

the  
la **COLLABORATIVE**



**CANADIAN FORUM** for  
**SOCIAL INNOVATION**  
**FORUM CANADIEN** pour  
**l'INNOVATION SOCIALE**

**CONSENSUS REPORT no.1**

## OUR PARTNERS





## **CONSENSUS REPORT no.1**

This document was created by Dr Sandra Lapointe on the basis of data collected and /or analysed by Dr Shannon Boss, Dr Katherine Bourdeau, Marie-Hélène Hardy, Jessica Hider, Dr Catherine Klausen, Shahdah Mahhouk, Dan Marianovic, Kyle Morrison, Brent Odland, Akacia Propst, Sid Rahman, Stephen Ross, Afroza Sultana and Erica Thomson.

# PRELIMINARIES

## CANADA'S SOCIAL SECTOR

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

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

### FACTS

- **170,000** organizations
- **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 Covid 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 organizations 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

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.<sup>1</sup>

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 anchor institutions, universities are expected to create moral, cultural, political and economic value for their communities, region and for 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 société.

## HOW AND WHY THIS CONSENSUS REPORT CAME ABOUT

Below is the full report of discussion for each of the 42 questions that were selected for deliberation by participants at the first edition of the Canadian Forum for Social Innovation, the theme of which was 'Innovation and Societal Impact'. The meeting was hosted at McMaster University 12-13 October 2022.

The aim of the meeting 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.

---

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

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.

All discussion notes and comments collected on post-its as part of the question selection process were then transcribed to produce an [Analytic Summary](#) of the discussion output. The document was then used to create a [Consensus Workbook](#) in the form of an online survey designed to establish that our interpretation of the discussion output continued to reflect consensus. 54 participants to the Forum and other stakeholders evaluated selected themes or subthemes, and indicated their degree of agreement with the some 225 claims generated through our analysis of deliberation outcomes. Only the claims that generated unilateral or strong agreement were included in the Consensus Report. The prose was adjusted for stylistic purposes.

## How to use the report

The Consensus Report is designed to provide evidence needed to help advance current discussions move toward action by ascertaining zones of agreement across stakeholder groups that can help create alignment on policy, education and practice for innovation, innovation in the social sector specifically and social innovation.

It can be used to streamline co-creation processes that support the design of a concerted action plans by providing documented insights into what would constitute baseline stakeholders agreement in the face of a wide variety of their needs, interests and motivations.

The Consensus Report of the first edition of the Canadian Forum for Social Innovation will be included in the briefing package for participants to the second edition of the Canadian Forum for Social Innovation which will be held at Université de Montréal, 11-12 June 2024.

# CONSENSUS REPORT

## KEY TAKEAWAYS

**Innovation in the social sector and social innovation are not the same thing.**

*Innovation for impact in the social sector and social innovation each involve processes and approaches that are different from those that underpin innovation in industry sectors. Universities can support/amplify social innovation and the innovative work and research done in social sector organizations, in particular to build the capacity needed to absorb knowledge and innovation.*

**Social innovation and innovation in the social sector need to be informed by Indigenous knowledges and decolonial approaches.**

*As experts, policy leaders and practitioners, we tend to privilege one form of knowledge and we need to be vigilant about settler bias. As settlers, we need to make clear to ourselves what it means to recognize and cede space for Indigenous knowledges. As experts, policy leaders and practitioners in the social sector, we need to be prepared to make space for decolonization and true engagement/recognition with/of other ways of knowing.*

**Engagement is a methodology for knowledge mobilization.**

*Social innovation and systems thinking should inform design, execution and engagement to bolster uptake and viability of social programs. The role of academic institutions and research experts in supporting innovation in the social sector goes far beyond the provision of research capacity, but academic culture is one of the main barriers to universities positioning themselves as anchors in their communities.*

**Universities need to build knowledge partnerships for a resilient, inclusive society.**

*Social innovation requires a support system. We need to reduce barriers to research and knowledge partnerships with society. This involves fostering trust to challenge ineffective power dynamics and detrimental assumptions and a culture of collaboration and partnership and the setting of clear expectations on both sides of an campus-community partnership is a key element of success in the social innovation space.*

**We need to better assess the impact of the Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts in communities.** *What impact means and how it should be valued depends on who you ask. But there is a widespread sentiment that social and human research is not currently meeting the needs of their communities around innovation and social impact. One way to increase the visibility could be to recognize and document the social impact of experiential learning.*

**We need to create better conditions for impact-driven research and practices.** *Current funding models for partnered academic research effectively support neither innovation in the social sector nor social innovation. New or better adapted funding models need to be made available to community-university partnership to support innovation in the social sector and social innovation and scholarly engagement with society needs better recognition, rewards and incentives.*

**Universities need to equip students with the skills for inclusive social innovation and partnerships in the social sector.** *Current experiential learning models are not designed for the social sector and should be adapted to meet the needs of communities. Current and future non-profit managers need to be equipped to foster inclusion and diversity, and this involves skills for change management and transformation leadership. There should be training programs available to those who are looking to work in nonprofit, and such programs should equip students with the skills needed for innovation in the social sector and social innovation*

**Universities need to equip students with the skills to address the social and municipal sector's human resources crisis.** *We need to foster the skills and talent to meet the demands of social sector and municipal governments and well as infrastructure to support experiential learning partnerships*

**Universities need to equip students with the skills to foster interdisciplinarity in research and innovation.** *University-based training environments need to prepare students for interdisciplinary and cross sectoral collaborations. The sectors that have the greatest needs for interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral collaboration around social innovation face a skill gap. We need to build and properly recognize contributions to interdisciplinary research and skills development.*



**Municipal governments need to support inclusive social innovation internally and in the community.** *Municipalities and social sector organizations' needs around capacity for social innovation are mutual and municipal staff have opportunities to create new initiatives and exercise leadership in the social innovation space. However, current bureaucratic structures can hold back the potential of municipalities to contribute to social change.*

**We need scientific advice and innovation in municipal policy and decision-making.** *The needs of municipalities around evidence-support are numerous and varied. The municipality network is heterogeneous. In this context mutualizing needs to create shared pools of expertise is a challenge but there are many governance models to support scientific advice in municipal government. Beyond the availability of scientific advice, other factors affect the capacity of a municipality to make evidence-based policy and decisions*

