KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION AND SOCIAL INNOVATION

INTEGRAL COMPONENTS OF INNOVATION STRATEGIES TO LEVERAGE INVESTMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

AUTHORS

Submitted to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

Knowledge Synthesis Grants: Leveraging Public Investment in Higher Education Research and Development to Stimulate Innovation

DAVID PHIPPS
Director, Research Services & Knowledge Exchange,
York University

JOHANNE PROVENÇAL, PH.D.
Research Associate,
York University

NAOMI NICHOLS, PH.D.
Research Associate,
York University

ALLYSON HEWITT
Director, Social Entrepreneurship, Director, SiG@MaRS
MaRS Discovery District,
Toronto, Ontario

15 May 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This knowledge synthesis examines how investments in higher education research and development can be leveraged through social innovation and knowledge mobilization as integral components of innovation strategies that strengthen industry, governments, community organizations, and members of the public as professionals and citizens. The authors provide an overview of an emerging literature on social innovation, drawing in part on the literature on the social economy and social enterprise, evolving understandings of innovation, and social innovation as an ecosystem that can create economic and social value. Discussed in some detail is the key role of knowledge mobilization between universities and other sectors to facilitate social innovation, the importance of collaboration among sectors with a focus on community-campus collaborations, and considerations for research, policy and practice. The authors close by briefly presenting conclusions and recommendations for leveraging investment in higher education through knowledge mobilization and social innovation as part of Canada's innovation strategies.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In considering how to better leverage investments in higher education research and development to stimulate innovation in Canada, the knowledge synthesis presented in this report draws attention to what has been described as an "innovation system paradigm shift."[01] In Canada and internationally there is increasing recognition that conceptions of and approaches to innovation must include social innovation in order to address the complex issues of a global society. There is an important role for universities and colleges in innovation, in particular, as innovation is now being understood, by definition, to include social dimensions. Indeed, higher education already represents a significant contribution to stimulating innovation, in advancing knowledge, in providing education, skills and training for highly qualified personnel for the workforce, and in ensuring that there are informed citizens for Canadian society more broadly.

Yet, as understandings about innovation change, lessons have been (and can continue to be) learned to further leverage investment in higher education research and development for innovation. There is now resounding acknowledgement that although innovation in science and technology is important, there is a broad spectrum of complex social issues confronting society, which cannot be addressed by technology transfer and commercialization of research alone. There is clearly a need for the development of a new paradigm to provide investment in infrastructure for social innovation that is on par with that given to technological and scientific innovation.

This report tackles four main concerns. The *first* is to consider how the literature on the social economy, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship can be drawn on to better understand social innovation. Although earlier approaches to innovation and social enterprise cannot simply be mapped on to social innovation, certainly some aspects are transferable and knowledge in this area can provide insight. The *second* concern taken up involves employment and understanding social innovation as an ecosystem that involves links between higher education, public policy, and industry and community organizations. Through this lens some focus is given to how social innovation can create both economic and social value. *Third*, the report gives focus to knowledge mobilization between universities and other sectors as a powerful and effective way to facilitate social innovation and leverage investment in higher education. Examples of knowledge mobilization institutionalized within universities or embedded in large-scale research units or

----

01   See Bullinger 2006, p. 14, cited in Howaldt and Schwarz, 2010, p. 12.

research projects provide insight for possible ways forward. The *fourth* section discusses key concerns for universities and other sectors in their efforts to plan and undertake the collaborative work necessary for knowledge mobilization and social innovation. The section aims to apply lesson from the literature on community-campus collaboration to understandings of conceptual frameworks and methodological concerns. Hindering factors and facilitating conditions for community-campus collaboration are also discussed.

Although this report provides an overview of several key issues in social innovation as they are taken up in the scholarly and professional literature, as well as in practice, central to each section of this report is the pressing need for improved collaboration among Canada's higher education institutions, governments, industry and community organizations. Innovation, understood now to include social innovation, requires a diversity of perspectives, resources, and skills. There is a clear need for investment in an informed, strategic approach to establishing infrastructure for sustained networks of social innovation in Canada.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSION 1: There is a need to support knowledge mobilization and measure the outcomes of social innovation in ways that are useful to a diversity of stakeholders.

» RECOMMENDATION 1 FOR SSHRC: As part of SSHRC's corporate performance and evaluation, SSHRC should enable longitudinal research and develop metrics in social impact, social innovation and knowledge mobilization across the disciplines.

» RECOMMENDATION 1 FOR GOVERNMENT: Collaborate with SSHRC, higher education, and industry and community organizations to develop and implement a strategy to better understand and advance social innovation and knowledge mobilization and communicate these impacts to Canadians.

» RECOMMENDATION 1 FOR ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS: Provide committed resources to university administration to plan institutionally for social innovation and knowledge mobilization across the disciplines and for the university as a whole; and partner with SSHRC and government in developing longitudinal metrics in social impact, social innovation and knowledge mobilization across the disciplines.

» RECOMMENDATION 1 FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: Explore opportunities for collaboration with academic institutions and develop capacity to be equal partners in social innovation and knowledge mobilization efforts.

CONCLUSION 2: Although there is much work being undertaken in universities, government, and industry and community organizations that contribute to social innovation and knowledge mobilization, there is a need for a systematic approach to coordinating those efforts and supporting sustained collaborations.

» RECOMMENDATION 2 FOR SSHRC: Leverage the Networks of Centres of Excellence model to develop a funding mechanism to invest in social innovation and knowledge mobilization, particularly for institutional infrastructure and project/discipline-based initiatives.

» RECOMMENDATION 2 FOR GOVERNMENT: Invest in networks of centres of excellence in social innovation and knowledge mobilization.

» RECOMMENDATION 2 FOR ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS: Integrate into research services offices institutional supports for social innovation and knowledge mobilization and build on regional and national initiatives to network, share practices and tools and build a pan-Canadian capacity for knowledge mobilization. There is also a role for the Canadian Association of University Research Administrators to partner as advocates for this emerging research service.

» RECOMMENDATION 2 FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: Leverage the wealth of experience and expertise in community organizations and advocate for equal partnership in knowledge mobilization and social innovation collaborations. There is a role for pan-Canadian umbrella organizations such as Imagine Canada and United Way Centraide Canada to represent the community voice in emerging social innovation dialogues.

CONCLUSION 3: There is tremendous potential for sustained collaborative relationships between universities and other sectors to contribute to social innovation and address social issues. In any collaborative relationship, there are also significant challenges, however, that must be recognized and addressed. Although universities, government, industry and community organizations can benefit greatly from collaboration and social innovation, the communities of practice and particular needs in each sector differ from each other. Strategies, policies, programs and plans to support and sustain social innovation must therefore be adequately informed by an understanding of the differences across sectors and the complexity of the problems that social innovation aims to address.

» RECOMMENDATION 3 FOR SSHRC: Provide training to peer review committees to more equitably value engaged scholarship and non-traditional scholarship in adjudication of grant applications. As appropriate to funding programs involving community partners, continue to include non-academic peers on adjudication committees and promote them as co-chair for competitions.

» RECOMMENDATION 3 FOR GOVERNMENT: Recognize the value of social innovation as a critical element in Canada's innovation strategies. Explore possibilities for policies and programs that identify and bridge the needs of academic, industry and community organizations in regard to social innovation and knowledge mobilization.

» RECOMMENDATION 3 FOR ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS: Explore possibilities for integrating both into the faculty reward system and in the interactions between university administration and faculty, measures that support social innovation, engaged scholarship and knowledge mobilization as scholarly practices.

» RECOMMENDATION 3 FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: Work with academic institutions to develop training offerings for community leaders, researchers and professionals interested in collaborating on social innovation and knowledge mobilization efforts.

"A social innovation is a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than present solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals."

— STANFORD UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR SOCIAL INNOVATION

INTRODUCTION

Investment in higher education research and development (R&D) is fundamental to the advancement of knowledge and the training of highly qualified personnel that are needed for Canada to thrive in a global, knowledge-based economy and society. Innovation is widely understood as central to industry progress and the development of workforce talent; however, often missing from strategy, planning and implementation of innovation is an understanding that *social innovation* plays a critical role in innovation, from the earliest stages of developing innovative ideas, to piloting and prototypes, to implementation and skills training as innovations are integrated into workplace production and processes.

Although there has been significant investment (in Canada and internationally) in technological innovation and commercialization of research for several decades, in recent years there has been growing recognition of the need to focus equally on social innovation. A recent statement by the European Commission signals an important shift: "In order for innovation to be a critical tool to address challenges covering many societal dimensions, a broader definition of innovation needs to be adopted. It is now widely agreed that this definition should include social innovation" (cited in Howaldt and Schwarz, 2010, p. 61-62).

There is an emerging research and professional literature taking up questions that involve social innovation. This report provides a synthesis of several key areas of discussion related to social innovation with a focus on those relevant to higher education research and development. There are four sections to this report. Section I provides a frame for social innovation as emerging from understandings about the social economy and social enterprise/entrepreneurship. Section II provides perspective on the relationship between social innovation and economic development. Section III presents an overview of knowledge mobilization between universities and other sectors as key enablers of social innovation and for leveraging investment in higher education R&D. Drawing from the literature on community-campus collaborations, Section IV gives focus to the importance of collaboration involving universities and other sectors and presents key considerations for research, policy and practice. The report closes by briefly presenting conclusions and recommendations for leveraging investment in higher education R&D through knowledge mobilization and social innovation as a key component of Canada's innovation strategies.

For Section I, a list of 142 sources (including both academic and grey literature) were used drawing on earlier work conducted for York University on social innovation and social entrepreneurship based on database searches for sources dating from 2000 to 2010.[02] Section II of the report draws primarily on three books that provide foundational reviews of the literature as well as research on emerging knowledge mobilization practices from Canada, UK and US.[03] For Section III, research was conducted by a Senior Advisor in Social Innovation practice at the MaRS Discovery District.[04] This information was gathered primarily through key informant surveys. For Section IV, the sources were originally read between 2006 and 2012, and many were solicited through a network of community-based scholars, knowledge mobilizers, and directors of research services or community-engaged scholarship institutes.[05]

---

02   Scholars Portal, Summon, and Google were used with the following keywords: social innovation, effectiveness, evaluation and social entrepreneurship.

03   These are: (1) *Knowledge Translation in Health Care: Moving from Evidence to Practice* (Strauss *et al*, 2009); (2) *Knowledge Mobilization in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Moving from Research to Action* (Bennet and Bennet, 2008); and (3) *Using Evidence: How Research can Inform Public Services* (Nutley *et al*, 2007).

04   See http://www.marsdd.com/aboutmars/story/: "Originally, MaRS was a filename: Medical and Related Sciences. Then our mandate expanded, including a broader range of innovative sectors. Now, it's not an acronym. It's just our name."

05   A search of the social science abstracts database was conducted using the following keywords: university and community and collaborat*; academic and community and collaborat*; interdisciplinary and collaborat*; institution* and collaborat*.

1 THE SOCIAL ECONOMY, SOCIAL ENTERPRISE, AND SOCIAL INNOVATION: KEY UNDERSTANDINGS FOR EFFECTIVE INNOVATION STRATEGIES FOR TODAY'S WORLD

Contemporary understandings of "innovation" have been changing over the course of the past several decades in what can be described as an "innovation system paradigm shift" that has come with "the transition from an industrial society to a knowledge and service economy" (Bullinger 2006, p. 14, cited in Howaldt and Schwarz, 2010, p. 12). Although innovation in science and technology remains important, there is increasing recognition that social innovation is a critical component of successful innovation strategies. This new understanding is particularly relevant for higher education research and development given the important role that universities and colleges have in contributing to innovative discoveries and practices. This section of our report offers an overview of key understandings in social innovation that can help inform government, industry, universities, and community organizations in their efforts to advance innovation and leverage investment in higher education. Three topics are discussed in brief in this section: (1) the social economy, social entrepreneurship and social enterprise; (2) understanding social innovation, why it has become critical and what is needed to move forward; and (3) moving social innovation forward through collaboration, knowledge exchange and knowledge mobilization.

