Report Type: 1st Progress Report, 1st Interim Report

Period covered by the report: September 2013 – September 2014

Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: A global study of effective institutional arrangements for the facilitation and support of research partnership between community and universities.

Report Prepared By:

Crystal Tremblay, Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon

Date: September 2014

Country/Region: Global

Full Name of Research Institution(s):

The University of Victoria, Canada

The Society for Participatory Research in Asia, India

Name(s) of Researcher/Members of Research Team:

University of Victoria

School of Public Administration

3800 Finnerty Rd

Human & Social Development Building, Room A302

Victoria, BC, V8P 5C2, Canada

Phone: 250-721-8055

Research Team:

      Budd L Hall (bhall@uvic.ca); Jutta Gutberlet (gutber@uvic.ca)

      Crystal Tremblay (crystal@uvic.ca)

Society for Participatory Research in Asia

42, Tughlakabad Institutional Area

New Delhi - 110062, India

Phone:+91-011-29960931/32/33

Research Team:

      Rajesh Tandon (rajesh.tandon@pria.org)

      Martha Farrell (martha.farrell@pria.org)

Centro Boliviano de Estudios Multidisciplinarios (CEBEM)

Calle Pinilla 291, Esq. Av. 6 de agosto

Casilla postal 9205

La Paz, Bolivia

Phone: (591-2) 243 2910

Research Team:

      Jose Blanes (jose.blanes@cebem.org)

Makerere University

P.O.Box 7062, Kampala University Rd,

Kampala, Uganda

Tel: +256 41 4534343

Research Team:

George Openjuru (george.openjuru@gmail.com)

Living Knowledge Network – Bonn Science Shop

Reuterstr. 157

53113 Bonn, Germany

Tel: (02 28) 201 61-0

Research Team:

Norbert Steinhaus (norbert.steinhaus@wilabonn.de)

Table of Contents

Synthesis

The practices of community-based research (CBR) and all of its variations have developed and evolved over the past 35 years. With roots in the Global South the practices have spread throughout the international development community and supporting bodies such as IDRC. Over the past 15 years, CBR has been 'discovered' in the Global North as the Carnegie and WK Kellogg Foundations, the European Union, the Research Councils of the UK and Canada and the AUCC have been promoting research partnerships as key engagement strategies for higher education. A variety of institutional structures are being created to facilitate authentic and respectful research partnerships. Community-University research partnerships are therefore no longer a South or a North issue, but are an evolving global field of action with several global networks supporting them, including the Canadian-based Global Alliance for Community Engaged Research (GACER).

Our ability to benefit from the promises of drawing the resources of universities further into the solution of community problems on their terms depends in part on our answers to several questions: 1. What are the institutional arrangements and processes that show the most promise in facilitating effective, respectful and impactful community-university research partnerships? 2. What are the institutional policies needed to mainstream CBR? What are the most promising policies that national governments and funding bodies could implement to improve the quality of CBR and create effective structures and processes? To answer these questions we have carried out five steps: A global survey, case studies, systematisation process, knowledge dissemination and policy dialogues. The deliverables will include recommendations for the future development of the field shared on virtual platforms of the UNESCO Chair and through regional policy dialogues, development of targeted policy briefs, a practical e-handbook on best practices and an e-book on the theory and practices of facilitating community university partnerships.

This annual report provides an overview of progress and project activities completed to date, research impacts and knowledge mobilization efforts, capacity building and highlights the main research findings from a global survey (phase I). We are currently entering phase II of the research, the development of country case studies, based on the

research findings from the global survey. The case studies are intended to illustrate how country policies on community-university partnerships are being institutionalized and practiced at the level of Higher Education Institutions and Civil Society Organizations.

The Research Problem

While CBR in its many varieties has been in existence for 35 years or so, the past 10 years have seen an emergence of a new set of institutional arrangements and structures designed to overcome some of the constraints that have limited the full potential of CBR. These new structures with specialized knowledge of how to create community university research partnerships have been located in universities (such as the Office of Community-Based Research at the University of Victoria) in community organisations (such as PRIA in India) and in networks (such as the National Coordinating Council for Public Engagement in Higher Education in the UK). Our study is focussed on these new structures and the associated policies.

