds the current funding models in place?	46
What rewards/incentives are there for opening up recognitions for scholarly engagement with the social innovation ecosystems?	47
What else could funders support beside research partnerships and community-engaged research to support innovation in the social sector? What new funding models/adapted models could be made available to community-university partnership for social innovation activity?	47
<i>THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC FACING SCHOLARSHIP</i>	49
Research is king in academia; how is it best mobilized to create impact in the community?	49
How diverse is public facing scholarship? Whose voices are being heard and what can we do to be more inclusive?	50
What are some of the risks and mitigation methods for public-facing scholarship?	50
THEME 4. SKILLS, TOOLS AND KNOW-HOW FOR SOCIETAL IMPACT	52
<i>WHAT DOES EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING NEED TO LOOK LIKE TO HELP BUILD SKILLS TO ADDRESS THE SOCIAL AND MUNICIPAL SECTOR'S HUMAN RESOURCES CRISIS?</i>	52
Are we fostering the skills/talent necessary to meet the demands of social sector and municipal governments will face over the next 25 years?	52
What should universities be contributing in terms of infrastructure for experiential learning partnerships?	54
<i>WHAT ARE THE SKILLS FOR INCLUSIVE INNOVATION AND PARTNERSHIPS IN THE SOCIAL SECTOR?</i>	55
Are the current experiential learning models adapted for the social sector and how could they be improved to meet the needs of social sector agencies?	55
Which training programs are available to those who are looking to work in nonprofit and are they targeting the skills needed for innovation in the social sector/municipal government?	56
What is the role of change management and transformation leadership in the social sector and how prepared are current and future non-profit managers to be truly inclusive and foster diversity	57
<i>WHAT SKILLS ARE NEEDED TO FOSTER INTERDISCIPLINARITY AROUND HUMAN/SOCIAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION?</i>	58

What sectors have the greatest needs for interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral collaboration around social innovation? What specific skills are lacking?.....	58
What needs to change in PSE training environments in order to prepare all students for interdisciplinary and cross sectoral collaborations?	59
How are we building and recognizing contributions to interdisciplinary research and skills development?	60
How are we building and recognizing contributions to interdisciplinary research and skills development?	61

OBJECTIVES AND GUIDELINES

HOW AND WHY THE CONSENSUS WORKBOOK CAME ABOUT

Below is the full report of discussion for each of the 42 questions that were chosen for deliberation by participants at the first edition of the Canadian Forum on Innovation and Societal Impact 12-13 October 2022.

The aim of the Forum was to create a genuinely cross sectoral context of dialogue and to identify areas of agreement and possible key actions. Each question was workshopped through a process moderated and facilitated by a note-taker. Each question was considered successively by up to 4 groups of participants through dialogue, each building in turn on the work of the previous group.

While each rotation required participants to spend time on three points - areas of agreement, key actions and implementation considerations - the outcome of discussion generally gravitated toward establishing common ground. In a cross-sectoral context, participants were negotiating their understanding of the issues on which they would have had different perspectives as stakeholders from different sector.

The Consensus Workbook is meant as an analytic summary of the discussion output. It is designed as a follow up with participants, to help confirm areas of agreement across sector so as to insure that the emerging action plan reflects needs, interests and motivations of all stakeholders.

PARTICIPANTS

COMMUNITY

- Patrick Byrne, Project Manager of City-Lab at the City of Hamilton
- Geraldine Cahill, Director of Up-Social Canada
- Isabel Cascante, Director or Research, Puyblic Policy and Evaluation at the United Way of Greater Toronto
- Rebecca Ellis, City Studio, Pillar Nonprofit Network
- Betsy Farrar, Manager of Community Impact at the United Way Peterborough
- Zee Hamid, CEO of CampaignRaven and Councillor at the City of Milton
- Alexya Heelis, Executive Director at the United Way St-John, NB
- Stephen Huddart, Board ChairBoard Chair YMCA's of Quebec Alternative Suspension Social Impact Bond

- Abid Jan, United Way East Ontario
- David Lasby, Director, Research & Evaluation, Imagine Canada
- Shawna Mutton, Vice-President to Community Impact, United Way Halton and Hamilton
- Joshua Okoe, United Way East Ontario
- Brad Park, CEO, United Way Halton and Hamilton
- Vanessa Parlette, Senior Project Manager at the City of Hamilton
- Luis Patricio, Manager of SDG-Cities at Pillar Network
- Kelsey Spitz-Dietrich, VP of Innovation & Inclusion at UCS Forest Group
- Vivien Underdown, Director of Capacity Building and Community Impact, United Way Halton and Hamilton
- Tamara Coleman-Lawrie, United Way Niagara
- Colleen Murdoch, United Way Guelph, Wellington, Dufferin
- Cyrus Therani, Chief Digital Officer at the City of Hamilton
- Candice Zhang, Policy Adviser at the Ontario Non-Profit Network

INNOVATION AND SCIENCE POLICY STAKEHOLDERS (by organisation)

Agriculture et Agroalimentaire Canada

- Pascal Michel, Director General - Ontario & Quebec / Directeur général - Région Ontario -Québec

Azrieli Foundation

- Orly Fruchter
- Mira Puri

Canadian Association of Science Centres

- Dr. Marianne Mader, CEO

Canadian Association of Graduate Studies

- Ian Wereley, CEO of CAGS
- Jennifer Polk, CEO at PhD to Life
- Heather Merla, Academic Affairs and Special Projects Officer at Queen's University

Canadian Council of the Academies

- Tijs Creutzberg, Director of Assessment
- Jeff Kinder, Project Director

Canadian Housing and Mortgage Corporation

- Andrew Cohen, Senior Specialist, Innovation and Partnerships

Canadian Institute For Advanced Research

- Rachel Parker, Senior Director of Research
- Kate Geddie, Senior Director of Research

Community Foundations of Canada

- Tim Draimin, Senior Fellow

Conference Board of Canada

- Michelle Gorea, Senior Research Associate, Education & Skills

The Conversation Canada

- Scott White, Chief Editor and CEO

Diversity Institute

- Wendy Cukier, Director

Evergreen Canada

- Martin Canning, Executive Director, Government Innovation
- Chelsea Carss, Coordinator, Outreach and Partnerships

Federation of Canadian Municipalities

- Myriam Hebabi, Program Officer, Canadian Women in Local Leadership
- Sara Lyons, Senior Director, Capacity and Sector Development
- Ty Smith, Senior Director, Diversity, Inclusion and Leadership

Federation of the Humanities and Social Sciences

- Sara El Rayo, Program Lead

Fond the Recherche du Québec, Société et Culture

- Louise Poissant, Directrice Scientifique
- Coryell Boffy, Senior Director, Society and Culture at Axelys
- Julie Dirwimmer, Conseillère principale, Relations Science & Société - Bureau du scientifique en chef du Québec

Future Skills Centre

- Trisha Williams, Director of Research Evaluation and Knowledge Mobilisation
- Rochelle Taheri, Research Associate
- Ramsha Naveed, Innovation Lab Specialist

Genome Canada (Partner, Bronze):

- Sapna Mahajan Sinclair, Director, Genomics in Society
- Pari Johnson, Vice-President, Policy and Public Affairs

Indspire

- Brandon Meawasige, Director of Communications and Marketing

Institute on Governance

- Rhonda Moore, Senior Practice Lead, Science and Innovation

IRPP/Policy Options

- Les Perreux

Let's Talk Science

- Bonnie Schmidt, CEO

Magnet

- Mark Patterson, CEO

McConnell Foundation

- Ryan Conway, Program Director, McConnell Foundation

Mitacs

- Sarah Fairlie, Business Development Director, Social Innovation
- Rahina Zarma, Senior Policy Analyst

NSERC

- Nathali Rosado Ferrari, Senior Program Analyst
- Shawn McGuirk, Director of Research Security

