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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Universities are looking to embark on a social third mission, to become more connected to their surrounding communities, and to find actionable solutions for today’s complex social challenges. An abundance of rhetoric exists on the need for community-university partnerships but there is no standard approach in place for engagement. There is also a growing knowledge base on new platforms that are being used to stimulate social innovations and solutions to today’s social challenges. These platforms include tools, venues, and/or structures, which need to be examined in the context of community-university engagement and partnerships to determine their potential to support the university’s third mission to achieve social impact.

The present study was conducted for the Centre for Global Studies (CFGs) because of the Centre’s interest in research partnerships with civil society organizations (CSOs), community-based research initiatives, and the potential of these engagement activities to stimulate social change. The study concentrated on the following research questions:

- What principles might assure an appropriate role for academe in building successful civil society organization (CSO)-university partnerships?
- What kinds of platforms, venues, and/or structures satisfy these principles?

This research paper develops a framework and consultation tool for the analysis of potential platforms to determine their appropriateness for supporting CSO-university partnerships and stimulating social change. The consultation tool, a two-way table titled the Principles-Platform Coherence (PPC) Matrix, is designed for partners to use in an interactive fashion during the planning phases of their partnership so that they may develop a clear indication of how to move forward and of which platform might best support their needs and capacities.

Literature Review

The discussion around community-university partnerships is closely related to conversations about knowledge mobilization (KMb), engagement, and co-creation, which have recently evolved to acknowledge the importance of multi-disciplinary approaches and networks in creating social value. KMb, community engagement, and co-creative partnerships with community organizations are also increasing priorities for universities because of a sense of responsibility and external pressures to be more active in solving community issues and increasing social value.

A review of the current engagement efforts made by universities reveals a variety of ways that universities connect with their surrounding communities and a lack of consistency in how these efforts are supported and recognized within academe. Partnerships range in size, scope, and duration and individual roles of partners also vary widely. Engagement efforts include internships, service-learning, and research partnerships but partnerships that facilitate genuine co-creation are limited.
Benefits that can be achieved through community engagement and CSO-university partnerships include increased access of funding, shared knowledge, expertise and resources, improved social services, and the potential for improved social outcomes. Social outcomes include better social services in the short-term and social, environmental, and cultural improvements in the longer term. Despite these benefits, community-university engagement partnerships are limited because of existing challenges and barriers. Potential barriers identified for implementation of partnerships and promising platforms include limited access to funding, human resources, and time, institutional resistance to the recognition of community engagement efforts, and the difficulty of measuring outcomes and broader social impacts of partnerships. Attempts at addressing these barriers have been made but more work is needed.

While universities are increasingly reporting to be engaged institutions, through strategic plans, and working to deliver on a new social contract with society, there is no clear indication that community engagement efforts are comparable to industry engagement and commercialization efforts. Universities put forward less effort in the social sciences than hard sciences because hard sciences have well-established and dedicated resources. This indicates room for increased engagement levels and an assessment of platforms that might facilitate community engagement.

Four promising platforms were identified in the literature: online platforms, community-based research structures, constellation models, and change labs. These platforms have the potential to facilitate CSO-university partnerships and to foster social change through social innovation. They are gaining momentum and support in practice because of their apparent success in developing innovative solutions to complex challenges. While engagement platforms are increasingly used in practice, building a culture within academia where partnerships with community organizations for the purpose of social change are accepted, supported, and rewarded is an ongoing challenge.

**Conceptual Framework**

Existing principles and recommendations for successful partnerships as well as expected benefits and potential barriers to implementation were distilled from the literature and incorporated into a conceptual framework. The framework has two main purposes. The first is to provide a list of principles, embedded within the framework, that assure an appropriate role for academe in building successful partnerships with CSOs. The second is to act as a benchmark and point of analysis for a detailed assessment of the identified engagement platforms. The seven principles - goal alignment, power balance, co-creation, learning, innovation, multiple touch points, and sustainability - are used to assess the characteristics of engagement platforms in terms of their potential to support community-university partnerships and to achieve associated benefits.

**Findings, Discussion, and Implications**

The platform assessment based on varying levels of engagement, shows that change labs possess the most promise, followed by community-based research structures, constellation models, and online platforms. While change labs promised to be the most successful because of their ability to satisfy the seven partnership principles, each platform implemented at a high level of engagement...
has the potential to facilitate productive community-university partnerships. The higher the level of engagement pursued, the more effectively the platform satisfies the partnership principles. With the exception of the constellation model, platforms can be implemented at a low level of engagement, which may be a more practical option for universities with limited capacity and/or resources to engage. Certain benefits are achieved at each level of engagement.

Change labs and community-based research initiatives, particularly at high engagement levels, require the most time, personnel, and funding to implement. Constellation models draw on fewer financial resources overall because of achieved economies of scope between partners. In all cases however, the potential for implementation will depend on the capacity of a university to engage in light of ongoing demands related to teaching, research, and other duties. Other engagement barriers are the result of institutional resistance to community engagement and the difficulty of demonstrating the social impact of partnerships. Institutional support varies across universities and third mission efforts are not necessarily rewarded in comparison to other academic duties and/or in comparison to industry engagement. Existing metrics and promotion structures fall short in terms of recognizing university engagement and/or co-creation efforts with civil society partners.

Findings from the analysis have several implications:

- Those universities that have the capacity to fully engage in partnerships will be more likely to achieve successful results and maximum expected benefits.
- Universities that do not have the capacity to engage in partnerships, may still achieve benefits if only low levels of engagement are possible. Therefore smaller universities need not be discouraged from engaging in collaborative activities with CSOs.
- Community-based research initiatives may be more feasible for some universities due to existing funding structures already in place for these types of partnerships.
- Change labs most effectively support CSO-university partnerships but other promising options exist for partners where there are limited resources.
- Committing to being an engaged institution in strategic plans is not enough if this commitment is not then acted upon.
- Because universities have varying capacities for engagement activities, cost-benefit assessments are necessary to determine which platforms are most feasible for implementation.
- There is a need to progress towards recognizing and rewarding community engagement efforts within promotion and tenure structures.

Implications exist for CSOs because increased efforts on behalf of universities lead to increased opportunities for CSOs to access partner resources at a time when they are facing limited access to funds and increasing demand for services. Implications also exist for potential funders because they can consider focusing funds towards community-university partnerships. They can also directly support social innovation and social change efforts by implementing new methods of accountability for funds.
Conclusions

This report suggests that the complexity of today’s social dilemmas increases the need for CSO-university partnerships. The analysis indicates that several potential platforms exist to facilitate and support community engagement activities. With the assistance of the PPC matrix resulting from the analysis, universities can choose an appropriate platform based on the level of engagement that they want or have the capacity to achieve. With the promise of engagement venues such as online platforms, community-based research structures, constellations models, and change labs, it is apparent that community-university partnerships have significant potential to impact positive social change.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

With limited evidence in both theory and practice, academics raise an abundance of questions in the literature regarding the best approach to take when engaging in community-university partnerships. While there is no standard approach for partnerships, there is a need for a summary of where the literature stands in this regard. Community-university partnerships are increasingly important to universities looking to become more engaged and connected to their surrounding communities and to conduct action-oriented research. In addition, this topic is gaining importance due to the increasing complexity of today’s social challenges and increasing pressure put on universities to become social change agents in light of these challenges.

One of the many unanswered questions in regard to this multifaceted topic is how to facilitate these community-university collaborations. There is a growing knowledge base on new platforms that are being used to stimulate social innovations and solutions to today’s social challenges. These platforms include tools, venues, and/or structures, which need to be examined in the context of community-university engagement and partnerships to determine their potential to support the university’s new social contract with society (Gibbons, 1999).

1.1 Research Objectives and Research Questions

The primary objective of the paper is to outline the requirements necessary for universities to effectively mobilize knowledge and engage civil society through partnerships. The secondary objective is to develop an understanding of which platforms allow for most successful facilitation of these partnerships.

This report will address the following research questions:

- What principles might assure an appropriate role for academe in building successful civil society organization (CSO)-university partnerships?
- What kinds of platforms, venues, and/or structures satisfy these principles?

The first question assesses what might be done to support successful partnerships and the second question assesses how, or through which platforms, these complex multi-stakeholder partnerships might be executed. Platforms – or tools, venues, and/or structures - that allow productive and creative interactions between universities and CSOs can eventually lead to better services for citizens and, in the longer-term, improved social outcomes.

1.2 Research Approach

In order to contribute to the existing knowledge base and to answer the research questions posed above, this project consists of four main components. They are: a literature review leading to the
identification of principles for successful partnerships including potential platforms to support these partnerships; development of a conceptual framework for analyzing the different platforms; analysis of the platforms using principles and criteria derived from the literature; a discussion of the promising platforms that satisfy the principles; and implications and conclusions based on the findings presented.

– Literature Review
  The literature review assesses the current narrative on community-university partnerships that are established for the purpose of creating social change. Examples from scholarly and grey literature are used to help illustrate the diversity of engagement relationships and the intricacies involved in these relationships. Characteristics of potential platforms are identified, and illustrative examples are provided.

– Conceptual Framework
  By drawing out key findings from the literature, a set of principles is identified indicating suggested requirements and criteria for the facilitation of successful community-university partnerships. A conceptual framework is developed in the form of a list of guiding principles and critical considerations including potential barriers and expected benefits.

– Analysis of Engagement Platforms
  The conceptual framework and subsequent principles and considerations developed are used to guide the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of potential platforms. The results of the analysis are presented in a newly developed tool titled the Principles-Platform Coherence (PPC) Matrix, which ensures appropriate reflection and evaluation based on principles identified for the conceptual framework so that appropriate platforms can be selected.

– Discussion of Promising Platforms
  This section reflects on the assessment of partnership principles and engagement platforms conducted in the analysis section. The discussion focuses on the platforms that are most promising based on their ability to satisfy the principles and criteria set out in the conceptual framework. The discussion also considers the appropriateness of these platforms in supporting community-university partnerships.

This study indicates the importance of CSO-university partnerships and their potential to participate in finding solutions to today’s complex social dilemmas. The study also indicates that several potential platforms exist to effectively facilitate and support community engagement activities. With the demonstrated promise of existing engagement venues and the diversity of these platforms, it is apparent that universities have significant potential to engage with their surrounding community to impact positive social change.
2.0 BACKGROUND

This section first introduces the client organization and key client representative for the present project. A description is provided of the client organization’s vested interest in the topic being researched. This section also identifies key themes and topics that provide context for an exploration of community-university partnerships and engagement platforms. The aim of this section is to provide background knowledge for a more comprehensive level of understanding for the present project.

2.1 Client

My client is the Centre for Global Studies (CFGS), represented by Rod Dobell, Professor Emeritus of Public Policy and Senior Research Associate at the Centre. With its long involvement in formal global institutional architecture as one dimension of academic engagement in global governance, the Centre sees crucial links to the declared interests of the University of Victoria in promoting more extensive community-engaged research. Though the Centre is interested both in formal research partnerships with civil society organizations (CSOs) and in informal community-based research initiatives, the research requirement suggested for the present work is focused on the development of principles to assess what platforms would be most promising for academic engagement with CSOs to stimulate social change. More specifically, this research paper develops a framework for the analysis of potential platforms to determine their appropriateness for supporting such CSO-university partnerships.

2.2 Context

Before examining the intricacies of the topic at hand, it is essential to have an understanding of the current social climate and subsequent expectations placed on universities as well as the university’s third mission, civil society organizations (CSOs), and the topic of social innovation. A sketch of this background is presented below.

2.2.1 Social Climate and Expectations

Today’s social challenges are increasingly complex and have led to a universal desire for change (Carnegie UK Trust, 2011). There are increasingly higher expectations placed on universities in terms of their role in helping directly to find solutions to social problems. These growing pressures come from a belief that universities should be playing a more active role in terms of civic engagement and social responsibility (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010; Chemikova, 2011; Community-Based Research Canada, 2012; Global University Network for Innovation [GUNI], n.d.; Hart & Northmore, 2011; Holland & Ramaley, 2008; Living Knowledge Network, 2012; Molas-Gallart, 2005; Ostrander 2004 as cited in Hynie, Jensen, Johnny, Wedlock, & Phipps, 2011; Winter, Wiseman, & Muirhead, 2006). For example, a university’s community engagement efforts
may be directed towards assisting CSOs in keeping pace with today’s increasingly complex social challenges. CSOs deal first hand with social issues: therefore CSO-university partnerships, ultimately seeking some form of social change, might lead to improved social services and, in turn, improved social outcomes.

Universities have historically had to consider a balance between the pursuit of basic research and creating more immediate value for society (Brodhead, 2011; Winter et al., 2006) and, over the past ten years, policy makers have been reviewing the economic and social role of universities (Molas-Gallart, 2005). Now more than ever, in response to increasing social challenges, the lines separating academia and society are blurring and universities around the globe are reaching outside of campus boundaries to form partnerships (Yarime & Trencher, 2012, para. 2).

2.2.2 Third Mission

The third mission, separate from teaching and research, encompasses all of a university’s social and economic engagement efforts (Molas-Gallart, 2005). Over the last twenty years policies have been implemented around the world encouraging universities to increase their engagement levels (Laredo, 2007; Nelles & Vorley, 2009). Such a priority now features centrally in the new strategic plan for the University of Victoria. Emphasis, however, has usually been put on commercialization of research results through patenting, licensing and/or spin-off companies because these outputs are easy to define and measure (Molas-Gallart, 2005). While partnerships with industry have been dominant in the examples that are widely recognized as successful, the third mission also encompasses engagement with other members of the community such as other academic institutions, CSOs, and individual members of the public (Thorp & Goldstein, 2010). For the purposes of this paper, third mission refers to a university’s community engagement efforts directed toward its social role, as distinct from its economic or commercial role, as well as the need for academic institutions to enhance their social responsibility with local communities and community organizations.

As part of the increased expectations placed on universities to enhance their social role and develop improved linkages with the social sector, there is also a need for universities to engage civil society in “more compelling, more genuine ways” (Bunt & Leadbeater, 2012, p. 69). Therefore, attention to the platforms a university can use to engage civil society is required because these platforms may enable more effective knowledge mobilization (KMb) and collaboration efforts eventually leading to positive social change.

While the present focus is on the third mission, all three university missions are related and should support each other. Focusing on a third mission, particularly in engagement with civil society, however, requires substantial shifts in traditional university structures and processes. This new emphasis is not widely recognized in institutional practices such as promotion and tenure (P&T) decisions. Social impact from community partnerships is also much more difficult to evaluate than commercialization efforts. These challenges help to explain why limited community-university partnerships exist, however, to create social impact Canadian universities should increase the
activities they perform – across all three missions – particularly with local groups that have the greatest need for sustainable change.

2.2.3 CSOs

Civil society is defined as “the arena, outside of the family, the state and the market, which is created by individual and collective actions, organizations and institutions to advance shared interests” (Civicus, 2012, p. 8). While civil society is a broad term, this paper focuses on CSOs, which represent the institutional dimension of civil society (Banthien, Mayer-Rise, & Zetzsche, 2007). In Canada the social sector includes over 161,000 nonprofit organizations (Imagine Canada, 2010a as cited in Mulholland, Mendelsohn, & Shamshiri, 2011, p. 3) and accounts for $106.4 billion (or 7.1 per cent) of the national economy, which makes it one of the largest in the world (Statistics Canada, 2010 as cited in Mulholland et al., 2011, p. 3).

Despite its importance in Canada, civil society has played a secondary role to other stakeholders in the production of new knowledge, typically asking for expertise from external sources (Banthien et al., 2007). The increasing recognition - among researchers, policy makers, practitioners, and citizens alike - that innovation grounded in hard science and technology will not be sufficient to correct complex issues of present or to achieve desired changes means that there is only increasing potential for CSOs to play a more active role in knowledge production, or co-production, and innovation. This paper looks at CSO-university partnerships whereby partners work together to achieve positive social change. Partnerships are increasingly important for CSOs: these organizations are facing increasing demand for services, because of demographic changes and recent recession, and, at the same time, declining revenues as a result of increased competition for public funding and a decline in donations (Lasby & Barr, 2010; Mulholland et al., 2011; Scott & Pike, 2005). These dilemmas also represent a gap that universities might help to fill.

2.2.4 Social Innovation

Social innovation, defined as “an initiative, product or process or program that profoundly changes the basic routines, resource and authority flows or beliefs of any social system (e.g. individuals, organizations, neighbourhoods, communities, whole societies)”, is a potential outcome of effective CSO-university partnerships (Social Innovation Generation [SiG], n.d., p. 1). A partnership between a CSO and a university is a social structure that has the potential to stimulate social change through knowledge co-creation and the development of innovative solutions for the improvement of social circumstances.

The premise of CSOs is to increase benefits for society and social impact, making this sector the most appropriate space for social innovation and social change to flourish (Banthien et al., 2007; Brodhead, 2010; Doosemagen, 2011). While innovation is not new, it is especially important in today’s turbulent climate where there is a need for resiliency and increased competition for limited public funds (Banthien et al., 2007; Brodhead, 2010; Bunt & Leadbeater, 2012; Doosemagen, 2011; McDonald, 2007; Narberhaus et al., 2011; Seelos & Mair, 2012; Winter et al., 2006).
3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this literature review is to synthesize what is known about community-university partnerships and potential engagement platforms as well as additional topics supporting the research questions posed in this paper. Themes are used to categorize the discussions, though some overlap does exist between neighbouring literatures. The sources used to inform the literature review include books, academic journal articles, reports, and websites of public sector and nonprofit organizations and agencies. Search terms include university-community partnerships, knowledge mobilization (KMb), engagement platforms, co-creation, community engagement, civil society, civil society organizations (CSOs), social innovation, and multiple combinations of these terms to generate as much information as possible. For current works discussing related topics, Social Innovation Generation’s (SiG) website and online reserves proved to be valuable resources.

This literature review consists of five main sections. The first section defines KMb and community engagement. This section also reviews academic KMb within civil society (as compared to traditional knowledge transfers on the industry side), illustrating the increasing importance of collaboration and knowledge co-creation. Finally, this section briefly acknowledges the potential of advanced technologies in the co-creative process. Section 3.2 identifies the associated benefits for stakeholders involved in partnerships as well as potential outcomes for society. Section 3.3 discusses the potential of community-university partnerships and provides examples of existing partnerships. Section 3.4 addresses why community-university partnerships are limited in practice by introducing some of the main challenges and barriers to establishing these partnerships. Section 3.5 reviews engagement structures and platforms that are based on network and partnership approaches for finding solutions to complex problems. The last section will provide a summary and reflection of the literature review.

