Community Engagement at SFU: What’s Working Well, and What Isn’t?

2020 Thoughtexchange

Introduction and purpose

SFU’s Vision makes it our mission to be Canada’s most community-engaged research university. Grounded in the 2013 Community Engagement Strategy, our work to integrate community engagement with our academic and research missions has earned local and global recognition. We have created strong partnerships and networks that have produced rigorous scholarship and achieved community impact.

Building on the 2017 Engaging the Vision consultations and extensive conversations among SFU’s faculties and departments, SFU’s renewed Strategic Community Engagement Plan now encourages us to deepen that integration. We are challenged to find ways to localize strategic conversations so that community partners and networks can help guide community engagement in an ongoing way.

Thoughtexchange offered us one way to do that. Openly sharing our diverse and concrete thoughts about community engagement with each other and with our partners enabled us to begin identifying key issues which will help us collectively build mechanisms of continuous improvement for community engagement, together.

We thank you very much for participating in the recent thoughtexchange on community engagement at SFU, and we are pleased to share the results of that exchange with you now.

Methodology

The Thoughtexchange process

Thoughtexchange makes it possible for large, diverse groups to contribute ideas and surface priorities among those ideas in order to help inform and improve the decisions made by the organizations that serve them.

The process consists of receiving and thinking about questions, contributing thoughts in response to those questions, assigning stars to their thoughts and those of others to show which thoughts they value, and then learning what was important to the whole group. These three steps are referred to as Share, Star, and Discover.

By applying mathematical modeling and AI to qualitative data, Thoughtexchange gives leaders unique insights about what their people truly value, cutting through the blind spots, bias and the biggest voices, to crowdsource perspectives in a way that creates deep understanding of common ground and areas of disagreement.

Privacy and anonymity

Designed for respectful, private thought sharing

Thoughtexchanges work best when input is concrete, respectful and actionable. With this in mind, we reminded participants to please be respectful when sharing thoughts.
Thoughtexchange employed automatic moderation to help detect the use of personal names, and the Office of Community Engagement provided additional human moderation of thoughts. We asked participants to ensure that when sharing thoughts, they did not enter personal information about themselves or others or any information that could have been used to identify themselves or others in any free text fields. Thoughts that contained personal information or personal criticisms were removed immediately in order to maintain compliance with FIPPA. A total of 44 thoughts were moderated out of the exchange based on these criteria.

**Demographic questions**
Understanding that it is possible to have a number of affiliations with SFU, participants were asked to identify the perspective from which they most wanted their thoughts to be understood (e.g. student, faculty, community partner, etc.). Analytics tools in the thoughtexchange allow these answers to be used as filters for the purposes of identifying and exploring common and divergent ratings of thoughts. At no time were participants’ answers to this question explicitly linked to their specific thoughts or ratings: it was not possible to see a “connection” between an individual participant’s thoughts and the answers they provided to this question. To further support anonymity, analysis of thoughts in the exchange excluded ratings data associated with any of the answer options that collected fewer than 5 responses.

**Remaining anonymous**
Participants were able to participate in this Thoughtexchange anonymously. Participants were not required to provide personal information or set up a user account to participate. Thoughtexchange did install a cookie on participant’s browser so that they were able to re-enter the exchange without having to answer the initial question a second time and so that participants were not presented with thoughts to rate that they had already rated. However, participants’ thoughts, ratings and activity were not linked to personal information in any way.

**Results**
From January 27 – February 7, 2020, SFU students, staff, faculty and alumni, together with community and institutional partners, donors, retirees and the general public, courageously weighed in on the question: “Community engagement at SFU – what’s working well, and what isn’t?”

**Who Participated?**
677 people shared 633 thoughts and made 14,683 ratings. Participation was beyond what was expected with an incredible range and diversity of ideas shared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Participant Group</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Percentage of Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff (APSA, CUPE, APEX, Poly Party, TSSU, Internal Postdoctoral Fellows)</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (undergraduate, graduate or continuing)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (member of the SFU Faculty Association)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leadership (excluded from SFU bargaining units)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partner (past or present)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional partner (past or present)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU retiree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connections

*Figure 1 – Connections over Time* shows the progression over time of the thoughts shared in the exchange and participants’ interactions with those thoughts. The frequency and density of interaction between participants and thoughts is represented by the orange connections.