Public Health Agency of Canada

- Sarah Viehbeck, Chief Science Advisor

Research Impact Canada

- Lupin Battersby, Simon Fraser University
- Elisabeth Huang, York University
- Krista Jensen, York University
- Michael Johnny, York University
- Marie Page, York University
- David Phipps, Director
- Connie Tang, York University

Social Innovation Canada

- Andrea Nemtin, CEO
- Jo Reynolds, Social Innovation Specialist
- Kirsten Wright, Financialization of Housing Lab

SSHRC

- Ursula Gobel, Vice-President, Stakeholder Engagement and Advancement of Society
- Thérèse de Groote, Director of the Future Challenges Division

Universities Canada

- Laurent Charbonneau, Assistant Director, Government Relations

Work Wellness Institute

- Kamilla Karoli, Vice-President Business Operations
- Cameron Stockdale, CEO

ACADEMIA

- Nick Baker, Office of Open Learning, University of Windsor
- Jean-Christophe Bélisle-Pipon, Assistant Professor in Health Ethics at Simon Fraser University
- Jessica Braimoh, Assistant Professor of Criminology at York University
- Samantha Brennan, Professor of Philosophy and Dean of Arts at the University of Guelph
- Dan Breznitz, Munk School of Public Policy, University of Toronto
- Dave Cormier, Office of Open Learning, University of Windsor
- Sheila Côte-Meek, Vice-Provost of Equity, People and Culture at York University
- Lorraine Davies, Associate Vice-Provost Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies at Western University.
- Robert Clapperton, Communication at Toronto Metropolitan University
- Charles Davis, RTA School of Media at Toronto Metropolitan University
- Monique Deveaux, Professor and Canada Research Chair in Ethics and Global Social Change at the University of Guelph
- Michelle Dion, Senator Wm. McMaster Chair in Gender & Methodology
McMaster University
- Claudia Emerson, Director of the Institute for Ethics in Policy and Innovation at McMaster University
- Martin Horn, Associate Dean Research, Humanities at McMaster University
- John Lavis, Professor and Director of the McMaster Health Forum
- Brandon MacFarlane, Professor of Creativity and Creative Thinking at Sheridan College
- Brent McKnight, Professor of Strategic Management, McMaster University
- Gillian Mulvale, Associate Professor of Health Policy and Management at the DeGroote School of Business at McMaster University
- Sandra Parmegiani, Associate Dean of Arts at the University of Guelph
- Savage Bear, Director for the McMaster Indigenous Research Institute (MIRI)

- James Stauch, Director of the Institute for Community Prosperity at Mount-Royal University
- Patricia Tersigni, Director, Academic Programs and Policy at the University of Guelph
- Elena Valenzuela, Associate Professor, University of Ottawa
- Vanessa Watts, Paul R. MacPherson Chair in Indigenous Studies at McMaster University

ACTION REQUIRED

Ideally we would want all participants to review all statements and indicate their agreement.

You agree with a claim if you believe or suspect or assume that it is true. You may be unsure whether the claim is true, but still agree with it. You may agree with suggestions and hypotheses that still need to be demonstrated. All relevant **claims will be examined critically at a later stage**, leveraging evidence and expertise. The first step in our approach is to confirm the level of agreement.

If you disagree or strongly disagree with one of the claim, we would welcome a brief explanation.

You have an opportunity to comment on each question as well and your comments will be recorded. You are not however asked or expected to provide such comments at this stage.

If you feel you would be interested to revisit one of the themes as part of a workshop, or if you would be interested to host such a workshop, please let us know. We would be happy to work collaboratively on such projects as part of a concerted action plan.

We would like to receive your input by January 15.

NEXT STEPS

In late January we will analyse the results.

In February, Forum partners will hosts a first workshop with the aim of discussing the results and establishing a research and action plan.

BACKGROUND

CANADA'S SOCIAL SECTOR

Canada's social sector is vast, diverse and essential. It contributes substantially to the economy. Social sector organisations, sometimes called “not-for-profits” include hospitals, universities, colleges, and social purpose organisations offering basic provisions that range from community food services, community housing and emergency relief to religious organisations, advocacy, sports and recreation.

In 2020, healthcare made for 42.2% of the social sector, research and education 19.6% with social services organisations representing another 12.9% of the sector.

FACTS

- **170,000** organisations
- **9.0%** of Canada's GDP, when including government not-for-profits, 2.2% when excluding them (social services make for 1.4% of the total economy)
- **1 in 10** Canadian workers (most hold a college or university degree)
- total employees: **2.4 million**
- **77%** are women
- **48%** are immigrants
- **29%** are visible minorities
- **5%** are Indigenous
- nearly **23%** are 55yo or older
- Canadians give **+14 billion** to charities every year
- total volunteers: **13 million**

The pandemic has provided rich evidence for the role of a resilient social sector as part of healthy, civic and democratic infrastructure. 95% of social sector organisations report that innovation has played a role in maintaining programs and/or pivoting during the pandemic, with more than 70% describing innovation as central to the process.

UNIVERSITIES' CIVIC MISSION AND THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES, AND ARTS

University-grown social and human research is increasingly geared toward social impact. In 2021 alone, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) awarded 376 grants worth \$72.2 million requiring applicants to work directly with community partners. SSHRC's investment in community-focused partnered research in 2021 however

represented only 6.3% of its overall budget for that year (\$1,133.5 million), which is itself a fraction of the overall federal funding for science and technology activities, an estimated \$304 billion.¹

As we move beyond the linear economic model of economic growth into a circular economy paradigm informed by Sustainable Development Goals and requiring high capacity for social innovation, universities are seen as central stakeholders in transformative societal change. As such, universities' community engagement and knowledge mobilisation mandates need to be informed by strategies that aim to make the institution an anchor of its community, contributing to all aspects of social and economic growth, and producing value for stakeholders on all sides.

What this means is that the mission of today's universities extends much beyond teaching and research: as anchors, universities are expected to create moral, cultural, political and economic value for their communities, region and society. In order to be part of the process, and lead it, change is needed in social and human science disciplines and programming. Commitments to community engagement need to move beyond individual strategy and be supported at the institutional level by initiatives that are informed by the needs, assets and constraints of communities, and a willingness to shift academic cultures toward imperatives driven by the creation of value in the social sector. In order to achieve this vision, all social sector stakeholders need to be part of the conversation and be aligned on what education, policy and practice looks like in the social innovation ecosystem.

SHARED TERMINOLOGY

Capacity: The level of an organisation's capability to deliver services, programs, and products according to its mandate or mission.

Experiential Learning (EL): The acquisition of knowledge and skills through practice and upon reflection of a period engagement, observation, and/or immersion. 'Experiential learning' and 'work-integrated learning' are often used interchangeably.

EL-partnership: In the context of this brief, a community-based or community-focused collaboration between an organisation and an academic institution that revolves around the hosting, facilitating, and supporting of one or more students involved, for instance, in service or project delivery.

Foundational Skills: A broad range of abilities and knowledge understood to be essential to employability and citizenship, and generally associated with social and emotional

¹ Statistics Canada (<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=2710000501>)

intelligence as well as cognitive literacy. They include critical thinking, problem-solving, creativity, self-management, intercultural awareness, and effective communication.

Innovation Process: A series of actions or steps designed to create, improve or implement ways of doing, framing, knowing or thinking and intended to create new value.

Knowledge Absorption: The ability of an organisation to assimilate information needed to support continuous and productive innovation.

Knowledge Mobilisation: Knowledge mobilisation is an umbrella term encompassing a wide range of activities relating to the production and use of research results, including knowledge synthesis, dissemination, transfer, exchange, and co-creation or co-production by researchers and knowledge users (SSHRC).

Reciprocity: A systems-level feature of collaborations and partnerships whose outcomes and impacts are balanced and mutually beneficial.

Research and Development (R&D): The planned creative work aimed at new knowledge or developing new and significantly improved goods, programs, and services which includes basic research, applied research and development. Research and practical experience is undertaken to produce new or significantly improved goods, programs, services or processes (Pearman 2019).

Resilience: The ability to effectively respond to and adapt to systemic change, seeking a balance of social, environmental, and economic needs.

