

# Learning For A Change Community Development Service Learning Project



Completed for *the Community Development Service Learning Project*: A national project to strengthen learning opportunities in community organizations. Project activities supported practitioners to integrate a learning lens into their community economic development projects, increasing the capacity of the student/learner, the organization and the community to contribute to social change.

December 2009

*Canadian Community Economic Development Network*: A national member-led organization committed to strengthening Canadian communities by creating better economic opportunities that enhance environmental and social conditions. For more information on CCEDNet go to our website: [www.ccednet-rcdec.ca](http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca)

*Funding for this project was provided to CCEDNet by the  
J.W. McConnell Family Foundation.*

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
Introduction .....	5
Project Phases and Outcomes .....	5
Chapter 1: Building Capacity for Learning .....	6
Chapter 2: Building Opportunities for Youth .....	10
Chapter 3: Building University–Community Partnerships .....	15
Chapter 4: Learning for a Change—Next Steps .....	18
Conclusion: Learning for a Change .....	19
The Accordion by Barbara Adler .....	20

## Appendices

- Appendix 1: Through Our Eyes: A Learning Experience
- Appendix 2 Project Phases and Activities
- Appendix 3 Evaluation: Project Outcomes Summary Table
- Appendix 4 Advisory Committee

## Executive Summary

---

Over the last three years the Community Development Service Learning Project (CDSL) had the opportunity to provoke and nurture a discussion about the role of learning in CED and the capacities that are necessary to utilize a learning lens for citizenship development and social change. From January 2007 to December 2009 this project facilitated peer learning and training, tool development, website development and partnership development between community organizations and university CSL programs. This report summarizes the activities that took place in the CDSL project and shares our understanding of how informal and formal learning can help CED organizations to become more reflective and connected to the purpose of their work and to each other. The report also describes the challenges and opportunities faced by CED organizations as they attempt to embed learning in their work environment.

By following an evaluation plan (see Appendix 3) we tracked participation in project activities and we documented both our own and participants' successes, challenges and questions about the role of learning in building the capacity of CED organizations. The evaluation gathered stories and reflections on the experiences of people involved in this project, particularly members of the project's advisory committee (see Appendix 2). The advisory included community practitioners, CSL staff, youth, students, researchers and policy influencers. From these conversations and reflections we noticed that similar observations were being made about learning and its potential for building the capacity of community organizations. We have woven the observations into a series of themes that summarize shared insights from participants in this project:

*i. Learning is action.*

There is tension between productivity and learning. Learning is only valued and, therefore, given attention when it is transactional. That is, when the act of learning is developing or applying a skill. Rarely is time given for transformational learning -- when the act of learning is intended to deepen our consciousness about our work and the context for our work. Reflection, dialogue and thinking are not built into work schedules. We have not yet developed a culture that explicitly values learning. Learning, therefore, is happening "off the side of busy practitioners desks."

*ii. Learning is critical to doing something different.*

Change work requires conceptual energy and this requires time to be creative. Creativity is fostered by insight – either conscious or unconscious. The act of becoming creative requires time for curiosity, exploration and imagination. It also

requires letting go of the impulse to make sense of things right away and allow ourselves to sit with the messiness for awhile.

*iii. Learning creates theory from action*

There is an interest, need and opportunity to provide policy influencers and policy makers with evidence through stories from people on “the ground.” When people engage in reflection-on-action, they are exploring their experience and they are learning from their experience. There is a repository of understanding and knowledge about CED documented by community practitioners, students and CSL staff that is not being tapped into by policy influencers. And likewise, there is a repository of research (for example Social Economy Hub research) that should be better transferred into the hands of community practitioners. This is a missed opportunity.

*iv. Learning requires a space in the now and the promise of space in the future*

Learning pulls us away from doing. It creates a space to describe, process and explore what is happening, what we are feeling and what we know and want to know. The act of learning creates a space to discover who we are and what moves us. This learning is where intent and actions meet. By creating time to learn we become better at responding to the urgency of the present, rather than only reacting, because we know there will be time in the future to unpack, process and re-examine situations.

*v. Learning demands a facilitator*

As humans we are social animals. We learn in relation. We learn with and from each other. When learning happens within groups there is heightened commitment. Trust and reciprocity between people increases. When learning is facilitated it leads to heightened intent and purpose. Facilitated learning and group learning requires dedicated resources such as time, people, money, knowledge and tools.

*vi. Learning is power*

Learning involves a power dynamic. This is especially true when learning involves measurement. Using learning for transformation becomes more challenging when the act of learning is measured by grades. And transformational learning requires that each person in the transaction participates fully and equally in learning activities. It is rare for students to learn with and from faculty, staff and community supervisors. Learning is often “done to” students.

*vii. Learning provides us with a set of keys*

Learning gives us time and systems (internal and external) to figure out what we need. The result of learning is that we develop the capacity to access what we need when we need to. There are groups within our population who do not have access to learning. In this project we discovered that young people who face multiple barriers do not receive the benefits that come from learning. There is a

need to create open, flexible and adaptable learning environments so those most marginalized can gain entry points to learning.

## Introduction

---

This report tells the story of the Community Development Service Learning Project. It also includes our personal stories of learning during this project because this report is about real people working for real change. This project has taught us that we don't create change only because of information -- we create change because we are moved to do so. For this reason and because the reflective tools used by project participants required for them to tell their story we decided to end this report by story telling our experience within this project.

Kerri Klein coordinated the CDSL project. Anne Docherty shared learning resources used by Storytellers' Foundation. Throughout the project Anne and Kerri adapted the tools to fit the needs and contexts of community organizations and CSL staff as they applied a learning lens to their work.

The next section of the report describes what happened during each phase of the project. Each chapter explains what we wanted to achieve and what actually happened. Our learning is woven through each chapter.

The last chapter describes activities that will take place because of this project. In this section you can find out what activities are scheduled and how you can stay (or become) involved in *Learning for a Change*.

The Conclusion offers a spoken word poem by Barbara Adler. This poem tells the story of the questions, angst, hopes and commitment held by people working in their own neighbourhoods to create change for a fair and just society.

The Appendices provide our personal stories, summaries of project activities, project advisory committee list, and the evaluation plan.

## Project Phases and Outcomes

---

The project had three distinct phases and four objectives. The outcomes of each of these phases are discussed in the chapters of this report. The following table summarizes the project phases and objectives. The activities that took place in each of these phases are listed in Appendix 1.

Phase	Objective
Research and Development (January 2007 - May 2008)	Build capacity of CED organizations to benefit from CDSL & contribute to the

Phase	Objective
	development of curriculum and programs in formal/non-formal learning organizations that meet community needs.
Capacity Building for CDSL (June 2008 – December 2008)	Build opportunities for students to engage in effective CDSL and network with youth leadership and the CED movement to contribute to social and economic change in Canada.
	Enhance the effectiveness of CDSL in building community assets and contributing to youth engagement in CED, inclusive of rural, urban, northern, aboriginal and disadvantaged communities.
University-Community Partnership (January 2009 – November 2009)	Build opportunities for formal/non-formal learning organizations to partner with CED organizations to expand CDSL opportunities that contribute to community needs and assets.

## **Chapter I: Building Capacity for Learning**

---

### **What we wanted to accomplish**

To build capacity of CED organizations to benefit from community development service learning & contribute to the development of curriculum and programs in formal/non-formal learning organizations that meet community needs.

### **What happened?**

CED organizations did build their capacity to benefit from learning. And, CED organizations have, through conversation and input on tool development, contributed to the curricula of programs such as CSL. CED organizations discovered roles for both informal and formal learning in helping them meet community needs. We discovered, however, that learning requires management and facilitation and this, in turn, requires at least one person within the community organization to hold a learning mandate.