# Table of Contents

- PRELIMINARIES ..... 3**
- CANADA’S SOCIAL SECTOR.....3
- UNIVERSITIES’ CIVIC MISSION .....3
- ..... 4
- HOW AND WHY THIS CONSENSUS REPORT CAME ABOUT ..... 4
- How to use the consensus report*..... 5
- KEY TAKEAWAYS ..... 6**
- CONSENSUS REPORT ..... 12**
- INNOVATION. INNOVATION IN THE SOCIAL SECTOR. SOCIAL INNOVATION ..... 12
- Innovation for impact in the social sector and social innovation each involve processes and approaches that are different from those that underpin innovation in industry sectors..... 12*
- Universities can support/amplify social innovation and the innovative work and research done in social sector organizations..... 13*
- Innovation requires the capacity to absorb knowledge and innovation ..... 13*
- SOCIAL INNOVATION AND INNOVATION IN THE SOCIAL SECTOR NEED TO BE INFORMED BY INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGES AND DECOLONIAL APPROACHES. ....14
- As experts, policy leaders and practitioners, we tend to privilege one form of knowledge and we need to be vigilant about settler bias. .... 14*
- As settlers, we need to make clear to ourselves what it means to recognize and cede space for Indigenous knowledges..... 15*
- As experts, policy leaders and practitioners in the social sector, we need to be prepared to make space for decolonization and true engagement/recognition with/of other ways of knowing..... 16*
- ..... 17
- ENGAGEMENT AS A METHODOLOGY FOR KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION ..... 17
- There is a gap between knowledge mobilization and knowledge use..... 17*
- Social innovation and systems thinking should inform design, execution and engagement to bolster uptake and viability of social programs. .... 18*
- The role of academic institutions and research experts in supporting innovation in the social sector goes far beyond the provision of research capacity..... 18*
- Academic culture is one of the main barriers to universities positioning themselves as anchors in their communities. .... 19*
- BUILDING KNOWLEDGE PARTNERSHIPS FOR RESILIENT, INCLUSIVE SOCIETIES ..... 20
- We need to reduce barriers to research and knowledge partnerships with society ..... 20*
- Fostering trust to challenge ineffective power dynamics and detrimental assumptions..... 21*
- Fostering a culture of collaboration and partnership requires a support system ..... 22*

<i>Setting clear expectations on both sides of an campus-community partnership is a key element of success in the social innovation space.....</i>	22
<b>ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS IN COMMUNITIES</b>	<b>23</b>
<i>What impact means and how it should be valued depends on who you ask .....</i>	23
<i>Social and human research is not currently meeting the needs of their communities around innovation and social impact .....</i>	24
<i>The social impact of experiential learning should also be recognized and documented .....</i>	25
<b>CREATING BETTER CONDITIONS FOR IMPACT-DRIVEN RESEARCH AND PRACTICES .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<i>Current funding models for partnered academic research effectively support neither innovation in the social sector nor social innovation .....</i>	26
<i>Scholarly engagement needs better recognition, rewards and incentives .....</i>	26
<i>New or better adapted funding models need to be made available to community-university partnership to support innovation in the social sector and social innovation .....</i>	27
.....	28
<b>THE ROLE OF PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<i>Research is best mobilized through engagement to create impact in the community.....</i>	28
<i>To be more inclusive, public facing scholarship needs all voices to be heard.....</i>	28
.....	29
<b>SKILLS FOR INCLUSIVE SOCIAL INNOVATION AND PARTNERSHIPS IN THE SOCIAL SECTOR.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<i>Current experiential learning models are not designed for the social sector and should be adapted to meet the needs of communities .....</i>	29
<i>There should be training programs available to those who are looking to work in nonprofit, and such programs should equip students with the skills needed for innovation in the social sector and social innovation.....</i>	30
<i>Current and future non-profit managers need to be equipped to foster inclusion and diversity, and this involves skills for change management and transformation leadership..</i>	30
<b>SKILLS TO ADDRESS THE SOCIAL AND MUNICIPAL SECTOR’S HUMAN RESOURCES CRISIS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<i>We need to foster the skills and talent to meet the demands of social sector and municipal governments .....</i>	31
<i>Infrastructure to support experiential learning partnerships .....</i>	32
<b>SKILLS TO FOSTER INTERDISCIPLINARITY IN RESEARCH AND INNOVATION .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<i>The sectors that have the greatest needs for interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral collaboration around social innovation face a skill gap.....</i>	32
<i>We need to increase and properly recognize contributions to interdisciplinary research and skills development.....</i>	33
<i>University-based training environments need to prepare students for interdisciplinary and cross sectoral collaborations.....</i>	34
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO SUPPORT INCLUSIVE SOCIAL INNOVATION INTERNALLY AND IN THE COMMUNITY .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<i>Current bureaucratic structures hold back the potential of municipalities to contribute to social change .....</i>	34

<i>Municipal staff have opportunities to create new initiatives and exercise leadership in the social innovation space.....</i>	35
<i>Municipalities and social sector organizations' needs around capacity for social innovation are mutual.....</i>	36
<b>SCIENTIFIC ADVICE AND INNOVATION IN MUNICIPAL POLICY AND DECISION-MAKING .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<i>The needs of municipalities around evidence-support are numerous and varied.....</i>	37
<i>The municipality network is heterogeneous. Mutualizing needs to create shared pools of expertise is a challenge.....</i>	38
<i>There is more than one governance model to support scientific advice in municipal government.....</i>	38
<i>Beyond the availability of scientific advice, other factors affect the capacity of a municipality to make evidence-based policy and decisions .....</i>	39
<b>APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>SHARED TERMINOLOGY .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<i>COMMUNITY .....</i>	42
<i>INNOVATION AND SCIENCE POLICY STAKEHOLDERS (by organization) .....</i>	42
<i>ACADEMIA.....</i>	45

### Innovation. Innovation in the social sector. Social innovation

Innovation for impact in the social sector and social innovation each involve processes and approaches that are different from those that underpin innovation in industry sectors.

What innovation is, and with it the distinction between traditional innovation, innovation in the social sector and social innovation, is generally not clear.