SSHA: Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts disciplines. Statistics Canada groups all non-STEM disciplines together: business, humanities, health, arts, social science and education (BHASE).

Skill: An aptitude, competency, or ability, broadly construed.

Social Sector Organisation (SSO): A service or product provider or facilitator that operates for and is organised around societal support and betterment, such as not-for-profits.

Social Enterprise: A business model with the dual focus of social and economic gain.

Social Finance: A financial service type that utilises private funds to support social goals, address social problems, and/or facilitate social change.

Social Ecosystem: The collection of interconnected institutions and organisations through which the resources, talent, and information that supports, interacts with, and affects the social innovation flow.

Social Innovation: The phrase "social innovation" is used in multiple contexts to refer to a number of things. Here, it is

used to refer to a collection of processes aimed at systems-level change, rather than as a type of product or outcome, which is the approach in some schools. This may include new ideas, services, processes, or frameworks intended to meet social needs and to do so by, at the same time, changing aspects of social organisations or relationships in the social impact ecosystem.

Social Research and Development (social R&D): The practice of acquiring, absorbing and/or utilising knowledge to create or improve processes, products and/or services in the social sector.

Social Sector: An umbrella term denoting the activities of organisations that identify and operate for the public benefit, including co-operatives, not-for-profits, registered charities, social enterprises/B corporations, or unincorporated grassroots or community groups; sometimes referred to as the “third sector”, in contrast to what has traditionally been labelled the private and public sectors. The recent emergence of, for instance, “social enterprise” as a for-profit business models embracing social goals tends to make boundaries between the three sectors more porous.

STEM: Science, Technology, Engineering and Math.





THEME 1. UNLOCKING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ALL SECTORS

Economists call ‘innovation’ any action that allows an enterprise to offer better products or services at current or lower costs. Generally speaking, innovation is unquestionably crucial to resilience and flourishing in any sector of industry, society and government. In general, Canadian universities manage to build strong innovation partnerships in the science, tech, and medical sectors and they benefit from federal and provincial subsidies of various forms, including sums specifically allocated to research internships, informed by the needs of these industries.

While R&D has been at the heart of Canada’s innovation strategy, growth can stem from incremental change or improvement to any aspect of an organisation’s activities. This is especially true in the social ecosystem where process and incremental innovation are ubiquitous: in the social ecosystem, impact, i.e., return on investment, rarely thrives on the creation of entirely new products or services. Process innovation and incremental innovation rest on iterative knowledge processes that lead to incorporating both modest, incremental, radical and revolutionary improvements in processes, services and product design.

Social return on investment, i.e., social impact, thrives on organisations’ capacity for “continuous innovation” in an ecosystem where capacity to absorb new ideas, approaches and processes is foundational. There are vast opportunities to build new kinds of knowledge partnerships between universities, social sector organisations and municipal government to better prepare future generations of social sector leaders and stakeholders to knowledge needs, knowledge absorption, and knowledge process capabilities. This is a territory in which social sciences, humanities and arts programming can be leveraged in creative new ways.

THE ROLE OF INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGES AND DECOLONIAL APPROACHES IN SOCIAL INNOVATION

*This workshop was by far the one that garnered the richest discussions, with participant exploring the topics broadly, often departing from the question under consideration.

How much are we as experts, policy leaders and practitioners privileging one form of knowledge? What would a failsafe against settler bias look like?

	These questions bring up concerns around bias, privilege, humility, trust and empathy. They also raise issues about the best way to address systemic injustice at its source, providing adequate funding to communities as a fundamental conditions of creating equity and genuine civic inclusion.
	Funding models designed to support academic expertise may contribute to bias toward one type of knowledge and/or expertise and create barriers to decolonisation.
	The idea that Indigenous people and settlers have different worldviews brings tensions in their respective conceptions of what is taken to be true. Upsetting these assumptions calls for a type of reflection that requires the capacity to think through complexity and understand the effects of cognitive biases.
	One adjacent question would be: how can we define success and impact in a non-colonial way; the suggestion was that this would require a reassessment of the role of strictly quantitative metrics.
	Best practices in research with Indigenous people are indispensable. This includes integrative approaches to codesign that might be better suited to cross-cultural collaborations in interdisciplinary settings, the use of spaces that make for inclusion and equity, and adequate compensation for community partners.

Are we clear on what it means to recognize and cede space for traditional knowledges? Creating and opening new spaces to share across knowledges could be a better metaphor.

	Most are not clear on what it means to recognize and cede space for traditional knowledges, and part of the problem is that it's not clear who should be defining these terms.
	Power dynamics need to evolve, as well as our conception of the value placed on lived experience.
	A number of practices need to be deployed to fully support decolonisation and the integration of traditional knowledges from the necessity to engage Indigenous leadership without overburdening traditional knowledge keepers, to the importance of reassessing institutional policies and requirements to make place for Indigenous expertise in academia (e.g. credential expectations when hiring Indigenous faculty).

	There is a perception that space needs to be made across the curriculum for courses where students are confronted with their assumptions and bias, and colonial histories.
	More collaborations are needed, which need to be supported by adequate funding strategies.
	More resources are needed to streamline access to information and best practices around Indigenous and decolonial approaches.

How are we as experts, policy leaders and practitioners in the social sector prepared to make space for decolonialization and true engagement/recognition with/of other ways of knowing.

	Creating space for different ways of understanding includes different ways of defining “knowledge”, different ways of creating knowledge, different ways of sharing and communicating knowledge, and different infrastructure and structure for this work to happen within. All parties need to be willing and able to break out from traditional Western structures we work and learn within.
	Engagement, accountability and universal design are required in the process of decolonisation: the objective is to increase accessibility and create inclusive spaces for different ways of understanding.
	Adopting decolonial practices reflects the need to be critical of how structures reflect Western notions of knowledge and a willingness to value and work within alternatives.
	There is a sentiment that making place for decolonialization and Indigenous knowledges requires a cultural shift away from academic and/or market economy to values that are rooted in community/society and cooperation: e.g. trust, respect.

What are the processes that have had success in bringing Indigenous knowledge and decolonial perspectives to bear in academia, policy and/or the social sector?	
	The focus of decolonisation should be on implementing solutions rather than on rationalisation. In the process, it is useful to take stock of what has already been done, and tools such as race/gender/critical theory that can enrich perspectives.
	Solutions need to reflect the fact that Indigenous approaches are not monolithic.
	Successful practices include intentionally placing Indigenous people (as well as others with different perspectives) in decision-making and leadership positions.
Many suggestions were made that were specific. They included making place for Indigenous languages, reassessing value places on current academic practices (e.g. publication) and creating physical spaces on campuses where we are reminded of Indigenous knowledges and other ways of knowing.	

INNOVATION IN THE SOCIAL SECTOR VS INNOVATION IN THE OTHER SECTORS

How is innovation for societal impact different from other innovation concepts and what do universities have to learn about those ways of doing and working?	
	All innovation is ultimately justified by the fact that it creates value for society and humans. However the value of technological innovation is often measured using metrics, e.g. in terms of short term economic return on investment that does not do justice to its long-term societal value. (The long-term societal value cannot be measured as a function of cumulative short-term economic impacts)
	It is difficult to produce simple metrics when it comes to assessing the value of innovation and transformative change in the social sector. Because the ROI cannot be measured in terms of short term economic outcomes, it seems intangible. This intangibility is one of the main barriers to appreciating the value of social innovation toward systems change. Shifting the focus of impact evaluation from economic to social ROI is however indispensable.
	Community-organisations' outcomes/targets are defined by federal policies and guidelines in which social impact is subordinate to economic impact, which makes it difficult to articulate the value of innovation in terms of social ROI.

	There is a sentiment that university-based innovation partners need to acquire a more accurate understanding of sector's processes and ways of doing, so that partnerships connected to research projects be shaped by the relevant aspects of organisations (e.g. policies, needs). This will require universities dedicate resources to developing and sustaining mechanisms/structures to engage with partners/communities.
	Developing capacity for innovation in the social sector will require money, time and resources. Scalability is a prevalent concern.
	Experiential learning can be a factor in deepening academic engagement around the needs of social sector when it comes to innovation.

