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These Proceedings are a summary of presentations and discussions that took place during a workshop on “community-based research”, which was part of a broader organizational development project undertaken by the Vice-President, Research at the University of Victoria.

The broader project was led by a team of individuals experienced in community-based research practice and policy, consisting of Dr. Budd Hall (former Dean, Faculty of Education, UVic), Dr. Peter Keller (Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, UVic), Ms. Maeve Lydon (Community Consultant and Programme Manager and community developer with Lifecycles and the Groundworks Learning Centre), and Dr. Kelly Bannister (Director, POLIS Project on Ecological Governance and Adjunct Professor, School of Environmental Studies, UVic).

Key advisors to the project included Dr. Lorna Williams (Canada Research Chair in Indigenous Learning and Knowledge, UVic) on Aboriginal involvement, and Mr. Peter Levesque (Institute of Population Health, University of Ottawa and former programme officer for the Community-University Research Alliance programme within SSHRC) on national and international networking and on external funding opportunities.

Assistance to the project was provided by Ms. Ann Zurbrigg (Office Manager, POLIS Project) and Ms. Michelle Reid (Research Apprentice to Kelly Bannister supported by the LE,NONET Project, UVic).

The overall goal of the project was to systematically gather information on existing community-based research projects and programs, as well as to better understand the needs, interests, and expectations of potential “contributor” and “user” groups regarding the potential creation of a new structure and function at UVic to support, facilitate and promote community-based research.

Initial feedback from UVic researchers (faculty, staff and students) and administrators, and from a representative sample of community researchers and partners was conducted through a web-based survey. A half-day workshop was held on June 8th to explore the survey questions in more depth within an interactive forum, and to identify additional aspects of interest or concern to participants.

Approximately 50 people attended the workshop (which was the maximum limit due to space constraints), and a further 20 people who could not attend requested an opportunity to contribute additional information in other ways (e.g., email, individual and small group meetings). Many participants had more than one affiliation (e.g., university and non profit organization, or non profit organization and First Nation) but the general breakdown of participation was as follows: approximately 30 UVic participants, 2 representatives from other local universities or colleges, and approximately 20 participants from the non profit sector, First Nation, or government. It should be noted that a separate smaller roundtable discussion was held in advance of the workshop on June 6, 2006 specifically to engage Aboriginal
organisations and UVic researchers involved in CBR with Aboriginal communities (reported separately from this Proceedings). Based on feedback received, the workshop was a tremendous success from the perspective of both the organizers and participants.

The workshop program included some brief presentations and two breakout sessions to enable interactive cross-sectoral discussions. The topics for Breakout session one were who is “community” and what is “community-based research”. Breakout session two included a discussion of priorities, assets, gaps and potentials within six themes that were chosen based on interest expressed in online survey responses:

- Community-University Collaboration: Partnerships and best practices
- Linking Local to Global CBR: Networks and networking
- Knowledge Mobilization: Exploring services and opportunities at UVic
- Enabling and Disabling Spaces: CBR involving Aboriginal communities
- Rights and Responsibilities: Research ethics and intellectual property policies
- Supporting Students in Community-based research and learning

Each breakout group shared a brief summary of their discussions with the larger workshop participants. A written summary of discussions within each breakout group was subsequently submitted by volunteer note-takers for inclusion in these Proceedings.

The predominant crosscutting theme that emerged from the breakout sessions was the need for creating an “enabling space” for respectful and fruitful research collaboration. Closely linked were needs for institutional acknowledgement, support and reward for building and maintaining the “relationship” component of research, accessing resources, and providing training for individuals. The need for training and skills development extended beyond simply research methodologies, including aspects such as cultural competency, mediation, increasing cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural communication, and development of research protocols.

The following sections summarise the format, content and outcomes of the workshop.
# WORKSHOP PROGRAM

**UVic Workshop on “Community-Based Research”**

JUNE 8, 2006 from 9:00 - 11:30 am  
Harry Hickman Building Room 110, UVic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>LEAD PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 - 9:00</td>
<td>Check-in and Refreshments</td>
<td>Ann Zurbrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 9:45</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Maeve Lydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome and message from Vice-President Research</td>
<td>Kelly Bannister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How did we get here? Overview of CBR initiative to date</td>
<td>Budd Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Workshop on CBR and Aboriginal communities</td>
<td>Lorna Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Online survey and objectives for workshop</td>
<td>Kelly Bannister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions and comments</td>
<td>Maeve Lydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 - 10:15</td>
<td>Breakout Session One</td>
<td>Maeve Lydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working understandings of “community” and “CBR”</td>
<td>(6 groups as seated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 - 10:25</td>
<td>Quick Stretch Break!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25 - 11:10</td>
<td>Breakout Session Two (see topics listed below *)</td>
<td>(6 groups by topic*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping priorities, assets, gaps and potentials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group mini-reports (6 groups)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 - 11:30</td>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>Peter Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions and comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Topics for Breakout Session Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Resource Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Community-University Collaboration: Partnerships &amp; best practices</td>
<td>Maeve Lydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Linking Local to Global CBR: Networks and networking</td>
<td>Budd Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Knowledge Mobilization: Exploring services and opportunities at UVic</td>
<td>Joaquin Trapero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Enabling and Disabling Spaces: CBR involving Aboriginal Communities</td>
<td>Lorna Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Rights &amp; Responsibilities: Research ethics &amp; intellectual property policies</td>
<td>Kelly Bannister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Supporting Students in Community-based Research and Learning</td>
<td>Peter Keller/Bruce Wallace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome Message

Dr. S. Martin Taylor
Vice President, Research, University of Victoria

Note: The following message by Dr. Taylor was read at his request and on his behalf (by Kelly Bannister) as Dr. Taylor was not able to attend the workshop in person due to a scheduling conflict with UVic Convocation ceremonies. Prior to reading the welcome message, it was acknowledged that the workshop took place on Coast Salish territory.

Welcome to the June 8th CBR Workshop participants.....