#### **a) Building Capacity for Learning in Community**

We started off in this project hoping to explore how service learning could be a tool to enable change to take place within community. At first we thought we'd talk with our colleagues inside the formal institutions of university, college and high schools and find ways to support the placement of students in community organizations. We thought that we could discover ways that learning could be

**transformational** – that is, where the student would have personal changes because of community service and the community organization would achieve their goals for change because of the relationship with a formal education institution. However, we quickly realized that before we could engage in a conversation with colleagues inside our institutions, we needed to better understand how learning was already being used inside community. We found that much of this informal learning was happening, but it was happening implicitly and its purpose was largely untapped or unknown.

What we've learned from this project is that *the potential for learning exists everywhere* but the act of learning itself does not just happen incidentally or accidentally. Learning requires intent and facilitation. Embedding learning within community organizations requires a person to hold a wider perspective. This requires a shift in the organizational culture.

We wanted to test what would happen when learning was embedded within community organizations. We developed tools for people to access informal learning opportunities so they became less accidental and more purposeful. This learning involved deep conversation, it involved reflection. We challenged the people we were working with to create space in the midst of busyness and urgency to talk, reflect and explore. We asked them to engage in learning – that is to do some things in order to understand the world around them. We organized activities so that their experience became their teacher. They asked honest and difficult questions of themselves and their work. And then we asked them to share their discoveries with each other and with us.

*By developing the ability to explore and be curious about our own experiences and actions, we suddenly open up the possibilities of purposeful learning – derived not from books or experts, but from our work and our lives. This is the purpose of reflection: to allow the possibility of learning through experience. (Joy Amulya<sup>1</sup>)*



In his writing about learning in community Mark Smith<sup>2</sup> describes the term learning as a gerund - a word that can stand as a noun or verb. He continues to

<sup>1</sup> What is Reflective Practice? Joy Amulya. Center for Reflective Community Practice. Massachusetts Institute of Technology

<sup>2</sup> Smith, M. K. (1999) 'Learning theory', the encyclopedia of informal education, [www.infed.org/biblio/b-learn.htm](http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-learn.htm), Last update: September 03, 2009

explain that learning is therefore the process of acquiring skills and knowledge, and an internal change of consciousness.

### **b) Building Capacity for Learning in CED**

Throughout this project we have witnessed people understand learning in both the ways that Mark Smith writes about. We spent a lot of time in this project looking at learning in community, specifically learning inside CED organizations. For the most part people thought of learning primarily as something we do to acquire skills and secondly as something we do to acquire knowledge. When people spent time learning it was usually for professional development. People attended workshops, training seminars, conferences, continuing education courses or formal education programs. *Rarely did people describe learning as an activity they did regularly within their work schedule to deepen or change their consciousness.* And so learning was relegated to developing the intellect or the cognitive. Rarely was learning used to name and talk about values, principles, beliefs, or so people could become better at recognizing biases, assumptions or understanding governing variables. **Learning was rarely done to change how we be, it was done to change what we do.**

People in the CED movement are working to reduce or remove barriers for citizen engagement, community empowerment, self-reliance, inclusivity and sustainability. CED practitioners work on issues such as poverty reduction, climate change, aboriginal rights and title, or alternate economies. Others in the CED movement are working to influence enabling policies so that the current economic paradigm that has created the injustices on the ground changes. Simply put, **CED work is about changing a paradigm.** It is about challenging collective assumptions about what we value and what we are striving for as a community and as a society. To challenge the paradigms and assumptions of others, we must continually and critically examine our own assumptions as practitioners and as a movement for change. An interesting finding from this project is that **rarely do CED organizations give time for learning** as a process to consider and develop our own internal consciousness.

Throughout this project learning has been used as tool for change. It has created trusting relationships, deeper understanding of contexts, motivation and purpose among practitioners, creative solutions to complex situations and it held the promise of a space to breathe, reflect, think and produce. And yet, the CED movement in Canada is generally a part of a dominant culture that does not value learning as part of the “doing” that is measured and resourced. We need to change our own paradigm of how we work and what we consider work to be. We cannot change external paradigms if we don’t start by changing our own habits and practices to include and develop our own paradigms.

### c) Building Capacity for CDSL to Contribute to Curricula Inside Institutions

“A teachable moment can be when I simply have a conversation with someone else. I stop worrying about who is a student and who is a supervisor.”<sup>3</sup> (CSL program staff)

Teachable moments are usually incidental but they don't have to be unplanned. During this project community and university practitioners were able to identify opportunities where a deeper conversation could take place between practitioners, students and people using the services of the community organization. Looking back on interactions they could see how a student orientation could have been a space for a conversation around hopes and fears rather than only scheduling and tasks. Practitioners began to understand how busy acts, such as serving food or cleaning up in a kitchen, offered a time for focused conversation that could be thought out ahead of time. This was a shift in understanding learning. Before, practitioners had considered that learning took more time because it had to happen outside of the busyness of day-to-day doing. Through conversations and tool testing they began to see that learning happens inside the real life activities of day-to-day living.



### d) Building Theory from Action

“We need to be vigilant about changes in the political context and to get better at weaving theory into our practice.”<sup>4</sup>

Margaret Ledwith

To facilitate deeper conversation requires a practitioner to hold a change framework. Holding a change framework requires that we articulate the values and beliefs that underpin our work. We need to articulate the change we want because of our work. Some practitioners (both community and university) admitted that they rarely do this. They have become focused on doing. They have a list that they must get through in a day and it leaves little time for personal or collaborative reflection.

<sup>3</sup> Demonstration Phase Phone Call conversation, May 2009

<sup>4</sup> Ledwith, Margaret (2007) 'Reclaiming the radical agenda: a critical approach to community development', *Concept* Vol.17, No.2, 2007, pp8-12

During this project, however, practitioners did take the time to reflect on their actions. And, when they did this something changed. Reflection means we deconstruct our practice. We make the familiar strange. This starts with us removing ourselves from the immediacy of our work and it requires us to unpack that which we do daily and almost instinctively. Reflection demands sorting, unpacking and then re-packing the pieces of our practice. Reflection does more than only evaluate. Reflection gives us a process to explore the beliefs, values, and principles that govern what we do. Through reflection we build knowledge from our experience. This is where ideas and solutions arise. This is where we draw on imagination, dreams and our stories to help us with analysis.

Practitioners who reflected during this project began to see their work and the problems they faced in a different light. They were able to link what they did to a bigger movement for change. They became articulate. They described theories they held and they became interested in theories from others.

The first phase of this project showed us that there is a great opportunity for the CED movement to connect with the theories and experiences of practitioners working inside community and inside our educational institutions (especially CSL) and to use these theories as evidence of why a social economy is critical for a healthy society. Through tele-learning calls, workshops, interviews and focus groups we saw a hunger from people doing CED work to learn from the theories of each other and those currently researching global trends and experiences.

## **Chapter 2: Building Opportunities for Youth**

---

### **What we wanted to accomplish**

To build opportunities for students to engage in effective community development service learning, and network with youth leadership and the CED movement, to contribute to social and economic change in Canada.

To enhance the effectiveness of community development service learning in building community assets and contributing to youth engagement in CED, inclusive of rural, urban, northern, aboriginal and disadvantaged communities.

### **What happened?**

When project activities included testing tools, there were opportunities for young people to engage in reflection about their experiences and to articulate their theories for change. This happened through collaborative reflections with interns and work supervisors, through focus group conversations, tele-learning calls and through on-line forums. However, when these activities stopped, the CED organizations did not continue to provide a process for youth reflection. Reasons given were lack of time, lack of skills, or lack of knowledge and confidence to facilitate learning.