How can university and municipalities best support/amplify the innovative work of the social sector? Can they work together on that?

	There is a false perception of irreconcilability between the needs and interests of universities and those of social sector organisations. Perceived differences and misalignments need to be addressed through clear engagement goals that aim for solidarity, the creation of interdisciplinary/cross-sectoral dialogical spaces that integrate what we can learn from lived and practical experience and a focus on application rather than theory.
	Knowledge mobilisation is seen as an instrument of campus-community partnerships, but it requires adapting tools and resources on both sides. These adjustments need to be systemic/structural and will require funding.
	Innovation in the social sector is invariably interdisciplinary. Disciplinary gate-keeping is an obstacle to social innovation.
	Innovation partnerships in the social sector require an understanding of inter-governmental structures – since change might require action/resources across governmental levels.

	There is a connection between social innovation and civic engagement that needs to inform universities' impact strategy.
--	--

What do we know about the capacity of the social sector to absorb knowledge and innovation? What would help drive up the capacity to absorb innovation?	
	The role of knowledge in innovation, and what it means for an organisation to have the capacity to absorb it was not well understood.
*The question was understood to be about knowledge creation and innovation.	
	On this participants agreed there is a need for more time and money, and that approaches to innovation (e.g. experimentation, design thinking, sandboxing) while they play an important role, are not typically supported by academic grant funding which needs to be more flexible. Market demand modeling doesn't track need for social innovation research/initiatives. Likewise, the focus on delivery and program assessment is not conducive to innovation.
	There is an important role for sharing and informal collaboration across communities.
	There is a perception that academic partners can help validate the outcome of R&D and innovation processes in the social sector, and play a role when it comes to amplifying the significance of community-based research to inform policy (the assumption being that they have more direct access to policy stakeholders)
	Grant application and reporting processes are perceived to create unnecessary overhead, redundancy and workload. This calls for a reassessment.
	Scholarly research reports are seen to have little purpose beyond meeting deliverables attached to contracts. The perceived inadequacy of academic partnerships output makes it difficult for community partners to justify partnerships in the first place. Even when relevant, uptake is challenged by a number of factor that have to do with capacity.

	There is a cost to organisation when it comes to delving into research and capacity for uptake needs to be factored into deliverables. There is no one size solution: each partner needs to be able to determine what they need in terms of access to information, whether it is an executive summary or a toolkit.
	There is a concern about reduplication of effort, both when it comes to generating data or solutions, e.g. toolkits.

Why/How is innovation still regarded as the domain of business and tech R&D in post-secondary?

	Innovation is still regarded as the domain of business and tech R&D because we are used to measuring the value of innovation in terms of economic return on investment, and there is not enough money (or no money) in social innovation.
Notes: The general sentiment seems to have been that there is a lack of clarity on what innovation is, especially in the social sector and that a better understanding would require some tangible models and illustration. But the discussion notes gathered lacked detail This questions will need to be re-examined.	

ENGAGEMENT AS A METHODOLOGY FOR KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION

What is missing from knowledge mobilization strategies when people don't use the knowledge? When they don't understand its benefits?

	Researchers might need to be better attuned to the conditions in which knowledge mobilization is successful and creates impact. This might require upskilling or learning.
	Knowledge mobilisation needs to happen in a language that is aligned with that of the target audience as a matter of creating equitable basis for collaboration.
	Knowledge mobilisation strategies should ensure that the information is presented relevant and adequately meets the needs of partners.

	Use of media in knowledge mobilisation should not be confined to traditional academic formats.
	Knowledge mobilisation strategies should ensure that results and recommendations are presented clearly, to support decision making. This might in turn require that researchers acquire a better understanding of policy.
	Inclusive co-creation processes are crucial to insuring that outcomes/solutions resonate with "target audience".
	More funding is needed to support the work of researchers around cross-sectoral exchange and co-creation and insure that community partners are fully involved in the process.
	There is a need/place for new types of connections between academia and the social sector that are geared toward action, and can accommodate the interests and needs of both academics and partners which can sometimes be reciprocal and complementary, rather than unidimensionally aligned.
	Create incentives, recognitions and reward mechanisms for academic that reflect the needs around time and funding when building connection in the social sector.

Plenty of social programs die from lack of uptake due to poor design, execution and lack of ongoing engagement of clients/beneficiaries. What best practices can be deployed to mitigate the problem?

	Co-design is one of the main ingredients of successful social program design. User-centric approaches have been demonstrated to be efficient, but it requires additional resources that may not be available.
	Generally, more resources (e.g. time, expertise) need to be allocated to design, research and development. There might be a role for different approaches to knowledge mobilisation - collaboration - in providing access to expertise.
	More training is needed around key elements of design, marketing and evaluation. Funders could play a role in the process by integrating training as part of successful grants.
	R&D needs to deliver processes that insure continuity so that programs delivery and accountability are maintained even when staffing evolves.
	It is not always clear how innovation processes can support successful program delivery in the social sector.
	Communities of practices. More collaboration and integration is needed amongst stakeholders to support knowledge sharing beyond mere reporting, including sharing practices and learnings.

	There is a perception that long term funding for projects might favour different R&D approaches.
--	--

What else besides research capacity can academic institutions and/or individual experts contribute to support innovation in the social sector?	
	There is a perception that innovation (as opposed to research) in the social sector is not valued in academic settings.
	Academic institutions can support innovation in the social sector if they open their doors to community and cater to needs and interests of communities as part of collaborative initiatives that are inclusive and egalitarian.
	Reciprocity and mutuality are pivotal to campus-community partnerships. It must also rest on formal institutional collaborations with dedicated operational resources (as opposed to individual collaborations). Cross-sectoral collaborative infrastructures can play a role; City-labs are a good model.
	Experiential learning is a promising model. It is an opportunity to bring intellectual capital into the community that can contribute to innovation in the social sector. In the social sector experiential learning might require a stronger emphasis on the importance of foundational skills.
	Funding models would need to reflect the commitment to cross-sectoral collaboration and be driven by a definition of impact that prioritises social outcomes and change. This in turn would require a reframing of assessment criteria and metrics.

	Collaboration strategies should be designed to build trust, and return value to partners. This might require that researchers develop more responsive ways (and timelines) to share knowledge.
	There is a perception that incentives and rewards for researchers are not aligned with the imperatives around social impact, and that community-engaged partnerships are not valued for academic purposes.

How are researchers approaching community partners and for what purpose? What barriers come from research culture and expert attitudes?

	Historically, research cultures have been perceived as extractive. Communities are hesitant to engage with researchers because they see them as biased, hierarchical and likely to weaponize results, which creates risks for reputation and funding. Co-design is perceived as a way to address some of these concerns. Decolonisation as another.
	There is a perception that community expertise is neither valued nor recognised by researchers. The complementarity of community and scholarly expertise can be framed in terms of content vs context expertise, which are both needed. Co-design is perceived, here again, as a way to address this concern.
	Community-engaged research requires the creation of trust-based relationships that should not end with the project. The lack of continuity is a barrier to the kind of trust that genuine collaborations would require. This might require centralised resources and facilitation, and would benefit from exemplars of best practices to bolster skills acquisition and learning.
	Researchers expectations and constraints make alignment with the partner difficult. There are misalignments as to both what people assume/believe, the way they describe and frame the latter as well as the value they place on experience.

