

## **Appendix 1**

### URB Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities Task Force Working Group 1 Summary Report and Attachments

---

#### **Contents:**

1. The External Context - Interim Report Updates
2. New Analysis
  - a. Engagement/Knowledge Mobilization/Communications/Advocacy

**Attachment** - URB SSAH Task Force, Working Group 1 Draft Report; The Ways in Which External Funding Agencies Are Pursuing Communication and Advocacy Strategies – Prepared by: Cathy Benedict (Faculty of Music) and Joshua Lambier (Faculty of Arts)

Working group's initial remit:

How do external entities, including funding agencies and professional organizations, define leading edge scholarly activity in social sciences, arts, and humanities disciplines?

- a. What are their priorities now?
- b. Where are they going in the next five years?

#### **1 The External Context - Interim Report Updates**

Federal Budget - The most important development since the interim report was presented to the URB was the Federal Budget, released on March 22, 2016 (<http://www.budget.gc.ca/2016/docs/plan/toc-tdm-en.html>). It included \$95M in new funds for the Tri-Councils: \$30M each to CIHR and NSERC, \$16M to SSHRC and \$19 million for the Research Support Fund (to support the indirect costs) (some additional funds were promised in the last budget so the reporting of numbers in different sources is quite variable). Of particular importance is that these funds were not targeted, leaving it up to the individual councils to decide how to spend the funds. The budget supported a variety of other programs targeting student support and STEM research, including Genome Canada, industry partnerships, the Perimeter Institute, etc. In addition, the budget included \$2 billion over three years, starting in 2016–17, for a new Post-Secondary Institutions Strategic Investment Fund, for 50% of eligible funds for research infrastructure (see <http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/051.nsf/eng/home>). Finally, the budget included new funds for the Mitacs Globalink program, which some SSAH researchers can access. With the reintroduction of the long form census and other measures, it is clear that this government has a very different approach to research both in the sciences and SSAH disciplines than pertained under the Conservatives.

SSHRC – The main update for SSHRC is how it instructed committees to handle budgets in the most recent round of Insight Grants. The committees were instructed to be more stringent in terms of their scrutiny of budgets, which is quite different from the last several years when budgets were generally not touched. This has led to an increase in success rate (from 24% last year to 31% this year). SSHRC also moved away from the old 4A system to giving individual grants sextile rankings. It will be interesting to see how universities respond to this in terms of the 4A reapplication programs that almost every institution (including Western) has had.

SSHRC has also made a firm commitment to support policy research that will address the recommendations in the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission:

[http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au\\_sujet/president/index-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/president/index-eng.aspx) .

NSERC – On April 21, 2016, NSERC announced that it was undertaking a review of Discovery Funding allocation ([http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Media-Media/ProgramNewsDetails-NouvellesDesProgrammesDetails\\_eng.asp?ID=832](http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Media-Media/ProgramNewsDetails-NouvellesDesProgrammesDetails_eng.asp?ID=832)) . The committee in charge of this review will, among other things, help to decide how future budget increases are to be allocated. Professor Dean, Dean of Western’s Faculty of Science is on the Advisory Committee ([http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/doc/Professors-Professeurs/MembershipAdvisoryCommittee\\_e.pdf](http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/doc/Professors-Professeurs/MembershipAdvisoryCommittee_e.pdf)) .

CIHR – Like SSHRC, CIHR made a commitment to support Indigenous Health Research (<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/49620.html>). It is not clear if this commitment is related to the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation report.

NCE – The NCE evaluations team shared with us the information that 20% of researchers in the networks reported being from SSAH disciplines, with 65% from natural sciences and engineering and 31% from the health sciences (multiple responses were permitted).

The NCE recently announced the 2017 International Knowledge Translation Platforms (NCE-IKTP) competition ([http://www.nce-rce.gc.ca/Competitions-Competitions/Current-EnVigueur/NCEIKTP-SITCRCE-2017/Index\\_eng.asp](http://www.nce-rce.gc.ca/Competitions-Competitions/Current-EnVigueur/NCEIKTP-SITCRCE-2017/Index_eng.asp)) . The competition funds networking and administration costs associated with knowledge translation and commercialization, but not research activities, students or stipends.

