	Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada	Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada	350 Albert Street Ottawa, Canada K1P 6G4

SOCIAL ECONOMY SUITE

NORTHERN ONTARIO, MANITOBA, AND SASKATCHEWAN REGIONAL NODE
—————————————————————————————

MILESTONE REPORT

1. Identification

File Number 859-2005-0007	Title: Linking, Learning, Leveraging: Social Enterprises, Knowledgeable Economies and Sustainable Communities / Réseaux, connaissances, synergies : entreprises sociales, économies intelligentes et communautés durables		
Report completed by:			
Family Name: Hammond Ketilson		Given Name: Lou	Initials
Primary telephone number Country Area Number Extension 1-306-966-8507	Primary E-mail: hammondk@commerce.usask.ca		
Date Submitted (dd/mm/yyyy): 30/03/2007			

2. Formal Application Follow-up

2.1 Discuss any issues raised by the adjudication committee at the time of the grant decision, and how these issues have been addressed.

For a detailed summary of project activity since September 2005, please refer to Appendix 1, p. 19.

The Linking, Learning, Leveraging team is pleased that the committee judged that the proposal was meritorious. We accept as additional guidelines the several suggestions and minor reservations expressed by the committee. Specific actions planned or already addressed by the project are described following each item identified by the committee:

1. The governance protocol should be more specific.
Please see Appendix 3 (pp. 26–30) for a detailed description of the model that has been implemented to govern this project.

2. The evaluation framework should be more specific.
Evaluation procedures linked to each aspect of the Milestone Report have been identified in detail in the text of this document. Section 7 (below) describes the formal evaluation process planned for the end of year three of the project.

3. The project team requires better representation from the Northern Ontario region.
The academic director for Northern Ontario, Dr. Gayle Broad, has made significant progress in enlarging the network of Northern Ontario community partners and academics associated with the Linking, Learning, Leveraging project. A workshop held in April 2006 brought together more than thirty community representatives and academics to explore regional needs and identify corresponding research priorities. Building on existing research and community networks, she has succeeded in bringing members of the Francophone and Aboriginal community into the project team, and expanded the reach of the research to include an academic from Laurentian University, a community leader from a women's social enterprise organization in Thunder Bay, and a community member from the far northern region on James Bay. A number of initiatives are now underway that cross the entire Northern Ontario region, including a mapping project with Francophone communities and a women's conference planned for the spring of 2008. A number of smaller initiatives are also working in a broader regional capacity, including a food security network and an Indigenous initiative related to the education, training, and retention of human capital within First Nations.
A Northern Ontario workshop held in February in conjunction with the Second Linking Learning Leveraging Regional Symposium in Winnipeg saw seventeen team members from Northern Ontario participate, moving forward on the research planning process. This workshop identified the themes that are arising in Northern

Ontario and reflected on the progress to date and any gaps. The group decided to continue its emphasis on the Francophone and women's projects and on continuing to build the Indigenous initiatives.

The addition of Dr. Rachid Bagaoui from Laurentian University, Sheila Gruner, a PhD student working with Fort Albany First Nation, and Christine Sy, an Aboriginal MA student from Trent, has extended the academic depth of the Northern Ontario team. The addition of Rosalind Lockyer, Monique Beaudoin, and José Reyes has added depth on the community partnership side.

4. We recommend that the project team develop an international strategy.

Two international partners have been added to the membership of the Management Board: Dr. Will Bartlett from the School for Policy Studies at the University of Bristol, UK, and José Reyes, a member of the ASOPRICOR Co-operative in Colombia. In addition to contributing to the overall governance of the project, each of these partners will collaborate in the research of the node.

Dr. Bartlett's earlier research has focused on co-operatives in Italy and Spain and the economies of the former Yugoslav states. A colleague of his at Leeds, Virginie Perotin, and Dr. Bartlett are also beginning a research collaboration around French co-operatives. As a contribution to the work of the Northern Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan node, he has proposed to examine the social economy in eastern Europe. His research will address the emergence of the social economy in the transition countries of eastern Europe, outlining the developments and factors that have determined the different emerging patterns of the social economy. He will draw comparisons with the developments in the social economy in southern Europe (Italy and Spain) and northern Europe (UK and Scandinavia).

ASOPRICOR is a partner in the Northern Ontario research led by the Community Economic and Social Development Unit at Algoma University College. The addition of a community partner from Latin America will make a significant contribution to understanding the social economy in an international context. To date, much of the research on the social economy has derived from examples from the UK and Europe, but Latin America shares a number of both similarities and differences to the North American context that may provide some valuable learnings for the social economy suite. ASOPRICOR is a small association involving several hundred families who have developed a number of co-operatives and social enterprises, as well as several other responses to the marginalization of their communities by the economy of Colombia, and indeed, of all of Latin America. Some of the issues that we will explore in this collaborative inquiry include the impact of the historical and cultural context on social economy and social enterprise development; Indigenous perspectives on the social economy; and the development of respectful relations between and among cultural differences. As we struggle to define and better understand the social economy, a Latin American perspective on these and other issues should prove a valuable comparator to the Canadian experience.

