Using Campus Community Engagement to Build Capacity for Poverty Reduction

Amanda Lefrancois

June, 2016

PATHWAY TO **POTENTIAL**
Poverty Reduction Windsor Essex

COMMUNITY FIRST: IMPACTS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

With 73,910 people living in poverty, Windsor-Essex County is consistently above the provincial and national poverty rates. Given the region's consistently high incidence of poverty, and the negative effects poverty has on children, families, and individuals, more attention to effective approaches for reducing poverty are needed. Pathway to Potential is committed to reducing poverty in Windsor-Essex County and believes using a model of campus-community engagement (CCE) will help move the needle on poverty. The University of Windsor has made engaging the community one of its five strategic priorities, though there is room for the university to create a space to focus specifically on reducing poverty in Windsor-Essex County.

Current Project

Pathway to Potential developed this project as part of the Communities First: Impacts of Community Engagement initiative. The purpose of the project was to explore and develop opportunities for leveraging and coordinating resources within and between the local community and university to build the local poverty reduction network's capacity for research, evaluation and policy influence. The project involved consultations with key stakeholders, a comprehensive scan of resources, and research on relevant models of CCE.

Main Findings

Two models to build capacity for poverty reduction through CCE were explored: (1) a Social Justice Leadership Program, and (2) a Social Action and Innovation Lab. Through the Social Justice Leadership Program, Pathway to Potential hopes to engage high school students who can offer unique and creative ideas to address poverty within our community. The Social Action and Innovation Lab ("Lab") will connect students and faculty from the U of W with community groups to support community-based research that advances social and economic justice.

Next Steps

At this time, Pathway to Potential is in the process of seeking funding for a staff member to coordinate the two initiatives. Applications for grants are being completed and it is hoped that Pathway to Potential will secure funding within the next year to pilot the Social Justice Leadership program and Social Action and Innovation Lab.

Using Campus Community Engagement to Build Capacity for Poverty Reduction

Introduction

The city of Windsor in one of the southern most cities in our country, lying between Detroit and the rest of Canada.Windsor's American neighbour, Detroit, is a city experiencing both urban and financial crises. While not at the same crisis levels as Detroit, in relation to the rest of Canada Windsor has not experienced the same level of economic prosperity. With 73,910 people living in poverty (23.7%; WeReality, 2015), the proportion of the population of Windsor-Essex County living in poverty is significantly higher than the provincial (13.9%) or the national (14.9%) averages (The Cost of Poverty, 2014). The disproportionate poverty figure comes with an additional cost to the Windsor-Essex community: in 2014, United Way of Windsor Essex County reported that the total cost of poverty in Windsor-Essex County was between $459 million and $629 million annually, with the Windsor-Essex County community funding 65.2% of the average total cost.

Literature Review

Poverty in Windsor-Essex

Poverty and the effects of poverty are complex and affect individuals differently. *Reality Check* (Pathway to Potential, 2015) gave a snapshot of poverty rates in Windsor-Essex, showing staggering results: 34.1% of lone parent families, 30.3% of non-family persons, 22.1% of children, and 14.1% of couple families, were experiencing poverty in the region. While 6% of seniors in Windsor-Essex were experiencing poverty, the poverty rate among seniors in Ontario has risen faster than the national average since 2007. Though poverty can affect anyone, lone parent families disproportionately experience it. More specifically, 41.8% of female-led lone parent families live in poverty (The Cost of Poverty, 2014), and approximately 1 in 5 (19,410) children and youth living in poverty (CCSD, 2015). Windsor, compared to the rest of Canada, posted the highest proportion of the low-income population living in *very* low-income neighbourhoods (Figure 1.b, 2015). Given the region's consistently high incidence and concentration of poverty, and the negative effects poverty has on children, families, and individuals, more attention to effective approaches for reducing poverty are needed.

Rather than focusing on reducing the symptoms of poverty through a charity model, the region must focus on the root causes by challenging poverty at the systemic level through advocacy, research, and policy development. By working at the systems level and creating a shift in policy, the Windsor-Essex community can address the root causes of poverty, and move towards greater income security. All individuals, organizations, and levels of government have a role to play in working for a more prosperous and equitable Windsor-Essex County. Currently, Pathway to Potential is a leader in the community, mobilizing a shift from a charity model towards a systemic approach that tackles the root causes of poverty in Windsor-Essex.

Pathway to Potential

Pathway to Potential (P2P) is a comprehensive, community-based network, comprised of a diverse group of stakeholders that are committed to reducing and preventing poverty in Windsor-Essex County (Pathway to Potential, 2016). P2P's mission statement – "Together we will reduce poverty and ensure the social and economic wellbeing of residents who live in Windsor and Essex County" – indicates the need for a collaborative effort when thinking about moving the needle on poverty. While there is no universally accepted definition of poverty, P2P defines poverty as resulting from "barriers to social and economic resources that prevent well-being and access to opportunities in the community" (Pathway to Potential, 2016). Understanding that poverty is a complex societal problem, P2P advocates for removal of systemic barriers that prevent wellbeing and access to resources within the community. During the development of P2P's strategic priorities for 2015-2018, four priorities were identified: (1) literacy and lifelong learning; (2) income security and equality; (3) employment and training; and (4) food security. While these priority areas are P2P's primary focus, it also plays a supportive role in other community initiatives that are integral to the reduction and prevention of poverty. P2P aspires to see a Windsor-Essex County that is a thriving community where every individual and family has access to quality opportunities and the resources needed for economic and social wellbeing.