The mainstreaming of community-based research linked to Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) is constrained by a number of roadblocks. There is a severe underestimate of the skills and time required to jointly develop a research question for the most impact in the community. While new administrative structures have emerged to deal with this issue in some universities, most universities do not yet have a dedicated institutional capacity to facilitate Community-University research partnerships. There has not been a comparative study that we are aware of that looks at the emergence of new institutional arrangements to facilitate support community university research partnerships on a global basis in any part of the world. What kinds of institutional arrangements have emerged? How are they funded? What is the relationship between public and private needs? What kind of impact have they had on local or regional issues? What are the challenges faced by the different knowledge cultures working together? Are there methodological lessons to be learned? What kinds of new structures should be supported in the Global South? A second roadblock is the lack of incentive structures within Higher Education Institutions to encourage faculty to begin working in new ways. While the category of 'impact' has been added recently to the research assessment exercises in the UK, the gold standard for career advancement for the vast majority of

researchers all over the world is still the number of peer-reviewed journal articles accumulated.

A further roadblock is the unevenness of the research capacities within community organisations themselves. Being an equal player in knowledge creation terms means having the time and specialized skills. Moreover the nature of the knowledge culture is different in community settings. Academics tend towards abstractions, cautions and tentativeness in making knowledge claims. Civil society organisations need equal opportunity in terms of resources and time to both co-create meaningful work and have the space to reflect on and build capacity within their organizations.

Research Findings

In order to gain an overview of trends and patterns around the world on Community University Research Partnership (CURP) facilitating structures, we conducted a multi-lingual global survey in cooperation with our regional and global network partners. In addition to documenting advanced Community-University Research Partnership (CURP) structures, the survey has captured those working in pre-formal structures or intermediary mechanisms of engagement, to inform on challenges faced to progress toward institutionalization. The survey was designed in collaboration with regional partners and aims to capture a diverse and broad understanding and practice of CURP structures around the world. The survey was conducted between January - March 2014, and administered globally through our national and global network partners. We received 336 responses from 53 countries, covering each region of the world.

The survey data reveals a variety of institutional arrangements and processes that show promise for facilitating effective respectful and impactful community-university research partnerships. Furthermore, the data points to important current challenges and opportunities for strengthening civil society and higher education to work collaboratively on societies pressing issues. The results have been instrumental in informing knowledge in the following key areas of our inquiry: CURP characteristics, institutional structures and funding support, goals, outcomes and motivations, process and roles of partnerships, challenges, recommendations, and training needs in CBR. As with all such first research

efforts, more questions remain than we have answers for, but there are never the less some important findings that we are pleased to share.

1. In spite of extensive efforts in translating our survey and making use of various networks, data from the global South, with the exception of India and South Africa, has been very difficult to obtain. There is much more work needed and more creative and effective ways to be found to dig deeper into these parts of the world.

2. We have been surprised that at least amongst the respondents to this survey, that some kinds of facilitative research partnership structures have been in place for a longer time and across a wider range of HEIs than we had previously thought. The University of Quebec in Montreal, the Science Shops in the Netherlands and structures in some of the South African universities have been around for 30-40 years. The USA land grant institutions claim a heritage of 150 years. This means that the institutionalisation of research facilitative structures is very uneven with some new structures being created in the past year or two and others much earlier.

3. However uneven the distribution of models of community university research structures might be there seems to be consensus that if CBR or CBPR is to be mainstreamed, institutional investment in structures to support and facilitate community interests and academic research interests is a key step forward. Support is needed to allow for brokering of interests, visibility of community based work, bridging across disciplines and credit for academic career development for this kind of work.

4. While there is obviously no common term for research which originates in the community and flows back to the community across all languages, it is noteworthy that the terms community based research (CBR) and community based participatory research (CBPR) have emerged as the most common way of naming these kinds of knowledge partnerships. Our survey also underscores the strong interest in the provision of training for these research approaches.

5. There is strong evidence suggesting that the 'knowledge cultures' of civil society organisations and HEIs are very different. The uses of knowledge, the kinds of knowledge needed, methods used, links to social change and advocacy are understood and practiced very differently. CSOs are looking for answers to concrete issues in the community. They are not interested in nuanced and subtle 'maybe this or maybe that' kind of results that academics often favour. Academics need to write often to a kind of academic formula that is required by journals or books, this language is often obtuse and

mysterious to outsiders. These and many other knowledge culture differences need to become more transparent if deeper and more respectful partnerships are to evolve.

