

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS WITH COLLEGE CAMPUSES: COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES

A MONOGRAPH

by Sally Leiderman, Andrew Furco,
Jennifer Zapf and Megan Goss



A Publication of the Consortium for the Advancement of
Private Higher Education's Engaging Communities and Campuses
Grant Program



THE COUNCIL OF
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES



The Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), an association of more than 500 colleges and universities, has over ten years of experience in promoting partnerships among institutions of higher education and community organizations. Through the generous support of The Atlantic Philanthropies, CIC's grantmaking unit, the Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education (CAPHE), administered the Engaging Communities and Campuses grant program. This program provided awards up to \$80,000 each to thirteen private colleges and universities to develop campus-wide initiatives that prepare students for a lifetime of contributions to society (Please see Appendix A for a complete list of grant recipients). The program focuses on assisting independent colleges and universities and their community organizational partners to extend and deepen their commitments to both student learning and community interests through the development of community/campus collaborations that center on community-focused experiential learning opportunities for students. The program supports building the organizational capacity of campuses in one or more of four key areas—*faculty skills and knowledge*, assisting faculty members in developing new experiential learning knowledge and skills; *institutional infrastructure*, establishing infrastructure to work with community organizations; *academic culture*, creating a campus culture supportive of faculty members' work with experiential learning pedagogies; and *partner relationships*, strengthening institutional partnerships with community organizations.

The evaluation of the Engaging Communities and Campuses program has included interviews with different stakeholder groups involved in the community/campus partnership. In September 2002, during a two-day summit, a series of focus group interviews were held with 19 of the community leaders involved in partnerships with the thirteen colleges and universities. The summit sought to capture community participants' perspectives regarding their partnership work with higher education. Through a series of focused discussions and small group activities, the community leaders were asked a series of questions designed to investigate their perspectives on what it takes to develop successful and effective campus/community partnerships. This monograph presents the findings from this investigation.

Although a number of the issues discussed during the summit were drawn from the community leaders' experiences with the Engaging Communities and Campuses program, many of the perceptions presented here extend beyond those formed through the Engaging grant program.

THE SUMMIT'S TWIN GOALS WERE TO:

- bring community perspectives into clearer focus by documenting the perspectives, experiences, and voices of experienced community partners regarding the creation and maintenance of partnerships between community organizations and institutions of higher education; and
- understand better those perspectives as a way to gain insight into common challenges and opportunities that ultimately lead to more successful and effective partnerships between institutions of higher education and community organizations.

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Formal collaborations and partnerships between community organizations and their local institutions of higher education increased substantially during the 1990s. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development reports that a growing number of higher education institutions in the United States are making significant contributions to nearby neighborhoods by developing partnerships with local community-based agencies and organizations (Vidal, Nye, Walker, Manjarrez, Romanik, Corvington, Ferryman, Freiberg, and Kim, 2003). The number of colleges and universities that are members of Campus Compact, an organization of college and university presidents seeking to advance their institution's community engagement, has grown from a little over 400 members in 1995 to 880 members today (Campus Compact, 2003). In addition, many community-based organizations are seeking out opportunities to collaborate with other community institutions, including local institutions of higher education (Maurrasse, 2001).

Several factors contribute to current growing interest in community and campus collaboration and partnership. As public resources dwindle and social needs proliferate, community-based organizations are increasingly looking for institutional partners with which to collaborate to address complex social issues. At the same time, many institutions of higher education are renewing their emphases on the civic purposes of higher education and consequently, have been expanding their connections to the local community of which they are a part. In addition, more foundations and other grants organizations are requiring multi-agency partnerships and collaborations as a condition for awarding grants. Such grant making entities see community partnerships as essential to the development of comprehensive approaches for achieving community goals. These trends, in particular, have encouraged the formation of partnerships between community organizations and their local institutions of higher education.¹

As public resources dwindle and social needs proliferate, community-based organizations are increasingly looking for institutional partners with which to collaborate to address complex social issues.

An emerging body of research suggests that communities that want to improve the quality of life of their residents potentially have much to gain from partnerships with institutions of higher education (Harkavy, 1999; Zlotkowski, 1999; Holland and Gelmon, 1998; Walskok, 1995). Local colleges and universities can provide expertise, volunteer resources, clout with certain constituencies, and amenities that are not readily available from other institutions in the community. For example, colleges and universities often have access to the most current research on many of the issues that affect community well being. In addition, institutions of higher education can serve as powerful allies and advocates on important community issues, and they can be "bridge" institutions to help sustain long-term community building efforts past inevitable changes in, for example, political leadership or foundation support.

In turn, community venues offer students, faculty, staff, and administrators of higher education institutions opportunities to apply learning to "real world" situations, to develop a sophisticated understanding of community goals, processes, and current issues, and to grow as individuals through civic, ethical, political, philanthropic, and other activities. Together, through a genuine, collaborative partnership, community organizations and institutions of higher education can build communities that are good and healthy places to live.

Analysis of the literature on community/campus partnerships reveals that the elements of effective collaboration are emphasized within community building and higher education literature, with scant attention paid to community voices and perspectives on these issues (Giles and Cruz, 2000). This is particularly true for literature representing multiple community voices and literature that highlights the costs as well as the benefits to community agencies and residents of participation in community/campus partnerships.

While relatively little has been written about community/campus partnership from a community perspective, there is substantial literature on the components

of effective collaboration within communities and across community spheres (such as neighborhoods and community institutions).² It is reasonable to assume these components apply to the subset of community partnerships that are formed with higher education institutions, as well as other kinds of partnerships. The literature suggests core elements that include:

- Analyses and strategies that focus on community assets and strengths (rather than focusing solely, or primarily, on deficits and needs);
- Comprehensive strategies that cut across systems, sectors, issues, and disciplines;
- Acknowledgement of the roles that privilege, institutional and structural racism, and power differentials play in creating and maintaining differential community conditions;³
- High quality and effective collaboration; and
- Sustained, long-term action.

From the higher education perspective, the literature has focused on detailing effective programmatic features of various community engagement approaches such as service-learning, experiential education, internships, community-based research, faculty professional service and outreach, and student volunteerism (Stoecker, 2002; Zlotkowski, 1999; Ward, 1998). More recently, the literature has explored the components necessary to institutionalize community/campus engagement within an institution of higher education (Furco, 2002; Vidal et al., 2002; Gray, Ondaaje, Fricker, Geschwind, 2000; Robinson, 2000; Holland, 1999).⁴

Although the components for institutionalizing community engagement initiatives in higher education have been identified and labeled differently by various researchers, collectively the components can be subsumed within the following four categories developed for the Engaging program:⁵

- Institutional infrastructure (including leadership, structure, practices, organization, connections, status, and services);
- Academic culture (including access, status, funding, support, mission, incentives, and connections);

- Faculty knowledge and skills (including student experiences, assessment, teaching practices, connections, and activities); and
- Partner relationships (including knowledge, organization, structures, connections, leadership, and roles).

In light of this framework, the Engaging Communities and Campuses program included a requirement for active participation by community partners, including the formation of an active advisory board with community representation, and a focus on meeting community as well as campus goals. CAPHE also established two strands of evaluation, one focusing on elements and processes that can spread an engagement culture through an institution of higher education (and thus, increase the likelihood of improved student academic and civic learning outcomes) and one focused on community perspectives and benefits from engagement.⁶ This design provided an opportunity to look a bit more deeply at the details of partnership than is typically the case, and particularly, to share the insights and lessons from often highly experienced community partners.

The program focuses on assisting independent colleges and universities and their community organizational partners to extend and deepen their commitments to both student learning and community interests.