Thoughtexchange’s algorithms work to ensure the balanced exposure and review of all thoughts shared in the exchange. This prevents “popular” thoughts from accruing more popularity simply by virtue of their popularity, alone.
Emergent Themes

Thoughts were grouped into 19 emergent themes and these were then further organized into the following four summary themes:

- Theme 1: Enhance EDI and Reconciliation
- Theme 2: Institutional policy and support
- Theme 3: On-campus community and experience
- Theme 4: Supporting participation in community engagement

An explanation of each theme is provided in the section below.

Theme 1: Enhance EDI & Reconciliation

Thoughts in this summary theme focused on the importance of increasing and enhancing equity, diversity and inclusion along with Reconciliation in the type of programming, partnerships, and ways that we engage.

1. Equity, diversity and inclusion – calls to broaden and deepen actions and partnership that enhance EDI through community engagement; enable equitable and diverse participation in community engagement.
2. Indigenous Reconciliation – support more community engagement that addresses Indigenous Reconciliation, both with external partners and the SFU internal community.

Theme 2: Institutional policy and support

Thoughts in this summary theme identified strengths, weaknesses and opportunities in SFU’s institutional policies and support for community engagement.

1. Build on strengths – build on the experience and reputation that SFU has in community engagement; opportunities to build on particular initiatives or areas of action that are working well.
2. Contradictions in policy impede community engagement – address SFU policies that act as barriers to doing community engagement effectively across academic, research and operational areas; address the internal contradictions in SFU policies that impede community engagement.
3. SFU’s distributed model for community engagement – the perception that community engagement at SFU needs to emerge from many places and people across the institution; opportunities to recognize and enable a model of distributed community engagement at SFU.
4. Embedding community engagement in the institution – an interest in embedding community engagement needs across academic, research, and non-academic mandates and/or models; opportunities to recognize and support an embedded approach.
5. Faculty recognition for community engagement – an interest in recognizing and rewarding faculty for community engagement work; identification that current systems of recognition impede faculty participation in community engagement.
6. Support for community engagement at the unit level – community engagement can be disconnected from unit functions and resources; departments and units need the mandate and resources to support and enable community engagement.
Unequal levels of community engagement across campuses – observations about the varying degrees and approaches to community engagement at SFU’s Vancouver, Burnaby and Surrey campuses; opportunities to participate in community engagement is dependent on campus/location.

Recognizing different understandings of community engagement – thoughts reflecting the many ways of defining or understanding what community engagement is; important to recognize that it means different things to different people.

Theme 3: On-campus community and experience
This summary theme includes thoughts focused on SFU’s internal community and the overall experience of working and studying at SFU.

1. Improve internal community and student experience – thoughts reflecting the desire for more community-building at SFU and ways to improve student experience through more connections and building internal community.

2. Welcoming spaces – some spaces are more welcoming than others for SFU community and for external community members and partners; overall desire for welcoming spaces.

3. Other/miscellaneous – thoughts seemingly unrelated to the broader topic of community engagement, but related to SFU.

Theme 4: Supporting participation in community engagement
Many thoughts emerged around barriers to participating in community engagement and opportunities for supporting participation in community engagement for faculty, staff, students, and community partners. Some of the themes in this category may overlap with the Institutional policy and support category, given that changes in institutional policy may be necessary to support participation in community engagement by specific groups of people. However, due to the large number of thoughts focused on improving support for participation in community engagement, we deemed it important to put these thoughts into their own focused category.

1. Bringing together people & information – challenges related to operating in silos and SFU’s distributed decision-making model; interest in opportunities that bring together people and information to support engaging with community partners.

2. Integrating experiential learning with community engagement – a desire for better links between community engagement and experiential learning (coursework, volunteering, co-ops, applied research, etc.).