To shape effective approaches to knowledge mobilization, universities would need to better understand the needs, assets and processes of organizations with which they seek to partner to create innovation and/or social impact. As partners for systems transformation and innovation in the social sector, universities need to dedicate resources to developing and sustaining mechanisms/structures to engage with communities so that research and innovation partnerships are informed by the relevant aspects of community organizations e.g. capacity, policies, needs - especially in coming to an accurate understanding of processes and ways of doing around social innovation,.

Developing capacity for social innovation and innovation in the social sector will require new investments, time, and resources. There are ongoing concerns about scalability. It is not clear that community organizations' outcomes or targets can be defined quantitatively or in terms of economic impact and this makes it difficult to articulate the value of innovation in terms of social ROI. These difficulties point to a more fundamental gap in our understanding of the way communities and the organizations through which they thrive, work to create change.

There is a tension between simpler quantitative metrics like those typically used to assess the impact of technological innovation and its economic return on investment (ROI) and their applicability or efficacy for social innovation. Social impact as ROI cannot be measured in terms of short-term economic outcomes, and this uneasy fit makes the value of social innovation and transformative change seem intangible and less valuable. Next steps must involve a shift of focus from economic to social ROI.

## *Universities can support/amplify social innovation and the innovative work and research done in social sector organizations*

There is a connection between social innovation and civic engagement. This connection needs to inform universities' impact strategies, and the premise should be that the needs, assets and interests of universities and those of social sector organizations are often reciprocal and can be reconciled to create mutual value. Perceived misalignments could be addressed by articulating clear engagement goals that aim for solidarity, creating interdisciplinary and/or cross-sectoral dialogical spaces that appreciate and integrate knowledge gained from lived and practical experiences and by shifting academic focus, e.g. onto application. Adjustments need to be systemic or structural, i.e. institutional and will require funding.

Much of academic social sciences and humanities scholarly work is focused on the same cross-cutting complexity we find in societal challenges. It would be useful to determine the extent to which academic culture and disciplinary gate-keeping is an obstacle to contributing to social innovation. Knowledge mobilization is usually seen as an instrument of campus-community partnerships, but ensure that knowledge is used requires adapting tools and resources on both sides. To best support the innovative work of community partners, university-based researchers need to better understand their needs and organizational structures.

## *Innovation requires the capacity to absorb knowledge and innovation*

It is important to clarify the role of research knowledge in innovation and what it means for an organization to have the capacity to absorb it. There are cost for organizations in the social sector when it comes to engaging in research partnerships, and the perceived inadequacy of academic output to meet the needs of community partners makes it difficult for them to justify partnering in the first place. More time and money would help drive up the capacity to absorb innovation.

To optimize knowledge use, capacity for uptake needs to be factored into the definition of deliverables in a campus-community partnerships. Scholarly research reports are seen to have little purpose beyond meeting deliverables

attached to contracts. There is no adequate 'one size' format for such deliverables: each partner needs to be able to determine the format in which knowledge will best serve their purposes, whether it is an executive summary or a toolkit.

In turn, academic partners could help validate the outcome of R&D and innovation processes in the social sector. They could play a role in amplifying the significance of community-based research to inform policy (the assumption being that they have more direct access to policy stakeholders). However, standard approaches to social innovation and R&D in the social sector (e.g. experimentation, design thinking, sandboxing) are not typically supported by academic grant funding. Furthermore, funding requirements often lack flexibility. Currently, grant applications and reporting processes, even when the process is supported by academic partners, are perceived by community-partners to create unnecessary overhead, redundancy and workload. This adds to the calls for their reassessment.

"Market demand" models do not provide an adequate picture of what communities need in terms of support for social innovation through research or other scholarly initiatives. The current focus on program delivery and assessment is not conducive to innovation. There is an important role for sharing and for informal collaboration across communities: there is a worry about reduplication of effort, both when it comes to generating data or solutions.



**Social innovation and innovation in the social sector need to be informed by indigenous knowledges and decolonial approaches.**

As experts, policy leaders and practitioners, we tend to privilege one form of knowledge and we need to be vigilant about settler bias.

We need to address both cognitive and systemic biases that act as barriers to decolonial approaches to social innovation. Best practices in research with Indigenous people are indispensable and should be integrated via co-design (and their work adequately compensated). Indigenous peoples and settlers tend to have different worldviews and this brings tensions in their respective conceptions of what is taken to be true. The type of reflection needed to challenge worldviews requires the capacity to think through complexity and

understand the effects of cognitive biases. This accentuates ongoing concerns about humility, trust and empathy, especially in relation to biases and the privileging of certain forms of knowledge over others.

In addition to empowering individuals to address cognitive biases, we must address systemic injustices at their sources. Providing adequate funding to community-based research and innovation partners is a fundamental condition of creative equity and genuine civic inclusion. It is possible that current funding models designed to support academic expertise on a colonial model contribute to bias and create barriers to decolonization. We can challenge biased funding models by working toward defining success and impact in a non-colonial way. One potentially fruitful avenue to explore involves reassessment of the role of quantitative metrics in evaluations of social impact.

As settlers, we need to make clear to ourselves what it means to recognize and cede space for Indigenous knowledges.

There is a need to clarify what it means to bring Indigenous knowledge and decolonial perspectives to bear in academia: the focus on decolonization should be on implementing new approaches rather than on rationalizing current practices. In the processes, it is useful to take stock of what has already been done, and tools such as race/gender/critical theory that may enrich perspectives. We lack clarity on what it means to recognize and cede space for traditional knowledges, and it might be more effective to think of the undertaking in terms of creating and opening new spaces to share across knowledges. Either way, it's important to agree on who has or should have the epistemic authority to define terms.

There is a further concern that the distribution of resources needed to streamline access to information and best practices around Indigenous and decolonial approaches may be unequal which raises a number of questions about capacity. Perhaps distribution of existing resources need to be shifted according to new priorities rather than simply increasing the total number of resources available. More collaborations are needed, which must be supported by adequate funding strategies.



In order to create and open space to share knowledges, power dynamics need to change or evolve. Entrenched power dynamics act as a barrier to decolonization. Lived experience should be valued so that its significance for innovation is recognized and truly appreciated. In the academy, one way to do this may be to make space across the curriculum for courses where students are confronted with their assumptions, biases, and colonial histories. This action can help address cognitive biases.