Many of the participating organizations and individuals that received tools in this project were also working in disadvantaged areas. The relationships between these participants have deepened throughout the project, resulting in mentorship between organizations and ongoing communication.

### a) Role of Young People in Creating Change

“The young people are ready – they’re just waiting for our call”<sup>5</sup>

Gali Skalun

The McConnell Foundation knows the important role that young people play in creating change. Their interest in this project has been about developing an active citizenry and exploring how service and learning might create experiences that ignite engaged citizenship, leading to new norms of behaving. This project was tasked with exploring how service and learning might spark a lifelong interest for young people to become involved in movements for social change.

What we found is that community service learning programs also suffer from the “treadmill” of having to produce and “manage a lot of people to show up in a lot of places”. Outside of reflective evaluating (which is usually done back in class) there is rarely scheduled time for a student to have a deeper conversation about the why’s of the work with CED workers. Community practitioners, community service learning staff and students recognized that opportunities to share hopes, dreams and ideas were not being fostered for a number of reasons:

- Lack of time
- As soon as things got busy, reflection was the first thing dropped
- Unclear on who’s role it is to facilitate the learning
- Lack of structure in the community organization to support deeper learning
- Social norms value objectivity (i.e. doing tangible projects) rather than time to explore subjective aspects of CED (i.e. theories of change).

Whether young people are participating in CED work as a learner or as a practitioner, we noticed a tension between productivity and learning. Time for learning – that conceptual process of interpreting and making sense of new knowledge, behaviours, values, preferences and dreams – is not recognized nor scheduled in to work plans. The emphasis is on doing, analyzing and documenting. There is



<sup>5</sup> Gali Skalun. Learning Shop Strategic Planning, Hazelton 2005

little or no time dedicated to processing how the work is impacting people emotionally or for fostering curiosity and reflection on how the work might be done differently. Young people mentioned the lack of facilitated process for hopes and dreams in community work.

There is a tension between service and charity. Young people hold a “critical eye and a hopeful heart.”<sup>6</sup> They want to serve but usually they want to serve because of a personal interest and passion – or because they are outraged at the way the world is going. Young people also want to serve because of relationship. They have built a connection with a person or a group. They want to serve community. In this project community has meant people sharing a physical place, an ideology, a project or a change movement.

Young people involved in formal education have often re-located to an institution of their choice. It makes it more difficult for them to have developed a relationship with the people that they may be providing a service for. This creates the tension between whether the service is an act of an engaged and active citizen or if the service is an act of charity. This tension is heightened when the service is inside a disadvantaged neighbourhood or community.

In this project we saw examples where this tension was less because the community organization and the formal institution had taken time to build a relationship and have deeper conversations about hopes and dreams for change before students were placed in service. Although there were many examples, two that stand out are Santropol Roulant and McGill University in Montreal and the soup kitchen in Sault St Marie and Sault College in northern Ontario.

### **b) Young People Living and Working in Disadvantaged Areas**

“The main focus is whatever issue they are dealing with that day whether it be homelessness, addictions, arrests, court appearances, having their kids taken away... My main purpose is to deal with all those factors first and then if there is time we get to everything else.”<sup>7</sup>

*CED youth practitioner*

We could categorize the young people we met in this project in to two categories: those whose promise and potential have been tapped and those whose promise and potential has been shut down. Sometimes we only met the youth whose life experiences have shut them down through the stories of their peers or the adults whose job it is to offer services to them.

Early on in this project we met with young adults who reflected the people whom Marshall Ganz suggests have “the combination of a critical eye and hopeful heart.” They were full of ideas for change, hope for the CED movement,

---

<sup>6</sup> Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government: Public Policy Lecture Marshall Ganz

<sup>7</sup> Post from On-line forum for youth testers (reflection-on-action), 2008

frustration at the lack of attention by governments to urgent concerns such as climate change. These young people had energy, a knowledge base to inform them and life experiences that gave them confidence. Some of these young people included:

- CCEDNet Emerging Leaders Committee
- CreateAction interns from 20 CED organizations used reflection-on-action tools
- Young adults involved in CED work (i.e. Multi-Cultural Health Brokers, Santropol Roulant, Core Neighbourhood Youth Co-op, Learning Enrichment Foundation, Lifecycles, etc.)

We also heard, however, from young adults who were still living and being “worked on” within their own backyards. Through tool testing, workshop presentations and interviews we heard from, or about, these young adults who were primarily refugee youth, aboriginal youth, and inner city street kids. These young adults were living in disadvantaged communities and neighbourhoods across the country. They reminded us of the isolation, despair, apathy and fear held by many youth in Canada.

And yet, despite all odds, these young adults were struggling to connect. They were accessing community support systems to gain control over their lives and to address oppressive power structures that prevented them from removing the barriers that kept them from becoming active citizens.

Many of these young adults had not experienced success with our formal institutions. They were isolated from families, struggling with substance abuse issues and living with impoverishment.



We heard that crisis after crisis created a cycle of reaction, anger and burnout that made it difficult if not impossible to find the time or energy for reflection, conversation and learning.

Early on in the project we learned from the community development literacy work of Storytellers’ and their colleagues in northwest BC. This work integrates literacy development with social and economic organizing and development. The result of this work is an emergence of young people who see themselves as part of the glue of

community. They begin to realize they are needed and they hold rights and responsibilities to influence and shape the society around them.

“People now stop me in front of the Post Office and ask me about community issues and I can talk with them – I even get invited to events. That’s new for me.”<sup>8</sup>

CDSL program participant

We wondered if the successes of this programming were only because of the remote-rural nature of the communities. These are small towns where people have extended relationships with kin. However as we adapted the tools used in these programs and shared them with others working with youth who face multiple barriers to engagement **we discovered that they offered the same potential for success.** Through the testing of these tools and in conversations with youth who are helping youth in vulnerable and often dangerous situations, **we discovered that learning plays a key role in creating change.** Learning in these circumstances is always dialogical. That is, it stems from conversations from the people involved in a situation rather than being driven by curricula. In listening to the experiences of these young people we discovered that when they talked of “success”, certain themes were consistent in the learning activity:

- Learning was flexible, adaptable and open  
There was a “go with the flow” attitude. Space was available both day and night for young people to talk with someone. Learning tools were used to prompt conversation and to structure conversation but there was flexibility to change according to the needs of the vulnerable youth.
- The learning environment was safe  
The learning environment was often a drop-in centre or a playground. In some circumstance the learning environment was a young mentor’s apartment. Regardless of the place, the mentor set boundaries around physical and emotional safety. The mentor was honest around sensitive issues such as disclosure. The mentor was clear around relationships and roles.
- Learning tools were fun and simple  
Because learning with disengaged youth was dialogic, youth mentors had tools to help them initiate conversations. These tools were very simple and at the same time profound. Sometimes the tools simply gave a troubled youth something to do with their hands while they shared their story. The successful tools created, adapted or shared during this project were playful and creative. They provoked interest because of their shape, colour or texture. They provided an opportunity for a smile or laughter. The tools created an entry point for a young person to remove themselves from their day-to-day and to begin a process of dreaming and hoping for a future different than the past.
- Time was given for intentional relationship building

---

<sup>8</sup> Learning Shop experiential education program evaluation. 2007

Youth mentors or adults working with disadvantaged youth were successful only when time was given to “hanging out”. That is the importance of building genuine relationships was recognized. In this project we heard from mentors and practitioners that hanging out and getting to know youth before formal roles were established made an impact. Hanging out looked different in every community, neighbourhood or city. It included playing basketball on street corners, eating at a soup kitchen, sitting in court, skating in a skateboard park, visiting playgrounds at night.