3. Removing barriers to staff participation in community engagement – identified challenges for SFU staff to participate in community engagement; interest in increasing opportunities for staff participation in community engagement.

4. Removing barriers to student participation in community engagement – identified challenges for students to participate in community engagement; interest in opportunities to remove barriers.

5. Working well with community – ideas for improving how we work with community partners; opportunities to implement best practices for working well with community partners.
The relative heat of themes by participant groups

Table 1 – Heat of Themes by Demographic Participant Groups shows, at a glance, how six different participant groups rated the importance of thoughts in the major themes of the exchange. The darker the color, the higher the average star rating for thoughts in the theme, relative to all the thoughts in that theme.

The heat map offers a way to compare how participants responded to key topics in the exchange, including seeing how different groups valued or prioritized thoughts in particular themes. Although there was representation in the exchange from 11 different participant groups, only the following six groups performed enough ratings for the results to be considered meaningful: students, faculty, staff, alumni, senior leadership, and community partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Senior Leadership</th>
<th>Community Partners</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Equity, diversity and inclusion</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Indigenous reconciliation</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Building on strengths</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Contradictions in policies that impede community engagement</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 SFU’s distributed model for community engagement</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Embedding community engagement in the institution</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Need for faculty recognition of community engagement</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Support for community engagement at the unit level (department, faculty, campus, etc.)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Unequal levels of community engagement between campuses</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Recognizing different understandings of community engagement</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Improving the internal community and student experience</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Welcoming spaces</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Other/miscellaneous</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Bringing together people and information</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Integrating experiential learning with community engagement</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Removing barriers to staff participation in community engagement</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Removing barriers to student participation in community engagement</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Working well with community</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 – Heat of Themes by Demographic Participant Groups*

**General observations:**
Although there is some variability between participant groups, thoughts in the following four themes were the “hottest” (generally rated as highly important):

- Theme 2.4: Embedding community engagement in the institution
- Theme 2.6: Support for community engagement at the unit level (e.g. department, faculty, campus, etc.)
- Theme 4.1: Bringing together people and information
- Theme 4.2: Integrating experiential learning with community engagement

At a next but still “warm” level, the following five themes were generally rated as important:

- Theme 1.2: Indigenous Reconciliation
- Theme 2.3: Distributed model for community engagement
- Theme 2.5: Faculty recognition for community engagement
- Theme 4.4: Removing barriers to student participation in community engagement
- Theme 4.5: Working well with community.

**Additional observations:**
- Thoughts in theme 1.1 – *Indigenous Reconciliation* were generally rated as highly important by faculty and staff and as important by community partners.
• Thoughts in theme 2.3 – *SFU’s distributed model for community engagement* were generally rated as important or highly important by the groups that had the most familiarity with the university (faculty, staff, senior administrators, students, alumni) and rated as not important at all by community partners.

• Both faculty and staff rated thoughts in 2.5 – *Faculty recognition for community engagement* as highly important. Alumni and senior leadership rated this as moderately important while community partners rated it as not very important.

• Staff and alumni rated thoughts in theme 2.6 – *Support for community engagement at the unit level* as highly important while faculty rated them as moderately important and students rated them as not important at all.

• Thoughts in theme 4.1 – *Bringing together people and information* were rated as important or highly important by all SFU internal groups (faculty, staff, senior administrators, students, alumni) while community partners rated these thoughts as moderately important.

• Thoughts in theme 4.2 – *Integrating experiential learning with community engagement* were rated as important or highly important by all groups (particularly so by community partners) except for faculty, who rated them as moderately important.

• Senior leadership rated thoughts in theme 2.8 – *Recognizing different understandings of community engagement* as very important while students, staff and community partners rated these thoughts as moderately important and faculty rated them as not particularly important.

• Staff and alumni rated thoughts in theme 4.3 – *Removing barriers to staff participation in community engagement* as very important while students and senior leadership rated them as not very important and faculty rated them as not important at all.