1.1 THE SOCIAL ECONOMY, SOCIAL ENTERPRISE, AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

In their historical review of the notion of "the social economy," Moulaert and Ailenei identify "various meanings of the term 'social economy'…over the course of the past 150 years" (2005, p. 2037), dated back to the French economist Charles Dunoyer in 1830,[06] but gaining notable currency in the 1970s, when:

> initiatives in the field of social economy were, on the one hand, reactions to the crises of the mass-production system and, on the other hand, responses to the

---

06   It should be noted also that Goldenberg *et al* (2009) remark on the strength of the notion of the social economy in Québec and similarly, Moulaert and Ailenei cite the frequent use of the terms "*économie sociale et solidaire*" in contemporary francophone literature, noting how this term expresses "the necessity of a new approach to a different type of economy, that accounts more explicitly for the new challenges and recognises the general value of economic co-operation and reciprocity" (2005, p. 2044).

overburdening welfare state...The high unemployment rate in the 1980s and espe-cially in the 1990s, and the loss of protection by the welfare system, explain the grow-ing interest in the social economy. (2005, p. 2041)

Although Moulaert and Ailenei caution against a "one for all" definition (2005, p. 2050), they do suggest that, "Generally speaking, the term social economy designates the uni-verse of practices and forms of mobilising economic resources toward the satisfaction of human needs that belong neither to for-profit enterprises, nor to the institutions of the state in the narrow sense" (2005, p. 2042). At the Ontario Institute for Studies in Educa-tion, Quarter, Mook, and Armstrong, in *Understanding the Social Economy: A Canadian Perspective*, define the social economy as:

an umbrella concept for the many types of organizations created to meet a social need but also involving economic aspects such as the payment of wages and benefits to employees, the purchase of supplies, and in some case, the exchange of services in the market. (2009, p. ix)

Academic institutions have a unique place in this dynamic, as economic resources are invested in higher education and in turn, these institutions have a responsibility to con-tribute to the public good. Academic institutions are also important centres of learning not only within academic disciplines, but also, in terms of shared learning. Klein *et al* (citing Bouchard 2004; Fontan *et al* 2005) describe the need, in the social economy, for "actors to 'learn' to make decisions for the benefit of the collectivity and develop collective competencies" (2009, p. 28). The significance of learning among stakeholders is central to social innovation efforts.[07]

Linked to the notion of the social economy are social enterprise and social entrepre-neurship, which "can be traced to different developments in the worlds of practice and academia. Beginning in the late 1970s, academics studying nonprofits and voluntary organizations began delineating the characteristics of, and relations between, the non-profit, for-profit, and government sectors" (Bielefeld 2006, p. 69).[08] There are differing views in the academic and professional literature on how "social entrepreneurship" can be defined. However, in their review of the literature, Austin *et al* find that:

Common across all definitions of social entrepreneurship is the fact that the underly-ing drive for social entrepreneurship is to create social value, rather than only personal

---

07   Related to this is discussion on "collective impact" (see, for example, Kania nd Kramer, 2001: http://www .ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact).

08   Some attention has been given to European versus US perspectives on social enterprise. According to Kerlin, for example, "social enterprise in Europe is viewed as belonging to the 'social economy' where social benefit is the main driving force... In the United States, the concept of a social economy is not used and nonprofit social enterprises are often discussed as operating in the market economy" (2006, p. 249). Kerlin suggests that lessons can be learned from both contexts. Europe offers useful examples of governance involving multiple stakeholders and fostering social enterprise. The US offers useful examples of expanding social enterprise across services and social enterprise for government contracts. Further, Dhesi notes that, "Broadly one may also distinguish between European/UK and US models of social entrepreneurship in the literature. The focus of the US models is on exceptional individuals aiming at large-scale top-down impact (Waddock and Post, 1991), whereas the relevant UK model's prime concern is with mobilisation of communities to meet local needs (Wilson, 2009)" (2010, p. 705).

and shareholder wealth (e.g., Zadek & Thake, 1997), and that the activity is character-ized by innovation, or the creation of something new rather than simply the replication of existing enterprises or practices. The central driver for social entrepreneurship is the social problem being addressed, and the particular organizational form a social enterprise takes should be a decision based on which format would most effectively mobilize the resources needed to address that problem. (2006, p. 2)[09]

The driving forces for social entrepreneurship can be understood as: (1) political, given "the devolution of social functions from national to local level and from public to private;" (2) economic, as a result of "the reduction of funding from the public purse;" and (3) social, due to "problems of increasing complexity and magnitude" (Lock, 2001, p. 1, cited in Urban, 2008, p. 347). The increased attention to social entrepreneurship is evidenced, for example, by the formation and work of the Research Initiative on Social Entrepre-neurship at Columbia University, the Social Enterprise Initiative at Harvard University, the Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship at Duke University, the Skoll Center for Social Entrepreneurship at the University of Oxford, the Center for Social Innovation at Stanford University, and Social Innovation Generation (SIG) at the University of Waterloo.

Although social entrepreneurship has gained momentum there has also emerged an understanding that "social entrepreneurship is not enough" (Sud *et al*, 2009, p. 203). Social entrepreneurship, while valuable, is not able "by itself, to provide solutions on a scope necessary to address large-scale social issues…by itself, [it] is inadequate to address the extent and complexity of social problems we currently face" (Sud *et al*, 2009, p. 202). In keeping with this view, Goldstein *et al*, drawing on the widely cited work of Leadbeater and others, contribute to research making the case that, "innovative solutions to social problems are not likely to emerge out of a market economy left to its own processes" (2010, p. 103), but rather, that social innovation is needed to address the increasingly complex challenges of societies in a globalized world. The place of higher education research and development in social innovation is critical.

1.2 UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL INNOVATION: WHY IT HAS BECOME CRITICAL AND WHAT IS NEEDED TO MOVE FORWARD

An understanding of social innovation requires revisiting conventional understandings of *innovation*. There are several considerations here. One is a tendency to think of inno-vation simply as invention; however, in the field of economics, innovation is defined as "encompassing the entire process – from idea to implementation – for new prod-ucts, services, processes, practices, and policies" (Gardner *et al*, 2007, p. 1052). Further, there is an important distinction between social and technological innovations: social innovations occur "at the level of social practice" (Howaldt and Schwarz, 2010, p. 21).

----

09   In keeping with this, the literature also gives some attention to the notion of the double bottom line (financial and social) or the triple bottom line (financial, social, environmental). See, for example, Kerr (2007), Urban (2008), and Goldenberg *et al*, (2009).

Although an emerging literature on social innovation offers various ways of defining "social innovation,"[10] the following definition from the Stanford University Center for Social Innovation captures key aspects of what is meant by the term: "A social innovation is a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than present solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals."[11]

The need for social innovation as integral to innovation strategies is being given increased attention in both research and practice. Reasons for the inclusion of social dimensions as critical to innovation vary; however, there is increasingly widespread recognition that the growing complexity and interconnectedness of the challenges of a globalized world require an evolving understanding of innovation that is not limited to scientific and technological innovation (see Murray *et al*, 2008; Howaldt and Schwarz, 2010; and Dahrendorf, 2009). Serrat articulates well the turn toward social innovation:

> Necessity is the mother of invention. The demand for good ideas, put into practice, that meet pressing unmet needs and improve people's lives is growing on a par with the agenda of the 21st century. In a shrinking world, social innovation at requisite institutional levels can do much to foster smart, sustainable globalization. (2010, p. 1)

Although "changed and intensified social and economic problems identified in public discourse are increasingly prompting a call for extensive social innovation, the topic continues to remain a largely under-explored area in the social sciences as well as government innovation policies" (Howaldt and Schwarz, 2010, p. 19). This is also the case more broadly in research practice and research funding policy.[12] Further, although social innovation has begun to be taken up in practice, there is limited reflection on and documentation of these practices.[13]

Social innovation confronts a number of challenges. There is a "cultural inertia" (Goldstein *et al*, 2010, p. 102) that social innovation must confront. As Hazel and Onaga describe it, "social innovations are difficult for a society to adopt because they often require radical changes in accepted role behaviors or the social structure of existing social organizations" (2003, p. 286). Similarly, Schwab and Hartigan (2008) describe the paradox of the need for social innovation as follows: "While the world clamors for innovation, it

---

10   See, for example,the SIG Primer on social innovation, which invites individuals and organizations to identify the definition for social innovation that best defines the work that they are doing (see: http://sigeneration.ca/primer.html).

11   See http://csi.gsb.stanford.edu/social-innovation

12   See Howaldt and Schwarz, 2010, p. 17, citing Rammert, 1997.

13   See Murray *et al* (2008), who describe the field of social innovation as "less self-aware than business, medicine or science" (p. 1). That said, Andrew and Klein (2010) have found the following themes emerging in the field of social innovation: "(1) Social innovation is most often not the creation of an entirely new idea but rather the reorganization of existing elements; (2) Social innovation occurs in all sectors of society; (3) Social innovation stems from a perception of an unmet social need and a desire to meet that need and therefore work towards an improvement in social conditions; (4) social innovation is a process and a large number of socially innovative ideas never make it beyond the early stages; (5) the question of trust is central to social innovation; (6) social innovation involves the wish to do things differently, to think in terms of transformations to institutions and social practices; (7) social innovation is socially and spatially embedded; (8) social innovation requires learning and institutional capacity to learn; (9) the creation of social innovations has been analyzed in two different, but complementary, ways: the role of a single individual...and the consequence of social movements" (p. 21-23). Also, SIG has begun work on social innovation case studies (see http://sigeneration.ca/profile.html).

tends to deprive innovators of the resources and recognition that would maximize their potential to transform societies for the better" (p. 8).

Some level of attention (and commitment) therefore needs to be given to possibilities for advancing social innovation. For a start, as Goldstein *et al* (2010) report, *doing things differently* is central to social innovation, whether in terms of "recombination" of resources (p. 109) or in "the powerful role…[of] differences in backgrounds, differences in perspectives, differences in heuristics, and differences in mental models" in contributing to the strengths of teams working in the area of social innovation (p. 113).

Often cited, also, is the need for a strategic and systematic approach to supporting and advancing social innovation.[14] This could include innovation teams, innovation hubs, institutional innovation departments and offices, public innovation agencies, innovation funds, innovation incubators, and innovation networks (Murray *et al*, 2010). Although academic institutions are involved to some extent in these kinds of initiatives (some of which are discussed later in this report), much of this is project-based and there remains a need for institutionalized social innovation in universities and colleges to leverage the investment in higher education to contribute to and accelerate community and project-based social innovation. Also needed is an investment in longitudinal research on social innovation that can assess outcomes beyond the short-term and contribute to the development of social policy (Hazel and Onaga, 2003).

In terms of the specifics of the Canadian context, in "Social Innovation in Canada: An Update" (2009), Goldenberg *et al* report that:

» Canada has a long and proud history of social innovation reaching back many decades and involving non-profits, government, and, increasingly, profits.