	Incentives for promotion and tenure in academia need to value and reward cross-sectoral collaboration and community impact and innovation in all its forms, especially process (incremental) innovation which is elemental in the social sector.
	Codesign and knowledge mobilisation processes in cross-sectoral collaborations demand time which traditional academic research models in SSHA do not provide for. This needs to be recognised and properly rewarded as part of tenure, promotion and merit review.
	Because innovation processes are in essence iterative and experimental, research design and implementation need to allow greater risk tolerance, and requires a shift from short-term to longevity thinking.
	Innovation-focused practices should be guided by a concern for replicability and scalability and integrate routines around the open access sharing of success and mechanisms for dissemination, translations, connections.
	There needs to be a greater intentionality in integrating R&D/innovation practices into program design in social sector organisation.
	DORA (SF declaration on research assessment) should guide the establishment of concerted evaluation frameworks and processes that focus on qualitative metrics.
	Innovation-partnership would require a broader and more holistic approach to funding. Funding programs need to allocate funds directly to community-partners if they are involved in the process, but there is a broad perception that skills-building should be intentionally integrated to research support.

THEME 2. FOSTERING AND ENABLING CIVIC ENVIRONMENTS FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

As a feature of organisations and institutions in the social sector, innovation benefits from municipal policies designed to foster resilient communities that are more likely to attract investments. In 2022, the City of Longueuil in Quebec set aside a budget for a new chief science adviser to coordinate data gathering and statistical analysis within the city, and to support transparency through science communication designed to inform citizens.

Longueuil's approach rests on the conviction that academic/research expertise increases government accountability and intelligence, which in turn supports innovation and growth. This is a fertile ground for municipal policy and decision-makers to create new partnerships with community organisations who can both contribute and benefit from the research. The nomination of a chief science adviser should also ideally lead to increased collaborations between municipalities, communities, and local university campuses.

In order to respond to a possible call to action from municipalities, the social and human research experts and the broader scientific community need a better understanding of the task at hand. Universities can support evidence-based policy, but they can also foster collaborations around increased capacity, both by mobilising expertise beyond traditional outlets and equipping students with the skills for a civic vocation.

HOW DO WE BEST SUPPORT SCIENTIFIC ADVICE IN MUNICIPAL POLICY AND DECISION-MAKING?

What are the different needs of municipalities around evidence support?	
	The importance of data and evidence to intelligent policy making (e.g. waste management, public health protocol) is recognised, but there is a perception that while municipalities are keen to embrace different strategies, there is a lack of means/capacity around the evaluation of these strategies.
	There is a perceived imbalance in most approaches: municipalities have lots of data on some things and very little about others and the general sentiment is that data/evidence/needs remain mostly invisible.
	There is a perception that municipalities (and generally government) need around evidence is not always well understood by universities, and that the pressure to produce such evidence is still new in universities. There also is a need to understand how evidence translates into action which would possibly be filled by university. But the suggestion is tentative.

	There needs to be synergy across government levels around evidence support: all governments need to act on the basis of shared understanding of the data available. This might require the development of system-level strategies and feedback mechanisms.
	There is a perception that the processes that allow municipal stakeholders to acquire the information they need does not reflect the constraints of their timelines.

The municipality network is heterogenous and this is a challenge: how do we mutualise needs to create shared pools of expertise? What else could help?

	Heterogeneity of needs is unavoidable, and solutions must meet the actual needs. On the other hand, even when the problems are similar, the solutions might need to be contextualised. The contrasts between rural and urban communities should be kept in mind.
	Nonetheless it is worth exploring how problems/issues might be common. One possibility is to leverage data available (e.g. through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and similar organisations to develop centrally mutual solutions/tools.
	There is a perception that, because this requires data analysis and research, municipal science advisories need to be involved to clearly communicate around needs/interests.
	There might be an opportunity for a SSHRC Knowledge Synthesis grant on the topic has never done a grant on social innovation (FRQSC has).

What are the biggest challenges facing municipalities and what governance models do we need to support scientific advice to tackle these challenges?

	The desiderata for a model of governance that would support scientific advice to tackle these problems would be: that it be integrative, make place for citizen involvement, support open access and data as well as participatory models and bottom-up advice.
--	---

	The role of scientific advice should be clearly defined and integrated into evaluation, decision and policy frameworks.
	There is agreement on the relevance of scientific advisory committees that lead to citizen-driven policies, especially around community economic development which is vital.
	The issues to be tackled require a regional approach, especially in the context of climate crisis which does not discriminate across municipal boundaries.

What other factors beyond the availability of advice affect the capacity of a municipality to make policy and decisions supported by adequate knowledge and evidence

	The processes around research are time-intensive and there was a sentiment that this could be addressed.
	The availability of data (needs/resources) is a key factor.
	There is a perception that more concertation and collaboration around the sharing of solutions and successes is needed. Barriers to this process include conflicting interests and needs.
	There needs to be a new science agenda, a renewed understanding of the role of knowledge in policy. The "living lab" model which rests on a collaborative, contextual, stakeholder approach to problem solving was mentioned as an example of best practice.

WHAT WOULD NEED TO CHANGE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO SUPPORT INCLUSIVE SOCIAL INNOVATION INTERNALLY AND IN THE COMMUNITY?

How do current bureaucratic structures hold back the potential of municipalities to contribute to social change?	
	There is a perception that all bureaucracies impede capacity for change, and constitute a barrier in particular for SSOs to do their work, among other things because approval and application processes are often too long, prevent engagement and therefore change.
	There is a perception that bureaucratic structures at all government levels impede municipalities, not just their own bureaucracy.
	Administrative processes benefit from institutional memory, so high staff turn around contributes to inefficiency.
	Change of leadership often comes with change of mandate, which creates redundancy and duplication.
	Administrative processes need dedicated resources to foster diversity.
	Administrative structures are needed, but it's not always clear that they serve the purpose for which they exist, especially when they are not effective. For instance, the division of labour within any given administration might make it difficult to address complex issues. Likewise, administrative layers often have misaligned priorities.
	There is a perception that administrative structures at the municipal level favour political ambitions to the detriment of societal progress. Mayoral leadership can be a positive element. As a whole, the sentiment is that both administrative and democratic structures need better design, and that the design itself should be guided by innovation

	approaches. The importance of accountability and openness in the consultative process was emphasised.
	Many suggestions were made including: develop more flexible, problem-centric evaluation frameworks, rebuild trust, relationships and communication, limit red tape around public space use. There is a perception that administrative processes would benefit from more agility and nimbleness, accountability and candidness about objectives. The sentiment is that municipal administrative structure are hard to navigate and are their logic somewhat evasive.

Municipal staff have opportunities to create new initiatives and exercise leadership independently of policy – and decision makers. What are the skills they need and what is the best way to build them. What are the opportunities to pursue innovation at the administrative level, through staff leadership, rather than the political level?

	Administrative staff are not elected, so they can have more room to take risks and innovate.
	Administrative staff can work from the ground up and work with local communities, building trust with them along the way.
	Administrative staff have more capacity to make connections with other people/agencies. However there is a perceived risk to innovation processes that can impact staff's career prospects.
	There might be opportunities to encourage staff-led innovation, such as e.g. to increase cross departmental collaboration (staff exchange could promote knowledge mobilization), increase connectivity and exchange between municipalities, other levels of government to mutualise needs around skills-building and information sharing.
	Time and money are significant constraints.

	Innovation processes, e.g. co-design with community might also be impeded by varying levels of trust and perceived accountability.
	Political and administrative organs are very connected and need to have channels of communication. However they might not always be working on the same timelines. There might be an advantage to reallocating resource toward longevity and the shepherding of projects across electoral periods to support innovation in the community.
There are skills that are perceived to be required for municipal administrative staff. They include: being able to engage stakeholders and diverse communities/relationship building; being able to advocate for policies they support; training and skills in creating inclusivity, accessibility, and diversity; design thinking, mental models, and systems thinking/complexity	

What are the shared and/or mutual needs of municipalities and social sector organisations when it comes to capacity?	
	When it comes to capacity building, there is some confusion as to who is responsible and some reluctance to take responsibility.
	The resources and structures in the municipal sector are different from those available in the social sector, but there might be an opportunity for engagement/collaboration. Collaborations need to be strategic and coordinated, set clear priorities and come with adequate incentives.
	Building capacity could involve outsourcing some projects to experts. (But there are questions around expertise.)
	The Human Resources crisis and the shortage of skilled worker is affecting capacity.
	Time and funding are considerable constraints. Political agenda can also create risks.