• Every group rated thoughts in theme 4.4 – *Removing barriers to student participation* as moderately important or higher, with students and alumni rating these thoughts as very important, senior leadership rating them as important, and faculty, staff and community partners rating them as moderately important.

• Thoughts in theme 4.5 – *Working well with community* were rated as very important by community partners, important by staff, alumni and senior leadership, and moderately important by faculty and students.

*Observations by demographic group and examples of top ranked thoughts:*

**Students**

151 students ranked thoughts in two specific themes as highly important:

• Theme 4.4 – *Removing barriers to student participation in community engagement* (average star rating = 3.8)

• Theme 4.1 – *Bringing together people and information* (average star rating = 3.7)

Top ranked thoughts in these themes included:

• A lack of accessibility to community engagement opportunities for students
• A lack of student incentives to participate in community engagement
• A lack of community engagement programs available to students
• Policies and procedures that hinder students from being involved and from being innovative
• Concerns over the availability of student time to be involved in community engagement and the general cost of education
• A lack of information regarding events and programs
• A need for greater coordination across departments
• A need for better ways to communicate opportunities outside of SFU
• A lack of understanding by students of what SFU means when it talks about community engagement
• An interest in accessing community engagement opportunities outside traditional co-operative education programs.

Faculty
99 faculty ranked thoughts in two specific themes as highly important:
• Theme 2.5 – Faculty recognition for community engagement (average star rating = 4.0)
• Theme 1.2 – Indigenous Reconciliation (average star rating = 3.9)

Top ranked thoughts in these themes included:
• A need to learn how to value community engagement activities in tenure and promotion
• A need for academic units to recognize community engagement as important
• Issues with the traditional university organizational structure not allowing time for community engagement
• The degree of time and work it takes to be involved in community engagement
• The need to build real relationship with local Indigenous communities
• An interest in investing in capacity building programs together with elders and other knowledge holders
• Concerns that current community engagement with Indigenous communities seems artificial or weak
• A need to include Indigenous communities at the table from the beginning of projects

Staff
318 staff ranked thoughts in six themes as highly important:
• Theme 2.6 – Support for community engagement at the unit level (average star rating = 4.0)
• Theme 1.2 – Indigenous Reconciliation (average star rating = 3.9)
• Theme 4.2 – Integrating experiential learning with community engagement (average star rating = 3.9)
• Theme 2.5 – Faculty recognition for community engagement (average star rating = 3.9)
• Theme 4.3 – Removing barriers to staff participation in community engagement (average star rating = 3.9)
• Theme 2.4 – Embedding community engagement in the institution (average star rating = 3.8)

Top ranked thoughts in these themes included:
• A need for academic units and disciplines to have resources and support to create strategies and approaches to implement community engagement in programs and curriculum
• Supporting Indigenous sovereignty as a university responsibility
- The need to build real relationship with local Indigenous communities
- A need to combine student education with community and experiential learning opportunities
- An interest in finding ways to incorporate applied and community-based research involving local communities and non-profit organizations in courses
- A greater emphasis on service learning
- A recognition that partnerships with community members and organizations help us to develop relevant and responsive curriculum.
- A need to recognize community engagement in tenure and promotion reviews
- The degree of time and work it takes to be involved in community engagement
- Staff members not feeling especially involved in community engagement efforts beyond the university
- Concerns over staff work commitments impeding the ability to be involved in community engagement
- Concerns that community engagement isn’t sufficiently integrated into the academic mission of the university
- An interest in integrating engagement within the curriculum of courses and programs
- Concern that community engagement is still on the fringes of the institution and a recognition that institutional infrastructure in the form of policies, resources, support structures, others are needed to further embed, support and legitimize this work.
- Concerns over not having enough time or resources to systematically support community engagement activity.