» However, we are lagging behind some jurisdictions in certain areas. These limitations will work to our economic disadvantage because social innovation is about more than "feeling good."

» In particular, while governments in Canada have acknowledged the importance of social capital and the social economy and have been relatively active in those areas in recent years, Canada has not adopted broader models for public support, funding, and encouragement of social innovation as has been done in other countries.

» Canadian governments could find inspiration in the actions undertaken by countries such as Australia and the United Kingdom. Steps already taken by the new American administration[15] could also be instructive for Canada. (p. 30)

There is also a need for formal analysis of social innovation processes and outcomes in order to inform decision-making and to be useful for problem-solving, for infrastructure, and for knowledge exchange that builds social innovation capacity (Restler and Woolis, 2007; Goldenberg *et al*, 2009; and Choi, 2003). The importance of knowledge exchange

----

14   See, for example, Dees *et al* (2004) and Goldstein *et al,* (2010).

15   This particular reference is to the Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation established in The White House by the Obama Administration (see http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/sicp).

and collaboration for successful social innovation should not be under-estimated and is discussed in some detail later in our report, as is the leadership of Ontario and BC in these arenas, but a brief overview of key points as relevant to social innovation is presented below.

1.3 SOCIAL INNOVATION, GETTING IT TOGETHER: COLLABORATION, KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE, AND KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION

Social innovation is fundamentally an "action-oriented, problem-focused approach… [that] requires a broader view of the processes and structures that contribute to the social problem" (Hazel and Onaga, 2003, p. 287). Knowledge exchange and knowledge mobilization support collaborations that are critical for social innovation. As Goldstein *et al* describe the situation:

> Often the environment presents a community with problems that individuals or even groups of individuals have been unable to solve according to "business as usual". A level of cooperation and coordination is needed, i.e. a degree of organizing, is necessary to address the complexity of the situation…This implies that a sort of pressure for individuals to organize in collective action to enact social innovations that test the boundaries and potentials of the problem or opportunity. (2010, p. 105)

Some useful reminders in the literature about collaboration and coordination that deserve attention when thinking about, planning, and undertaking social innovation include the following:

» "Social scientists must work collaboratively with those most affected by the social problem to design and evaluate innovative solutions" (Hazel and Onaga, 2003, p. 286).
» "Knowledge creation for social innovation occurs when knowledge is created through the very process of accomplishing work" (Restler and Woolis, 2007, p. 95);
» There is "a high degree of knowledge sharing as knowledge itself is recombined" (Goldstein *et al*, 2010, p. 112).
» "Tensions between the perspectives and needs of different stakeholders are often a key source of new ideas and approaches" (Biggs *et al*, 2010).
» "Social innovation does not mean that new social bonds emerge *ex nihilo*, but instead arise in ways more like a reinterpretation or production of already lived social relations but with new contexts" (Moulaert and Ailenei, 2005, p. 2050).

In considering the potential for social innovation, but also in understanding the challenges, there becomes clear a need for investment, facilitation, development and systematic support for the collaboration necessary to advance social innovation. In regard to the role of policy:

> Governments can play an important role in supporting collaboration between sectors and therefore in helping social learning to occur in ways that allow for the

development of strong, and positive, links between sectors...The literature on social innovation...clearly demonstrate[s] the need for institutionalization...There must be a commitment to support and this commitment needs to be for a certain period of time. Short project funding is totally counterproductive to the absolutely necessary process of institutionalizing social innovation...Government support needs to be sustained and it needs to go beyond financial support to include capacity building, partnerships and possibly transfer to other operating agencies. (Andrew and Klein, 2010, p. 40-41).

In addition to the role that public policy can have in advancing social innovation, there are steps that can be taken by universities and colleges, given their potential role as inter-mediaries and for facilitation.[16] As noted in "Social Innovation in Canada: An Update" by Goldenberg *et al*:

One of the trends that has emerged in the last several years is the creation of univer-sity 'knowledge mobilization units'...housed at a number of post-secondary institu-tions, [that] serve as central offices to connect the wider community with researchers and graduate students on campus...to link up the university's skills and interests with the needs and aspirations of the public, private and not-for-profit sectors. (2009, p. 26)

KEY OBSERVATIONS: There are knowledge mobilization challenges for universities that can present obstacles to social innovation. As Mulgan *et al* (among many others) note: "After two decades of energetic reform to improve technology transfer, universities are only just beginning to think about how to achieve equivalent results in the social field, through the employment of heads of social innovation and social transfer." (2007, p. 31). There is also a challenge locally to mobilize resources, actors, knowledge and balanced leadership (Klein *et al*, 2009).[17] To overcome these challenges universities can explore possibilities for leveraging both their research and administrative strengths. The limited scholarly research on social innovation and a conventional reward system that does not encourage faculty collaboration beyond academe also pose challenges in terms of the appeal of social innovation for faculty. University administrations confront challenges in terms of planning and implementation for social innovation, as it remains a relatively new area of university activity. A strategic and collaborative approach to addressing these limitations – involving government, funding agencies, academic organizations, and uni-versity infrastructure – is key for leveraging investment in higher education research and development for social innovation as integral to innovation strategies in Canada.

---

16   It is important to recognize, however, that "facilitation is a skilled task that takes time and energy, and its centrality to success should not be underestimated" (Restler and Woolis, 2007, p. 95).

17   In planning localized social innovation, Morelli emphasizes that, "Local systems of innovation are defined by networks of actors directly or indirectly participating in the development of solutions. The identification of the actors is critical to explore the system of interests, skills, and (tacit and explicit) knowledge that can be mobilized. Social construction studies suggest mapping tools to identify such actors and to qualify their interaction with the system" (2007, p. 11).

2 UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL INNOVATION AS AN ECOSYSTEM: CREATING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC VALUE IN SOCIETY

The goal of a strong innovation system is to support people to create both social and economic value in society. The Ontario Economic Development Corporation describes the value of social innovation in this way: "Social innovations can for instance, concern new competencies, jobs and forms of participation in the labour market, each of which contributes to improving the position of individuals in the workforce" (2010, p. 223). The focus of this section of the report is on understanding social innovation as an ecosystem in Ontario. The following dynamics are noteworthy:

» A large number of organizations in Ontario self-identify as involved in social enterprise, social innovation and social entrepreneurship (these include universities, research institutions, networks, consultancies, non-governmental organizations, private companies, incubators and accelerators, and real-estate hubs).

» There does not currently exist a system for identifying significant overlap or gaps in service provision.

» Inputs to the social innovation system (networks, mentorship, resources) and definitions are varied and inconsistent, making measurability and comparison difficult.

» There does not exist a standardized approach to measuring the success of current inputs nor are there clear, measurable success factors.

» Funding scarcity in non-profit organizations results in mission-creep among organizations involved in social enterprise, social innovation, and social entrepreneurship.

Given the space limitations for this report, focus will be given in this section only to two key concerns in an ecosystem approach to social innovation: (1) challenges for determining the impact and success of social innovation efforts; and (2) a social innovation ecosystem as it supports employment and can address fragmentation.

2.1 CHALLENGES FOR DETERMINING THE IMPACT AND SUCCESS OF SOCIAL INNOVATION EFFORTS

Although universities, research institutions, networks, consultancies, non-governmental organizations, private companies, incubators and accelerators, and real-estate hubs self-identify as involved in social innovation or social entrepreneurship, there are challenges in measuring the impact and success of their efforts and efficacy due to the absence of:

» Agreed-upon measurement of social or economic impact;
» A point of coordination for these efforts; and
» A comprehensive list of social innovation initiatives.

Approaching social innovation as an ecosystem requires a platform and metrics that allow for measurability and comparability of inputs, processes, and outputs:

> The outcome of any social innovation is "a function of the participants and the internal and external social situation processes operative at that time" [Fairweather and Davidson, 1986, p.40]...Thus, it is imperative that the understanding of a social problem, its potential solution, and the evaluation of any social innovation include multiple indicators of participant characteristics as well as characteristics of the organization (e.g., leadership, composition, size, reinforcement system, etc.) and the community or environment in which it operates (e.g., socioeconomic indicators, geographic culture, relationships to other organizations, etc.)" (Hazel and Onaga 2003, p. 287)

To understand the workings of social innovation as an ecosystem there is also a need for information on the organizations involved, advisory and support services, mentorship, research, events, networking and marketing. This information is currently lacking in Ontario's fragmented social innovation ecosystem. One option for addressing these needs is the development of an online hub with a central living database that would:

» Function as a clearing-house of programming (advisory services, grants, metrics, space, resources, networks, mentorship, training, competitions) in the social innovation sector;
» Standardize measurements across organizations facilitated by quantitative web analytics (downloads, comments, connections made, ventures registered, advisory hours provided);[18]
» Provide those involved in social innovation with the ability to survey in real-time to get a snapshot of the ecosystem; and
» Function as a gathering point for qualitative analysis and measurement through success stories, comments, and FAQs.

Important for the development of measurement and collaboration, however, is an understanding of the need for principles of "bottom-up meeting top-down efforts" in order that metrics and outcomes meet the needs of the various stakeholders.

2.2 A SOCIAL INNOVATION ECOSYSTEM AS IT SUPPORTS EMPLOYMENT: PATHS AND EXAMPLES, PUBLIC POLICY, AND ADDRESSING FRAGMENTATION IN SOCIAL INNOVATION

Although it is important to recognize that the research literature cautions against reducing the value of social innovation to a measurement of "economic utility,"[19] it is also necessary to recognize that job creation and employment are key indicators for government.

----

18   Efforts in regard to metrics for social innovation are being undertaken by MaRS (see http://www.marsdd.com/news-insights/mars-reports/social-entrepreneurship-social-impact-metrics/) as well as the Global Impact Investing Network (http://www.thegiin.org/cgi-bin/iowa/home/index.html) and Impact and Reporting Investment Standards (see http://iris.thegiin.org/).
19   See, for example, Howaldt and Schwarz (2010) and Kesselring and Leitner (2008).

It would therefore be useful to have a better understanding of social innovation as an ecosystem in terms of organizational capacity to identify inputs (resources, advisory services, research, networking, and space) that lead to measurable outputs in job creation and employment. There are several paths to employment to be considered:

1. The path from graduation to a first job;
2. A career transition to a new job;
3. A business idea brought to market (job creation); and
4. Non-profit social enterprise and innovation (job creation).

Consider a few examples of each of the above paths to employment. In regard to the path from graduation to a first job, colleges and universities have many opportunities for students to be involved in co-op programs as part of coursework. Organizations such as Career Edge,[20] Civic Action,[21] Students Involved in Free Enterprise (SIFE)[22] and Advancing Canadian Entrepreneurship (ACE)[23] can provide support and direction for students interested in a career path that involves social innovation. In regard to the path of career transition and job mobility, examples of organizations and programs providing support and direction include the Emerging Leaders Network (ELN)[24] and MaRS.[25]

---

20 See https://www.careeredge.ca/en/home: "Since 1996, Career Edge Organization, a national not-for-profit service provider, has provided thoughtful, results-driven leadership in connecting multi-sector businesses with diverse, qualified talent through innovative paid internship programs to fulfill talent strategies for recent grads, internationally qualified professionals and graduates with disabilities" (2012).

21 See http://www.civicaction.ca/history: "The Greater Toronto CivicAction Alliance is an organization with a proven track record of catalyzing change and convening civic leaders to tackle the tough issues and big opportunities facing the Toronto region... We have provided a neutral platform for collaboration and leadership focused on improving our region's social, economic and environmental future. We engage the key players – including the 'unusual suspects' – from business, labour, the academic, non-profit and voluntary sectors, and all three orders of government and leverage their collective energy, networks and thought leadership to drive real progress on pressing issues" (2012).