University of Windsor and Poverty

The University of Windsor (U of W) recently celebrated its 150th year, where it has been part of the lives of more than 90,000 alumni, and has contributed to the wellbeing of the Windsor-Essex community in many ways (Thinking Forward, Taking Action, 2010). The U of

W's mission, "Enabling people to make a better world through education, scholarship, research and engagement," (pg. 8) drives the university's role in helping create a stronger community rich with knowledge. The U of W has made engaging the community one of its five strategic priorities – "Engage the community in partnerships that will strengthen the economy, quality of life, and well-being of the Windsor-Essex region" (pg.11) – though there still is room for the U of W to create a space to focus specifically on reducing poverty in Windsor-Essex County. There is no mention of improving the wellbeing of the community through poverty reduction in any of the U of W's strategic priorities or objectives. Given Windsor-Essex County's current unemployment rate of 7.2% (Labour Force Characteristics, 2016), and the U of W's commitment to engaging community for a stronger economy and greater wellbeing in the region, there is a clear opportunity for this anchor institution to make reducing poverty rates a priority.

A scan of the various community engagement groups at the U of W uncovered dozens of unique groups focused on connecting students at the university with a variety of community service organizations. Of the twenty-three groups reviewed, only three had a mission related to poverty reduction: Empower Equality; Right to Play; and UNICEF Windsor. Further research indicated that Empower Equality is no longer operating, and the remaining groups focus exclusively on children and youth in poverty. Right to Play focuses specifically on empowering children and youth to overcome the effects of poverty, and UNICEF Windsor focuses on the health, education, and equality needs of children experiencing poverty. While these resources are indeed needed within the community, there is a lack of support on campus for the general population experiencing poverty in Windsor-Essex, and there are no programs seeking to advance a social justice mission to reduce poverty.

A recent program, Community-University Partnership (CUP) for Community Development, Research and Training, was developed with a goal to address the issues of community resilience; revitalize low-income neighbourhoods; and create a supportive, healthy environment for residents of Windsor-Essex (CUP Runneth Over as U of Windsor Social Work Partnership Marks Five Years of Success, 2010). The CUP Model has four primary pinnacles: (1) university civic engagement; (2) community/resource engagement; (3) interdisciplinary field education/experiential learning; and (4) student/tenant partnerships and leadership development – new programming was established for the community's most vulnerable tenants. While CUP

has received numerous awards for their contribution to the community (Social Work Program to help Improve Troubled Housing Complex, 2012), its mandate does not include a systemic approach to poverty reduction.

History of P2P and University of Windsor

Throughout the past decade, P2P has developed a strong working relationship with the University of Windsor. Over 150 students have been involved with various P2P projects and internships, including community-based advocacy and research projects; contributing more than 15,000 hours to achieving P2P's goal of a poverty-free Windsor-Essex County. In October 2008, P2P was officially launched, with the University of Windsor's School of Social Work as one of the founding partners and a member of the steering committee and roundtable. Later the following year, the Centre for Business Advancement & Research (CBAR) at the U of W produced a communications and awareness plan for P2P. CBAR also created a report for P2P and the United Way Windsor-Essex, discussing the feasibility of starting a social enterprise in Windsor-Essex.

During 2011, several P2P projects came to fruition that utilized U of W students. One project produced a report outlining opportunities for P2P to strengthen research capacity. Another involved a PhD student working under the supervision of a professor for *Civic Engagement: Promoting Social Justice*. An Anthropology class produced a report, "Speaking of Poverty: Conversations in Southwest Ontario, " after interviewing individuals with lived experiences of poverty. Students from Communication Media and Film studies created a short documentary on P2P's "Do the Math Challenge" advocacy project, highlighting the inadequacy of social assistance. Throughout 2012, the director of P2P, in collaboration with Professor Gemma Smyth, a professor at the University of Windsor's Faculty of Law (Windsor Law), developed a Law and Poverty Policy Supervised Research opportunity. This supervised research opportunity allowed two students to complete projects in the areas of social assistance and internationally trained professionals.

Several successful initiatives took place in 2014. First, P2P launched its living wage campaign, advocating for employers to sign on as living wage champions throughout Windsor-Essex County. Graduate students in Applied Social Psychology completed a program evaluation guide for P2P's living wage campaign. To date, 26 employers have signed on as living wage

champions, which is one of the highest in the province. P2P partnered with Enactus Windsor, a group of motivated students at the University of Windsor who are determined to position their team to become a major catalyst for economic change (Enactus Windsor, n.d.), and created Windsor SOUP. Windsor SOUP's mission is to help innovative projects in Windsor-Essex County gain micro-funding through a public dinner that offers the community an opportunity to celebrate unique projects in Windsor. Individuals who participate in Windsor SOUP have the opportunity to come together as a community to allow for unique collaborations of non-profit projects within the community. To date, over 20 social innovation initiatives have received funding through Windsor SOUP. P2P also partnered with Windsor Law and received funding to hire four law student externs for the 2014 summer for a Law and Poverty Policy Externship Pilot. These students were the pilot class for Policy 101 and Policy 102; workshops, which were developed for P2P by Dr. Suzanne McMurphy, a University of Windsor Sociology professor.

In September of 2014, the director of P2P received the Community Leadership in Justice Fellowship from the Law Foundation of Ontario to develop a Social Justice Externship Program for law students. The Report built on the 2014 Law and Poverty Policy Externship Pilot that provided law students with a unique opportunity for experiential learning in research and the development of policy initiatives in a non-traditional field placement. Students were involved with various projects, including living wage, food security, affordable transportation, and social enterprise. Students also helped to coordinate two candidate engagement sessions on related issues in the lead-up to the municipal election. Students who completed this externship were very positive when reflecting on their experience in the externship. The final report written for the Community Leadership in Justice Fellowship (Vasey, 2015) recommended hiring a full-time Externship Director to facilitate expansion of what was viewed as a positive and necessary program to strengthen partnerships between Windsor Law and the Windsor-Essex community. Windsor Law has committed to hiring an Externship Professor based on this recommendation.