Alumni

39 alumni ranked thoughts in five themes as highly important:

- Theme 2.4 – *Embedding community engagement in the institution* (average star rating = 3.9)
- Theme 4.1 – *Bringing together people and information* (average star rating = 3.8)
- Theme 4.3 – *Removing barriers to staff participation in community engagement* (average star rating = 3.8)
- Theme 2.6 – *Providing support for community engagement at unit levels* (average star rating = 3.8)
- Theme 4.4 – *Removing barriers to student participation in community engagement* (average star rating = 3.7)

Top ranked thoughts in these themes included:

- Concerns that community engagement isn’t sufficiently integrated into the academic mission of the university
- That students, staff and faculty may be burning out due to the demands of community engagement
- Concern that community engagement is still on the fringes of the institution and a recognition that institutional infrastructure in the form of policies, resources, support structures, others are needed to further embed, support and legitimize this work.
- That SFU seems to be unwilling to cover the costs of facilities and infrastructure needed for community based programs
• That more collaboration is needed across portfolios/units/departments to effectively leverage our capacity as an institution for meaningful community engagement
• A need for ways to engage with communities long term outside of the traditional co-op experience
• That long-term transformation of academic units within the university will require significant investment in time, resources and support

Senior leadership
20 members of SFU’s senior leadership ranked thoughts in five themes as highly important:
• Theme 4.1 – Bringing together people and information (average star rating = 3.8)
• Theme 4.2 – Integrating experiential learning with community engagement (average star rating = 3.8)
• Theme 2.8 – Recognizing different understandings of community engagement (average star rating = 3.8)
• Theme 2.3 – SFU’s distributed model for community engagement (average star rating = 3.7)
• Theme 3.1 – Improving internal community and student experience (average star rating = 3.6)

Top ranked thoughts in these themes included:
• That more collaboration is needed across portfolios/units/departments to effectively leverage our capacity as an institution for meaningful community engagement
• An interest in increasing communication across and outside of the campus
• That the landscape of community engagement at SFU can be confusing

Community partners
16 community partners ranked thoughts in two themes as highly important:
• Theme 4.2 – Integrating experiential learning with community engagement (average star rating = 3.9)
• Theme 4.5 – Working well with community (average star rating = 3.7)

Top ranked thoughts in these themes included:
• Increasing emphasis on service learning

Concluding statement, recommendations and next steps
SFU’s work to integrate community engagement with our academic and research missions has earned local and global recognition. It has created strong partnerships and networks that have produced rigorous scholarship and achieved community impact.

SFU’s renewed Strategic Community Engagement Plan encourages us to deepen that integration. One step in realizing this was the participation of approximately 700 students, faculty, staff, alumni, community partners, institutional partners, senior leaders, retirees, donors, and members of the general public in a thoughtexchange where together we pondered the question: “Community engagement at SFU: What’s working well and what isn’t?”

Over an 11-day period, more than 600 thoughts were shared and these thoughts were rated almost 15,000 times.
The thoughtexchange has yielded diverse and concrete thoughts about community engagement. With each other and with our partners, it has helped us to identify and surface some key issues, many strengths, and a number of challenge areas that we can work on together.

Over the next months, SFU’s Office of Community Engagement will begin the process of following up with different stakeholder groups to look for opportunities to work with you to dig deeper into the important issues that you have raised and to help mobilize a number of next step discussions and initiatives designed to improve community engagement at SFU and with our communities.

To stay connected with the process, we encourage you to sign up for our newsletter. Progress and opportunities to engage will also be updated in the thoughtexchange section of our website.

For those of you who are keen to dig into the results of this thoughtexchange in a way that we cannot offer in a static report like this, please explore the online and interactive version of the report, where you can explore the top (and bottom) thoughts in the exchange, examine a subsection of thoughts based on the demographic question, or drill into the themes by ratings or total thoughts.

We leave you with the word cloud below that summarizes, at a very high level, some of the words you used when you shared your thoughts in the exchange. The words are shown as large or small, depending on the average star rating given to the shared thoughts that contained those words. Coloured words were often mentioned together when thoughts were shared. (E.g. faculty and staff or sense and belonging or relationships, partners and work, or academic and research, or support, resources, and institution, or people, access, learning and programs, etc.)