3.1 Knowledge Mobilization (KMb), Community Engagement, and Co-Creation

Knowledge mobilization (KMb) refers to the means and methods used to disseminate knowledge (Hall et al., 2011, p. 17) allowing it to flow within academe and between researchers and the broader community (Social Science and Humanities Research Council [SSHRC], 2012, para. 1). It is defined as “the act of moving research results into the hands of research users” (SSHRC, 2010, para. 6) to increase the economic and social value of research (Levesque, 2011). KMb is based on the idea that research should produce results relevant beyond intrinsic academic interests and beyond economic benefits even though these are not easily assessed using simple indicators or monetary terms (Science, Technology, & Civil Society [STACS], 2009, p. 13).

A study conducted by German, Urquhart, and Wilson in 2008 identifies principles for effective facilitation of KMb. These include supporting exchanges between academia and civil society organizations (CSOs), promoting and improving the local application of research, sharing best practices, and co-producing new knowledge (p. 32). German et al. found that best practices of KMb
were lacking in the literature but, since their study was conducted, the discourse around KMb has increased.

The term KMb has been appearing in the literature since the late 1990s (SSHRC, 2009). Although scholars debated its exact meaning, KMb was primarily used to describe activities beyond knowledge transfers that exist in the hard sciences (Levin, 2008; SSHRC, 2009). More recent discussions of KMb look through a social sciences and humanities lens and recognize that knowledge is constructed socially. This means that it consists of more discursive and multi-disciplinary approaches rather than traditional approaches of KMb such as transferring knowledge for the development of patents (SSRHC, 2009, p. 5). Current literature confirms that KMb requires networks of people to create value (Cooper & Levin, 2010; Levesque, 2010) and the movement of research into society is believed to increase its overall societal impact and value when the right conditions are met. It can be assumed, therefore, that the co-production of knowledge through partnerships with societal actors will further increase the overall impact of research. The movement of knowledge within the social sector however, is more complex than the customary route, requiring much more than a transfer of knowledge. Where KMb traditionally referred to the transfer and translation of research results, collaborative approaches of KMb involve action-oriented research that is initiated at the request of a community organization. Therefore KMb in the context of social sciences and community-university partnerships requires a higher level of engagement that is more intricate and hands-on. A partnership approach is critical because it can improve the effectiveness of KMb, and result in valuable contributions to social change, including the dissemination of knowledge to a broader audience (Brown, 2011, p. 43; Cuthill, 2010).

In 2008 at the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL) and SSHRC symposium, KMb thought-leaders discussed the impacts of KMb. They found that KMb has the potential to bring about change through increases in quantity, quality, and access to knowledge, and through “improved capacity to make effective decisions and to innovate or develop new solutions to problems” (Levin, 2008, p. 5). These findings also consider the role of KMb beyond traditional knowledge transfers. In addition to such theoretical contributions, practical contributions are also being made to improve KMb between universities and communities. SSHRC (2009), for example, has established specific KMb objectives so the agency can play an active role in increasing the overall impact of knowledge and facilitating reciprocal and co-creative relationships between researchers and knowledge users. SSHRC plans to meet their objectives through the use of networks, tools, and the development of best practices (p. 1).

3.1.1 Community Engagement

Community engagement, like KMb, is an increasingly important priority for academic institutions (Carnegie UK Trust, 2011; Holland & Ramaley, 2008; Sá, Li, & Faubert, 2011; Weerts & Sandmann, 2010; Winter et al., 2006). The Carnegie Foundation, an independent policy and research centre for the advancement of teaching, considers community engagement as collaboration between academic institutions and their surrounding communities (at the local, regional/state, national, and global levels) for a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources (Carnegie Foundation, n.d., para. 3; University of British Columbia [UBC], 2012). Engagement
initiatives that establish connections and partnerships between universities and community organizations include a range of activities from community-based research to consulting services offered by faculty to CSOs for professional development, training, and capacity building (Sá et al., 2011). Engagement partnerships - where there is mutually beneficial exchange and co-creation of knowledge - are those developed with the intention of solving a community issue while, at the same time, building capacity, developing new ideas, and expanding any existing knowledge base (Hall et al., 2011, p. 9; Holland & Ramaley, 2008, p. 34).

Hall et al. (2011) describe engagement as a continuum of processes for communication, collaboration, and relationship-building (p. 8). This engagement continuum also provides value to the KMb discussion as KMb requires higher levels of engagement on the social side. For example, a transfer of knowledge would be located on the far left end of the engagement continuum, followed by knowledge translation to its right, indicating a need for a higher level of engagement. Further to the right would exist a more practical form of knowledge translation that is, for example, initiated by a partner organization such as a CSO. Co-creation, on the other hand, would be located at the far right end of the continuum, as the engagement and KMb efforts in this case are genuinely and proportionately reciprocated between CSO and university partners. Considering co-creation, or the co-production of knowledge, stakeholders in these partnerships put forth proportionate efforts and high levels of engagement are occurring at every phase of the project. Other points that could be placed on the continuum include community outreach (which is one-way communication), cooperation, and collaboration, which would fall to the left of co-creation on the continuum in increasing order. Engagement, in the literature, is often used interchangeably with these terms but, when placed on a theoretical continuum, each actually represents a different level and/or intensity of engagement. As an institution or organization operates along the continuum and gradually participates in initiatives involving deeper levels of engagement, such as co-creation, the organization becomes more flexible and open to new networks and partnerships (Banthien et al., 2007).

3.1.2 Co-Creation

While the KMb literature dates back to the late nineties, more recently there has been increasing discussion of knowledge co-creation and co-production. The production and legitimacy of knowledge has changed and scholars such as Nowotny, Scott, and Gibbons (2001) find that the legitimacy of knowledge now depends on it being produced in a trans-institutional and multi-disciplinary way, outside of the university walls, in groups and networks of people with a diverse range of skill sets (Banthien, Mayer-Rise, & Zetzsche, 2007, p. 10; Gibbons, Limoges, & Nowotny, 1994). The core of co-creation involves the engagement of people for the creation of valuable experiences (Ramaswamy & Gouillart, 2010). Co-creation, therefore, attempts to eliminate any sectoral divide by allowing the academic and the practitioner to work together through every stage of the process, jointly developing the idea and purpose of a project (Chernikova, 2011; STACS, 2009). Similarly, Clark et al. (2002) found that improving the effectiveness of knowledge in addressing social challenges requires boundary work whereby diverse stakeholders from various organizations come together for the purpose of developing usable, action-oriented knowledge (p. 1).
Social Innovation eXchange [SIX], Knowledgeland, and Dialogue Café (2011) recognize that no one formula exists for successful co-creation but, nonetheless, offer a useful summary of co-creation principles developed based on discussions among 100 participants across all sectors (modified from pp. 11-12):

1. Dialogue should be knowledge driven (rather than position driven), participatory, and should encourage learning and diversity.
2. Partners must be open-minded, trusting, tolerant of failure and bending the rules, focused on sustainability, and open to the creation of unexpected partnerships.
3. Partners should use social media and new forms of connectivity, networks, all available talent, new process designs, and different approaches at the same time.
4. Partners should share power, bring people together offline and online, feel engaged, and celebrate success.

These principles are consistent with the co-creation narrative assessed for this review and aim to provide thoughtful considerations for co-creators. Notably, the third and fourth principles above discuss the use of social technologies, which represents a consideration surfacing throughout the co-creation literature. Where organizational structure is the primary facilitator for interaction in an offline co-creation platform, social technologies are used to encourage interactions in online co-creation platforms (Board of Innovation & Mission-e-Motion, 2011; Kittilson & Dalton, 2011; Seppälä, 2012). As presented by Dobell et al. (2012), social technologies help to eliminate barriers to collaboration (with partners, clients, and/or the masses) which will be needed to develop solutions for today’s complex social challenges. The potential of social media and their role in creating societal benefits is still to be seen (Brabham, 2011) but the advancement of social technologies have already broken down sectoral barriers, created new means of knowledge dissemination, and have made it easier for networks of people to engage (Banthien et al., 2007; Buecheler, Sieg, Füchslin, & Pfeifer, 2010; Dobell et al., 2012; Hazelkorn, 2012; Huddart, 2008; Lee, Olsen, & Trimi, 2010; 2012; Torjman, 2012). The ability of new technologies to increase interactions make them an important factor in developing long-term co-creative platforms for CSO-university partnerships.

The recognition of the importance of co-production, community engagement, and KMb is gaining traction across all sectors and is reinforced throughout the literature (Hewitt, 2011a). The trend to unite academic institutions and civil society for the co-creation and mobilization of knowledge has the potential to improve social and economic conditions while, at the same time, allowing for partners to glean mutual benefits (Global Alliance on Community Engaged Research [GACER], 2009, p. 6). Despite this trend and the understanding of the importance of co-creation, community-university partnerships are currently fragmented and lacking the recognition required to address their potential (p. 7). These challenges, which are discussed further in Section 3.4, indicate that many unanswered questions exist when it comes to co-creation. At the same time, co-creation is considered by many scholars as an area with significant value potential (Degnegaard, 2012; Dobell et al., 2012; GACER, 2009; Hackett, 2012; Ramaswamy, 2009; SIX et al., 2011).
3.2 Benefits of Collaboration and Principles for Community-University Partnerships

This section first discusses the potential benefits that exist for stakeholders involved in community-university partnerships. Next, it reviews the potential for the achievement of broader social outcomes. Finally, this section identifies guiding principles for successful CSO-university partnerships that allow partners to engage in productive relationships and achieve the expected benefits associated with collaborative work.

3.2.1 Benefits for Collaborators

CSOs and universities share the mutual objective of improving services and circumstances for citizens. Several mutual benefits that arise from working together to achieve this broader purpose can be achieved. For instance, CSOs benefit from the vast knowledge and expertise that universities provide as well as the credibility that comes with this expertise (Broad, 2011; Chernikova, 2011). CSOs also benefit from university demonstrations, teaching, and research capacities. Universities benefit from the direct access to local communities and networks that CSOs provide, including close connections to those citizens who benefit from their services (Chernikova, 2011; Science in Society, n.d.). Where evaluation is needed for funding, CSOs may rely on the university to assist them with monitoring and evaluation. This type of academic expertise brought to a partnership increases capacity within CSOs and increases the CSO’s profile, which could, in turn, increase its impact (on policy, society, etc.) (Chernikova, 2011). In addition to complementary skill sets, benefits realized for both parties exist through cost-sharing, access to human resources, and access to additional forms of funding (Chernikova, 2011).

Holland and Ramaley (2008) have found that CSOs are motivated to work with universities if universities show commitment to reciprocity and achieving mutual benefits (p. 35). CSOs are interested in working with partners who will invest the time to get to know the community being served. They expect partners to respect their culture and to share knowledge and resources in ways that are relevant to the community and its welfare (p. 35). Universities are most interested in working collaboratively with CSOs when they can explore new areas of research or increase the relevance of their research through direct access to local networks and experts (Chernikova, 2011).

In addition to building new capacities and gaining mutual benefits, longer-term outcomes are likely to be achieved (Bussières & Fontan, 2011). Beyond better social services for citizens, these can include a range of social impacts. The European Commission (2010) has broken down potential social impacts into three categories: social, environmental, and cultural. Respective examples include the improvement of health and quality of life, the improvement of how natural resources are managed, and building a better understanding of the culture of our nation and society (p. 42). Winter et al. (2006) also state that community partnerships and consultations allow universities to make tangible contributions to both local communities and to the greater public good (p. 223).
3.2.2 Principles for Successful Partnerships

While no standard list of best practices exists, various academic works provide guidelines and principles that might lead to successful community-university partnerships and that might, in turn, lead to the achievement of the benefits and outcomes outlined above.

The need for power balance in a partnership, where stakeholders contribute freely and proportionately, is consistent. Broad (2011) states that successful partnerships must set aside any power differentials so that partners can contribute proportionately to the achievement of objectives. The author finds that successful community-university partnerships require the researcher to act as a facilitator, to listen and respond to community needs, and to value local expertise in the knowledge co-creation process (p. 132). Agreement of the removal of power differences is also presented in Chernikova’s (2011) study. The author states further that support for individuals and space for dialogue are essential to successful CSO-university collaborations (p. 78).

CSOs and universities are complex organizations with different cultures, priorities, goals, and attitudes and societal demands that exceed their respective resources and capacities (Beere, 2009; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; McKitrick et al., 2011). Therefore, partners need to consider a balance between contributions in order to establish a dynamic partnership and to glean the benefits that result from the partnership. Chernikova (2011) found that mutual involvement in the ideation phase for research or a joint project, clear understanding about partner objectives, and agreement on the problem being assessed made collaborative efforts more effective (p. 6).

Strier (2010) conducted an analysis of a community-university partnership in Israel to provide advice for the management of successful partnerships. The author’s review of the literature indicated that universities typically get more out of partnerships than do communities because they have more power to impact the project’s agenda. However, the Haifa Partnership for the Eradication of Poverty (HPEP) is an example of genuine co-creation where the Welfare Department of Haifa Municipality and the members of the University of Haifa came together to work in a genuinely reciprocal partnership. The project was deemed a success and social workers claim to have learned to become more proactive in terms of initiating change. Strier (2010) found that the success of partnerships “depends on the capacity of the leaders to provide a learning and reflexive organizational culture and a participative organizational structure capable of making room for the supplementing, competing or even conflicting agendas embodied in these partnerships” (p. 95). Again, there is agreement that all stakeholders must be involved and engaged for a partnership to achieve desired outcomes and benefits (Steinhaus & Shields, 2012).

Additional principles for sustainable CSO-university partnerships were developed by Hall and Tremblay (2011). These include but are not limited to (p. 25):

1. Value of alternative forms of knowledge.
2. Recognition of the knowledge generating capacity of the community sector.
3. Recognition of socio-economic structures and options.
4. Capacity of project to reduce inequality.
5. Use of social economic approaches.

The principles, particularly the first four listed, reinforce the importance of equal power and proportionate participation from both parties in a collaborative relationship and are consistent with the findings documented throughout this literature review. The European Commission (2009) goes one step further by providing guidelines for encouraging the formation of CSO-university partnerships. These include but are not limited to (modified from p. 7):

- Establishing connections with CSO networks and platforms where potential partners can meet, exchange knowledge, and build capacity to manage future projects.
- Establishing better incentives and rewards for investments with communities and CSOs, which will require a re-evaluation of scientific excellence and societal relevance.
- Shaping funding to better-fit partnerships, allowing for mutual learning and participatory processes.
- Installing channels/structures to discuss research needs/issues with civil society actors.
- Exploiting project outputs to increase interest across sectors, broadening the evaluation systems to include public participation and social innovation alongside conventional science and technological innovation.

These guidelines indicate a need for new and innovative processes that work to facilitate co-productive partnerships between universities and CSOs (Broad, 2011). They go beyond what inputs or behaviours might be required for a productive partnership to offer advice on how the partnership can come together and where the co-creation process can happen alluding to the relevance of engagement platforms. The guidelines also introduce additional areas of inquiry such as how academic institutions can support and reward academic involvement in community engagement and the role funders can play, in terms of supporting co-creative relationships between universities and CSOs.

3.3 Examples of Community-University Partnerships and Reflection of Current State

This section will use examples to illustrate the current state of community engagement and KMb initiatives taken by universities operating at various levels of engagement. A reflection of the current state of community-university partnerships and engagement efforts is then presented to close this section.

3.3.1 Examples of Engagement and Partnerships

Examples of universities’ community engagement efforts are diverse ranging from student internships to research partnerships (Chernikova, 2011) but overall, the engagement level of relationships and the quantity of genuine co-creative partnerships are limited especially in comparison to industry and private sector engagement efforts.
Student internships through York University’s KMb Unit proved to be successful for both students and community as a means for building knowledge capacity, creating new knowledge by working together on co-developed projects, and promoting ongoing partnerships even beyond the length of the internship (Chernikova, 2011; Hynie et al., 2011). Internship programs vary by institution and there remains significant potential for these to have a greater focus on community engagement and also to play a role in the initiation of CSO-university partnerships.

The former Community University Research Alliance (CURA) program funded by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) promoted sharing of knowledge, resources, and expertise between post-secondary institutions and civil society organizations (CSOs) (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010). The Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship (ICES) at the University of Guelph also promotes and supports community-university research partnerships where Guelph’s faculty and students work with CSOs “to identify and address social problems, and develop policies for positive change” (Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship [ICES], 2012, para. 3). The success of SSHRC (formerly through CURA), Guelph’s ICES, as well as the University of Victoria’s Office of Community Based Research (OCBR) (which will soon be a part of a new Institute for community-university engagement at the University of Victoria), indicate potential for successful collaborative and co-creative partnerships between academic institutions and CSOs (Chernikova, 2011).

Strategic plans of universities are including new commitments to engage their local communities (Britner, 2012; Simon Fraser University [SFU], 2012; UBC, 2012; Winter et al., 2006). For example, SFU’s (2012) principles for engagement include finding sustainable solutions for community engagement by creating best practices, limiting its ecological footprint and maximizing its social and economic health (p. 4). This demonstrates how universities are acknowledging the importance of the third mission in their strategic plans and objectives. The University of Connecticut’s 2009-2014 Academic Plan goes one step further by including a new indicator to account for the number of external community engagement programs and partnerships in place (Britner, 2012). In addition to commitment through strategic plans, some universities offer recognition through awards such as the Community Partner Award at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2012). While some institutions have developed strategies, few have made internal structural changes to support their KMb strategies (Sá et al., 2011). Academic institutions recognize the importance of mobilizing knowledge to fulfill the third mission but mobilization strategies across universities vary widely and community engagement efforts are often marginal – and not rewarded – in comparison to the fulfillment of other academic missions and duties.