6. There is, we suggest, an emerging or a continuing contradiction between professed commitment to co-construction of knowledge and partnerships with communities on the part of university based scholars, and the actual practice of doing CBR which has to do with the origins of projects, sharing of resources and building of community capacities. A significant finding in our study is that when discussing the origins of recent research projects or question, in less than 15 per cent of the cases did research questions or projects originate at the CSO or community level.

7. Linked to this is perception of relative apathy in CSO and Community organisations about continued efforts to partner with HEIs taking into account the difficulties entailed, and the frustrations of past experiences in moving the practice beyond the rhetoric. There is an expressed need for building community capacity to play equitable roles in the research partnerships

8. Finally, in part because our survey did not contain language around these dimensions, the lack of a discourse around what some call knowledge democracy, attention to excluded or marginalized knowledge leaves us with further work to do in this critical area.

Some highlights from the survey include:

Regional Characteristics

- Community University Research Partnerships (CURP) activities are predominantly identified within the typology of Community-based Research, Community-based Participatory Research, and Engaged Scholarship;
- There is a large variation in the language, conceptualization and practice of these engagements, from 'extension' to 'co-creation' of knowledge. The language seems to be changing, but is the practice?

Institutional Support Structures and Funding

- Just over 60% of Higher Education Institutions identified in this research have some form of structure to support CURPs within the last 10 years.

- 45% of support for CURPs are coming from Government; 30% from within the HEIs, as apposed to CSOs, which seem to be more self funded, with less coming from Government (35%).

- Just over 40% of all respondents are dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with funding support for planning and partnership development.

- Over 60% of CSOs do not have access to library and academic funding opportunities. There is a need for capacity at CSO level.

- CSOs rely heavily on volunteers. More then 65% of CSOs have between 1-20 volunteers.

Goals, Outcomes and Motivations for CURP

- Over 95% of all respondents believe that the co-creation of knowledge is a primary goal in CURP.

- The different cultures of knowledge are using the CURP process to achieve different objectives. The main goals of HEIs are student training, co-creation of new knowledge, KM and problem solving; the main goals for CSOs are co-creation of new knowledge, capacity building, social change and support community services.

Role and Process of Partnership

- Less then 15% of CURPs originate in the community. These partnerships are still very much top down, initiated at the HEI level.

- Active participation in decision-making and distribution of funds in research projects is predominantly controlled by HEIs.

- In terms of the criteria most important in a CURP, overwhelmingly respondents agree that trust and mutual respect are essential, but also point to 'funding support for planning and partnership development'.

- Just over 25% of respondents are dissatisfied with the governance structure of the research partnership - and are not based on consensual decision-making. Also, very dissatisfied in community review process for funding and ethics.

- There seems to be a trend in the engagement and decision-making process of CSOs in the life-span of the research partnership. They have higher active participation in

networking and framing research agenda, and much less so when it comes to administration in research funding and data analysis. In addition, CSOs ranked high in participation of policy advocacy and development community action plan.

Challenges and Recommendations

- The most common challenges indicated by respondents are differences in timeline expectations (43.7%), and the participation of members (42.9%). These challenges are indicative of a very different culture of process and practice between HEIs and CSOs. It is clear from these results that there is a 'different language' between these cultures and diverse institutional processes that shape how research partnerships function, and ideally, flourish.

Training in CBR

- Over half (52.4%) the respondents have not had training in CBR. The most common training need identified in this survey is 'methodology for participatory research', including the philosophy and practice of co-created knowledge and ways of increasing equity in partnerships, methods and tools in participatory research, research design, data collection and analysis.

The results from the global survey have contributed to addressing our stated research objectives by providing knowledge on: a) the current trends and best practice in CURP structures and process from around the world, and b) consensus around the role and type of structures needed to support CURP. The case study research will inquire in more depth the 'best practice' policies and structures

Project implementation and management

The Table below describes the project activities during the reporting period. Details below also include research methods, and analytical techniques, and any changes that occurred since project design.

Global Survey and Systemization of Results

The primary research activity during this reporting year has been the design, implementation, analysis and dissemination of the global survey. The data was analyzed collaboratively with project partners at a systemization workshop May 17-19 in Victoria, BC (*Not New Delhi, as originally planned*). The workshop was planned in conjunction with a conference on Community University Engagement at the University of Victoria. An open workshop was held at the conference where the survey data was presented and discussed; an estimated 40 national and global leaders in this field participated.