In October 2014 and November 2015, P2P received funding under Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement (CFICE), a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) grant to develop a campus-community engagement (CCE) model that builds capacity for effecting policy change related to poverty. See *Current Project* for more details.

Though the U of W and P2P have collaborated continuously since P2P's inception, there still exists a gap between the university and surrounding community when it comes to poverty reduction. The programs available at the university are not actively attempting to reduce poverty within the region, and the programs that have poverty-related mandates do not generally address systemic barriers. To address this gap, with a vision of implementing a lasting model of campus community engagement that addresses the complex problem of poverty, a review of relevant definitions of CCE, best practices, and review of existing CCE models throughout Canada was completed.

Relevant CCE Definitions

Campus Community Engagement. CCE consists of a partnership between community-based organizations and institutions of higher education with a goal to mobilize the strengths and resources of both, ensuring mutual benefit (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Curwood, Munger, Mitchell, MacKeigan, Farrar, 2011). Commonly utilized resources from colleges and universities include students, staff, faculty, funding, knowledge and experience; and community-based organizations commonly contribute by helping to define the issues within the community, providing access to difficult-to-reach populations, and additional in-kind experiences and contributions. In order to be successful, CCE must involve a partnership between community members and the individuals from the higher education institution (Baum, 2000). These partnerships are essential in working toward shared goals (Green, Daniel, & Novick, 2001). There are several forms of CCE within the literature, but the most common forms are described below.

Community Service-Learning. The Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning (CSL) defines CSL as educational approaches that integrate service in the community with intentional learning activities (Gemmel & Clayton, 2009). In successful CSL models, both the educational institution and community organization work together towards outcomes that are mutually beneficial (Gemmel & Clayton, 2009). In order to develop a successful CSL, there must exist a reciprocal collaboration between faculty and staff (at the institutional level), students, and community organizations/members. Collaboration may result in various outcomes and activities that benefit the community, institution, and students involved. Communities may benefit from CSL as the members and organizations in the community are able to share and

integrate their expertise with individuals from the institution, fostering a greater understanding of community-based issues. Enhanced understanding may result in short-term change, long-term change, or both. Benefits to the institution may include an enhanced reputation (increasing awareness, relevance, and philanthropy), increased student engagement and retention, and importantly, fulfilling the institutional mandate/mission (Gemmel & Clayton, 2009). CSL efforts succeed in more than enriching student learning experiences. Students involved in CSL experience feelings of excitement to create real and lasting change within their communities, while enhancing their specific skill set and professional development (Gemmel & Clayton, 2009). In the development of the current CCE model, integrating aspects from CSL is vital for success.

Community-Based Research. Community-based research (CBR) is a collaboration between academic researchers and community members to jointly create and implement initiatives aimed at meeting a community need as defined by the community, through using multiple sources of knowledge, discovery, and dissemination (Schwartz, Weaver, Forster-Gill, & Pei, 2013; Strand, 2000). Strand (2000) explains that CBR is different from traditional academic research in that the former is conducted *with* the community as opposed to *on* the community. Essential to CBR is the inclusion of community members throughout each stage of the research process. The researchers involved should recognize and appreciate the knowledge and experiences of the community members with whom they are working. Critical to CBR is that it meaningfully contributes to the lives of individuals living within the community.

Experiential Education. The Association of Experiential Education defines experiential education as "a process through which a learner constructs knowledge, skill and value from direct experience," and that takes place when "carefully chosen experiences are supported by reflection, critical analysis and synthesis" (Luckmann, 1996, p. 7). Experiential education is derived from experiential education theory, which consists of four stages: (1) a concrete experience; (2) either conscious or unconscious reflection on that experience; (3) abstract conceptualization (understanding principles inferred from experience); and (4) active experimentation (applying the learning to new situations) (Kolb, 1984). Many disciplines utilize experiential education initiatives in both the classroom and outside the classroom (Campbell, 1999).

Community-Based Experiential Learning. Community-based experiential learning (CBEL) is an all-encompassing term that includes community-based pedagogical practices. CBEL acts as a guiding principle allowing students the opportunity to apply academic knowledge to the issues surrounding them (UBC Learning Exchange – Welcome, n.d.). The most effective CBEL provide learning experiences that are collaborative: all parties take place in the teaching and learning process. Some key objectives of CBEL include developing partnerships with community members, providing community-based learning opportunities for students, and instilling a sense of commitment to awareness and action to social issues within the community (Student Life and Support Services - Community-Based Learning, (n.d.)).

Existing CCE Models across Canada

Many universities across Canada have implemented CCE models. Of particular interest to P2P are the universities that have poverty reduction as a priority within their CCE model. Below are examples of various universities that focus on poverty reduction within their mandate. Following the poverty reduction examples are more general models of CCE within Canadian universities.

Carleton University. Carleton University has a long history of CCE through community research and volunteerism (Community First, 2016). Within the Educational Development Centre, the Community Engaged Pedagogy (CEP) program utilizes experiential learning approach that calls students to action, reflection, and engagement with the community. The goal of the CEP program is to have students participate in activities to foster relationships between academic life and the larger society.

Carleton University also initiated the Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement (CFICE), which is an action research project aimed at strengthening the relationship between community-based-non-profits and post secondary education facilities, to build more innovative and prosperous communities throughout Canada. The CFICE project will be successful by answering the question: "How can community campus partnerships be designed and implemented to maximize the value created for non-profit, community-based organizations?" (Community First, 2016). Within the CFICE project are five separate hubs that work autonomously: Poverty Reduction, Community Food Security, Community Environmental Sustainability, Violence Against Women, and Knowledge Mobilization. As part of the Poverty

Reduction hub, P2P is working to develop a CCE model to address the multiple overlapping causes, evolving manifestations, and symptoms of poverty within our region.