Broad’s (2011) study also shows that a diverse range of partnerships exist. The author provides examples of research partnerships where Algoma University played a range of unique roles. One of the partnerships was the Penokean Hills Farm which is a cooperative of eight beef farmers in the Algoma region. The cooperative’s mission is to maintain family farming and healthy meat production. The aim of the partnership is for the cooperative to gain access to local markets after the U.S. border closed to them during the mad cow crisis in 2003, where cattle suffered from a fatal and untreatable neurodegenerative disease. Community-based research was used for strategic marketing and business planning, identifying a niche market, and informing funding applications. To meet the
needs of the local niche markets identified through research, farmers used their expertise to respond. The farmers showed commitment to the project by making significant changes to their production process which took two years to implement. One of the key determinants of success in this case was the recognition on behalf of researchers of the expertise of local farmers. Farmers and researchers used their respective knowledge to participate in all stages of the research process and to co-develop the research question (Broad, 2011).

In a study of Carnegie data, Beere (2009) identified significant variance in the complexity of community-university partnerships ranging from three faculty members evaluating a CSO web-based program to a government funded partnership involving hundreds of universities and community organizations. In addition to the difference in scope, Beere also found significant variance in the duration of community-university partnerships: anywhere from two to ten years. Some partnerships were initiated and managed by a few faculty members, others at the department level, and others through campus institutes. In addition, most interactions occurred on an ad hoc basis rather than through formalized partnerships (Chernikova, 2011). In terms of funding, some partners had access to external resources for their work but most cases involved in-kind work on behalf of university faculty.

The examples demonstrate limited efforts but also indicate a growing interest from CSOs and researchers to work together to best reflect the needs of society (Science in Society, n.d., para. 1). Recent policy initiatives in Europe show additional support for a growing interest in collaborative partnerships between CSOs and universities. Examples include the European Commission’s (2011) Horizon 2020 Programme, which is dedicated to increasing research and innovation efforts aimed at solving societal challenges. Horizon 2020 will consolidate existing programs to increase their importance, such as the Seventh Framework Program (FP7) that encourages collaborative partnerships for an integrated overarching research and innovation framework in the European Union. This includes a funding scheme to support CSOs partnering with research organizations allowing them to jointly respond to calls for proposals and the Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society (PERARES) program aimed at strengthening public engagement in research by involving CSOs in the formulation of research questions and processes (Living Knowledge Network, n.d.). The Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) Action Plans is a new development that encourages community-university partnerships for research, capacity building, and training (Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, 2012). These venues seem to be promising in terms of increasing the effectiveness of engagement and KMb as partners are continually learning to work together in real-time and as a result, attempting to solve real-world problems.

3.3.2 Reflection of Current State

Despite the growing trend of community-university partnerships in research, learning, and KMb around the world (GACER, 2009, p. 2), universities and communities are still unaware of the potential of partnerships and often lack the required commitment and knowledge for the development of these partnerships (Beere, 2009, p. 55). Hall et al. (2011) suggest that, where universities include engagement and partnerships as part of their mandate, this does not necessarily
represent a commitment to engagement. Commitments need to go beyond mission statements and strategic plans (p. 3). Overall, engagement and partnership examples are not easily identified or easily distinguished in the existing narrative, which helps to explain why neither a standard approach nor best practices exist.

3.4 Challenges and Barriers to Community-University Partnership Efforts

While universities are being encouraged to engage in partnerships to increase their social impact, there are several challenges and institutional barriers that need to be considered and/or overcome in order to proceed. These are: motivational challenges for collaborators, access to funding, institutional resistance, and measurement challenge (Brown, 2011; Jackson, 2008; Krücken, Meier, & Müller, 2009; Sá et al., 2011; Schuetze, 2012; Yarime & Trencher, 2012). These challenges are described below.

3.4.1 Motivational Challenges for Collaborators

Challenges of collaboration between CSOs and universities stem from differences in culture, structure, motivations, and goals. These differences generate trust issues, for example, the concern on behalf of CSOs that new funding schemes might be the sole motivation for universities to engage in partnerships with CSOs (European Commission, 2009, p. 10; Holland & Ramaley, 2008). From the university perspective, concerns exist that CSOs might lack an open mind or may carry a bias related to the mission of their organization (European Commission, 2009, p. 11). An additional challenge for academics and practitioners is that engaging in a partnership is one of many responsibilities that compete for their time (McKitrick et al., 2011, p. 212). Despite challenges partners may face, CSO-university relationships are formulated on the basis that both entities want to create social value and that this is more likely to be achieved by working together rather than individually (German, et al., 2008; Hall et al., 2011).

3.4.2 Access to Funding

Austerity is a current reality. Government funders have smaller budgets coupled with increasing pressure to account for every dollar and to show how funds contribute to economic growth (Bhattacharya, 2012; Public Policy Forum, 2011). Therefore, the need to find external funding is a significant barrier for academia engaging civil society (Laredo, 2007). Some foundations, such as the McConnell Foundation, provide funds to post-secondary institutions specifically for community engagement projects, which represent one avenue for CSOs to access a university’s intellectual capital (Brodhead, 2011). While some public initiatives are starting to acknowledge the importance of collaboration (Europe’s MML mentioned earlier, for example), the existing narrative indicates that this has not been the norm amongst public funders. A study of existing community-university partnerships conducted by the Office of Community-Based Research (OCBR) (2009) identified a need to strengthen knowledge exchange and collaboration through new funding and participatory policies (OCBR, 2009, p. 6).
Typically in CSO-university partnerships, where efforts are made to achieve social goals, the results are not seen until the longer term. In practice, moving funding contributions towards longer-term initiatives is a difficult task, creating obstacles to receiving funds and impacting the likelihood of practitioners and researchers to engage in socially driven research (Molas-Gallart, 2005, p. 15). In addition, greater requirements have been put in place in recent years for researchers to receive funding from public research bodies. Researchers must indicate the impact their research will have on the economy and/or society to show the value of their work outside the institution’s walls (Hazelkorn, 2012). Though this may seem to encourage a move towards engaged scholarship and partnerships, there is ongoing resistance from academics who are engaging in basic research and fear that these new policies may put undesirable restrictions on potentially ground-breaking work (Molas-Gallart, 2005).

Kania and Kramer’s (2011) study discusses reasons why current funding structures limit the potential for collaboration. Because funders select only a few grantees from several applications, grantees emphasize their individual actions and potential impacts independent of competing organizations. Funders, however, are looking for significant contributions for solving social problems and it seems obvious that potential impact would only be heightened where organizations combine their strengths and work together (Kania & Kramer, 2011, p. 38). Collective impact will require a fundamental change by funders because social change is a long-term process where solutions are not necessarily known at the outset. Funders need to support the entire collective system that has come together for change (Kania & Kramer, 2011).

3.4.3 Institutional Resistance

Harkavy and Hartley (2012) argue that structural and ideological changes are required for a commitment to engagement as this would provide engagement efforts with increased legitimacy (p. 32). A change in mindset and institutional identity that accepts the value of community-university partnerships and embraces a new standard of achievement is needed (Holland & Ramaley, 2008, p. 36). Recognizing that knowledge exists outside of academic institutions will be a significant step toward achieving this new mindset (Living Knowledge Network, 2012, p. 2).

There is also some debate about the required level of institution-wide focus needed for successful community engagement efforts or whether this could be better managed by individuals or even groups of individuals. In an attempt to understand how a commitment to engagement becomes embedded in the work of a university, Harkavy and Hartley (2012), find that institutional commitment is demonstrated through the development of structures and cultures that facilitate and support local engagement. They also observe that a critical mass of organization members must be committed to and understand the importance of community engagement (p. 17). Some authors argue that it is important for an organization to have a vision and support from the top of the hierarchy in order to change the internal processes and mindsets of all stakeholders (Chernikova; 2011; Cooper & Levin, 2010; Living Knowledge Network, 2012; Winter et al., 2006). Others occupy a middle ground, stating that support among senior administrators and validation in institutional strategies might help to minimize the resistance at the institutional level (Holland & Ramaley, 2008; Sá et al., 2011). However, there are those who hold a contradictory view and
discuss the importance of initiatives taken at the individual level or from small groups of individuals. For example, Krücken et al. (2009), find that the majority of a university’s linkages with the community occur in a decentralized way and that third mission activities are initiated voluntarily through individual motivation and existing community connections (p. 143). Inevitably, the level of support and centralization will vary among institutions. Some examples of institution-wide commitments to engagement include SSHRC’s former CURA and the Beacons Public Engagement project, which is funded by Research Councils UK and the Wellcome Trust to increase public engagement efforts of universities (Global Alliance on Community Engaged Research [GACER], 2009). While these examples indicate that community engagement is gaining traction, efforts to unite academic institutions and civil society for co-creation and knowledge mobilization (KMb) continues to be fragmented and continues to be restricted by several barriers (p. 1).

Rooted in the lack of internal support frameworks and institution-level approaches to community engagement is a lack of recognition as a result of promotion and tenure (P&T) structures at universities. The argument is that there is a need for alignment between community engagement objectives and existing university incentive structures where P&T policies would reflect community engagement efforts (Jackson, 2008). Most universities do not yet provide formal incentives for faculty to engage in collaborative partnerships with communities and many existing structures within academic institutions, such as recognition, are barriers to both engagement (GACER, 2009, p. 7) and KMb efforts (Sá et al., 2011, p. 510). A similar situation exists within the European Union, where engaging with CSOs is considered to fall outside of recognized university activities (Science in Society, n.d.). The European Commission (2009) believes, however, that a thorough review of engagement work is necessary to identify the professional implications and career opportunities for academics so that partnerships with CSOs become more appealing (p. 14). Because community initiatives are not currently rewarded, there is also the risk of goal displacement, where original goals are lost because of a disconnect between performance metrics and personal and/or organizational goals (Dobell et al., 2012; Krücke et al., 2009; Schön, 1995).

Sá et al. (2011) assessed organizational factors that might influence whether academics engage in KMb (such as institutional priority, support, and recognition) and document KMb strategies used by faculties in Canada and abroad. The study showed that few faculties had institutional support in place for KMb (Sá et al., 2011, p. 506). For example, the Universities of London and Melbourne had administrative support in place but Melbourne was the only institution with an associate dean dedicated to KMb. In addition to existing administrative support, London and Melbourne have made adjustments to P&T processes allowing for the provision of incentives for faculty who engage in KMb activities. At the University of London, the dissemination of research is now also reflected in P&T criteria. Melbourne is in the process of changing their P&T processes to acknowledge KMb and engagement activities. Faculties at universities such as Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Harvard are recognizing achievements in KMb throughout their hiring processes and the University of Michigan distributes awards to recognize faculty who excel in this area (Sá et al., 2011, p. 509). Barriers for KMb include limited resources, divided opinions of KMb among faculty, the difficulty of measuring KMb outcomes, lack of coordination at the institutional level, lack of leadership support, and lack of acknowledgement in P&T criteria (Sá et al., 2011).
Cooper and Levin, (2010) argue that addressing evaluation and recognition challenges will help improve KMb and engagement effort levels within universities. These institutional challenges are far from being solved but some initiatives have been taken to make progress in this area. Limitations exist within the models discussed below however, they are included because they provide recognition of a need for progress in this area and they aim to stimulate necessary discussion around these dilemmas. For example, the Carnegie Foundation in the U.S. developed a classification system for recognizing community engagement efforts made by universities (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). Carnegie uses survey data to put institutions into classifications based on their engagement efforts. Examples of the survey questions include (Carnegie Foundation, 2010, pp. 1-38):

- Does the institution formally recognize community engagement through campus-wide awards and celebrations?
- Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?
- Are there internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?
- Does the institution have search/recruitment policies that encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement?
- Do the institutional policies for promotion and tenure reward the scholarship of community engagement? If no, is there work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward the scholarship of community engagement?

A second example is the University of Vermont’s Faculty Community Engagement Tool (FCET). With this tool the university conducted a web-based survey, designed to help inform P&T decision-making by asking faculty about their community-based activities and their attitudes and opinions on engagement (Britner, 2012). Once a need and desire for community engagement has been identified, this information can be used to help inform decisions that support engagement activities, programs, and initiatives in universities and departments (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000 as cited in Britner, 2012, p. 14).

Third, a new initiative has been launched in hopes of making progress towards rewarding community-engaged scholarship at Canadian universities. A group of eight universities and an international organization have come together to work towards changing university culture and practices to reflect the importance of community-based efforts undertaken by faculty. Committees have been established to meet on a regular basis to discuss challenges and to identify ways to break through existing barriers. A website is used to report on the progress of this initiative and to house all resources related to the need for recognition of community engagement efforts within university policies and programs (University of Guelph et al., 2013).

3.4.4 Measurement Challenge

Institutional resistance is related, in part, to the lack of standards or widely accepted solution for defining and measuring a university or faculty member’s engagement efforts or the outcomes of
these efforts (Kania & Kramer, 2011). While the number of publications is considered an insufficient measure of quality of work (European Commission, 2009), it has long been an institutional norm that can easily be quantified and measured. Community engagement and community partnerships are mostly overlooked because they take several different forms and are difficult to measure (Schuetze, 2012, para. 5). While partnerships with CSOs can lead to positive outputs and social outcomes, these outcomes cannot be measured using conventional indicators (European Commission, 2009; Krücken et al., 2009). For example, OECD indicators such as the number of patents and spin-off companies are not suitable for measuring the success of community-university collaborations (European Commission, 2009, p. 15). This implies the need for a new approach to measurement or a new institutional epistemology for assessment and legitimization of this new form of scholarship (Schön, 1995, para. 1) because the social benefits from humanities and social sciences are more complex and more difficult to tally than traditional sciences (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010, p. 568). Since the third mission is broad, new indicators need to be developed and defined and mechanisms for data collection should be established. On the other hand, it will be difficult to develop a short list of indicators for the wide set of community engagement activities that exist (Molas-Gallart, 2005).

Universities bring significant benefits to society beyond financial and economic benefits but these outcomes are not easily assessed (Shaheen, 2011). Despite the factors that make measurement a challenge, some useful ideas have been introduced to address these challenges. These ideas are included because they provide recognition of a need for progress and further discussion in this area. Callon, Lascoumes, and Barthe (2009), for example, discuss a concept of evaluation called measured action which recognizes that definitive decisions are difficult to make in a co-creative environment (p. 191). Measured action embraces the uncertainty involved with social challenges and allows for the flexibility and incorporation of ongoing discoveries. It allows actors to exercise the precautionary principle, which is described as “exactly the opposite of a clear-cut definitive decision” (p. 192). Callon et al. note that measures must take into account sustainable development and generational equity and that any action taken should include all stakeholders involved in the project (p. 221).

Social issues tend to be controversial and Schön and Rein (1994) explain how reframing problems can facilitate more productive conversations about these problems. The authors challenge ideas that portray reflection as a negative distraction from immediate action. Schön and Rein advocate for collaborative, reflective research where academia and practitioners work together. Westley, Zimmerman, and Patton (2007) also emphasize the importance of reflection. The authors believe that developmental evaluation should be used as a form of reflection through data collection and assessment. Patton (2011) assess complex and dynamic systems, defined by high quantities of interactions and interdependent relationships, and introduces developmental evaluation as a solution to support the dynamic nature of the social innovation process. Social innovations require an evaluative model that can keep pace and evolve in parallel and leaders need to foster dialogue and creativity, watch for emerging patterns, be flexible, and make time for reflections. Developmental evaluation supports innovation development and guides “adaptation to emergent and dynamic realities in complex environments” (Patton, 2011, p. 1).
Westley et al. (2007) present a systems and relationship approach to understanding social challenges, and, as such, the authors argue that an understanding of complex relationships will enable progress towards solving social problems. The authors go on to state that formal evaluation can be a significant barrier to innovation (Westley et al., 2007, p. 26). Funders want measurable outcomes and accountability measures in place but, for new innovative ideas, the evaluation tools are not yet in place. Westley et al. (2007) concede, that while formal evaluation can inhibit social change and social innovation, innovators do need a way to measure success (p. 82). The authors recommend that change-makers integrate developmental evaluation as a part of their culture so they can learn from their successes and failures.

In summary, various barriers and challenges exist limiting the amount of partnerships and level of community engagement on behalf of universities. The barriers discussed, do not represent an exhaustive list but include those that are most highly represented in the literature: motivational and structural differences between partners, the difficulty in accessing funding, institutional resistance to recognize and reward work conducted in the social sector versus within industry, and the difficulty in measuring community engagement efforts as well as the social innovation process and associated outcomes. The evaluation and recognition of university engagement efforts and associated social impact are widely discussed, especially due to increasing accountability pressures and expectations placed on academic institutions. These, however, are complex challenges that will not be easily overcome and will require further attention in both theory and practice.

3.5 Potential Engagement Structures and Platforms

There is significant agreement in the literature that today’s unpredictable social challenges will need to be approached in new ways with innovative solutions (Brodhead, 2011; Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, 2012; Lee et al., 2012; Narberhaus et al., 2011; Public Policy Forum, 2011; Turkama & Mattila, 2012; Westley, Goebey, & Robinson, 2012; Yarime & Trencher, 2012). Solutions need to be resilient and sustainable to withstand the unpredictable nature of today’s dilemmas. Organizations will need to develop structures that increase levels of collaboration and support the exploration and exploitation of innovation (Lee et al., 2012; Public Policy Forum; 2011). King and Cruikshank (2010) state that engaging communities in effective KMb and co-creation will require organizational, structural, and cultural change (p. 9), an appropriate governance structure, and an alignment of incentives among partners (Seelos & Mair, 2012, p. 17). German et al. (2008) find that sustainable community-university partnerships require the appropriate infrastructure to be in place to embrace the diverse desires and values of stakeholders involved (p. 1) and this reflects the need for a shift in mindset and culture (Lavis, Robertson, Woodside, McLeod, & Abelson, 2003; Public Policy Forum; 2011) as well as ongoing support for creativity and innovation (Ramaswamy, 2009; Westley et al., 2012; Westley et al., 2007).

A range of knowledge mobilization (KMb) and engagement platforms and venues for community-university partnerships seem to be increasing in popularity as partners are continually learning to work together in real-time and attempting to solve real-world problems (Banthien et al., 2007). These structures are procedural innovations characterized by their potential to mobilize the actors and to build collaborative relationships between diverse stakeholder groups. Callon et al. (2009) use
the term hybrid forums to describe the venue or platforms where stakeholders come together for collective experimentation to enable effective management of today’s complex issues. The authors depict how community members play an important role in the production of research by participating in the dialogue and research process. This section considers the most commonly described types of platforms and structures that might support civil society organization (CSO)-university partnerships. These include online platforms, community-based research structures, constellation models, and change labs.