There is perception of a range of skills needs around capacity for innovation at the interface of social/municipal sectors. The following were mentioned: change management, foresights, data collection/analysis, risk assessment and tolerance.

WHAT IS KEY TO BUILDING KNOWLEDGE PARTNERSHIPS FOR A STRONG, INCLUSIVE SOCIAL INNOVATION ECO-SYSTEM?

What barriers, formal or informal come in the way of knowledge partnership in the social innovation ecosystem	
	Some barriers arise in the context of communication, when language and communication expectations are not shared. For instance, it's not clear that the definition of what counts as innovation in the social sector is defined in the same way by all those involved, or that it is intentionally defined. Innovation partnership need to revolve around shared knowledge and partnership goal.
	Some barriers are connected to institutional structures. For instance, there is a perception that academic stakeholders are expect to lead these partnerships (However this is no longer the case for SSHRC partnerships).
	There is a perceived lack of funding and incentives. In particular, participation in innovation partnerships should recognised and rewarded on both sides in ways that are meaningful to the participants. In academia recognition should be integrated to merit/tenure review.
	There are misalignments between <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • academic timelines and the timelines on which innovation is expected to happen in the social sector. • needs of academic and social sector partners around innovation • conception of expertise; which can leads to tensions between partners. In particular, there is a perceived asymmetry in the power dynamics between partner that puts the community partners at a disadvantage
	Community partners do not always trust that partnerships with researchers in academia will generate real actions or real change.
	Campus-community, and collaborative relationships need to pre-exist the development of projects. Relationship building might require brokering and facilitation support.

	Universities should be involved in the community a more integrated way, maintaining and nourishing partnerships with their communities even outside of academic research projects. This could include shared knowledge and data, partnership around knowledge advice (as opposed to research) in SSOs and access to research resources such as libraries.
	There is a perception that academics at all level (student and faculty) would benefit from upskilling around communication, including communication of objectives and deliverables around partnered projects. This should however be compatible with the ability to adapt and pivot in the context of innovation that may require experimentation and sandboxing.
	Integrative approaches to research should reserve physical and conceptual space for interdisciplinary collaboration and co-habitation. This could include finding ways to formally include practitioner expertise in research grant (possibly on the model of SSHRC).
	There was a concern that academic structures and policies are not designed to feed into system change.

How can trust be fostered to meet the challenges of power and inherited assumptions?

	We need to approach our partners with humility since we all have expertise, especially in context where Indigenous knowledge and decolonial approaches are central. The process is important.
	Relationship building is a crucial part of campus-community partnerships. Commitments to building ongoing relationships between researchers and SSOs need to be more intentional.
	Trust requires a shared vocabulary, honesty, transparency and time. Timeline might need to reflect the fact that outcomes are not immediate.
	Power dynamics and asymmetries e.g. around who is compensated, what value is being created and for whom, as well as whose expertise is being mobilised in the process can undermine partnerships. It's important to understand and neutralise them so that all stakeholders feel they are being treated equitably.

Fostering a culture of collaboration and partnership is easier said than done. What systems are in place, and what is good and bad about them?

	Research is often driven by individuals, which makes it hard for partners to think of their relationships with universities as an organic one. Some programs exist that provide resources that open the possibility for long-term projects, but collaborations remain onerous in terms of time, money and bureaucracy.
	Academic administrative processes, e.g. the creation of memoranda of understanding, legal agreements reporting and even only research ethics accreditation can be intimidating and difficult to navigate and accommodate for small SSOs.
	There is a perception that more information is needed about collaborative opportunities, that would make it easier for partners on both side to find matches.
	Collaborations can be overwhelming to SSOs that are already strained for resources and funding
	There needs to be recognition of the resources and time that goes into collaboration and a deliberate effort on universities' part to reduce expectations as to what SSOs can take in a partnership.
	There needs to be a reciprocity in campus-community partnerships. The expectation should not be by default that academic expertise need to be mobilised toward the community, but also that community-expertise ought to be mobilised into the academy. This could take a number of forms, including "residencies".
	There needs to be a more holistic approach to balancing the needs and expectation of partners on all sides. There is a perception that collaborative relationships should not be merely transactional, but build on trust and accountability, especially around knowledge mobilisation.

What should a social sector organization expect from a university partner? What can a university expect from a social partner?

	When building a partnership, social organisations expect equality as a starting point, reciprocity as well as the recognition of the value of lived experience and practitioner expertise around social issue. There is a need for greater conceptual flexibility to accommodate the latter.
	Building reciprocal relationships in which community expertise is recognised and valued might require the creation of new standards of expertise.
	There is a worry that many campus-community partnerships are founded on relationships that are transactional. Trust and relationship need to rest on an understanding of what creates value and a shared determination to pursue it.
	The creation of campus-community partnerships would benefit from more effective centralised coordination. This may require the support of brokers/match-makers. The expectation is that universities would be expected to support the process.
	Establishing a shared understanding of the objectives, i.e. a clear logic model/theory of change from the get go would help calibrate the expectation of partners on all sides.
	There is a perception that continuous training is something that could be expected from a university by a community partner.

THEME 3. OPENING UP THE ACADEMY

Over the last few decades, Canadian universities have adopted a range of new approaches to community engagement and knowledge mobilisation specifically geared at increasing the impact of social and human research in the social sector and beyond. Canadian research funders' concerted emphasis on impact has provided both more clarity on the outcomes, and potent incentives toward both cross-sectoral partnerships and interdisciplinary research to address societal challenges that include but are not limited to climate, health, and policy.

Research is a factor of impact in the social sector. But more research-partnerships might not be what is needed to increase the capacity of social sector organisations to innovate. This is especially true of the needs of social sector organisations that revolve around the iterative processes that drive knowledge absorption and change management in a constantly evolving ecosystem.

Other academic assets can drive campus-community partnerships dedicated to building a rich, capable, and resilient eco-system. A narrow understanding of the kind of campus expertise that can cater to needs of communities around innovation creates a gap, and reduces the relevance of the research mandate of academic institutions. Opening up academia will require innovative approaches that broaden what we understand to be the impact of academic activities.

HOW IS THE IMPACT OF SSHA IN COMMUNITIES BEST MEASURED AND ASSESSED?

What do we mean by 'impact', what aspects of impact is valued more and by whom?	
	Impact is the change that results from our actions. Impact is complex. Impact is not linear.
	There is a bias for quantitative indicators when it comes to impact measurement.

	Value is often measured in terms of return on investment. If impact assessment is meant to reflect "value", it should reflect social return on investment.
	Impact assessment frameworks should be informed by the perspectives of all stakeholders. Impact should be about measuring changes that people themselves want.
	<p>Future initiatives should prioritise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a better understanding of indicators of impact that reflect perceptions of value of all stakeholders • support for social sector participants in understanding impact • definition of qualitative and relational metrics academics can use to document their impact in the community (e.g. well-being indicators). • a better understanding of the way to contribute to system-level impact?

Who measures the impact of SSHA on society and for what purpose?	
	<p>There is unclarity on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the purpose of measuring SSHA impact • whether what is being measured is SSHA impact or something else • whether SSHA impact can or should be measured
	One purpose of measuring SSHA impact should be to build self-awareness.

	Defining metrics as part of an evaluation plan can be part of creating a new logic model, and understanding what outcomes are expected and what success looks like. Assessment is a reflective tool that can generate meaningful new information about the object of the evaluation beyond its success.
	Measuring outcomes and/or impact for the mere purpose of reporting to funders/institutions is not meaningful.
	There is a difference between output, outcomes and impact.
	Metrics need to take into account diversity of purpose across disciplines/sectors.
	Metrics should reflect impact on all stakeholders.
	Measurement has an ethical dimension.