At the systems level, a number of practices need to be deployed to fully support decolonization and the integration of traditional knowledges. Examples of ceding space for traditional knowledges include engaging Indigenous leadership without overburdening traditional knowledge keepers, and reassessing institutional policies and requirements to make place for Indigenous expertise in academia. An exemplary practice is the challenging of recalcitrant credential expectations when hiring Indigenous faculty.

As experts, policy leaders and practitioners in the social sector, we need to be prepared to make space for decolonization and true engagement/recognition with/of other ways of knowing.

Creating space for different ways of understanding knowledge involves coming to terms with 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 stakeholders in decolonization need to be willing and able to break out from traditional Western structures in which they work and learn.

Furthermore, in order to adopt decolonial practices, actors will need to accept to be critical of how structures reflect Western notions of knowledge and a willingness to value and work within alternatives. Making place for decolonization and Indigenous knowledges requires a cultural shift away from academic and/or market economy to values that are rooted in community/society and cooperation, such as trust and respect.

While engagement, accountability and universal design may be required in the process of decolonization, it is not yet clear what else could increase accessibility and create inclusive spaces for different ways of understanding. Solutions need to reflect the fact that Indigenous approaches are not

monolithic; and successful practices will include intentionally placing Indigenous people (as well as others with different perspectives) in decision-making and leadership positions.

## Engagement as a methodology for knowledge mobilization

There is a gap between knowledge mobilization and knowledge use

University based researchers need to become better attuned to the conditions in which the knowledge they produced is used successfully to create impact. Knowledge mobilization needs to happen in a language that is germane to the target audience. This is a matter of creating an equitable basis for collaboration. In turn, inclusive co-creation processes are crucial to ensuring that outcomes and solutions resonate with target audience. This might require upskilling or learning.

There is a need or place for new types of “action oriented” collaborations between academia and the social sector. The interests and needs of academics and community partners are often reciprocal and complementary, rather than perfectly aligned and a good knowledge mobilization strategy would cater to the needs, interests and assets of all involved. For example, the format of media in knowledge mobilization should not be designed solely to fit academic audiences.

Researchers may also need to acquire a better understanding of policy, because knowledge mobilization strategies should ensure that results and recommendations are presented to intentionally support decision making, that is to be used by stakeholders. Knowledge mobilization strategies should ensure that the information presented is relevant and effectively meets the needs of partners.

More funding is needed to support the work of researchers around cross-sectoral exchange and co-creation and ensure that community partners are fully involved in the process. There is a need to create incentives, recognitions, and reward mechanisms for academics that reflect the needs around time and funding when building connections in the social sector.

Social innovation and systems thinking should inform design, execution and engagement to bolster uptake and viability of social programs.

Co-design is one of the main ingredients of successful social program design. User-centric approaches have been demonstrated to be efficient, but we should be mindful that the resources required for success be available. Generally, more resources (e.g., time, expertise) need to be allocated to design, research and development.

One way to mitigate the risk of social programs dying from lack of uptake due to poor design, subpar execution and/or lack of ongoing engagement of clients/beneficiaries is to increase collaboration and integration and support knowledge sharing beyond mere reporting, including sharing practices and learnings. One obstacle to creating such sharing spaces resides in the fact that we are often expected to solve complex systemic problems through short-term programs with limited budgets and over-burdened staff and to produce specific outputs as a requirement by funders who operate on short cycles.

New collaborative approaches to knowledge mobilization could play a role in providing access to expertise as part of these design, implementation and engagement processes. However, it is not always clear how to use social innovation processes to support program design and delivery in the social sector. Part of the solution could be training for social innovation, but more needs to be done to determine what this would consist of. In turn, training might be needed around key elements of design, marketing, and evaluation. To mitigate some concerns about the costs of training, funders could play a role in the process by integrating training for social innovation processes as part of successful grants.

High staff turnover is a risk to the viability of social program. One focus of social innovation R&D could be to deliver design that ensure continuity in program delivery, which might help to maintain accountability even when staffing evolves.

The role of academic institutions and research experts in supporting innovation in the social sector goes far beyond the provision of research capacity.

Key to universities' engagement with society are two obvious but nonetheless still exotic propositions: a) that universities need to contribute to "innovation

in” in addition (and as opposed) to “research on” society; b) the notion that innovation is indeed needed in the social sector, and what that looks like.

Academic institutions could better support innovation in the social sector if they open their doors to community, and cater to actual needs and interests of communities as part of collaborative initiatives. These initiatives should be inclusive and egalitarian. Collaboration strategies should be designed to build trust and to return value to partners. This might require researchers to develop more responsive ways (and timelines) to share knowledge. To best support social innovation in the social sector, academic research funding would need to buttress the commitment to cross-sectoral collaboration and be driven by a definition of impact that prioritizes social outcomes and change. This in turn would require a reframing of assessment criteria and metrics.

Academic culture is one of the main barriers to universities positioning themselves as anchors in their communities.

Community-engaged research requires the creation of trust-based relationships that should survive any individual projects. But academic research cultures have historically been perceived as extractive. Communities are hesitant to engage with researchers because they see them as biased, hierarchical and liable to weaponizing results, which creates risks for reputation and funding.

Researchers’ expectations and constraints can make alignment with community partners difficult: misalignments in what people assume/believe, the way they describe and frame the latter, as well as the value they place on experience. Community partners often perceive that their expertise is neither valued nor recognized by researchers. It would be more purposeful to frame community and scholarly expertise as complementary and both equally needed in the context of community partnerships. Co-design is perceived as a way to address some of these concerns. Decolonization is another.

Effective knowledge mobilization approaches such as co-design in cross-sectoral collaborations demand time, which traditional academic research support funding models in SSHA do not provide for. The time commitment campus-community partnerships demand needs to be recognized and the effort properly rewarded as part of tenure, promotion and merit reviews. A shift in approach would require that academic processes reflect an adequate appreciation of cross-sectoral collaboration and community impact and innovation in all its forms, and also understand that iterative replication

processes are elemental to the scaling of social innovation and other types of innovation in the social sector.