In March, MITACS (which started as an NCE) and the University of Waterloo partnered to bring together grad and post doc students in philosophy to “solve hands-on innovation challenges using philosophical approaches in collaboration with local partners.”

<http://www.mitacs.ca/en/newsroom/news-release/philosophy-researchers-address-ethical-and-social-challenges-through-industry> . MITACS tends to be STEM oriented, but they are interested to support projects from the SSAH disciplines, as this project demonstrates.

Canada Council for the Arts – The emphasis on culture and the arts that was outlined in the federal budget included \$550M over the next five years for the Canada Council. These funds will allow the Canada Council to open “a new chapter on the artistic and cultural history of this country” (<http://canadacouncil.ca/council/blog/2016/03/budget16-canadacouncil>) .

Ontario’s Culture Strategy – This program was not mentioned in the interim report, but bears watching closely (see <https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontarios-culture-strategy>). This is an effort by the Province to “set a vision for arts and culture, define priorities and guide support for the sector in the years to come”. The strategy is still being developed and they are seeking input (see the web site).

## **2 New Analysis - Engagement/Knowledge Mobilization/Communications/Advocacy**

A new research paradigm is emerging in the granting councils and many Universities’ strategic plans: the “engaged research” paradigm. The key component of this new paradigm is the fact that an increasing body of scholarship now no longer operates as a unidirectional transfer of knowledge from the academy to recipient knowledge users. Rather, knowledge users are engaged right from the beginning in a bidirectional (or multidirectional) exchange in order to define research questions, lay out research programs and to ensure the adequate and targeted mobilization of knowledge that arises from the research. The research is therefore inherently collaborative, engaging communities, the public, patients, industry etc. The nature of the engagement will necessarily vary depending on the nature of the partnership.

Engagement at the Tri-Councils is expressed in a variety of ways. SSHRC talks about “community engagement” (<http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/society-societe/community-communitie/index-eng.aspx>), CIHR uses the terms “citizen engagement” (<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/41592.html>) and “patient engagement” (<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/45851.html>) and the Canada Council uses the term “public engagement” (<http://canadacouncil.ca/council/news-room/news/2014/simon-brault-apm>) (NSERC’s concept of “community engagement” appears to refer to the community of researchers rather than external partners; see [http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/NSERC-CRSNG/Reports-Rapports/Visits-Visites\\_eng.asp](http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/NSERC-CRSNG/Reports-Rapports/Visits-Visites_eng.asp)). Engaged research is happening in all faculties at Western, but community based research is commonly found within the SSAH disciplines, including, to name only a few, projects that are Aboriginal, archaeological, geographic, educational, sociocultural anthropological, migration and ethnic relations, and transitional justice in nature.

While engaged research is a new and emerging paradigm that is being enthusiastically embraced by the Federal granting councils (and many other granting agencies), it must be noted that not all academic research can be accommodated within this model. However, the increasing emphasis on knowledge mobilization at all granting councils means that researchers in all disciplines must be more attentive to their audience.

### 2.1 Western’s Position on Knowledge Mobilization and Engaged Research

Western’s most recent strategic plan: *Achieving Excellence on the World Stage* ([http://president.uwo.ca/strategic\\_planning/index.html](http://president.uwo.ca/strategic_planning/index.html)), lists 4 fundamental strategic priorities, one of which is: *Raising Our Expectations: Create a world-class research and scholarship culture*. Within this strategic priority is a goal to: *Partner with other institutions and communities*. This text does not use the rhetoric of “engaged” research, but its intent could be

consistent with the engagement paradigm, particularly the quote that “We must identify and pursue more opportunities to advance and apply knowledge in partnership with the private sector, non-profit sector, and specific communities within the broader public (e.g., Aboriginal and immigrant communities).”