Other opportunities for survey analysis and discussion of case study sampling occurred at the Living Knowledge Network in Copenhagen, Denmark April 9-11, 2014. Crystal Tremblay hosted a working session with European and global partners on the preliminary analysis of the global survey. This was also an opportunity to further disseminate the survey to target global regions where we had minimal response (*i.e parts of Latin America, Africa and Asia).*

Challenges: There were a few challenges in the design of the survey stemming from a very diverse language and practice of CURP. Although this also provides interesting observation on the scope and culture of this practice globally, the dissemination was modestly delayed. Likewise, we received a low response rate from the Global South, despite continued efforts to target Community and University networks in these regions.

Case Studies

The framework and methodology for case study selection occurred during June-August, in collaboration with project partners. We have identified 13 countries, based on global survey data and consultations, where national policies for engagement exist (Category 1) or are in development (Category 2). Contributors in each country were identified and invited to conduct the case study in July 2014. Case studies field visits and research are being conducted September −October with the final draft due November. We intend to publish the case studies in an open source e-book on theory and practice. It is expected that each case-study country will be between 15-20 pages (4500-5000 words) highlighting practical policies, tools and instruments.

Policy Dialogues

There have been a number of policy dialogues throughout the world during this reporting period, including Asia, Africa, Europe, and North America. The policy dialogues have been in conjunction with planned conferences and symposia in each region.

Asia Policy Dialogues

The policy dialogue is titled "Strengthening Community Engagement in Higher Education Institutions", saw the participation from a number of sectors including academia, NGOs, Government representatives, students, etc. Some of the premier UK academicians also attended the conference to share their experience on the theme. They are Dr Michael Osborne (Chair and Professor, Adult & Lifelong Education, University of Glasgow, UK), Dr. Emma McKenna (Co-ordinator, Queen's University, Belfast) and Dr Jenny Chambers (Senior Policy Manager, North Star Avenue, Wiltshire).

A similar conference was also scheduled in Delhi on the 5th of March' 2014. It witnessed extensive deliberations between an array of stakeholders, spanning government representatives, NGOs, academicians, etc. The Delhi event also witnessed the launch of the 5th GUNi World Report on Higher Education. The Report provides visibility and critically examines the theory and practice of engagement. It approaches the challenge of Community-University Engagement (CUE) in an integrated manner. It explores ways in which engagement enhances teaching and learning, research, knowledge mobilization and dissemination.

Africa Policy Dialogues

Rajesh Tandon provided a keynote presentation to a high profile policy event in Cape Town, South Africa at the end of August, 2014 in cooperation with the University of Cape Town. An additional policy dialogue was held at Stellenbosch University where we combined our findings with the launch of the World Report on Higher Education. There were 300 participants, many senior policy leaders in the region, at both events

We are in the planning phase of a networking and policy dialogue session to take place in October of 2014 at Makerere University in Kampala that will bring in representatives from Rwanda, Tanzania, Kenya, Sudan as well as other parts of Uganda.

Latin America Policy Dialogues

Crystal Tremblay led a discussion about our mainstreaming CBR project at the founding meeting of the Better Futures Network that took place in Rio de Janeiro in November of 2013. Walter Lepore from our research team has just completed discussions as part of the Annual General Meeting of the Latin American Network for Solidarity and Service Learning (CLAYSS) in Buenos Aires, August 2014.

Dissemination

Knowledge mobilization has been an on-going process. The UNESCO Chair website is maintained regularly and recently was updated to a more user-friendly platform. In addition, we have created a Facebook page, and a twitter account, both of which are very active. @buddhall is also active with twitter having over 1,200 followers at the time of the report.

The survey results have been finalized and are currently being distributed through our partner networks, in addition to the website. We are planning to produce a series of policy briefs (*see details in project activity table*), and the publication of all research results in 2 open source e-books and open access publishing of the case study material.

Table 1. Project Activities.