	Measuring the impact of SSHA is difficult (participants made comments about what they perceived could contribute to increasing the relevance and meaningfulness of metrics for SSHA impact)
--	---

In what ways can community-integrated teaching and engagement be recognized and its impact measured?	
	It's unclear what community-integrated teaching and engagement are.
	There needs to be a better understanding of recognition criteria for community-integrated teaching and engagement. Such criteria would need to take into consideration the fact that what counts as success or meaningful outcomes varies across stakeholders.
	Community-integrated teaching and engagement needs to be more visible, and requires more incentives.
	There is a perception that SSHA could learn from approaches developed in business schools where engagement with the community is more prevalent.

	Disciplinary boundaries are not relevant when it comes to community perceptions of impact of SSHA.
	Impact of SSHA disciplines is usually understood to belong on timeline that does not reflect the needs of community stakeholders. How do we address this perception and/or the resulting attitudes toward SSHA?
	We don't have an adequate understanding of the way in which the individual impact of SSHA researchers compounds. Scalability is a recalcitrant issue.
	<p>There is a need for greater clarity on the success conditions of community-integrated teaching and engagement, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capacity • Recognition and reward • Differences in needs, motivations and perceptions of value between academic and community participants • scope of project matches students skills • Constraints on partnership on all sides • effectiveness of matching/brokering processes • reciprocity

Are social and human sciences researchers attuned to the needs of their communities, and if not, why?

	While SSHA researchers understand the issues that need to be addressed, they do not have an intimate knowledge of the inner workings of communities. This is both the cause and the effect of the fact that researchers' and universities' social capital is inadequate.
--	--

	Improved campus-community connections would require a shift in attitudes toward the objectives of training at both undergraduate and graduate levels that reflects a shift in the value we ascribed to all stakeholder knowledge. (Asset-based approach)
	Attempts to resolve issues would need to be systematic and may affect research practices, e.g. assumptions as regards what counts as research, what counts as data and what may constitute bias. Academics make assumption about what work/data/research is valuable that does not always reflect community needs.
	Time is a constraint on the ability of researchers to gain an understanding of the needs of their community partners. Time is needed to build trust, relationships etc. and for academics to engage in the type of co-creation processes that are truly inclusive of partners both upstream when research questions are being defined and downstream, at the implementation stage.
	Other constraints include: deliverables and expectations set by/for funders.

WHAT WOULD ACADEMIC AND COMMUNITY FUNDERS NEED TO CHANGE TO
CREATE BETTER CONDITIONS FOR IMPACT-DRIVEN RESEARCH AND PRACTICES
IN THE SOCIAL INNOVATION ECOSYSTEM?

Current funding models support partnered academic research. Do they also fund innovation in the social sector? What holds the current funding models in place?

	While funding opportunities exist for partnered research projects that bring academics and social sector stakeholders to collaborate, universities and SSOs belong to different funding ecosystems when it comes to "innovation".
	In academia, opportunities are not typically geared toward the innovation process, but often toward research questions that are not perceived to have direct implication for innovation and impact.
	Partnerships between universities and SSOs often revolve around service contracts, with deliverables that are not directly connected to innovation.
	Articulate the distinction between "research partnerships" and "innovation partnerships" in the social sector, to do justice to the nature and structure of the innovation processes (as opposed to implementation and evaluation).
	Scan of funding opportunities for innovation in the social sector that would make clear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for SSOs • Opportunities for academics • Opportunities for partnerships
	Make clear the needs, interests and constraints of community-partners and researcher, including the cost of bureaucratic loops on community partners who have reduced.

What rewards/incentives are there for opening up recognitions for scholarly engagement with the social innovation ecosystems?	
	While community engagement is no longer seen as career limiting, more work is needed to dispel the myth that engaged scholarship should not be valued as much as academic research.
	<p>There are factors that may affect uptake of such opportunities by academics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authorship and ownership raises questions in the context of partnered research and calls for a better understanding of the motivations and impact for collaborations, including accountability, recognition and impact. - Criteria for tenure and promotion are often unclear as to the value of community-engaged researcher
	Develop clear assessment criteria for community-focused knowledge mobilisation and partnered research. Draw on existing framework such as DORA to inform guidelines, and create open access resources.
	Reassess guidelines and timelines for research grant programs that revolve around community-focused partnership that involve community partners in co-design or other collaborative research activities.

What else could funders support beside research partnerships and community-engaged research to support innovation in the social sector? What new funding models/adapted models could be made available to community-university partnership for social innovation activity?	
	Research relevant to community-partners need to be accessible to community partners, which requires an element of sci-comm.

	Academics' ability to implement research, as opposed to conduct research is limited.
	Academic research is not geared toward the sort of innovation that is needed in the social sector. There seems to be a bias or flaw in the design of funding programs that perpetuates this.
	There needs to be a better account of the difference between funding research project (that can lead to innovation, but whose objectives often are remote) and funding innovation projects.
	The number of individual projects is large and the objectives of this research to disperse. Assuming the research funded is geared toward innovation, funding for innovation in the social sector (as opposed to research in the social sector) needs to be more strategic.
	There should be clarity as to what it would mean to fund innovation in social sector, i.e. programs should pursue incremental/process innovation as well as productive innovation.
	<p>Current funding programs should be reassessed to reflect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More realistic expectations as to the resources needed (time, money) to meaningfully connect with communities, including building relationship and trust • The importance of incremental innovation, capacity support and scaling in the innovation process

	<p>Funders should play a role in the creation of campus-community, cross-sectoral fora or research collaboratives that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aim to develop targeted partnership focused on communities' needs • provide community partners with incentives and deliverables that would increase their ability to participate • collect/evaluate research to pinpoint effective innovation
--	---

THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC FACING SCHOLARSHIP

Research is king in academia; how is it best mobilized to create impact in the community?	
	Best practices include co-creation and action-oriented research with stakeholder engagement.
	Effective knowledge mobilisation might require structural change, in an effort to address some of the barriers such as lack of training, and added burden of research bureaucracy on partners (e.g. grant applications, ethics application). This would also include recognition, rewards and incentives that adequately reflect the time invested
	Knowledge mobilisation would be more effective if campus and community stakeholders shared a language.
	Change in funding models are needed.

How diverse is public facing scholarship? Whose voices are being heard and what can we do to be more inclusive?

	There is a difference between community-engaged scholarship and public-facing scholarship
	Demographics play a role in diversity: while junior faculty are more diverse, they have less incentives to engage in public-facing scholarship. Likewise, more senior academics are likely to have more funding and resources and visibility outside academia.
	Supporting diverse forms of research and developing better sharing practices within and across departments, faculties, etc. could be a factor for increasing the diversity of public-facing scholarship.
	Creating inclusive spaces involves knowing when to stop talking and listen and being able to question whether you're the right person to speak on an issue
	Community-engaged scholarship needs to integrate (as opposed to "include") input from communities, which may include co-authoring or favouring new modes of communications, e.g. story-telling.

What are some of the risks and mitigation methods for public-facing scholarship?

	Public-facing scholarship, especially online, presents specific psychological risks, including but not limited to harassment and lack of uptake.
--	--

	Researchers have few opportunities to learn how to engage in public debate/discourse
	Public-facing scholarship takes time away from "traditional" academic research, which can constitute a risk for those who have to meet tenure/promotion criteria.
How Effective is public engagement how does it contribute to evidence support? (Report on this question did not yield informative input.)	

THEME 4. SKILLS, TOOLS AND KNOW-HOW FOR SOCIETAL IMPACT

Key to innovation in the social sector are knowledge processes and approaches to change management that place high demand on both individuals who need to be skilled to adapt, pivot and continue to learn and on organisations that need to display capacity to manage change.

Federal, provincial and community-based programs are dedicated to upskilling the social sector workforce around social innovation techniques that future social sector participants should be able to navigate. However, social innovation skills, just like other important skills (e.g., digital, social and emotional) are not currently part of academic training. The long-term view would be for social sciences, humanities and arts programs to leverage the rich potential of their disciplines to cater to the social sector's vocational need by offering students the opportunity to build those skills without having to transform curriculum or dilute disciplinary training.

First and foremost, universities need to reassess their approach to experiential learning as part of SSHA-based vocational training. While experiential learning poses distinctive challenges for both SSHA students and social sector partners, SSHA programs are uniquely positioned to help current and future not-for-profit managers build the skills they need to contribute to innovation in the social sector.