McMaster University. In 2007, McMaster University formed the McMaster Community Poverty Initiative (MCPI), which is a group of students, faculty, and staff who are committed to three priorities: conducting research, advocacy, and education surrounding poverty reduction within their community (McMaster Community Poverty Initiative, 2016). MCPI's vision is to further understand the consequences of poverty, and how it affects individuals differently according to demographics (race, gender, class, immigration status, ability, etc.) to better inform and advocate for the systemic changes needed to eliminate it.

The work of MCPI is guided by individuals with lived experiences of poverty. MCPI members partner with other local committees such as Hamilton Organization for Poverty Elimination, the Roundtable for Poverty Reduction, and Living Wage Hamilton. In 2013, the MCPI was awarded the McMaster Synergy Award, which recognizes "excellence in building cross-faculty partnerships" (McMaster Community Poverty Initiative, 2016). The MCPI operates with a coordinator and steering committee that organize events, conduct research, advocate, and provide resources to those who are concerned with eliminating poverty in the Hamilton region. The MCPI is funded by the Provost and Office of the Vice-President – Research.

Wilfred Laurier University. The Poverty Reduction (PR) Research group is one of four separate research groups within the Centre for Community Research, Learning, and Action at Wilfred Laurier University. The PR research group consists of students, faculty, and community members with a shared goal of addressing poverty through conducting community-university research partnerships that will ultimately inform social policy (Poverty Reduction Research, 2016). The mission of the PR research group is to "shift social policy through community-engaged research, policy analysis, knowledge mobilization and advocacy."

The main initiative with the PR research group is the Poverty Policy Project (P3), which is a research project conducted by doctoral students in the Community Research and Action (CRA) course in Laurier's Community Psychology program, who are also in partnership with Opportunities Waterloo Region. P3 was designed collaboratively between students and faculty to create a community-based participatory research study that focuses on the role of policy in poverty reduction. The PhD program includes a three-year community engagement and action

component for each student in the curriculum. Opportunities Waterloo Region agreed to commit to the project for ten years, and partnered with the innovative service learning initiative. Opportunities collaborates with government (for consultation), businesses, voluntary sectors, and individuals with lived experiences in poverty to change societal attitudes toward poverty, informs policy, and advocates for the systemic removal of barriers associated with poverty.

The University of British Columbia. The University of British Columbia (UBC) has a Centre for Community Engaged Learning where students, faculty, and community partners work through local and international complex social problems. The programs available within the Centre put students in the community for a hands-on experience to gain valuable and educational experiences. Resources are also available for faculty and departments to enhance the learning and teaching process. For community partners, resources are provided to facilitate building relationships with students and faculty, and creating successful research projects.

Since 1999, The Learning Exchange has connected UBC and the community in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside (UBC Learning Exchange – Welcome, n.d.). UBC views learning as a "two-way street," inspiring others to not only learn, but teach as well. Central in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside, The Learning Exchange is accessible to the community, student population, and individuals interested in being involved with unique learning opportunities. For the community, there are several learning opportunities available from ESL conversation groups, developing computer skills, and learning about how to use the Internet. Students are able to volunteer at The Learning Exchange, or be involved as a required part of an academic course. Faculties have resources available to develop CBEL tools and implement them in the classroom.

University of New Brunswick. In 2009, the University of New Brunswick (UNB) created the Promise Partnership. The Promise Partnership helps UNB Saint John realize aspects of its strategic plan, "to provide exceptional opportunities for our students, while building a better UNB and a better province – to be leaders in community engagement" (The Promise Partnership, n.d.). Working with teachers and staff at a local high school, students are assigned a UNB mentor to help with academics taught in the classroom. The Promise Partnership has established itself as a diverse and effective tutoring and mentorship program that is lead by educational professionals.

Dalhousie University. Within the College of Sustainability, Dalhousie University emphasizes community-based learning in the Environment, Sustainability, and Society (ESS) curriculum. The ESS is focused on bringing together thinkers and problem solvers to work through and take action against the most urgent global issues (Mission, n.d.). The ESS has fostered many partnerships and new relationships between Dalhousie University and municipal, provincial, and federal governments, businesses, and the non-profit sector.

Huron University College. The Community-Based Learning Office supports Huron's mission of "combining rigorous learning with the exploration of new territory" through connecting the classroom to the community, and vice versa (Student Life and Support Services – Community-Based Learning, n.d.). Students are able to participate through their course material in CBEL, CBR, and independent study, which benefit both the students and community partners. Benefits to the community may include enhanced human resources, new knowledge, connection to policy makers through the academic institution, and students may bring enthusiasm and energy to the community organization. Benefits to students may include a greater engagement in the classroom, critical thinking skills, increased understanding of how course content relates to surrounding community, and increased sense of personal efficacy.

The Current Project

P2P developed this project as part of the CFICE initiative. The purpose of the project was to explore and develop opportunities for leveraging and coordinating resources within and between the local community and university to build the local poverty reduction strategy's capacity for research, evaluation and policy influence. The project involved consultations with key stakeholders, a comprehensive scan of resources, and research on relevant CCE models.

Methodology

Phase I.

Phase I of the current project spanned from March 2014 to November 2015. Within Phase I, three focus groups were conducted to discuss poverty within Windsor-Essex County, the university's role in a model of CCE, and how a CCE model would function if implemented. Research on relevant CCE models was conducted and the culmination of Phase I included the

Charity is Good, Justice is Better: Mobilizing Campus and Community Against Poverty workshop.

    Focus Groups. Three focus groups took place at the P2P office. The Research Evaluation Working Group (REWG) collectively agreed that the focus groups be held separately in order to gather rich data from all three sources. The first focus group consisted of four students from the University of Windsor's law and social work disciplines. The next focus group had eight participants with shared experiences of living in poverty. The final focus group consisted of three faculty members from the U of W in the Faculty of Law and Odette School of Business. While the sample size of the three groups was limited, useful qualitative data was achieved from each of the separate groups. Each focus group was approximately 90 minutes in length and had an unstructured interview style. The informal conversation included open-ended items to allow for free-flowing discussion between participants (Rubin & Babbie, 2013). The items were developed by the REWG and a research assistant from P2P completed interviews (Appendix A). Following the interviews, a research team from P2P transcribed recordings to code responses and identify themes in responses.

