

Relationships Before Agendas: Members' Experiences of a Novel Changemaking Microcredential in Post-Secondary Education

By: Awneet Sivia¹, Nicolle Bourget¹, Leah Douglas¹, Cindy Schultz¹, Candace Stewart-Smith¹, Sukhi Brar-Cherrille¹

¹University of the Fraser Valley

Keywords: Changemaking, higher education, personal growth, social innovation, qualitative collaborative self-study

Abstract

The Ashoka Changemaker campus model provides a methodology and framework to help universities achieve structural changes and develop students who want and understand how to make change. The University of the Fraser Valley, working with Ashoka Canada and Royal Roads University, ran a novel pilot program to help embed Changemaking within the institution. While there were specific measurable deliverables, the felt, lived, and internalized experiences of the cohort members were missing. Results show that participants have experienced personal growth and have become involved in specific changemaking activities, which are advancing changemaking at UFV. The study identifies recommendations for the next iteration of the course as well as thoughts on how the university could move forward.

Introduction

The University of the Fraser Valley (UFV) is located in one of the most diverse regions in Canada, with over 30 First Nations with 146 urban and rural reserves that experienced a history of colonization and marginalization. The region also includes the second-largest South Asian community in Western Canada, of both established community members and new immigrants. The Fraser Valley is home to a vibrant and productive agricultural industry, with one in five jobs in the region affiliated directly or indirectly with the agriculture sector.

Increasingly, the Fraser Valley is challenged by climate change in the form of drought, floods, forest fires, and air quality. Recent atmospheric events have had devastating effects on the social, economic, and cultural landscapes in the area. There are also challenges to social values as religious right-wing conservatives gain momentum through social media and political channels in the region, fueling violent gender disagreements and political demonstrations. Economic challenges have resulted in increased homelessness and, relatedly, the actuality of, and stigma around, drug overdose, mental illnesses, and poverty.

Against this backdrop, the world is experiencing social, economic, and environmental issues at an unprecedented rate. The role of higher education has come into sharper focus as academic institutions are called on to prepare students to solve complex global problems. Yet, universities themselves are struggling to shift from standard delivery of discipline-based content to graduating students who can make change and create innovative solutions (Arvanitakis &

Hornsby, 2016). The dominant systems, cultures, and norms of academia act as roadblocks to social innovation and the addressing of such challenges. Given that post-secondary institutions are uniquely placed to address these challenges, more institutions are gradually moving to a community-focused and interdisciplinary model that enables students to make sense of the problems by sharing knowledge in creative ways (Staunch, 2023; McConnell Foundation, 2021). Furthermore, and increasingly, post-secondary programs are embedding content to expand students' readiness for sustainability, diversity, and innovation to respond to the sea change in geo-political contexts (Budinich et al., 2022).

In response, UFV is working to achieve the Ashoka Changemaker Campus designation and fulfill its mission of Engaging Learners, Transforming Lives, Building Community (University of the Fraser Valley, 2021), and prepare graduates who will make a difference to address myriad global challenges. The objective is to create a community of UFV members (students, staff, faculty, and administrators) who will lead changemaking and champion social innovation within and beyond the institution.

Ashoka recognized both UFV's strong motivation and potential to intentionally drive social innovation, education, and changemaking, noting that UFV would need to build organizational alignment and institutional capacity to carry out the necessary change work. UFV, Ashoka Canada, and Ashoka University partnered with Royal Roads University to create a pilot program to be delivered at UFV; a 100-hour Leading Social Impact in Post-Secondary Microcredential anchored in the four pillars of the designation criteria.

A cohort of 20 UFV staff, faculty, and administrators enrolled in the course in the Spring of 2023. The microcredential included assignments that formed the building blocks of UFV's ecosystem scan. Additionally, the learning and coursework were designed to equip the cohort with knowledge of changemaker concepts and methodologies, and the opportunity to apply and practice them within the UFV context. Cohort members, both individually and collectively, were assessed on their ability to demonstrate and implement their learnings in the assignments in order to earn the micro-credential. UFV, as an institution, was to be assessed for designation based on the cohort's primary output, the Ecosystem Scan, and the institution's response to the scan, as one of the main requirements in the designation process. The Ecosystem Scan was created over three weeks and involved individuals from across UFV. The draft document was reviewed by Ashoka Canada, and priority items were identified for UFV to work on to move to the next step of designation. The program ran from June 2023 to October 2023 and finished with the cohort presenting outcomes and recommendations to the UFV senior leadership team.