3.5.1 Online Platforms

Online platforms have been introduced as a means for universities to increase engagement efforts with communities. Online models and tools can be developed for several purposes including, but not limited to, mobilizing knowledge, initiating community-university partnerships, and/or sourcing ideas and input from the community and the masses. Advanced technologies and social media have made the online, open source model more appealing and have increased the potential of universities, governments, and other organizations to engage audiences and potential partners in greater numbers across geographic boundaries. Engagement can occur purely online or online models can be used as a complimentary practice to offline models that already exist. While online capacities may vary, universities are increasingly working to build online tools that provide direct access to communities and vice versa (Memorial University, 2009).

Memorial University launched an online tool called Yaffle that provides global access to its research initiatives and respective research summaries written in lay terms for broad audiences (Yaffle, 2009). Examples of research project results available for access on Yaffle include plans for non-profit provincial museums and options for new marine transportation systems (Memorial University, 2009, para. 5). Yaffle was developed at Memorial as a supplementary tool that directly supports existing efforts undertaken by the KMb team at the university. A conceptual model depicting how Yaffle functions is presented in Appendix A. This knowledge sharing resource allows community partners to both use existing research and suggest new research that can be consumed for their direct benefit (Adams-Warburton, 2011, p. 5). In addition, 400 experts across various fields can be contacted through Yaffle for media and speaking engagements (Memorial University, 2009). Yaffle has shown that there is great interest in this type of tool on behalf of community members. Since its launch date in 2009, Yaffle has had over 75,000 searches. In 2010 alone, 18 new partnership projects where initiated and Yaffle has become the primary source for graduate students to identify their thesis topics (Adams-Warburton, 2011, p. 14). Other universities across the country have also shown interest in developing similar tools using Yaffle as a benchmark (Memorial University, 2009).

The University of Guelph (2013) is using another online venue to try to determine what engagement activities to pursue by asking community members for their input. A new open source portal has been developed for ongoing discussions about how the university should make contributions to civil society through teaching, research, and other engagement activities. The online community, called Designing a School for Civil Society, initiates online discussions by posting questions in an open forum. It also provides background materials and inspiration for offline group discussions, such as
findings from ongoing stakeholder consultations, and encourages feedback to be submitted over email (University of Guelph, 2013). The knowledge that has been generated to date is currently being used to create a plan for a new School for Civil Society at the University of Guelph.

3.5.2 Community-Based Research Structures

Community-based research has direct relevance to a community or CSO. Community-based research efforts can range from the development of academic knowledge that benefits the community to a genuine partnership where academics and CSOs conduct research together (Community-Based Research Canada [CBRC], n.d.). Several universities, including the University of Victoria, have KMb offices and Science Shops onsite to meet community needs through academic research activities, service-learning initiatives, and internship programs (Brodhead, 2010). Formal partnerships for community-based research occur in the space between the academy and its external partners as presented in Appendix B (Dobell et al., 2012). Canada has been recognized for a high level of support and recognition for community-based research and this can be attributed to the fact that community-based research initiatives have been supported by SSHRC and its funding programs since 1999 (formerly called the Community-University Research Alliance (CURA)) (Brodhead, 2010; STACS, 2009). SSHRC promotes knowledge sharing and co-creation between universities and CSOs for the direct purpose of coping with complex social challenges (STACS, 2009).

Science Shops, a model of community-based research established in the 1970s in the Netherlands, aim to develop collaborative relationships between universities and CSOs and to provide access of research results to the broader community (Community-University Connections, n.d.). Science Shops vary in size and scope but have gained international presence over recent years. Science Shop projects can range from providing information at the request of a CSO to working on original community-led research where the CSO co-develops the research study with academic researchers (Community-University Connections, n.d.). Gnaiger and Martin (2001) evaluated the various models of Science Shops and determined that the main distinguisher between Science Shops and traditional knowledge exchange venues are a commitment to participatory methods where research is produced primarily in response to the needs of CSOs rather than those of academic institutions (p. 6). No standard organizational structure exists for collaborations, however. The only similarity among Science Shops is a demand and supply for research as well as a physical location for co-creation. The Shops can be organized within or outside of a university and some are more centralized than others (Beere, 2009; Living Knowledge Network, n.d.).

Other community-based research approaches have been developed based on the traditional Science Shop model. Examples of community-based platforms across the globe include the University of British Columbia’s (UBC) Community Learning Initiative (UBC, n.d.), the Archway Partnerships at the University of Georgia (Garber, Creech, Epps, Bishop, & Chapman, 2010), the Community Engagement Team at Cardiff University (n.d.), AsiaEngage, which is a regional organization developed to support community-university partnerships within the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Sharma, 2012), and the University of Victoria’s Office of Community-Based Research (OCBR) (which will soon be a part of a new Institute for community-university
engagement at the University of Victoria).

The OCBR, which was launched in June 2007, brands the University of Victoria with community-based research (Dunnett, 2004, p. 66) by supporting multi-stakeholder and multi-disciplinary community-university partnerships through a physical location and resource centre on campus. The OCBR also has an open-source website for researchers and community members to connect and share knowledge. In addition to providing a venue for the initiation and nurturing of partnerships, the OCBR has developed national and global networks, Community-Based Research Canada (CBRC) and the Global Alliance for Community-Based Research (GACER) respectively, to provide further opportunities, support, and general awareness for community-based research (Community-Based Research Canada [CBRC], n.d.). The OCBR supports community-university partnerships that provide training, knowledge co-creation, and evaluation in topic areas ranging from homelessness to climate change. An example of a current OCBR project is the Vancouver Island Local Food Project where local knowledge and academic expertise are being merged to improve existing food systems on Vancouver Island so that they become sustainable (Office of Community-Based Research [OCBR], n.d.).

3.5.3 Constellation Models

Surman and Surman (2008a; 2008b) describe the constellation model as one “designed to bring together multiple groups or sectors working toward a joint outcome” where action is taken by small teams called constellations (p. 25; para. 7). Constellations have the flexibility to work autonomously on a particular issue while focusing on a broader social goal and, at the same time, are governed by an overarching partnership framework. This allows constellations to pursue self-interests while still working to achieve the overall objectives of the partnership (Surman & Surman, 2008b, para. 8). Constellations are created where pooled resources can make a more significant impact than each organization on its own. For example, one constellation can work on research and another can focus on building awareness and others still can gather around them based on group interests (Surman & Surman, 2008a). A stewardship committee is established to reflect community interest and focus on the overarching need that brought the constellation together and to provide guiding principles for the partnership. Leadership roles are shifted between partners and granted to people with initiative rather than authority. There is significant flexibility in that partners can leave and join at any time and constellations can be phased out once its goal is achieved without disrupting the overall partnership (Surman & Surman, 2008a; 2008b). Appendix C provides an illustration of the model and a detailed description of how this framework can be used to guide the work of a diverse group of social actors. In addition to the factors of the framework described in Appendix C, success of the constellation model requires ongoing communication and transparency to achieve desired outcomes (Surman, n.d.).

The constellation model, inspired by complexity theory, was first developed for the Canadian Partnership for Children’s Health and the Environment (CPCHE), a diverse group of Canadian CSOs interested in building awareness of children’s environmental health (Surman, n.d.; Surman & Surman, 2008a; 2008b). The partnership allowed for the delivery of one cohesive message rather than working individually. The CPCHE collectively raised three million dollars for awareness efforts and more than 1,000 service providers and thought leaders across provinces and sectors have
Another example of a functioning constellation model is the Community and Human Services Area Genesis Centre of Community Wellness. The goal of this initiative is to develop a collaborative approach to provide better services to community members (United Way Calgary and Area, 2011). An illustration and description of this model is included in Appendix D.

3.5.4 Change Labs

Change labs have become a focal point since 2010 whereby they are being established to support systemic change and to assist governments, civil society, and businesses in finding solutions to complex challenges (Westley et al., 2012). A change lab, also referred to as a design lab or innovation lab is defined as “a creative environment that employs proven and repeatable protocols to seek disruptive, potentially systems-tipping solutions” (Torjman, 2012, p. 4). Torjman (2012) at Social Innovation Generation (SiG) conducted a literature review assessing change labs and building a case for their importance in addressing complex 21st century problems. Torjman believes that collaborative approaches to dealing with growing social challenges are gaining traction in practice. For change to last, participatory and purposeful methods are needed (p. 18). In addition, challenges to be solved are assessed from each party’s unique perspective (Hewitt, 2011b). This is consistent with SiG’s (2011) perspective that everyone views the world and its social dilemmas in a different way. The work conducted in a change lab is creative and emergent; therefore participants have to be comfortable with the idea of working on something where the outcomes are unknown (SiG, 2011). Members of change labs produce new relationships and strengthen capacities to co-create social change and a new social reality (Aalbers & Kahane, n.d., para. 4; Gibbons, 1999; Reos Partners, 2012).

Westley et al. (2012) developed a white paper that outlines the requirements for a change lab to be successful. The authors call for expertise in data collection, effective process design, and selection of problems appropriately suited to the lab and its stakeholders. The authors also offer a list of elements of a successful change lab including co-creation, rapid prototyping, and continual learning, which are consistent with topics presented in the present review. A complete list and detailed description of each element is presented in Appendix E.

While change lab theory is still gaining momentum, several practical examples exist indicating that change labs might be a successful platform for CSO-university partnerships. For example, MIT’s D-Lab develops technologies and sustainable solutions to improve the quality of life for low-income households (MIT D-Lab, n.d.). It also aims to provide students with experiential learning through fieldwork opportunities and relationships with partner organizations. Through D-Lab Scale-Ups, students work with corporations and other organizations to develop action-oriented technology research projects (MIT D-Lab, n.d.). The D-Lab has recently been awarded a grant from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to help create the International Development Innovation Network (IDIN), which will consist of universities aiming to provide support and structure for local technological innovation in developing countries (Dizikes, 2012, para. 3). The IDIN project will include six academic institutions, six non-governmental
organizations, and eight global Innovation Hubs. All parties involved will convene for international design summits to assess new technologies based on their ability to improve local development. IDIN will work to develop innovations in areas such as agriculture, clean water, and health-care (para. 6). The USAID-funded project is consistent with D-Lab’s Creative Capacity Building (CCB) initiatives that invest in increasing local capacity for innovation. The MIT D-Lab (n.d.) believes that the principles of co-creation are relevant to innovations aimed at eradicating poverty.

Pluk is another example of a change lab created in the Netherlands in 2007 based on the recognition that social innovation is not progressing quickly enough to keep pace with today’s complex social issues (Aalbers, 2011; Hommels, 2011). The Pluk platform allows non-profits, private companies, and universities to come together to co-create and co-evolve ideas about combating social challenges in innovative and sustainable ways. More specific examples of Pluk initiatives include finding ways to reduce carbon emission, reintegrating prisoners into society, and planning for sustainable urban development (Aalbers, 2011). Pluk change labs supply both content and process support for collective gatherings to foster co-creation and capacity building and, at the same time, learning is passed on to additional mini labs that put this learning into practice. Pluk change labs compel people to think outside the box because the setting makes them feel personally connected to an important challenge (para. 10). There has been great enthusiasm in the Netherlands about joining Pluk change labs indicating a significant interest on behalf of participants for working together in this format (Aalbers, 2011). For more examples of change labs see Appendix F.

Engagement platforms introduced in this section demonstrate university potential to build capacity to embark on their third mission, to partner with CSOs, and to initiate positive social change. Despite the barriers, practitioners are moving forward because of the benefits of partnerships and cross-sectoral relationships.

3.6 Summary of Literature Review

The literature review began by defining knowledge mobilization (KMb), engagement, and co-creation. It described the status of the literature with respect to these topics, specifically in terms of community-university partnerships. KMb has evolved to acknowledge the importance of multi-disciplinary approaches and networks in creating social value. KMb, community engagement, and co-creation are also increasing priorities for universities because of both a sense of responsibility and external pressures to be more active in solving community issues and increasing social value.

The review discussed engagement efforts made by universities in terms of the variety of ways that engagement occurs and the ways that academic institutions are starting to support and recognize these efforts. Partnerships range in size, scope, and duration and roles of partners also vary widely. Engagement efforts include internships, research partnerships, and acknowledgement in strategic plans of universities but pure co-creation appears limited. The review also identified some of the benefits that can be achieved through community engagement and CSO-university partnerships as well as the potential for these relationships to produce positive social outcomes. Benefits include tapping into and learning from respective knowledge and expertise, access to different forms of funding and cost sharing. Social outcomes include better social services in the short-term and social,
environmental, and cultural improvements in the longer term. The review further found that community-university engagement partnerships exist but are limited because of existing challenges and barriers. Barriers include motivational differences that exist between potential partners, limited access to resources and traditional sources of funding, institutional resistance due to a lack of recognition in promotion and tenure mechanisms. In addition, partnership efforts and results from efforts are extremely difficult to measure. Attempts at addressing these barriers have been made but more work is needed. While universities are increasingly claiming to be engaged institutions, through strategic plans, and working to deliver on a new social contract with society, there is no evidence that community engagement efforts are comparable to industry engagement and commercialization efforts. Universities put forward less effort in the social sciences than hard sciences because of the well-established and dedicated resources found in hard sciences. This indicates room for increased engagement levels and an assessment of platforms that might facilitate this engagement.

The last section of the review described engagement platforms and institutional changes that have been implemented in an attempt to discover solutions to existing social dilemmas. A structural change or a culture of acceptance for community engagement within academe can involve small one-off initiatives such as individual relationships or short-term funded research projects. On the other hand, change can involve an overhaul of existing practices or a dedicated space for stakeholders to come together and innovate. The most important component of social innovation is increasing the support efforts of collaboration and community-university partnerships. Platforms have been identified, including online platforms, community-based research structures, constellation models, and change labs, which have the potential to facilitate CSO-university partnerships and to foster social change through social innovation. These platforms are gaining momentum and support in practice because of their success in developing innovative solutions to complex challenges. While various engagement platforms are increasingly used in practice, building a culture within academia where partnerships for social change are accepted and used to their full potential is an ongoing challenge.

The review has looked through a community-university partnerships lens identifying the increasing importance of partnerships as well as the associated cultures, venues, and structures that might support productive collaboration. The review has outlined potential benefits and social outcomes associated with these partnerships that might be achieved while acknowledging the existence of barriers and limitations. The literature review directly informs the next section of the report. Key findings are distilled and translated into principles and criteria that can be used to assess the appropriateness of engagement platforms for the facilitation of community-university partnerships.
4.0 DEVELOPMENT OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The literature review identified existing principles and recommendations for successful partnerships as well as potential engagement platforms that might facilitate these partnerships. These principles have been distilled from the literature and incorporated into a conceptual framework so they can be used to test the characteristics of engagement platforms in terms of the platform’s potential to support community-university partnerships and to achieve associated benefits.

Objectives of Conceptual Framework

Before the conceptual framework is described, the two main objectives of the framework are first presented here:

1. The primary objective of the framework is to present a consolidated list of principles that assure an appropriate role for academe in building successful partnerships with civil society organizations (CSOs).

2. The secondary objective is to help determine if the platforms identified in the literature review can effectively support successful CSO-university partnerships and which of these platforms are the most effective in doing so. To accomplish the secondary objective, the framework acts as a benchmark and point of analysis for a detailed assessment of the various engagement platforms.

The conceptual framework is depicted in Figure 4.1 and described in more detail in section 4.1.
Figure 4.1. Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Access to more funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased expertise and credibility for CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to local knowledge for universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved climate for social innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved efficiency and delivery of social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive long-term social, environmental, and cultural outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New protocols at universities for community engagement efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Themes and Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL ALIGNMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER BALANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-CREATON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNOVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE TOUCHPOINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Implementation Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Limited funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in evaluating social impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time constraints due to competing responsibilities and pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutional conventions do not readily support community engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Description of Framework

The first section of the framework, Expected Benefits, provides a list of the benefits that can potentially be generated from establishing CSO-university partnerships. These include increased access to funding, shared knowledge, expertise and resources, improved social services, and the potential for improved social outcomes. The focus of the forthcoming analysis is to use principles of successful partnerships to test engagement platforms and to determine their capacity to achieve these expected benefits.

The second section of the framework, Major Themes and Principles, presents the seven principles and associated themes that characterize successful CSO-university partnerships. The principles represent those most commonly suggested for the implementation of a successful CSO-university partnership. The themes summarize the principles so that each principle can be easily referenced in the analysis section of this report. Themes include goal alignment, power balance, co-creation, learning, innovation, multiple touch points, and sustainability. The principles and their respective themes in the framework are supported by references from the literature to provide the reason for including the principle as a success criterion. A detailed description of each point of analysis is provided below:

– The first foundational principle for a successful CSO-university partnership is represented in Figure 4.1 by the Goal Alignment theme. This principle indicates that a promising platform will respect the need for mutual goals and shared commitment levels on behalf of stakeholders involved in a partnership. This principle is arguably the most important because achieving goal alignment between partners is necessary for the initiation of a partnership.

– The second principle for a successful CSO-university partnership is represented by the Power Balance theme. In order for a platform to satisfy this principle, a level of trust and mutual respect must be established by partners. In addition, all partners must contribute to the partnership proportionately and share a sense of ownership and accountability.

– The third success principle is represented by the Co-Creation theme indicating that a promising platform will facilitate the co-development of knowledge between partners. This principle acknowledges that, for a CSO-university partnership to be successful, a discursive and participatory approach among partners is required.

– The Learning theme signifies that successful CSO-university partnerships will adopt a culture that inherently fosters and encourages continuous learning. This principle also supports reflection, evaluation, and ongoing improvements, which will contribute to the success and longevity of partnerships. A promising platform will therefore support continuous learning to ensure the success of the partnership.

– The Innovation theme represents the importance of the role of partnerships in encouraging flexibility and creativity to stimulate innovation. A successful CSO-university partnership,
established to create social change, must work to develop a capacity for innovation. This includes the exploration of potential innovative ideas and the exploitation of those ideas that are most promising. An effective platform will therefore support and encourage a culture of innovation.

- The sixth principle suggested for a successful CSO-university partnership is represented by the *Multiple Touch Points* theme. This principle states that partners will engage at all stages of a project through more than one medium. Having multiple touch points throughout a project and the option to work over multiple mediums will increase engagement levels and the potential opportunities for partners to interact. Therefore, a platform that increases the opportunities for interaction among partners would appropriately support a successful partnership.