22 See http://www.sife.org/aboutsife/Pages/Overview.aspx: "SIFE is an international non-profit organization that works with leaders in business and higher education to mobilize university students to make a difference in their communities while developing the skills to become socially responsible business leaders. Participating students form teams on their university campuses and apply business concepts to develop outreach projects that improve the quality of life and standard of living for people in need" (2012). For a list of the 59 Canadian universities and colleges with active SIFE teams, see: http://www.sife.org/AboutSife/CountryLocations/Pages/Canada.aspx

23 See http://www.acecanada.ca/_bin/aboutUs/what.cfm: "ACE is a national, charitable organization dedicated to teaching and igniting young Canadians to create brighter futures for themselves and their communities. Through a collaborative partnership between industry and higher education, ACE delivers programming that provides university and college students access to real world experience that complements in-class studies. Ultimately, students make a meaningful contribution to their communities today, while also discovering their true potential to achieve an ever greater impact as the entrepreneurial leaders of tomorrow" (2012).

24 See http://elnonline.ca/about-2/: "ELN is a diverse network of rising civic leaders committed to advancing the Toronto region's economic and social prosperity. ELN plays the role of an "action incubator" by convening leaders, helping inform and facilitate dialogue, and offering mentorship and organizational support to groups working collaboratively on challenges facing the region" (2012).

25 See http://www.marsdd.com/aboutmars/mission/: "MaRS envision[s] Canadian communities that are prospering through enhanced employment prospects, the creation and retention of local wealth and an enriched cultural and social environment. To realize this vision, we foster and promote Canadian innovation...MaRS provides resources – people, programs, physical facilities, funding and networks – to ensure that critical innovation happens. We stimulate, identify and harness great ideas, nurture their development and guide the transformation of those ideas into reality" (2012).

In regard to social innovation business ideas brought to market, examples of organizations providing support include SiG@MaRS,[26] Ontario Centres of Excellence,[27] and Canadian Youth Business Foundation.[28] For the non-profit sector's job creation through social enterprise and innovation, organizations that provide support include: Enterprising NonProfit,[29] Canadian Community Economic Development Network,[30] Ontario NonProfit Network,[31] Endeavour Volunteer Consulting for Non-Profits,[32] and Ashoka Innovators for the Public.[33] Other organizations and networks supporting employment

26   See http://sigeneration.ca/about-us.html: "Social Innovation Generation (SiG) is a group who believes that serious social problems can be solved. SiG is a collaborative initiative seeking to address Canada's social and ecological challenges by creating a culture of continuous social innovation. Our focus is on fostering social innovation to achieve impact, durability and scale by engaging the creativity and resources of all sectors" (2012).

27   See http://www.oce-ontario.org/about-oce: "Ontario Centres of Excellence (OCE) drives the development of Ontario's economy by helping create new jobs, products, services, technologies and businesses. In partnership with industry and academia, OCE co-invests to commercialize innovation originating in the province's colleges, universities and research hospitals. OCE co-invests in commercialization, technology transfer and talent development projects in the segments of the economy that will drive Ontario's future prosperity and global competitiveness. These segments include energy and environment (including water); advanced manufacturing; advanced health technologies; information, communications technologies and digital media; and social innovation" (2012).

28   See http://www.cybf.ca/about/: "CYBF is Canada's 'go to' place for young entrepreneurs, and our success is proven. As a national charity established in 1996, we've invested in more than 4,900 young Canadians who have established successful businesses that have created more than 19,430 new jobs, $138 million in tax revenue, and hundreds of millions of dollars in sales and export revenues... As an organization, we are always looking for new opportunities to promote youth entrepreneurship on the world's stage – building partnerships with government, corporate and non-profit organizations" (2012).

29   See http://www.enterprisingnonprofits.ca/about/history: ENP "began in Vancouver, British Columbia in 1997 with a pilot project led by Vancity Community Foundation in collaboration with the Vancouver Foundation and the United Way of the Lower Mainland. With additional funding from the McConnell Foundation, the project was designed to help 10 non-profits become more self-sustainable by developing social enterprises" (2012).

30   See http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/home/%3Fq%3Den/about: "The Canadian Community Economic Development Network believes in sustainable and inclusive communities directing their own social, economic and environmental futures... We are a member-led organization committed to strengthening communities by creating economic opportunities that improve environmental and social conditions...We bring people and organizations together to share knowledge and build a collective voice for CED action. Our members are part of a movement creating community-based solutions to local and global challenges" (2012).

31   See http://www.theonn.ca/who-we-are/: The Ontario NonProfit Network "mandate is to communicate, coordinate, and collaborate with nonprofit organizations working for the public benefit in Ontario. ONN has been created in order to: Gather, analyze and interpret information about what is going on in the sector as a whole; Enhance communication across the sector; Work strategically with nonprofit organizations, government, business and other stakeholders; Respond to government at all levels about policy, legislation, and practices that affect how the sector operates; [and] Develop a sense of shared interests and common purpose within the sector in order to strengthen the role of nonprofits in Ontario" (2012).

32   See http://www.endeavourvolunteer.ca/wp/about/?menu=abo: "Endeavour Volunteer Consulting for Non-Profits (Endeavour) is a non-profit organization that provides management consulting for non-profit groups that cannot afford professional consulting. Since its founding in 2007, Endeavour has recruited and managed more than 200 volunteers to provide management advice to 31 non-profits in Ontario. These client organizations help communities in many areas, such as the arts, children and family services, disabilities, education, environment, healthcare, immigrant services, rural development, skills training, poverty relief, and youth development" (2012).

33   See http://www.ashoka.org/about: "Ashoka is leading a profound transformation in society. In the past three decades, the global citizen sector, led by social entrepreneurs, has grown exponentially. Just as the business sector experienced a tremendous spurt in productivity over the last century, the citizen sector is experiencing a similar revolution, with the number and sophistication of citizen organizations increasing dramatically. Rather than leaving societal needs for the government or business sectors to address, social entrepreneurs are creating innovative solutions, delivering extraordinary results, and improving the lives of millions of people" (2012).

that involves social innovation include: United Ways,[34] The HUB,[35] Charity Village,[36] Pubic Policy Forum,[37] Social Enterprise Development Innovation,[38] Community Foundations of Canada,[39] Philanthropic Foundation of Canada,[40] Imagine Canada,[41] The Mowat Centre,[42] and Community Forward Fund.[43]

Social entrepreneurship is becoming a desired pursuit by the current graduating generation and for workers in transition. Universities and colleges, industry, governments and community organizations increasingly recognize the value of social innovation. There is an anticipated increase in demand for opportunities to network and to gain information and advice, and there is considerable potential for growth in job opportunities. Many organizations have already begun to add in a programming layer for social innovation. Yet, as a field of research and practice, social innovation remains highly fragmented, and this fragmentation has an adverse effect on the extent to which investment in higher education R&D leverages innovation generally and social innovation in particular. The social innovation "ecosystem" remains a collective of individual, unconnected initiatives with few organizations providing higher-level leadership. There are also some challenges to be noted in terms of public policy:

> Public policy has been limited and flawed in its understanding of the nature and process of innovation in public services. These limitations include a flawed model of innovation derived from manufacturing rather than services management experience, the re-conceptualization of innovation as incremental change, and the normative and prescriptive tenor of much public policy in relation to innovation. Importantly these shortcomings have occurred despite a growing body of knowledge both about innovation in general and about innovation in public services that has important lessons to offer to policy and practice, but that has thus far failed to make an impact upon public policy. The responsibility for this must lie as much with the research community, for failing to make this impact with its work, as with the policy making and practitioner communities. (Osborne and Brown 2009, p. 18)

KEY OBSERVATIONS: There is a need for the academic community, government, industry and community organizations to take a collaborative approach to advance social innovation in Canada. Given the role of universities and colleges, both in the development of innovation and in the provision of knowledge and training for the workforce that is required for a thriving social innovation ecosystem, there is an important opportunity for colleges and universities to take a leadership role in addressing fragmentation in the social innovation ecosystem. That role can be fulfilled, in part, by knowledge mobilization.

----

34   See http://www.unitedway.org/
35   See http://www.the-hub.net/
36   See http://www.charityvillage.com/
37   See http://www.ppforum.ca/
38   See http://www.sedi.org
39   See http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/
40   See http://pfc.ca
41   See http://www.imaginecanada.ca/
42   See http://www.mowatcentre.ca/
43   See http://www.communityforwardfund.ca/

3 FACILITATING INNOVATION THROUGH KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION: LEVERAGING HIGHER EDUCATION R&D BY INSTITUTIONALIZING SOCIAL INNOVATION THROUGH KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION

Institutionalized knowledge mobilization is an emerging practice based, in part, on a well-established literature describing structures, processes and efforts of knowledge mobilization and related activities (such as knowledge transfer and engaged scholarship) that connect research to decision-makers. The focus of this section of the report is on three areas: (1) key messages and gaps in the literature on knowledge mobilization; (2) examples of knowledge mobilization institutionalized within universities or embedded in large-scale research units or research projects; and (3) gaps in emerging knowledge mobilization practices.

3.1 ENGAGING DECISION-MAKERS WITH RESEARCH, MOVING EVIDENCE INTO PRACTICE, AND THE UTILIZATION OF RESEARCH FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND PUBLIC SERVICES

In *Knowledge Mobilization in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Moving from Research to Action* (2008), Bennet and Bennet focus on how research in the social sciences and humanities can inform social policy and social services. They describe knowledge mobilization as "collaborative entanglement," which they define as meaning, "to purposely and consistently develop and support approaches and processes that combine the sources of knowledge and the beneficiaries of that knowledge to interactively move toward a common direction such as meeting an identified community need" (2008, p. 48). This description evokes the messy ("entanglement") and social ("collaborative") nature of the relationships that are inherent in knowledge mobilization processes.[44] Knowledge brokers also play a role in both connecting and translating knowledge to end-users by focusing on relationships between researchers and decision-makers.[45] Bennet and Bennet examine knowledge mobilization *as a program*, an approach that is distinct from much of the literature, which looks at individual knowledge mobilization interventions.

In *Knowledge Translation in Health Care: Moving from Evidence to Practice* (2009), editors Strauss, Tetroe and Graham present an in-depth review of how evidence, synthesized through systematic reviews, is implemented in new health practices and policies. One of the book's contributors, Michelle Gagnon, points out that "involving knowledge users as partners in the research process is a strong predictor that research findings will be used and that the research endeavour will achieve a greater impact" (2009, p. 240). In each of the stages described in the "Knowledge To Action" cycle, strong relationships

---

44   See, for example, Prahalad and Krishnan's (2008) *The New Age of Innovation: Driving Cocreated Value through Global Networks* and "A Co-creation Primer" (http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2011/02/co-creation.html).