METHOD

Data were collected from 19 leaders within community organizations partnering with Engaging Communities and Campuses program grantee institutions. These leaders, referred to as community partners, participated in a two-day summit at which they were asked to discuss their partnership experiences, to provide insights about the challenges of partnering with institutions of higher education, and to offer recommendations for implementing successful community/campus partnerships. The summit provided an opportunity to analyze the cumulative knowledge of community leaders, based on their experiences working with higher education institutions. The summit was designed as an opportunity for them to talk openly with each other and with the evaluators of the Engaging program.⁷ An advisory group of seven community leaders worked with the evaluators to develop the topics to be discussed and formats through which the discussions were to occur at the summit. Members of the advisory group also led several activities during the summit and helped open and deepen conversations.

Research questions

All of the overarching questions, which were developed by the advisory group and were explored during summit focus groups and working sessions, address issues pertaining to community voices and community perspectives. The questions are:

- What is a good partnership, from your perspective? In contrast, what is a bad partnership? What are spoken and unspoken issues that have affected your partnership?⁸
- What are you doing within your own partnership that other similar initiatives might get excited about?
- From your perspective, what are the benefits and costs of participating in these kinds of partnerships?
- What do you want campuses to know based on your experiences in these kinds of partnerships?
- What recommendations do you have for the broader field?

Discussions were captured through extensive notes and easel chart summaries. This information was organized and analyzed by the research team. Emerging themes and recommendations were identified and included in a draft of this monograph. The draft was shared with community partners to assure the report's accuracy; their comments helped shape the final version of this report.

Sample

Community partners were invited from each of the thirteen Engaging Communities and Campuses colleges and universities. The partners were nominated by campus-based project directors at each site. Partners were selected based on the depth of their expertise of community processes and interests and their experience with community/campus partnerships. The final group of 19 represented eleven of the thirteen Engaging sites (the partners from Loyola University New Orleans could not attend at the last minute because of local weather conditions; the Bates partnership was unable to participate due to time considerations).

The summit participants were all active in community/campus partnership activities. In addition, many

were also very experienced with community/campus partnering outside this particular grant program. Collectively, their work centered on a variety of issues or areas of community improvement including early childhood education and care, K-12 education, economic development, hunger and homelessness, comprehensive community building, arts and cultural activities, and resident leadership and empowerment. The group was diverse with respect to race and ethnicity, gender, years of experience, education, and geography.

Data Analysis

The notes collected by the researchers during the various focus groups and small group discussions held at the summit were analyzed over a period of several weeks through inductive, qualitative, content, and subtext analyses that searched for common themes. For each research question, the researchers developed a relational scheme that grouped participant responses into clusters according to themes. Each cluster of responses was categorized into themes using descriptive labels. Whenever evident, subthemes (or categories) were identified and labeled. The emergent themes and subthemes identified form the structure of this monograph.

Caveats

Two caveats regarding the sample should be noted. First, as noted above, community partners were asked to speak from their organizational perspectives. While they work on behalf of community residents, and many live in the areas they serve, they do not purport to represent the views of community residents. Thus, these findings represent the views of community organizations, not community residents per se. Second, participants are a convenience sample, not selected from a defined universe with known probability. The findings from this analysis are qualitative and not generalizable in a statistical sense, and should be interpreted in that fashion. At the same time, there was a great deal of convergence in the perspectives offered (and some differences) suggesting findings may have broad applicability. Indeed, the majority of the findings from this investigation corroborate with the general perspectives offered in the few existing treatises that have explored community perspectives in community/campus partnerships (see Cone and Payne, 2002; Giles and Cruz, 2000).

...a two-day summit...with 19 of the community leaders...sought to capture community participants' perspectives regarding their partnership work with higher education.

II. EMERGING

THEMES

These emerging themes regarding community perspectives in community/campus partnerships reflect a broad categorization of issues that were raised most often and most fervently during the summit. The remainder of this monograph discusses the nature of each of these themes and presents some of the quotes and comments that characterize each theme. The emerging themes were drawn from the research questions that focused on the following topics:

- Core elements of effective partnerships;
- Benefits and costs of participation;
- Power, parity, and perceptions of exploitation; and
- Recommendations for practice and policy.

The emerging themes and sub-themes for each of these research areas are discussed.

CORE ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS

For community partners, a good community/campus partnership is characterized by careful preparation, excellent implementation, and meticulous follow-through.

The community partners revealed that they have thought a great deal about what constitutes a good partnership or engagement activity with an institution of higher education. Many have participated in partnership activities over the years, often with several different higher education institutions. Several are offered more such opportunities each year than their organization can absorb. Overall, for the community partners, good partnerships are ones that are effective in meeting short-term goals, contribute to long-term ones, develop relationships with higher education institutions with promise of benefits beyond the results of a given engagement activity, and are worth repeating.

One of the chief insights from the summit was that good community/campus partnerships are created daily

through the routine interactions and cumulative outcomes of their processes and activities. They are intentional, with a focus not just on design and broad concept, but on careful preparation every time, excellent implementation, and meticulous follow-through. In addition, it appears that community partners value frequent and candid communication not just about schedules, expectations, policies, and accomplishments, but also about issues of power, privilege, race, and class as they play out in the partnership, as well as in interactions between students and community residents. The evidence from this summit suggests that even though a partnership is long-standing, it is not always robust. Our conclusion is that in this work, the devil really is in the details and even very long-standing relationships should not be taken for granted.

The community partners revealed that they have thought a great deal about what constitutes a good partnership or engagement activity with an institution of higher education.

Components

Community partners were largely in consensus about the essential elements of an effective partnership that is worth sustaining. Elements they mentioned cluster into seven major categories, as noted below:

- ***A set of mutually determined goals and processes, including processes to select and train people who will come into contact with a community organization or community residents.*** The community partners expressed the need to have a say over the selection of the college and university students and faculty who come to work with them. They wish to be involved in the development of the projects early on, when the primary goals and expectations of the community engagement work are being developed.
- ***Shared vision, resources, rewards, and risks.*** The community partners expressed a strong desire not to be considered solely as recipients of services or resources, but rather as equal partners who also have resources to share. In addition, the community partners would like to have more open discussions of the resources available for a particular engagement. They also wish they would be able to talk more freely about the potential risks to their organizations and constituents, as well as potential rewards, as a pre-

cursor to decisions about how resources, rewards, and risks will be allocated.

- **The members of the partnerships have a shared vision that is built on genuine excitement and passion for the issues at hand.** Community partners prefer working with higher education institutions when the community/campus partnership is not artificial or forced. Artificial or forced partnerships sometimes occur when higher education institutions seek to partner with the community primarily to fulfill a requirement for a grant or solely for symbolic purposes. For a community/campus partnership to be successful, its focus and activities must be important and relevant to all partners.
- **Strategies focused on issues as they play out in a particular location, based on deep understanding of a community's interests, assets, needs, and opportunities.** Good community/campus partnerships meet specific community goals. For the community partners, this is most likely to happen when campus partners have a comprehensive understanding of the local context and manifestation of the issues that students are being asked to address (such as poverty, hunger, school reform and achievement issues, resident leadership and economic development, or arts development).
- **A variety of roles and responsibilities based on each partner's particular capacities and resources.** Based on the summit participants' responses, it appears that a community partner's capacity to participate fully in an engagement activity depends on many conditions, including staff capacity to supervise the work and mentor students, resources to pay for and manage additional staff if necessary, other priorities for the use of time and resources, space and transportation constraints, and fit between an organization's responsibilities and the capacities and skills of campus partners to help meet them. They also expressed that they sometimes feel that campus partners do not fully understand how stretched resources are for many community organizations, and thus, plan activities that are well meaning but burdensome. For these community partners, good community/campus partnerships take the individual capacities and resources of community-based organizations into account, sharing roles and responsibilities based on each partner's ability to do them well.