## **Chapter 3: Building University–Community Partnerships**

### **What we wanted to accomplish**

Build opportunities for formal/non-formal learning organizations to partner with CED organizations to expand community development service learning opportunities that contribute to community needs and assets.

### **What happened?**

We spent the final year of this project building relationships between CED organizations and university CDSL programs. After tele-learning conversations with members of the Community Alliance for Community Service Learning (CACSL) and a one-day meeting at the University of Toronto, three CED organizations and three universities agreed to plan a community service learning project. This partnership development happened through facilitated telephone conversations. The conversations were guided by questions presented inside a cultural dialogue workbook. Rather than plan a project that was driven by curricula goals and objectives, we wanted to drive a project that was driven by the **beliefs, values and ideas** of the people involved. We also wanted potential CSL projects to be driven by the real needs and interests of the community. The partnerships that resulted were:

- Partnership between University of Toronto and the Learning Enrichment Foundation with a planned CSL project beginning in January 2010.
- Partnership between Sault College and Sault St. Marie Soup Kitchen resulting in interest to embed the reflective tools from this project into the CSL program of the nursing faculty at Sault College. Reflection on Action 2-day training planned for May 2010.
- Partnership between the University of Victoria’s Office of Community Based Research and Lifecycles Project Society with commitment to continue developing the relationship.

## a) Partnership Development between University and Community Organizations

“We talk often and have talked lots over the past three years, but we’ve never really had a conversation with each other before this...”<sup>9</sup>

CSL program staff

In the spring of 2009 we facilitated three community-university partnership groups to have three telephone conversations with each other. These conversations were framed around cultural guidelines for citizenship. Two themes emerged from these conversations – one theme is relationship and the other theme is dialogue.

Partnerships do not just happen. And when they do happen, just like learning, there are two paths a partnership can take. **A partnership can be transactional** – one partner produces and the other consumes. A community organization approaches a CSL program and says, for example, we need a brochure. The CSL program responds by having a student produce a brochure. These are useful partnerships but they are not partnerships that lead to societal change. **A partnership can also be transformational** – people join together to dialogue. This partnership is built around conceptual work. People refine questions and discover new paths of inquiry. These partnerships lead to societal change, however, they rarely provide immediate results.

This project has shown us that partnerships between CED organizations and CSL programs can lead to immediate and tangible products as well as new paths for inquiry and changes in consciousness.

We knew entering this project that transformational partnerships do not happen only because people have a good idea. We also learned that partnerships do not happen only because people are skilled and knowledgeable. **Transformational partnerships happen because of relationship.** It is through our conversations and our reciprocal exchanges that we develop relationships with others. These relationships help us create a sense of attachment, a sense of belonging and a sense of unity with others. This in turn creates trust and reciprocity, which are the pillars of any successful partnership.

When we shifted the conversation from partnership development to relationship development, people talked differently to each other. There was a shift from “professional” to citizen. We became people “in community” rather than people working “for community”. Remembering this, helped people find a personal meaning in project activities. They were able to recognize the value of their own knowledge and experience and they were able to make connections to others and deepen their own understanding of the why’s of their partnership and their place in it.

---

<sup>9</sup> Demonstration Phase Phone Call conversation, May 2009

## b) Holding a Change Framework

“Questions can be dangerous – they take us to the edge of what is known and comfortable and then push us beyond that safe edge.”<sup>10</sup>

Teresa Healy

Canada has seen an increased trend toward an individualized market approach to education and learning. The focus of this approach tends to be on the individual and on access to formal education courses and programs. Learning within this view is seen to be a result of teaching and the outcomes are measured in terms of qualifications and certificates. There is an assumption that if people can develop their individual skills and knowledge, then they in turn will use this learning to transform society.

We entered this project with a goal of testing how a learning lens can be a tool for social change.

The CSL staff and faculty who participated in this project resonated with our view that learning is a tool for creating change in the conditions affecting communities. There is an assumption within this approach that social change necessitates some form of collective learning and collective action. This does not mean that the development of individual skills and knowledge are not important. They are important but within this project the development of individual skills is seen to occur in conjunction with shared experiences with others.

**This approach to learning requires dialogue and inquiry.** During the partnership development phase of this project, participants committed to a deeper level of conversation and to asking questions of each other and themselves. This resulted in community practitioners and CSL staff/faculty sharing their hopes and dreams for a future. It resulted in conversations about the change that was hoped for because of CSL projects. For example, the partnership development between a community organization in Sault Ste. Marie and Sault College became less about the how's and what's and more about poverty reduction and inspiring hope and activism in students. By keeping the change mandate at the forefront of the discussion there was a tendency to think about a bigger picture of society.

Those involved in the demonstration projects identified interests in challenging others (mainly students) to consider their opinion and their role in shaping community and change. We plan to continue working on our demonstration projects and on distributing our learning from this project. How we will do this is explained in the following chapter.

---

<sup>10</sup> Northern Champions Lounge: A Virtual Learning and Support Space. A Prospectus by Teresa Healy, Northern Health (British Columbia) March 2009

## Chapter 4: Learning for a Change—Next Steps

---

This project built relationships. Relationships between community organizations interested in learning, between universities and CED organizations, between two national networks (CACSL and CCEDNet) and between youth that are interested in learning how to create meaningful change.

Because we took the time for deep conversations, which included sharing our stories with each other, we achieved what Marshall Ganz teaches us to do – we created a story of us. This, in turn, has created trust and a development of social capital between people involved in this project. These qualities allowed us to continue to work together in the final year of this project and to deal with the uncertainty of this project, an uncertainty that is inherent in community development work.

Because of these relationships and because of a shared belief that learning is critical to mobilizing engagement in a democratic society we have planned several activities that will continue the work started in this project. Our intent is to create a culture shift in both community organizations and our institutions so that learning is recognized as a critical tool for change and resources are re-directed so that practitioners are given the responsibility to hold a learning mandate within their CED work and within their CSL coordination.

The following paragraphs describe the activities that will continue beyond the life of this project:

### **Learning for a Change Website ([www.learningforachange.org](http://www.learningforachange.org))**

Participants involved in this project wanted continued access to resources for developing their skills, knowledge, confidence and consciousness. The favoured way to access resources was through face-to-face facilitation such as workshops, reflective conversations and mentorship. However, it was recognized that this is extremely expensive. Participants agreed that a website would be the second best method of sharing resources.

The final activity of this project was the design and development of a website. The site is designed and developed by community practitioners. The site houses the resources used, shared and discovered during this project.

It is a repository of resources for anyone interested in change work. This site houses articles, videos, pod casts, power points, tool kits, research and profiles on people engaging in CED work. The site is organized under three themes: Learning, Organizing and Development.

SPARC BC (Social Planning and Research Council) will administer the site to ensure its quality and integrity and Storytellers' Foundation will continue to

moderate and facilitate the site for content. SPARC recognizes the relevance of the site for community practitioners interested in capacity building. The site will continue to be a “stand alone” site and will remain true to CCEDNet’s philosophy of shared ownership. This site will be an open space site.

### **CDSL Training on Reflection and Learning**

We are planning a consultation and training on how to embed reflection and learning activities in to a CSL program offered through Sault College. A conference on reflective practice has been scheduled for May, 2010 in Sault Ste Marie. Project staff will present at this conference and will work with Sault College faculty to integrate the reflection-on-action tool kit from this project in to Sault College’s nursing program that offers CSL.