However, missing from the presentations and recommendations were the felt, lived, and internalized experiences of the cohort members who engaged in the microcourse and produced the Ecosystem Scan. Thus, this research delves into the experiences of five of the individuals involved in the UFV course in an attempt to understand how they made sense of the content, processes, and concepts of Changemaking, what impact the microcourse had on them and their capacity for changemaking, and what impacts they feel they would be able to make across UFV having completed the course. Through the lens of the experiences of the five co-researchers, this study aims to provide recommendations in the form of lessons learned that could inform future

offerings of the microcredential, as well as inform the work of Changemaking that lies ahead at UFV.

Literature Review

The University of the Fraser Valley is located in southern British Columbia and is experiencing significant climate, social, and economic issues. These issues are being felt not just locally but globally through climate change, biodiversity loss, water scarcity, pollution, global poverty, racial violence, geopolitical conflicts, social pathologies, etc. (Nardi, 2019; Delva & Abrams, 2022). Globally, there is a sense of crisis (Mdleleni, 2022) and a feeling of danger that societies may be at a tipping point and begin to move backward with regard to environmental, social, and economic challenges. These issues can be overwhelming (Nardi, 2019), and a change in the form of social innovation is required (Westley, 2008).

Ashoka believes that higher education institutions are uniquely situated to help solve these problems and drive social change (Sen, 2006). Such institutions foster collaborations with communities and support universities in social innovation and social impact (Alden Rivers, Nie, & Armellini, 2015; Kim et al., 2018). Changemaker institutions lead by example, share best practices and results, collaborate with community partners, and measure impact (Kim et al., 2018).

Changemaking can be a strategy for institutional change with social innovation providing both an education framework and an approach for institutional change, rewiring “the institutional ecosystem to become more innovative, resilient, relationship-oriented, and responsive to the needs of its core constituents and the community within which it is embedded” (Kim et al., 2018, pp. 25-26). However, change needs to occur at the systemic level (Teasdale et al., 2021), and embedding social innovation into the university is complex and challenging.

Higher education institutions (HEIs) are increasingly under pressure to facilitate change, build community and policy; realize a broader socioeconomic potential; support knowledge exchange; and facilitate private and public partnerships (Prantl et al., 2022; Vorley et al., 2008). These activities are external to the HEI; however, knowledge from multiple disciplines and different epistemologies, for example, science, health, social, racism, law, history, and economics, and collaboration within the institution are required (Feijóo-Quintas et al., 2024; Delva & Abrams, 2022).

Changing structures within a university is not easy; organizational change must occur for an institution to shift to social innovation (Prantl et al., 2022). However, this is difficult as many change projects fail. Resistance, lack of support, and challenges creating new structures often result in failure (Prantl et al., 2022). As noted by Kim et al. (2018), changing culture in a university environment is not easy. It requires a coordinated approach from both the top and bottom of the institution, while engaging the middle. A team supporting the vision is required; this team may be made up of individuals at different levels of the organization who can “engage and bring along allies, partners, and collaborators across the entire institution” (Kim et al., 2018, p. 38).

For an organization to change, culture must change. Culture change is difficult, and academic staff, administrative staff, and students must all be involved (Prantl et al., 2022). Culture “lives in the collective hearts and habits of people and their shared perception of ‘how things are done around here.’ Culture change needs to happen through a movement, not a mandate” (Walker & Soule, 2017, Summary).

There has been an upward trend in student interest in social innovation at HEIs, yet HEIs lag in social innovation (Lough, 2022). Lough (2022) notes that “structures and practices of HEIs may influence their ability to engage effectively in social innovation processes” (p. 13). Lough (2022) notes that HEIs “support cross-sectoral collaboration” while having the resources to “support the research and development” (p. 14). Yet there are barriers. HEIs are “administratively conservative, resistant to new ideas [...] and slow to implement changes” (p. 15) as reported by Hazenberg et al. (2019). Lough (2022) notes that dispersed institutes for social innovation can enhance engagement in social innovation through decentralization, localization, and collaboration. Such dispersed institutes help EHIS by bridging the academic-practice divide, enabling co-creation and co-production, facilitating experiential and co-curricular education, and supporting interdisciplinary collaborations.