[http://president.uwo.ca/strategic\\_planning/priorities/expectations.html](http://president.uwo.ca/strategic_planning/priorities/expectations.html)

The strategic plan notes that Western will support this core priority by “*focusing more attention and resources promoting and rewarding (1) excellence in scholarship and innovation; (2) knowledge creation; and (3) the translation and mobilization of that knowledge into languages and applications useful in the public realm.*” This statement does emphasize knowledge mobilization, but it does not use the rhetoric of engagement and it does not recognize the bidirectional flow of knowledge or the act and process of collaboration and co-creation.

## 2.2 Impediments to the Implementation and Recognition of Engaged Research – Case Study

However, it is clear that there are some fundamental structural impediments to the goal of engaging with other institutions and communities. An examination of Aboriginal research can serve as a case study of some of the most important of these issues. The Tri-Councils’ strategic focus on Aboriginal research (discussed in the interim report and above) presents both an opportunity and a challenge to SSAH researchers at Western. The opportunity arises from Western’s current efforts to develop an Indigenous Strategic Plan and the strong research base in this area that exists within the University. The challenges include:

- the community engaged nature of Aboriginal research, meaning that such research projects often cannot be developed and executed within the term of a single grant
- an increasing number of Indigenous communities in Canada have research protocols that researchers must agree to in order to move ahead with the project. These contracts specify what is important for the community, and this might not cohere with what is seen as important by the university, making Indigenous research a challenging venture for university based researchers. In other words, the researchers must be accountable to two groups, each of which has their own standards and priorities.
- the outcomes of Aboriginal research do not necessarily fit university definitions of “leading edge” research. This particularly applies to outputs such as mandated reports, the need for enhanced relationships with government and/or service organizations, the development and dissemination of plain language texts that need to be completed for Aboriginal organizations/groups and social media projects. These are usually done “in addition to” journal publications and do not merit serious consideration on the Annual Performance Evaluations, even though the Indigenous community has deemed them just as (if not more) important than the academic outputs
- there are different forms of community peer-review of research output that are usually undertaken for Indigenous research that are not seen as valid by institutionalized authorities, leading to important questions about whose knowledge is most important -- the institution or the community involved in the research -- *which is at the heart of this ongoing debate.* Furthermore, even when journal articles result from such research, they are usually published in journals that do not have high “impact factors” or are open-source so that the broader Indigenous community can readily access the information

In order for Western to live up to its stated commitment to "improving the accessibility and success in higher education for Indigenous peoples" (*Strategic Plan - Achieving Excellence on the World Stage*), there must be a corresponding commitment to enhance the type of research that is valued and validated at Western. This can be done by incorporating the principles of engaged research into all research aspects of the University, from funding internal grants, going into the community and bringing the community to Western, to reconsidering how research is valued broadly and how it is assessed at the level of the Annual Performance Evaluation, thus demonstrating that Western is serious about cultivating institutionalized change. It can also be achieved by incorporating complementary resources on campus, such as the Community Engaged Learning group in the Student Support Centre. This requires the attention, commitment, and support of both the University and the communities to work together effectively within this new paradigm, so that Western can live up to its promise to be a "leading edge" research institution for Indigenous people in Canada and globally.

This case study focused on Aboriginal research, but the same issues arise with any project practicing engaged research. Simply put, the resources are not available to support the development of such projects, nor is there institutional or local level recognition of the value of this research.

### 2.3 Engaged Research, Knowledge Mobilization, Communications and Advocacy

It should be clear from the discussion above that the distinction between *knowledge mobilization* and *engaged research* is becoming increasingly blurred. Indeed, SSHRC's definition of knowledge mobilization is very similar to the definition of engaged research presented above:

*“Knowledge mobilization: The reciprocal and complementary flow and uptake of research knowledge between researchers, knowledge brokers and knowledge users—both within and beyond academia—in such a way that may benefit users and create positive impacts within Canada and/or internationally, and, ultimately, has the potential to enhance the profile, reach and impact of social sciences and humanities research. Knowledge mobilization initiatives must address at least one of the following, as appropriate, depending on research area and project objectives, context, and target audience:*

Within academia:

informs, advances and/or improves:  
research agendas; theory; and/or methods.