The community partners felt strongly that their expertise and experience need to be acknowledged and utilized in the community/campus partnership.

- **Peer relationships among faculty (and other campus partners) and management and staff of partner organizations in the community.** The community partners felt strongly that their expertise and experience need to be acknowledged and utilized in the community/campus partnership. Community partners acknowledged their appreciation for the special expertise that campus partners may bring to the table—research skills and up-to-date research knowledge, an interest in publicizing community work through peer reviewed publications, theoretical context, and applied experience. However, they expect campus partners to understand and value their organization's expertise at all staff levels. They also hope that campus partners acknowledge the academic, as well as the experiential credentials of their community partners, since many directors of community institutions hold advanced degrees and are highly trained. The community members suggested more effective and longstanding community/campus partnerships are likely to develop when there is parity among the partnership members.
- **Benefits (short- or long-term) to each partner sufficient to justify the costs, level of effort, and potential risks of participation.** According to the summit participants, there are always costs, and risks, to community organizations when they partner with others, since the partnership includes putting their reputations on the line and making choices about where to invest scarce resources. Therefore, community partners weigh a number of costs against benefits in deciding whether to enter into, or maintain, a partnership with any given higher education institution. Their decision processes, potential benefits, and costs are described more fully in the next section of this report.
- **A system of accountability that covers responsibility for carrying out jointly determined plans, ensuring that quality work is produced, and benefits accrue to communities and campuses.** The community members felt it is important to hold each level of partnership—organization and campus administration, line staff and faculty, and students—accountable for quality work. In addition, they saw evaluation and continuous improvement as important. As they revealed, these efforts arm them with data that they can use to garner more internal and external support for their work as well as identify ways to improve the partnership.

The community partners also described some of the specific activities or processes that increase the likelihood that these components will be realized in community/campus partnerships. *Elements of a Good Partnership* (see sidebar pg. 9) lists some of the specific activities and processes of a good community/campus engagement partnership mentioned by the community partners.

Areas of disagreement

While community partners were generally in agreement on the importance of these core elements, they differed in two important ways as to how they could or should be implemented. The first difference was in their opinions about whether higher education community engagement activities should be required or voluntary. Some partners expressed strong beliefs that higher education institutions should require faculty or students to engage with the communities near their campus. They believe engagement activities, when done well, provide a necessary part of the education of future citizens and potential community leaders. Some also believe that higher education institutions have a responsibility to be active citizens of their local communities, both through the actions of individual faculty members, staff, and administration, and as an institution through policy and by other means.

While not disagreeing with these ideas, other community leaders shared that they believe that engagement activities—particularly in the form of service-learning, community-based research or community service—should be voluntary, and that mandating them is counter-productive. In their experiences, mandating engagement activities devalues them and can lead to work done in a perfunctory manner. Because there are real costs to community organizations for engaging with campuses, they do not place organizational priority on creating what they call “make-work” for students who just want to get their hours in.

The community partners stated that they view student work quality as a shared responsibility of their own organization, faculty members, campus administration, and the students. According to the summit participants, if work is not done well, community partners will sometimes place responsibility with faculty mem-

bers and administrators even more than with students, for failing to establish norms and a context that motivates and prepares students to sufficiently recognize the greater context into which their particular assignment falls. Partners who have experienced many of these situations appear to support voluntary, but not mandatory, community engagement in higher education.

The summit participants also differed about their appropriate roles as community partners in relation to building faculty interest and capacity, and making engagement activities meaningful for students. Some of the partners believe it is a community partner’s role to create projects that will meet community needs, give students context and specific training, and ensure that the work meets high standards. They do not expect the campus to be able to do this as well as a community partner. The partners operating in this mode often

work from their own community or organizational strategic or master plan and fit various engagement opportunities into the plan. Such a plan may or may not have been developed with any particular campus partnership in mind.

Other community partners specifically rejected this assumption. Though they are interested in helping to educate students, and helping administrators and faculty understand issues important to communities with which they work, these community partners believe that campus partners who have not taken time to learn about their local neighborhoods will ultimately not be able to organize and sustain quality engagement processes or useful joint work.

WEIGHING BENEFITS AND COSTS

The community partners asserted that there are a number of risks in working with institutions of higher education, and therefore, they carefully weigh the ratio of benefits to risks and costs in deciding to enter into, or continue in, a community/campus partnership.

In choosing to engage with campuses, the community partners revealed that they weighed the perceived benefits and costs carefully, along with several mediating factors. Potential benefits and costs, as described by the summit participants, are described more fully below.

Mediating factors important to a community partner's decision about whether or not to engage and remain in a partnership include:

- **The presence of sufficient, qualified staff at a campus center.** Whether or not the campus has an office or unit that coordinates community engagement work (a service-learning center, internship office, or community outreach center for example), the community partners consider the degree to which the institution has allocated sufficient and appropriate staff to handle the scope and scale of the partnership work. Specifically, community partners look for the presence of enough staff and staff hours to handle the various tasks, enough access and clout within the campus to get things done, an ability to bring the right people to the table, and for staff and leaders with excellent community relationships.
- **The level of sustained administrative interest and visible leadership supporting community engagement.** The community partners expressed that they want to be part of campus activities that have high visibility and that they also want to be considered important to the overall mission of the campus. Summit participants explained that community partners often view the college or university leadership's attitude toward community engagement activities as reflective of the institution's actual commitment. Community partners expect high-level campus administrators to demonstrate that they value engagement work by incorporating it into institutional culture and infrastructure. According to the summit participants, community partners view the college or university leadership's attitudes toward community engagement work as a marker of how important the community engagement work really is to the institution. Community partners expect high-level campus administrators to show that they value engagement work through its incorporation into overall academic culture and institutional infrastructure.
- **An assessment of the quality of prior experiences with campus partnerships generally, and with a given higher education institution and particular faculty.** A number of the summit participants' comments suggest that understanding the history of town/gown relationships between the campus and various agencies in a community helps define the context in which new efforts must be planned, implemented, and assessed. If community members have had previous positive experiences with a facul-

Basic and Required Elements of a Good Partnership

(Success requires that these be met sufficiently, but more of them does not necessarily improve results. Represents the minimum for success).

- Faculty and student participation in engagement activities.
- An understanding of each partner's assets and capacities to participate.
- Shared decision making and resource allocation.
- Realistic expectations.
- Knowledge of community needs—understanding of how theoretical and macro issues (like homelessness and K-12 schooling) play out locally.
- Diverse representation and participation from colleges, including faculty, students, administration, and staff.
- An understanding of student's capacities.
- An understanding of different ways to work in communities.
- Adherence to basic standards for planning, using another's resources, and interacting with another's and base of legitimacy.

Enables the Enhancement of Partnerships (The more these are practiced the more likely engagement is to produce meaningful results, be sustained, and become institutionalized over time. These factors motivate stronger partnership and engagement).

- Recognition that communities and campuses each have multiple players and perspectives (partners are not monolithic).
- Explicit attention to faculty and student development and preparation.
- Existence of people in communities who can network and make connections.
- Attention to building the capacity of all partner organizations.
- Specific opportunities for community partners (staff and residents) to make use of campus resources, such as attending classes, accessing research, and obtaining advanced degrees, not just use of the gym.
- Stated outcomes with an evaluation to determine if desired goals are met.
- Attention to the institutionalization of a college's partnership in the community.

The list, generated by the community partners, is consistent with the elements of sound collaboration noted in other community collaboration initiatives (Chaskin, 2001; Leiderman, 2001). Since this list is fairly well known among practitioners and researchers who work on community self-determination and improvement, it was particularly frustrating to community partners that its elements are not better observed in collaborations between community organizations and higher educational institutions.

ty member, campus department, or program, or a particular institution of higher education, they are more likely to trust plans that are not fully articulated, for example, or to be willing to help students and faculty engage with residents and other organizations within their own network.