45   See, for example, Ward *et al,* (2009) and Lomas (2007).

between researchers, practitioners, policy makers and patient advocates will maximize the impact of evidence on policy/practice.[46]

Using Evidence: How Research can Inform Public Services (2007) is a seminal review of the literature on research utilization by Nutley, Walter and Davies, who work in the Research Unit for Research Utilization at the University of Edinburgh.[47] The authors emphasize that knowledge mobilization is a social process and that interactive forms of engagement between researchers and decision-makers should be encouraged through informal networks and more formal partnerships. The authors also stress that these relationships are built through individuals within organizations. Creating a culture of research use within organizations (both research and policy/practice organizations) can help support the collective and embedded nature of the links between research and decision-making. Nutley and colleagues also recognize, however, that "the evidence that we have about developing effective organisational – and system – level research use strategies, while emerging, is still fairly thin on the ground" (2007, p. 307).[48]

3.2   KEY MESSAGES AND GAPS IN THE LITERATURE

As noted, while there is a growing literature on various aspects of knowledge mobilization, key messages that are particularly relevant for leveraging higher education research and development for innovation are as follows:

» Knowledge mobilization is a social process between/among individuals within and between institutions;

» Knowledge mobilization is only beginning to emerge at the organization and the system/sectorial level;

» Institutions are beginning to invest in organizational and systems level knowledge mobilization services;

» Efforts to enhance knowledge mobilization need to be interactive and focus on the relationships between researchers and decision-makers and their organizations; and

» Knowledge mobilization is a process that enables social innovation (the outcome). Knowledge mobilization thus creates value for the institution as well as for researchers and their decision-maker partners, both in the impact of research used to launch new services or better policies, and in leveraging additional investment of resources.

There is a large body of literature on the process of connecting research to practice or policy. Yet, although knowledge mobilization and related activities leverage investments in higher education R&D, there is little literature on the role of institutionally based

----

46   See also, for example, Lavis *et al* (2003).

47   See http://www.ruru.ac.uk/

48   Although Best and Holmes (2010) discuss this kind of emerging thinking on systems levels knowledge mobilization, as traditional linear models and contemporary relationship models of knowledge mobilization are insufficient for complex systems ("wicked problems") involving institutional commitments and multiple stakeholders, Morton and Nutley (2011) maintain that key to current efforts to enhance research use and knowledge mobilization is the role played by organizations. This is echoed by Rickinson *et al* who argue that "infrastructures to support research-user interfaces are critical in facilitating greater and more sustainable user engagement" (2011).

activities. A more robust literature on the emerging instances of institutional knowledge mobilization would provide a more definitive assessment of the impact of institutional knowledge mobilization activities.

3.3   EXAMPLES OF INSTITUTIONALIZED KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION

There are many examples of knowledge mobilization being embedded in large-scale research units or research projects, including the activities in the Institute for Work and Health[49] and many of Canada's Networks of Centres of Excellence (for example, PRE-VNet: Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence).[50] While some universities are recognizing the need for institutional knowledge mobilization capacity and support on par with the ubiquitous technology transfer, industry liaison and research commercialization services (Agrawal, 2001), knowledge mobilization is still an emerging area of concern and expertise and there are relatively few examples of universities that have invested in institutionalized knowledge mobilization and related support services. Three international examples that illustrate the varied forms in which universities have invested in an institutional capacity to connect research to policy and/or practice are as follows:

1. The Community Partnership Programme (Cupp), University of Brighton[51]
2. The Centre for Families and Relationships (CRFR), University of Edinburgh[52]
3. The Institute for Health Policy, University of Texas School of Public Health[53]

Cupp, CRFR and the University of Texas use different strategies to support different levels of engagement between researchers and decision-makers. All three have professional staff supporting the knowledge mobilization activities of their institution and they illustrate how knowledge mobilization services are social processes supported by interactive (in person or online) relationships between researchers and decision-makers.[54]

In Canada, York University was the first university to invest in institutional knowledge mobilization services, which are under the authority of the Vice-President Research and Innovation. The knowledge mobilization services operate on a pan-university level and are fully integrated into the university's research enterprise (Phipps and Shapson, 2009). In 2009 York University commissioned an evaluation of its first two and a half years of knowledge mobilization services.[55] This evaluation showed how York University's Knowledge Mobilization Unit uses a variety of methods (Phipps, 2011) including graduate student internships (Hynie *et al*, 2011) to connect research expertise to decision-makers. Lessons learned from five years of supporting institutional knowledge mobilization demonstrate how the interactive process of knowledge mobilization results in outcomes that

----

49   See http://www.iwh.on.ca/
50   See http://prevnet.ca/
51   See http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/
52   See http://www.crfr.ac.uk/
53   See https://ktexchange.sph.uth.tmc.edu/Default.aspx
54   Note, however, that only Cupp is implemented as an institutional capacity to support knowledge mobilization.
55   See http://researchimpact.wordpress.com/2010/05/28/york-responds-to-the-knowledge-mobilization-evaluation/

benefit both the university and the community partners (Phipps *et al*, 2009; Phipps and Zanotti, 2011).

York University reports that its investment in knowledge mobilization support services (approximately $250K per year since 2006, for a total of $1.25M) has helped to generate more than $1M in sponsored research, $1M in funding for community programs and services, and more than $17M in funding for large-scale engaged scholarship research programs, all of which leverage non-academic cash and in-kind contributions (Phipps, 2011). Collaborations supported by York University's Knowledge Mobilization Unit have informed policy and practice in industry and community, in areas including green business services, immigrant settlement services, municipal heat response policies, and programs to support community-based programs in York Region, to name a few (Phipps *et al*, 2012). These benefits not only leverage investment in higher education R&D, but also, they illustrate the potential impact of higher education and academic research on society through knowledge mobilization initiatives.

York University is also leading ResearchImpact-RéseauImpactRecherche (RIR), Canada's knowledge mobilization network. All six RIR universities[56] have invested in institutional knowledge mobilization support services. Although there are institutional differences, a recent scan of the RIR universities illustrates that a variety of interactive strategies are used to connect university research to decision-makers so that research can be used by collaborators to inform decisions about public policy and professional practice.

3.4   EXISTING PROGRAMS AND GAPS IN EMERGING PRACTICES

In 2008, SSHRC, NSERC, and CIHR invested in an evaluation of the Intellectual Property Mobilization (IPM) program. From 1995-2009 the IPM program supported the growth of Canada's technology transfer and commercialization industry showing a growth of revenues from $21M to $55M. Seventy-two per cent of grant recipients in the program responding to a survey also reported an increase in sponsored (contract) research illustrating a leveraging of investments in higher education R&D. The 2008 evaluation also demonstrated that there was a lack of understanding of knowledge mobilization activities by the IPM stakeholders interviewed and that the amount of funding dedicated to these activities was very small, with the 2005 York University and University of Victoria application being the only knowledge mobilization application supported.[57] The evaluation found that evidence of engaging in knowledge mobilization activities was anecdotal although it did predict "increased knowledge mobilization activities by social sciences researchers" in the future. The Interagency Evaluation Steering Committee's "Management Response" to the evaluation concluded that, "the Intellectual Property Mobilization (IPM) program was initiated to serve as a catalyst to promote technology transfer activities in universities and has been successful in meeting this goal."[58]

----

56   The universities signed on to ResearchImpact-RéseauImpactRecherche (RIR), Canada's knowledge mobilization network, are as follows: Memorial University of Newfoundland, Université du Québec à Montréal, York University, University of Guelph, University of Saskatchewan, and University of Victoria.

57   See http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/_doc/Reports-Rapports/evaluations/IPM_Final_Report_FINAL-ATIP_2008_e.pdf

58   See http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/_doc/Reports-Rapports/evaluations/IPM_response_April-27-2008-e.pdf

However, there is no complementary programming in Canada designed to support the growth of institutional knowledge mobilization. All Centres for Excellence for Commercialization of Research (CECR) are focused on commercialization within specific industry sectors.[59] Even the Networks of Centres of Excellence Knowledge Mobilization New Initiatives are focused on mobilizing knowledge in specific disciplines all related to children.[60] While these funding mechanisms are important they do not support emerging institutional knowledge mobilization practices positioned as institutional, not project-specific, research infrastructure. This is a concern that needs to be addressed by all research funding agencies including the tri-council, as all three councils support non-commercial, policy relevant research.

There are also clear gaps in knowledge mobilization as an emerging practice:

» There is limited formal evaluation and reporting of knowledge mobilization activities undertaken by individual faculty or units within an institution;

» Institutional knowledge mobilization activities have only begun to be discussed in peer-reviewed literature (and often the focus returns to the few universities where an investment to institutionalize knowledge mobilization has been made, as with York University's Knowledge Mobilization Unit and the University of Brighton's Community Partnership Programme);

» Although there is anecdotal evidence indicating that the collaborations developed through knowledge mobilization can lead to the development of social innovations to address unmet social needs, a more systematic review of the outcomes of emerging institutional knowledge mobilization activities and support services has not yet been undertaken.

KEY OBSERVATIONS: The literature makes clear that interactive methods and practices to support relationships between researchers and decision-makers are required to support knowledge mobilization and that these methods and practices are only now emerging as institutional services. Environmental scans of emerging practices show that a diversity of approaches is taken in knowledge mobilization activities to leverage investment in higher education R&D, creating outcomes and social innovations that are valuable to the university, to decision-maker partners, and to society. Investment in institutionalized knowledge mobilization services has begun to be recognized as a valuable complement to already established support for technology transfer and the commercialization of research. Further, social innovation developed through the collaborative work supported by knowledge mobilization activities can address a broad spectrum of social issues and needs that cannot be met by technology transfer and commercialization of research alone. In order for social innovation efforts by universities to be effective, however, sustained collaborative relationships are necessary. The next section of this report, therefore, gives some attention to key considerations in embarking on collaborations between universities and other sectors.

----

59   See http://www.nce-rce.gc.ca/NetworksCentres-CentresReseaux/CECR-CECR_eng.asp
60   See http://www.nce-rce.gc.ca/NetworksCentres-CentresReseaux/NCEKM-RCEMC_eng.asp

4 COMMUNITY-CAMPUS COLLABORATION IN LEVERAGING HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR RESEARCH, POLICY, AND PRACTICE

Fundamental to social innovation developed through knowledge mobilization are strong collaborative relationships between post-secondary institutions and the community, broadly conceived. While there is general consensus that community-campus connections have the potential to stimulate social change (Pearlman and Bilodeau, 1999; Roche, 2008; Research Triangle Park, 2004; Office of Community-Based Research, 2009), there is not a clear sense of *how* collaborative relationships engender "new ideas that resolve existing social, cultural, economic and environmental challenges for the benefit of people and planet" (The Centre for Social Innovation, 2012).[61]

Community-campus interactions – "collaborations between community organisations and institutions of higher learning for the purpose of achieving an identified social change goal through community engaged scholarship" (Eckerle *et al*, 2011, p. 3) – fall under the rubric of "engaged scholarship" and are distinguished by democratic values: partnership, reciprocity, and action (Campbell and Lassiter, 2010). Engaged scholarship "seeks the public good *with* the public" (Saltmarsh *et al*, 2009, cited in Campbell and Lassiter, 2010).[62]

An international scan of community-campus collaborations identifies four broad categories of community-campus interactions:

1. Relationships between individual faculty members and community organizations that are not supported by institutional structures;
2. Centres or institutes that support community-academic collaboration;
3. Institutional structures organized within and across academic settings to systematically engaged community partners in research; and
4. Multi-institutional community-based research partnerships operating regionally, nationally, and internationally.[63]

Community-campus research collaborations offer a way to leverage inter-disciplinary and inter-institutional skills and knowledge for the public good.

4.1 COMMUNITY-CAMPUS COLLABORATION: AN OVERVIEW OF CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

It has become widely understood that complex problems – for example, health, social,

---

61   See http://socialinnovation.ca/about/socialinnovation

62   There is overlap between the principles of engaged scholarship and community-based research. The primary difference is that engaged scholarship does not require original research to be conducted.