WHAT DOES EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING NEED TO LOOK LIKE TO HELP BUILD SKILLS TO ADDRESS THE SOCIAL AND MUNICIPAL SECTOR'S HUMAN RESOURCES CRISIS?

Are we fostering the skills/talent necessary to meet the demands of social sector and municipal governments will face over the next 25 years?	
	We are not fostering the skills/talent necessary to meet the demands of social sector and municipal governments will face over the next 25 years

	<p>Focus on foundational skills (skills for innovation and partnerships) is crucial, but academic training is not designed to equip students with a good understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the skills they have and acquire through their training • the complementarity and continuity of discipline-specific skills with skills for innovation and adaptability. • How to apply their research skills to experimentation and design in the context of social innovation (re: change, trial and error, uncertainty, failure)
	<p>There is a need for skills assessment and literacy tools that help students articulate and communicate the value of the their skills</p>
	<p>Instructors need resources, including learning and assessment support to help them emphasise, draw out and/or articulate the way in which their courses contribute to skills-building.</p>
	<p>There is need for greater access to experiential learning</p>
	<p>Instructors need to be a willing part of the implementation process, and institution need to support them in the transition.</p>
	<p>Cross-sectoral partnerships focused on the exchange of knowledge and skills should underpin efforts, with academia redirecting training funding/resources to scale the scope of such initiatives and their impact.</p>

	The knowledge and experience of colleges could be usefule
--	---

What should universities be contributing in terms of infrastructure for experiential learning partnerships?	
	<p>Universities need to provide the pedagogical infrastructure required to streamline experiential learning and lower the intangible cost (supervision, onboarding, calibration, mentring) to partners since which is supervision heavy in the social sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students should be in a position to apply a baseline of relevant foundational skills prior to placement. • Students need to have a clear understanding of the expectations of placement
	<p>Experiential learning partnerships need to rest on civic infrastructure: universities need to foster relationships of trust that rest on an adequate understanding of the needs and constraints of community-partners and a desire to create reciprocity.</p>
	<p>Capacity to host experiential learning in the social sector is variable and scalability is likely to be hard to achieve. Support should be provided to help partners understand expectations as well and attention should be placed on capacity.</p>
	<p>More knowledge is needed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which experiential learning models work well in the social sector • What incentives are most relevant for all involved • What support is needed • What resources are needed

WHAT ARE THE SKILLS FOR INCLUSIVE INNOVATION AND PARTNERSHIPS IN THE SOCIAL SECTOR?

Are the current experiential learning models adapted for the social sector and how could they be improved to meet the needs of social sector agencies?	
	Experiential learning models are predominantly adapted from STEM, and there are no models of experiential learning that focus on innovation in the social sector.
	The motivations and needs of stakeholders (academic organisation, student, community partners) are not well understood which undermines the capacity to achieve “balance” or reciprocity.
	Students have difficulty articulating and communicating the value of the skills they have because they are unaware of the way in which these skills are applicable in experiential context. One aspect of creating the right conditions for experiential learning is to do justice to the attitudes that drive innovation processes in the social sector.
	Develop clear assessment criteria for community-focused knowledge mobilisation and partnered research.

	Create skills assessment and literacy tools that help students articulate and communicate the value of their skills. Specifically, provide tangible examples of contexts in which foundational skills are transferred from research context to social sector/employment context.
	<p>More knowledge is needed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • needs of all stakeholders and the co-design process that would ensure transparency • the best way to embed skills-building into curriculum/degree

Which training programs are available to those who are looking to work in nonprofit and are they targeting the skills needed for innovation in the social sector/municipal government?	
	SSHRC-partnership programs can be leveraged to work with nonprofit and target skills for innovation in the social sector, but there is need for an expansion across social sector/municipal government
	There is a skills gap. Many of the skills non-profit employees need end up being self-taught, as opposed to acquired as part of university training. This includes a mismatch between students' expectations (grand projects) and the reality of the scope of duties
	Assess the potential of reframing the objectives of SSHA training in vocational terms by emphasising the foundational, transferable skills already implicit in curriculum. Identify the gaps.

	Educate all stakeholders on the value of SSHA skills and vocational preparedness.
--	---

What is the role of change management and transformation leadership in the social sector and how prepared are current and future non-profit managers to be truly inclusive and foster diversity.	
	Change management and transformational leadership are key factors of innovation in the social sector that require specific skills.
	Genuine inclusion in the context of change and for the purpose of transformation goes beyond guidelines for EDI, to create psychological safety
	Many elements can create barriers to inclusion to a change mindset and transformational leadership some of them cognitive (e.g. lack of knowledge) psychological (e.g. risk-averseness, perceptions of lack of transparency) some institutional (e.g. reporting structures, maladapted performance review processes) and some material (e.g. lack of resources or funding)

	<p>More knowledge is needed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the best way to insure that SSHA graduates have the individual skills needed for change management and transformational leadership and to understand how organisational change leads to or hinders social/system change the role of funding in supporting the process in the social sector
--	---

WHAT SKILLS ARE NEEDED TO FOSTER INTERDISCIPLINARITY AROUND HUMAN/SOCIAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION?

What sectors have the greatest needs for interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral collaboration around social innovation? What specific skills are lacking?	
	The sectors dealing with social determinants of health are most in need of interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral collaborations, but the need is urgent in any sector that deals with complexity involving a human element: e.g. climate adaptation, pandemic response, food, agriculture, housing.
	Some skills, e.g. foundational skills are relevant to all sectors, but other skills are sector specific, e.g. legal knowledge in some cases (e.g., immigration)
	There is a perceived tension between the imperatives of interdisciplinary research and specialised research.

	Collaboration between different groups of stakeholder is difficult.
	<p>Collaborative models need to be developed that are informed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate understandings of stakeholder needs and motivations around knowledge motivations • Empathy • Awareness of privilege • Diversity of approaches

What needs to change in PSE training environments in order to prepare all students for interdisciplinary and cross sectoral collaborations?	
	<p>Two of the main deficiencies of PSE training are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of practical knowledge/training • The inadequacy of student assessment and supervision which do not prepare students for activities outside academic structures.
	<p>There is a widespread sentiment that current approaches to training need to be reassessed and transformed to provide students with opportunities to build skills they need to be in a position to transition into employment. Such opportunities could include: skills literacy, skills-building and experiential learning as well as mentorship.</p>
	<p>Collect, analyse and share data on WIL programming to inform program development.</p>

How are we building and recognizing contributions to interdisciplinary research and skills development?	
	At least some of the skills needed for interdisciplinary research and innovation need to be fostered from an early age and are honed over time.
	The value-added such skills bring need to be visible to all stakeholders, including but not limited to academic stakeholders.
	In order to encourage the acquisition of skills for interdisciplinary research, academic institutions need to reward activities in which such skills are applied. At the graduate level, this could include new approaches to evaluation and professional training, including adequate levels of skills-literacy.
	There is a tensions between the vocational and academic mission of universities: new approaches to evaluation, professional training and skills building can be perceived as incompatible with the imperatives of academic training.
	Forum dedicated to postgraduate skills-building.

How are we building and recognizing contributions to interdisciplinary research and skills development?

	Interdisciplinarity is not sufficiently encouraged and rewarded in academic settings. This could be linked to specific training and supervisory cultures in SSHA, to disciplinary territoriality or even to perceptions of risk associated with funders' expectations.
	Supervisors could play a key-role in a culture shift.
	There needs to be more opportunities to collaborate, and these opportunities need to be embedded in institutional structures that provide the required infrastructure and support: space, funding and time to pursue interdisciplinary projects.
	To shift academic culture toward interdisciplinarity, incentives are needed. But transforming curricular objectives and fostering interdisciplinarity from early on is crucial.
	The participation of SSHA researchers and emerging researchers in large interdisciplinary ventures might be affected by misunderstandings of the role of social and human research outside their faculties.