Project Activities	Details
1. Global Survey *Completed August 2014*	a. Design and development of a multi-lingual global survey and platform selection
	b. Development of national, regional distribution lists
	c. Disseminate the global survey
	d. Analyze the quantitative and qualitative data in collaboration with project partners
	e. Derive criteria for case study selection
2. Case Studies *In progress*	a. Identification of case studies through consultations

Project Activities	Details
	b. Field visits and in-depth interviews with key stakeholder
3. Systemization of Results *In progress*	a. A collective analysis workshop to analyze findings of survey data with research team and invited practitioners and policy makers in Victoria, BC, May 2014.
	b. A second systemization meeting to develop the methodology framework for the case studies in Victoria, BC, May 2014
4. Policy Dialogues	a. Latin American policy dialogue in Buenos Aires, Argentina at the World Congress on Comparative and International Education, June 26-28, 2013.
	b. Asian policy dialogue in New Delhi (linked to first systemization meeting) – Feb 2014
	c. European policy dialogue event at the Living Knowledge Network conference in Denmark, April 2014.
	d. North American policy dialogue at the "Beyond Engagement" International Conference at the University of Victoria, June 2014.
	e. African policy dialogue event at Makerere University, November 2014

Project Activities	Details
5. Dissemination	a. Enhancing the UNESCO Chair website as a virtual platform for sharing on-going web-based discussion and findings on the: b. Development of a series of policy briefs for: - bi-lateral and other international funding bodies; - global networks working in the field of CU research partnerships; - national granting councils in research and bi-lateral granting agencies investing in international development; and - UNESCO, GUNi and their regional networks in Latin America, Asia and Africa. c. Publication of results - E-publication of a practical handbook on "facilitating effective CURPs; - Publication of an electronic open access book of theory, practice and policy; and - Electronic open access publishing of case study materials.

Project Design

In addition to our regional project partners, we have had significant support and collaboration from various networks and individuals across the world. Invaluable contributions were made in the design, and dissemination of the survey from leading global experts in this field including: Leslie Brown (University of Victoria), Heather McRae (University of Alberta), Henk Mulder (Living Knowledge Network), Lorlene Hoyt (Talloires), Robert Hollister (Talloires), Joanna Ochocka (CCBR), Michael Cuthill (APUCEN), Bruno Jayme University of Victoria), Emilio Luis Lucio-Villegas Ramos (University of Sevilla), Maria Nieves Tapia (CLAYSS), Christina Escrigas (GUNi), Beth Tryon (University of Madison), Manuel Rebollo (CEBEM), Paul Manners (NCCPE),

Sophie Duncan (NCCPE), Sarena Seifer (CCPH), Ken Carter, Bruce Gilbert, Linda Hawkins (CBRC), Barbara Ibrahim (The American University in Cairo) Eric Bastien (SSHRC), Liam Roberts (European Commission), and Oliver Schmidtke (University of Victoria).

Through our partnerships we have identified additional networks that have been useful in disseminating and participating in our research and global efforts including: Association of Commonwealth Universities, Better Futures Network, TRUCEN, PASCAL International Observatory, the University-Community Engagement Network of South East Asia.

Project Management

The administrative and financial management of the project have been directed by Shawna McNabb, Faculty of Human and Social Development at the University of Victoria. We have been fortunate to have excellent human resources during this project tenure. We have not had any project management issues that have affected the project during this reporting period.

Forecasted Expenditures

We have completed year one of project activities with no remaining funds ($44,864). We are forecasting year two funding ($73,851) to be allocated as per requested in the original application.

The request to revise the budget travel funds to New Delhi ($5,460) was approved to be used for the Victoria meeting in May 2014. There are two budget lines in the year two funding that reference the New Delhi meeting, that we would like to allocate to other activities. There is a total of $6,480 initially earmarked for New Delhi (accomm/space/food = $4,500 and local participant travel = $1,980). A request for reallocating these funds will be submitted, along with requesting to move $4,000 for Crystal Tremblay's work on case studies (design and in country collection) to year two.

Table 2. Project Schedule.

Project Timeline	Actions
1.1 April – July 2013	a. Planning meeting at the GUNi conference in Barcelona, Spain (May 13-15, 2013) including:
	• Overview of project
	• Design of survey
	• Creation of Regional Working groups (LA, Asia, Africa, Europe, North America)
	b. Latin American policy dialogue and workshop in Buenos Aires, Argentina at the World Congress on Comparative and International Education, June 2013.
	c. Preliminary knowledge mobilization
1.2 July – September 2013	a. Discuss Survey content in regions and networks
	b. Indentification of potential participants
	c. Preliminary characteristics of case studies
	d. Survey platform
1.3 October – December 2013	a. Finalize survey
	b. Translations
	c. Dissemination- of global survey
	d. Knowledge mobilization
1.4 January-May 2014	a. Systemization workshop in Victoria, BC Canada, May 17-19, 2014