■ **Whether or not partners have discussed and begun to work through issues of trust and accountability.**

Consistent with the comments above, the community partners discussed how they consider the various individuals involved in a partnership. Community partners explained that they are more likely to re-engage with partners that operate from a base of expertise and a position of respect for a community's residents, organizations, and the particular organizational staff and constituencies with whom they interact most directly (see next section of this report). They seek to develop relationships that are built on trust, mutual goals, responsibility, and accountability.

■ **Clear expectations about who will prepare students and faculty for engagement activities.**

The community partners revealed that they are sometimes unclear about why students are being asked to participate at their site, what the faculty member hopes students will get from the experience, or what schedule the students will keep. The community members also discussed how they sometimes have no say as to which students get placed at their site, or are asked to take on students who do not have the proper skills or training to assume designated responsibilities at the agency.

In the context of these mediating factors, it appears that community partners consider four main questions as they weigh the benefits and costs of their organization's participation in community/campus partnerships:

- How well does this engagement activity align with my broad goals for partnering with campuses?
- To what extent will this engagement activity contribute to achieving my organization's mission, or improving outcomes for the constituencies to whom our organization holds itself accountable?
- What is the risk or potential harm of engagement activity in terms of my organization's credibility, capability to produce quality services and products,

and ability maintain respectful and trusting relationships with community residents; and

- What are the actual and opportunity costs of participation—in terms of time, money, redirected staff resources or foregone relationships, activities, and opportunities?

Each of these questions is addressed in the following subsections. Each subsection presents a list of the key findings that emerged from the summit.

Community partners' goals for engagement with campuses

Overall, the community partners expressed a deep interest in the civic purposes of higher education. In fact, most summit participants said their primary goal for engaging with campuses through service-learning, community based research, and other student-focused partnerships is to play a role in developing a next generation of citizens who understand and can promote needed change. Though many said that they justify their organization's involvement in terms of the hours, services, and products that students provide, this is not the primary reason for getting involved or remaining involved over time. The partners were

clear to say that if the partnerships are not aimed at the goal of civic education, then the time commitment, actual staff costs, and organizational demands placed on them would be less justifiable.

The partners also considered other goals for campus engagement, including:

- Increasing the number of community residents who attend the partner university or college. One community partner suggested that every engagement effort be assessed on the extent to which this goal is achieved, notwithstanding its other goals;
- Raising the expectations and exposure of neighborhood residents more generally to the idea that they can attend and succeed in college. This applies especially to youth, but it also applies to older community residents;
- Increasing community capacity to address a particular issue at the systemic or structural level, particu-

If community members have had previous positive experiences with a faculty member, campus department, or program, or a particular institution of higher education, they are more likely...to be willing to help students and faculty engage with residents and other organizations within their own network.

larly issues such as K-12 education, economic development, housing and homelessness, small business development, or the viability of arts venues and programs. These issues are often approached in fragmented ways without broad community collaboration and partnership; and,

- As would be expected, achieving outcomes that contribute to an organization's ability to meet its mission, implement its programs, and deliver products and services.

Note that these goals are generally more profound and broader than the specific outcomes against which community/campus partnerships are usually assessed (such as the completion of a certain number of service hours). Assessment of success, therefore, would include at least a review of the quality of services performed (like tutoring) and, where relevant, materials produced (such as lesson plans, resource guides, or research product for community use), some indication of changes in students' civic values, attitudes, skills or behaviors, and a sense of the contribution of their work to the broader social goals to which community partners, or community residents, hold themselves accountable. While it is typically not feasible to measure every engagement activity at this level of depth, community partners believe that there ought to be some accountability for cumulative progress within a partnership, a neighborhood, or a sustained issue alliance among community and campus collaborators.

Types of benefits

Consistent with these goals, one or more partners reported each of the following benefits from a current or former community/campus partnership. Not all of these benefits are typical, though each is possible, according to community partners. Benefits noted include:

- Growth in college student understanding and potential for informed citizenship;
- Exposure of young residents to the possibility of higher education (through exposure to students and campuses);
- Access to the expertise of faculty members;
- Access to people (administrators, staff, faculty) who can serve on boards of community organizations or participate meaningfully on community planning,

advocacy and service coalitions, task forces, and collaborations;

- Access to other campus resources including libraries, gymnasiums, and other intellectual and recreational facilities;
- Access to programs that bring community youth onto campus for residential and non-residential skill building or leadership development;
- Expansion of community partners' own approaches to an issue through others' ways of looking at the same things;
- Opportunities to learn new skills and tools;
- Expanded resource base;
- Grant opportunities;
- More legitimacy, stature, or credibility for a community effort by virtue of its affiliation with an institution of higher education; and
- Mission advancement, including specifically:
 - ◆ Changes to extant public systems;
 - ◆ Increased ability to perform tasks that an organization otherwise would not have the labor to do through student and campus volunteerism;
 - ◆ The ability to meet constituency requests to add or enrich some programs and services;
 - ◆ Personnel cost savings (though many community partners noted that volunteers require additional personnel for proper supervision);
 - ◆ More effective and visible advocacy for community driven efforts to improve outcomes (such as educational attainment, economic development, violence prevention, and others);
 - ◆ Evaluation or assessment opportunities, capacities, and products; and
 - ◆ Other specific products (for example, resource guides or data analyses that students produce).

Types of costs and risks

Without denying the many benefits of this work, one community partner summed up the feelings of several by saying, "Community agencies are at risk whenever

(Cont'd on page 12)

- Many higher education institutions engage primarily with the directors of community organizations (the executive director of a multi-service agency, a school superintendent, or principal). In fact, successful partnerships require the buy-in and expertise of departmental supervisors and line people who will work directly with students and community residents. Partnerships that take this into account, and build in sufficient time and resources to engage frontline staff and their supervisors, demonstrate a much greater understanding of how community organizations work and are more likely to be effective.
- Community partners underscore the need to avoid jargon in community/campus partnerships, whether it is disciplinary, pedagogical, issue, or agency-specific. They note that jargon allows people to be theoretical rather than to apply theory to the actual conditions of a community. Communicating through jargon-free language forces all partners to think through the actual meaning of their work in terms of how it will affect real people in real places.
- Community partners emphasize the importance of framing engagement activities in terms of how broad issues play out locally. For example, a community partner involved in reducing homelessness talked about how, in the community in which she works, people without permanent homes find shelter by living for a few days with whomever will take them in; they do not typically live on the streets or stay in shelters voluntarily. She points out that students and faculty members are not usually aware of the impacts of this kind of homelessness or how to address it. For community partners, this kind of disconnect signals a limited understanding by the higher education partner, as well as having the practical side-effect of supervising students who are not well prepared for work in her agency.

(Cont'd from page 11)

they devote the time to doing community engagement work.” This partner was referring specifically to the opportunity cost of taking time to do community engagement work with one partner, at the risk of losing other partners or opportunities, given very scarce organizational resources of staff and time.

However, community partners also point out that these risks come from a sense that community/campus partnerships usually involve a community partner lending its credibility within a community to the campus—in a sense, certifying that the campus is a worthwhile and trustworthy ally and resource. Communities are often skeptical on this point, as many partner organizations move on when their interests and needs turn to other issues or don’t sustain work until the promised goal is achieved (for example, until performance in K-12 improves). So the community partner, who cannot control the actions of the campus partner, takes a risk by lending its name to a joint effort.

In addition, community organizations with legitimacy among their constituents have often worked hard for a long time to gain it. So the risk of partnership to the organization—in terms of its own credibility and ability to work in a community—may be much greater than campus partners perceive.