    Student. There were several main themes that were identified in the student focus group. First, students identified the major issue surrounding poverty in Windsor-Essex as a lack of access to basic resources. Second, the student group did not think campus was "doing enough" in the area of community engagement, and relatedly, that the existing student groups on campus were disengaged. There was an identified disconnect between the decision makers at the U of W and the students. Further, the group had feelings that the U of W did not want to be involved with the community. However, the students identified a need for a student group addressing the issue of poverty.

    Community. The community focus group identified a lack of access to resources as the major poverty issue in Windsor-Essex. Similarly, the community members found there was a lack of education about how to gain the resources that were available. Another major discussion surrounded a lack of connection between the community and university. Members of the community felt the U of W is not accessible for their needs and the group highlighted a need for an advocacy bridge between the two. By advocacy bridge, the community members were referring to an entity that would act as a broker/liaison on their behalf to better access the U of

W's resources. Another interesting issue discussed was the lack of mentorship program for community youth. There was consensus that the U of W has a part to play in mentoring at-risk youth within the community.

Faculty. There were two main themes identified in the faculty focus group. The group identified the major issue surrounding poverty within Windsor-Essex as a gap between resources and accessibility. The faculty discussed a need for the U of W to provide someone to act as a connection between the university and community to ensure the members of the community have better access to the university's resources. The other main theme was a need for more instances of place-based learning. One faculty member in particular suggested a mentorship model for students working with the community to ensure ethical behavior on the students' part. It was also suggested that a contract between both the student and community members/organization the student is working with would assist in creating a sense of responsibility for all individuals involved.

Main themes. Across all three of the focus groups, the main theme noted was the perception of a lack of access to resources within the Windsor-Essex. Participants in the focus groups discussed that while resources may be available, it is the lack of access that proves challenging for individuals, especially concerning transportation. Having a "point-person" to connect community members to resources on campus was also addressed across the focus groups. Additionally, an idea presented across the faculty and community groups was the need for a mentorship-model for campus and the community. Individuals felt the students going into the community had a need for mentorship, and that students in the community would benefit from having a university student as a mentor as well. The main themes across the focus groups helped inform the development of the culminating workshop, Charity is Good, Justice is Better, where the focus was highlighting the importance of a justice-based approach to local poverty reduction.

Charity is Good, Justice is Better Workshop. On October 2 2015, P2P hosted an event at the U of W titled, Charity is Good, Justice is Better: Mobilizing Campus and Community Against Poverty. The workshop brought together students, faculty, and members of the community with the shared goal of CCE and action efforts to fight local poverty. Nearly one-

third of individuals who signed up for the event were students and three out of the ten panelists were students at the U of W.

The morning focused on updating participants on the challenges of poverty in Windsor-Essex, the U of W's responsibility to address poverty, and research on CCE. An important point of discussion surrounded the U of W's strategic priority: "Contribute to the economic and social well-being of Windsor-Essex." By making this a priority, the U of W stated its commitment to the community, though this sparked much discussion and debate about its current role with poverty on campus.

Panel Highlights. The panel discussion offered ten varied perspectives from students, faculty, and community members on theory and practice of CCE, student experiences of CCE, poverty and social change, and the university's role in CCE. One student, a former P2P intern, described her positive experience with CCE as fortunate, especially when compared to other classmates who were not given the same opportunities to learn from their community as those offered through an internship with P2P. It was suggested that the U of W could implement more internships and campus volunteer opportunities to strengthen CCE.

Culture of Campus-Community Engagement:

Members of the panel highlighted the many institutional barriers and pressures keeping U of W students, faculty, and staff from interacting with the broader community in meaningful ways. For example, when students and individuals involved in academia interact with people with lived experiences with poverty, there may be an element of empathy missing. To deal with the policy and impact on ground level in the community takes much energy, and it is difficult to integrate community timelines and priorities into U of W curriculum. Research interests at the U of W may not align with community needs and creativity in projects can be stifled by the U of W's preoccupation with liability and risk.

Students' Experiences with CCE:

U of W student panelists described their personal experiences with CCE and agreed there exist both positives and negatives. Interacting with members of the broader community is part of CCE and is invaluable experience that cannot be obtained through course-based curriculum. However, some students do not have a choice regarding their placement agencies, and some believe there is a lack of investment in systemic issues while overemphasis on individual/micro

issues. Student panelists were passionate about reducing poverty in Windsor-Essex and believe there is a need to use U of W resources to address the systemic issues surrounding poverty in the region. Another opportunity for student engagement includes having community organizations continue to work with students after completion of placements. Frequently organizations are reluctant to work with students due to frequent turnover.

Role of CCE models in effecting systemic change on poverty:

In order for the CCE model to effectively create systemic change on poverty, panelists felt it was important to find allies within the university, as people are the most important resources to mobilize against local poverty. Fostering strong relationships between people on campus and lived experiences of poverty is vital to a successful CCE model. The culture of a perceived dichotomy between campus and community needs to be changed as it presupposes that campus is not a part of the community. An accessible space needs to be created where systemic issues related to poverty can be discussed.

What Role University of Windsor should play in CCE:

The panelists agreed that the role U of W should play with CCE includes a need for more immersion between campus and community. Specifically, more community issues should be brought into the classroom and more U of W faculty and students should be involved within the community to deconstruct false dichotomies. Further, individuals should be prepared before entering the broader community as to not engage as "tourists." In order to accomplish a greater connection between campus and community, the model has to be flexible and focus on sustainability. There is an opportunity to develop a model of CCE that works to address poverty at the systemic level in Windsor-Essex, but a commitment from the U of W and community is needed.

