Halifax, Nova Scotia, Roundtable FoodARC, Mount Saint Vincent University May 17, 2018

Co-hosts: Patty Williams (Mount Saint Vincent University), Manfred Egbe ((Mount Saint Vincent University)

Participants (16): Administrator (3), Faculty (4), Student (1), Community (6),

Government (1), Funder (1)

We would like to acknowledge that we are in Mi'kma'ki, the ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq People. This territory is covered by the "Treaties of Peace and Friendship" which Mi'kmaq Wəlastəkwiyik (Maliseet), and Passamaquoddy Peoples.

Assets Time
Maintain Lessons driven
networks resources
experts building
Change financing Decolonize Adapt
respectful practice knowledge Partners
training alignment Listen Community
transparency
application Trust relationships Capacity
power project power Project Patience

Highlights of the SOAR

Strengths: Building on previous successes: Participants expressed that learning needs to take place from previous successful CCE i.e. partnership between Shannex and University of Moncton in relation to retirement living. Defining the conditions for success and finding ways to measure success help to shift the lens of "success". Previous community champions have results showing toward decolonization. **Support for CCE:** Participants felt that there is support for CCE in Nova Scotia. There are a lot of people who are willing to both help and participate. There is also policy support and political goodwill, and both health and wellness are on the provincial agenda. **Strong stakeholders:** Participants see benefits to the work with engaged communities and noted the expertise of economic development services and a strong academic presence in Nova Scotia.

Opportunities: Funding and Sustainability: Participants suggested creating ways to connect communities to funding opportunities, assistance with funding applications, and identify the impact of the community engagement. Needed reforms in economic development services (e.g. business associations, assistance for small businesses) could play role in supporting community engagement. Structural & Systems Change: Participants see opportunity in taking the community challenges and integrating them into student learning. They propose asking more questions about how research needs to change, which in turn can facilitate avenues of how to improve. Networks: There are currently a lot of resources available but the awareness is low. One way of moving forward can be to draw on and to learn from previous CCE research champions.

Aspirations: Reciprocal Value: Participants aspire to CCE as a two-way street and a

pathway for students to become global citizens. CCE can create more opportunities for students after graduation and ensure greater awareness. **Sustainability:** Participants look toward developing ongoing authentic partnerships. Interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary research and partnerships (e.g. industry, social sciences and communities), engaging beyond disciplines and



integrating approaches where communities are partnering with other communities and stop working as a single unit. Universities as facilitators of a process to determine what is needed, how to fill the gaps, and who can help. **Communication and Knowledge Sharing:** Particiaptns felt that better communication across the board is needed and proposed that one way to share knowledge is to create a toolkit.

Results: Develop Infrastructure: CCE requires more approachable language to create a more welcoming and comfortable space (i.e. less acronyms). Developing curriculum of community engagement and frameworks for articulating community needs in a way that everyone understands. Developing CCE toolkits of skills and knowledge before engaging. Finally, participants suggested developing a call-in line for communities to get in contact with universities and people. **Structural/System Changes:** Allow communities to become living laboratories. Participants expressed that there needs to be a better understanding of community based research and to allow community members on Tenure and Promotion committees

Recommendations: Vision: Change the way we value the process and view the engagement and create a shared language that supports it. Frameworks for articulating community needs in a way that everyone understands and feels more welcomed. Change the name (participants indicated that it feels wrong). Find a common fundamental purpose of the work to decrease tensions in relation to evaluation and research. Starting from "What do we want to learn together?" Strive to lead the work from "in-between" (communities and academia) rather than from one or another end. Use and reporting of social capital instead of just financial benefits. **Building Capacity and Momentum** (Sustainability): Need to democratize knowledge, to allow people outside of academia to have access to databases. Co-create a healthy ecosystem of action with diversity and distinctiveness).. Utilizing the opportunities – more students into community-based research (directed by communities) i.e. graduate students e.g doctoral project adjudication **Relationship Management:** Identify and address challenges to ensure productive collaboration. Allyship – not just working together, standing together beyond collaboration. Skills for working across disagreements and difference **Impacts**: Toolkit of skills and knowledge for students. Curriculum of community engagement. More opportunities for publication of CBR/PAR research. Advocacy on the federal level; for Tenure and promotion issues for faculty members.