3. Community and University Partnerships

3.1 Using the table below, identify any team members (community and university researchers, community partners, students, knowledge users) who have joined the team **since the time of application**. (**See Appendix 2**)

3.2 **Append to your report** a description of the node's planned or actual management/governance structure and Advisory Board(s) (including mandates). Include the names, affiliations and responsibilities of members. Be sure to describe such elements as: how integration of all participants will be ensured, particularly in the development of the research agenda; lessons learned about community-university partnership and how they relate to your partnership; how the balance in the partnership between community and university researchers will be ensured and assessed; mechanisms that will allow for partnerships to evolve and expand. (**See Appendix 3**)

3.3 Has your regional node established written agreements or protocols outlining partnership functioning?
● Yes (go to 3.3a)   ○ No (go to 3.3b)

3.3a What type(s) of written agreement(s) or protocol(s)? Check all that apply:
● Terms of Reference (**See Appendix 4**)
● Guiding Principles (**See Appendix 4**)
○ Conflict-Resolution Mechanisms
○ Resource-Allocation Principles

● Contracts (Please specify type/nature of contract): Research Partnership between ASOPRICOR and Algomo University College, Memoranda of Understanding, Subtransfer Agreement, Student Internship Contracts, and other general templates **(See Appendix 4)**

● Other(s) (Please specify): Band Council Resolution with Batchewana First Nation **(See Appendix 4)**

Please note that SSHRC may request copies of the documents for your file. **(Attached as appendices)**

3.3b If no written agreement or protocols have been established, explain how partnerships will be managed.

3.4 To date, has the team experienced management challenges with such things as ethics review, resource sharing, funds and personnel administration, publication policies? If so, describe how these issues were addressed (referring to written agreements or protocols as appropriate).

The project overall has experienced no particular challenges beyond the ongoing but rewarding one of any community-university research partnership: enormous investment of time and personnel (including community, academic, and administrative staff) in supporting the relationship building with community-based organizations, in engaging and supporting their participation in research definition and implementation, in training and supervising students in the field, and in stretching relatively few dollars. The period from October 2005 to February 2006 was devoted to creating the management and governance structure and reaching agreement on operational policies and project management roles and responsibilities. These agreements are set out in the Project Policy Manual (see Appendix 4, pp. 31–37).

Ethics Review
We initially received ethics approval for the project overall, which expedited ethics approval at all partner universities, a step necessary to set up accounts and receive research funds. All subsequent research must be vetted by the individual university Ethics Review Committees, and any work involving human subjects cannot begin until ethics approval has been received. So far this has not created any delays in the start-up of projects. In the past, however, some WIRA-sponsored participatory action research projects (where the methodology is developed as part of the research process as the project progresses and is, therefore, not yet developed at the time of ethics review) have encountered delays in the ethics approval process.

Funds and Personnel Administration
Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) have been signed with the two universities in Manitoba (Winnipeg and Manitoba) and one in Ontario (Algoma) where academic co-leads are located. We require one more MOU with an Ontario (Western) university. These MOUs have established the procedures for the administration of decentralized funds and associated reporting requirements. On the whole, the process of distributing funds to the project's sister universities has gone very smoothly, and internal processes and procedures at the respective universities have been supportive of project objectives.

In one case, however, the hourly rate to be paid to the student approved by the WIRA Executive Steering Committee (ESC) was challenged by the University of Winnipeg's Human Resources department, who felt that it was too high (higher than the standard range of pay for comparable work). Consultation with the HR department allowed the rate of pay to stand. Despite efforts to share decision-making power, and although the research partners have a certain degree of latitude in how their research project will operate (the WIRA ESC has a degree of decision-making power in this regard as well), there are certain university policies that can supersede the partners and ESC's decisions.

Resource Sharing
Division of project funds has been accomplished by allocating specified annual amounts to each cluster and provincial organization. These amounts have been allocated on an equitable basis, and each co-lead is aware of the funds that have been allocated to others. The relocation of a co-applicant from one university to another has presented a number of unanticipated challenges related to the relocation of funds. These problems have been identified and will be addressed using the Project Policy Manual as the guideline.

Publication Policies
Research partners in northern Ontario have established a publication policy with ASOPRICOR Holistic Association to address their concerns regarding publication. The partner organization has a right to approve all materials prior to publication and to veto publication of certain items. This latter item addresses the highly conflictual context of Colombia, i.e., the safety of the partnering organization's members could be compromised should certain

information be released. Since outside researchers would not necessarily be able to determine what information could place people at risk, the community partner must have final say on all materials published. This actually conforms to the tri-council policy on ethics in conducting community-based research but may state it a bit more explicitly.

In Saskatchewan and Manitoba, existing protocol in the Memorandum of Understanding for researchers (see Appendix 4, pp. 84–85) sets out procedures for addressing issues related to community ownership of knowledge and copyright.

3.5 To date, has the team been successful in ensuring a balance between community-based and university-based representatives in the activities of the node? Provide supporting example(s).

A co-management model permeates both the governance and management structure of the project. The Management Board is a decision-making body responsible for setting policy and direction for the overall project, taking into consideration input from the Advisory Council. The Management Board is comprised of the project director, the five cluster academic and community co-leads, the directors of the three provincial-level organizations, and two international representatives — one an academic, one a community member. The Advisory Council will be comprised of two community partners from each of northern Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan, plus two at-large community partners.