The partners also considered other, more direct costs to their organizations. They include:

- ◆ The time it takes to create work, supervise student volunteers, or participate in research;
- ◆ The opportunity cost of not doing funded or billable work using the same staff resources;
- ◆ Time lost to work with other constituencies (a board, donor base, or other partners);
- ◆ Loss of organizational identity and privacy, in some instances; and
- ◆ The “irritation” factor when organizational staff members are not treated as experts and peers by campus partners and students, or when respect is not demonstrated in the way things are planned and decisions are made. The partners spoke of having to “mop up the organizational damage” from these experiences.

One major finding of the summit is the frequency with which the community partners found that the

benefits of engaging with higher education institutions did not outweigh these costs. Many of the participating community partners provided examples of how their organization had begun to limit or decline to renew particular engagement opportunities. This issue is particularly important given that all the partners who participated in the summit are actively engaged with at least one higher education institution. They represent, in some sense, the group of community leaders who have chosen to stay involved, often, as noted earlier, because of a belief in the importance of student civic education rather than for the direct benefits to their organizations.

PARITY AND PRIVILEGE

For the community partners, parity, power, and privilege are always part of a partnership, even if they are not addressed overtly. The community partners revealed that they particularly value campus partners who recognize and address these issues.

Issues of parity, power, and privilege ran consistently through summit discussions. They arose in several ways. First, the community partners have learned that effective partnerships require certain elements, such as respect for the expertise of community partners, shared resources and roles and attention to the details of implementation—all of which speak to parity. Second, the partners believe that campus partners who attend to these issues demonstrate an understanding of community processes, interests, and capacity, including a sense of its assets as well as its needs. The community partners suggested that this perspective is more likely to lead to successful community outcomes, and thus, to tip the ratio of benefits and costs toward community benefit. Finally, the community partners gauge the level of parity in relationships with a given higher education institution as an indicator that the higher education partners have educated themselves, and have the capacity to educate their students about important issues of privilege and oppression. This makes it more likely that community/campus interactions will be respectful at an individual level and insightful at issue and policy levels. According to some of the community partners, many of the risks or harm done by commu-

...the community partners gauge the level of parity...as an indicator that the higher education partners have educated themselves, and have the capacity to educate their students about important issues of privilege and oppression.

nity/campus interactions come from the inability or unwillingness to directly address issues of privilege, oppression, and power as they play out in local and broader settings.

The community partners pointed out that unspoken issues of privilege and oppression—particularly in the form of structural or institutional racism—have undermined the ability of partners to engage with community residents and address root causes of community problems, and contributed to overlooking opportunities to build on leadership that already exists among community residents. The community partners would particularly like to avoid reinforcing analyses of community conditions that tend to associate problems with the behaviors of residents alone, instead of examining structural factors (such as persistent resource disinvestments or policies that promote the inequitable distribution of resources) and ways that power relationships operate locally. Since higher educational institutions, like community-based organizations themselves, are part of these power relationships, the community/campus partnership functions best when partners acknowledge these issues and can address them at a high level of sophistication at various stages of partnership development (when establishing partnership goals, setting up governance policies or structures, allocating resources, and choosing who will decide whether the effort is successful).

The partners also pointed out that people work from their assumptions about these things, whether they articulate them or not. The more that people do not raise and openly discuss issues of power, racism, classism, oppression, and privilege, the more they must make assumptions, often incorrect, based on incomplete information about why their partners make various strategic decisions. Unwillingness to put these issues on the table may suggest a lack of expertise about how to deal with them. Failure to address these issues either as individual or structural issues tends to exacerbate their importance in the partnership. The challenges that the partners observe in this regard are well-documented in community building literature. (See, for example, DelGado, 2002; Guinier and Torres, 2002; Maguire and Leiderman, 2001; Batten and Leiderman, 1995).

The community partners were quick to point out that they hold themselves accountable, along with their campus partners, for putting these kinds of issues on the table. They recognize their own reluctance to pursue these conversations and do not view themselves as either powerless or lacking responsibility for creating parity in their relationships with higher education institutions.

Indicators of Parity

Community partners are keenly aware of parity in the everyday workings of community/campus partnerships. Partners note the following indicators of parity:

- **Early consideration of sustainability, as evidence that partners are interested in creating meaningful community outcomes.** The community partners expressed their desire to be assured that the investment they are making to develop the partnership will not be for a short-lived project that will end when the semester or school year is over. The partners noted that to create meaningful community outcomes, community engagement work requires a sustained effort that develops and deepens over time.
- **Processes and staffing that distribute authority and funds across community and campus partners.** Through such efforts, campus partners demonstrate respect for the competency of community partners and help build organizational and community assets. For example, as part of this grant program, three campuses used grant funds to hire a coordinator for an engagement initiative. In one instance, the funds went to a community-based organization to hire a community leader to coordinate the partnership among the community partners. In the other, funds helped support a work-study position held by a community leader, enabling the individual to run a campus coordinating office while pursuing a master's degree. Another higher education institution hired a community agency staff member to be an adjunct professor.
- **Issue or advocacy alliances, including the willingness of a campus to "step-up" in settings other than the partnership (such as at city council or**

before a leadership group) in support of a community driven agenda. The community partners were especially appreciative of campus trustees and senior leadership who promote a community cause (for example, improved transportation, changes to zoning conditions, loan funds for small businesses, or anti-racism efforts) in settings where access is sometimes denied to community residents.

- **Welcoming community partners onto campus in roles normally reserved for faculty.** The community partners noticed and appreciated institutions of higher education that walk the talk when it comes to parity. Institutions of higher education need to go beyond simply saying community partners are "equal members;" they must demonstrate it through their actions. One way to show parity is to honor community partners' experiences and expertise by inviting them to co-teach a course, train faculty members, or help design curricula.

The community partners went on to cite examples and experiences of feeling used or devalued in their partnerships with campuses. They provide the following examples:

- The many instances when higher education institutions receive funding or opportunities for scholarship based on their location in economically distressed or oppressed communities, without sharing those resources or using them to directly benefit the people behind these data. The community partners noted that the community as a whole usually does not find out about these opportunities in any routine or easily accessible fashion. This makes it particularly difficult for community organizations or individuals to hold the institution accountable for the outcomes of community focused activities. This condition applies to some community/campus partnership grants and many other grants, research, scholarship, and other activities.
- When students are consistently assigned to "tour" a neighborhood, or are otherwise offered a community as a laboratory for their own growth, without significant preparation and an understanding of context. Frequent assignments of this type are perceived as disrespectful and demeaning to community residents.

The community partners were especially appreciative of campus trustees and senior leadership who promote a community cause...in settings where access is sometimes denied to community residents.

Some of the community partners at the summit felt that such assignments not only reflect poorly on an institution's understanding of community processes, but such assignments can be perceived as disrespectful or demeaning because they reveal that the people making the assignments are not aware of their own privilege.

- When faculty members structure community engagement activities without first assessing a community's interests and needs, send large numbers of students on short-notice, or otherwise fail to plan with community representatives or partners;
- When partners fail to hold themselves and students accountable for completing meaningful work, so that accountability becomes the full responsibility of a community partner, or does not occur at all; and
- When a higher education institution takes a position directly counter to a community's stated interests, without informing or engaging community partners about the position. For example, a higher education institution deeply involved in community/campus engagement was reported to have blocked further creation of a community college that residents and community partners were successfully developing up to that point.

These kinds of activities are perceived to send the following messages:

- ◆ Campus partners have not taken the time to understand how community organizations or processes work and are distanced from community residents;
- ◆ When push comes to shove, campus partners are only interested in getting their own service, research, and course needs met;
- ◆ The campus does not respect their community partners or the work they do; and
- ◆ The engagement effort is for show—perhaps only to meet mandated requirements or for public relations purposes, but is not a genuine effort at engagement or community betterment.