### **Community Development Learning Training**

We are scheduling a series of two-day training courses to be offered across the country. These courses are being offered in partnership with various provincial organizations. Storytellers’ Foundation will offer the training as part of a member-led initiative of CCEDNet. Project staff and CCEDNet regional staff are collaborating with the following potential partners. We will confirm schedules and locations early in 2010. For more information on training or to book training contact Kerri at [kerri@bchealthycommunities.ca](mailto:kerri@bchealthycommunities.ca)

### **Community Development Learning Schedule:**

<b><i>Province</i></b>	<b><i>Partner</i></b>	<b><i>Timeline</i></b>
British Columbia	BC Healthy Communities	Feb 2010
	BC Rural Summit	March 2010
	Capacity Building Consortium	May 2010
	Community Social Planning Network	
Manitoba	Canadian CED Network	March 2010
Ontario	Sault College	May 2010
	Canadian CED Network	
	George Brown College	

## **Conclusion: Learning for a Change**

---

We are leaving this project with a deeper understanding and appreciation for how learning can be a tool for creating change. The people who have worked with us during this project agree. Once they used learning as a tool for deeper conversation, reflection and thinking they immediately recognized a gap when they stopped learning in intentional and purposeful ways. Those that used the learning tools talked about approaching their work differently and approaching

their work with more intent and motivation. Relationships deepened and a sense of trust and solidarity developed. People felt less hurried and scattered. It was as if the treadmill was turned off for a short period. People described being more creative and felt renewed passion and energy for their work. Unfortunately, when the testing period was over and we were not there to guide, support, challenge or prompt people then the day-to-day busyness of the work and the organization took over and the learning was dropped.

We have learned from project activities that as a society we are rewarded for doing and developing our analysis. Throughout this project we saw and heard about the emphasis placed on evidence and data. We must have empirical data in order to get funding. Practitioners talk about the never-ending trek to conferences, training seminars and workshops. They must report out on numbers and dollars and statistics. We place tremendous value on information. And yet we also saw and heard about innovative acts of change. The projects that were promoted as being successful were the ones that had placed value on the emotion, passion and spirit of individuals and had spent time building relationships of trust and reciprocity. The innovative projects had taken time for story telling of experience rather than only a critical analysis of experience. This struck a chord with the project team because it related closely to what we were hearing around the tensions between productivity and learning.

Community development learning and community service learning are distinct models of learning for change. Each has unique goals and approaches. And both hold potential as a tool for change by diverse sectors. However, until learning in its entirety is widely recognized as an important activity in the workplace, then we will fail to tap in to the potential that learning holds for us to create change.

We hope that the website, tools and training emerging from this project will continue to encourage structural and cultural shifts in the way we practice CED work so as to include learning as an explicit component of creating social change. When learning is facilitated then there is a rigor applied in describing, processing and exploring community work. This offers up an opportunity for the CED movement to achieve its goals and it offers an opportunity for young people to adopt a lifelong practice of activism and engagement.

We end the report with Barbara Adler story telling the experience of CED practitioners organizing for change in their remote-rural and aboriginal communities in Northwest British Columbia.

## **The Accordion by Barbara Adler**

---

**Behold** the miracle of the accordion.  
It's an instrument that shouldn't work but it does...

Accordions are so improbable they should be considered in the same scrap heap of unlikely miracles as unexpected apologies and grassroots movements...

Speaking to you, you who take on difficult things. You wake up on most days to your duty and tend to the delicate gardens of human needs in spite of the nagging certainty that any minute now it might all get paved.

You strap yourselves to the PA system even when it's difficult to prove that anyone is listening. Ideas that used to be played often and openly are now holding the dust up in slumbering attics...

How are you supposed to get anything done when general interest in the way the world is going has become an instrument too shameful to play in public?

Consider the accordion...  
Frankly, when you start cataloguing what can go wrong on an instrument where everything can go wrong then the moments where everything is okay become sublime...



(The accordion) is not an ideal machine like a Swiss watch or an academic essay, the parts do not mesh perfect but in this everyday fragility I see a kind of gallantry. Pick your favourite thing in the world. A sunset, chocolate... the community where you perform your labours...

If you look closely enough everything that we love is like this – difficult, pitted by accident and full of things that break. But this is the measure of our luck, to be here together and to be willing to wear the responsibility of loving the unlikely.

We shouldn't be able to do this and yet our readiness creates a particular beauty that can be considered in the same stubborn category as a donkey kick, kitchen sink politics and the resolution to keep moving. Failure becomes too familiar to deserve a name.

Here we are. Listen to the rattles. Listen to the unpleasant sounds you can make -- the obstinate opposite of harps and angels, the confusion of too many hearts having to find a way

We are the poster children of the especially unlikely miracle... And yet behold we still work.

## Appendix 1: Through Our Eyes: A Learning Experience

### Anne's story

I took a break from writing this final report to meet a friend (whom I consider brilliant) for lunch. I'm spending time in the city as I write this report. It's quite different from my home community, which is 1,000 kilometres north where, between our 14 remote communities, we can almost claim a population of 5,000 people. So going for lunch in the city, especially with a brilliant friend, is pretty exciting.

Over lunch we talked about the tensions within CED in Canada. Has CED become more of a professional community rather than a movement for change? Is it still grass roots people connecting because of the work they are doing locally or is it people in paid positions acting in intermediary roles? Are the people who are at the margins (whom we often represent) called neighbours or are they considered clients? Can you create change without a change framework? How can you hold a change framework if you are only busy with the doing and have no time for the thinking and reflecting? How do you ignite social action because you are outraged at the injustices done to people and the planet when you are caught in the same old cycle of "do, react-to-crisis, breathe", "do, react-to-crisis, breathe"?

These questions have been asked in different ways within every part of the *Community Development Service Learning* project. The Canadian CED Network (CCEDNet) was funded by the McConnell Foundation to explore the potential of service learning as a vehicle for developing active citizenship while supporting the community's outcomes. This project was to explore the role of learning and to test what happens when practitioners working in community hold a learning lens and access learning systems in order to create change while, at the same time, developing engaged citizens.

My friend's work is divided between working for a university and for a grass roots community organization. She is a repository of knowledge and stories for me. Our lunch conversation was stimulating. It was a great opportunity for me to process for this report and to have someone to bounce ideas back and forward with.

As we were walking back from lunch a man sitting on the street asked us for some money. He asked if we had change we could throw his way. My friend said she did have some change and took it out of her wallet and bent down to give it to the man. As she was doing this, she looked at him and said, "You look very tired." As is her way, she said it with true compassion, one person seeing another person.

The man's eyes changed as he began to tell us how, in the middle of the night, someone had hit him over the head with a crow bar. He showed us the stitches on the back of his head, the blood still matting his dirty, thinning hair. As he was telling us this story he stood up and the three of us talked for maybe 3 or 4 minutes. He took our hands and kissed them and told us we had lovely faces and he thanked us for talking with him.

3 people standing on a street corner talking. We say our goodbyes and go our separate ways. 2 of us heading to homes and to lives with suggested promises and potentials. What about the man on the street? What promises and potential does he dream of? What promises and potential do we, as a society, offer him? I'm back to writing the report and I'm still outraged. All of a sudden linking theory to practice and sharing our learning from this project seems minimal. Offensive almost. I'm sitting in a

comfortable apartment typing on an expensive computer, drinking my fair trade coffee and the man is still on the street with freezing cold hands and a slashed head and all I'm offering is flat words on a page.

Marshall Ganz talks about the need to tell the story of "me" and then, as community organizers, to build to a story of "us". He talks about the two ways of knowing "analysis" and "narrative". The analysis draws from our intellect and its truth is in the validity of the data. The narrative draws from our emotive and its truth is in that what moves us. The narrative is the powerful tool. We create change because we are moved to do so. The narrative is often the difficult to articulate but it is felt. It is primal and it touches at the core of our humanity.