Because innovation processes are in essence iterative, replicative and experimental, research design and implementation need to allow greater risk tolerance, and requires a shift from short-term to longevity thinking. Likewise, there needs to be a greater intentionality in integrating R&D/ innovation practices into program design in social sector organisations. This could be supported by a more holistic approach to funding and support innovation-partnerships. This could include the creation of funding program that require the allocation of funds to support directly community-partners involved in the process. It could also include the intentional integration of skills-building (for interdisciplinary, cross-sectoral innovation partnership) into research support.

## Building knowledge partnerships for resilient, inclusive societies

We need to reduce barriers to research and knowledge partnerships with society

Universities should bolster their integration in the community by maintaining and nourishing knowledge partnerships that include but are not limited to academic research projects. This could take the form of establishing partnerships around knowledge advice that revolve around data-sharing and knowledge use or providing access to research resources such as libraries. Community partners do not always trust that partnerships with researchers in academia will generate real actions or real change, and this is a barrier to collaboration.

Innovation partnerships need to revolve around shared knowledge and partnership goal, and this include a shared understanding of innovation and social innovation. Additional obstacles arise when partners do not share a language in which they can effectively communicate, or the means to “translate” adequately. For instance, it’s not clear that the definition of what counts as “innovation in the social sector” as opposed to “transformative social innovation” is the same for all those involved, and/or that the definitions that are effectively use are always purposeful.

Integrative approaches to research should involve the allocation of spaces, both physical and conceptual, for interdisciplinary and intersectoral collaboration. This could involve finding ways to formally include and intentionally recognize practitioner expertise in research grant (possibly on a model used by SSHRC).

Campus-community relationships need to pre-exist the development of collaborative projects. Relationship building might require brokering and facilitating support. Arguably, researchers at all levels (students 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.

Some barriers are connected to institutional structures, including lack of funding and incentives. In particular, participation in innovation partnerships should be recognized and rewarded on both sides, in ways that are meaningful to the participants. In academia recognition should be integrated to merit/tenure review. There is misalignment on a number of front, between e.g. academic timelines and the timelines on which innovation is expected to happen in the social sector, the needs of academic and social sector partners around innovation and the conception of expertise. All this which can lead to tensions between partners fueled by perceived asymmetry in the power dynamics that puts the community partners at a disadvantage.

### Fostering trust to challenge ineffective power dynamics and detrimental assumptions

University-based researchers need to approach community partners with humility since all have expertise, especially in context where Indigenous knowledge and decolonial approaches are central. The engagement process itself is important. Relationship building is a crucial part of campus-community partnerships. Commitments to building ongoing relationships between researchers and community organisations need to be more intentional. Trust requires a shared vocabulary, honesty, transparency and time. Timelines will 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 mobilized in the process can undermine partnerships. It's important to understand and neutralize these imbalances so that all stakeholders feel they are being treated equitably.

Fostering a culture of collaboration and partnership requires a support system

Collaborations can be overwhelming for community partners who are often strained for resources and funding. Reciprocity needs to be a standard feature of campus-community partnerships. 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. Research administration processes, e.g., the creation of memoranda of understanding, legal agreements reporting, and even research ethics accreditation can be intimidating and difficult to navigate and to accommodate for community partners.

The expectation should not be, by default, that knowledge mobilization unidirectionally brings academic expertise into the community. Community-expertise ought to be mobilized into the academy. This can take a number of forms.

There needs to be a more holistic approach to balancing the needs and expectation of partners on all sides. Collaborations should not be merely transactional, but build on trust and accountability, especially in the processes around knowledge mobilization. Recognizing that resources and time go into collaboration will help mitigate stress in partnerships. In such context however, information about partnership opportunities need to be easily accessible for community partners.

Setting clear expectations on both sides of an campus-community partnership is a key element of success in the social innovation space.

Trust and relationship need to rest on a shared understanding of what creates value and a mutual determination to pursue it. As early as possible,

partnerships should establish a shared understanding of the objectives, i.e., a clear logic model or theory of change. This would help calibrate the expectations of partners on all sides. Building reciprocal relationships in which community expertise is recognized and valued might require the creation of new standards of expertise.

When building a partnership, social organizations expect equality as a starting point. There needs to be reciprocity as well as recognition of the value of lived experience and practitioner expertise around social issue(s). There is a need for greater open-mindedness to accommodate the latter. There is a worry that some campus-community partnerships are founded on relationships that are merely transactional.

Research projects are often driven by specific individual initiative, but partnerships can be strengthened by institutionalisation structures. The creation of campus-community partnerships would benefit from more effective centralized coordination. This may require the support of intermediaries, knowledge brokering or match-making. The expectation is that universities would be expected to support the process because catering to knowledge needs and driving knowledge use is part of their mandate.

## Assessing the impact of the Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts in communities

What impact means and how it should be valued depends on who you ask

Impact is the change that results from intentional actions. But social innovation is not linear; it is complex. However, there is a bias for quantitative indicators in impact measurement practices, and the value of social innovations is often ultimately measured in terms of return on investment (ROI). If impact assessment is meant to reflect the 'value' for society in terms of societal well-being, it not clear that the notion of a "return on investment" will capture what it means. In order to reflect the value for society, impact assessment frameworks need to be informed by the perspectives of all stakeholders: impact assessment should be about measuring changes that people themselves want.



Metrics should be defined as part of an evaluation plan or for the purpose of building a logic model, to buttress a shared 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. 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 social impact is complex. It is not always clear to stakeholders what the purpose of measuring social impact is, or whether social impact can or should be measured. This is especially true in context where quantitative metrics are favored at the expense or exclusion of qualitative metrics and/or other evaluative processes. Measuring outcomes and/or impact for the mere purpose of reporting to funders or other external institutions is not meaningful.

Priority areas include working toward a better understanding of indicators of impact that reflect perceptions of value of all stakeholders. This could take the form of a framework for qualitative and relational metrics academics can use to document their impact in the community (e.g., well-being indicators). Priorities also should include support for social sector participants in understanding impact and how to contribute specifically to system-level impact.