I want to thank you for taking time to participate in today's workshop. Over the past few months the UVic Task Force on CBR, led by Budd Hall and Peter Keller, has provided excellent leadership and direction as a follow-up to the very successful CBR Forum held just over a year ago in April 2005.

The Forum and successes since then on the CBR front - including the Health and Society Knowledge Mobilization program in partnership with York University, the launch of the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL) Health and Learning Knowledge Centre, and the SSHRC-funded national node for the Canadian Social Economy Hub - confirm the lead role that UVic is positioned to play nationally in CBR, a role endorsed at last year's CBR Forum by then SSHRC President, Dr. Marc Renaud.

Our challenge is to determine how best to coordinate and enhance our CBR strengths and to put in place the appropriate combination of centralized and decentralized organizational supports. We appreciate the experience and ideas that as participants in this workshop you can bring forward so that the UVic Task Force on CBR has the benefit of a wide range of views in formulating its report and recommendations.

Enjoy the day and thanks again for the commitment of time and interest that your participation represents.

Martin Taylor
Vice President, Research
I would like first to thank everyone for coming and to acknowledge that we are on the land of the Coast Salish and Straits Salish Peoples. There have been communities of people on this land creating and recreating knowledge for many thousands of years, before the concept of “research” was named.

Community-based research refers to research carried out by members of the community or by community organizations outside the walls of academia. It also refers to research done by community-members with university partners. Community-based research most often implies a partnership of university, community and sometimes other partners working on issues and topics which originate in the community. And while the term community-based research is of more recent usage in Canada, the practice of university and community partnerships for research and social change in Canada is a long one.

In the 1930s Father Jimmy Tompkins, the Director of University Extension at St. Francis Xavier University began to hear stories of poverty and exploitation from the fishing villages of Nova Scotia. Fishers of the day were living in poverty with a poor quality of life while the buyers in the fishing business were getting rich. Father Jimmy and later, his cousin Fr. Moses Coady linked local knowledge, community research, adult education and the establishment of credit unions with a movement that became known around the world as the Antigonish Movement. Similarly, if somewhat less well known, are experiments that took place in Alberta by the University of Alberta extension office, in Saskatchewan and the University of Saskatchewan, in Manitoba and at the University of Toronto.

In the 1970s, a second wave of community-based research sprang up as scholar-activists of the 1960s and 70s sought ways for their values to find consistency with their aspirations to create a better world. In Quebec, with support from the Trade Union movements, all the universities in Quebec established structures often called “Service aux Collectivities”. These multi-function structures served as brokers for organized community groups to approach the university for questions of joint research projects, access issues for women and so forth. In English-speaking Canada, the Participatory Research Project was founded in Toronto in 1976 by idealistic young researchers who had been influenced by the Antigonish movement, the ideas of Paulo Freire, research practices in Tanzania and India and elsewhere. They were organized officially outside of the university, but for the first 10 years had offices at the University of Toronto. The Participatory Research Project became part of a global network, the International Participatory Research Network which championed action and social change oriented community-based research for 20-25 years.

In Europe, the Science Shops emerged from similar instincts with science students and their engaged young professors wanting to see their science used in the service of the needs of the
communities within which they lived and worked. Beginning in the Dutch Universities, the science shops have not only survived as an exiting and viable model for university-community engagement, they have spread through many European countries and have a vibrant network called the Living Knowledge Network linking them one to another.

In the early 21st century there are community-based research initiatives at Trent University, University de Quebec a Montreal, University de Quebec á Trois Pistoles, Laval University, University of Winnipeg, University of Saskatchewan, University of British Columbia, University of Toronto and more. At the international level there are interesting models at the University of Brighton, University of Barcelona, University of Wisconsin, University of Alaska, Goldsmith’s College (University of London), Edinburgh University.

Community-based research is a part of a wider set of structures, which are designed to broaden university engagement with the community. At the University of Victoria we often speak of the “dynamic triangle of community-engagement” by which we mean community-based continuing education, community-based service-learning and community-based research. CBR is part of a process of democratizing knowledge production and a space for respectful sharing of research agendas and strategies. The role of research in university and community settings differs. There are different knowledge cultures in diverse community settings. An Office for Community-Based Research could ideally function as a space that serves to bridge the differences and enhance the opportunities for community-based and university-based researchers to combine resources in the interest of responding to social issues of the day in Victoria, the Capital Region District and Vancouver Island in particular. CRB seeks to validate multiple sources of knowledge, multiple methods of discovery and the application of knowledge to the solution of everyday problems.

We are seeking your ideas today about whether the establishment of a specific structure for community-based research would be welcome. We want to know what to be careful about. We would like ideas about some of the best ways to work together. We are seeking your support in the hope that we can open a new door at the University of Victoria to the needs of all of the peoples in the communities that we live and work in together.

Thank you again for coming and I look forward to hearing from each of you.
CBR AND ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

Summary of the Workshop on held on June 6, 2006

Dr. Kelly Bannister
on behalf of Dr. Lorna Williams (Professor, Faculty of Education)

A half-day workshop on CBR involving Aboriginal communities was held on June 6, 2006 as an initial conversation on how research partnerships can contribute to the goals of the Aboriginal communities. The workshop objective was to understand more fully the priorities, opportunities and concerns of Aboriginal faculty, staff, students and community members with expertise in educational and health research involving Aboriginal communities. The workshop was organized by UVic’s Task Force on CBR, under the guidance of Dr. Lorna Williams and with assistance from Mary McQueen and Ann Zurbrigg. The workshop received financial support from the Faculty of Education.

Fifteen participants attended the workshop, and several more sent regrets at not being able to attend. Participants had affiliations with UVic (as faculty and graduate students) and/or local Aboriginal community organisations. After an opening presentation by Dr. Budd Hall, the workshop used a circle discussion format, facilitated by Dr. Lorna Williams. Michelle Reid (LE,NONET Project) served as note-taker and prepared a summary of discussions.

A UVic structure to support CBR was proposed as a doorway into the university community - a “draw bridge around the mote of Ring Road” to create a more welcoming link for Aboriginal communities. Participants discussed the need for such a structure to extend to the whole university community, across all faculties in an integrated way; support the development of research capacity within Aboriginal communities; create a space for mutual university-community exchanges and sharing; and enable Aboriginal community epistemologies.