Beyond academia:

informs:

public debate; policies; and/or practice;  
enhances/improves services; and/or informs the decisions and/or processes of people in  
business, government, the media, practitioner communities and civil society.”

<http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/definitions-eng.aspx#km-mc>

Thus, it can be argued that the “reciprocal and complementary flow and uptake of research knowledge between researchers, knowledge brokers and knowledge users” must emerge from an engaged research program. Knowledge mobilization is also part of two other key priorities for SSHRC – open access and data management/curation.

Further, successful knowledge mobilization strategies that emerge from engaged research programs include communications strategies and can be effective tools in advocacy efforts. This would seem to be the logic underlying the Tri-Councils’ push on all four fronts. Effective *story telling* is an increasingly important component of the granting councils’ rhetoric (see [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/society-societe/storytellers-jai\\_une\\_histoire\\_a\\_raconter/index-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/society-societe/storytellers-jai_une_histoire_a_raconter/index-eng.aspx)). The same can be said for recognizing that *impact* comes in many forms, which indicates that the best way to assess impact is to assess research outputs against the goals that were developed collaboratively within the initial engagement process. This is a more nuanced view of impact as something more than simple bibliometrics and as such requires changes at the institutional and disciplinary levels to facilitate and recognize this kind of research.

Finally, it is very important to note that many of our students are already actively participating in engaged research. We must be in a position to provide them with opportunities, train them in best practices, as well as to recognize non-traditional research outputs, such as blogs, websites, films, oral and digital storytelling projects as valid ways of presenting their research and engaging with their communities. SSHRC has recognized the importance of graduate training in this area with its story telling project (web site above). Students participating in this project are getting additional training in public engagement as well as the writing of op-ed pieces enabling them to mediate the academic and public spheres. Thus, at the same time as we struggle with the value of these outputs at the University and APE level, the generational change is already happening amongst our students.

Working Group 1 membership included:

Andrew Nelson, Charles Weijer, Cathy Benedict, Alan Leschied (Education), Jim Davies (FSS), Jeff Dixon (Schulich), Joshua Lambier (student A&H), Sam Trosow (FIMS/Law), Janice Forsyth (FHS)

This report was informed by additional submissions by:

Cathy Benedict – Faculty of Music  
Jim Davies – Faculty of Social Science  
Jeff Dixon – Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry  
Janice Forsyth – Faculty of Health Sciences  
Stephanie Hayne – Student Support Centre  
Lisa Hodgetts - Faculty of Social Science  
Joshua Lambier – Faculty of Arts  
Joanna Quinn - Faculty of Social Science  
Andrew Walsh - Faculty of Social Science  
Graduate Student Working Group  
NCE and SSHRC

## Attachment

URB SSAH Task Force  
Working Group 1 Draft Report  
The Ways in Which External Funding Agencies Are Pursuing  
Communication and Advocacy Strategies  
Part 1  
Cathy Benedict (Faculty of Music)

### Advocacy

The case can be made that the processes, mechanisms and strategies for advocacy are to laud and to appeal to the sensibilities of the status quo. As such, advocacy often stems from the need to protect a system that for whatever reason is unable or unwilling to embrace change. Advocacy, then, has a specific agenda and in the case of external funding agencies that are supported by governmental sources, agenda and status quo will constantly be in flux. Much like public relations, the target of advocacy is fundamental to the success of the message. The directionality of such a message has (until recently) flowed from agency to audience (target), with little care for what will be referred to in these reports as co-creation and shared authority.

The other side of the advocacy coin, the prevailing systems that govern flux, while always already present, more often than not remain unarticulated. That said this report will highlight the ways in which a narrative turn away from metrics represents a distinct embrace of the ways in which people come to know. Fueled in nature by the necessity to be recognized, seen, heard, and supported financially, this turn represents an epistemological shift toward an awareness of the human need to engage in sense making. This report, then, will focus on how language has shifted throughout both external and internal documents and those ways a unilateral focus on numerical metrics as proof of knowledge mobilization and impact has shifted toward the use of narrative.