Community partners created a list of common organizational resources and limitations that need to be kept in mind by campus personnel when partnering with community organizations:

- Capacities vary among community partners, and their resources are often stretched very thin.
- Community demographics and most pressing needs are always changing (though underlying causes stay fairly constant). It is important to stay current on how issues play out locally and to understand current community characteristics.
- Community partners may or may not be grass roots organizations. The depth of their connections with residents varies a lot.
- Community partners' standards for volunteers are tied to the volunteers' abilities to help an organization achieve its missions.
- A given community organization usually has many partners—in higher education, other community groups, and public sector departments.
- Senior staff of community agencies have expertise, often hold advanced degrees, are often very familiar with current research on the issues on which they work, and are experienced at policy and planning.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

FOR PRACTICE AND POLICY

Both the institution of higher education and the community partner are responsible for nurturing the conditions that lead to the development of a good partnership.

Two key findings emerged from the summit:

- Good partnerships are created and sustained over time, through the cumulative effects of even the most routine interactions and outcomes. In this instance, the devil really is in the details; and
- Community partners hold themselves equally accountable to institutions of higher education for nurturing the conditions that lead to the development of a good partnership.

Drawing on the summit participants' cumulative experiences with a broad range of community/campus partnerships, the following seven recommendations were offered to institutions of higher education and community partners interested in strengthening their partnerships.

1) Allot time for relationship building early on, and as an ongoing part of community engagement work. Effective, sustainable, and successful partnerships require trust and cohesion among their members, clear goals and objectives, effective communication, and parity among partners. Achieving this requires a purposeful, concerted effort, based on the joint development of a set of key principles around which the partnership revolves. Before any activities begin, time should be spent by all partners getting to know each other, building trust, clarifying expectations, creating effective communication systems, and clarifying the contributions each partner will make to the effort. Trust is often built through the creation of a participative culture whereby considerable time and resources are devoted to enlarging the skills, knowledge, and responsibilities of partnership members.

2) Learn how to talk together about racial, ethnic, and economic inequalities and their causes with candor, and incorporate those discussions into community/campus partnership-building work. It is important to address these issues and go beyond superficial understandings or assumptions about how they play out in community/campus partnerships. Lack of understanding and lack of candid discussion, can lead to inappropriate or disrespectful planning and implementation, ill-informed strategies, and can exacerbate poor town/gown relationships. On the other hand, ongoing, skillfully facilitated, frank discussion of understandings builds trust, provides learning opportunities for community and campus partners, including students, and has been a starting point for bridging traditional institutional and community divides.

3) Identify the underlying reasons for establishing or developing community/campus partnerships. While partnerships between community-based organizations and their local institutions of higher education are formed for a variety of reasons, there often remain many underlying goals and implicit intentions that are never brought to the fore. Because hidden agendas seem to breed mistrust, these underlying, implicit intentions (improving town/gown relationships, for example) need to be explicated and discussed in order for the partnership to achieve its full potential. The trust that is built among the partnership members can serve as the glue that will keep the partnership together during inevitable personnel changes, partnership goal realignments, and funding challenges.

4) Understand the organizational contexts in which all partnership members work. Community-based organizations and institutions of higher education often operate on different sets of norms when engaging in community/campus partnerships. For example, community partners may place high value on solidarity, community, equality, freedom, justice, individual dignity, respect for differences, civility, and political democracy. Colleges and universities place high value on academic integrity and legitimacy, educational value, knowledge production and dissemination, individual expertise and specialization, peer-review and critique, and academic freedom. Understanding when respective values are in synch or in conflict helps to create a foundation for establishing mutually determined goals. Successful community/campus partnerships develop an understanding of the expectations, norms, culture, and traditions of various organizations. An understanding of each other's cultures can help ensure the establishment of realistic expectations and effective strategies for all involved.

5) Ensure fairness in the exchange of resources among partnership members. Along with receiving benefits from the partnership, each member of the community/campus partnership should have something to offer to the other partnership members. Partnerships in which members give much but receive little in return are less likely to be successful. The resources that are to be shared and exchanged should be discussed and agreed upon at the goal-setting stage, in order to ensure that everyone is clear on what each partnership member will offer and receive.

6) Colleges and universities can invite community partners onto campus so they can share their expertise with faculty and students. Campuses that encourage community partners to share in the role of "expert" can enrich academic offerings and be models of parity. Community partners can be asked to teach in traditional classes as well as classes focused on community engagement activities to help address some of the barriers between campus and community partners.

7) Be meticulous about the details. It is important to keep in mind that all the systems necessary for effective community/campus partnerships—preparing faculty members and students for community engagement work, attending to issues of privilege, parity, and accountability, and setting standards for quality and success—need to be put in place before community engagement activities begin. Creative uses of the resources and opportunities that community/campus partners make available need to be explored in ways that help challenge entrenched assumptions and feelings of the partnership members. The success of the partnership should periodically be assessed from a variety of perspectives, including outcomes for each partner and to the satisfaction of each partner. Finally, all partners need to follow through on their promises, and should agree to adhere to high standards of performance.

¹ For purposes of this article, community/campus engagement refers to a formalized relationship between a college or university and one or more community-based entities or groups to meet academic and community goals. Service-learning, experiential education, internships, community-based research, and community service fall under this definition of community/campus engagement.

² See, for example Chaskin, R., Brown, P., Venkatesh, S., and Vidal, A., 2001; Maguire and Leiderman, 2000; Stephens, S., Leiderman, S.H., Wolf, W., and McCarthy, P., 1994; Stephens, S. and Leiderman, S.H., 1999) and materials available at www.aspenroundtable.org and www.aecf.org (Technical Assistance Resource Center).

³ People working in the sustainable livelihoods arena explain the impact of power differentials in creating and maintaining inequities in terms of differences in power among stakeholders. They note: "Differences in power among stakeholders shape their opportunities to participate in the decisions that affect them....strategies often target sites of inequity by: facilitating access of disempowered groups to power, authority, and resources, raising consciousness about inequity and, strengthening the ability of marginalized people to transform existing structures." (see www.sdgateway.net/livelihoods/actors.htm).

⁴ Institutionalization, as used here, refers to the process by which the value of experiential education and working with or for community goals (and the practices to broaden and make operational those values) are fully embedded within the academic fabric and everyday culture of a higher education institution.

⁵ For other categories and dimensions, see Furco, 2002. "Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education." *Journal of Public Affairs*, VI, 39-67; and Vidal, A., Nye, N., Walker, C., Manjarrez, C., Romanik, C., Corvington, P., Ferryman, K., Freiberf, S., and Kim, D., 2002. *Lessons from the Community Outreach Partnership Center Program: Final Report*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

⁶ For information on the link between community engagement and student learning, see Batchelder, T.H. and Root, S., 1994. "Effects of An Undergraduate Program to Integrate Academic Learning and Service; Cognitive, Prosocial Cognitive, and Identity Outcomes." *Journal of Adolescence*, 17, 341-356; Eyler, J.S., and Giles, D.E., 1999. *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers; Markus, G.B., Howard, J., and King, D., 1993. "Integrating Community Service and Classroom Instruction Enhances Learning: Results From an Experiment." *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(4), 410-419; Sax, L.J., 2000. "Citizenship Development and the American College Student." In Ehrlich, T. (Ed.). *Civic Responsibility in Higher Education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 3-18 (2000).

⁷ Community partners were invited to discuss their own organizational and community-based perspectives. They were not asked to represent the perspective of the overall partnership or higher education partner.

⁸ The definition of "good" was intentionally left open for discussion.