Decisions regarding research activities and the allocation of research funds are made by decision makers representing the community and academia. At the provincial level, each of the three organizations has a co-management model in place, with a person responsible for academic leadership and liaison, and a person responsible for community leadership and liaison. Two of the three provincial organizations (CUISR and WIRA) sponsor an annual call for research proposals. Guidelines ensure that proposals meet the research objectives of the node while remaining responsive to the needs of the community organizations that respond to the call for proposals. Proposals are adjudicated in WIRA by a community-led executive committee and in CUISR by an advisory committee comprised of academics and community representatives.

Each of the five research clusters is led by a community and academic co-lead, who works in close collaboration with the members of the research cluster to make decisions regarding research priorities and the allocation of resources. The academic co-lead provides academic and administrative leadership, in consultation with the community co-lead, within the clusters. Community co-leads have been chosen or elected based on their relevant expertise and background. Their role, degree of, and length of involvement may vary by cluster, but is expected to be that of a peer to the academic co-lead in terms of research leadership. Depending on the decision of the cluster, it is also possible that they will provide administrative leadership as well.

In conclusion, we have put in place the structure and the process for making decisions inclusive of both academic and community partners' interests and priorities. Both constituencies have participated at high levels, but not always to the same degree at the same time. The time and financial resources of community participants are often stretched, which prevents the co-leads from participating fully in all board meetings and workshops. Job changes have resulted in turnover and reduced involvement of the community co-leads within two of the research clusters. One cluster was delayed in identifying a community representative. The academic partners find that university teaching schedules also interfere with full participation. We have had very good attendance at our regional symposia (January 2006: 75; February 2007: 44) and attendance at provincial workshops has been excellent in some locations, fair in others (Ontario, April 2006: 30 plus; ASOPRICOR in Colombia: three assemblies with 150 people at each; Saskatchewan, December 2006: 34).

On balance, the participation of community and academic partners in governance and management decisions has been fairly equal. This is a high priority of the project and we continue to work towards achieving this balance.

3.6 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION – Community-University Partnerships: How do you plan to assess or measure the effectiveness of your management/governance structure? How will you demonstrate that your written agreements/protocols have been implemented?

We will be developing standardized evaluation forms that will be applied to all aspects related to the governance and management of the Linking, Learning, Leveraging project.

Governance
The purpose of the governance structure is to ensure balanced representation as well as community and academic relevance and applicability of research themes and identified priorities. At the provincial level, balanced representation on the executive and advisory committees is intended to ensure that the full range of issues is taken

into consideration during the adjudication of each research application, and that approved applications are solid in methodology, theory, and based in community reality.

The effectiveness of governance structures will be measured by a number of indicators.
1. Balanced participation
2. Degree of participation by all members (presence alone does not indicate participation)
    at research planning meetings and symposia
    in the process used to adjudicate research proposals
    in decisions made at the management-board level

Method: Representation at above gatherings. Ongoing evaluation of meetings, workshops and symposia. Scale items will include such items as the perceived level of comfort of members participating in workshops and meetings and the range of discussion during the adjudication process, perceived ability to influence decisions.

3. The success of approved research to affectively address community priorities
4. The strength of the partnerships in the approved research initiatives

Method: Evaluation upon completion of project. Scale items will ask perceptions regarding nature of partnerships within research groups and relevance of research objectives and outcomes.

Management
The effectiveness of management structures will be measured by a number of indicators.
1. Decisions made at meetings are implemented.
2. Implementation of decisions occurs in a timely fashion
3. The administrative process for research projects and other activities runs smoothly and efficiently.
4. Communication within the project is comprehensive, effective, and timely.
5. Finances are managed well, within budgets, and according to established timelines.
6. The ability of the project administrators (overall and in each province) and community liaison directors to interpret SSHRC guidelines and regulations and ensure projects adhere to these guidelines.
7. The ability to develop effective dissemination of results

Method: Annual survey of management board members, and post-project survey of partners and students involved in research.

Demonstration of Implementation of Written Agreements or Protocols
The Project Policy Manual provides guidelines for the functioning of the governance and management structure, as well as the roles and responsibilities of each member. To the extent that people are familiar with its contents, find it useful in understanding their roles and the expectations regarding the values and philosophy of the project, then it will have been successfully implemented.

In terms of research proposal development by applicants, it can be demonstrated that the protocols have been implemented by the degree of adherence to the guidelines. If all of the applications are "way off base," then the requirements/guidelines have not been well communicated.

In terms of the research process, it can be demonstrated that the protocols have been implemented by the degree of collaboration within each research team, the level of engagement with community (as appropriate to the topic), and the degree of involvement and learning of students. Ultimately, this should lead to a comprehensive research report that sheds light on some aspect of the social economy (a demonstration of the implementation of the general principles of the initiative). Research is completed in a timely manner, on budget, and has built positive balanced relationships among partners involved.

Method: Annual survey of management board members, and post-project survey of partners and students involved in research.

4. Research and Knowledge Mobilization Training

4.1 Describe the anticipated or actual **collaborative research skills** that **community and university researchers** will acquire (or have already acquired) as a result of their participation in your regional node.

Building collaboration into the process of developing a proposal and then working through the successful proposal requires planning and sensitivity to community needs. Researchers in this node are involved in processes of consultation that go beyond the usual research project. These collaborative efforts build consensus and community sensitivity. Our team's interdisciplinary character requires researchers and community partners to move beyond their normal operational "silos" and consider alternative methods of collecting and interpreting information.