### Communication

In 2007 the *Higher Education* Funding Council for England (HEFCE) moved to create a “broad framework for the assessment of impact” which would be submitted and reported as case studies (Research Excellence Framework- REF). Recognizing that research in Higher Education is manifold across the disciplines it was noted that as such it is “difficult to reduce this diversity to numbers.” Thus, the use of “qualitative case studies were found to “capture the diverse connections between research and society” (Grant, 2015, [bit.ly/1D7aunD](http://bit.ly/1D7aunD)). Aside from the multiple critiques of the REF, research impact in the form of narrative and story has made multiple inroads and is readily observable on several platforms and media sites.

The ability to “[craft] a good story” was recently cited in a March 30th, 2016 column in the journal *University Affairs* ([bit.ly/1orcl0d](http://bit.ly/1orcl0d)) as a most effective way to communicate scientific research to the general public. Seminars that address how to better present scientific findings as a story exist ([bit.ly/21ZO6mR](http://bit.ly/21ZO6mR)), as do those that instruct the use of the 140 character tweet ([bit.ly/1QSI72Y](http://bit.ly/1QSI72Y)), not to mention several existing twitter accounts that speak to the importance of finding the story in the data (see for instance [@FromTheLabBench](https://twitter.com/FromTheLabBench), [@lunascientific](https://twitter.com/lunascientific)). An entire day was devoted at the 2011 World Science Fair to story telling as a way to “explore the

communication of science—on the page, on the screen, and on the stage—illuminating the process of translating science to story” ([bit.ly/1SJt3mb](http://bit.ly/1SJt3mb)) and finally it is worth reading a blog post devoted to interrogating “story” in scientific research as well as thinking through the typology of science stories ([bit.ly/1N3LVI3](http://bit.ly/1N3LVI3)).

Most telling of all, for our context, is the way in which institutions of all kinds (including universities, and government supported programs) have begun to articulate not only the impact of research creation, but also with whom the research begins, evolves and benefits. This narrative presentation moves beyond simple storytelling and perhaps even questions the primacy of meta-narrative or the “Truth” of the numerical presentation of metrics.

### **The Purpose of These Reports**

The following report presents analysis of the communication and advocacy strategies from the following websites in order to underscore not just the ways in which the sciences have moved away from the presentation of metrics to narrative, but also the ways in which research priorities are developed, identified and articulated.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council – SSHRC  
Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada – NSERC  
Canadian Foundation for Innovation - CFI  
Canada Institutes of Health Research - CIHR  
Canada Council for the Arts

### **SSHRC**

One of the prominent links on the SSHRC landing page is *Connecting with Community* (italics added), under which includes Aboriginal connections, Community Engagement, Imagining Canada’s Future and Storytellers. Under the Community Engagement link “engagement” for SSHRC is addressed as a “committed to engaging its stakeholder communities” which suggests an interest in reciprocity of knowledge mobilization. Indeed, knowledge mobilization for SSHRC is stated as “The reciprocal and complementary flow and uptake of research knowledge between researchers, knowledge brokers and knowledge users” (<http://bit.ly/1fkDA84>).

This reciprocity is further exemplified by the kinds of questions SSHRC incorporates to frame a research agenda that suggests a reciprocal relationship between all stakeholders:

Imagining Canada’s Future  
How is our world changing?  
What Challenges lie ahead?  
Whose insights do we need?  
Are we ready for Tomorrow?  
Where must Canada do better?

And finally, since 2012 SSHRC has hosted an annual Storytellers contest which “challenges postsecondary students to show Canadians how social sciences and humanities research is affecting our lives, our world and our future for the better” (<http://bit.ly/1btDWjd>). Students are encouraged to address and reflect upon where research is taking us, the story of the research, and how it impacts Canadians.