### Social and human research is not currently meeting the needs of their communities around innovation and social impact

While many SSHA researchers have a vast and deep theoretical and empirical understanding of various aspects of the issues that need to be addressed, they do not have an often lack intimate knowledge of the inner workings of solutions deployed by community organizations and a practical understanding their context. Academics, for instance, make assumptions about what work/data/research is valuable that do not always reflect community needs. This is both the cause and the effect of a lack of connectivity between universities and their communities.

Attempts to increase connectivity between universities and social sector organizations in their communities would require institutional transformations that may affect research practices, for example, challenging assumptions about

what counts as research, what counts as data and what may constitutes bias. This includes researchers' conception of adequate deliverables which are often connected to expectations set by/for funders. Likewise, 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.

It is not clear whether time itself constrains university-based researchers' ability 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.

The social impact of experiential learning should also be recognized and documented

Recognizing and measuring the social impact of experiential and community-integrated teaching would call for clarity on criteria, and would need to take into consideration the fact that what counts as success or meaningful outcomes varies depending on the role of the partner. There is a need for greater clarity on many aspects of the conditions in which community-integrated teaching and engagement is successful, including: uneven capacity and the variability of needs, motivations and perceptions of value between academic and community participants; the most effective structures for recognition and reward; the appropriateness of the scope of project given the students' skills; effectiveness of the matching/brokering processes and; generated reciprocity. In this context, scalability is also a recalcitrant issue.

While SSHA face specific challenges when it comes to experiential learning partnerships, they might learn from approaches developed in business schools where community-integrated teaching and engagement with the community is more prevalent. Either way, better support and incentives are needed to encourage new initiatives. As with other aspect of social impact, careful consideration should be given to the timelines along which impact is measured.

The impact of SSHA researchers is often on a timeline that is not aligned with the needs of community stakeholders.

## Creating better conditions for impact-driven research and practices

Current funding models for partnered academic research effectively support neither innovation in the social sector nor social innovation

While funding opportunities exist for partnered research projects that bring academics and social sector stakeholders to collaborate, universities and community partners belong to different funding ecosystems when it comes to “innovation.” Partnerships between universities and community organizations often revolve around service contracts, with deliverables that are not directly connected to innovation. It would be worthwhile to complete a scan of funding opportunities for innovation in the social sector, compare their funding structures and identify opportunities for community organizations and academics.

It is important to articulate the distinction between “research partnerships” and “innovation partnerships” in the social sector, and to do justice to the nature and structure of the innovation processes (as opposed to implementation and evaluation). When looking at social sector innovation, it is important to keep in mind the needs, interests and constraints of community-partners and researchers, including the costs of bureaucratic loops on community partners who may have reduced time and capacity.

## Scholarly engagement needs better recognition, rewards and incentives

While community engagement is no longer seen as career limiting, more work is needed to dispel the myth that community-focused scholarship is less valuable than academic research. To increase scholarly engagement, it will help to reassess guidelines and timelines for research grant programs that revolve around community-focused partnerships. Community partners should be

involved in co-design or other collaborative research activities, and this should be reflected in the outcomes, guidelines, and timelines.

There are factors that may affect academics' capacity for community-focused scholarly activities. Authorship and ownership questions are raised in the context of community-partnered research, which 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-focused scholarship and research. To mitigate this, there needs to be clear assessment criteria developed for community-focused knowledge mobilization and partnered research. One possibility involves drawing on an existing framework such as DORA (San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment) to inform guidelines and create open access resources.

New or better adapted funding models need to be made available to community-university partnership to support innovation in the social sector and social innovation

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. Academics' ability to *implement* research, as opposed to *conduct* research is limited. There is sometimes a perception that academic research is not geared toward the sort of innovation that is needed in the social sector. This is more true of research completed at universities than colleges and may reflect a bias or flaw in the design of funding programs. The number of investigator-led and/or smaller research projects in the community is large and the objectives of these research projects often disperse.

Funding for research and innovation in the social sector needs to be more strategic. There should be clarity as to what it would mean to fund innovation in the social sector, i.e. programs should support incremental/process innovation as well as productive innovation. Minimally, this would involve that research relevant to community-partners be accessible to community partners, which requires an element of translation. Timelines surrounding impact and impact

measurement also ought to reflect the need for capacity support and issues of scaling in the innovation process.

Current funding programs should be reassessed to meet more realistic expectations as to the resources needed by researchers (time, money) to meaningfully connect with communities. This includes the resources required to build relationships and trust amongst partners in cross-sectoral and interdisciplinary contexts. Funders can play a role in the creation of campus-community cross-sectoral research collaboratives, especially collaboratives that aim to develop targeted partnerships focused on community needs. These partnerships should provide community partners with incentives and deliverables that would increase ability to participate and support capacity.

## The role of public scholarship

Research is best mobilized through engagement to create impact in the community

Action-oriented research is strengthened with ongoing stakeholder engagement. Best practices in knowledge mobilization include co-creation, which is more effective when campus and community stakeholders share a language. Effective knowledge mobilization might require structural change in an effort to address some barriers, such as researchers skills gap, and the 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. Ultimately, increasing research knowledge use to create impact in the community would require changes in funding models.

To be more inclusive, public facing scholarship needs all voices to be heard

To be more inclusive, community-engaged scholarship needs to integrate (as opposed to “include”) input from communities, which may include, for instance, co-authoring or favoring new modes of communications such as story-telling.

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.

There is a difference between community-engaged scholarship and public-facing scholarship. 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. In academia, demographics play a role in diversity: while junior faculty are more diverse, they have less incentives to engage in public-facing scholarship. More senior academics are likely to have more funding, resources and visibility outside academia.

### Skills for inclusive social innovation and partnerships in the social sector

Current experiential learning models are not designed for the social sector and should be adapted to meet the needs of communities

Determining how experiential learning can support deeper academic engagement to address the needs of the social sector and around social innovation should be a priority. It is especially important to consider the potential of a culture shift toward genuine reciprocity in experiential learning partnerships. Experiential learning should not accrue benefit for universities at the expense of the needs and interests of community partners.

While many experiential learning models are adapted from STEM disciplines, the assumption should be that innovation in the social sector and social innovation require dedicated approaches. To assess the suitability of current experiential learning models in community organizations, more knowledge is needed on the specific needs of stakeholders. Co-design could help ensure relevance and transparency. We also need to establish the best way to embed skills-building into post-secondary curricula and/or degree requirements, and develop clear assessment criteria for community-focused experiential learning.