To the extent that community and university researchers engage in all aspects of the research, they both gain an appreciation for all the tasks that are part of the process. In addition to developing collaborative skills as they work on these particular tasks together, they develop a better understanding of each others' perspectives, they develop a better working knowledge of participatory research approaches, they develop a sense of the potential of research and its application, and they gain a greater appreciation of the strengths that partnerships can bring to the research process. They also gain a better understanding of the importance of governance in partnership approaches to collaborative research, the importance of developing working guidelines, methods of conflict resolution, etc.

In Saskatchewan, student researchers have been learning how to mobilize knowledge for different audiences in different settings and how that process itself becomes part of the project of building social capital and cohesion. Community partners and academic researchers (students and faculty) have had ongoing discussions on how to enable community-university partnerships in ways that fully respect community knowledge, that offer opportunities for community-university learning, and ensure that benefits are returned to the community.

Student interns have already developed or refined skills in the following areas:
- research methodology design
- completing ethics applications
- respectful research protocols for Aboriginal communities
- individual and focus-group interviews
- data collection and policy analysis
- case and report writing (including editing and proofreading)
- poster and PowerPoint presentation skills suited for varied audiences
- geo-coding and organizing data, mapping distributions of co-operatives in different regions of Canada

In Manitoba, student and community researchers will gain the following skills:
- community liaison
- literature reviews
- data collection, organization (coding), and entry
- data analysis using SPSS
- survey development
- interview techniques
- transcription
- draft report writing
- and presentation skills

In northern Ontario, community and university researchers are developing skills in:
- participatory action research
- interviews and focus groups
- data collection
- data analysis using grounded theory analysis and N6 and SPSS software

Community and university researchers are also gaining an understanding about the nature and processes of community-based research.

4.2 Indicate the **anticipated** number of **research staff** that will be participating in your regional node. (Please note that actual figures will be required in your midterm and final research reports.)

Table 4.2.1: The number of students participating in the Northern Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan regional node

STUDENTS		
Paid	**# Canadian**	**#Foreign**
Undergraduate	30	
Masters	20	
Doctoral	10	1
Postdoctoral		
Unpaid	**# Canadian**	**#Foreign**
Undergraduate	10	
Masters	2	
Doctoral		
Postdoctoral		

Table 4.2.2: Research Staff Participating in the Northern Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan Regional Node of the Social Economy Project **(See Appendix 5)**

4.3 Use the table below to indicate (✓) what specific **applied research skills research staff** can expect to acquire through their participation in your regional node.

Skills	Students				Community Partners and other Research Staff
	Under-graduate	Masters	Doctoral	Post-doctoral	
Research Design					
Participate in designing project	✓	✓	✓		✓
Write grant proposals	✓	✓	✓		✓
Design methodology	✓	✓	✓		✓
Data Collection & Analyses					
Collect data or information	✓	✓	✓		✓
Analyse research results or content	✓	✓	✓		✓
Manage databases	✓	✓	✓		✓
Presentation of Results					
Present research at conferences	✓	✓	✓		✓
Publish articles/books	✓	✓	✓		✓
Produce performance/exhibit	✓	✓	✓		✓
Administrative Tasks					
Develop/monitor budgets	✓	✓	✓		✓
Provide admin support	✓	✓	✓		✓
Application of Specific Skills					
Design Web sites / programming	✓	✓	✓		✓
Specific skills (language, software)	✓	✓	✓		✓
Translate/edit/proofread	✓	✓	✓		✓
Interactions					
Organise conferences, workshops	✓	✓	✓		✓
Mentor/supervise other students	✓	✓	✓		✓
Liaise with community stakeholders	✓	✓	✓		✓
Participate in mtgs. With co-researchers	✓	✓	✓		✓
Participate in mtgs. With partners	✓	✓	✓		✓
Work in interdisciplinary environment	✓	✓	✓		✓
Other (please specify)					
Develop Toolkit Suitable for Community Organizations and Trainers		✓			✓
Develop a Business Plan for Social Enter-prise (undergraduate student will assist)	✓				✓

4.4 Describe the degree to which research staff (students, community partners, others) are expected to participate in the regional node, including an indication of the depth of involvement and the range or diversity of opportunities that will be provided to them in order to help build their knowledge, expertise and research skills. Provide examples as appropriate.

In addition to being involved in all stages of the research process, research staff (students, staff, and community partners) are provided with opportunities to participate in the regional node through participation in: (1) discussion forums on the Linking Learning Leveraging website; (2) the annual provincial workshops; and (3) conferences directly related to their research.

In northern Ontario, weekly research discussion forums will be held throughout the academic year. Researchers will have the opportunity to develop skills through training, mentoring, and supervision. For example, in April 07, student researchers will have an opportunity to attend a conference on resiliency in forest-dependent communities in Hearst, a northern Ontario Francophone community. Two participants from the ASOPRICOR project in Colombia will be attending this conference. A group of researchers interested in food security and working with community-based organizations will also be meeting in April to examine opportunities to collaborate among Francophone, Indigenous, and Anglophone communities in northern Ontario as well as with the community researchers from Colombia.