That's what happened to me when I met the man on the street. I *felt* this meeting. I'm connected within many social movements. I get the numbers on homelessness, I get the numbers on hungry kids, I have just become a board member on GPI-Pacific because I want to change how we measure progress in our society. Much of my involvement in change movements has come from analysis and my developing intellect through my adult years.

But I felt the man on the street. He moved me. I'm still trying to figure out why. I know that something about him reminded me of my dad. As a child I had a home and I had love. We had little money and later in life I learned a term that described us – we were the "immigrant poor". I hadn't known that and I hadn't known we were poor. My dad always told us we had a place, we mattered and we were the change waiting to happen, we just didn't have cash. The man on the street has touched something that I can feel. I know enough because of my own story to feel an understanding of injustice. I don't only have my intellect to draw from I also have my emotions. What is the man on the street's story? I still don't know.

John Steinbeck once said, it always starts with a story. He understood the need to share a story and to be part of a story. He understood the need to co-create. He says,

We are lonesome animals. We spend all of our life trying to be less lonesome. One of our ancient methods is to tell a story begging the listener to say – and to feel – "Yes, that is the way it is, or at least that is the way I feel it."

The stories from the CDSL project are a co-creation. Each individual story has become a story of us. Together these stories have woven themselves together and they describe a society that people hope for. The people we met during this project are outraged in their own and different way. Outraged enough to decide to work in environments where many of us don't want to remember exist – homeless shelters, drops-ins for prostitutes, soup kitchens, food banks, youth shelters, hotlines for victims, multicultural health brokers so that refugees can find some dignity in their new "home land", standing on a remote and isolated blockade so a multi-national corporation can't destroy the last bits of remaining wilderness, relentlessly trying to organize a housing cooperative so families can have a place to call home. This is the world that many people who share the principles of CED spend a lot of their time. They are working desperately to make sure that those living with injustices have some relief and that basic needs are being addressed. This is where the sharing of humanity sits.

Barbara Adler is a spoken word poet from Vancouver. In *The Accordion* she asks us:

How are you supposed to get anything done when general interest in the way the world is going has become an instrument too shameful to play in public?

During this project we met, and heard from, people who are working to change systems. They are working as policy influencers, leading networks, researching alternative ways, working within governments and working within civil society to challenge governments. There is a growing conviction heard throughout this project that change will come especially when we link, in real ways, the people living and working “on the ground” with the people working within our institutions, especially government.

On one hand there is a feeling of hope as the CDSL project closes. Hope because hundreds of people across Canada decided to name the shame of our society and to work towards changing the way the world is going. As a child I grew up knowing solidarity and I feel solidarity because of my involvement in this project.

On the other hand there is a feeling of urgency. The man in the street is sleeping outside now. We need to act – now. I need to reconcile within myself why I’m here and the man in the street is out there. I need to find my place and know my story and I need to find out where others are “at” and hear their story.

I’m learning to appreciate the power of the story that Ganz so articulately tells us about. This project definitely showed us the absolute need for CED work to balance analysis and narrative. We seem to have fallen back on the myth that truth only comes from the intellect and the sense of “doing.” We seem to have lost the time for each other. Maybe, rather than being busy as practitioners and “clients” we simply need to slow down and spend time talking as people. Rather than only being part of the few that are mobilized we need to reach the dis-engaged. We need to become co-creators. People, together creating solutions, building community assets, making decisions, organizing ourselves – locally -- to address the issues that impact our lives. To do CED work requires reflection, learning and literacy development. This will ensure that each person, in each neighbourhood or community, has the opportunity to develop skills, knowledge and confidence to organize for change.

The stories throughout this project were about the “treadmill” and the lack of time to reflect, learn, and think. People repeatedly mentioned a need to “slow down.” They talked about the wish to have learned from their experience rather than only have lived it. The stories in this project were about the stresses that come from only doing. I’m leaving this project affirmed that a cycle of action, reflection and learning is critical if CED is to achieve the goals and dreams of people living in their own locality trying desperately to address injustices.

The man on the street needs us to know our story and to spend time discovering what moves us. He needs us to slow down and ask him his story and what moves him. We all need our stories because we need to be moved and outraged in order to create. We need the co-creation of a shared story. It is so urgently needed -- now. If any movement can create a story of us, surely it is all of us, working in solidarity, for a fair and just world.

### **Kerri’s Story**

Reflecting back on my personal learning in this project has been a profound (and sometimes messy) experience. While I was coordinating the many phases of this project, I was also simultaneously applying

the tools, approaches and concepts to my own social change work with another organization I work with. In retrospect, I think it would have been impossible to understand the learning of others involved in this project without also entering into a reflective learning space myself. So, after exposing my own assumptions, unpacking my “aha” moments and repacking it all together, four main themes stand out for me:

### **Learning is Action:**

Early on in this project I conducted a focus group with the CreateAction Interns that were just finishing up their placement. One of the things they shared was that while they had the intention to regularly reflect on their experience, when things got busy, reflection was the first thing that was dropped. They expressed a fundamental tension between productivity and learning. As we moved on in the project I noticed this theme continued to surface amongst students, youth and seasoned CED practitioners alike.

Learning takes place within a culture. Our culture, by and large, rewards swiftness, efficiency, productivity, and the ability to produce tangible, measurable results. Time for reflection, thinking and learning is not often valued as “doing”. Learning is not written into our workplans, our strategic plans, or our performance reviews. The underlying assumption is that learning and reflection happen on our own time, on the side of our desks.

This project has reaffirmed what a mentor of mine has always said:

*“ Learning is not the prelude to action—it is the way we take action. Mindful action. Informed action. Discerning action. And it’s the way we make action as effective and sustainable as it can possibly be.”*  
(Tam Lundy)

Learning is not something we do from ‘time to time’ to prepare for the next project that is coming. It is as much about what we be as what we do.

### **Learning is critical to “doing something different”**

Communities are dealing with increasingly complex issues. CED is continually challenged to utilize approaches that can sufficiently hold this complexity and account for interconnecting influences and consequences. Sometimes, those of us that work in community describe it as trying to “nail jello to the wall.” Just when we think we have a solution, the context slides away and a new context appears.

In this project I noticed that a learning lens in CED allows us to take the time we need to sense what is emerging. Unless CED organizations are intentional about their learning, they will likely resort to habitual ways of thinking and acting. At best, they will end up getting better at what they have always done. Many of the CED practitioners involved in this project spoke about their shared motivations for doing this work: they want to create alternative models of development that are just, equitable and sustainable. They want to create an alternative future.

Creating something different requires we move beyond reacting to current circumstances. It requires an approach that can access deeper levels of learning and knowing. It means paying as much attention to developing ourselves as we pay to developing alternative economic models. It requires the courage to let go of ‘getting the right answer’ for a short time so that we can “hang our assumptions in front of us” and allow fresh ways of seeing to emerge. Can we carve out spaces in the busyness of this work to dedicate time to reflection and learning? Moreover, how can we support individuals to learn within CED organizations if the organizations have not yet developed a culture that explicitly values learning?

### **My Experience Using a Learning Lens**

During the course of this project I brought some of the reflective learning tools we were using in the CDSL initiative into another organization I work with called BC Healthy Communities. Seven staff members committed to using a reflective tool for three months. We set time aside to have a two hour “learning meeting” every two weeks. One meeting per month focused on deepening our learning about creating change by reading articles, reflecting on questions and linking it to our practice through discussion. The other meeting was a space to share experiences as well as things that came up in our individual reflections throughout the month. The outcomes from these three months were profound.