A further conversation with Ursula Gobel underscores the ways in which SSHRC takes reciprocity as their mission:

SSHRC is about people and humanities, about novel ideas and thinking out of the box – that is our strength. We look at issues and problems from all sides and listen to new ideas and explore pathways – days of sending out the press release is not going to fly- if we truly want to benefit humanity than we need to engage differently. (April 8, 2016, personal communication)

### **NSERC**

The landing page of NSERC offers multiple links as entry points. Phrases such as “feedback loops,” “strategic partnerships” and “collaborate research” (<http://bit.ly/1sR16J9>). Less obvious on this page is a sense of what these terms indicate. If one scrolls down on the landing page there is a link that take you to Impact Stories. At the time of this writing both stories highlighted issues of import to Canada, fresh water and greenhouse gases.

### **CFI**

At left hand top of the landing page is Research in Action. Each of the stories speaks to bringing primary stakeholders together in order to move research forward; trusting and listening to the patient, or bringing young voters together to wonder with them what can be done in order for them to vote. Bringing research stories alive through video furthers the message of care between and not simply a positioning of knowing what’s best.

### **CIHR**

One of the three priorities listed on the CIHR landing page makes reference to research strategies that are designed to involve all stakeholders at every stage of development.

Patient-oriented research refers to a continuum of research that engages patients as partners, focuses on patient-identified priorities and improves patient outcomes.

### **New Paradigms of Engagement**

The following report (Part 2 of Working Group 1) extends and builds on the issue of communication strategies and the construction of engagement. Language signals intent and if Western’s intent is to “[build] upon a “shared ambition” that “seek(s) always the betterment of the human condition” (Achieving Excellence, 2014, p. 4) the recommendations presented suggest the acknowledgement of and support for policies that encourage research connected to “interweaving new modes of public engagement into the fabric of the research process”.

URB SSAH Task Force  
Working Group 1 Draft Report  
The Engagement Paradigm and External Communication  
Part 2  
Joshua Lambier (Faculty of Arts)

In recent years, there has emerged a new paradigm of engagement in higher education to rethink the public mission of universities and colleges across North America and beyond. Canadian universities have increasingly focused attention on the public good as an integral part of the strategic planning process, and integrated robust community engagement activities into institutional vision statements for research, teaching, and service. The new paradigm moves beyond the traditional “one-way” model of expert knowledge delivery, extension, and outreach towards a more dynamic “two-way” approach that emphasizes collaboration, co-creation, and shared authority with public partners. To facilitate this “civic turn,” to use David Scobey’s term,<sup>1</sup> government funding bodies in Canada have renewed their mandates to support research programs that engage broader publics in the process of knowledge production and dissemination, with particular emphasis on projects that address issues of pressing concern. This section highlights some of the ways in which public and private funders are shifting their communication strategies to foreground initiatives that cultivate open dialogue between the campus and community, which may in turn bolster public support for the vital role that research-intensive universities can play in Canadian society. The Western social science, arts, and humanities community could enhance advocacy efforts beyond the university by studying the evolving conceptual vocabulary underpinning the scholarship of engagement, while incorporating principles (where necessary and desirable) that align our activities with the stated objectives of various social science, arts, and humanities funding agencies.

Like other universities in Canada, Western has recently published a new strategic plan that reaffirms our collective commitment to the public good. From the outset of *Achieving Excellence on the World Stage* (2014), the new mission statement reads as follows: “Western creates, disseminates and applies knowledge *for the benefit of society* through excellence in teaching, research and scholarship. Our graduates will be global citizens whose education and leadership will *serve the public good*” (emphasis added 5). While each of the four strategic goals of the plan respond to emergent themes of engagement, the third goal (“Reaching Beyond Campus: Engage Alumni, Community, Institutional & International Partners”) places the greatest stress on the value of collaboration between the university and its publics, whether local, regional, national, or international. In the final section on “Western’s Institutional Principles and Values,” the plan also underscores the University’s commitment to “partnership” and “social responsibility,” two critical components for the advancement of an engaged culture on campus. Other universities in Canada, however, have taken additional steps to institutionalize the principles of community