- The last principle for a successful CSO-university partnership is represented by the *Sustainability* theme. Where partners believe in building lasting relationships, they will pursue additional opportunities that arise through working together and this will contribute to the longevity of the partnership. If a platform can contribute to the longevity of a partnership, it will effectively satisfy the sustainability criterion.

The third section of the framework, Potential Implementation Barriers identifies the engagement and implementation barriers that exist. These are: limited access to funding, human resources, and time, institutional resistance to the recognition of community engagement efforts, and the difficulty of measuring outcomes and broader social impacts of partnerships.

After determining which are the most effective platforms for CSO-university engagement, these barriers will be considered to determine the ability of partner organizations to implement selected platforms. While the platforms discussed may not be able to eliminate all potential barriers, or guarantee the achievement of all benefits, these factors are considered to ensure a robust and accurate analysis.

In summary, the conceptual framework - including expected benefits, principles, and potential implementation barriers - provides the basis for the analysis and discussion throughout the remainder of the paper.
5.0 ANALYSIS

The literature discussed the need for providing dedicated spaces where civil society organizations (CSOs) and universities can meet (STACS, 2009). Such places, known as engagement platforms comprise: online platforms, community-based research structures, constellation models, and change labs. The aim of this section is to analyze each platform and to measure its potential effectiveness based on the conceptual framework presented in the previous section.

This analysis is organized in two parts. The first part assesses the level of engagement of each platform against the themes listed in the conceptual framework (Goal Alignment; Power Balance; Co-Creation; Learning; Innovation; Multiple Touch Points; and Sustainability). The second part assesses the platforms against the implementation barriers (Limited Access to Funding, Resources and Time, and Institutional Resistance and Measurement Challenge). The analysis concludes with the use of a newly developed two-way table, the Principles-Platform Coherence (PPC) Matrix, and a brief overview of the findings.

5.1 Levels of Engagement

While relative levels of engagement for the platforms lie on a continuum, for purposes of this analysis, each engagement platform has been disaggregated into three levels (levels 1, 2 and 3). The definition of the engagement levels varies by platform so as to take into account the specific and differential characteristics of each platform. Therefore, twelve different options exist for selection of an engagement platform. Figure 5.1 shows the least engaged level of each platform is represented by the descriptions in the left-hand column of the progression model, a moderate level of engagement is represented by the descriptions in the middle column, and the highly engaged version of each platform is represented by the descriptions in the right-hand column of the model.

**Online Platforms**

Engagement level 1 is represented by a knowledge dissemination tool accessible by community members, and is used by a university to facilitate one-way communication to share the results of academic research. The intent is to deliver knowledge to the community and other local and/or global stakeholders that might find this knowledge valuable. Progressing to level 2 requires that communication is now open and that contributions are made by all parties. Level 2 also includes the solicitation of input from the community so that academic efforts become more action-oriented. Level 3 is represented by a virtual space for CSO-university partnerships to interact on a regular basis and to co-create knowledge.

**Community-Based Research Structures**

Engagement level 1 is represented by an ad hoc research project conducted by a student for a community organization where research is conducted mostly in isolation with limited input from the CSO (Chernikova, 2011). Results are delivered to the CSO upon completion of the project with little guidance on how the research might be used. Progressing to level 2 requires action-oriented...
research where community members engage with academics in the development of the primary research questions. At level 2 a research project is conducted and the results are put into practice by the CSO to meet a specific need. Level 3 is represented by a physical or virtual location where academic and community partners work together on an ongoing basis. The partners work through a research challenge, and subsequent stages of the project, together.

**Constellation Models**
No opportunity for engagement exists at level 1 because organizations operating within the same ecosystem are found to be working in complete silos. Level 2 is represented by stakeholders beginning to exchange knowledge however, they are not yet seeing the value of partnering and sharing resources. At level 2 organizations’ efforts are still spread thinly as formal constellation groups have not yet been formed around immediate interests. Level 3 is represented by partner organizations working together through collaborative teams called constellations. At this level economies of scope allow for the achievement of immediate objectives while at the same time allowing for the advancement of common overarching social goals.

**Change Labs**
Level 1 is represented by the presence of a physical creative venue that stimulates innovation. Stakeholders from various sectors conduct work in the change lab but are working in silos. Progressing to level 2 requires that community members can offer input at multiple stages of a project and that ideas are exchanged across sectors before academic projects are undertaken. Finally, level 3 is represented by a physical creative venue for partners to work together, learn from each other, and co-develop ideas and ground-breaking innovations.
5.2 Platform Analysis

The three levels of each engagement platform are assessed below based on their ability to effectively satisfy the seven principles/themes embedded within the conceptual framework. The following scale has been created for conducting an analysis: not effective = the platform does not satisfy the principle/theme, minimal = the platform’s ability to satisfy the principle/theme is minimal, minimal/moderate = the platform’s ability to satisfy the principle/theme is greater than minimal but not quite moderate, moderate = the platform moderately satisfies the principle/theme, moderate/effective = the platform’s ability to satisfy the principle/theme is greater than moderate but not fully effective, and effective = the platform effectively satisfies the principle/theme.

5.2.1 Online Platforms

Online platforms take advantage of modern technology to allow universities to engage with communities using various online tools for mobilizing knowledge, initiating community-university
partnerships, and/or sourcing ideas and input from the community and the masses.

Engagement Level 1:

- **Goal Alignment (minimal)**
  Immediate objectives and missions of each party involved do not have to be the same for this type of platform to function. However, the opportunity for both parties to achieve positive benefits does exist. For example, an online knowledge dissemination tool could speed up the timeframe and number of community recipients for academic research results. Also, community members who want access to academic research would have the ability to access it with ease and on their own schedule.

- **Power Balance (minimal)**
  A balance of power is also not necessary for an online knowledge dissemination tool. There is a mutual understanding that academics are the primary knowledge owners and knowledge providers and community members are the recipients of that knowledge. Academics share their research and findings with the broader community with the hope that it will be used to bring educational value to community work. Community members might be able to benefit from research but they do not have a venue to influence what research is conducted nor do they have an opportunity to participate in research projects at this level.

- **Co-creation (not effective)**
  The co-creation principle is not satisfied because engagement is not facilitated between parties nor is knowledge co-developed between stakeholders at this level.

- **Learning (minimal)**
  Significant learning can be achieved for the recipients of knowledge especially if they are able to access knowledge that directly informs their present work. However, stakeholders may not receive answers to all of their questions as two-way communication is not facilitated at this level. In addition, where there is a need for an explanation and/or demonstration to accompany the knowledge received, this platform will not be beneficial.

- **Innovation (minimal)**
  The capacity to facilitate a partnership that stimulates innovation does not exist. The content being disseminated, however, could potentially support innovation and/or the generation of innovation within CSOs. For example, research results could inform the innovation process of a CSO depending on the content provided and its relevance to the CSO’s work. This would also depend on the CSO’s capacity for innovation.

- **Multiple Touch Points (not effective)**
  The multiple touch points principle is not satisfied because it does not facilitate interaction between stakeholders nor does it necessitate the contact between stakeholders over more than one medium. Online knowledge dissemination tools, for example, are designed to allow for
flexibility where stakeholders locally and globally can access knowledge remotely and at their own leisure.

- **Sustainability (minimal)**
  If community members are continually accessing academic knowledge through an online venue, this demonstrates that community stakeholders are open to input from academe. High interest levels might also be a positive indication of community potential and/or future willingness to partner with universities. Unfortunately, an online venue with no opportunity for engagement makes it difficult to build relationships.

**Engagement Level 2:**

- **Goal Alignment (minimal)**
  These platforms are not designed for engagement or partnerships therefore goal alignment and a shared level of commitment are not required. While mutual goals are not necessarily established, stakeholders can share a mutual understanding for respective goals and commitment level. Therefore, stakeholders can agree on using this venue as a place to share knowledge and ideas that benefit their respective interests.

- **Power Balance (minimal/moderate)**
  While academics are the primary knowledge providers, these two-way communication platforms provide a venue for communities to contribute, share ideas, and exchange information. A desire to share power does not exist because partnerships are not yet in place. However, there is the opportunity for all stakeholders to contribute as much as they feel will provide them and/or others with valued benefits.

- **Co-Creation (not effective)**
  This principle is not satisfied because the co-development of knowledge between multiple stakeholders is not supported. At most, community members might inspire the next research question to be pursued but the efforts in terms of developing new knowledge rests with the university.

- **Learning (minimal/moderate)**
  Learning is not maximized because of the lack of direct contact between stakeholders. Some learning can be achieved, however, on behalf of community stakeholders where knowledge assists their present work. Learning can also be achieved by academics where communities and/or CSOs share insights to influence and/or assist with the direction of academic research.

- **Innovation (minimal)**
  These platforms are also not necessarily created for the purpose of stimulating innovation but there is the potential that the knowledge being shared could support innovation and/or the generation of innovation within CSOs. At this level CSOs can identify a need for research on innovation and/or request advice on this topic from a university.
- **Multiple Touch Points (not effective)**
  This principle is not satisfied because knowledge exchange between universities and community organizations is only supported through one medium. These platforms are designed to allow for flexibility so stakeholders locally and globally can access and share knowledge remotely and at their own leisure.

- **Sustainability (minimal/moderate)**
  Communities can collect data, participate in knowledge exchange, and contribute ideas for future academic research. Strong participation on behalf of CSOs provides promising indication of a desire for input from academe and the willingness to build relationships and partnerships with university stakeholders. Unfortunately, development of partnerships might be difficult if stakeholders are using the online tool on an inconsistent basis and if stakeholders are dispersed across various geographic locations and/or time zones.

**Engagement Level 3:**

- **Goal Alignment (moderate)**
  This principle can be achieved in an online environment however it may be more challenging to maintain goal alignment over a virtual network than in a physical environment. For example, as with all partnerships, it is important to meet and communicate to ensure that focus remains on mutual goals. Unfortunately, this may not happen as readily where partners interact online and operate in different time zones and/or geographical locations.

- **Power Balance (moderate)**
  These platforms effectively bring experts and laypeople together and it is easier for power to be balanced in a virtual space where no assumptions or biases are made based on appearances. They also allow for shared participation on behalf of all stakeholders but, at the same time, it is harder to control the balance of efforts being put forward. An additional risk is that accountability may be spread thinly considering the potentially high number of stakeholders involved.

- **Co-Creation (effective)**
  This principle is satisfied because these venues allow several stakeholders to work together on the development of knowledge. Co-creation is possible between partners that are not able to meet in person. For example, online interactions eliminate geographic boundaries between partners so that knowledge can be co-created from any location. Online technologies also support a greater number of people for the co-creation process than in a physical meeting place.

- **Learning (moderate)**
  The capacity to include greater numbers of people increases the learning potential for online partnerships. These platforms can provide the fastest and greatest amount of access to research and knowledge than any other platform, which might allow stakeholders to make better-informed and more timely decisions. Technology also makes it easier to document and evaluate community engagement and lessons learned from evaluations can help to improve future
processes. For face-to-face learners, however, this will not be the best venue. In addition, there is a risk of learning being lost where partners are not committed to participating regularly through sharing knowledge and providing feedback.

- **Innovation (effective)**
  Online platforms themselves provide innovative ways for diverse groups to work together. Virtual venues eliminate paperwork and geographical boundaries and this allows for the flexibility that is needed to stimulate creativity and idea development. There is no shortage of tools available for customizing online engagement to boost interactions and stimulate innovation.

- **Multiple Touch Points (minimal)**
  Various technologies can be used to interact in different ways. For example, open forums can be used for ideation and working together in real-time, video conferencing can be used to simulate face-to-face interaction, and message forums and email systems can be used to facilitate ongoing communication. However, if partners are working in various locations and time zones it can be challenging for them to correspond in real-time without having advance notice.

- **Sustainability (moderate)**
  These platforms can be more easily replicated and scaled-up than physical models but momentum for the continuation of partnerships might be harder to generate if partners are dispersed across geographic locations. Connections built through online tools could increase the potential for new spin-off partnerships and the attractiveness of the flexibility for participation might entice partners to re-engage. These platforms also make it easy to incorporate an open source model generating ideas from a broader audience and/or audiences that are potentially impacted by the dilemma trying to be solved. However, access to technology may not be available to all community stakeholders wanting to participate.

**Summary of Online Platforms**

A table showing detailed results is included in Appendix G. Level 1 had a minimal ability to satisfy the majority of the principles except *Co-Creation* and *Multiple Touch Points*, which were not effectively satisfied. Level 2 had similar results except *Power Balance*, *Learning*, and *Sustainability* principles were moderately satisfied. Overall effectiveness results for levels 1 and 2 are minimal, with only small differences between them. Each, however, represents a step towards engagement across sectors and a suitable option for academic institutions that do not have the capacity to implement at level 3. At level 3 two principles were effectively satisfied, four moderately satisfied, and only one at a minimal level. Since level 3 effectively satisfies more principles than levels 1 and 2, it is also likely to achieve the greatest amount of expected benefits of the three. Therefore, where institutions are able to implement level 3 online platforms, these have the greatest capacity to facilitate productive partnerships.
5.2.2 Community-Based Research Structures

Community-based research platforms range from service learning initiatives to academic research structured around a community need to a genuine partnership where academics and CSOs conduct research together (Brodhead, 2010; CBRC, n.d.).

Engagement Level 1:

- **Goal Alignment (minimal)**
  A shared level of commitment on behalf of stakeholders is not expected at this level. Students, community members, CSOs, and other stakeholders who want access to knowledge and training can achieve this objective. At the same time this structure allows academics to pursue outreach and education objectives and to disseminate their research findings.

- **Power Balance (minimal)**
  A balance of power is also not expected and there is no anticipation of shared accountability or ownership. Despite the lack of power balance, community stakeholders demonstrate open-mindedness and a level of trust because they are benefiting from connecting with academia through receiving knowledge and education.

- **Co-Creation (not effective)**
  The co-creation principle is not satisfied because knowledge is not co-developed by stakeholders.

- **Learning (minimal)**
  Where an academic shares knowledge, education, and/or training with the broader community, this will provide value and learning to community members even with a minimal level of engagement. Learning can occur beyond the immediate recipients of knowledge in cases where the CSO disseminates research findings to broader audiences. It is a challenge however to promote ongoing and continuous learning because projects are catered to a specific purpose and/or they are primarily ad hoc in nature (Chernikova, 2011).

- **Innovation (minimal)**
  Limitations exist in terms of being able to effectively stimulate innovation. Providing knowledge and training to CSOs does not allow for the exploration of ideas or idea sharing between parties. Where traction can be made is if the content of the outreach, training, and/or knowledge being shared is focused on innovation-related topics such as how CSOs can build an internal capacity for innovation.

- **Multiple Touch Points (minimal)**
  Multiple touch points of access exist because different types of knowledge dissemination projects and educational training can occur simultaneously. Flexibility also exists where projects take place through multiple mediums such as in person and/or online. The difficulty is a lack of consistency and connection between existing touch points. This is because several
projects and training sessions occur simultaneously and each caters to unique topics with no
guarantee that these topics are related or that the same stakeholders are recipients for each.

- **Sustainability (minimal)**
  The nature of ad hoc projects and lack of engagement make it difficult to build long-term
relationships. Also, there is no guarantee of ongoing engagement between stakeholders once
education is provided and respective goals are achieved. What is promising, however, is a
desire to connect to other parties (academics to provide education and/or knowledge and CSOs
to access knowledge and input), which indicates a willingness for future engagement.

**Engagement Level 2:**

- **Goal Alignment (minimal/moderate)**
  Neither a shared level of commitment nor goal alignment is required. Both universities and
community organizations, however, want to share ideas and make connections to achieve
respective goals and to glean associated benefits from each other’s contributions.

- **Power Balance (minimal/moderate)**
  An even distribution of power does not exist but all parties make contributions and share
insights. The lack of power balance stems from the fact that stakeholders have different levels
of capacity, different types of expertise, and different levels of knowledge to share with one
another. Critical at this level is a willingness to trust each other and a mutual respect for
knowledge and insights to be shared.

- **Co-Creation (not effective)**
  This structure does not satisfy the co-creation principle because knowledge is not co-developed
by stakeholders.

- **Learning (minimal/moderate)**
  Stakeholders can achieve significant learning directly from knowledge being exchanged.
Feedback and input is solicited throughout multiple stages of research projects increasing the
potential for ongoing learning. CSOs are also able to gain customized learning relevant to their
current work where they request specific topics to be researched. Research findings in this case
are not handed-off; explanations and advice for application of research results are provided. The
difficulty however, is that most projects are conducted on an as needed basis where engagement
usually comes to an end when the project is completed (Chernikova, 2011).

- **Innovation (minimal)**
  The incremental advantage over level 1 is that ideas are now exchanged between parties. The
more ideas shared, the more potential there is for creativity and innovation. Stakeholders may
be working on several projects simultaneously, however, there might not be sufficient
momentum to see every idea achieve its full potential. A higher level of flexibility is needed to
promote ongoing creativity on behalf of all parties involved.
• **Multiple Touch Points (minimal/moderate)**
  Multiple points of access and mediums exist and there are a greater number of connections made with greater focus on working together. For example, stakeholders connect at the beginning of a research project to co-develop a research question and again at the end of the project to share action-oriented research results. There also exists greater consistency and connectivity between various points of access. Connectivity can take place over more than one medium where universities have online tools as well as a physical location onsite acting as a resource centre for CSOs and a meeting place for stakeholders.

• **Sustainability (minimal/moderate)**
  Stakeholders exchange knowledge and ideas and gain insight on what can be expected from future partnerships. Demonstrated success from working together and exchanging knowledge at this level might represent increased potential for longer-term co-creative partnerships. Also, projects conducted for a specific CSO need might lead to spin-off projects with the same stakeholder groups where there is familiarity of working together.

**Engagement Level 3:**

• **Goal Alignment (moderate)**
  While goal alignment and a proportionate level of commitment are both present at the participant and partnership level, in most cases there is a lack of support at the management level within academic institutions. There is an ongoing risk that this lack of support could derail the commitment made on behalf of academic partners.

• **Power Balance (moderate)**
  Roles and responsibilities are assigned at the onset so that partners carry proportionate ownership and accountability. The physical meeting place of these structures also plays a role in power balance. For example where a community-based research office, used for partners to work together face-to-face, is located off-campus it is a power-neutral location that ensures that even the perception of accountability and ownership are proportionately distributed. Often, these offices and meeting places are located on a university campus which can leave the CSOs feeling like authority lies with their partners.