First, I noticed that we were approaching our work (and our conversations with each other) with more depth. Our conversations shifted from simply ‘reporting out’ to taking the time to develop shared understanding of why we did what we did. We began to make the links between theory and practice. For some, it was the first time they had laid out their own theories of change on the table. We grappled with what our shared theories of change were and how our own community development approaches were supporting or thwarting this. As a result, we all became more articulate at describing the desired outcomes of our work.

Second, we strengthened our relationships and commitment to each other. We all knew that throughout the month, we could “park” the burning questions we struggled with to bring to the group for discussion. We began to really appreciate and learn from each others’ experiences and all of us became teachers in some way. In the past we had encouraged individual reflection, but no one else would really notice if you got too busy and skipped it. When we reflected together, we were accountable to each other and we challenged each other to ask *why* more than any one of us would have done on our own.

*For many practitioners, doing swallows up learning. Even staying aware of what we are doing does not itself create learning. (Joy Amula)*

A learning approach in our organization worked well when there was one person who was tasked with facilitating and overseeing the process. Someone had to create the reflective questions, organize the calls, select the articles, pull out themes from the meetings and remind everyone to engage. We found it did not work as well when this task was shared amongst the whole team. And in fact, when the organization went through changes in staff roles later in the year, the learning calls stopped because no one was “holding” the process anymore. In my experience this process worked best when it wasn’t another task added onto someone’s role, but when it was integrated right into their job description. This got me thinking about the CDSL initiative and what capacities need to exist for CED organizations to be intentional about their learning?

### **Capacities for Learning in CED**

One of the main objectives of this project was to explore the opportunities for students/learners to contribute to community CED objectives through participating in community development service learning. We realized that before we could more fully understand the potential for the community – university learning partnership, we first needed to better understand how learning is already taking place within CED. What we learned about this topic is shared in the rest of this report, so I won’t describe it in detail here. However, as we move ahead, I am interested in leadership as a core capacity for learning within an organization. There needs to be at least one person to hold a wide perspective that can link learning into a bigger framework for change. It also seems to be a shift away from

“business as usual” (which sometimes looks like running on a hamster wheel) to an approach that integrates and values the learning, reflection and dialogue as a critical part of how we are more effective in doing the work.

Abraham Maslow said “If the only tool you have is a hammer, then every problem looks like a nail.” Adopting a learning lens in CED will require we have a few more tools in our toolbox. This project has introduced some of those tools to many in the CED movement in Canada and in doing so has changed the way several practitioners view the problems they are addressing. I think for many, including myself, it has reaffirmed the notion that we cannot develop our communities without continuing to develop ourselves.

## Appendix 2. Phases and Activities - Community Development Service Learning Project

January 2007 – December 2009

Project Phase	Objectives met	Project Activities	Participants
<b>Phase One: Research &amp; Development</b>  <b>January 2007 – May 2008</b>	Build capacity of CED organizations to benefit from CDSL & contribute to the development of curriculum and programs in formal/non-formal learning organizations that meet community needs.	Workshops: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2007 CCEDNet Conference Newfoundland</li> <li>• 2007 Winnipeg CED Learning Event</li> <li>• Rural Roots Learning Event, Northwest BC</li> </ul>	100 participants
		Key Informant Interviews	6 interviews
		Discussion Papers	2 Papers
		Development of CDSL Advisory Committee	25 participants
		Hosted 2 Tele-learning Calls	~ 20 participants / call
		Emerging Leaders Tele-learning Call	9 participants
		Create Action Interns Focus Group	10 participants
		Community University Expo Workshop	20 participants
<b>Phase Two: Capacity Building for CDSL</b>  <b>June 2008 - December 2008</b>	Build opportunities for students to engage in effective CDSL, and network with youth leadership and the CED movement to contribute to social and economic change in Canada.	Training workshops (Haida Gwaii, Chetwynd, Vancouver, Edmonton)	4 workshops, ~ 50 participants
		Testing sites for community development tool kits	6 testing sites
		On-line forums for tester support	2 forums
	Enhance the effectiveness of CDSL in building community assets and contributing to youth engagement in CED, inclusive of rural, urban, northern, aboriginal and disadvantaged communities.	Tele-learning sessions for hosting CreateAction Interns	20 organizations participated
		Case Studies with testing sites	2 case studies completed
		Organizational capacity building for CCEDNet	1 tele-learning call
<b>Phase Three: University - Community Partnership for CDSL</b>  <b>January 2009 – November 2009</b>	Build opportunities for formal/non-formal learning organizations to partner with CED organizations to expand CDSL opportunities that contribute to community needs and assets.	Toronto Dialogue for Social Change: Opportunities for CSL in Canadian CED (CACSL, CCEDNet, University and CED orgs)	20 participants
		Demonstration Phase with Community & University Partners	3 sites participated (3 comm orgs and 3 univ.)
		Workshop CCEDnet National Conference Winnipeg	20 participants
		Pan-Canadian CSL Symposium (Ottawa)	Participated
		National CACSL Tele-Learning Call: Learning for a Change	26 participants
		Website Launch: Learning for a Change	
Planning for Learning for a Change workshops 2010	3 sites confirmed		

**Project Outcomes Summary Table**

Outcome	Indicator	Assessment Method	Results
<p>CCEDNet has increased capacity and appropriate resources to engage with their membership around CED and community development service learning.</p>	<p>1. Extent to which CCEDNet feels capable of engaging members in CDSL.</p> <p>2. % of testers who describe the CDSL toolbox as useful for engaging in a community development service learning project.</p>	<p>Survey of core team</p> <p>Digital stories</p>	<p>The CCEDNet team noted how the interaction with the project tools created a process for them to reflect on service and learning in their own lives. And, how their interaction with the tools has increased and/or affirmed their capacity to engage others in the conversation about CDSL. The tools and processes have also allowed others beyond the core team to engage in this conversation. CCEDNet staff reported that their understanding of the role of learning deepened but the lack of explicit recognition of learning as an objective in current projects limits the extent to which broader strategies can be taken on to engage the membership in learning.</p> <p>The testers all described the usefulness of the tester package in helping them understand, articulate and support learning as a form of citizen engagement. All testers stated that using the material in the package and the subsequent conversations has also heightened their intent to consider how they influence interest and capacity of young people to engage as citizens of their community. However, testers rarely continued with the tools beyond the testing period – when work got busy the reflection was the first thing to be dropped. When people were paid (even the honorarium we gave) it seemed to give validity to the reflection and so it took place.</p>
<p>CCEDNet members are informed about, and contributing to developing community development service learning discourse in the CED movement.</p>	<p>1. # of members who respond to online survey</p> <p>2. # of members that participate in tele learning calls</p> <p>3. 3 community organizations share their experiences of CDSL</p> <p>4. # of members who participate in the CDSL workshop at the U. Vic and CCEDNet national conference</p>	<p>Online survey</p> <p>Tele learning call tally sheet</p> <p>Key Informant interviews</p> <p>Workshop feedback form</p>	<p>- 6 members engaged with on-line forum on a weekly basis</p> <p>- 18 CreateAction interns engaged with the on-line forum on a weekly basis</p> <p>- 20 organizations participated in the tele-learning sessions (18 included supervisor and intern, 2 included only intern)</p> <p>- 2 organizations were interviewed around their experiences with CDSL</p> <p>- 25 people attended the conference workshops</p> <p>People who engaged with the tools are eager for more ideas of how to integrate learning into their work environments</p>
<p>Youth contribute reflections, experiences and ideas to the discourse of community development service learning within CED.</p>	<p>Emerging leaders adopts CDSL as a core focus in their 2008 plans</p> <p>Examples of reflections from emerging leaders that participate in a CDSL tele learning call</p> <p># of Create Action Interns that participate in a focus group on CDSL</p>	<p>Minutes from EL planning meetings</p> <p>Compilation of EL reflections</p> <p>Focus group</p>	<p>The Emerging Leaders committee of CCEDNet supported the project through the participation of CreateAction Interns (17 interns completed weekly reflections and feedback on an online forum over 8 weeks)</p> <p>Interns (and other youth interviewed) expressed frustration at the limited time and energy given to reflective learning. They found a lack of creativity and “thinking outside the box” when it came to what was termed “learning.” Some interns think the tools are too conceptual and don’t see the point of talking about governing variables when the organization itself hasn’t articulated values, principles or a bigger picture of change</p>
<p>Youth and other CCEDNet members will have heightened intent in fostering active citizenship, and contributing to</p>	<p>2 youth driven CED organizations share their experiences of CDSL</p>	<p>Key Informant Interviews</p>	<p>1 youth driven organization was explicit in describing the difficulty in hosting both CSL and any type of reflective learning because of a) the busyness of the work [eg Santropol Roulant] and b) the nature of the people they work with [eg CYC] Again, the theme of being too busy and not</p>