Methods

This research is conducted through a hybrid of qualitative and collaborative self-study research (Samaras, 2011) to explore the impact on five individuals who have had a shared experience of engaging in the pilot Changemaker course at UFV, Leading Social Impact in Post-Secondary Microcredential. Through critical friendship (Pine, 2009), the authors examine and unearth the nuances of their experiences in this course, with each other and in relation to the broader goals of impact and social innovation. During this process, authors wrote reflexively and engaged in praxis-oriented dialogue (Ragoonaden et al., 2015) about their experiences as learners and engaged participants.

Data for this study consisted of three sets: co-authors' discussion posts from the course, individual reflective journals, and collaborative meetings of the co-authors conducted over a period of six months following the completion of the microcredential. The authors, individually and collectively, analyzed the discussion posts in the course using descriptive and axial coding (Saldana, 2021). Then, each author responded to the questions driving this study in individual reflective journals (Dataset 2), which were used to inform the collaborative meeting discussions. The third dataset consisted of a series of collaborative meetings where we each discussed our reflections on the following seven questions:

1. How did the course impact your understanding of changemaking?
2. How was the idea of changemaking initially understood by you, and did that perception change over the time of the course?
3. How did your view of yourself as a systems leader shift through this experience?
4. What impact do you think you can make now that you have taken the course?
5. How did the course impact and influence you as a change agent?

6. To what extent (and in what ways) are you applying what you learned and experienced in the course in other parts of your (professional) life?
7. What feedback do you have, given your experience, on the design of the course?

Findings

Over the course of the study, the five participants had the opportunity to revisit their initial discussion post entries during the course, as well as their thoughts one year later. There were five themes that appeared during data analysis: measurement, personal journey, relationships, students, and systems and structures.

Measurement

Participants described measurement in reference to designation, as a changemaker campus, and in terms of the processes used to measure or assess how we are currently engaged in changemaking as an institution. Assessing and measuring social impact is hard (Brock, 2008), yet it is a necessary step. Understanding how and what to measure adds to the complexity and cost of any social innovation project (Brock, 2008), including the implementation of such work in an institution.

A concern about honesty in sharing the outcomes of measurement to “establish trust, transparency and accountability” (Candace) was followed by a reminder that measurement as a process needed to include the voices of those most impacted within the institution. Awneet named the “process as the product,” noting the importance of effective tools and questions in the process of gathering data on changemaking. Finally, Candace reiterated the focus on needing to “ensure that the indicators can be observed or measured – with the reminder that the indicators must be meaningful to those most affected and reflect changes that are important to them. In all we do, we must remind ourselves about who we are doing this work for.”

Personal Journeys

A common thread in all our discussion posts was the interweaving of personal stories and learning journeys. What surfaced were concepts of hope, uncertainty, and our needs. The experience of being members of this cohort allowed us to “recognize that each group member brings unique experience and perspective to this work; [we] leverage each other’s expertise, strengths, and connections” (Nicolle). As Leah stated, the impact of this course on her professional story/journey was highlighted in a change in her sabbatical project, as she eloquently remarked, “my changemaker story is still very much a work in progress. I enjoyed this process, and it allowed me to reflect on some of the memorable and inspirational events in my life (both “good” and “bad”) and how they shaped my outlook on teaching and leadership. That excites me.” These personal/professional stories helped participants connect at a deeper level with the changemaker experience.

The importance of connection, empowerment, and boundaries in leadership were stressed, prioritizing quality over expansion. The need for adaptive leadership in navigating the

complexities of the modern world was highlighted, along with the importance of empathy, soft skills, and inspiration in leading positive change management efforts. Leah reflected on the potential for massive changes to universities, noting:

One of the pieces that stood out to me from that course was quite close to the beginning, where they presented this idea that universities might become obsolete. And it felt to me kind of alarmist. [...] I think the intent was - [for everyone in academia to] - start thinking about how to do differently. There's so many valued professions that can't exist without an accredited university. But ... whose responsibility is it then to change this university? It's not mine, right? [...] But then - what can I do just in my classes? That's what I took from this course, is that problems can be really big. But at the end of the day, I can only do what I can do in my sphere of influence. [...] That helped me to be practical, be focused. Use your leadership in your own sphere.

Changemaking supports the development of personal values, beliefs, and activities that are necessary to build the ability to influence positive social change (Alden Rivers, Nie, & Armellini, 2015), as identified by the participants.