• **Co-Creation (effective)**
  Research partnerships are developed for the purpose of co-creating knowledge and are committed to using participatory methods (Gnaiger & Martin, 2001). Community-based research has direct relevance to communities making CSOs integral to the knowledge development process.

• **Learning (effective)**
  These partnerships support diversity which fosters learning, openness, and acceptance. Projects are catered and designed to meet the needs of stakeholders involved, which stimulates learning for those impacted by the challenge at hand. Partners also benefit directly from the diverse level of expertise and knowledge that each counterpart brings to the table.
• **Innovation (moderate)**
  These initiatives have stimulated the development of networks with both national and global reach, which represents an innovative way to promote community-university partnerships and the importance of action-oriented research. While this research has the potential to stimulate innovation, the level of flexibility and creativity supported depends on the partners involved. Also, the purpose of these partnerships is to conduct research, which represents only one step in the innovation process.

• **Multiple Touch Points (effective)**
  These structures ensure academics are accessible to the local community through multiple mediums (Gnaiger & Martin, 2001). A physical location is established for partnerships and is the primary way for CSOs and researchers to work together to conduct research projects. In addition to a physical venue, complementary online resources for knowledge exchange and ongoing interactions are used.

• **Sustainability (moderate)**
  There exists an ongoing demand for services and projects on behalf of community members, which indicates an increasing need for community-based research partnerships and the potential longevity of these partnerships. However, projects often take too long to complete for immediate CSO needs (Gnaiger & Martin, 2001), which might make them less likely and/or willing to engage in future partnerships.

*Summary of Community-Based Research Structures*

A table showing detailed results is included in Appendix H. The ability of level 1 to satisfy all principles was minimal except for Co-Creation, which was not satisfied. Level 2 moderately satisfied all principles except minimally for Innovation and not at all for Co-Creation. Overall effectiveness results for levels 1 and 2 are minimal but represent steps towards engagement between sectors and offer potential options for academic institutions that do not have the capacity to implement at level 3. Level 3 satisfied all principles at a moderate level or greater. Since level 3 effectively satisfies more principles than levels 1 and 2, it is also likely to achieve the greatest amount of expected benefits. Therefore, these structures at level 3, despite potential implementation challenges, have the capacity to facilitate productive CSO-university partnerships.

5.2.3 Constellation Models

Constellation models bring together different groups of stakeholders across organizations to work towards achieving mutual social outcomes (Surman & Surman 2008a; 2008b).
Engagement Level 1:

- **Goal Alignment (not effective)**
  Organizations are working in the same ecosystem with similar goals (Surman & Surman, 2008b) but goal alignment is not achieved because there is no capacity or effort made to collaborate.

- **Power Balance (not effective)**
  Potential partners are working in silos, each with full ownership and control of their respective initiatives therefore the power balance principle is not satisfied.

- **Co-Creation (not effective)**
  The co-creation principle is not satisfied because stakeholders with similar social missions are not collaborating.

- **Learning (not effective)**
  There is no knowledge sharing between organizations and, as a result, no learning.

- **Innovation (not effective)**
  The innovation principle is not satisfied because stakeholders are not connecting to share ideas or stimulate creativity.

- **Multiple Touch Points (not effective)**
  There are no points of access put in place to facilitate connections or contact between stakeholders.

- **Sustainability (not effective)**
  The sustainability principle is not satisfied because the lack of contact between stakeholders does not allow for relationship building.

Engagement Level 2:

- **Goal Alignment (minimal)**
  Stakeholders are beginning to work together based on their aim to achieve a similar social mission. Individual objectives still take precedent however, making the broader social goals difficult to realize. Formal constellation groups have yet to be formed and there is limited understanding of how to work together to achieve common goals. This understanding needs to first be in place to achieve goal alignment.

- **Power Balance (minimal)**
  Individual objectives take precedent in this case therefore, despite knowledge exchange efforts, accountability and ownership are not yet shared proportionately among stakeholders and the leadership role is not yet rotated between parties. Constellation groups have yet to form around common individual objectives and interests therefore a lack of power balance persists.
• **Co-Creation (minimal)**
  Discussion and knowledge sharing occurs between organizations and some resources are combined between organizations. However, knowledge is not co-developed because constellation groups are not yet formed across organizations.

• **Learning (minimal/moderate)**
  Significant learning can be achieved from discussion and knowledge sharing between organizations. Stakeholders are beginning to tap into each other’s strengths and to identify opportunities for collaboration.

• **Innovation (minimal)**
  The fact that stakeholders are encouraged to work together at this stage could stimulate new ideas and the creativity needed to foster innovation. Even at the highest level of engagement, however, overt emphasis on innovation does not exist within the constellation model because more emphasis is put on the efficiencies achieved through shared resources and economies of scope.

• **Multiple Touch Points (minimal)**
  Stakeholder organizations working within the same ecosystem are no longer working in complete silos. Organizations are connecting and communicating, however, in order to receive a higher effectiveness score, ongoing communication and full transparency are needed (Surman, n.d.). The effectiveness score is low because of minimal emphasis on connectivity and interaction.

• **Sustainability (minimal)**
  Collaboration between stakeholders occurs but this depends on initiative taken by individual parties (Surman & Surman, 2008b) therefore it is difficult to predict how often it will occur and how long it will last.

**Engagement Level 3:**

• **Goal Alignment (effective)**
  Constellations are formed on the basis of working together to serve individual group-level goals while, at the same time, working to achieve overarching social objectives that are consistent across partner organizations. Overarching governance structures that are lightweight and flexible are deliberately used to avoid any goal misalignment among stakeholders (Surman & Surman, 2008b). There is also a common understanding of the magnetic attractor and its importance, which limits the risk of goal misalignment.

• **Power Balance (effective)**
  After goal alignment is established partners determine and form an agreement on individual roles and responsibilities for the project at hand. The constellation model inherently focuses on mutual inclusion and allows individual groups to pursue work that is of direct interest and benefit to them (Surman & Surman, 2008b). Within individual groups, which form around
mutual interest, there is a strong sense of cohesiveness and a balance of authority and accountability (Surman, n.d.). In addition, the opportunity exists for individuals to take on leadership roles but never at the expense of the overarching social goals.

- **Co-Creation (effective)**
  Shared participation and knowledge co-creation from all members involved in a project is facilitated. Community members are seen as integral to the research process and are provided with strong guidance and support throughout the project (United Way of Calgary and Area, 2011). There is a mutual understanding on behalf of stakeholders that combining resources will make a bigger impact by working together versus alone.

- **Learning (effective)**
  Diversity is supported and parties engage with external networks where there is potential for increased overall value to the project (Surman, n.d., p. 13). Perspectives and voices that are directly impacted by the social dilemma being solved are deliberately included in the processes of the project to increase learning. When partners work together using a constellation model, there is potential for both impact and credibility to increase which can facilitate increased learning for all parties. In addition, all processes are iterative and ongoing adaptations based on learning are incorporated.

- **Innovation (moderate)**
  Administration of these models leaves flexibility to support an entrepreneurial culture, which supports innovative efforts on behalf of participants. Ideation is encouraged within the model because it is adaptive and suited to complex environments (Surman & Surman, 2008b). It has the potential to facilitate social innovation because forces are joined to collaborate and create social change. However, overt emphasis on innovation does not exist. More emphasis is put on achieving efficiencies through shared resources and economies of scope.

- **Multiple Touch Points (minimal)**
  There is connectivity and ongoing communication through online mediums but constellation group formations happen in physical locations and teams are based on physical relationships. Relying solely on physical relationships could make it a challenge to identify stakeholders interested in participating in socially meaningful work.

- **Sustainability (minimal)**
  A weakness, in terms of being able to satisfy the sustainability principle, is that groups can leave a project at any point if they are no longer interested. A project left incomplete, however, creates a learning curve for others to pick up where the previous group left off. Therefore significant pressure can be put on constellations to remain relevant to all stakeholders involved (Surman, n.d.). An additional weakness is that it can take several years for partnerships under the model to grow and for members to fully understand their role in the bigger picture of the magnetic attractor (Surman & Surman, 2008a).
Summary of Constellation Models

A table showing detailed results is included in Appendix I. There are significant differences between all three levels of engagement in this case. Constellation models cannot operate at level 1 due to the lack of engagement: none of the principles were satisfied. Level 2 has minimal ability to satisfy all principles except a moderate ability for Learning. This still represents steps toward engagement and a potential option for academic institutions that do not have the capacity to implement the full-scale model. At level 3, the majority of principles are effectively satisfied. Therefore, these platforms, despite their limitations, help to facilitate productive CSO-university partnerships.

5.2.4 Change Labs

Change labs are physical creative environments that support collaborative and cross-sectoral approaches for dealing with growing social challenges (Torjman, 2012).

Engagement Level 1:

- **Goal Alignment (minimal)**
  A shared level of commitment on behalf of stakeholders is not present or expected. A mutual understanding exists, however, that a venue for making connections across sectors will bring value to stakeholders even with minimal formal engagement. Students, community members, CSOs, and other stakeholders gain access to knowledge and training and, at the same time, academics are able to pursue outreach and education objectives.

- **Power Balance (minimal)**
  A balance of power is not necessary. There is also no expectation of shared accountability or ownership present. Despite the lack of power balance, stakeholders benefit from connecting with others to receive knowledge and input.

- **Co-Creation (not effective)**
  The co-creation principle is not satisfied because knowledge is not co-developed by stakeholders.

- **Learning (minimal)**
  A significant amount of learning is achieved on behalf of the stakeholders on the receiving end of knowledge, training, and mentorship. Stakeholders also begin to gain an understanding of the unique perspectives held by others across sectors. This demonstrates support for diversity and helps stakeholders to think about the specific challenges they are working on in a more systemic way. It is challenging however to promote ongoing and continuous learning because the projects are catered to a specific purpose and/or they are primarily ad hoc in nature (Chernikova, 2011).
• **Innovation (minimal)**
  The ability to effectively stimulate innovation is lacking because the platform does not support immediate exploration of ideas or ongoing idea sharing between parties. Traction can be made if the content of the outreach, training, and/or knowledge being shared is focused on innovation-related topics. The unique environment is designed to stimulate creative thinking but stakeholder groups are conducting mostly independent work.

• **Multiple Touch Points (minimal)**
  Multiple points of access exist and different types of knowledge dissemination and/or education projects are occurring simultaneously. Flexibility also exists where projects take place through the use of multiple mediums such as in person and online. The challenge is the lack of consistency between existing touch points because several projects occur simultaneously, each catering to a specific topic.

• **Sustainability (minimal)**
  The nature of ad hoc projects and lack of engagement make it difficult to build long-term relationships. Also, because goal alignment is not a requirement, there is no guarantee or expectation of ongoing engagement between stakeholders once respective goals are achieved. There is, however, a desire to connect to other parties for knowledge and input indicating willingness for ongoing and/or future engagement.

**Engagement Level 2:**

• **Goal Alignment (minimal/moderate)**
  A shared level of commitment and mutual goals are not required. All parties involved have a mutual desire to create and/or stimulate social change. Therefore, ideas are shared and connections are made between stakeholders across sectors to assist with the achievement of respective goals.

• **Power Balance (minimal/moderate)**
  Contributions from all parties are made but a shared distribution of power is not required because stakeholders have different levels of capacity, different types of expertise, and different levels of knowledge. Crucial at this stage is a willingness to trust each other and to share and exchange knowledge so there is increased potential for achieving social change.

• **Co-Creation (minimal)**
  While stakeholders can be involved in all projects, a co-development of knowledge does not occur. The specific challenge and research question are co-developed by both parties involved but academic stakeholders conduct the necessary research. Even in cases where academic stakeholders solicit input from community stakeholders, academic researchers control and fulfill major aspects of the projects.
• **Learning (moderate)**
All stakeholders have the potential to achieve significant learning as knowledge is exchanged between parties. This includes developing a better understanding of the unique perspectives of others across sectors. There is also a greater chance for ongoing learning because of both feedback and touch points that exist at all phases of a project. However, projects remain ad hoc and are conducted on an as needed basis (Chernikova, 2011).

• **Innovation (moderate)**
The incremental advantage over level 1 is that ideas are exchanged between parties and these can be tested in the change lab venue. Although stakeholders are not committed to the same project, they exchange input and feedback directly into the testing phases of each other’s ideas. This brings significant value, unique perspectives, and increased success directly to the innovation process.

• **Multiple Touch Points (minimal/moderate)**
Multiple points of access and mediums exist and there is a greater connection and focus on working together. Therefore, greater consistency and connectivity exists between various points of access. For example, where a CSO co-develops a challenge with a university, the university will connect back with the CSO to report on vital insights found throughout progress of the project.

• **Sustainability (moderate)**
Stakeholders are working together, exchanging knowledge and ideas, and gaining insight on what can be expected from a potential partnership. Therefore, there is increased potential for longer-term co-creative partnerships to be formed. Also, projects conducted specifically for a CSO need might lead to spin-off projects with the same stakeholder groups when new and unexpected challenges arise from the original project. Stakeholders are inherently building the capacity needed to establish longer-term and co-creative partnerships.

**Engagement Level 3:**

• **Goal Alignment (effective)**
Goal alignment is established between all stakeholders. Having congruent goals and desires to achieve social outcomes is often the reason collaborative partnerships are established in the first place. Commitment to achieving mutual goals supports a systemic approach to solving today’s complex challenges. There is always a risk, however, that goals can become misaligned over time therefore reasonable objectives and timeframes should be set. These should be flexible due to the uncertain and dynamic nature of change lab processes. In addition, communication between teams about goals and expectations should be ongoing.

• **Power Balance (effective)**
The dynamic and systemic approach applied supports the quest for innovative change using a multi-disciplinary approach bringing together unique perspectives (Hewitt, 2011b; Westley et al., 2012). Therefore a balance of power and proportionate contribution level is encouraged to
ensure all ideas are being shared. The uncertainty of the outcomes and dynamics of the research process may require different individuals to take on different levels of power at different times but this can be managed with proper communication and sufficient re-evaluation and agreement of project objectives.

**Co-creation (effective)**
Co-creation is fundamental and these platforms would not exist without the presence of stakeholders who want and are willing to work together to achieve change. Change labs encourage and purposefully create opportunities for interaction, collaboration, and co-creation because of the belief that complex problems require systemic and innovative solutions (Banthien et al., 2007; Westley et al., 2012)

**Learning (effective)**
Rapid proto-typing and continual learning are fundamental. These platforms allow for the development of tools, methodologies, and training, which stimulate ongoing learning (Westley et al., 2012). Learning is inevitable where a diverse group of stakeholders are brought together from different areas of expertise (MIT AgeLab, 2012) and multiple perspectives are assessed to understand all dimensions of a complex problem (Hewitt, 2011b). The outcomes of projects are unknown therefore learning will always be ongoing and sometimes unexpected (SiG, 2011). Part of the process is to develop tools to document learning and to share learning with interested stakeholders (Westley et al., 2012).

**Innovation (effective)**
Not only do these venues encourage a collaborative approach but they also support the creation of new ideas, prototype development, and ongoing testing. They are designed to support creativity, flexibility, and the development of innovation (Banthien et al., 2007). They are continually seeking unique and disruptive solutions to today’s complex dilemmas (Torjman, 2012, p. 4). The physical setting, and complementary online forums, are inventively decorated and designed to stimulate creativity by encouraging movement and ongoing idea sharing.

**Multiple Touch Points (effective)**
Both a physical face-to-face environment and an online environment are supported. While much of the work and testing occurs face-to-face, these platforms also capitalize on social technologies and the increased interactions that these allow (MindLab, n.d.).

**Sustainability (effective)**
Stakeholders that join and participate understand that most innovative projects are ongoing and will benefit from a long-term commitment. They also recognize that, in addition to outcomes being unknown, the timeframes needed to achieve outcomes are equally difficult to identify at the onset of a project. Change labs are dynamic and adaptable by nature therefore there is always a palette for increasing scale of projects where necessary and facilitating networks of partners on both a local and global scale (MIT D-Lab, n.d.).
Summary of Change Labs

A table showing detailed results is included in Appendix J. Level 1 has a minimal ability to satisfy all principles except for Co-Creation, which was not satisfied. Level 2 ranged from minimal to moderate in terms of effectiveness. Both level 1 and 2 represent steps towards engagement across sectors and potential options for academic institutions that do not have the capacity to implement at level 3. Change labs effectively satisfy all principles at level 3 indicating their potential to support successful partnerships. This score however does not speak to the ease or difficulty of implementation for change labs. (Potential implementation barriers are considered in more detail in section 5.4). Where institutions are able to implement at level 3, change labs have the highest potential to facilitate successful CSO-university partnerships.

5.3 Summary of Platform Analysis

This section summarizes the overall findings from the platform analysis. A summary of results is presented in Table 5.3 where the three levels of each engagement platform are ordered from greatest to least in terms of their ability to satisfy the principles seven principles/themes embedded within the conceptual framework. The numbers in the first row of the table represent these principles (1 = goal alignment, 2 = power balance, 3 = co-creation, 4 = learning, 5 = innovation, 6 = multiple touch points, and 7 = sustainability) and a shorthand has been created for each point on the effectiveness scale: not effective = NE, minimal = Min, minimal/moderate = Min/M, moderate = M, moderate/effective = M/E, and effective = E.
### Table 5.3. Summary of Platform Ability to Effectively Satisfy Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Engagement Platforms</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Ability to Effectively Satisfy Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Min/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Min/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only platform found to effectively satisfy all principles, is a level 3 change lab indicating that it has the greatest potential to support a successful CSO-university partnership. There is an obvious gap between level 3 change labs and the remaining of the platforms but community-based research structures follow, as they moderately satisfy the majority of the principles and effectively satisfy the others at level 3. Constellation models and online platforms at level 3 are close behind community-based research structures. Level 1 online platforms were found to least effectively satisfy the principles but are comparable to level 1 community-based research structures and change labs in terms of their ability to effectively satisfy the principles. Constellation models, the only outlier at level 1, are found to be completely ineffective without some form of two-way engagement. In between (at level 2) are the remaining platforms that allow for minimal to medium levels of interaction and collaboration and are minimally to moderately able to satisfy the principles. These are shown to achieve several benefits because learning is achieved through knowledge sharing and there is indication of a general appreciation and desire to work together to maximize social outcomes.