ongoing critical reflection, thought and action.	# of CCEDNet members that share their new understanding of applying social learning theories in their daily practice	Members Stories	having any mandate to reflect was cited as a key barrier to learning being facilitated on a regular basis. Youth saw the irony in this as they recognized learning as the way to remove barriers but that can only happen when people have time to imagine something different rather than “same old-same old”
A supported learning network develops between CCEDNet, formal/non-formal learning organizations and the CCEDNet membership.	# of community learning organizations identified as potential partners  Up to 3 post-secondary institutions join CDSL network advisory  # of post-secondary institutions offering CED programs who engage in dialogue about CDSL	Database of interested members  Database of CDSL network advisory  Tele learning call between CED organizations and post-secondary institutions	25 members on the project advisory, 5 from post-secondary institutions 26 CASCL members participated in a tele-learning call (all from post-secondary institutions) The networking between members of CASCL and members of CCEDNet was limited. The relationship between the CASCL director and project staff really developed towards the end of the project. Relationships between CASCL members, their CED partners and project staff developed as the development of partnerships evolved. One of these partnerships will continue between CCEDNet, a CED org. and two post-secondary institutions. It is unfortunate that the relationships between the post-secondary institutions and CED organizations only deepened in the final phase of the project. However, due to change in CCEDNet staffing and the need to help build the capacity of CED organizations around learning, project staff could not facilitate relationships any sooner. Relationship building takes time!
Community development interests come together with youth and formal/non-formal learning organizations to network and learn from one another about community development service learning.	# of times peer learning advisory engages with resources and each other  Stories of change in thinking and practice from CDSL network advisory members	Storyboard of Change  Storyboard of Change	CCEDNet members responded to the tools far more than we anticipated. It seems most CED practitioners are hungry for support in slowing down and examining their practice in more rigorous ways. CSL staff noted that although they engage in professional development about reflection it was usually conceptual. There appears a lack of pragmatic tools available to help people actually start reflection in the work environment. CED practitioners agreed with this. The learning tools available to people created very explicit theories from both practitioners and CSL staff.
New CDSL arrangements are created with key partners.	# of new relationships established  # of new CDSL activities and arrangements	Database of interested members and CDSL network advisory  Key Informant Interviews	The advisory had 25 members engage with the project and through a face-to-face meeting and follow up tele-learning call 26 members of CASCL engaged with each other and with CED practitioners.  People who engaged with the tools with colleagues and partners described a shift in their relationships. Conversations were “deeper” and they got to know each other as people, this created a sense of active citizenship, which changed they way they talked about their work. People said they rarely talked about the “mundane” but talked more about why they were doing the work and how they wanted to see others engage. Reflective learning intensified their passion and commitment and this seems to counteract burn out.  23 CED organizations tested the tool for at least eight weeks and 3 formal education institutions used the tools alongside their CED partner  12 CED organizations used the tool after workshop attendance at one of the CCEDNet national conferences
A model of service learning that is relevant and meaningful to CED organizations is developed and	# of CED organizations using project tools and resources to support intentional learning within their	Member survey at national conference	285 CED practitioners engaged with the tools via workshops, train-the-trainer professional development, tele-learning calls, testing and trial uses of the tools 35 CED organizations maintained mentorship relationships with the CDSL project staff

circulated across Canada.	organization  # of CED organizations partnering with a formal/non-formal learning organization to support service learning in Canada	Database of members and CDSL network advisory	3 partnerships between CED organizations and formal learning institutions happened because of this project
---------------------------	--	---	--

#### Appendix 4: CDSL Network Advisory Committee:

Name	Organization	Community	Notes
Rupert Downing	CCEDNet	Victoria, BC	Project Management Team
Kerri Klein	CCEDNet	Victoria, BC	Project Management Team and BC Healthy Communities
Anne Docherty	Storyteller's Foundation	Hazelton, BC	Project Management Team and the Learning Shop
Doug Donaldson	Storyteller's Foundation	Hazelton, BC	Project Management Team and the Learning Shop
Melanie Sondergaard	Storyteller's Foundation	Hazelton, BC	Project Management Team and the Learning Shop
Dini Silveira	CCEDNet	Victoria, BC	Youth in Charge Project
Janel Smith	Social Economy Student Network Coordinator	Victoria, BC	Student at University of Victoria
Katie Shaw, Coordinator	City of Victoria Youth Council	Victoria, BC	She also is a coordinator for Youthcore
Chris Perrin	Emerging Leaders	Vancouver, BC	
Dee McRae	Northwest Regional Literacy Coordinator	Northwest, BC	Based in BC and familiar with literacy and involved provincially with district literacy plans.
Treena Decker	Community Futures Pacific Northwest	Prince Rupert, BC	Youth in Charge Project (potential)
Dana Welsh	Columbia Basin Trust	Castlegar, BC	Youth in Charge Project (potential)
Jorge Sosa	University of Alberta Faculty	Edmonton, AB	Alberta Social Economy Research: Research interests in Learning styles in social economy organizations
Yvonne Chiu	Multi-Cultural Health Brokers Co-operative	Edmonton, AB	Youth Mentorship Project
Anita Verlangen	Core Neighbourhood Youth Co-op	Saskatoon, SK	Youth Mentorship Project
Brendan Reimer	CCEDNet (Manitoba)	Winnipeg, MB	Project Management Team
Jana McKee	MB CED Network Advisory Team	Winnipeg, MB	Part of Elwick Community School
Cassandra Buchan, CD/CED Training Intermediary	Community Education Development Association	Winnipeg, MB	In Winnipeg and have a CED CSL relationship with Red River College
Cheryl Oliver-Linton Franca DeLuca	Learning Enrichment Foundation	Toronto, ON	Youth Mentorship Project
Paul Chamberlain	CCEDNet (Ontario)	Toronto, ON	Youth Mentorship Project
Connie Nelson, Co-Director	Lakehead University	Thunder Bay, ON	Food Security Research Initiative
Todd Barr, Director	Trent Centre for Community Based Education	Peterborough, ON	He's also the chair of CASCL
Heather Reid, Director ULINKS	U-Links Centre for Community Based Research, Haliburton County, Ont.	Haliburton County, ON	Works in rural community
Laura Howard	Santropol Roulant	Montreal, QC	Emerging Leaders member
Michael Toye	CCEDNet	Tingwick, QC	Project Management Team
Christie Meadus	FINALY	St. John's, NL	Youth Mentorship Project