REFERENCES

Batchelder, T.H. and Root, S. "Effects of an Undergraduate Program to Integrate Academic Learning and Service; Cognitive, Prosocial Cognitive, and Identity Outcomes." *Journal of Adolescence*, 17, 341-356, 1994.

Batten, S.T. and Leiderman, S.A. *Project Change: Planning an Anti-Racism Initiative*. Bala Cynwyd, PA: CAPD, 1995.

Chaskin, R. J., Brown, P., Venkatesh, S. and Vidal, A. *Building Community Capacity*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 2001.

Cone, D. and Payne, P. "When Campus and Community Collide: Campus-Community Partnerships from a Community Perspective." *The Journal of Public Affairs*, VI, 203-218, 2002.

Delgado, Gary. *Mapping the Immigrant Infrastructure*. Oakland, CA: Applied Research Center, 2002.

Eyler, J.S. and Giles, D.E. *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1999.

Furco, A. "Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education." *The Journal of Public Affairs*, VI, 39-67, 2002.

Giles, D.E. and Cruz, N. "Where's the Community in Service-Learning?" *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, Special Issue, 2000.

Gray, M.J., Ondaaje, E.H., Fricker, R.D., and Geschwind, S.A. "Assessing Service-Learning: Results from a Survey of Learn and Serve America, Higher Education." *Change*, 32, 31-29, 2000.

Guinier, L. and Torres, G. *The Miner's Canary*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B. B. *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Harkavy, I. "School-Community-University Partnerships: Effectively Integrating Community Building and Education Reform." *University and Community Schools*, 6 (1/2), 7-24, 1999.

Holland, B. "Factors and Strategies that Influence Faculty Involvement in Public Service." *The Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4, 37-43, 1999.

Holland, B. and Gelmon, S. *The State of the Engaged Campus: What Have We Learned About Building and Sustaining University and Community Partnerships?* AAHE Bulletin, American Association for Higher Education, 3-6, 1998.

Leiderman, S.H. *Guide to Collaboration: Lessons from the Children First Initiative*. Philadelphia, PA: CAPD, 2001.

Maguire, J.D. and Leiderman, S.H. *15 Tools for Creating Healthy, Productive Interracial/Multicultural Communities*. Claremont, CA: The Institute for Democratic Renewal and The Project Change Anti-Racism Initiative, 1998.

Markus, G.B., Howard, J., and King, D. "Integrating Community Service and Classroom Instruction Enhances Learning: Results from an Experiment." *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(4), 410-419, 1993.

Maurrasse, D. *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnerships with Their Communities*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Robinson, G. "Service-Learning at Community Colleges." *Horizons*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges, 2-4, 2002.

Sax, L.J., "Citizenship Development and the American College Student." In Ehrlich, T. (Ed.). *Civic Responsibility in Higher Education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 3-18, 2000.

Stephens, S.A., Leiderman, S.A., Wolf, and McCarthy, P.T. *Building Capacity for System Reform*. Bala Cynwyd, PA: CAPD, 1994.

Stephens, S.A. and Leiderman, S.H. *New Models of Community-Foundation Partnerships: Lessons Learned from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation Pre-Birth Through Age-Three Initiative*. Bala Cynwyd, PA: CAPD, 1999.


Stoecker, R. "Practices and Challenges of Community-Based Research." *The Journal of Public Affairs*, VI, 219-239, 2002.

Vidal, A, Nye, N., Walker, C., Manjarrez, C, Romanik, C, Corvington, P., Ferryman, K, Freiberg, S, and Kim, D. *Lessons from the Community Outreach Partnership Center Program: Fina Report*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003.

Walshok, M. *Knowledge With Boundaries: What America's Research Universities Can Do For the Economy, The Workplace, and the Community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Ward, K. "Addressing Academic Culture: Service-Learning, Organizations, and Faculty Work." In Rhoads, R.A. and Howard, J. (Eds.), *Academic Service-Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Zlotkowski, E. "Pedagogy and Engagement." In Bringle, R. and Duffy, D. (Eds.), *Colleges and Universities as Citizens*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 96-120, 1999.



APPENDIX A

ENGAGING COMMUNITIES AND

CAMPUSES: PARTICIPANTS

- Augsburg College (MN) and Project for Pride in Living, Cedar Cultural Center, Our Saviour's Center, Cedar Riverside School, Brian Coyle Community Center, Habitat for Humanity, Friends of the Mississippi River, Youth Farm and Market Project, In the Heart of the Beast, Longfellow/Seward Healthy Seniors Project, and San Miguel School
- Bates College (ME) and LA Excels
- Calvin College (MI) and Grand Rapids Area Center for Ecumenism and Garfield Development Corporation
- Chatham College (PA) and Communities in Schools, Conservation Consultants, Inc., the East End Neighborhood Forum, and Global Connections Pittsburgh
- Emory & Henry College (VA) and Washington County Schools, People Incorporated of Southwest Virginia, Washington County Office on Youth, Highlands Community Services, and Damascus Town Council.
- Loyola University New Orleans (LA) and Catholic Charities, Volunteers for America, Junior Achievement, Association for Retarded Citizens of Greater New Orleans (ARC), Help One Student to Succeed (HOST), and Benjamin Banneker Elementary School
- Madonna University (MI) and All Saints Neighborhood Center
- Mars Hill College (NC) and the North Carolina Juvenile Evaluation Center, Hospitality House of Asheville, and the Richard L. Hoffman Foundation, Inc.
- Otterbein College (OH) and the Westerville Area Chamber of Commerce, Communities In School, First Link, Columbus Foundation, Columbus City Schools, Westerville Schools, and the City of Columbus
- Saint Joseph's College (ME) and Crooked River Elementary School, Windham Family Resource Center, and the City of Standish
- St. Thomas University (FL) and Florida Memorial College and the Campus and Community Alliance for North Dade
- Tougaloo College (MS) and United Way of the Capital Area, Inc., Tougaloo Community Civic League, Jackson Public Schools, Tougaloo Community Center, the Hinds County Mental Health Commission, and the International Association of Machinists Center for Administering Rehabilitation and Employment Services (IAM CARES)
- Wartburg College (IA) and Bartels Lutheran Retirement Community, Waverly-Shell Rock School District, and Bremwood Lutheran Children's Home

APPENDIX B

COMMUNITY SUMMIT

PARTICIPANTS

SEPTEMBER 27-28, 2002

WASHINGTON, DC

Martha Are, Hospitality House of Asheville, Asheville, NC. Higher education partner: Mars Hill College

Ernie Braganza, Washington County Office on Youth, Abingdon, VA. Higher education partner: Emory & Henry College

Doris Bridgeman, United Way of the Capital Area, Inc., Jackson, MS. Higher education partner: Tougaloo College

Linda Brooks, Town of Standish, Standish, ME. Higher education partner: Saint Joseph's College of Maine

Stephanie Byrdziak, Cedar Riverside School, Minneapolis, MN. Higher education partner: Augsburg College

James Clausell, North Dade Community Council, Carol City, FL. Higher education partner: Saint Thomas University

Terry Cuson, North Dade Regional Chamber of Commerce, Miami, FL. Higher education partner: Saint Thomas University

Sue DeVries, Garfield Development Corporation, Grand Rapids, MI. Higher education partner: Calvin College

Shirley Gibson, North Dade Community Council, Miami, FL. Higher education partner: Saint Thomas University

Jay McHale, Cedar Cultural Center, Minneapolis, MN. Higher education partner: Augsburg College

Linda Midgett, People Incorporated of Southwest Virginia, Abingdon, VA. Higher education partner: Emory & Henry College

Sara Neikirk, Communities in Schools, Columbus, OH. Higher education partner: Otterbein College

Dennis Nordmoe, All Saints Neighborhood Center, Detroit, MI. Higher education partner: Madonna University

Jean Olivis, Communities in Schools, Pittsburgh, PA. Higher education partner: Chatham College

Ellen Ridley-Hooper, Food & Fellowships Inc., Scarborough, ME. Higher education partner: Saint Joseph's College of Maine

Carol Peterson, Longfellow/Seward Healthy Seniors Project, Minneapolis, MN. Higher education partner: Augsburg College

Shakura Sabur, East End Neighborhood Forum, Pittsburgh, PA. Higher education partner: Chatham College

Stan Slessor, Waverly-Shell Rock School District, Waverly, IA. Higher education partner: Wartburg College

Deyni Ventura, Garfield Development Corporation, Grand Rapids, MI. Higher education partner: Calvin College

Auspos, P., Brown P., Chaskin, R., Fulbright-Anderson, K., Hamilton, R. and Kublish, A.C. *Voices From the Field II: Reflections on Comprehensive Community Change*. The Aspen Institute, 2002.