In Saskatchewan, students and community partners will actively participate in the design of the research. Community partners will facilitate the collection of the data (organizing focus groups and interviews) for the students. Once the data is collected, community partners and researchers will discuss the analysis of the data together. Weekly updates from researchers will also keep community partners informed on literature reviews and the general write-up of the report. At the end of the project, both community partners and researchers will understand the process of community-based research, will have knowledge of research methodology, and also ideas regarding dissemination and communication.

4.5 Please provide details of planned or actual university curriculum development that has been or will be generated as a result of the regional node's activities?

Faculty will incorporate the findings of their research as well as aspects of methodology into existing courses they teach. Their project work allows them to bring practical experience into the classroom, which is an important aspect of curriculum development. Students will also use the reports in class papers, thereby gaining knowledge of the social economy in their studies. Students who are directly involved in the project research will develop all the skills noted above, enhancing their knowledge but also skills relevant to obtaining long-term employment.

Curriculum has been or will be developed in the following program areas:

Undergraduate
- University of Saskatchewan — Management 498.3 Business and Community, the capstone course for the Management of Co-operatives major, Management of Social-Economy Organizations stream, College of Commerce
- Community Economic and Social Development (CESD) program, Algoma University College — Qualitative methods courses in both CESD and Sociology departments of Algoma University College are being adjusted to reflect new methodological learnings in community-based research methods. These qualitative methods courses will also be adjusted to reflect the experience gained in working with Indigenous communities. The CESD courses, including field placement courses, will also be adjusted to reflect the learnings gained from working with community groups and extending the social economy in the region and internationally. One "special topics in CESD" course on co-operatives as a CESD strategy will be offered in June 2007. The curriculum for this course is being designed by a member of one of the partners in the Social Economy project, OnCoop in Ontario.
- University of Winnipeg — Research from the project will contribute a module on social economy, social enterprise, and co-operatives to course content for 60.3110/3: Poverty-Focussed Development in the International Studies Program

Graduate
- Graduate student workshop on community-based research methods, Saskatchewan, May 2007
- University of Saskatchewan — Co-operatives and Sustainable Development, Co-operative Studies Concentration, Interdisciplinary Graduate Program
- University of Saskatchewan — Methods in Conducting Community-Based Research, Co-operative Studies Concentration, Interdisciplinary Graduate Program
- University of Saskatchewan — Aboriginal Economic Development, Concentration in Indigenous Management, MBA program, College of Commerce
- University of Western Ontario — Politics 542b: Public Policy, offered winter 2007. Concerns public policy and Canada's community and voluntary sector. Participation in the Social Economy project will enhance and deepen the instructor's ability to teach the course, as well as inform the curriculum content.

4.6 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION – Research and Knowledge Mobilization Training and Development: How do you plan to assess or measure the degree to which researchers (both community- and university-based) have acquired collaborative research and knowledge mobilization skills as a result of your regional node? How do you plan to assess or measure the degree to which research staff (students, community partners, others) participate in your regional node, as well as the impact of their participation? How will you demonstrate that research staff have acquired the applied research and knowledge-mobilization skills mentioned above?

Acquired the Skills
A post-project assessment with a survey and an interview will be used to determine skill development. The project will use traditional as well as innovative measures of success of collaborative research and knowledge mobilization skills.

Sample indicators of collaborative research skills:
- number of meetings among partners
- number of meetings with community stakeholders
- identification of new methods/tools for extending the reach of action research into the community
- continued work in collaborative research projects or other similar initiatives

Sample indicators of knowledge mobilization skills: number of
- published articles by community partners
- academic presentations by community partners
- publications by academic partners in popular publications
- academic and practitioner-oriented conferences and workshops participated in
- conference posters and presentations
- articles in newspapers and magazines
- chapters in books, books
- websites, fact sheets
- public fora, community consultations
- brown-bag lunches
- research orientation packages for community and student interns
- leveraged research collaborations

Degree of Participation
Sample indicators of participation of research staff in regional node:
- participation at regional symposiums, conferences, etc.
- number of collaborations among academics and practitioners project to project, within regions, and region to region
- time sheets describing these types of activities on a weekly basis for students

Impact of Participation
Sample indicators of impact of participation:
- impact on individual personally and professionally
- impact on their organizations and/or communities – expressed interest by community partners to be involved in subsequent research projects
- impact on the research project itself — ability of project to continuously adapt to the emerging priorities of research staff

5. Research and Knowledge Production

5.1 Will your regional node be receiving any additional support (in-kind or $) in order to pursue its research and knowledge production objectives? Indicate the source, the role of the organization or person in your regional node, and the nature and amount of support in the table below, **excluding support already mentioned in your formal application.** Indicate whether the support is confirmed (C) or anticipated (A).