Relationships

The discussion posts included themes of community, sharing, and trust. Participants collectively saw the importance of relationships in driving or hindering this work of changemaking. Nicolle noted that she “can see how UFV is working with community on issues around flood issues, housing, agriculture, and diversity.” Other ways that relationships referenced sharing were the “need to listen and go deeper” (Candace), “opportunities for faculty to reflect on their courses and share ideas” (Awneet), and Cindy’s call for her to “have a significant role to play in supporting new faculty to be successful, feel supported and encouraged to share ideas, and ultimately stay at UFV.”

With respect to trust, Candace cautioned that “all involved have to be willing to rebuild trust. This is the profound change in belief system - how do you get individuals' mindsets to trust again once they have been burnt?” Leah raised the point that “this requires vulnerability, trust, and support. So... perhaps a better question is, how can we strengthen these at UFV?” while Cindy commented, “What I came to realize was the importance of teamwork and bringing together a group that trusted each member to do their part and be honest with each other.” Relationships and trust were noted as key to changemaking moving forward at UFV.

Students

Discussion posts referenced students in two significant ways: missing student voice in this work and the importance of student success as the cornerstone of a successful Changemaker campus. As an example, Cindy shared that “having spent the last year listening to students, hearing their concerns and excitements, and sharing their thoughts and ideas with others, I think it is critical their voices be brought to the table.” Additionally, in thinking about “what it means to be student ready,” Cindy shared how important it was for her to support faculty to be successful in their

teaching practices. In this sense, student success in learning how to become changemakers was dependent on faculty becoming effective educators.

Systems & Structures

Some participants struggled initially to understand changemaking, viewed it as unattainable, or experienced identity conflicts and concerns with it. Participants shifted from viewing changemaking as an external strategy to seeing it as an embedded approach that involves faculty, students, and key stakeholders in the institution. Systems in learning institutions include five levels: “policy, educational community, school leadership, and teacher level and beyond” (Azorín & Fullan, 2022, p. 138).

Many of our discussion posts referenced systems through the themes of changing systems, leadership qualities, and systemic structures and issues. A system is “a relationship of parts that work together in an organized manner to accomplish a common purpose” (Buchanan, 2019, p. 86) and university systems can be described as interconnections which “include the standards for admission, the requirements for degrees, the examinations and grades, the budgets and money flows, the gossip, and most important, the communication of knowledge that is, presumably, the purpose of the whole system” (Meadows, 2008, p.14). Meadows (2008) further notes that “systems can’t be controlled” (para. 5).

Awneet stressed “the structure of working from a 'people up' approach seems to be an effective way to counter authority flows that are 'people down' approaches. This is powerful for me. How can we be more 'people up' in our quest to become a changemaking campus and to foster/nurture change agency in our students at UFV?” Candace commented that “the focus is driven by those whose lives are most affected by the organization’s actions” in terms of people-driven change. Leadership qualities and actions surfaced in terms of soft skills such as “empathy and adaptability” (Awneet) being necessary. Leah described the importance of shifting mindsets of leaders to reframe the focus of institutions. She stated, “instead of ‘is the institution still relevant’ [change to] ‘how can we best prepare students.’” The need to look critically at structures was reflected consistently throughout our discussion posts.

Further, Awneet resonated with the groundwater metaphor to understand systemic racism and why it is important to recognize leverage points and ask different questions when things are not working. The importance of changing system structures requires “bringing students into the equation [to] challenge the social interactions and potentially create a culture shift that has the potential to create systems change” (Cindy). Cindy also shared an example of a faculty member who “challenged a system and authority which emphasized competitiveness. This led to a different way of thinking and viewing physical activity in girls.” The discussion post data emphasized the focus on systems and how changemaking, as understood by us, could shift the narrative of institutions like UFV: “I know there will be resistance along the way; however, it is through the resistance and discomfort that the greatest change can happen” (Cindy).

Regarding resistance, Awneet stated,

A change maker would ask, **why** are they resisting? Not **what** are they resisting? They wouldn't put it back on the person, they would look at the system that is causing that resistance. So, I think it shifts the way that we see dissent, or resistance. And in fact, resistance is part of change making, because you're also resisting the status quo to a certain extent. [...] It's the process and not the product.