While the other platforms are maybe not as promising as change labs, the analysis shows that, where a high level of engagement is achieved (level 3), the other platforms also have the potential to facilitate productive partnerships.
5.4 Implementation Barriers

The aim of this section is to acknowledge the existing challenges that universities face and to identify which of the platforms might be the easiest to implement given these barriers. For purposes of this analysis, barriers identified in the literature review that limit the potential for universities to engage with communities and/or to implement engagement platforms are divided into two main categories. The first category includes limited access to funding, resources, and time. The second includes institutional resistance to the recognition of community engagement efforts and the difficulty of measuring the outcomes and broader social impacts of partnerships. Each category is first described briefly below.

- **Category 1: Limited Access to Funding, Human Resources, and Time** have become more prominent in today’s climate of fiscal restraint (Bhattacharya, 2012; Public Policy Forum, 2011). With limited government funds available, there is increased competition for funding support (Laredo, 2007). Increasing pressure is put on academics to fulfill a social mission but their time and human resources are already divided between their teaching and researching responsibilities (McKitrick et al., 2011). Because funding, human, and time resources are scarce, priority is put on activities that are measureable and rewarded such as publication of research (Molas-Gallart, 2005). Though the present focus is on universities, limited resources are also a reality for CSO partners who face increased competition for funding coupled with increasing demand for the services they provide (Lasby & Barr, 2010; Mulholland et al., 2011; Scott & Pike, 2005).

- **Category 2: Institutional Resistance and Measurement Challenges** represent a lack of support for community engagement at the institutional level and the difficulty in measuring outcomes of these social efforts. Without formal structures in place at universities to support a social third mission, academics are prevented from participating in this mission (GACER, 2009; Harkavy & Hartley, 2012). As a result, community engagement efforts are minimal, fragmented, and ad hoc in nature. If institutional support was present and academics were rewarded for these efforts, more social progress could be made (GACER, 2009; Sá et al., 2011). Some ideas have been introduced to attempt to support academic recognition of these efforts (Britner, 2012; University of Guelph et al., 2013; Weerts & Sandman, 2010). Institutional resistance persists, however, due to the difficulty in measuring the broader outcomes of community engagement and/or partnerships (Kania & Kramer, 2011; Schuetze, 2012). Social outcomes from partnerships are difficult to measure because they are often not realized until the longer-term, are difficult to attribute to their causes, and often do not allow for the use of conventional indicators (European Commission, 2009; Krücken et al., 2009). Some ideas have been developed in this area where scholars have introduced flexible measurement practices in attempt to cope with this measurement dilemma (Callon et al., 2009; Patton, 2011).

Table 5.4 is used to evaluate each barrier category in terms of its impact on the ability for an institution to implement each platform at each level. Platforms remain in order from greatest to least in terms of their ability to satisfy the seven principles as shown in Table 5.3, page 57. Barrier
classifications corresponding to each platform are found in the last two columns of the table: *significant* = the barriers significantly impact a university’s ability to implement the platform, *moderate* = the barriers moderately impact implementation, and *minimal* = the barriers have a minimal impact on the ability to implement.

### Table 5.4. Impact of Barriers on Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Platforms</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Limited Access to Funding, Resources, &amp; Time</th>
<th>Institutional Resistance &amp; Measurement Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that change labs and community-based research structures, which were found to be most effective in supporting productive relationships, also require significant investment in financial, human, and time resources. When considering constraints on funding, online platforms at level 1 and 2 might be the most cost effective because of ease of implementation and lack of overhead costs (minimal impact on implementation). Though online engagement platforms are less expensive, it may be more difficult to prove a case for external funding for this type of engagement at level 3 (moderate). On the other hand, funding structures already exist for level 3 community-based research, such as through SSHRC, which directly promote and fund the co-creation of knowledge between universities and CSOs. The dedicated physical locations needed for community-based research structures and change labs at level 3, however, can be very costly (significant). Level 3 constellation models might be a close second to online platforms in terms of lowest cost because they work to bring down expenses by sharing resources and achieving economies of scope across the partnership organizations (moderate). On the other hand,
constellation models do not have as many options as the other platforms in terms of implementing at a lower level or smaller scale to save on resources.

Considering institutional resistance, research based partnerships might be the most highly accepted because they can lead to an increase in the number of publications, which is consistently recognized in promotion and tenure decisions. While any of the four platforms presented can effectively facilitate research partnerships, level 3 community-based research structures are dedicated to these types of partnerships, which might make them the most promising for coping with institutional resistance. On the other hand, it could be argued that engaging in level 3 community partnerships and building partnership venues is taking time away from the core business (teaching and research) of the academy (moderate). In terms of measurement, each of the four platforms discussed support a culture for continual learning and improvement, especially level 3 community-based research structure, constellation models, and change labs (moderate, minimal, and moderate respectively). Community-based research structures, constellation models, and change labs all effectively satisfy the learning principle at level 3 demonstrating a commitment to learning, growing, and improving which is a step in the right direction for coping with the measurement challenge.

5.5 Summary of Analysis

Table 5.5 provides an overall summary of results from each section of the analysis. For ease of reference the summary has been designated as the Principles-Platform Coherence (PPC) table. Although the PPC represents preliminary findings it could serve as a potential consultation tool for partners to use during the planning phases prior to the formal establishment of a community-university partnership. The PPC will allow partners to think through the seven principles to create a mutual vision of how each principle will be satisfied. It has the potential to shorten the planning phase for partners so that the co-creation process can begin as soon as possible while, at the same time, employing a structure to anchor the partnership and to assist with selecting a promising platform to support the partnership. This matrix demonstrates that the development and use of the conceptual framework (developed in section 4.0) can present useful conclusions and can stimulate productive discussions and planning amongst partners. The PPC matrix was developed and used as one model for evaluating potential engagement platforms but other models are also possible.
Table 5.5. Summary of Results - Principles-Platform Coherence (PPC) Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Engagement Platforms</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Ability to Effectively Satisfy Principles</th>
<th>Results Based on Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Min/M</td>
<td>Min/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Min/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research Structures</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Platforms</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Models</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in this section focused on identifying how effectively each success principle was satisfied by online platforms, community-university research structures, constellations models, and change labs. This included assessing three levels of engagement to help account for the variables that exist within each of the four main platform categories. The assessment showed that, while all four platforms implemented at their highest level of engagement have the potential to facilitate productive community-university partnerships, change labs proved to be the most promising based on their ability to satisfy all seven partnership principles. While some platforms might more effectively support partnerships than others, some might also be easier to implement than others in terms of costs, external support for funding, and institutional acceptance. The PPC matrix showed the platforms found to be most effective in terms of satisfying the principles (change labs) are not necessarily the most cost effective or easiest to implement.
6.0 DISCUSSION

The first objective of this research project was to identify the principles for universities to effectively mobilize knowledge and engage civil society organizations (CSOs) through successful community-university partnerships. Seven principles were distilled from the relevant literature and identified as part of a conceptual framework for a broader assessment of CSO-university partnerships. The conceptual framework also includes expected benefits of successful partnerships and barriers that limit the formation of these partnerships. The second objective was to determine which platforms might appropriately support CSO-university partnerships. This objective was achieved by using the framework as a benchmark to evaluate each potential platform based on its ability to satisfy the principles.

This section of the paper discusses the potential implications of the conceptual framework, attempts to interpret the results from the analysis of platforms, and introduces relevant considerations based on the research findings.

6.1 Discussion of Conceptual Framework

The literature review synthesized existing knowledge on community-university partnerships and related discourses including knowledge mobilization (KMb), community engagement, and co-creation. Despite the vast discussions around these topics, a list of best practices is lacking (German et al., 2008; SIX et al., 2011). Using justification from across these literatures (see Figure 4.1 on page 35), seven principles for successful CSO-university partnerships were distilled representing a summary of literary works and opinions. The seven principles, built into a broader conceptual framework, include goal alignment, power balance, co-creation, learning, innovation, multiple touch points, and sustainability (defined in section 4.1 on pages 36-37). These principles provide a comprehensive list of how universities can engage in community partnerships to co-create knowledge and identify a need for planning and discussion among partners to come an agreement of a mutual way forward for each. Schön and Rein (1994) advocate for collaborative reflection between academia and practitioners because working together on a reflective review will produce a more effective way forward. Where these guidelines are implemented, there will be increased potential of achieving mutual benefits (Broad, 2011; Chernikova, 2011) and creating social change (Bussières & Fontan, 2011; Winter et al., 2006). The principles can be used as a benchmark for universities to assess their current community engagement practices. They can also provide universities with general considerations for future community engagement and partnership efforts.

Hall and Tremblay (2011) offer suggestions for building a sustainable CSO-university partnership, but the present study has broadened the scope to include learning and innovation principles, which are critical considerations when attempting to achieve social change (Levin, 2008; SIX et al., 2011). The European Commission (2009) has also developed guidelines to encourage the formation of partnerships between sectors. These guidelines include suggestions such as asking external parties like funding bodies to take action, whereas this study has focused on the partner organizations
themselves and what they need to do to first build productive relationships. The principles developed in this study aim to first ensure the development of productive partnerships between CSOs and universities. These principles can then be used to find appropriate platforms, venues, and structures by evaluating how effectively they support and/or satisfy each principle. The idea is that platforms should fit the partnerships, rather than allowing a platform to dictate the rules of the partnership.

6.2 Discussion of Results From Platform Evaluation

The second objective of this research was to identify platforms that appropriately support successful CSO-university partnerships. The complexity of platforms created a need to break down each into three engagement levels representing different approaches a university takes in performing its engagement activities. While it may be assumed that universities want to achieve a high level of engagement for the achievement of genuine partnerships and optimal social outcomes, most institutions do not have the capacity to do so. As discussed in the literature review and analysis sections, this is due to varying levels of institutional support, time, human resources, and/or funds. The progression model (Figure 5.1 on page 40) was used to illustrate this reality: universities are making efforts to engage and explore the third mission but universities are operating at different levels of engagement and no standard approach to engagement exists (Beere, 2009; Chernikova, 2011). The analysis was therefore conducted for each of the three levels of engagement within each platform category.

The findings from the platform evaluation show that, save for level 1 constellation models, some benefits can be achieved without the establishment of a formal level 3 partnership. For example, significant learning can be achieved by CSOs where academics disseminate knowledge over online platforms for access by community organizations (level 1), research questions can be co-developed in a community-based research initiative (level 2), stakeholders identify opportunities for collaboration in a constellation model (level 2), and unexpected findings in a change lab-based project can lead to additional spin-off projects with community organizations (level 2). Despite the benefits achieved at lower levels of engagement, if universities can implement at level 3 versus level 2 the expected benefits will be much greater in all four cases and especially in the case of change labs.

The overall results of the assessment support the concept that partnerships require high levels of engagement (Brown, 2011; Cuthill, 2010). The higher the level of engagement pursued, the more effectively the platforms satisfy the partnership principles. For example, at level 3, online platforms can support a large number of people for co-creation over a physical meeting place, community-based research partnerships support diversity and openness allowing for increased levels of learning, constellation models allow for rotational leadership contributing to a balance of power between partners, and change labs foster a culture for continuous innovation.

The platform found to be most effective was a level 3 change lab because it successfully satisfied all seven principles, demonstrating the potential of this venue to successfully support partnerships for social change. Because of their potential, there exists an obvious gap between change labs and
the remaining platforms. At level 3 the remaining platforms also have significant potential to support productive partnerships and the ability to generate benefits. Though these three platforms are relatively close in terms of satisfying the principles, community-research structures are slightly more effective, followed by constellation models, and then online platforms. At level 2 the platforms allow for minimal to medium levels of interaction and collaboration and are minimally to moderately able to satisfy the principles, each with comparable results in terms of effectiveness. Level 1 online platforms were found to least effectively satisfy the principles but are comparable to level 1 community-based research structures and change labs in terms of effectiveness. These results are not surprising especially with the developed understanding of natural progression between levels of engagement for each platform. What is somewhat unexpected is that a level 1 constellation model is unable to satisfy any of the seven principles. This indicates that a moderate level of engagement supporting two-way interaction is required for this model to function at all.

Level 3 community-based research partnerships were second to change labs as they moderately satisfied the majority of the principles and effectively satisfied the Co-Creation, Learning, and Multiple Touch Points principles. These findings are consistent with the Hall et al. (2011) study, which also describes the potential of community-based research partnerships to facilitate the co-creation of knowledge between universities and CSOs and to ensure that research is relevant and useful for the community (p. 4).

Change lab findings are consistent with the Westley et al. (2012) recent study suggesting that continuous learning and co-creation across sectors are foundational elements of a change lab. Westley et al. also state that change labs have the potential to foster social innovation, however, for universities to consider such initiatives, institutional barriers will need to be broken down to shift the scale such that equal emphasis is placed on social innovations as compared to current commercialization efforts (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010; European Commission, 2009; Krücken et al., 2009).

### 6.3 Discussion of Results From Barrier Evaluation

The current need for universities to engage civil society in “more compelling and genuine ways” (Bunt & Leadbeater, 2012, p. 69) has led to the exploration of current practices for engagement and also potential platforms that might be useful to universities as they look for effective ways to engage their surrounding communities. However, some unanswered questions remain. Despite the fact that effective platforms and tools are in place, community-university partnerships are limited. Also, university strategic plans and mandates illustrate their commitment to and acknowledgement of the importance of community engagement but then fall short in practice (Beere, 2009; Hall et al., 2011).

CSO-university partnerships are found to be limited and fragmented due to several existing barriers (GACER, 2009). For the analysis, identified barriers were divided into two main categories. Category 1 includes limited access to funding, resources, and time. Category 2 includes institutional resistance to the recognition of community engagement efforts and the difficulty of measuring the
outcomes and broader social impacts of partnerships. The results from the assessment of platforms based on these two categories are now discussed in more detail.

**Limited Access to Funding, Resources, and Time**

Universities have limited financial and human resources and face time constraints because they are continually balancing teaching, research, and other duties and ongoing demands that arise. Universities vary in terms of their capacity, ability, and desire to fully engage in partnerships. It is much more challenging for a small university to dedicate resources to a partnership than a larger university with more resources at its disposal. While the platforms do not directly ease these constraints, some attract more funding support and others are less costly and/or take less time and human resources to implement. In cases where there are limited resources at a university’s disposal it will be important to understand where committing their time might be most beneficial to the partnership and might lead to the greatest achievement of potential benefits. For example, an online platform might be the least expensive to implement and might require the least amount of time commitment and minimal strain on human resources because it offers the greatest flexibility for participants to work around their busy schedules. However, online venues do not allow for the achievement of certain benefits that are possible through a physical venue.

Level 3 change labs and community-based research initiatives on the other hand allow for the achievement of significant benefits for partners. While there is an obvious gap between change labs and other venues in terms of effectiveness, they require the most time, personnel, and funding to implement. On the whole, level 3 community-based research structures are not much more effective than constellation models and online platforms at level 3, however, they require the most significant time, personnel, and funding to implement in comparison to the others. Although all partnerships will require time and human resource commitments to ensure goal alignment between partners, level 3 constellation models draw on fewer financial resources in the end because of achieved economies of scope between partners. Level 2 platforms in all cases were found to have a moderate amount of impact on implementation but yet again the potential for implementation will depend on the capacity of a university for engagement.

The findings also suggest that smaller institutions with fewer resources may not be able to engage through certain platforms, particularly through level 3 partnership platforms, without external funding and support. There are policies in place that encourage universities to increase their engagement efforts (Laredo, 2007; Nelles & Vorely, 2009) but the emphasis has traditionally been placed on technological innovation and commercialization (Molas-Gallart, 2005). The present study narrows the scope to engagement specifically with CSOs rather than private sector organizations because of the need for social progress beyond spill over effects from economic progress (STACS, 2009). The European Commission (2009) also recognizes the need for funding that directly supports the formation of partnerships for social change. Community-based research initiatives are the only platforms that currently have formal funding support in place; SSHRC has funding in place that directly promotes knowledge co-creation through CSO-university research partnerships.
Institutional Resistance and Measurement Challenges

Despite the range of options and tools available to support community-university partnerships, engagement efforts are limited. Platforms do little to eliminate institutional resistance and measurement challenges. Despite the benefits that can be achieved by engaging in community-university partnerships, as well as the incremental benefits achieved through platforms, both the issue of institutional resistance to community engagement and the difficulty in demonstrating the social impact of partnerships remain.

Universities are increasingly reaching out to community partners (GACER, 2009; Yarime & Trencher, 2012). The diverse range of engagement efforts and the ad hoc nature of efforts are related to a varied range of institutional support across universities (Beere, 2009; Broad, 2011; Chernikova, 2011). Few universities have made structural changes that support the facilitation of partnerships (Sá et al., 2011) and third mission efforts are not rewarded in comparison to other academic duties (Dobell et al., 2012). The European Commission (2009) finds that incentives and rewards should be put in place to encourage the establishment of partnerships because sectors need to work together as partners to increase the potential to find innovative solutions to today’s social dilemmas. This would allow for progress in implementing platforms for partnerships with CSOs which lag behind those with private companies.

Concerns with existing metrics - due to an emphasis on technological innovation and commercialization efforts - have been identified in the literature as they fall short in terms of recognizing university engagement and co-creation efforts with civil society and CSOs (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010; European Commission, 2009; Krücken et al., 2009; Molas-Gallart, 2005). While the conceptual framework does not provide a definitive solution, it may get universities thinking about the need for non-traditional performance criteria and incentives. To effectively satisfy the co-creation principle for example, institutions will need to develop ways to measure and recognize contributions made within partnerships and research results and/or outcomes that come about in a more applied setting rather than through journal publications. The principles in the framework also support continual learning because they recognize that social problems are long-term and hard to measure. The conceptual framework will only become more useful when there is greater institutional and external support for recognizing the community engagement efforts made by universities.

It is somewhat unexpected that institutional resistance and measurement challenges were allocated with mostly moderate and minimal impact, rather than significant impact, in terms of limiting implementation (see Table 5.4 on page 59). This is because the assessment considers the progress being made around expanding measurement practices to embrace the uncertainty that comes along with social challenges (see Callon et al., 2009; Patton, 2011; Schön & Rein, 1994; Westley et al., 2007), and the importance of supporting the expansion and recognition of university’s community engagement efforts (see Britner, 2012; Carnegie Foundation, 2010; University of Guelph et al., 2013; Weerts & Sandman, 2010). These initiatives, attempt to increase recognition and show the importance for CSO-university partnerships and social innovation.
Introducing platforms into the CSO-university partnerships discussions may bring more attention to the importance of working to overcome these barriers so that partnerships and associated benefits, as well as incremental benefits from platforms, can be achieved.