---

<sup>1</sup> David Scobey, “Civic Engagement and the Copernican Moment,” Plenary Address, Imagining American National Conference. Minneapolis, MN. 21 September 2011. Available at: <http://imaginingamerica.org/fg-item/civic-engagement-and-the-copernican-moment/>

engagement through the development of strategic documents<sup>2</sup> or community-engaged programs.<sup>3</sup> What each of these frameworks and programs offers is a university-wide consensus for working definitions of key terms along the way towards a new critical vocabulary for engagement. While many successful campus-community projects and exchanges are already taking place in the social science, arts, and humanities disciplines at Western, university leaders could boost our profile by developing a unified framework for public engagement. Just what counts as rigorous engagement should be established clearly and transparently from the outset. One of the most widely adopted definitions comes from the Carnegie Foundation’s new Community Engagement Classification: “Community engagement,” according to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, “describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.”<sup>4</sup> Looking ahead to future directions for the social science, arts, and humanities community, Western could open new avenues for community-oriented research by cultivating an inclusive definition that suits the unique culture of our campus and responds to the engagement frameworks of external funding agencies.

With the emergence of engagement as a strategic priority for higher education institutions, funders and other national organizations have also developed the following terms to orient their programming and external communications:

**Public Engagement at the Canada Council:** “Actively engaging more people in the artistic life of society notably through attendance, observation, curation, active participation, co-creation, learning, cultural mediation and creative self-expression.”<sup>5</sup>

**Community Engagement at SSHRC:** “Through engagement, SSHRC fosters interchange with and among key audiences on university and college campuses, in communities, and across public, private and non-governmental organizations, to enhance informed decision-making on SSHRC programs, policies and directions.”<sup>6</sup>

**Citizen Engagement at CIHR:** “For CIHR, citizen engagement is the meaningful involvement of individual citizens in policy or program development, from agenda-setting and planning to decision-making, implementation and review. It requires two-way communication that is interactive and iterative with an aim to share decision-making power and responsibility for those decisions. This requires bringing together a diverse group of citizens that includes the broader

---

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, York’s “Towards an Engaged University: President’s Task Force Report on Community Engagement,” February 2010; Memorial’s *Public Engagement Framework, 2012-2020*; or Simon Fraser’s “Community Engagement Strategy”(2013).

<sup>3</sup> The promotion and practice of publicly engaged scholarship is beginning to find regional and national champions, such as Victoria’s Institute for Studies & Innovation in Community-University Engagement, Memorial’s Office of Public Engagement, Guelph’s Community Engaged Scholarship Institute, Simon Fraser’s Community Engagement Initiative, McMaster’s Centre for Scholarship in the Public Interest, and McGill’s Institute for the Public Life of Arts and Ideas, to highlight only a few.

<sup>4</sup> The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, “Community Engagement Elective Classification,” 2008. Available at:

[http://www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92#CEdef](http://www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92#CEdef)

<sup>5</sup> Canada Council for the Arts, “Public Engagement in the Arts: Discussion Paper,” October 2012. p. 3.

<sup>6</sup> See SSHRC’s Community Engagement section on the website: <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/societe-societe/community-communitie/index-eng.aspx#1>

public, not just the usual stakeholders for ongoing dialogue, deliberation and collaboration in informing CIHR’s work.”<sup>7</sup>

**Patient Engagement at CIHR:** “Meaningful and active collaboration in governance, priority setting, conducting research and knowledge translation. Depending on the context patient-oriented research may also engage people who bring the collective voice of specific, affected communities.”<sup>8</sup>

**Community-Campus Engagement at CBRC:** “Within the broader context of community-campus engagement, nationally and internationally, CBRC is part of a movement to change the research culture, especially to promote the importance of community and post-secondary sector collaboration to co-create knowledge, advance social innovation, and generate evidence that is timely, robust and appropriate for informing policy and practice.”<sup>9</sup>