While Stauch (2023) notes that “social innovation learning happens largely in spite of the dominant systems, cultures, and norms of academia” (para 1), participants felt that changing the systems structures will enable UFV to move forward more quickly. Systems change is not easy (Kim et al., 2018) and can make situations worse when not done properly (Seelos & Mair, 2018). As changemaking is introduced into a higher education institution, educators may resist. There are, however, ways for educators to feel empowered through relationships; the use of lived experiences; the disruption of existing barriers, and collaboration (Jez et al., 2023), as this course is building.

Discussion

Within the themes, there is consistency with the values coding and how the values reflect the personal journey that all went through. While participants entered the course experiencing uncertainty of their role and the impact this course could have on higher education, they left with *hope* and a *shift in thinking* that they had the ability to emerge as leaders in *creating change within the system*. It is evident that all participants embarked on their own personal journey, and it was recognized that engaging in self-study research may not have been possible with other initiatives across the University. Cindy noted that participating in the course and being part of this work “gives me hope and provides me with the courage to speak up, to use the language of change making, and identify where this is already happening in the institution.”

All who engaged in this research worked to create their own personal safe space and a safe space for others. As Candace stated, “...creating our own safe spaces didn't just happen, we did the work to make this happen.” While being in these spaces created some uncertainty at first, through support, collaboration, and contribution of participants, all were able to engage and learn from each other. A culture of trust was developed, and participants felt safe in the group relationship. This has led to further engagement with students, not only in this work but also in the development of a Social Innovation Microcredential, which is currently under development.

This led to significant discussions surrounding power and who really holds the power as it relates to higher education. The following questions emerged in our discussion: “Are we even aware of our power? We're talking about agency, maybe we are the people right now with the power, and we don't even know it.” As such, participants came to question the power in the institution and the power we hold as change agents, but also our ability, based on the concepts learned in the course, to become agents in dismantling the power structures, which can impede change. Again, this is consistent with the values coding that emerged. As Awneet notes,

So maybe change making, in a sense, and the experience of the course, has helped us dismantle some of that [top-down] power... There are people who suddenly

might feel threatened in their role, because they felt they had some power, and now don't have as much. People are taking on small-scale leadership, or leadership is being distributed in different ways.

In essence, participating in the course helped to empower participants to engage in the work of change making, become voices in dismantling power structures in higher education, and gain hope in higher education as the institution strives for change maker status.

We began this study curious about our experiences of taking the microcredential course. What emerged was a deeper appreciation of the collaborative nature of our experience and a hunger for understanding individual felt, lived, and real experiences of cohort members. The research team, all from diverse academic backgrounds, institutional areas, and lived experiences, was richly engaged in the course and in exploring their experiences further. This research emerged as a call to discuss the impact of this course on our understanding of changemaking practice and theory.

Recommendations

Through reflection on our study results and personal responses to question 7 of this study, we identified ten recommendations for designing future offerings of a microcredential in Changemaker Education and for embedding changemaking across HEIs.

1. **Ensure the course is taught by authentic facilitators.** The spirit of facilitators was identified as being especially important. Leah noted that “what they brought was so, I think, strengthening to us as a group. They were so focused on building safety and process, and they were open. They were vulnerable. They ... brought so much richness to the process.” Awneet noted that “I think the two facilitators, the word that kept coming back to me was they're so authentic. They live this work. They love this work.” What became evident is that the facilitators were required for the level of success achieved.
2. **Give participants ample time and space to form relationships.** As participants come from all over the university with different roles and responsibilities, it was important that time was spent building relationships and community. Cindy noted that “I think it was necessary for us to get to know each other, develop relationships, think about and share our stories, for us to be able to engage in the work.” This time was well spent as course participants were able to develop a level of trust and are now continuing to work together on post-course activities.
3. **Ensure a combination of quality readings, resources, and guest speakers.** Awneet summed up by stating: “I felt that the online readings, the readings, and the resources that they provided were outstanding. [...] the guest speakers were phenomenal.” Leah noted that “The speakers and Ashoka Fellows remind me of the importance of making connections between practices and vision and action and beliefs.” Co-researchers spoke about specific speakers and how they are continuing to use the resources provided.