### 6.4 Principles-Platform Coherence Matrix

The Principles-Platform Coherence (PPC) Matrix was created and used to summarize the data stemming from the analysis. The PPC matrix supports the application of the conceptual framework, accounting for the varying levels of engagement as well as the data resulting from an evaluation of potential implementation barriers. This tool can be useful for partners in the planning phases before a formal partnerships is established and before a platform is selected.

### 6.5 Summary of Implications for Academe

In light of the research findings and discussion, a summary of implications has been developed and is presented in this section. Implications are first provided for academics and academic institutions as these are the primary stakeholders considered for this research. Next, implications are provided for additional stakeholders that might also benefit from the research results.

#### 6.5.1 A Framework for Engaging in Productive Partnerships

The conceptual framework provides a summary of where the literature stands on CSO-university partnerships and a comprehensive list of principles to guide universities as they form and engage in co-creative partnerships with CSOs. The framework includes additional considerations for universities such as the benefits that can be achieved through successful implementation of these partnerships and the potential barriers that might limit the initiation and/or potential of universities to engage with their surrounding communities. The framework can also act as a benchmark for universities to evaluate their current community engagement practices. The framework is purposefully forward thinking, recognizing innovation, co-creation and continual learning so that it will continue to be helpful in the future when recognition, reward, and implementation of community engagement are commonplace.

#### 6.5.2 A Consultation Tool for Partners

To support the application of the conceptual framework, the Principles-Platform Coherence (PPC) matrix can be used by partners as a practical tool around which they can structure their collaborative discussions, planning, and analysis.

#### 6.5.3 Successful Partnerships Require High Engagement Levels

The higher the level of engagement pursued, the more effectively the platforms satisfy the partnership principles. Therefore, where feasible, universities should aim to achieve high levels of engagement. This will ensure that maximum expected benefits are gleaned.
6.5.4 Potential Benefits at Lower Engagement Levels

No standard approach to community engagement exists because universities have different resource capacities for engagement, few have institutional level support, and there is limited external funding for the direct promotion of community partnerships. Three engagement levels were summarized in a progression model to account for these varying capacities, and the analysis of these varying capacities indicate that some benefits are gleaned even at lower levels of engagement, with consistencies across platforms (at level 2 there were only subtle differences in effectiveness between platforms, and at level 1 there were subtle differences between online platforms, community-based research structures, and change labs). Therefore engagement efforts can be pursued based on what is most feasible for the university and smaller universities need not be discouraged in regards to engaging in collaborative activities with CSOs.

6.5.5 Community-Based Research Initiatives Have Greater Institutional Support

Community-based research initiatives might be more feasible and, therefore, more attractive to some universities to pursue where formal funding structures are in place to support these efforts (such as through SSHRC). This might also make it easier to achieve institutional level support for these types of community engagement initiatives.

6.5.6 Several Promising Partnership Platforms Exist

Change labs satisfy all seven principles and therefore have the greatest potential to effectively support the facilitation of successful CSO-university partnerships, however, they also require significant resources to be implemented. The other platforms also provide a range of promising options for partnerships. Therefore, where capacity is limited, other platforms and varying levels of engagement can be considered.

6.5.7 Talking About Engagement is Not Enough

CSO-university partnerships and engagement initiatives are limited, diverse, and fragmented in the research. There is, however, consistency in the mention and acknowledgement of the importance of community engagement in university strategic plans and mandates. These written claims are not enough. To commit to a greater social mission and to achieve social change, universities must engage in partnerships with their surrounding communities.

6.5.8 Efforts Should Be Customized Based on Cost-Benefit Tradeoff

A university’s capacity and access to resources will and should dictate at what level and with which platforms they can engage. Some engagement platforms attract more funding such as community-based research initiatives, which might make this approach more feasible in some cases. Others, such as constellation models, might be more feasible because they draw on fewer financial resources by achieving economies of scope. It is important for universities to understand where
committing their time is most beneficial to the partnership and which venue will lead to the greatest achievement of potential benefits.

6.5.9 Progress is Required to Overcome Barriers

Progress needs to be made to eliminate and/or minimize institutional resistance. Despite this barrier, academics are reaching out to their surrounding communities in hopes of achieving positive social impact. Unfortunately, these individuals, or groups of individuals, will not be able to achieve maximum expected social benefits until greater support is provided at the institutional-level. Solutions found for measuring the outcomes of community partnerships might help to decrease institutional resistance and might also help to increase the potential of recognizing community work within the academy. The literature shows that efforts are being made through the Carnegie Foundation and others to begin to recognize community engagement but more conversations are needed to move the needle on eliminating these barriers.

6.6 Summary of Implications for Other Stakeholders

6.6.1 Progress in Community Engagement Benefits CSOs

While the present focus lies on academic institutions, the concepts discussed also apply to the organizations that universities wish to engage with. Increased efforts on behalf of academic institutions lead to increased opportunities for CSOs to work with universities. CSO partners will benefit where they have help fulfilling research and other initiatives they would not have had the capacity to do alone. For CSOs that have capacity to fund research, the concepts discussed will encourage consideration of whether their funding requirements effectively support the formation of partnerships and social change efforts.

6.6.2 External Funding Needed to Support Social Change

Policies and funding structures for partnerships to stimulate social change are lagging behind those that support technological innovation and commercialization. Literature shows that measurement efforts are being expanded to allow for uncertain outcomes and non-linear social innovation processes: this might represent an opportunity for funders to consider new methods of accountability that allow for greater flexibility and support for social change efforts.

6.7 Summary of Discussion and Implications

This section examined the contribution of the conceptual framework and principles for the development of productive CSO-university partnerships. It also listed the implications based on the evaluation of potential partnership platforms. With principles in place and options for effective platforms to support partnerships, there was a need to understand why partnerships are limited in practice. Therefore, the discussion included a closer look at barriers that limit the implementation of engagement initiatives and partnerships. Implementation barriers include time, funds, and human
resources available, especially when considering the teaching and research demands of academics. Further, the current lack of institutional support and recognition for engagement efforts are also significant barriers to engagement and partnership efforts which were discussed. These concepts have provided general considerations and implications for universities embarking on their third mission and working to increase their social role.
7.0 CONCLUSIONS

This study was completed for the Centre for Global Studies (CFGS) because of the Centre’s interest in research partnerships with civil society organizations (CSOs), community-based research initiatives, and the potential of these engagement activities to stimulate social change.

The findings in this study elevate an already pressing need for work that supports a university’s community engagement efforts and that recognizes and rewards these efforts so the benefits and social outcomes, generated by partnerships, can be exploited. Despite institutional barriers and constrained resources that have limited community engagement efforts, the increasing complexity of today’s social dilemmas coupled with increasing pressure for universities to play a more active social role, make it important for universities to engage with their surrounding communities. First, justification from the literature was used to established a list of guiding principles necessary for universities to consider to successfully engage in partnerships with CSOs. Consistent with current literature, the present study determines that partnerships require high levels of engagement to achieve expected benefits of partnerships. The present study also addresses the important question of how to engage because partnerships require an appropriate venue to facilitate continuous learning, co-creation, and innovation. To answer this question the guiding principles were used to evaluate potential engagement platforms.

Universities connect in different ways with their surrounding communities to attempt to find solutions to modern day dilemmas. It is therefore important for universities to choose an appropriate platform based on the level of engagement they want, or have the capacity, to achieve. It is now possible to state that, despite the diverse range of engagement initiatives performed across universities, several platforms exist to effectively facilitate and support these activities. With the demonstrated promise of engagement venues such as online platforms, community-based research structures, constellations models, and change labs, it is apparent that community-university partnerships have significant potential to impact positive social change.

7.1 Suggestions for Future Research

There remains a need for more research to identify ways of overcoming the barriers that limit university engagement with communities. One approach is identifying ways for governments and funding agencies to directly support CSO-university partnerships. This might stimulate conversations within funding circles to support co-creative initiatives between universities and CSOs to stimulate social change. Furthermore, it would be helpful if the historical foundations of the relationships between universities and community organizations were explored.
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9.0 APPENDICES

9.1 Appendix A: An Online Platform Example

The Yaffle Model

The diagram below is a conceptual model of how the online model, Yaffle, was developed to function. Yaffle is represented in the centre of the model by the letter Y. The column on the left represents potential sources of demand for information, research, and other resources. The column on the right represents the resources available at Memorial University that are made available to satisfy the demands of various external stakeholders.

(Adams-Warburton, 2011, p. 5)
Appendix B: A Logic Model for Hybrid Forums

The model shows that movement towards formal, co-creative research partnerships requires a move into the informal spaces between the academy and its external partners. These spaces are depicted in the cloud shape shown below titled Hybrid Forums (Dobell et al., 2012).
Appendix C: The Constellation Governance Model

Enabling Factors of the Constellation Governance Model

1. **Lightweight governance**: The constellation model is formed based on a need or opportunity, also known as a magnetic attractor. Interested groups form around the magnetic attractor and then a Stewardship Group is formed to set strategic direction and to ensure the overall goals of the partnership are continuously supported. Governance of the partnership is described as lightweight so that the majority of decision-making occurs within the constellations themselves. As the magnetic attractor becomes more clearly defined, a shared vision and common set of assumptions are developed for all stakeholders to use as a guide (Surman & Surman, 2008a).

2. **Constellations (action focused teams)**: Constellation groups are then developed based on issues and interests related to the magnetic attractor (Surman & Surman, 2008a).

3. **Third party coordination**: Constellations can adapt on an ongoing basis, with help of a designated Secretariat, to fill gaps and to ensure they evolve as the magnetic attractor evolves. When the need or opportunity has been met, constellations are finished and efforts can be focused on new challenges and opportunities (Surman & Surman, 2008a).
Appendix D: Governance Model

Community and Human Service Area Genesis Centre of Community Wellness

Constellations: self-governing action-teams bringing residents and organizations together to identify needs/issues so that solutions can be developed. Constellations report to Stewardship Group to keep the partnership informed of local needs/activities.

Residents: community participants that are part of the Stewardship Group where strategic decisions are made and part of the constellations that develop outcomes for local issues.

The Collaborative: a group of service organizations that have signed an agreement to work together with the community and will respond to the local needs that have been identified.

The Stewardship Group: provides oversight and makes strategic decisions. The Stewardship Group is made up of four residents from the community, four representatives from the collaborative, and the Trustee Agency and United Way. The stewardship group also functions as a central information point of the work of the constellations, but has no authority over constellations.

Trustee Agency: assigned both the legal and financial responsibilities of the collaborative. The Stewardship Group provides direction and oversight to the Trustee Agency and the Trustee Agency is chosen by members of the collaborative to perform administrative duties and support.

(modified from United Way of Calgary and Area, 2011, p. 5)
9.5 Appendix E: Elements of a Successful Change Lab

- **Broad-based research** is used for the understanding of complex systems. Qualitative research is used to complement to statistics so that voices can be heard. No one methodology is used, rather a variety of information sources are used.
- **Co-creation of solutions** is encouraged across sectors with a goal of citizen engagement to foster diversity, which will increase the potential for innovation.
- **Specialized physical environment** that stimulates creativity.
- **Clear process design and facilitation** is important so that participants understand where their work fits into the bigger picture of social change. Processes are built to provide direction, not to stifle creativity.
- **Rapid prototyping** allows for quick developments of models of potential solutions to problems, which can help generate a greater understanding of how the creative solutions will be implemented.
- **Multi-disciplinary support staff** can allow participants to maximize their time focusing on the creative process and can assist with broad variety of requests.
- **Continual learning** is commonplace because methodologies are created and documented specifically for training purposes. The focus on experimentation in change labs also supports continual learning.

(modified from Westley, Goebey, & Robinson, 2012, pp. 9-10)
9.6 Appendix F: Case Examples of Change Labs

The following are case examples of recently established change labs. These change labs have been recognized for their ability to bring partners together across sectors and disciplines. They have also been credited for their ability to stimulate innovation and innovative thinking for continued learning, growth, and for the development of solutions to real problems.

*MIT’s AgeLab*

MIT’s AgeLab (2012) was established within MIT’s School of Engineering in 1999 to support the invention of new ideas and innovative technologies that will improve the health and daily tasks of people as they get older. The AgeLab includes a range of stakeholders from different disciplines: designers, engineers, social scientists, behavioral scientists, clinicians, business stakeholders, and government representatives. Research initiatives conducted through the AgeLab fall within a range of themes from *Transportation & Community* to *Longevity & Planning*. Topics within these themes include *Health, Medication & the Older Driver* and *Gender Differences in Retirement Planning* respectively (MIT AgeLab, 2012). The AgeLab uses unique tools and methods to support the work of researchers whether in the laboratory or through an online environment. One example is a field-based vehicle simulator, called Miss Daisy, used to study driving behaviour. This tool uses a real car connected to a simulation system to provide feedback to the driver through sensory and kinetic channels. Another example is the Innovation Studio used for conducting interactive workshops with organizations and AgeLab researchers to better understand the impact of aging on their business or to develop new products or new policies (MIT AgeLab, 2012).

*Harvard Innovation Lab (i-lab)*

The Harvard Innovation Lab (i-lab) (2012) connects faculty, students, entrepreneurs, and members of the community to help support the process of turning ideas into new ventures. The i-lab encourages innovation across the university from multiple faculties and disciplines. The i-lab offers courses and workshops, including a course on commercializing science, that unite students from business, medicine, science, engineering, law, public health, and government programs. Students can apply for dedicated workspace at the i-lab to test their ideas and prototypes or they can drop in and use the shared space available any time between nine a.m. and midnight. Entrepreneurs-in-Residence, mentors, and a network of experts, such as investors and lawyers, are resources that are accessible to students through the i-lab. In addition to events and courses, the i-lab encourages innovative thinking through competitions, which aim to help students develop solutions to complex systemic problems. The competitions facilitated by the i-lab show Harvard’s commitment to bringing people together in multi-disciplinary initiatives and a commitment to stimulating entrepreneurship in the community.

*Stanford ChangeLabs*

Stanford ChangeLabs (2012) has developed an innovative and co-creative approach to face today’s complex social challenges by bridging traditional research with real-world dilemmas. The
ChangeLabs create action-oriented methodologies and toolkits for practitioners, including CSOs, so that they can create change in real-time. The guiding principles for the effective implementation of Stanford ChangeLabs (2012) include the following (modified from website):

- **Taking on Issues of Global Importance:** Stanford Labs work on strategic projects that lead to new models for addressing global challenges. Research and innovation projects are crafted strategically to create new paradigms (e.g. behaviour based energy interventions), and serve as a platform for cross-agency and trans-disciplinary collaborations.
- **Believing in the Power of Networks:** Stanford Labs are creating a global community of ChangeLab entities around the globe, embedded in other institutions, to promote cross-boundary learning, implementation, and research.
- **Crafting Novel Partnerships:** The Labs are crafting strategic cross-agency partnerships around specific large-scale challenges like altering energy consumption. For example, a current energy project involves investigators across academic departments, experts from other universities, electric utility and energy start up companies, the local community, government agencies, and research labs.
- **Embracing a Trans-Disciplinary Approach:** The Labs combine multiple fields with the strategic objective of transcending the rubrics and creating combinatorial epistemologies and methodologies.
- **Acting as a Multiplication Amplification and Diffusion Engine:** The Labs implement events and activities to multiply the center and research base, to amplify the impact, and to diffuse the new methodologies for widespread leverage. This includes developing a base of university courses, executive education modules, workshop structures, transfer tools for dissemination of the emerging theories, methodologies, and practices.

**MindLab**

MindLab is a cross-ministerial innovation unit established in Denmark to allow businesses and citizens to influence decisions made by government and to participate in co-creating new solutions for society (Hewitt, 2012; MindLab, n.d.). The lab provides a physical venue where members across sectors can come together to collaborate. The lab is used to collect data from citizens and to test potential solutions. A specific example is where MindLab worked with the National Labour Market Authority (AMS) to determine how AMS could use the Internet to match the unemployed with suitable volunteer mentors. Based on the research conducted, AMS is now developing a pilot program to assess the potential of a digital mentorship program. MindLab collects and disseminates Danish and international knowledge through dialogue and collaboration with international networks in academia, private companies, and public organizations. The Lab considers itself an enabler of innovation. Rather than coming up with solutions on their own, they “create the conditions for solutions to emerge” (Hewitt, 2012, p. 5).

These case examples show that change labs are dynamic organisms that are continually shaped and re-shaped around the problems to be solved and by the diverse stakeholders that come together to co-create, test, and implement innovative ideas.
Across all principles there is an increase in effectiveness from level 1 to 3. Overall, the ability of online platforms to satisfy the principles of successful CSO-university partnerships at both engagement levels 1 and 2 is minimal. However, the satisfaction level is significantly greater for level 3 indicating the potential to support CSO-university partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Engagement</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained Impact</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Touchpoints</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Co-Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Creation</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Learning Programs</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of assessment of online platforms.
9.8 Appendix H: Assessment Results for Community-Based Research Structures

There is an increase in effectiveness across all principles when moving from level 1 to 3. Overall, the ability of community-based research structures to satisfy the principles of successful CSO-university partnerships at both engagement levels 1 and 2 is minimal. However, the satisfaction level is significantly greater for level 3 indicating the potential of a level 3 community-based research structures to support CSO-university partnerships.
9.9 Appendix I: Assessment Results for Constellation Models

Level 1 does not satisfy any of the principles because a constellation model cannot operate at a low level of engagement. There is an increase in effectiveness moving from level 2 to 3 save for multiple touch points and sustainability. To achieve maximum expected benefits from implementing a constellation model, a high level of engagement is required. At level 3, constellation models have the potential to effectively support CSO-university partnerships.
Appendix J: Assessment Results for Change Labs

There is an increase in effectiveness moving from level 1 to 2 and from level 2 to 3. The ability of change labs to satisfy the principles at level 1 is minimal. At level 2, the ability of change labs to satisfy the principles is moderate. The overall effectiveness is significantly greater at level 3, which indicates a strong potential for change labs to effectively support CSO-university partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Co-Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Alignment</td>
<td>Power Balance</td>
<td>Learning Multiple</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Change Labs</td>
<td>Change Labs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Assessment of Change Labs