Though each organization activates the discourse of engagement in a highly distinct way to address their strategic priorities, the various definitions call attention to the common constitutive elements of mutually beneficial partnerships, shared authority, social responsibility, and a collective purpose (or purposes) amongst multiple individuals or groups. While the traditional idea of outreach situates the scholar as the expert who delivers knowledge to the community with a unidirectional approach (e.g., the standard lecture series at the public library), the engaged scholar participates in a two-way process of exchange and co-creation to produce knowledge with, for, and by the community. What each of these reports and policy documents also highlights is the need for social science, arts, and humanities scholars to begin to think of “engagement” as *more than a public relations strategy* to address the rhetoric of crisis that surrounds the cultural disciplines. Indeed, the civic turn in higher education calls attention to the need for the social science, arts, and humanities disciplines at Western to interweave new modes of public engagement into the fabric of the research process.

Public and private funding bodies are now using a similar model to orient their communication strategies around participatory models of community engagement. NSERC, for example, recently completed their “Community Engagement Visits 2015,” which were designed to give researchers and other stakeholder groups the opportunity to meet with representatives to discuss various aspects of the Council’s programming, including discovery research, scholarships and fellowships, as well as policies and guidelines. In the new strategic plan of the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, too, the first two strategic goals outline the need to “increase our reach with people in Canada” and to “improve our relevance to our members,” goals that illustrate the growing desire to develop innovative communication strategies to engage broader audiences within and beyond the university system.<sup>10</sup> To bridge the gap between the academy and the public, funders in the US are also developing new strategies that intertwine engagement with scholarship. The National Endowment for the Humanities, for instance, has introduced new

---

<sup>7</sup> Canadian Institutes of Health Research, “CIHR’s Framework for Citizenship Engagement,” p. 14. Available at: <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/41270.html>

<sup>8</sup> Canadian Institutes of Health Research, “Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research: Patient Engagement Framework” (2014), p. 5. Available at: [http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/documents/spor\\_framework-en.pdf](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/documents/spor_framework-en.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> Community Based Research Canada, “Strategic Plan 2014-2018,” September 2014. p. 6.

<sup>10</sup> Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, “Strategic Plan, 2016-2020,” January 2016. Available at: [http://www.ideas-idees.ca/sites/default/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-final-2016-01-13\\_0.pdf](http://www.ideas-idees.ca/sites/default/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-final-2016-01-13_0.pdf)

publicly engaged initiatives like “The Public Scholar Program,” which supports “well-researched books in the humanities intended to reach a broad readership.”<sup>11</sup> This particular project demonstrates the blurring of distinctions between traditional academic work and publicly engaged scholarship. Rather than thinking of public engagement as a communication strategy distinct from research, public funding agencies are beginning to design initiatives that marry both functions into a cohesive knowledge creation process. Against the grain of the traditional idea of the isolated scholar, the new model privileges scholar-citizens who are trained to narrate a compelling story of their research to broader publics (e.g., SSHRC’s Storytellers contest for graduate students).

The turn to engagement, however, presents new challenges. For many social science, arts, and humanities disciplines at Western, the place of both the public scholar and public scholarship has yet to receive sufficient institutional recognition and support. Research programs geared towards the public sphere are often perceived to lack sufficient academic rigour and autonomy, to be ideologically motivated, or simply to be reserved for a few well established professors (i.e., public intellectuals). Younger scholars in the arts and humanities are rarely trained to translate their research to fit policymaking processes or broader forms of engagement, and there remains a widespread resistance on behalf of Canadian universities to include publicly engaged scholarship in considerations for granting promotion and tenure. With these challenges and opportunities in mind, the social science, arts, and humanities community should establish a more meaningful system to recognize, reward, and highlight the public engagements of their researchers, both faculty and students, which will assist their future efforts to attract external grants and awards, especially if they are earmarked for scholars who engage with broader audiences. This new system of evaluation might also encourage a new generation of scholars to pursue projects that connect their public engagement activities with research and teaching strengths of the University.

---

<sup>11</sup> The National Endowment for the Humanities, “Public Scholar Program,” February 2016. Available at: <http://www.neh.gov/grants/research/public-scholar-program>