The motivations and needs of stakeholders in community-focused experiential learning (academic organizations, students, community partners) are not sufficiently 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.

To improve current experiential learning models, we should create skills assessment and literacy tools that help students articulate and communicate the value of their skills. Specifically, we can provide tangible examples of contexts in which foundational skills are transferred from research context to social sector/employment context.

There should be training programs available to those who are looking to work in nonprofit, and such programs should equip students with the skills needed for innovation in the social sector and social innovation

It is not clear the skills needed in community organizations to support innovation can be acquired as part of current university training. There are at the very least mismatches between students' expectations which can be unrealistic and the reality of the scope of work.

We should work towards educating stakeholders on the value of SSHA skills and the sort of "vocational" (as opposed to professional) preparedness SSHA programs offer. One way to do this might be to reframe the objectives of SSHA training in vocational terms by emphasizing the foundational, transferable skills already implicit in curriculum.

SSHRC-partnership programs can be leveraged to work with nonprofit and support the development of skills for innovation in the social sector in the social sector. But effective approaches would need to be intentional and expanded across social sector/municipal government.

Current and future non-profit managers need to be equipped to foster inclusion and diversity, and this involves skills for change management and transformation leadership.

Change management and transformational leadership are key factors of innovation in the social sector and they require specific skills. Genuine inclusion in the context of change and for the purpose of transformation goes beyond the establishment of guidelines for EDI and involve 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).

More knowledge is needed on the best way to insure that SSHA graduates have the individual skills needed for change management and transformational leadership. They also need to acquire an adequate understanding of how organizational change leads to or hinders social/system change.

### Skills to address the social and municipal sector's human resources crisis

We need to foster the skills and talent to meet the demands of social sector and municipal governments

It is not immediately clear whether the academy is currently fostering the skills and talent necessary to meet the demands of the social and municipal sectors over the next 25 years. Focusing on foundational, transferrable, “human” skills is crucial. But academic training is not designed to equip students with a good understanding of the skills they have and acquire through their degrees.

Students are not provided with a clear understanding of the complementarity and continuity between discipline-specific skills and foundational skills for innovation and adaptability, and so lack understanding about how to apply their research skills to experimentation and design in the context of social innovation which involve intentional change, trial and error, uncertainty, failure.

This suggests that there is need for greater access to experiential learning. There is a need for skills assessment and literacy tools that help students articulate and communicate the value of their skills. In order to increase access to experiential learning, instructors need to be a willing part of the implementation process, and institutions need to support them in the transition.



To be successful, instructors need resources, including learning and assessment support, to help them emphasize, draw out and/or articulate the way in which the courses they offer contribute to skills-building.

Cross-sectoral partnerships focused on the exchange of knowledge and skills should underpin these efforts, with academia redirecting training funding/resources to scale the scope of such initiatives and their impact.

### Infrastructure to support experiential learning partnerships

The capacity to host experiential learning in the social sector is variable, and scalability of experiential learning programs is hard to achieve. Support should be provided to help partners understand expectations, and attention should be placed on capacity. Experiential learning partnerships need to rest on “civic infrastructure”: universities need to foster relationships of trust that reflect an adequate understanding of the needs and constraints of community-partners and a desire to create reciprocity.

Universities also need to establish the pedagogical infrastructure required to streamline experiential learning and lower the intangible costs (supervision, onboarding, calibration, mentoring) to partners. Experiential learning partnerships in the social sector are often supervision heavy. To mitigate this, students need to have a clear understanding of the expectations of placement and be in a position to apply a baseline of relevant foundational skills prior to placement.

More knowledge is needed on which experiential learning models work well in the social sector, what incentives are most relevant for all involved, and what particular support and resources are needed.

### Skills to foster interdisciplinarity in research and innovation

The sectors that have the greatest needs for interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral collaboration around social innovation face a skill gap.

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. It would be purposeful to better understand possible tensions between the respective imperatives of interdisciplinary research and specialized research in SSHA and the specific challenges of multistakeholder collaborations.

Foundational skills, are relevant to all sectors, but other skills are sector specific, e.g., legal knowledge in some cases (e.g., immigration). Collaborative models need to be developed that are informed by and adequate understandings of stakeholder needs and motivations around knowledge motivations, empathy, awareness of privilege and diversity of approaches.

We need to increase and properly recognize contributions to interdisciplinary research and skills development.

There is a tension between the vocational and academic mission of universities: new approaches to evaluation, training and skills building are sometimes perceived as incompatible with the imperatives of SSHA disciplinary training. To shift academic culture toward interdisciplinarity, incentives are needed. But transforming curricular objectives and fostering interdisciplinarity 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.

Sometimes, interdisciplinarity is not sufficiently encouraged or rewarded in academic settings. This could be linked to specific cultures in SSHA, disciplinary territoriality or even perceptions of risk. To mitigate this and begin to encourage and reward interdisciplinarity, 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. Collaborations and experiential learning opportunities can help cultivate skills needed for interdisciplinary research and innovation.

The added value skills for interdisciplinary research and innovation bring to society needs 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 training, including adequate levels of skills-literacy. It is not immediately clear what role supervisors would play here: it is possible they could play a key-role in a culture shift.

University-based training environments need to prepare students for interdisciplinary and cross sectoral collaborations.

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 to employment. Such opportunities could include: skills literacy, skills-building and experiential learning, as well as mentorship. Collecting, analyzing and sharing data on experiential programming is needed to inform program development.

### Local government needs to support inclusive social innovation internally and in the community

Current bureaucratic structures hold back the potential of municipalities to contribute to social change

Administrative processes could benefit from more agility and nimbleness, accountability and transparency. Municipal administrative structures are hard to navigate and their logic somewhat evasive. Administrative processes need to dedicate resources to foster diversity. Suggested improvements to administrative processes include: developing more flexible, problem-centric evaluation frameworks; rebuilding trust, relationships and communication; and limiting red tape around public space use.

There is also a perception that administrative structures at the municipal level favor 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 must be emphasized.