63   This list is taken from the Office of Community-Based Research (2009). These activities can also be understood as forms of "engaged scholarship."

and environmental problems – are multi-dimensional with inter-dependent causes and that arriving at solutions to these problems similarly requires multi-dimensional perspectives (see, for example, Emschoff *et al*, 2007). Inter-systemic, inter-institutional, and inter-disciplinary collaborations are a means for addressing such complex problems, while also maximizing resources, reducing inter-institutional fragmentation and service duplication, creating conceptual and organizational synergy, building community capacity, and engaging people in research (Emschoff *et al*, 2007).

Notions of reciprocity and inclusivity are important to all collaborative endeavours, but they are considered vital to community-campus collaboration (Campbell and Lassiter, 2010; Carlton *et al*, 2009; Eckerle Curwood, 2011; Flicker and Savan, 2006; Isreal *et al*, 1998; Pearce *et al*, 2007; Vazquez Jacobus *et al*, 2011). Positive community-campus collaborations recognize and build on the divergent expertise that partners contribute to the collaborative process. Terms like *co-researchers*, *co-development*, *co-creation*, and *knowledge exchange* are used to signal the centrality of the reciprocal partnership in community-campus collaborations.[64]

It is common for community-campus collaborations to revolve around research. The use of community-based research (CBR) and community-based participatory research (CBPR) methods are meant to ensure that research is ethical, attentive to the needs of research subjects, includes structures for participation by communities and/or community organizations, improves community health and well-being through action and social change, and is useful outside of academic settings.

In order to contribute to existing bodies of research evidence, careful attention is paid to the rigor of community-informed research studies. While it is important to maintain a focus on participation throughout the research process, community-campus research collaborations should recognize a continuum of participatory strategies for research stakeholders. The use of multiple methods is one way to encourage interdisciplinarity and the involvement of a diversity of stakeholders. Many collaborative projects have a mixed methods research design that uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative research strategies. Methodological reflexivity and flexibility are also key facilitators of a collaborative research agenda (Carlton *et al*, 2009; Nichols, 2012; Roche, 2008; Isreal *et al*, 1998).[65] In a community-informed research framework, methods should be informed by the purpose of the study and collaborators' desired use for research findings.

----

64   Mutual trust is another pillar of community-academic collaborations (Carlton *et al*, 2009; Isreal *et al*, 1998; Wright *et al*, 2011; Vazquez Jacobus *et al*, 2011). Trust is thought to be an outcome of a collaborative process, which is built on the principles of reciprocity and inclusivity (Carlton *et al*, 2009). It also requires dialogue and deliberation among stakeholders – signs that the process is indeed democratic and that public or community participation is a valued asset (Campbell and Lassiter, 2010; Calton *et al*, 2009; Isreal *et al*, 1998; Wright *et al*, 2011).

65   Research methods and instruments also need to be culturally appropriate (Flicker *et al*, 2007; Koné *et al*, 2000; Kovach, 2005; Wright *et al*, 2011). Particularly when engaging in participatory community-based research approaches, culturally relevant research tools and methods are essential to an equitable and rigorous research partnership (Koné *et al*, 2000; Wright *et al*, 2011). Some studies describe the use of collaborative or team ethnography to facilitate a community-university partnership (Austin, 2003) and community engagement in research (Campbell and Lassiter, 2010). Collaborative ethnography is a form of qualitative community-based research that uses observation, text analysis, and various forms of interviewing to understand the cultural and social norms of a people or place. Other popular CBR methods include arts-informed research strategies (Sakamoto *et al*, 2008), photo-voice projects (Carlson *et al*, 2006), and community mapping (Amsden and VanWynsberghe, 2005; Burke *et al*, 2005).

There are differences in disciplinary culture, paradigm, and institutional values that need
to be taken into consideration when undertaking inter-institutional collaboration (Chibu-
cos and Lerner, 1999 in Carlton *et al*, 2009; Henderson *et al*, 2010) as there are barriers to
collaboration that diminish the effects of collaborative endeavours (Henderson *et al*, 2010;
Lowe and Philipson, 2009; Nichols, forthcoming).[66] While research identifies structural
or organisational barriers to collaboration (e.g. Bowen and Marten, 2005; Flicker and
Savan, 2006; Lantz *et al*, 2001), there are few concrete examples of the specific structural-
institutional conditions (e.g. faculty time allocation, tenure and merit review processes,
funding timelines) that inhibit positive community-campus knowledge exchange and/or
other forms of collaboration (see Eckerle Curwood *et al*, 2011; Flicker *et al*, 2007; Nichols
et al, submitted). Even more limited is research that is focused on explicating the specific
structural-institutional factors that limit collaboration or knowledge mobilization (Coo-
per and Levin, 2010) across sectors. Some attention is given here, therefore, to hindering
and facilitating factors in community-campus collaborations.

There are notable institutional factors that can hinder community-campus collabo-
ration. Isreal *et al* (1998) identify the following as undermining university-community
engagement and collaboration: the control and distribution of funds; competing institu-
tional demands; inappropriate funder timelines and expectations; and university tenure
and promotion practices. Funding processes, reporting, and timelines significantly shape
collaborative outcomes. Co-developing a research agenda and collaborating on analysis
and writing take considerable time. Ethical review processes, while necessary, are also
identified as key institutional barriers to meaningful community-engaged scholarship
(Flicker *et al*, 2007).[67] In order to institutionally support the use of community-based
research strategies, funding timelines and budgets need to acknowledge the value added
from collaboration. Further, the necessarily emergent research trajectory continues to
pose challenges for research funders and other stakeholders charged with responsibility
for assessing the potential of a research proposal or the rigor of a program of work (Ahmed
and Palermo, 2010; Isreal *et al*, 1998). Community-based and community-informed
research must be assessed differently than traditional science and social science projects.

There are also facilitating conditions that can support community-campus

----

66   Differences in perspective, vocabulary, expertise, and culture can impede positive communication between collaborators
     (Carlton *et al*, 2009; Isreal *et al*, 1998). Differences in vocabulary and perspective are reinforced by institutional factors such
     as an organization's policies and procedures, mission, mandate, and funding priorities (Nichols, Gaetz, and Dyck, submit-
     ted). One way to understand differences in people's orientation to research in general, and a collaborative research initiative
     in particular, is as an outcome of people's membership in differing professional or institutional cultures.

67   A review of 30 ethical review board forms and guidelines in the United States and Canada revealed that ethical review pro-
     cesses and texts operate within "a biomedical framework that rarely takes into account common CBPR experience" (Flicker
     et al, 2007, p. 478). The ethical review processes focuses on issues relating to privacy, autonomy, and access, overshadow-
     ing considerations of compensation, distribution of resources, and dissemination. An orientation to risk-assessment at the
     individual, rather than community level, as well as traditional assumptions about what community and academic partners
     contribute to a research process limit the relevance of the ethical review process for CBR.

collaboration. These are particularly important for the success of collaborative undertakings and therefore are addressed in the sections below.

INSTITUTIONAL READINESS AND MECHANISMS. It is important for organizations to assess institutional readiness to participate in a collaborative endeavour.[68] Mechanisms to support collaboration are key and one valuable institutional mechanism that can support community-campus partnerships is a community outreach partnership centre or community engagement institute. Whether an institute or centre is community-based (Cherry and Shefner, 2004) or housed within an academic organization (Hart and Northmore, 2012; Northmore and Hart, 2011), they have been found to successfully increase community-campus outreach activities. These centres can also support project management and mediate between the different institutional demands arising from academic and community settings. Finally, institutional policy and practice changes that are implemented with an explicit goal to support community-engaged scholarship are essential facilitators of community-engaged research (Isreal *et al*, 1998; Knowledge Mobilization Works, 2010; Roche, 2008).

PROJECT MANAGEMENT, FUND-DISTRIBUTION, AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE. Institutional supports are particularly important for project management, which is integral to the success of collaborative projects, particularly those involving multiple institutions (Austin, 2003; Isreal *et al*, 1998; Lantz *et al*, 2001). Effective project management requires institutional support at all levels of the partnership (Eckerle Curwood *et al*, 2010; Isreal *et al*, 1998). Sufficient, equitably dispersed funding is also critical to collaborative work (Austin, 2003; Cherry and Shefner, 2004; Isreal *et al*, 1998; Lantz *et al*, 2001).[69] It is important to keep in mind how a project's governance structure will support collaborative outcomes. Distributing project leadership across co-chaired (community and academic) subcommittees (Wright *et al*, 2011) is one way to facilitate shared community and academic involvement in project governance. Decision-making authority must also be distributed equitably across stakeholder groups (Vazquez *et al*, 2011).[70]

GUIDING AND FORMALIZED DOCUMENTATION. Shared terms of reference are important to ensure that everyone who participates in a project can understand and contribute to design and implementation (Carlton *et al*, 2009; Koné *et al*, 2000). Co-developed

---

68   Eckerle Curwood *et al* (2011) articulate a set of questions about institutional context that they suggest potential partners ask themselves before initiating a community-academic partnership. The questions they pose point to specific structural, economic, and social conditions that will support a sustainable partnership. Mechanisms for fund distribution, possible meeting spaces, commitment from faculty willing to teach, details of people's workload adjustments, communication strategies, and community access to data management and storage programs need to be addressed prior to initiating a collaboration.

69   Flicker and Savan (2006) emphasize the need for adequate funding when a project requires participation by community members. Community members and organizations need to be appropriately compensated for the time and expertise they bring to a project.

70   Vazquez Jacobus *et al* (2011) indicate that sustainable collaborations require strategies for increasing capacity and network-building within and beyond a project in order to facilitate sustainability that does not rest with the current leadership. Other examples include the use of boards of directors and steering committees that are comprised of academic and non-academic project stakeholders (Lantz *et al*, 2001; Vazquez Jacobus *et al*, 2011).

collaborative principles, a memorandum of understanding, co-developed operating norms, and/or a statement of ethics are cited as important facilitators of positive communication, conflict resolution, and co-learning (Campbell and Lassiter, 2010; Carlton *et al*, 2009; Isreal *et al*, 1998; Lantz *et al*, 2001; Pearlman and Biladeau, 1999; Wright *et al*, 2011). That said, a further collaborative asset is flexibility and project dynamism (Vazquez Jacobus *et al*, 2011). Projects are only able to evolve in relation to changing conditions when infrastructure that supports a productive collaborative process is already in place.

COMMUNICATION AND NETWORKING. Face-to-face or technologically-mediated contact is important (Koné *et al*, 2000). Communication facilitates and is facilitated by supportive structures and therefore is central to the collaborative process. Structured and informal opportunities to network and learn together may serve to unsettle people's misconceptions, nurture relationship building, and allow individuals and a group to establish mutual trust (Bowen and Martens, 2005). While trust-building is facilitated by opportunities to learn across difference it also engenders mutual learning as a critical outcome of productive collaborations. Diverse partners bring divergent expertise to the collaborative process that, when mobilised, increases the capacity of the group as a whole (Wright *et al*, 2011).

PAST EXPERIENCE OR PRECONCEPTIONS. People's past experiences, prior relationships, and assumptions shape community-campus interactions (in both positive and negative ways). A history of prior positive engagement between partners can support future collaborations (Isreal *et al*, 1998; Research Triangle Park International, 2004; Smith, 2003).[71] Trust and mutual respect is a key facilitator of positive collaborative relations (Isreal *et al*, 1998; Koné *et al*, 2000; Lantz *et al*, 2001; London *et al*, 2011; Wright *et al*, 2011).