Source (organization or person name)	Role (partner, collaborator, other: specify)	Nature (financial, intellectual, in-kind, other: specify)	Amount (for financial contributions only)	Is support confirmed (C) or anticipated (A)?
FedNor	Other: funder of CESD	Financial	$50,000	C
FedNor	Other: funder of Francophone project/CESD	Financial	$127,500 (approx.)	A
Ministry (Ontario) of Northern Development and Mines	Other: funder of CESD internships	Financial	$27,500	C
Ministry (Ontario) of Northern Development and Mines	Other: funder of CESD internships	Financial	$110,000	A
Community Development Corps.	Other: funder of community organzations	Financial	$8,500	C

Urban Aboriginal Strategy	Partner	Financial	$15,500	C
Saskatchewan Association for Community Living	Partner	Financial	$9,000	C
Centre for the Study of Co-operatives	Home of LLL/RCS	Financial	$76,000	C
Co-operatives Secretariat	Other: project, conference	Financial	$23,000	C
Canadian Co-operative Association	Partner	Financial	$4,000	C
Winnipeg Partnership Agreement (Province of Manitoba)	Other: funder of community organizations	Financial	$55,190	C
Human Resources and Skills Development Canada — summer student program	Other: Francophone project	Financial	$4,000	A
Association of Cooperative Educators	Other: conference	Financial	$13,500	C
University of Saskatchewan	Other: conference	Financial	$2,500	C
CCEDNet	Other: project	Financial	$1,500	C
ARUC (Quebec Regional Node)	Other: conference	Financial	$400	C
Canadian Social Economy Hub	Other: conference	Financial	$1,000	C

5.2 Have community and university researchers applied for additional research funding to pursue the node's research projects? Indicate the primary applicant(s), source, and whether funding has been received in the table below.

Primary applicant(s) (last name, first name, title)	Role (partner, collaborator, other – specify)	Source (SSHRC, CIHR, NSERC, other – specify)	Amount requested	Amount awarded (if applicable)
Fairbairn, Brett, Professor	Co-applicant	SSHRC	$178,500	
Murray Fulton, Professor	Co-applicant	SSHRC	$99,710	
Roger Herman	Collaborator	CIDA	$20,000	

5.3 To what degree are the resources available to your regional node sufficient to allow the team to achieve its objectives?

There are a number of areas where the initial budget underestimated the actual costs associated with the nature of the work necessary. These additional costs can be attributed to the size and linguistic and cultural diversity of the project's geographic region, and the additional administrative burden associated with community-university research collaborations. These additional costs are associated with:

- Network building — The purpose of our first symposium was to introduce participants to the project and to each other. As we began year two, we felt it important to continue to build our internal community, so we held a second symposium, supported by a portion of the funds planned for dissemination, thus reducing the amount available for the second conference planned for year four).
- International researchers —Involving international researchers is difficult when SSHRC does not fund their expenses. We are currently developing a number of proposals to other organizations, specifically CIDA, to support the international research.

- Translation and interpretation — Simultaneous interpretation and translation of publications is a significant issue. We have been able to secure funds from partner organizations for an upcoming international conference and continue to look for funds to support translation.
- Travel — A significant amount of travel is necessary for the principal investigator related to both project administration and knowledge-dissemination events. The Centre for the Study of Co-operatives has contributed additional funds to support the PI's travel.
- Community liaison — The original proposal called for one community liaison, but three are required in the current management model. Both WIRA and CESD have provided matching funds to support these activities.
- Project funding — Many of the projects require more funds than are available through SSHRC. CESD has augmented the northern Ontario funds through applications to FedNor and Northern Development and Mines for internships. Several of the community groups have also submitted funding applications, particularly to Community Development Corporations. CESD also augments the funding of some projects through its consulting work to community groups. The Centre for the Study of Co-operatives has matched partner dollars to fund additional internships.

5.4 PROGRAM OF RESEARCH: Append to your report a brief overview of your regional node's main research objectives, identifying any changes from those identified in the formal application. Provide a brief overview of the way in which the research team is organized (e.g., units, clusters, themes, teams, departments), as well as a detailed description of planned research projects. Please provide a similar template as the one suggested below. **(See Appendices 6 and 7)**

5.5 Describe the anticipated or actual mechanisms in place to ensure that participants (i.e., from community-based organizations and universities) have input and influence on research conducted and on the knowledge generated by your regional node.

Please refer to Appendix 3 (Section 3.2: Management/Governance Structure and Advisory Boards, pp. 26–30) for details regarding how all participants will have input into governance as well as research conducted and knowledge generated.

Ensuring Integration of All Participants

Project participants (co-applicants, collaborators, and partners) are invited to regional symposia and provincial workshops to share ideas, provide feedback on planned and completed research, to set research priorities, and to signal interest in participating in or initiating a research project. Each of these gatherings is intended to facilitate the ongoing research planning, implementation, feedback and analysis, and dissemination process occurring within and among clusters.

Partner organizations are offering the time of senior management, board volunteers, and research and marketing staff as in-kind contributions to the project. These community personnel have been and will continue to be involved in research planning, providing input into the direction of the research, brokering connections between the project and local members and communities, and in some cases, data collection.

Regional symposia and provincial workshops, a project newsletter and web pages, as well as Internet-based discussion fora provide mechanisms to maintain communication among all participants. Within the clusters, Internet and telephone conferences and the discussion fora are primary means through which research can be planned and implemented.

At the specific project level, regular meetings will be held to which participants will be invited to give input throughout the duration of the project, including during the data-gathering stage and discussion of the draft results. For example, CESD holds weekly research meetings where the research activities are reported on by student and/or community-based researchers and feedback is provided. All community partnership research projects hold regular meetings with the community partner. In the ASOPRICOR project, for example, the research is discussed at annual general assemblies, as well as at quarterly meetings with the association's executive and other meetings with the focus communities.

5.6 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION – Research and Knowledge Production:
How do you plan to track:
➔ the execution of your planned research program?
➔ individual projects and their expected deliverables?
➔ the usefulness and quality of the research conducted (from an academic and community perspective)?