The need was discussed for direct involvement of Aboriginal people as partners with expertise to contribute rather than “subjects” of research to be exploited. A key element raised was the question of “who benefits?” It was pointed out that researchers need greater sensitivity and knowledge about Aboriginal communities before they can collaborate in meaningful, respectful and mutually beneficial ways. In particular, researchers need to develop “cultural competency” about Aboriginal worldviews and cultural protocols to minimize misunderstandings.

Participants discussed the need to recognize historical injustices to Aboriginal people and the extractive role that research has played in order to understand hesitation, fear or mistrust about research. Even the physical environment of the university can be intimidating and a barrier for Aboriginal involvement. A neutralized, safe “ethical space” where people can come together to learn about how to work together is needed, particularly to learn ways of being and methods of respecting Aboriginal ways of knowing in an academic setting. The creation of this space is part of a much larger need to transform the ways and structures of universities. Within this structure, there should be a place for all peoples and their knowledge to be valued equally - for the university to have real relationships with Aboriginal communities, and to break down the bureaucratic barriers standing in the way of the pursuit of true collaborative learning. This workshop was seen as an initial conversation only – more conversations that include more Aboriginal community people and Aboriginal organisations were seen as vital.
SUMMARY OF THE ONLINE SURVEY

Dr. Kelly Bannister

A web-based survey proved a successful tool to gather feedback from the campus and non-campus communities on CBR. Approximately 300 individuals were sent an invitation to participate in the survey. Approximately 110 responded within the 10-day period. The majority of respondents were affiliated with a college or university (73%) and many respondents indicated more than one affiliation. The remaining sectoral breakdown was: Non-profit organisation (30%), First Nations (6%), Funder (6%), Government (3%), Business (5%). Almost half of the survey respondents were able to attend this workshop as a means of follow-up and further engagement on developing institutional capacity and support for CBR.

There was a high level of interest in creating a voluntary CBR directory to facilitate communication and networking among university and community researchers and organizations. Over 80% of respondents indicated willingness to participate. Creation of this directory would be logically undertaken in collaboration with the new Knowledge Mobilization Unit, based in the Office of Research Services, headed by Dr. Joaquin Trapero.

Working understandings of “community” and “community-based research” were proposed in the survey for reaction and these were widely agreed as sufficient by the vast majority of respondents (65-75%). A number of useful comments, criticisms and considerations were also received, which should assist UVic in developing an integrated conceptual and theoretical foundation for strengthening and facilitating scholarly and applied CBR activities. Some examples are included to stimulate discussion in Breakout Session One of this workshop.

Ninety-four respondents shared their personal experiences with community-university research relationships, including a brief description of the project, what worked well and what did not. While the majority of respondents indicated an overall positive experience, some common challenges expressed were related to lack of acknowledgment in university reward criteria and by funders for the significant time, financial and energy investments in relationship building and in developing project outcomes that met community partner needs, lack of training for these necessary aspects of CBR, inflexibility in project financial management and in meeting timelines for deliverables, inadequate recognition of community contributions, loss of relationship and social capital investments in the “disengagement” (end of funding) phase leading to the need to start again/reinvent the wheel in re-building research relationships.

Support for creating a structure to facilitate CBR (also linked with knowledge mobilization activities) was very strong, albeit with some concerns about potential to increase bureaucracy. The idea of a combination of centralized and decentralized functions, a goal to facilitate communication, funding opportunities and reporting requirements, and the combination of virtual/physical/personal presence were all enthusiastically received.

Experiences and concerns with existing UVic policies on human research ethics, intellectual property ownership and faculty merit criteria were shared by 62 respondents (53%), clearly indicating that these policies will require careful review in light of any initiative undertaken to enhance CBR activities.
WORKING UNDERSTANDINGS OF “COMMUNITY” AND “CBR”

Summary of Breakout Session One

A written summary was distributed during the workshop with some examples of survey responses to the questions of “what is community?” and “what is community-based research?” Participants were asked to discuss their understandings in this interactive setting, for the purposes of:

(i) Further expanding their own understandings by learning about other perspectives, and
(ii) Attempting to come up with general consensus on working definitions of the terms.

Participants formed 6 breakout groups and notes were made for each group by volunteer recorders Rachel Forbes, Robin J. Hood, Amy Maass, Michelle Reid, Heather Tufts, and Kersten Wuthrich. The survey questions, response rates, sample responses and a synthesis of the breakout group discussions are presented below for both topics (i.e., community and CBR). Note that the summary of group discussions has been clustered under sub-themes, based on a retrospective assessment by the editors.
A. Understanding “community”

1. Survey Question on Community

Within this project, the term “community” is used broadly to refer to non-university communities of place, interest or circumstance. A community research partner could be from any sector of society (e.g., non-government organization, Aboriginal group, government department, small business, an informal group of individuals who consider themselves a community) but typically the term does not include industry.

Is this description consistent with your understanding of “community” within the context of CBR? Please explain.

2. Survey Response Rate on Community

YES 75/100
NOT QUITE 18/100 (mostly related to government or private sector)
NO 7/100

3. Survey Sample Responses on Community

YES - “I think that community are all of us, no matter what our origin are. Community are a group of people who share something in common.”

NO – “I would only include place-based community, or else the meaning becomes so fuzzy as to be lost. If you want to include interest-based groups, or people of shared circumstance, that is what I would call them. I would limit the meaning the meaning of community.”

NO - “I don't consider a government department, small business, or crown agency as part of "community" There needs to be a conceptual and analytical distinction made between the state, economic, market-based organizations, and organizations of civil society, although there might in reality be considerable linkages across these sectors.”

NOT QUITE - “A ‘partner in community research’ could include a government or corporate organization, but a ‘community partner’ would include neither government nor corporate organization (nor university). If ‘community research partner’ means the former, I would not include government agencies under that heading.”