Project Timeline	Actions
2.1 June-August 2014	b. European Policy dialogue at the Living Knowledge Network conference in Denmark, April 9-11, 2014
	b. Analyze data and refine criteria for case studies
	a. Identify case studies
	d. Knowledge mobilization
	c. Dissemination of survey results to partners/respondents
	e. Outline for e-books complete
2.2 September - October 2014	a. Continue case studies in all the regions
	b. Knowledge mobilization
	Africa policy dialogue at Makerere University, Uganda in November 2014.
	c. Policy brief outlines
2.3 November – December 2014	a. Development of recommendations b. Analysis and writing c. Finish draft manuscript • Handbook on facilitating CURPs • Book on theory and practice in community university partnerships
2.4 January – March 2014	a. Development of policy briefs (HEI, CSO, Funders, Ministries) b. Knowledge Mobilization

Project Outputs and Dissemination

Category 1: Information Sharing and Dissemination:

Reports:

1. Global Trends in Support Structures for Community University Research Partnerships: Survey Results is a 40-page synthesis of the global survey "Strengthening institutional structure for Community University Research Partnerships'. The complete document is available on the UNESCO chair website under projects.

2. Community Engagement Practices in Punjab University' Chandigarh, India - See more at: http://unescochair-cbrsr.org/unesco/resources/ #sthash.H6SM9f28.dpuf

3. Community Engagement Practices in North Bengal Universty' Siliguri, India - See more at: http://unescochair-cbrsr.org/unesco/resources/ #sthash.H6SM9f28.dpuf

Publications:

We have had meetings with colleagues at the University of Victoria Library with whom we will be developing our open access publications. We are in the midst of creating our case studies, have explored a number of open access publishing options and are moving forward according to our timetable.

Conferences:

1. Budd Hall presented at the Community-Based Research Conversations – University of Massachusetts and other regional universities September 2013 – four sessions in different parts of Boston.

2. Crystal Tremblay was keynote at the Engagement Scholarship Consortium 14th Annual Conference. Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas. October 6-10th, 2013. Panel discussant for the Global University Network for Innovation session and Plenary speaker for the closing ceremonies.

3. Education for a Better World: Our Global Responsibility-Canadian Bureau of International Education-Vancouver, BC, Canada November 2013 Budd Hall-keynote

4. Crystal Tremblay presented at the Better Future Network: Building an International Network and Forum Communities, Universities, Livelihoods and Citizenship. Presentation: Empowerment and Communication in Brazil, the PSWM project. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, November 25-28, 2013.

5. Rajesh Tandon was keynote at the Learning Cities Conference, PASCAL International Observatory, Hong Kong, November 2013.

6. Budd Hall was keynote at the Education for a Better World: Our Global Responsibility-Canadian Bureau of International Education-Vancouver, BC, Canada November, 2013.

7. Budd Hall attended the Congress of the Humanities at Brock University, St. Catherines, May 25, 2014. Presentation: Learning from Community-University Engagements: A national study on Community Outcomes Achievements and Conditions for Success.

8. Crystal Tremblay, Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon co-presented a workshop at the CUVIC conference, University of Victoria, May 21 2014.. Workshop session: Institutional structures to support Community University Research Partnerships: A Global Study.

9. Crystal Tremblay presented at the Living Knowledge Network: An Innovative Civil Society: Impact through Co-creation and Participation, in Copenhagen, Denmark, April 9-11, 2014. Presentation: Global Launch of the 6th report on Higher Education, and networking session on preliminary findings of global survey.

Websites:

1. The UNESCO Chair website posts project updates regularly: http://unescochair-cbrsr.org/unesco/

2. Social media platforms are updated weekly including Facebook and Twitter

Category II: Knowledge Dissemination Events

Knowledge creation

1. Knowledge creation is occurring everyday in the project as we move forward with the analysis of the survey results, the creation of the case studies, the conversations in the policy dialogues and conferences and amongst members of the project team. The University of Victoria session in May of 2014 was specifically designed as a collective knowledge synthesis process with key members of our network from Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe present.