The principal investigator and project administrator will be monitoring the overall execution of the research program. This will be facilitated through the reports required from the academic partners administering the decentralized funds, as well as standardized activity reports completed by the co-leads/directors of the five clusters and three provincial organizations.

Internal tracking systems have been established at the various universities. At CESD, for example, each project has a proposed end date with a set of deliverables. All dates are on a calendar and are tracked internally by both the CESD department and the accounting department at Algoma University College. The co-directors meet with the community partners on a regular basis and provide supervision and support to all community-based researchers. Full reports on methodology are required of all researchers, both academic and community-based.

Within WIRA and CUISR, the progress of research projects is monitored by the research liaison and community liaison directors, who regularly check on progress, require a status report half-way through the work, and check on the status of work if projects are not completed on time. Upon completion of the work, the directors review the draft report and make suggestions for improvements, provide editing, and also discuss dissemination possibilities with the partnership team.

The usefulness and quality of the research conducted will be monitored by collecting information regarding: dissemination events; publications; media coverage; spin-off research initiatives; ability to leverage other money; and impact on policy development and program development, as both illustrate the policy relevance of the work.

In the longer term, research outputs will be examined for
- lasting effects in the community — the sustainability of the research network, for example; the use of information by community groups in efforts to influence policy; feedback indicating that tools developed through the project have been relevant and useful
- long-term outcomes for students — numbers successfully completing their programs, finding relevant jobs, pursing additional graduate work, etc.

6. Dissemination of Research Results

6.1 Has your regional node developed a formal knowledge-dissemination / communication plan?

● Yes (please append document to your report) (**See Appendix 8**)
○ No (go to 6.1a)

6.1a If not, describe plans for the development of a formal dissemination / communication plan, including anticipated completion date.

6.2 Use the table below to indicate the **number** of knowledge dissemination mechanisms/tools/vehicles the team has already developed (D) or plans to develop (P).

Dissemination Mechanisms/Tools/Vehicles	Number Developed (D)	Number Planned (P)
Research tools (e.g. database, dataset, archive, directory, bibliography, concordance, physical collections, catalogue)	2	2
Web site	1	
Presentations (non-academic)	2	40
Conference presentations (academic)		56
Journal articles (academic)		15
Books (academic)		4
Public lectures or address		11
TV/radio interviews	2	10
Media products	1	10
TV broadcast (e.g., documentary, series)		
Audio-visual material (e.g., video, film, sound recording.)	1	2
Newspaper/magazine article(s)		7
Textbook/educational aid		3
New course(s)	1	3*/**

New program(s) of study		
Performance (e.g., theatre, dance)		
Advisory services (e.g., participation in task forces, advisory committees)		5
Consultancy (e.g., research contracts)		2
Other(s) (please specify): Book chapters GIS maps Individual project posters * Univ. of Hearst is planning to offer CESD program in French ** U of S Interdisciplinary research methods graduate seminar		

6.3 Use the table below to indicate the **number** of knowledge-dissemination events that have already been held (H) or that you plan to hold (P). Also indicate whether the events are aimed at primarily academic or primarily non-academic audiences, or both.

Event Type	# Aimed at academic audiences		# Aimed at non-academic audiences		# Aimed at both academic and non-academic audiences	
	H	**P**	**H**	**P**	**H**	**P**
Workshop	2	5		4	3	8
Conference		0				2
Congress						
Symposium					2	
Meeting		3		3	5	
Other(s): (please specify): _____						

6.4 Who will be the main audiences of the knowledge-dissemination efforts? Please check all that apply, then priority rank the **top three identified audiences** (#1, #2 and #3):

Audience	Rank
● Academic and Other Experts	3
○ Administrators	
● Community Groups	
● Community Leaders	
● Decision Makers	
● Federal Government	
● General Public	
○ International Intergovernmental Body	
○ International Organization	
○ International Research Communities	
● Learned Societies (discipline-based)	
○ Libraries, Museums, Archives	
● Municipal Government	
● Non-Profit Organizations	
● Policy-Makers	2
○ Private Sector	
● Professionals/Practitioners	1
● Provincial Government	

● Students: Undergraduate-Graduate	
○ Unions	
○ Universities	
○ Foreign Government	
○ Informed Public	
○ Media	
● **Other(s)** (please specify):	

6.5 Describe the anticipated or actual mechanisms in place to ensure that audiences have input and influence on research-dissemination activities organized by your regional node.

Presentations of research findings will be made at a preliminary stage to community partners, who will assist with the analysis and provide feedback on the interpretation of results, which is ultimately incorporated into the final document. Draft reports will be circulated amongst the interviewees for input and guidance. Academic leads will provide guidance and feedback to student and community-based researchers. For policy consultations, we will ask participants what we should do with the information: how it should be presented, who it should be presented to, and what role they'd like to play in it.

Examples
Community-University Institute for Social Research
- CUISR has collaborated significantly with the Urban Aboriginal Strategy on research design, implementation, community consultation, and a communication plan.
- In pilot research conducted during the first year, interviewees reviewed drafts and gave feedback, which was incorporated in revisions.

Winnipeg Inner-City Research Alliance
- The following decision was made by those who attended the provincial workshop on 20 February 2007: Once research projects are complete or nearing completion, the findings will be presented at annual provincial workshops of the MB LLL/Social Economy group. Dissemination ideas already developed by the research team will be shared and then expanded upon/refined by the entire group, with the development of specific ideas and approaches appropriate to the findings and target audiences.