NOT QUITE – “The description is not entirely consistent with my understanding of "community" since for me "community" could also include industry, as long as the research partnership between university and industry is not meant only to facilitate the development of a marketable product. For me community based research typically involves research that is done with, for, and on a community partner. If research is done 'on' something to do with a partner from industry, then that could be included under CBR.”
ADDITONAL CONSIDERATIONS – "Aboriginal group is too broad. There is a difference in how UVic will work with urban Aboriginal organizations and First Nations communities. Principles are the same but the approach will need to be different. Many Aboriginal organizations are conglomerates of education departments, counselors, Aboriginal service agencies and Aboriginal professionals working within NGO’s. Aboriginal groups tend to cut across government/community/department.”

4. Synthesis of Breakout Group Discussions on “understanding community”

a. How do we define community?
A community is an area, people, culture and family that collectively contain everything necessary for survival. It is not possible to say “community” is one thing; people within a community come and go and this dynamic flow needs to be embodied in any definition. Community has many components, with multiple power dynamics and relationships. It is useful as a term because it is very flexible, works with communities of place, of interest and others. Networks of place, family, and relationships are fundamental to people’s associations, and a sense of place is also fundamental. However, communities are social relationships so not just about location, but the term community has a much broader definition. It is therefore important to build sustainable networks that should be process-oriented. We are all part of the community so there is a need for a more holistic term that is more inclusive. It is important to avoid “them” and “us” definitions. Community is not a fishbowl.

The definition of ‘community’ can produce a dynamic of inclusion/exclusion. All sides should be open-minded and willing to redefine how they perceive “community.” It is essential to regard each individual’s knowledge as equally important, and to let people self-define in more than one way. Community intersects with government, NGO’s and civic society, and is made visible because of that interaction. It is also necessary to understand the thought process that informs individual definitions.

b. Who should be included in the definition of community?
Industry, business and government all need to be considered. Should industry, for example, be included in CBR? What is included in the definition of industry? Ultimately, because community is bottom-up, if industry can accept a bottom up point of view then they should be included. Business may not be a part of CBR but a business network perhaps could be. Ultimately, the nature of the partnership and the collaboration needs to be clear, and it is also important to acknowledge that community has a different relationship with government and industry.

Government’s relationship with community is not easy to determine, as the boundaries between state and civic society are blurred and interrelated. On the one hand, government could remain within the definition of community because it has a huge influence in provoking social change. For example, schools and hospitals, the responsibility of government, are an aspect of community. But how do we get the government to not just listen but to take action? There is also a divide between government and non-profit groups, and it is necessary to determine how we can work together. Civil society can be defined as groups of citizens, cooperatives, and citizens engaged in collective action to improve society. All research, therefore, needs to include government at the table.
Finally, how does academia fit into the community? Do all members in the group have the same working definition for social research? Academia is inherently hierarchical and power based. There is a dilemma that can occur when creating partnerships between the university and non-profit organizations, and it is necessary to consider certain questions when assessing academia’s role in CBR. What is the role of each? Is UVic a funder, a partner or both? And, how is the power dynamic distributed? We have to shift power dynamics so that researchers are working for non-profit organizations and doing research with community organizations, not on them. Research questions can often be too personal, leading to potential tensions between the university and community. Communities are passionate about their issues, and so research is more effective when truly community-based. Right now, UVic researchers conduct research in community-based projects that he or she feels are important. Communities, however, have different timeframes and timelines than what is expected by UVic, and community goals need to be examined when making research decisions. One way to strengthen the relationship between academia and community is to examine UVic’s history of CBR.

Communities may also conduct research on their own, without university involvement. It may be important to rework the definition of CBR, or to add “or by communities on their own” to ensure that this distinction is acknowledged. Self-determination is key: communities’ own actions and terms should be used to understand projects. These questions, too, such as ‘What is community’ and ‘what is CBR,’ must be generated by the community.
B. Understanding Community-Based Research

1. Survey Question on CBR

The term “community-based research” has been variously defined. In a broad sense, CBR can include a spectrum of research that actively engages community members or groups to various degrees, ranging from community participation to community initiation and control of research. As part of this project, we hope to elaborate a working definition that meets the needs of UVic researchers and their community partners who self-identify their work as “community-based research”.

Strand et al. (2003: 6) propose the three central features of CBR are as follows:
1. CBR is a collaborative enterprise between academic researchers (professors and students) and community members.
2. CBR seeks to democratize knowledge by validating multiple sources of knowledge and promoting the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination.
3. CBR has as its goal social action for the purpose of achieving social change and social justice.

Does this definition adequately describe your understanding of and approach to CBR?

2. Survey Response on CBR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Not Quite</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Sample Responses on CBR

YES – “I am very relieved to see a commitment to social change and social justice is central to the definition.”

NOT QUITE - “Although most CBR projects may have social action as their goal, the creation of new knowledge together in the sense of curiosity-driven research should not be excluded from CBR.”

NOT QUITE - The description uses value-laden and ideological language (“democratize”; social justice”) when it is not necessary… the goal of CBR is that all partners learn. I think you can have effective CBR which has as its objective shared learning, without the expectation that learning will necessarily lead to social change. It may lead to behavioural changes, organizational change, or economic change.

---

NO - It is university-centric. ...most of the new knowledge in the world is created outside of universities and research institutes by persons engaged in activities in their communities and workplaces.

NO – “This definition does not allow for research undertaken solely at the community level without a university partner.”

NO – ‘I do NOT think CBR should be confined to the goal in (3), except in the very broadest sense that all knowledge should do this. The danger of advocacy, which would destroy the status of an academic researcher as 'honest broker' would do damage both to the university and to the community involved by being vulnerable to the accusation of special pleading. This serves neither party.”

4. Synthesis of Breakout Group Discussions on “understanding CBR”

a. How do we define CBR?
CBR is a good catalyst for social change. Key elements of CBR are trust-building, engagement, knowledge-sharing, the valuation of community input, and research-focused discussion. Because partnerships mobilize research, there is a need to acknowledge working relationships between university and community and a real need for collaboration between the two. Perhaps the real question here is, how diverse can a definition of CBR be?