Breakout Sessions. Interactive breakout sessions occurred on various topics including: implementing a living wage, making poverty a federal election issue, neighbourhood renewal strategies, food justice, missing and murdered Indigenous women, and activism 101, as well as a roundtable discussion on building an equitable model for antipoverty CCE. Highlights of the breakout sessions included individuals planning to attend the Sisters In Spirit vigil for missing and murdered Indigenous women at Dieppe Park on October 4th 2015, Voices Against Poverty

planning an event for the Vote to End Poverty campaign, and planning for more advertising in the West-End area for neighbourhood renewal strategies.

Roundtable Discussion. In addition to the breakout sessions, there was a roundtable discussion on how to build a CCE model that supports systemic antipoverty work. Thirteen individuals participated in the session. Participants included community residents, students, faculty and staff. The roundtable discussion was co-facilitated by the Director of P2P and Faculty of Law Professor Gemma Smyth. A research assistant for the Windsor-Essex CFICE project presented an overview of research at the outset of the session as a jumping off point for discussion. During the discussion, the lead for the CFICE Poverty Hub provided insights on CCE generally as well as examples from the Carleton experience.

There was broad agreement among participants that there is a clear need for a coordinated CCE model that supports systemic antipoverty work. There are many pockets of experiential learning happening at the U of W, however there is a bigger opportunity to coordinate campus resources for greater community impact. Coordinating existing experiential learning activities into a larger model of CCE could be beneficial to both campus and community, as it would be more efficient to have one point of contact to navigate and connect relevant resources. In order for the model to be successful, effective coordination, communication, and strong relationships are essential. It also is vital that the broader community voice not get lost in bureaucracy of CCE. In short, the participants agreed the CCE model should be inclusive, democratically run, and be open to building unlikely partnerships to strengthen community impact.

Workshop Survey Results. After the event, participants completed a survey on their opinion of the effectiveness of the workshop ($n = 29$). Nearly 90% of respondents agreed that the workshop was informative and useful; two-thirds of respondents developed a greater awareness of how campus-community initiatives can strengthen local efforts to fight poverty; because of the workshop, two-thirds of respondents felt confident in advocating for campus-community initiatives to fight poverty; eight out of 10 respondents gained a greater appreciation for campus/community due to their efforts to reduce poverty; and nearly 3 out of 4 respondents learned about the university's responsibility to address poverty. Due to the success of the first workshop, a second event is currently being developed to further understanding of CCE and action efforts to fight local poverty.

Results from Phase 1. Given the valuable information collected from the focus groups and workshop, two main models to build capacity for poverty reduction through CCE were explored: (1) a Social Justice Leadership Program, and (2) a Social Action and Innovation Lab. Through the Social Justice Leadership Program, P2P hopes to engage high school students who can offer unique and creative ideas to address poverty within the community. The students involved will build local capacity for systemic poverty reduction, rather than utilizing the charity approach when developing their action projects. Postsecondary student mentors will be paired with high school aged youth to engage in their community-based action projects in an interdisciplinary setting focused on systemic approaches to reducing poverty. This model will foster leadership opportunities for all individuals involved, support youth involvement within the community, and prepare students for the modern workforce by fostering transferable skills in creativity and innovation.

The Social Action and Innovation Lab ("Lab") will connect students and faculty from the U of W with community groups to support community-based research that advances social and economic justice. The Lab will be a space for the U of W and the community to come together to develop the capacity to effect systemic change in order to meaningfully address the root causes of poverty in Windsor-Essex. During the focus groups and Charity is Good, Justice is Better event discussions, and this need for systemic approaches to poverty was a recurrent theme that supported the exploration of models like the Social Justice Leadership Program and the Lab.

Both the Social Justice Leadership Program and Lab will be informed by the feedback provided through the focus groups and Justice is Better event. The Social Justice Leadership Program will work to foster strong relationships between people with lived experience of poverty and people in the university, using a mentorship model and a contract component to address ethical concerns while working with the community. P2P envisions having a "point-person" to connect the community with the available resources in the Lab and who will coordinate campus resources for greater community impact. Through the Social Justice Leadership Program and Lab, P2P hopes to drive social change in Windsor-Essex.

Phase II.

Phase II spanned from November 2015 to May 2016. Highlights of Phase II included two stakeholder engagement sessions, further development of the two models of CCE, and planning for a second workshop to take place in the winter 2016 semester.

Stakeholder Engagement. Two stakeholder engagement sessions took place on campus at the U of W to seek input from students and faculty on P2P's proposed CCE models. The individuals involved were presented with an overview of poverty in Windsor-Essex, highlights of the relationship between P2P and the U of W, the CFICE project, and were introduced the Social Justice Leadership Program and the Lab. Attendees were asked for their concerns and opinions in a non-structured manner. The conversation-style engagement sessions both resulted in positive responses to the two initiatives.

Social Justice Leadership Program. The members of the stakeholder engagement sessions were highly interested in the idea of the Social Justice Leadership Program and offered several ideas for consideration. First, there was discussion of the reach of the program and if the program would extend into the rural areas of Essex County or be primarily based in the city of Windsor. If the program were to be Windsor-based, members hoped to incorporate interested students from the county by building transportation costs into future grants. After discussion it was decided that the program would be piloted within the city and when able, would extend to the county. Another discussion took place around the time commitment that students would be involved. Members debated the amount of time involved, and intensity of the time involved (for example, if a student wanted to do a workshop that would be less time-intensive than a larger, more involved project). Given one of the goals of the program is for students to be able to complete their 40-hour mandatory community service hours, taking into consideration the amount of time projects take is important. The research team used this information when developing the Social Justice curriculum.