Bureaucratic structures are often seen as hinderances to cross-sectoral collaboration. There is a perception that bureaucratic structures at all government levels impede municipalities, not just their own bureaucracy. 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. Administrative processes benefit from institutional memory, so high staff turnaround contributes to inefficiency.

It is not the case that all bureaucracies impede capacity for change and constitute a barrier to social-sector organisations. Although political influence and bureaucracy can create some barriers and constraints on agility, the strength of the large institution allows brings much strength that can be leveraged through community partnerships. This includes drawing on the leadership of highly skilled municipal staff to: help convene core tables and initiatives, review and assess best practices in research literature and other communities; develop system change plans with the input of diverse partners; and advocate strategically with federal and provincial partners.

It is also not always the case that change of leadership comes with change of mandate, creating redundancy and duplication. Compared to provincial and federal governments, municipalities are not constrained by the partisan system and the major shift in mandates that comes with a change in power between elections. Municipal staff are also not required to report through multiple levels of bureaucracy to an elected minister and therefore are able to move much more quickly in designing new policies and programs that respond to immediate and emerging community needs.

Municipal staff have opportunities to create new initiatives and exercise leadership in the social innovation space

There are opportunities to encourage staff-led social innovation in municipal government. This can take a number of forms: creating new ways to promote cross departmental collaboration (opportunities for exchange increase knowledge capacity), increasing connectivity and exchange between municipalities and other levels of government to mutualize needs arounds skills-building and information sharing. Administrative staff can also work from the ground up with local communities, building trust along the way.

The skills that are perceived to be needed by municipal staff to support innovation 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. Time and money can significantly constrain the development of these skills.

However, there are also risks associated with innovation that could impact staff career prospects. Political and administrative actors in municipalities are often tightly connected, but they are not always working on the same timelines. There might be an advantage to reallocating resources toward longevity and the shepherding of projects across electoral periods to support innovation in the community. Innovation processes, e.g., co-design with community, might also be impeded by varying levels of trust and perceived accountability.

### Municipalities and social sector organizations' needs around capacity for social innovation are mutual

Municipalities and social sector organizations are resourced and structured differently, but there are opportunity for engagement/collaboration around mutual or reciprocal needs. Collaborations need to be strategic and coordinated, setting clear priorities and providing adequate incentives. Time and funding are considerable constraints to capacity. Political agenda can also create risks for community organizations. Building capacity in that context could involve outsourcing some projects to experts, but there are questions around the expertise needed and the best way to source it.

The range of technical skills needed around capacity for innovation at the interface of social/municipal sectors including: change management, foresights, data collection/analysis, risk assessment and risk tolerance. When it comes to capacity building at the social/municipal sector interface, there is some confusion as to who is responsible along with some reluctance to take responsibility.

## Scientific advice and innovation in municipal policy and decision-making

The needs of municipalities around evidence-support are numerous and varied.

The impact of partnerships between municipal government and community-based organizations is premised on a reciprocal and mutual understanding of the needs and structures on each side. In addition, attention should be paid to inter-governmental structures because change often requires action or resources across levels of government. There needs to be synergy across government levels around evidence support. All governments need to act on the basis of shared understanding of the available data. This might require the development of system-level strategies and feedback mechanisms. 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. This may reflect the constraints of their timelines.

The importance of data and evidence to intelligent policy making (e.g., waste management, public health protocol) is recognized, but while municipalities are keen to embrace different strategies, there is a lack of means/capacity around the evaluation of these strategies. In turn, the mandate to support evidence-based decision-making in municipalities is still new in universities and what municipalities (and government generally) need around evidence support is not always well understood by universities either. But universities could help municipalities in a number of ways, including in helping understand how evidence translates into action.

The municipality network is heterogeneous. Mutualizing needs to create shared pools of expertise is a challenge

Needs in the social sector are unavoidably heterogeneous - the many contrasts between rural and urban communities are a case in point. Even when the problems are similar, solutions cannot be adopted en masse: they must be contextualized to meet a community's actual needs through a process of "iterative replication". Nonetheless, it is worth exploring how some challenges and issues might have commonalities and the approaches to solving them mutualized. One approach would be to leverage networks (e.g., through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and similar organizations) to develop centrally mutual solutions/tools.

Next steps will consider the possible opportunity for a SSHRC Knowledge Synthesis grant on the topic. SSHRC has never done a grant on social innovation, though FRQSC has. This would require data analysis and research, which may require municipal science advisories be involved to clearly communicate around needs or interests.

There is more than one governance model to support scientific advice in municipal government

The needs of communities are varied and complex and, for this reason, it is unclear what benefits would accrue from integrating a unique definition for the role of scientific advice across all evaluation, decision and policy frameworks. A model of governance that would support scientific advice would need to be integrative, make space for citizen involvement and support open access and data. Participatory models and bottom-up advice should be valued.

Scientific advisory committees that lead to citizen-driven policies are relevant to evidence-driven municipal 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. It takes cross-collaborative and interdisciplinary collaborations to tackle these challenges.

Beyond the availability of scientific advice, other factors affect the capacity of a municipality to make evidence-based policy and decisions

The processes around evidence and research advice are time-sensitive and it is unclear how to address this. More concentration and collaboration around the sharing of solutions and successes is needed, but conflicting or incompatible interests and needs create barriers, as does also uneven and often scarce availability of data on programs, needs and resources.

While there might not be a need for a new science agenda or a reconceptualizing of the role of knowledge in policy, models of knowledge mobilization used to structure 'living labs' and 'city lab', which rests on a collaborative, contextual stakeholder approach to problem solving, represent best practices.



# APPENDIX

## 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 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 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 Impact:** the impact of an organization through the creation and delivery of a product, service or program intended to satisfy a need in the social sector.

**Social Innovation:** a collection of processes aimed at systems- level change and transformation, and at changing aspects of institutions or relationships to address global and societal challenges.

**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 organizations 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 model embracing social goals tends to make boundaries between the three sectors more porous.

**Social Sector Innovation:** New ideas, products, services, processes or frameworks intended to be deployed in the social sector to meet social needs.

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

**STEM:** Science, Technology, Engineering and Math.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Canadian Forum for Social Innovation, McMaster University 12-13 October 2023

### 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 Chair Board 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 organization)

#### 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 Winsor
- 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 Winsor
- 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
- 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 DeGroot 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