4. **Keep the Ecosystem Scan (ES) as the final deliverable.** While participants felt that the approach and time provided to produce the ES could be improved, the ES itself was seen as an important work item. Awneet noted that “the assignment was valuable. We produced something that was used to exercise in changemaking.” UFV continues to use the ES as a roadmap for changemaking. However, it was difficult to complete the ecosystem scan in the time frame provided, prepare the leadership presentation, and suggest implementation options. Institutions should consider the best approach for the ES completion for their institution.
5. **Weave the Mission, Vision, and Values of the University into the course.** As we started looking at the data, it became clear that we could have done a better job of incorporating the mission, vision, and values of the University into the work we did in the course. One of the pieces we kept coming back to is designation and asking ourselves and each other, why are we doing this work, why are we moving forward with designation? Incorporating the language of the Mission, Vision, and Values would have helped people understand the purpose as we moved through the course/microcredential.
6. **Allow attendees to prepare for the pre- and post-course workload.** Attendees did not understand the purpose of the course and workload. Pre-planning and discussion prior to the course start, including more clarity on workload and time commitments, would have helped prepare people and potentially reduced the initial skepticism. For example, more could have been done to prepare colleagues to engage with the ES to ensure accurate information was gathered for the purposes of the task.
7. **Extend the duration of the course.** In the end, we felt rushed, especially knowing that the work was important. Therefore, we recommend increasing the time for the course from six months to one year.
8. **Present to leaders across the University.** This is a must; however, senior leaders also need preparation before coming to the presentation. Senior leaders must understand what this work is and what this group has gone through to get to this point. Leaders can then take this back to their functional area. As the goal is to implement changemaking and the changemaking language across the institution, leaders need to understand the initial premise.
9. **Invite students to participate.** Participants identified that students were missing from the course and that the course was poorer for the experience. As students are “the most important stakeholders of the university” (Leko Šimić et al., 2022, p. 1) and today’s students care about social issues and the environment, changemaking involvement would “allow students to be socially innovative, explore social issues they are passionate about and make a real difference to society” (Power et al., 2018, p. 265). When staff and students view themselves as peers, both benefit. Such an opportunity would help to address a “lack of confidence” and “the lack of social or cultural capital” that students experience (Thorogood et al., 2018, pp. 552-553).

10. **Plan post-course work.** Participants noted that having the time to reflect about the course was valuable for themselves. Rather than the cohort disbanding after the course, we recommend that all twenty cohort members be brought together regularly after the course to engage in some self-reflection and talk about how they are implementing changemaking in their lives, personal or professional.

Prantl et al. (2022) notes that “social innovation seems to trigger great enthusiasm and euphoria at first” followed by a “more realistic and down-to-earth view” (p. 155) with less positive attitudes. By bringing the cohort together, we may be able to better maintain positive attitudes.

Implications and Conclusions

The research contributes to the theme of social innovation in education by focusing on how post-secondary institutions can implement change from within, as well as how partnerships between different institutions can benefit all. The authors provide recommendations for other higher educational institutions that may assist them in strengthening their changemaking processes and supporting personal journeys. Through the hybrid impact methodology, the authors provide nuanced perspectives as insiders about their experiences of engaging with the concepts and pillars of changemaking toward the goal of creating positive changes. Findings are in the form of “lessons learned” about how to create educational experiences that lead to impact and social innovation for post-secondary educators seeking to prepare students to respond to global and local challenges. The researchers offer feedback and provide general recommendations to the designers of the first iteration of this course as they consider future applications of the microcredential.