Rich conversation arose from discussing opportunities that students would gain from being involved with the program. Both the university students and the high school students would gain valuable leadership, communication, social justice, and advocacy skills from being involved. In addition to completing their 40 hours of community service, members saw a positive outcome as the meaningful contribution the high school students would make in their community, which would contribute to a sense of pride of where they were living, and hopefully

would result in greater youth retention in Windsor-Essex. It was useful to discuss the problem of out-migration given the high level of young people leaving the region. Having students realize their potential and how they may improve their community would be an added benefit of the Social Justice Leadership program. Another interesting idea was to have the students give a culminating presentation at the end of the curriculum. Through this presentation students would gain public speaking skills, the university mentors would have the opportunity to supervise the creation of the presentation, and community members would be given the opportunity to hear about the positive impact of the projects on the community. Evaluation was another important consideration for the program. It was suggested each student would be responsible for their project by evaluating how they see themselves as effective within the community, and how effective they see their project being. Further, the community members would also complete evaluations for how effective they thought the students were, and also how effective they thought the project was. Relatedly, the students and community members would complete a "contract" to establish a negotiated learning agreement.

Social Action and Innovation Lab. As with the Social Justice Leadership Program, the members of the stakeholder engagement sessions were very interested in the idea of the Lab. A major discussion surrounded the location of the Lab: on campus or in the community? Community members have expressed feeling intimidated when coming to the U of W campus, and that they do not feel welcome, so it is important to find a space that is accessible and welcoming for all individuals. Further, the downtown core and west-end of Windsor are seen as separated, so no consensus arose as to where the location should be. A possible solution to this issue was to have satellite locations housing different agencies. Identified benefits of having satellite locations were that there would be several access points to reach the community and it would help address transportation barriers. There was consensus that the Lab would need to incorporate community members' consultation throughout the process. The research conducted through the Lab would impact the surrounding community, so it was deemed crucial that community members would have input into what types of projects those might be.

A suggestion made by members was to include an inventory of all faculty and courses that might be interested in being involved with the Lab. An inventory would allow students, community members, and faculty to be able to quickly and efficiently discover individuals who

might have similar interests. One member discussed a previous initiative, Community Partners for Applied Research and Consultation (CPARC), which is a "collaborative community research venture… [that] promotes civic engagement and dynamic partnerships by linking the community with faculty, resources, expertise, and research" (About Us, n.d.). This initiative is no longer active, despite members of the session agreeing that there was a need for some sort of Centre to take on research projects for agencies. One reason cited was that projects did not develop because the researchers involved were "too busy." In order to ensure commitment, it was suggested that an application process could determine what role the individual would be interested in (researcher, data collector, advisory capacity, volunteer, etc.), and amount of time the individual would be willing to commit to the Lab. An alternative solution was to find a way to compensate faculty for participation, especially if the person is dedicating time to supervise students and/or research projects. Additional ideas for the Lab included an introductory training session to have everyone on the same page in terms of poverty in Windsor-Essex and the role of the Lab. Existing interns could provide mentorship to incoming students, which would also serve to provide the interns with supervisory experience.

Results from Phase II.

Social Justice Leadership Program. Based on the feedback from the stakeholder engagement sessions, P2P updated the Social Justice Leadership program curriculum. To ensure all students are "on the same page," students will complete a mandatory orientation that highlights poverty in Windsor-Essex, gives students an opportunity to learn about principles and expectations of community engagement, and provides time to brainstorm community action projects they might be interested in being involved with. Students will also complete Poverty 101, Policy 101, Public Speaking, Media Literacy, Conflict Resolution, and Anti-Oppressive Practice sessions as part of their training. The majority of the curriculum will be the Community Project piece, which will include the design, implementation, and evaluation of their community project. Students will be working closely with their university mentor, and also with community members and other P2P staff when necessary.

For evaluation, students will be given a pre-post test to assess whether the Social Justice Leadership curriculum changed their attitudes toward poverty and civic engagement. P2P will use the Attitudes toward Poverty – Short Form to assess whether curriculum is "sensitizing

students to the structural causes of poverty, and thus boosting the likelihood of their becoming professionals that are committed to poverty reduction efforts" (Yun & Weaver, 2010, p. 184-185). Higher scores on the scale will demonstrate a shift in youth thinking from the individualistic causes of poverty to structural causes of poverty. It is hypothesized that this shift from a charity approach to a systemic, justice-based approach will likely result in an increase in poverty *reduction* efforts as opposed to the poverty *alleviation* efforts.

Social Action and Innovation Lab. Input from the stakeholder engagement sessions will help to inform the development of the Lab, which would eventually culminate in a shared space, where both campus and community members would be able to access resources, and collectively work to reduce poverty in Windsor-Essex. The Lab will offer a number of resources and training sessions to students, faculty, and community members. Social action consulting would be available to those interested, which would consist of best practice and innovative models to strengthen social action and advocacy campaigns (community mobilization; coalition building; media advocacy; etc.). The Lab would also facilitate education and training sessions and workshops to provide accessible materials in the areas of policy (how to write a policy brief; Policy 101 and 102; research and use of data, etc.), social justice (Poverty 101 and 102; anti-oppressive practice, etc.), leadership (public speaking; personal narrative; dispute resolution for social change, etc.) and advocacy (public education; political will campaigns; advocacy campaign development, etc.). Additional services would also be provided through the Lab, given the community need (for example, forming community networks; mentorship facilitation; etc.).

Next Steps

P2P is currently developing a focus group (Appendix B) to administer to high school students to help inform further development of the Social Justice Leadership program. A research team has identified key questions to ask the students to gather information about the program's goals and intended outcomes. Further, P2P is also in the process of conducting a needs assessment for the Social Action and Innovation Lab. Currently, an electronic survey is being developed to send out to various community agencies and students and faculty from the U of W who may be interested in being involved with the Lab to inform its development. At the end of the survey, participants will be asked if they may be contacted for a more detailed

discussion on their responses to the survey. P2P will connect with those who indicate that they are willing to be contacted for more in-depth discussions to inform the development of the Lab.