CBR involves 3 parts:
- A collaborative partnership approach that can involve industry partners
- A methodological aspect around PAR that engages and empowers
- Community as defined by civic society. Civil society has another domain, the 'p' for small political and policy. It generates learning through practice and then needs scaled-up knowledge to change policy for social change and social justice.

The role of community is distinct, a part of civic society. CBR could have a similar structure to the Innovation Development Center (IDC) at UVic, and partnerships are fundamental:
- Partnerships and power are disembodied. With industry, it depends on the resource community you are in but there are always structured power relationships. If I want to partner with industry or academia, to what degree do I lose autonomy over my self-defined community?
- We need inclusivity but also to prevent money and positional power to dictate the on-the-ground action/results/processes (which tends to happen with industry dollars).
- By talking about community-university partnerships, we are setting ourselves up for an us-them mentality. We are really talking about intra-community partnerships and equal power bases. We do not want to set up unequal power and resource relationships.
- Intra-community partnerships, university as one of constituent interest groups

In the CBR process, it is sometimes difficult to determine who starts relationship-building. Sometimes the community does not know where to take its questions. The academy also has questions, and does not always know how to make links. Academics may see a logical connection to the academy, but the point of entry is very difficult. There needs to be a
connection from the inside in order to collaboratively build the package. Therefore, successful CBR requires collaboration, networking, personal skills, and the valuation of other ideas.

A challenge of CBR is how to keep the research in the community. If it needs to be supported by outside funding, how do we ensure that the research is not conducted and then abandoned? Follow-up is crucial in community-based research. However, researchers have a tendency to set up relationships and then leave. The drive, therefore, needs to come from universities to maintain the relationship process because otherwise the incentive to do follow-ups or reviews is lacking. The volunteer sector is over-burdened and under-capacity.

Another key issue is funding. How do we determine who will be allotted funding? Will smaller groups be able to have equal access to funds? What principles need to be put into place for initial set up and to demonstrate a solid partnership? A university-based procedure will have to be implemented if we are going to get research grants. If this is the case, how do you really engage both groups with equal resources while allowing them to actively maintain self-identity? One possible solution could be respectful compensation. Researchers that work for community based projects do go into the field like the academics but do not have resources to conduct thorough analysis or to access publications like university researchers do. Time is a huge factor in limiting proper research. Do researchers know how or what to do with research results?

There are many questions that still need to be answered. For example, how does service-learning differ from social action? How do we engage with community? The definition of ‘social change’ also needs clarification and accountability, and there is concern regarding what CBR has to do with or needs (if anything) from the university. Academic self-funded research, which may be too individualistic, opposes research questions that come “from the ground” (i.e., civil society). There is a false notion of “objectivity” maintained by university researchers. Successes, on the other hand, stem from people in the community having control in research, as well as the inclusion of sensitivity and expertise in researchers’ skill sets. In order to prevent exclusivity and become more useful, research with the community needs to become a two way street.

b. Who does CBR exist for?
A lot of people, particularly marginalized people, question the presence of a researcher in their life. They do not want to be researched and do not trust researchers, especially because they do not feel the researchers are doing anything for them and are not part of their community.

Some people are uncomfortable with strictly defining community-based research. CBR could be defined as community-based action research, which is an important distinction to make. A distinction should also be made between social change and social justice, since social change can be a broader term. Community agencies need to restructure or reposition themselves to do social justice work. We should note that, ‘best practices’ terminology is no longer popular: preferred alternatives are ‘best options’, or ‘possible practices.’

Research needs to come down to the level of the community and actually serve, and be in the hands of the people who are being researched; they ought to have a say in the direction of it. The University ought to try being in the instrumental position, not the director of, or even the equal, to the community's purpose. It is important to maintain an open mind, and ask the
question: What does CBR mean to me? There can be a tendency in research to stay within the confines of ‘what and who you know’. More opportunities are needed to develop CBR.

What happened to heart, and to soul? Some First Nations people think research is too much in the head. If heart and soul are missing, the research will go nowhere. There needs to be a trust relationship before there can be a partnership in research.

c. What are the most important functions and activities of a UVic initiative?
Interdisciplinary aspects are essential to effective CBR initiatives. UVic not only has important resources that community groups need access to, but CBR needs support of other faculty and students, as well. The university has the capacity to help fuel the outcomes that can create healthy communities. There is room for change with regard to applied versus non-applied research. Finally, we must find a way to give legitimacy to grass roots work that may be under the radar of UVic.

d. Influence of funders
Does the mandate imposed by funders influence how researchers design methodologies and choose samples? Do funding parameters restrict researchers from looking critically at their project? Should university practica pay for field research?

One problem with using consultants is that they are usually affiliated with a specific organization and thus may carry a certain agenda in order to fulfill or create a research proposal. Difficulties can also occur between funding providers and CBR. Funding for non-profits is also important because most non-profits do not get money from government grants or programs. Non-profits generally do not have researchers available to conduct research so they must go through consultants. There is a need to have funds that get people out and researching about general issues and who have no ties to an organization.

e. How to make links between community and academia without institutionalizing CBR?
The academy needs to recognize and embrace different types of knowledge. An academic background is not sufficient preparation for CBR and therefore people struggle once they enter the field. The policies and values of UVic can be replete with power games (old value system) whereas a social movement needs ownership and engagement. Communication between the university and the community needs to change; all the structures in place at the university simply get in the way and create a disconnect between the two. Researchers also need to be aware that they destroy trust with certain groups every time they research that group for their own purposes. People resist research because they are reluctant to be subjects or tools. Research, therefore, must have a purpose for the community; it cannot just be academic pursuit for the sake of itself. There is a need to work from the academic end of things to include/count/validate community-based research.

f. How do we communicate information in CBR?
Ethics and security issues are important in any research project. Who, for example, are the peers in a peer review? Are there common values that ensure reviews are viable? What about common goals? Methods of evaluation limit ways to gather data, so training programs should be installed to train researchers how to convey information once they have collected and analyzed it. Vested interests need to be put on the table openly, whether it is to get elected, have a publication peer reviewed, or to affect change. Also, it is necessary to acknowledge and respect everyone’s underlying goals and motivations.
g. Who or what else should be involved in these discussions?
An issue raised by many people during the morning introductory remarks was the importance or creating an “enabling space”. Voluntary open databases are very good at mitigating barriers and time delays for academics accessing community, and community getting in touch with academics. Literacy issues for citizens, especially seniors, also need to be taken into account. Co-operative is not an inclusive enough term, and it should be questioned in terms of CBR. Experiences such as school placements and internships can be community focused, and continuing studies also has practical engagement beyond course work.