4.3   KNOWLEDGE GAPS IN THE LITERATURE ON COMMUNITY-CAMPUS COLLABORATION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR R&D POLICIES AND PRACTICES

There is increasing interest in researching and/or evaluating community-campus collaborations. The literature points to the use of survey instruments, interviews, and focus group discussions to assess collaborative outcomes and describe the collaborative process (e.g. Carlton *et al*, 2009; Eckerle Curwood *et al*, 2011; Hart and Northmore, 2012; Lantz *et al*, 2001; Wright *et al*, 2011). Further research is needed to understand the balance between inter-personal conditions (such as trust and prior relationships) and institutional or infrastructural supports. There is also a need for research, which tracks the broader impacts of collaborative work. While university benchmarks and performance indicators have been developed to measure socio-economic and cultural contributions, few standardized assessment tools or outcomes-focused evaluations exist (Hart and Northmore, 2012). Part of the challenge in this is that, in contrast to community development (understood as service to the community), community engagement is a reciprocal relationship

----

71   On the other hand, when prior engagements have not resulted in the production and use of findings to make change or when they have failed to equitably distribute leadership, then people may enter into collaboration with a lack of trust and/or commitment to the collaborative process (Bowen and Martens, 2005; Isreal *et al*, 1998).

based on "non-market forms of reciprocity" (Pearce *et al*, 2007) and requires more than a quantitative (numeric or economic) evaluation.[72] Hart and Northmore (2012) suggest that the paucity of outcomes-based evaluation of engagement may be linked to timing. A long-term timescale would be required to capture higher-level institutional outcomes and broader social or community-level impacts.[73] Although some valuable studies have been done, a significant gap in the literature involves assessing the outcomes or impacts of community-campus collaboration.

In considering implications for research and development policies and practices, it is important that higher education institutions, community organizations, industry, governments, and funding agencies understand how equitable and effective collaborations are organized, supported and rewarded differently from traditional, faculty-driven or commercial profit-driven research and development. A review of the research indicates that building meaningful and effective collaborations between communities and academic institutions requires significant inputs of time and human resources. Sustaining these collaborations requires ongoing attention to, and deliberation about, collaborative processes *and* outcomes.

KEY OBSERVATIONS: This section of the report has identified the kinds of institutional conditions required to effectively leverage resources between communities and higher education institutions. Reciprocity is the key to sustaining community-campus collaborations. Effective community-campus collaborations leverage the stability and infrastructural supports of academic institutions *and* the organizational "nimbleness" of community organizations (Northmore and Hart, 2011). In order to engender sustained engagement across community and academic settings there is a need to identify the factors that foster reciprocity and mutual benefit between community and academic partners, as well as their respective institutions (Northmore and Hart, 2011).

----

72 A strong partnership between academic and non-academic stakeholders can be a facilitator *and* an outcome of collaborative research. For example, Eckerle Curwood *et al* (2011) point out that community-based service learning (CBL) can foster meaningful inter-institutional engagement, which may lead to subsequent community-based research activities. The collaborative community-university-agency ethnography described by Austin (2003) cites collaborative partnerships between people in academic, government, and community settings as well as interdisciplinary partnerships within the university, as its primary outcomes. In a survey of community-based research in a Canadian context, Flicker and Slavan (2006) found that most partnerships produced presentations (73%), published papers (52%), and policy documents/recommendations (47%). Community-academic research partnerships were also found to increase community capacity (62%), result in plans for future research (60%), facilitate strategic coalitions (47%), stimulate changes in agency programming (38%) and to a lesser degree, government policy (15%).

73 One instrument that Hart and Northmore identify as showing significant promise in terms of an outcomes-focused assessment of engaged scholarship is the University of Bradford's (UK) "Reciprocity, Externalities, Access and Partnership" (REAP) tool. The tool is designed to facilitate critical reflection, while also "capturing and evaluating multidisciplinary and cross-boundary partnerships" (Hart and Northmore, 2012, p. 7). The REAP tool enables ongoing assessment, planning, and monitoring of engagement activities in light of four pre-determined principles (Pearce *et al*, 2007):
    • Reciprocity: do knowledge, information, and benefit flow between university and community partners?
    • Externalities: does the flow of benefits extend beyond direct partners, contributing to social networks and cohesion locally and nationally?
    • Access: do partners have access to all university resources? and
    • Participation: do reciprocity and access shape a meaningful partnership?
    The REAP developers suggest applying rigorous qualitative methods (i.e. interviews, focus group discussions, participant observation, and questionnaires). They also indicate the importance of developing and implementing simple output data-collection systems to track engagement outputs over time.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the interest of providing clear and actionable next steps for how knowledge mobilization and social innovation can leverage investment in higher education research and development, presented here is a very brief list of conclusions and high priority recommendations for SSHRC, government, community and academic institutions in Canada.

CONCLUSION 1: There is a need to support knowledge mobilization and measure the outcomes of social innovation in ways that are useful to a diversity of stakeholders.

» RECOMMENDATION 1 FOR SSHRC: As part of SSHRC's corporate performance and evaluation, SSHRC should enable longitudinal research and develop metrics in social impact, social innovation and knowledge mobilization across the disciplines.

» RECOMMENDATION 1 FOR GOVERNMENT: Collaborate with SSHRC, higher education, and industry and community organizations to develop and implement a strategy to better understand and advance social innovation and knowledge mobilization and communicate these impacts to Canadians.

» RECOMMENDATION 1 FOR ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS: Provide committed resources to university administration to plan institutionally for social innovation and knowledge mobilization across the disciplines and for the university as a whole; and partner with SSHRC and government in developing longitudinal metrics in social impact, social innovation and knowledge mobilization across the disciplines.

» RECOMMENDATION 1 FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: Explore opportunities for collaboration with academic institutions and develop capacity to be equal partners in social innovation and knowledge mobilization efforts.

CONCLUSION 2: Although there is much work being undertaken in universities, government, and industry and community organizations that contribute to social innovation and knowledge mobilization, there is a need for a systematic approach to coordinating those efforts and supporting sustained collaborations.

» RECOMMENDATION 2 FOR SSHRC: Leverage the Networks of Centres of Excellence model to develop a funding mechanism to invest in social innovation and knowledge mobilization, particularly for institutional infrastructure and project/discipline-based initiatives.

» RECOMMENDATION 2 FOR GOVERNMENT: Invest in networks of centres of excellence in social innovation and knowledge mobilization.

» RECOMMENDATION 2 FOR ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS: Integrate into research services offices institutional supports for social innovation and knowledge mobilization and build on regional and national initiatives to network, share practices and tools and build a pan-Canadian capacity for knowledge mobilization. There is also a role for the Canadian Association of University Research Administrators to partner as advocates for this emerging research service.

» RECOMMENDATION 2 FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: Leverage the wealth of experience and expertise in community organizations and advocate for equal partnership in knowledge mobilization and social innovation collaborations. There is a role for pan-Canadian umbrella organizations such as Imagine Canada and United Way Centraide Canada to represent the community voice in emerging social innovation dialogues.

CONCLUSION 3: There is tremendous potential for sustained collaborative relationships between universities and other sectors to contribute to social innovation and address social issues. In any collaborative relationship, there are also significant challenges, however, that must be recognized and addressed. Although universities, government, industry and community organizations can benefit greatly from collaboration and social innovation, the communities of practice and particular needs in each sector differ from each other. Strategies, policies, programs and plans to support and sustain social innovation must therefore be adequately informed by an understanding of the differences across sectors and the complexity of the problems that social innovation aims to address.

» RECOMMENDATION 3 FOR SSHRC: Provide training to peer review committees to more equitably value engaged scholarship and non-traditional scholarship in adjudication of grant applications. As appropriate to funding programs involving community partners, continue to include non-academic peers on adjudication committees and promote them as co-chair for competitions.

» RECOMMENDATION 3 FOR GOVERNMENT: Recognize the value of social innovation as a critical element in Canada's innovation strategies. Explore possibilities for policies and programs that identify and bridge the needs of academic, industry and community organizations in regard to social innovation and knowledge mobilization.

» RECOMMENDATION 3 FOR ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS: Explore possibilities for integrating both into the faculty reward system and in the interactions between university administration and faculty, measures that support social innovation, engaged scholarship and knowledge mobilization as scholarly practices.

» RECOMMENDATION 3 FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: Work with academic institutions to develop training offerings for community leaders, researchers and professionals interested in collaborating on social innovation and knowledge mobilization efforts.

In March 2012 the Public Policy Forum released "Leading Innovation: Insights from Canada's Regions." This report stated that, "collaboration is the lifeblood of innovation" and "fostering these relationships takes more than a simple introduction, it requires consistent networking capacity."[74] Knowledge mobilization and campus-community collaborations are key to social innovation and are based on a shared value for social benefit. Post-secondary institutions, governments, SSHRC and community organizations have the opportunity to collaborate to leverage investments in higher education research and development and make social innovation an active component of Canada's innovation strategies to address persistent social challenges, to improve the quality of life of Canadians, and to increase the effectiveness of governments, industry and community organizations in Canada.

---

74   See http://www.ppforum.ca/sites/default/files/Leading%20Innovation%20-%20Insights%20from%20Canadian%20
Regions_0.pdf

REFERENCE LIST

Agrawal, A. (2001). University-to-industry knowledge transfer: Literature review and unanswered questions. *International Journal of Management Review* 3(4): 285-302.

Amsden, J. & VanWynsberghe, R. (2005). Community mapping as a research tool with youth. *Action Research* 3(4): 357–381.

Ahmed, S. & Palemo, A. (2010). Community engagement in research: Framework for education and peer review. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(8): 1380-1389.

Andrew, C. and Klein, J–L. (2010). Social Innovation: What is it and why is it important to understand it better. Centre de recherche sur les innovations socials (Crises).

Austin, J., Stevenson, H., Wei–Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1): 1–22.

Austin, D. (2003). Community-based collaborative team ethnography: A community-university-agency partnership. *Human Organization*, 62(2): 143-153.

Bennet, A. and Bennet, D. (2008). *Knowledge Mobilization in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Moving from research to action*. Frost, WV: MQI Press.

Best, A. and Holmes, B. (2010). Systems thinking, knowledge and action: towards better models and methods, *Evidence & Policy* 6(2): 145-159

Bielefeld, W. (2006). Issues in social enterprise and social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 15(1): 69–86.

Biggs, R., Westley, F.R., Carpenter, S.R. (2010). Navigating the back loop: Fostering social innovation and transformation in ecosystem management. *Ecology and Society* 15(2): 9.

Bowen, S. and Martens, P. (2005). Demystifying knowledge translation: learning from the community. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy* 10(4): 203-211.

Bouchard, M. (2004). "Un exemple de service collectif innovant: le logement communitaire au Québec" in D. Demoustier. Économie sociale et développement local. Paris: L'Harmattan, pp. 103-106.

Bullinger, H-J. (2006): Verdammt zur Innovation. *RKW-Magazin* 57 (1): 12-14.

Burke, J., O'Campo, P., Peak, G., Gielen, A., McDonell, K., Trochim, W. (2005). An introduction to concept mapping as a participatory public health research method. *Qualitative Health Research:* 15(10), 1392-1410.

Campbell, E. and Lassiter, L. (2010). From collaborative ethnography to collaborative pedagogy: Reflections on the other side of Middletown Project and community-university research partnerships. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 41(4): 370-385.

Carlson, E., Engebretson, J., and Chamberlain, R. (2006). Photovoice as a social process of critical consciousness. *Qualitative Health Research* 16(6): 836-852.