Community Economic and Social Development Unit
- CESD created the Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) Tool, a manual about how to start a CSA, with the feedback of community groups.

6.6 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION – Knowledge Dissemination: How do you plan to track:
➔ the implementation of your formal knowledge-dissemination / communication plan?
➔ the impact of audiences' input and influence on knowledge-dissemination activities?
➔ the impact of knowledge-dissemination activities on audiences?

Implementation
The principal investigator and project administrator will be monitoring the overall implementation of the knowledge dissemination/communication plan. This will be facilitated through standardized activity reports completed by the co-leads/directors of the five clusters and three provincial organizations on an annual basis. Internal tracking systems will be established to generate the activity reports.

Impact of Audience Input
Consultations will be held with the planned audience for research results to determine if they are satisfied with final output and the manner in which their input was integrated prior to publication or dissemination.

Impact of Knowledge-Dissemination Activities on Audiences

Success will be measured by organizing a cross-sectoral symposium to evaluate the results of the Linking, Learning, Leveraging projects and focus discussion on the implications for policymaking. The goal will be a symposium that allows for meaningful dialogue among residents, community partners, and government, with each participating on an equal level.

In addition to the symposium, the project will track
- requests for information
- suggestions for or requests for other research initiatives
- funding of additional research
- initiatives, projects, and programs started as a result of research findings
- policy change that can be attributed to the influence of research findings (examples where research reports have been used to direct policy formation)

7. Performance Measurement and Evaluation

7.1 Provide any additional information on your regional node performance measurement and evaluation plans, **not yet discussed in this report.** For example, you may use this space to discuss plans for a formal evaluation of your regional node. Append any relevant documents to further describe your performance measurement and evaluation plans.

The research proposal included a commitment to conduct an assessment of the quality of the community-university partnership in an ongoing manner, specifically at the end of each year, by soliciting feedback from both community and university partners regarding the following areas: opportunities for genuine input into shaping and managing the research program; relevance of the research program to perceived needs and priorities; and value of outcomes gained from participating in the research partnership. It was also proposed that we conduct a thorough assessment of all aspects of the research network and its outcomes following the third year of the project.

We will focus our assessment on three main areas: (1) the impact on research linking community and university partners; (2) the effectiveness of knowledge transfer and knowledge sharing between community and university partners; and (3) the impact on the training of students, community-based researchers, and the wider community. In September 2008, we will establish a Review Steering Committee to develop guidelines and direction for the review process. The committee will be composed of an equal representation of community and academic partners, and will also involve representation from the Advisory Council. We will hire a Research Evaluator/Research Outcomes Analyst to undertake the evaluation of the Northern Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan Social Economy node's work. The process will include interviews with community group representatives, researchers, staff, and node leaders. It will also involve reviewing board minutes, publications, newsletters, the project's website, conference and workshop proceedings, and other relevant knowledge transfer venues. It is anticipated that stakeholders will attend a number of the node's events; information will be gathered from those in attendance.

Framework for Evaluation

The node is considering an adaptation of a framework developed by Moote et al. (2001)* to evaluate the processes used to engage the community in participatory decision making, research, and ownership. Moote et al. identify six key dimensions of successful community-based initiatives: inclusiveness, accessibility, transparency, mutual learning, adaptability, and collective vision.

Inclusiveness

To be effective, community-based processes must engage all stakeholders and give them equal voice and participation regardless of their size or influence in the community. Inclusiveness is not measured by the number of participants but rather by the representation of the diverse interests and views in the community and respects the spectrum of traditions, cultural concepts, and self-determination of community groups. The processes must be open, encourage participation, and respect diverse forms of knowledge systems.

Accessibility

To ensure inclusiveness, processes must be accessible. Access is often defined narrowly as receiving an invitation and having the resources (human and financial) to attend meetings. This definition must be expanded to customizing the process to meet the diverse needs and communication styles of all stakeholders.

Transparency

Processes need to be understandable to all stakeholders. The roles and responsibilities of all parties must be clear at the outset if a trusting and productive relationship is to be established and maintained.

Mutual Learning

Mutual learning is best achieved through collective action. To be effective, program processes must promote inclusive and interactive learning among participants. Emphasis must be placed on activities that encourage participation by all interested stakeholders and ensure their perspectives are valued and considered in the decision-making process.

Adaptability

Processes need to be flexible because of the complex and dynamic nature of social systems. Innovation and flexibility improve the quality of decision making. Continual monitoring of outcomes is necessary so that the project and its activities remain responsive to the diverse needs of the various interest groups. This monitoring of practices is best done collectively by all stakeholders so that the interests of all groups are addressed.

Collective Vision

A clear, shared vision that represents the interests and values of all stakeholders is essential if all interested groups are to be vested members of the process. Trust and commitment are the foundations for collective action. Leadership must be creative and able to build bridges between different interests and perspectives, facilitating the establishment of networks between interest groups and strategic partners.

* Moote, Margaret A., Beverly A. Brown, Eric Kingsley, Steven X. Lee, Steve Marshall, Donald E. Voth, and Gregg B. Walker. 2001. "Process: Redefining Relationships." *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* 12 (3/4):97–116.