Benson, L., Harkavy, I, and Puckett, J. "An Implementation Revolution as a Strategy for Fulfilling the Democratic Promise of University-Community Partnerships: Penn-West Philadelphia as an Experiment in Progress." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 24-45, 2000.

Campus Compact. Membership web page, 2003. <http://www.compact.org/membership/>

Chaskin, R., (Ed.). *Building Community Capacity*. Aldine de Guyter, 2001.

Chavez, V., Duran, B., Baker, Q.E., Avila, M.M., and Wallerstein, N. "The Dance of Race and Privilege in Community Based Participatory Research." In Minkler, M. and Wallerstein, N. (Eds.). *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*. Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Ciofalo, A. *Perspectives on Experiential Learning: A Guide to Internship Management for Educators and Professionals*. Krieger Publishing Company, 1992.

Connors, K. and Seifer, S. *Partnership Perspectives*. San Francisco: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Summer 2000.

Dombro, A. L., O'Donnell, N. S., Galinsky, E., Melcher, S.G., and Farber, A. *Community Mobilization: Strategies to Support Young Children and Their Families*. New York: Families and Work Institute, 1996.

Duenes, L., Ciurea, M., Edelsberg, E. and Parkes, R. *Building Partnerships for Neighborhood Change*. Washington, DC: Fannie Mae Foundation, 2001.

Harkavy, I. and Wiewel, W. "University-Community Partnerships: Current State and Future Issues." *Metropolitan Universities*, (6)3, 7-14, Winter, 1995.

Lerner, R.M. and Simon, L.A.K. (Eds.) *University-Community Collaboratives for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998.

Mayfield, L. "Town and Gown in America: Some Historical and Institutional Issues of the Engaged University." *Education for Health*, 14(2), 231-240, 2001.

Potapchuk, M. *Holding Up the Mirror: Working Interdependently for Just and Inclusive Communities*. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 2002.

Schmidt, A. and Robby, M.A. "What's the Value of Service-Learning to the Community?" *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Fall, 2002.

Snyder, E. "Making the Connection: College and Community." *Campus Community Collaborations: Examples and Resources for Community Colleges*. September, 1996.

Sullivan, M., Chao, S., Allen, C., Koné, A., Pierre-Louis, M., and Krieger, J. "Community-Researcher Partnerships: Perspectives from the Field". In Minkler, M. and Wallerstein, N. (Eds.). *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*. Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Working with Members: Building Capacity for Local Decision Making. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of of Social Policy, 1998.

Young, W.B. "University-Community Partnerships—Why Bother?" *Metropolitan Universities*, (6)3, 71-78, Winter, 1995.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES (CIC)/CONSORTIUM FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION (CAPHE)

The Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) is an association of more than 500 independent colleges and universities that work together to strengthen college and university leadership, sustain high-quality education, and enhance private higher education's contributions to society. To fulfill this mission, CIC provides its members with skills, tools, and knowledge that address aspects of leadership, financial management and performance, academic quality, and institutional visibility. The Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education (CAPHE) is a grantmaking unit of CIC that assists corporations and foundations in stimulating reform in private colleges and universities for the benefit of higher education and society. Over the years, CAPHE has administered more than \$17 million in grants to approximately 200 independent colleges and universities nationwide for more than 30 corporations and foundations. CAPHE grants have focused on issues of costs and pricing, teaching and learning, diversity, technology, teacher preparation, and institutional planning, among other topics. Leadership for the Engaging Communities and Campuses grant program was provided by Michelle D. Gilliard, executive director, CAPHE; Jacqueline Skinner, associate director, CAPHE; and Stephen Gibson, projects coordinator, CIC.

SALLY LEIDERMAN

Sally Leiderman is president of the Center for Assessment and Policy Development (CAPD), an evaluation and social policy organization, based near Philadelphia. The organization works nationally to support foundations,

communities, and institutions working to improve outcomes for children, families, and neighborhoods, in the areas of education, family and child well-being, adolescent pregnancy and prevention, anti-racism work, leadership, and civic engagement. Ms. Leiderman provides policy and evaluation support to several foundations and communities involved in comprehensive community building efforts and leadership development. CAPD's recent publications include *A Community Builder's Toolkit: 15 Tools for Creating Healthy, Productive Interracial/ Multicultural Communities*, with the Institute for Democratic Renewal and Project Change Anti-Racism Program; and *Training for Racial Equity and Inclusion: A Guide to Selected Programs*, with the Alliance for Conflict Transformation, the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives, and Project Change. CAPD is also currently developing a toolbag that communities can use to assess their own progress toward anti-racism and inclusion goals, in partnership with NABRE, a program of the Joint Center on Political and Economic Studies. For more information, please see www.capd.org.

ANDREW FURCO

Andrew Furco is director of the Service-Learning Research & Development Center at the University of California-Berkeley, where he serves on the Graduate School of Education faculty. His publications include the books, *Service-Learning: The Essence of the Pedagogy* and *Service-Learning through a Multidisciplinary Lens*, which he co-edited with Shelley Billig. His articles have appeared in the *Journal of Adolescence*, *Journal of Public Affairs*, *The Journal of Cooperative Education*, and *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*. He has presented papers on service-learning, civic engagement, educational reform, and experiential learning at more than 100 conferences

and institutes in the United States and abroad. He currently serves as a member of the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement, the American Association for Higher Education Service-Learning Consulting Corps, and the National Service-Learning Partnership Board of Directors.


JENNIFER ZAPF

Jennifer Zapf is an evaluator with more than ten years of experience conducting evaluations, research, and strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations. Dr. Zapf received a Masters of Arts from Stanford University in Higher Education Administration, Research, and Policy and a Ph.D. in Educational Evaluation from the University of Virginia. As both a practitioner and applied researcher, she has worked with foundations, public institutions, collaboratives, and community stakeholders on improving the life chances of children and families at risk for poor educational, health, and life outcomes. At the Center for Assessment and Policy Development, Dr. Zapf

has worked on assessments of national, state, and community-based initiatives. Her recent work includes two national projects that fund higher education institutional collaboratives to promote civic understanding and participation. She also serves as a national evaluation coach and trainer for AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve America, and National Senior Service Corps programs throughout the United States.

MEGAN GOSS

Megan Goss is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at UC Berkeley and a graduate student researcher in Berkeley's Service-Learning Research and Development Center. Her research interests include issues of literacy as a cultural activity, educational reform, and alternative education options within the public school setting. Ms. Goss has taught in grades K-5 and has a reading specialist's credential from Berkeley.





THE COUNCIL OF
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES

One Dupont Circle ■ Suite 320
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 466-7230 ■ Fax: (202) 466-7238
E-mail: cic@cic.nche.edu ■ www.cic.edu