Toronto, Ontario, Roundtable
Centre for Community Partnerships, University of Toronto
May 1, 2018

Co-hosts: Centre for Community Partnerships (CCP), University of Toronto and CFICE
Participants (44): Academic administrator (29), Faculty (3), Student (2), Community (5), Government /Policy/Intermediary agency (3), Funder (1), National network (1)

We wish to acknowledge the land on which this roundtable was held. For thousands of years it has been the traditional land of the Huron-Wendat, the Seneca, and most recently, the Mississaugas of the Credit River. Today, this meeting place is still the home to many Indigenous people from across Turtle Island and we are grateful to have the opportunity to work on this land.

A note on the day's context: In the morning, attendees heard presentations on national community-campus engagement (CCE) topics (presented by Peter Andree, CFICE), Ontario higher education policy perspectives (Cecilia Brain, Council of Ontario Universities) and a local CCE research project from a community organization's perspective (Sarah MacPherson, Oakville Community Foundation).) Attendees identified sector-specific needs and gaps; explored cross-sectoral opportunities and aspirations, and developed recommendations for advancing community-campus engagement in the region. A highlight of the day was a First Story tour led by Jill Carter (https://firststoryblog.wordpress.com/). (First Story Toronto provides public tours that build awareness and pride in Indigenous presence and contributions to the city.

Background/ Current issues: At the provincial policy level, the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) is coordinating efforts to identify metrics for CCE outcomes to prepare for the introduction of an envelope of engagement outcome-based funding into Ontario's post-secondary education funding formula.

Highlights of the SOAR (Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, Results) Analysis
Strengths
The strengths activity reiterated that this work is building on existing partnerships and relationships and that there is knowledge, expertise and activities that are already happening across sectors and with existing networks and organizations. These represent an investment in resources, including space and innovation centres. The students also offer subject matter expertise, diversity, altruism and idealism. It was noted that it is important to reflect on privilege and practice and to be humble in this work.

Opportunities
There were several opportunities that participants highlighted related to resources, leveraging existing partnerships and working on salient issues. First, related to resources, participants recommended making use of existing expertise, resources, tools, and technology. Similarly, working to amplify, connect, and leverage existing networks, organizations, initiatives, and interests within and across sectors, leveraging government opportunities and priorities (ON well-being strategy), working closely with community-- on community priorities, enhancing existing and create new approaches/models, and, adopting a regional focus. While also working to promote changes within institutions/the academy and a focus on social justice, linked to academics/advocacy. Finally, building on interest and momentum (genuine interest), co-partnering investments for institution and community. It was noted that we are in a period of truth and reconciliation and that truth needs to be addressed.

Aspirations
There was a strong desire to advance system level changes by breaking down the existing structures and shifting the focus from outcomes to root causes. Participants aspired to create equitable, sustainable and reciprocal partnerships that enhance community access, focus and control (specifically data and evaluation), and institutional collaborations, resources, and supports. This includes sharing information and collaboration with a shared vision/build collaboration and issue-based work with less duplication. Related to the notion of working better together, there was an aspiration to optimize student involvement and to incentivize CCE for faculty, community, and government through the creation of policy drivers. Understanding the impact of CCE is important and having leadership that is community minded, involved, and supportive is essential. Finally, we are encouraged to be mindful of language/discourse about knowledge.

Results
The desired results from this work include: that the impact is known/understood; that the impacts are significant/positive; CCE is equitable and reciprocal; and that the infrastructure and supports for CCE are in place- within institutions and beyond.

Recommendations for all:
Vision
1. Develop an overarching purpose (vision) statement for community-campus engagement.
2. Equitable frameworks imbedded in all CCE partnerships.
3. Share power (not use Carnegie tool, look at deliver-ology model).

Develop Infrastructure
1. Develop a body/Network/organization as a long term and sustainable convener for CCE (structural support). Hire a coordinator (or leverage existing leaders) to facilitate regional processes.
2. Open lines of communication across institutions, sectors, and disciplines to disrupt the current ways we work together and build sustainable infrastructures to operationalize CCE for all stakeholders (in the context of WIL pressures)
3. Develop a clearinghouse where community partners and faculty can connect on action-based research and vice versa. Create an e-portal/database containing repository of CCE Resources (exercises, recommendations, resources) CEL, CER, SL, PAR, curricular and co-curricular).
4. More regional/national conferences/symposia, publishing, studying within Canada on CCE.
5. Advocate for the government structure and process changes are needed so that CCE can achieve its goals.

Building Capacity and Momentum (Sustainability)
1. Co-creating initiatives with community partners, students and faculty that are sustainable, equitable and long-lasting.
2. Incentivize CCE for all stakeholders so they have motivation to participate.
3. Building capacity for community engagement professionals.
4. Strengthen Ontario (institution-based and city-based) CSL Communities of Practice
5. Acknowledge areas of competition and then find areas for collaboration to build capacity in the system.
6. Advance systemic changes in support of more equitable and reciprocal campus-community partnerships (e.g., add "community lens" requirement to grant applications).

Impacts
1. Community impact *as defined by community.*
2. Deliver-ology model
3. Create co-self evaluation tool for institutions to review their CCE infrastructure, similar to Carnegie/EDGE tool.