At this time, P2P is in the process of seeking funding for a staff member to coordinate the two initiatives. Applications for grants are being completed with the goal of P2P securing funding within the next year to pilot the Social Justice Leadership program and Social Action and Innovation Lab. Significant planning has been undertaken in relation to both projects and it is hoped that, with community buy-in and adequate funding, both initiatives may become a reality and CCE will begin to move the needle on poverty in Windsor-Essex.

REFERENCES

About Us. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from http://www1.uwindsor.ca/cparc/4/about-us

Baum, H. S. (2000). Fantasies and realities in university-community partnerships. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, *20*(2), 234-246.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2002). Campus–community partnerships: The terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*(3), 503-516.⎡SEP⎤

Campbell, C. (1999). Empowering pedagogy: Experiential education in the social work classroom. *Canadian Social Work Review/Revue canadienne de service social*, 35-48.

Community First. (2016). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from https://carleton.ca/communityfirst/

CUP Runneth Over as U of Windsor Social Work Partnership Marks Five Years of Success. (2010, December 3). *Marketwire*.

Curwood, S. E., Munger, F., Mitchell, T., Mackeigan, M., & Farrar, A. (2011). Building Effective Community-University Partnerships: Are Universities Truly Ready? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *17*(2), 15-26.⎡SEP⎤

Enactus Windsor. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from http://www.enactuswindsor.com/

Figure 1.b Proportion of low-income population living in very low-income neighbourhoods (low-income concentration ratio), by selected census metropolitan areas (CMAs) and census agglomerations (CAs). (2015, December 23). Retrieved June 02, 2016, from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-014-x/2011003/c-g/c-g01b_3-eng.cfm

Gemmel, L. J., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). *A comprehensive framework for community service-learning in Canada*. Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning. Retrieved from: http://deepeningcommunity.ca/files/A%20Comprehensive%20Framework%20for%20CSL.pdf

Green, L., Daniel, M., & Novick, L. (2001). Partnerships and coalitions for community-based research. *Public health reports*, *116*(Suppl 1), 20.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Labour force characteristics, unadjusted, by census metropolitan area (3 month moving average) (London (Ont.), Windsor (Ont.), Barrie (Ont.)). (2016, May 06). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/lfss04h-eng.htm.

Luckmann, C. (1996). Defining Experiential Education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *19*(1), 6-7.

McMaster Community Poverty Initiative. (2016). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from https://poverty.mcmaster.ca/

Pathway To Potential. (n.d.). Retrieved March 10, 2016, from http://pathwaytopotential.ca/

Poverty Policy Project (P3). (2016). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from https://legacy.wlu.ca/page.php?grp_id=2615

Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (2013). *Research methods for social work.* (8th ed). Farmington Hills, MI: Cengage Learning ISBN 1-285-17346-5

Schwartz, K., Weaver, L., Forster-Gill, D., & Pei, N. (2013). *A Handbook on Facilitating Community-Campus Engagement for CBR* (Rep.). McMaster University.

Social work program to help improve troubled housing complex. (2012, July 16). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from http://www1.uwindsor.ca/annualreport2012/60/social-work-program-to-help-improve-troubled-housing-complex

Strand, K. J. (2000). Community-based research as pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *7*(1).

Student Life and Support Services - Community-Based Learning. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from http://www.huronuc.on.ca/CurrentStudents/StudentLifeandSupportServices/CommunityBasedLearning

The Cost of Poverty in Windsor-Essex County (2014, Rep.). Windsor: United Way.

The Promise Partnership. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from http://www.unb.ca/saintjohn/promise/

UBC Learning Exchange - Welcome. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2016, from http://learningexchange.ubc.ca/

Vasey, A. (2015). *Social Justice Externship Report* (pp. 1-112, Rep.). Windsor.

Focus Group Items

Overview: Participants were given an overview of the Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement (CFICE) project; an overview of Pathway to Potential's role in the local poverty reduction strategy; and an overview of Campus Community Engagement (CCE). Participants were then asked to identify themselves as faculty, students, university administration, or members of community-based organizations, and, if applicable, what university department they were in.

Question/Theme 1: What are the key issues relating to poverty as you see them in the Windsor/Essex area?

Question/Theme 2: What do you see as the university's role in strengthening the local poverty reduction strategy (by 'University' I mean all aspects of the university, not just the university as an institution)?

Question/Theme 3: What resources already exist at the university and in the community which could be coordinated into a broader Campus Community engagement model which could strengthen the local poverty reduction strategy?

Question/Theme 4: What would the administration of such a CCE model possibly look like? What would be the role of a.) Academics (both faculty and students) at the university b.) The university as an institution, and c.) Community members, especially low-income community members who are the most important stakeholders in such a project? d.) Community based non-profit organizations?

Question/Theme 5: What are the potential problems that you see in forming a CCE committee composed of both university faculty, staff and students, and members of community based organizations?

Question/Theme 6: What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of these groups working together to strengthen the local poverty reduction strategy? What are the strengths and weaknesses of different university academic departments in working to strengthen the local poverty reduction strategy?

APPENDIX B

Focus Group for High School Students

Brainstorming Session (Part 1): Questions

(Provide an overview of project)

Does this sound like something you would be interested in participating in?

Any suggestions/comments/questions/concerns so far?

What does the word poverty mean to you?

What do you think causes poverty?

Are you willing to help recruit interested participants? (From your group of friends or your school and/or other activities)

How many community hours have you completed so far? What types of activities did you do to complete the hours? What grade are you in?

Do you learn about poverty in school? If yes, what do you learn or have you learned?