References

- Alden Rivers, B., Nie, M., & Armellini, A. (2015). University teachers' conceptions of "Changemaker": A starting point for embedding social innovation in learning and teaching. *Education+ Training*, 57(5), 588-600.
- Arvanitakis, J., & Hornsby, D.J. (2016). Are universities redundant? In J. Arvanitakis & D. J. Hornsby (Eds.), *Universities, the citizen scholar and the future of higher education*. Palgrave Macmillan https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137538697_2
- Azorín, C., & Fullan, M. (2022). Leading new, deeper forms of collaborative cultures: Questions and pathways. *Journal of Educational Change*, 23(1), 131-143.
- Brock, D. D., and The Global Academy for Social Entrepreneurship. (2008). *Social entrepreneurship teaching resources handbook*. Available at SSRN 1344412.
- Buchanan, R. (2019). Systems thinking and design thinking: The search for principles in the world we are making. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, 5(2), 85-104.
- Budinich, V., Raine, F., & Wells, D. (2022). System changers for a new era of value creation. In R. Baldegger, A. E. Tarabishy, D. Audetsch, D. Kariv, K. Passerini, W. Tan (Eds.), *The future of business schools* (pp. 148-167). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Delva, J., & Abrams, L. S. (2022). Social work researchers: From scientific technicians to changemakers. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, 13(4), 645-661.
- Feijóo-Quintas, S., Gerbaudo-González, N., Gandoy-Crego, M., Gutiérrez-Moar, M. D. C., Costa, E., & Facal, D. (2024). Higher Education Institutions as Strategic Centers for Promoting Social Innovation in Gerontology: Insights from the Senior Innovation Lab Training Initiative. *Geriatrics*, 9(3), 76.
- Hazenberg, R., Wang, N., Chandra, Y., and Nicholls, A. (2019). *Surveying the Landscape of Social Innovation and Higher Education in Hong Kong*. London.
- Jez, R. J., Dennis, C., Coleman, M., Conradie, C., Matyaleni, A., Ramirez, D., ... & Herndon, C. (2023). Changemakers share their why, collaborate as critical friends, and highlight leadership skills. *African Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, 2(1), 15.
- Kim, M., Krampetz, E., & Ansari, B. (2018). *Changemaker institutions: How higher education can use social innovation to better prepare students, transform campus culture, and lead society toward a better future*. Ashoka U. <https://ashokau.org/media/418/download>
- Leko Šimić, M., Sharma, E., & Kadlec, Ž. (2022). Students' perceptions and attitudes toward university social responsibility: Comparison between India and Croatia. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 13763.

Lough, B. J. (2022). Decentering social innovation: the value of dispersed institutes in higher education. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 18(1), 12-27.

McConnell Foundation. (2021). *The Role of Canadian Universities in Society*.
<https://www.mcconnellfoundation.ca/report/the-role-of-universities-in-society/>

Mdleleni, L. (2022). University as a vehicle to achieve social innovation and development: repositioning the role of the university in the society. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 18(1), 121-139.

Meadows, D. H. (2008). *The Basics. In Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Nardi, B. (2019). Design in the age of climate change. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, 5(1), 5-14.

Pine, G. D. (2009). The validity of action research. In G. J. Pine (Ed.), *Teacher action research: Building knowledge democracies* (pp. 80-91). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Power, A., Dakri, T., & Irwin, W. (2018). Changemaker: Preparing student midwives for employability, qualification and beyond. *British Journal of Midwifery*, 26(4), 264-266.

Prantl, J., Freund, S., & Kals, E. (2022). Strengthening social innovation in higher education institutes—an organizational change process involving staff and students. *Social enterprise journal*, 18(1), 140-162.

Ragoonaden, K. O., Sivia, A., & Baxan, V. (2015). Teaching for Diversity in Teacher Education: Transformative Frameworks. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2015.3.6>

Saldana, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. (4th ed.). Sage.

Samaras, A. P. (2011). *Self-study teacher research: Improving your practice through collaborative inquiry*. SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452230481>

Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2018). Mastering system change. *Stanford Social Innov. Rev*, 201(8), 35-41.

Sen, P. (2006). Ashoka's big idea: Transforming the world through social entrepreneurship. *Futures* (39) pp. 534-553. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2006.10.013

Stauch, J. (2023). Diagnosing the Social Innovation Challenge in Universities. *Social Innovations Journal*, 16(1). <https://socialinnovationsjournal.com/index.php/sij/article/view/5378>.

Teasdale, S., Roy, M. J., Ziegler, R., Mauksch, S., Dey, P., & Raufflet, E. B. (2021). Everyone a changemaker? Exploring the moral underpinnings of social innovation discourse through real utopias. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 12(3), 417-437.

Thorogood, J., Azuma, F., Collins, C., Plyushteva, A., & Marie, J. (2018). Changemakers and change agents: Encouraging students as researchers through Changemaker's programmes. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2018.1460804>

University of the Fraser Valley. (2021). *Integrated strategic plan*.
https://www.ufv.ca/media/assets/strategic-planning/UFV-integrated-strategic-plan-2021-2026_p2.pdf

Vorley, T., & Nelles, J. (2008). (Re) conceptualising the academy: Institutional development of and beyond the third mission. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 20(3), 1-17

Walker, B. and Soule, S.A. (2017). Changing Company Culture Requires a Movement, Not a Mandate. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2017/06/changing-company-culture-requires-a-movement-not-a-mandate> (accessed October 16, 2024)

Westley, F. (2008). *The social innovation dynamic*. Frances Westley, SiG@ Waterloo.