So much knowledge and so much synergy can happen if you have awareness!
Summary of Breakout Session Two (6 themes)

In the second part of the workshop, participants again formed 6 breakout groups based on their choice of one of the following sub-themes:

- Community-University Collaboration: Partnerships and best practices
- Linking Local to Global CBR: Networks and networking
- Knowledge Mobilization: Exploring services and opportunities at UVic
- Enabling and Disabling Spaces: CBR involving Aboriginal communities
- CBR Rights and Responsibilities: Research ethics and intellectual property policies
- Supporting Students in Community-based research and learning

Designated resource people facilitated each breakout group and notes were made for each group by the 6 volunteer recorders. Summaries and key points for each session are included below.

A. Community-University Collaboration: Partnerships and best practices

Resource Person: Maeve Lydon
Recorder: Kersten Wuthrich

1. Key Points
   Priorities should be
   - Funds
   - Facilitating relationships
   - Enabling spaces
   - Training
   - Understanding role of other/ increase of dialogue

2. Comments
   Can we redefine research? It has negative connotations outside of academy, and so we must establish a social connection between university and CBR. The two groups have the same common goals, and so we need to collaborate and come up with commonalities, mobilizing not just theories but also practices and actively try to see overlapping among goals.

   Learning about the process of research can help us develop an extended community. How can research help in a practical way? We need a place for community voice, which means understanding the ideas of both researchers and community. The tools used for relationship building also need to be addressed. How do we mobilize this initiative? How do we deal or control sensitive information? Do we have to re-invent the wheel? Is the university adaptable to this change? There is a need for a more decision-based structure.

   Community is our client. They should direct projects, contributing what they need and want to see happen. “Relationship”, therefore is key, as is redefining power relationships between groups. The agendas of researchers may not include those of communities, and so we must suggest different ways to think about this. Also, in conducting research, someone with a
personal connection to the person who needs the research done usually conducts it. How do we change this? Should we institutionalize CBR? How do we not bureaucratise it?

What is the university interested in? Will the interests of the university drive divisions between those who fall into categories and those that do not? Clients could be an attractive idea to universities because it creates economic initiatives. Enabling space is another key component to connecting CBR with the university. How do we combine the two together?

Informal networks allow people to meet up and share knowledge. Non-profits need help with research funding because it is difficult for them to access these funds. Furthermore, the community needs to be able to find researchers and researchers to find clients and understand what they want. Developing a personal relationship within research, however, takes time. Often even finding a researcher who is conducting research in your particular field of interest is difficult. Networks need to be established where individuals can find out what graduate students are studying or professors are researching and be able to contact them. Programs also need to be made accessible, and so we have to make sure individual goals are known and explicit.

B. Linking Local to Global CBR: Networks and networking

Resource Person: Budd Hall
Recorder: Heather Tufts

1. Key Points
   • Networking leads to capacity-building and creates greater opportunities
   • Education needs a broader definition.
   • Research partners “social economy” with global networks.

2. How do we form effective networks?
To enlarge our capacity of global networks, we need advice and ideas. How do we best support UVic in getting involved with global networks in a long term, sustained manner? Learners’ potential can be developed through networks. Community development with co-operative programs, therefore, leads to more opportunities and experiences.

We are part of national/international network to co-create knowledge. There is an interest in strengthening the relationship between UVic and civil society, and in facilitating connections (for example, with Indigenous communities). Support services are also needed for research in community mapping, fair trade projects and local and global cooperatives, such as 10,000 Villages and recycling programs in Brazil. Ideas, however, are connected to funding.

Who are the teachers and who are the learners? The status quo is restrictive, and there is a need for a community model with an analysis of what community is and what it means to learn. Educator and parent connections with the ‘real world’ need a greater focus on local areas. Teachers and students must broaden their definitions and become more holistic. What are we missing?

Solution-orientated programs through international networks are beneficial, such as networking with international human rights organizations, local poverty issues and popular education.
Local NGO work regarding the community and environment should use local materials in a culturally acceptable manner. National associations regarding community development have many social and economic opportunities, including peer learning and policy development. Action plans can be developed though collaboration with local and international organizations.

3. Suggestions:
The World Peace Forum is a good model to examine, encompassing a variety of themes, which evoke passion in its participants and relate to passionate areas of work. Forums are useful in expanding networks, exchanging ideas and encouraging youth participation. Agendas must be set by needs, with mutual global learning. A central office is also essential to facilitate networks so people can access groups and organizations. Networks also need tools like mapping of issues. Evolve the network through passion and diversity.

There are two important factors for successful networks: engaging members of the network in practical ways around their passion, and social justice in the community. Ways to implement these factors are:

- Creating assets that have an impact on peoples’ lives
- Linking learners (regional peer learning)
- Publishing stories about what is being done or what needs to be done

UVic’s role could be focused on helping to resource and provide some expertise. Students also need to work with civil society networks to be “community-based scholars.” Academics, teachers and students should work together to support each other and to change curriculums, so that networks are working together as one.