Carlton, E., Whiting, Jason B., Bradford, K., Hyjer Dyk, P. and Vail, A. (2009). Defining factors of successful university-community collaborations: An exploration of one healthy marriage project. *Family Relations* 58: 28-40.

Cherry, D. and Shefner, J. (2004). Addressing barriers to university-community collaboration: Organizing by experts or organizing the experts? *Journal of Community Practice* 12(3/4): 219-233.

Choi, J.N. (2003). How does context influence individual behavior? Multilevel assessment of the implementation of social innovations. *Prevention & Treatment* 6: 23.

Cooper, A. and **Levin**, B. (2010). Some Canadian contributions to understanding knowledge mobilization. *Evidence and Policy*, 6(3), 351-369. 2010

Dahrendorf, R. (2009). Nach der Krise: Zuruck zur protestantischen Ethik? Sechs Anmerkungen. *Merkur Deutsche Zeitschrift fur europäisches Denken*, 63 (720): 373-381.

Dees, J.G. (2005). Social entrepreneurs and education. *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 8(1): 51–57.

Dhesi, A.S. (2010). Diaspora, social entrepreneurs and community development. *International Journal of Social Economics* 37(9): 703–716.

Eckerle Curwood, S., Munger, F., Mitchell, T., MacKeigan, M., Farrar, A. (2011). Building effective community-university partnerships: Are universities truly ready? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* Spring: 1-13.

Emschoff, J., Darnell, A., Darnell, D., Erickson, S., Schneider, S. and Hudgins, R. (2007). Systems change as an outcome and a process in the work of community collaboratives for health. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 39: 255-267.

Fairweather, G. and Davidson, W. (1986). *Community experimentation*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Flicker, S. and Savan, B. (2006). *A snapshot of CBR in Canada*. Wellesley Institute.

Flicker, S., Travers, R., Guta, A., McDonald, S. and Meagher, A. (2007). Ethical dilemmas in community-based participatory research: Recommendations for institutional review boards. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 84(4): 478-493.

Gardner, C., Acharya, T. andYach, D. (2007). Technological and social innovation: A unifying new paradigm for global health. *Health Affairs* 26(4): 1052–1061.

Goldenberg, M., Kamoji, W., Orton, L. and Williamson, M. (2009). Social innovation in Canada: An update.

CPRN Research Report.

Goldstein, J., Hazy, J., Silberstang, J. (2010). Complexity science model of social innovation in social enterprise. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 1(1): 101–125.

Ward, V., House, A. and Hamer, S. (2009). Knowledge brokering: The missing link in the evidence to action chain. *Evidence & Policy* 5(3): 267-279.

Hart, A. and Northmore, S. (2012). Auditing and evaluating university-community engagement: Lessons from a UK case study. *Higher Education Quarterly* 65(1): 34-58.

Hazel, K.L. and Onaga, E. (2003). Experimental social innovation and dissemination: The promise and its delivery. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 32(3/4): 285–294.

Henderson, J., MacKay, S. and Peterson-Badali, M. (2010). Interdisciplinary knowledge translation: Lessons learned from a mental health fire service collaboration. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 46: 277-288.

Howaldt, J. and Schwarz, M. (2010). Social innovation: Concepts, research fields and international trends. IMO.

Hynie, M., Jensen, K., Johnny, M., Wedlock, J. and Phipps, D. (2011). Student learning from community engaged graduate internships. *Education and Training* 53(1): 45-56.

Isreal, B., Schultz, A., Parker, E. and Becker, A. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health* 19: 173-202.

Kania. J. and Kramer, M. (2001). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved April 28, 2012, from: http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact.

Kerlin, J. (2006). Social enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and learning from the differences. *Voluntas* 17: 247–263.

Kerr, J. (2007). Sustainability meets profitability: The convenient truth of how the business judgment rule protects a board's decision to engage in social entrepreneurship. *Cardozo Law Review* 29(2): 623-669.

Kesselring, A. and Leitner, M. (2008). Soziale Innovationen in Unternehmen. Study compiled by order of the Unruhe Stiftung. Vienna.

Klein, J–L., Fontan, J–M., Tremblay, D–G. (2009). Social entrepreneurs, local initiatives and social economy: Foundations for a socially innovative strategy to fight against poverty and exclusion. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science* 32(1): 23–42.

Knowledge Mobilization Works. (2010). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship environmental scan. *What Works? A report prepared for York University and the United Way of York Region.*

Koné, A., Sullivan, M., Senturia, K., Chrisman, N., Ciske, S. and Krieger, J. (2000). Improving collaboration between researchers and communities. *Public Health Reports* 115(2/3): 243-248.

Kovach, M. (2005). Emerging from the margins: Indigenous methodologies. In Leslie Brown & Susan Strega (Eds.), *Research as Resistance: Critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*, pp. 19-36.

Lantz, P., Viruell-Fuentes, E., Isreal, B., Softley, D. and Guzman, R. (2001). Can communities and academia work together on public health research? Evaluation results from a community-based participatory research partnership in Detroit. *Journal of Urban Health* 78(3): 495-507.

Lavis J., Woodside, J., McLeod, C. and Abelson, J. (2003). How can research organizations more effectively transfer research knowledge to decision makers? *The Milbank Quarterly* 81: 221-248.

Lock, I. (2001). Summary report of proceedings: strategic alliance: seeking common ground. Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship.

Lomas, J. (2007). The in-between world of knowledge brokering." *British Medical Journal* 334(7585):129-32.

London, J., Zagofsky, T., Huang, G. and Saklar, J. (2011). Collaboration, participation, and technology: The San Joaquin Valley Cumulative Health Impacts Project. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* 4: 12-30.

Leadbeater, C. (2007). Social enterprises and social innovation: strategies for the next ten years. A social enterprise think piece for the Cabinet Office of the Third Sector.

Lowe, P. and Philipson, J. (2009). Barriers to research collaboration across disciplines: Scientific paradigms and institutional practises. *Environment and Planning* 41: 1171-1184.

Morelli, N. (2007). Social innovation and new industrial contexts: Can designers "Industrialize" social responsible solutions? *Design Issues* 23(4): 3–21.

Morton, S. and Nutley, S. (2011). What happens next? Getting research into policy and practice. In Jamieson, L. Simpson, R. and Lewis, R. (Eds). *Researching Families and Relationships*. London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Moulaert, F. and Ailenei, O. (2005). Social economy, third sector and solidarity relations: A conceptual synthesis from history to present. *Urban Studies* 42(11): 2037–2053.

Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R. andSanders, B. (2007). Social innovation: What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated. Oxford University.

Murray, R., Mulgan, G., Caulier–Grice, J. (2008). How to innovate: The tools for social innovation. Retrieved April 28, 2012 from: www.youngfoundation.org/files/images/publications/Generating_Social_Innovation_0.pdf

Nichols, N., Gaetz, S. and Dyck, M. (Submitted). Both sides now: The social organisation of community-academic collaboration.

Nichols, N. (2012) *"All my life I've slipped through the cracks:" The Social Coordination of "Youth Work."* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Nichols, N. (2010). Learning across the borders of community and academy. *Pedagogies* 5(4). 313-324.

Nichols, N. (2008). Understanding the funding game: The textual coordination of civil sector work. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 33(1): 61-88.

Northmore, S. and Hart, A. (2011). Sustaining community-university partnerships. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* 4: 1-11.

Nutley, S., Walter, I. and Davies, H. (2007). *Using Evidence: How research can inform public services*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

Osborne, S. and Brown, L. (2009). Innovation, public policy and public services delivery in the UK. The word that would be king?

Office of Community-Based Research, University of Victoria and Community Based Research Canada. (2009). The funding and development of community university research partnerships in Canada: Evidence-based investment in knowledge, engaged scholarship, innovation and action for Canada's future.

Pearce, J., Pearson, M., with Cameron, Sam. (n.d.) The ivory tower and beyond: Bradford University at the heart of its communities. The Bradford University REAP Approach to Measuring and Evaluating Community Engagement. Retrieved February 14, 2012 from http://www.tufts.edu/talloiresnetwork/downloads/REAP_ Report_Bradford_U.pdf

Pearlman, S. and Bilodeau, R. (1999). Academic-community collaboration in teen pregnancy prevention: New roles for professional psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 30(1): 92-98.

Phipps, D. and Shapson, S. (2009). Knowledge mobilization builds local research collaborations for social innovation. *Evidence & Policy* 5(3): 211-227.

Phipps, D. (In press). A report detailing the development of a university-based knowledge mobilization unit that enhances research outreach and engagement. *Scholarly Research and Communications*.

Phipps, D. and Zanotti, D. (2011). It's the basement stories, not the belt. Lessons from a community-university knowledge mobilisation collaboration. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* 4: 203-214.

Phipps, D., Zanotti, D. and Johnny, M. (2009). Lessons learned from knowledge mobilization: turning research into action. *Research Global* 22: 20-23.

Phipps, D., Jensen, K. and Myers, J. (2012) Applying social sciences research for public benefit using knowledge mobilization and social media. In *Social Sciences and Humanities - Applications and Theories* / Book 1. Ed. Lopez-Varela, M. forthcoming from In Tech.

Prahalad, C. and Krishnan, M. (2008).*The New Age of Innovation: Driving Cocreated Value through Global Networks*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Quarter, J., Mook, L., and Armstrong, A. (2009). *Understanding the Social Economy:* A *Canadian Perspective.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Restler, S. and Woolis, D. (2007). Actors and factors: Virtual communities for social innovation. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management* 5(1): 89–96.

Research Triangle Park, International – University of North Carolina. (2004). Community-based Participatory Research: Assessing the Evidence. *Evidence Report/ Technology Assessment,* 99. Prepared for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Rickinson, M., Sebba, J. and Edwards, A. (2011). *Improving Research through User Engagement*. London & New York: Routledge.

Roche, B. (2008). *New Directions in Community-Based Research*. The Wellesley Institute.

Sakamoto, I., Khandor, E., Chapra, A., Hendrickson, T., Maher, J., Roche, B. and Chin, M. (2008). *Homelessness – Diverse Voice, Common Experiences, Shared Solutions: The Need for Inclusion and Accountability.* Toronto, ON: Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto.

Serrat, O. (2010). Sparking Social Innovations. *Knowledge Solutions* 79: 1–8.

Schwab, K. and Hartigan, P. (2008). Social Innovators with a Business Case. *Innovations* 7–12.

Smith, D. (2003). Research collaboration with community organizations: A case example. *Families in Society*, 84(1): 75-79.

Strauss, S., Tetroe, J. and Graham, I. (2009). *Knowledge Translation in Health Care: moving from evidence to practice.* Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Sud, M., VanSandt, C. and Baugous, . (2009). Social entrepreneurship: The role of institutions. *Journal of Business Ethics* 85: 201–216.

Urban, B. (2008). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa delineating the construct with associated skills. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research* 14(5): 346–364.

Wright, K., Wright, S., Williams, P., Lieber, E., Carrasco, S. and Gedjeyan, H. (2011). Ties that bind: Creating and sustaining community-academic partnerships. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* 4: 83-90.

Vazquez Jacobus, Michelle, Baskett, Robert & Bechstein, Christina. (2011). Building Castles Together: A sustainable collaboration as a perpetual work-in-progress. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 4, pp. 65-82.

Waddock, S. and Post, J. (1991). Social entrepreneurs and catalytic change. *Public Administration Review* 51(5): 393-401.

Wilson, A. (2009). Social Entrepreneurship. School of Social Entrepreneurship, London.

Zadek, S. and Thake, S. (1997, June 20). Send in the social entrepreneurs. *New Statesman*, 26, 31.