Training

1. Crystal Tremblay and Sarah Wiebe co-hosted an emerging scholars workshop *'The Arts of Engagement'*, as a conference capacity training initiative of the CUVic conference 'Beyond Engagement: Creating Integration, Innovation and Impact' at the University of Victoria, May 22-23, 2014. This interdisciplinary workshop, sponsored by Community-Based Research Canada, brought together over forty emerging scholars and experienced practitioners in community-university engagement to present, discuss and share the promises and challenges of this approach to scholarship. The workshop featured experts versed in arts-based, visual and participatory research methods to provide a reflective and interactive space for emerging and established scholars. Emerging scholars had the opportunity to work with the workshop convenors on a project integrating social media, photography and film throughout the conference. On the last day of the conference, a visual presentation was presented for all conference participants on the theme of: "What does community engagement mean?" The final video can be seen here: http://vimeo.com/96133566

Forthcoming Outputs and Dissemination

Reports:

1. Development of a series of policy briefs for:

    a. bi-lateral and other international funding bodies;

    b. global networks working in the field of CU research partnerships;

    c. national granting councils in research and bi-lateral granting agencies investing in international development; and

    d. UNESCO, GUNi and their regional networks in Latin America, Asia and Africa.

Publications:

1. Two open source e-books and case studies will be published with the University of Victoria Press:

    a. "*Facilitating effective Community-University Research Partnerships*", a practical guide on policy, structures and practice;

    b. An academic e-book on theory, practice and policy; and

    c. e-publishing of case study materials.

Conferences:

1. Rajesh Tandon with support from Wafa Singh will lead a policy discussion in Assam, India mid September, 2014.

2. Crystal Tremblay and Rajesh Tandon will attend the Engagement Scholarship Consortium, October 6-9th, 2014 in Edmonton, Canada. Rajesh is keynote speaker of the conference and will participate in a panel with Crystal Tremblay, and Beth Tryon (University of Madison) on CBR networks, and present the findings from the global survey on institutional structures.

3. Crystal Tremblay will attend the Talloires conference in Cape Town, South Africa December 4-7, 2014. She will host a workshop on the findings of the global survey

on institutional structures and CURP process. Over 350 University presidents will be in attendance.

4.Rajesh Tandon will attend the Asia Engage conference in Bali, November 2014.

5.Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon will take part in the East African Networking Meeting in Kampala Uganda, October 25-28.

6.Budd Hall, Rajesh Tandon, Norbert Steinhaus (Living Knowledge Network) will take part in a GUNi conference in Barcelona on October 14, 2014.

7. Budd Hall will present findings from the mainstreaming survey at the NCCPE national conference in Bristol, UK December 4-5, 2014.

8. Budd Hall will take part in the PERARES conference in Brussells October 1, 2014

Capacity-building

There has ben numerous opportunities for capacity-building throughout the project. Two undergraduate students at the University of Victoria have worked closely with the development of the project, have accompanied the policy dialogues, and contribute to social media and knowledge mobilization. Building collaborative project management has also been an asset, working alongside the new administrative support team at the University of Victoria.   In addition, Crystal Tremblay, the research coordinator, has gained valuable skills in conducting global partnerships research, throughout the life cycle of the project.

Impact

Our work is having significant impact in India where Rajesh Tandon has been working closely with the University Grants Commission, the Ministry of Higher Education, the Planning Commission and others on a series of meetings and policy discussions in various parts of India that have had very positive impact of directing significant government investment into programs to stimulate community university research collaboration. Through the creation of the survey and its implementation, we have also found that the term 'community based research' is more and more understood

and accepted. We are having an impact at Makerere Univeristy in Uganda in giving visibility to work that has been underway with excluded groups. We are seen by UNESCO, the International Association of Universities, Asia Engage, South African networks, CLAYSS, CEBEM , Talloires, PASCAL and others as sources of expertise on the theory and practice of CBR.

.

Recommendations

It has been a pleasure working with IDRC on this project so far. Dr. Luc Mougeot has been far more than a program officer, but has brought his very significant knowledge and expertise to our work at several key times. We feel that we are working with colleagues at IDRC who share a common vision of the role of knowledge as a contributor to a more just, sustainable and fair world.

We have appreciated the flexibility with the budget re shifting funds from the Delhi meeting to the Victoria event and giving us a go ahead with the Uganda meetings that will necessitate a request for a modest supplement at the end of the project.

One thing that IDRC might think about is being able to offer advice on open source open access publishing. This is required of all IDRC projects, but when we asked about how to go about this, we were told that they did not have information on this. We have found a way to do this through the University of Victoria library, but the question of dissemination and library take up is still a big question.