C. Knowledge Mobilization: Exploring services and opportunities at UVic

Resource Person: Joaquin Trapero
Recorder: Rachel Forbes

1. Key Points
- Knowledge brokering by creating new knowledge/working on existing knowledge.
- Creating an infrastructure to facilitate – what does that look like, act like; who is involved in the design.
- Be up front about individual goals and motivations.
- Be explicit about abilities, inherent limitations, roles and expectations.
- Accessibility of information, making knowledge practical and applicable.
- Identify needs of university and of community.
- Identify skills, abilities
- Create synergies

2. Description of UVic’s Knowledge Mobilization Unit
The main idea behind the Knowledge Mobilization Unit is to create an institutional mechanism to get results from university to community and vice versa. Within the project, we acknowledge that knowledge is produced on both sides, through knowledge users and creators. At some point, part of the project is related to the CBR initiative, but not everything within it is CBR. The work is sometimes as a knowledge broker: to be independent of both research and community, and try to understand our capacity at the university and to identify the needs and initiatives that
can be matched to create a space where we can build a partnership. The knowledge mobilization project began three months ago and we cannot proceed too quickly, because trust-building is such a fundamental component of the project. To be sure, the results are useful, we need to systematically identify needs, groups, build partnerships, create new knowledge or work on existing knowledge.

3. Comments
There is a potential to raise the capacity of the whole community. However, whereas there is an interest in packaging knowledge so that people who need it can use it, literacy is a huge barrier. CBR bridges the gap between the ivory tower and the ground. This knowledge mobilization project has the powerful role of taking university’s knowledge and repackaging it to be more accessible. How can we best share knowledge more generally and accessibly? How can we sustain knowledge over time?

Good things going on seem to be result of individuals and groups, and it would be best for the institution to take this on so it becomes a feature of what the university has to offer. Many continuing studies programs are very practical, involving links back to the community and applied practice. This is not research, but it is a powerful way of making content meaningful. A helpful metaphor for this approach is to see the community and university on two parallel tracks; CBR is striving to have them converge.

Non-profits do not have the time or money to search through the various people on campus to find the right researcher, assuming that person even exists. ‘Knowledge brokers’ can help facilitate this initial common ground searching. And what about community-to-community connections, with non-profit and for-profit groups?

Applying mapping principles to research connections, and the lack thereof (gap analysis), would be interesting for the university; from a non profit point of view, this is not practical because of a limitation in resources, but it is still appropriate as an internal analysis.

Part of this project will be a database that asks all researchers for their focus. It differs from existing research databases by being project-based, rather than encompassing general areas of research expertise. Involving end-users in the database design to ensure it is functional is key, and in order to do this we need infrastructure in place, which is a priority for UVic communications. What about a community connections office (through UVic communications)? And what about staff at university and their knowledge and skills, will it also be databased?

If this Knowledge Mobilization Unit is based in CBR, what are the needs of the community? The first bit of research should be identifying needs. Also, how do we ‘twist’, if necessary, those needs into ‘research’ that the university can translate into funding. There should be a database of needs as well.

University has to learn from community, and community has to learn what university is good for. This day is delivering a message to the community that ‘we want to play in a more structured way, across the board.’ Research is a vehicle, and the will of individual people to engage is essential, as is the knowledge of personal and professional limitations.

Do not raise expectations too much because the longevity of money at the university is often limited. Be clear about limitations and abilities. Students, graduate and undergraduate, are
also a resource. They do not always have to be paid, graduates often come with their own money. Community does not always understand that money going into research can benefit them.

D. Enabling and Disabling Spaces: CBR involving Aboriginal communities

Resource Person: Lorna Williams
Recorder: Michelle Reid

1. Key Points
   • Academic, spiritual and communal partnerships are necessary between universities and Aboriginal peoples.
   • It is important for researchers to know the community's expectations and work with them.
   • In all stages of research, people need to have an understanding of Aboriginal worldview.
   • Before we discuss the word "research" there is much work to be done, because construction of the research world is often alien to Aboriginal peoples, and historically has been a destructive force.

2. Comments
   People working within the communities need support and reinforcement within their programs; academics working with a community need to access the information relevant to that community, and they cannot do that with no people of the community actually involved. We must think of the endeavour as a two-way process, with both sides learning from the other and working together to share knowledge, discuss and converse.

   Understanding is necessary for collaborative work to be able to be put into practice. Researchers must know protocols and information about working with an Aboriginal community; there needs to be enough funding or capacity for them to spend time in the community prior to starting the research, so that they are informed and connected enough to be able to truly benefit the community. There also needs to be an understanding of the destruction that research has done, in order to see that there can be a way that research can be done respectfully in Aboriginal communities.

   There is a need to have really good, respectful, meaningful knowledge that can be shared from the Aboriginal community, but it cannot be shared unless there is a real dialogue first about how that sharing will happen. The university also needs to change its relationship with the land around it; universities are placeless institutions, building over others. They must acknowledge the place where they are and then their cultural identity will change in a way that allows them to connect to communities. Aboriginal knowledge must be seen as equal and valid in the university setting; if it is considered inferior by the researcher, there can be no meaningful exchange.
E. Rights and Responsibilities: Ethics and intellectual property policies

Resource Person: Kelly Bannister
Recorder: Amy Maas

1. Key Points

- Researchers are accountable to institutions, funders and communities.
- There is a lack of time and enabling space to understand each other, build relationships and develop mechanisms to protect and share rights and benefits.
- Need an appropriate language to communication between/among research partners and to use in reporting to funders/institutions.
- Need a mindset shift at individual and institutional levels, as well as shifts in policy and practices.

Issues of ethics and knowledge mobilization should arise at the beginning of research but sometimes arise at the end, especially if things did not go well. There is a need to unpack the issues. But we don’t have the language – we go away from the table and one group thinks they heard one thing while another group thinks they heard something else. Some key questions are who owns the data and how do we negotiate this? Also, who has access to the data?

Knowledge translation is a buzz word but what is it really? Metaphors and language are missing for disseminating the kind of knowledge that is created and ways that knowledge moves. Support and structures are not in place at the university. A guiding structure – a “resources centre” - is needed.

What kind of knowledge can or should linguists create? What kind of research can we do in a post-colonial process? Many Aboriginal people feel an understandable resistance towards how information is valued. A lack of time and enabling space to understand each others’ contexts contributes to this resistance and miscommunication. Our training as academics hasn’t been in this area. What information or answers are needed by society now? There is need to recognise and respect the co-creation process between all those involved. A transformative change, creating a physical space and sense of sustainability for the project and for prospective partners is essential.

We are pressed into quick responses and reactions to funding windows – research ethics takes so long! The university draws more time and energy than most can afford. Bureaucratic processes can be disrespectful of both communities and of researchers.

What counts as knowledge deliverables? Satisfying needs of Granting Councils and needs of community may be incompatible. This is frustrating to university researchers as they are accountable to both.

Some Granting Councils give little physical space on their forms to report on any research outcomes, and forms for reporting especially do not encourage CBR. Funders need to be pushed so they evolve, e.g., communities give tremendous in-kind support not through dollars, but through knowledge, culture and expertise that should valued more heavily; funders are starting to accept in kind contributions. There is still an individual mindset applied to
collaborative grants. The roles of individual and collaborative grants are very different. We are developing a process for communicating, e.g., developing MOUs, etc. We have to report on this process and highlight its importance, but we aren’t trained in this way. Where and how do we report in a place and way that is respectful?

How do we build a structure to get outcomes out to meet multiple and diverse requirements? This is fraught with complexity. Creating enabling space for relationships is essential, but not seen as a priority. Without this as a foundation, whatever we build will crumble. Investments in research relationships can repeatedly be lost, and therefore we need to focus on cross-disciplinary relationship building.

A lot of CBR happens off the side of the desk in communities so it is hard to give time for partnerships. Differences exist in university and non-campus communities. We need to build understanding. We need time and space to understand where each other is coming from. We need to listen to each other, and we need time and space to do this. We need to build a foundation for research relationships, not just projects and activities, otherwise it will all crumble later. We want and need to listen part way through – not just at the end of a project. We are vested in relationships. How do we honor whole individuals? We have lives outside of research/work.

A sense of sustainability is needed around projects, investments (of time, energy, resources), and funding, otherwise CBR seems futile as researchers just keep coming, taking what they want, and going. Then the research ends. We need to build capacity around creating an ongoing and enabling space – physical and virtual, including time and energy.

We all have to admit that we are in an experiment – a transformative learning process for funders, institutions, individuals.

F. Supporting Students in Community-based Research and Learning

Resource persons: Peter Keller and Bruce Wallace
Note taker: Robin Hood

1. Key Points
   - Some see CBR as central for undergraduate researchers.
   - There is interest in research as a tool for teaching.
   - There is also a need to evaluate and to support the needs of students, and for ongoing support and coordination.

2. Comments
   The integration of research and teaching is in its infancy, but is a great opportunity for the many kinds of learning. The issue is broad and needs institutional support, including interdisciplinary space and programs. Besides the need to create more space and more courses, however, there is also the need to give up some things. CBR needs a home, to be well defined, and students need clear supervision, with ad hoc programs all brought together.
Agencies fund innovation but the university does not support it, and so work is dependent on soft grants. Finding funding for students and student support, therefore, may be a good early entry point. For example, the Geography department has a fund for student research. It is important to get real money for research assistants, such as through co-operative education terms. One route is to get endowments to support CBR and student research assistants. The LE,NONET Project, too, is a good model for examining various supports in place for First Nations students.

There have been student courses on community research but these face many challenges: students often have little connection to the issues and are given limited time to do the work that communities need. We are interested in student orientation regarding CBR and questions of ethics. How can support for this type of research be sustained? Everyone is interested in supporting this, and requests from the community are always high, but so far there is no way to sustain support for this type of research or its coordination. There is a big gap here, although perhaps through a type of coordination there could be ongoing support to communities. Continuing Studies is also developing a certificate on service learning.
WRAP-UP

Dr. Peter Keller
Professor, Department of Geography and Dean, Social Sciences

My impression of this workshop can be summed up in three words: brilliant, humble, awe. I want to express my thanks to everyone.

This moment in time is part of a journey. Each individual in this room is on a journey. Today is like meeting in the alpine hut. We meet and we say to one another “Here’s my story” and “Do you want to travel together?”

What I heard today was a message of duality. On the one hand, I heard enthusiasm, endorsement, positive energy. On the other had I heard confusion, concern, caution. The most important part of the message, however, is legitimacy – legitimacy of the journey we are all on. We need to acknowledge the grass roots – that this is not a new journey, but one that many people have already been traveling on a long time. For some there is relief, that finally their efforts are being recognized. We have hope, that this journey can become sustainable – the water, fertilizer to establish strong plants from the seeds sown.

There is also concern – about bureaucracy, structure, need for “definition”, another initiative to drain resources to feed itself, and are we just repeating mistakes?

Be assured that both messages are being heard today.

Twenty years ago, we could have imagined building an industrial development centre, now the Innovation and Development Corporation (IDC). Today we can imagine a community development centre. I want to return to the questions Budd raised at the onset of this workshop:

- Do you have advice, concerns, suggestions, support for a structure to facilitate CBR?
- What are the most important functions/activities of a UVic initiative?
- Who else should be involved at these discussions?
- Are you interested in getting involved in planning CUExpo 2008?

Where do we go from here? We move forward in our journey, celebrating diversity. There is a vision of moving towards an IDC structure with a mission for knowledge mobilization. But it is important to have form before function so we need an emphasis on process before definition.

We hope that what is created will be enabling and enduring, and give recognition to the people involved in the journey so that people can be recognized and overcome fears of exclusion and barriers.

And what to do about the “moat”? A drawbridge has been proposed, but it must be a two-way bridge. We need creation of a two-way street through which knowledge can flow freely, and we can engage and share our visions with one another. I suggest we just fill the moat in and create a new path to journey together!
PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

Rachel Forbes (UVic grad student)
Rachel indicated that students often want to contribute but don’t know how. She is interested in assisting with the initiative and making it more accessible to students.

Marie Cooper (Saanich Elder and Educator, member of Saanich Indian School Board)
Indicated that she was pleased to be part of this gathering and was excited to have people all disciplines together in one place discussing how to work together. The university is a difficult place to navigate from the outside. Bringing people together in one place to work together like this is needed.
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