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Community engagement initiatives have experienced an increase in attention, appreciation, and participation among those in academic, nonprofit, and other community-based organizations over the past two decades. The purpose of this study is to explore the meanings of community-campus partnerships among stakeholders in the community and in academia towards the goal of generating a theory grounded in these data that will concomitantly contribute to the social work profession and the community engagement movement. Using as its foundation the shared interest among the social work profession and the community engagement movement on values and ethics, this study utilizes a traditional grounded theory methodology as a means to systematically examine the question “What does it mean to be involved in a community-campus partnership?”

The theory that emerged from the data in this study is about what it takes to sustain partnerships between community and campus organizations. The final five
themes found in this theory are: A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built; navigating the process of a partnership project; goodness-of-fit for all involved; resources; and impact. Overall, the theory of partnership sustainability draws the attention of partnership practitioners and stakeholders to the importance of relationships as being the core for any partnership activity. When contemplating how a particular resource, impact, process-related challenge and issue of partner match was addressed within their partnership, the participants continually came back to the idea that partnership sustainability can be traced back to the relationship between partners. Implications for further research involve a deeper study of the nature of relationships within community-campus partnerships; the organizational culture dynamics that are unique to academia; the nature, value, and perceived importance of research done in the community; and the intersectionality of student engagement and community engagement, particularly in an age of assessment and benchmarking.
Chapter One: Rationale for the Study

Community engagement initiatives have experienced an increase in attention, appreciation, and participation among those in academic, nonprofit, and other community-based organizations over the past two decades. This amplified interest is joined by a concomitant increase in funding opportunities from government agencies for the formation of community-campus partnerships. This intensified attention to community engagement built through the late 1980s and 1990s, and at the end of the first decade of the new millennium suggests that the community engagement movement is quickly achieving mainstay status at colleges and universities across the country. Community engagement may for some signify the latest trend in higher education; however, this is a phenomenon that is just as old as the practice of higher education in the United States. Community engagement as we know it today is much more than a trend. Instead, it is comparable to a living organism that has, over time, adapted to its ever-changing surroundings and in turn retains, transforms and releases components in direct response to the current environment.

The environment in which community engagement occurs provides a unique context marked by social, economic, and political factors. In review of the interactions between institutions of higher education (IHEs) and the community over the past three centuries, the context of community engagement has changed immensely. While there is great variation over time and place that influence the definition of a community engagement activity, at the heart of community engagement is the partnership formed by the IHE and the community. This study focuses on a subject crucial to all areas of practice, instruction, and scholarship that are considered types of community
engagement activities: the dynamics that compromise the community-campus partnership process. Partnership processes are often overlooked altogether or severely overshadowed by the intense push for outcomes, which is possibly a repercussion of the push for evidence-based practice or perhaps a consequence of shortsightedness when the sole focus appears to be on short term outcomes of the partnership. Focusing on the process of partnering provides an opportunity to humanize the community engagement experience on a deeper level, and has the potential to positively impact the products of the partnership activities.

The focus of this study is on the nuances associated with the process of partnerships between community-based organizations (the ‘community’) and IHEs (the ‘campus’). Chapter one provides a grounding and rationale for the study, which includes the operationalization of the study’s key concepts, the rationale for conducting research on the partnership process phenomenon, the justification for the utilization of a grounded theory methodology, and an examination of the relevance of this study to the social work profession’s core values and ethics. Chapter two begins with a review of the history of higher education community engagement and a discussion on the historical relationship between the social work profession and community engagement. Next, the literature on community engagement initiatives is reviewed from both the philosophical and empirical perspectives. Grounded in the partnership process focus rationale provided in the first chapter, the literature review will conclude with an in-depth discussion of organizational culture as a phenomenon, a process, and a theoretical framework. In addition to delineating the research design, data collection, and data analysis plan for this study, Chapter three includes discussions on the philosophical
underpinnings of this study, an introduction to qualitative research, and a review of
grounded theory methodology. Chapter four presents the findings of this research
study, and Chapter five provides an assessment of the implications of these findings for
community organizations, the social work profession, social workers in academe, and
the higher education community.

Defining Community Engagement and Community-Campus Partnerships

What is community engagement?

Often used as interchangeable terms, the concepts of civic engagement,
community engagement, and community-campus partnerships are conceptualized as
unique and separate phenomena. IHEs may choose to label their work with the
community as civic engagement given that this term invokes a sense of active
participation towards goals associated with a call to action or advocacy role that the IHE
stakeholders play within the community. Embracing the term civic engagement in lieu
of a more generic terminology (community engagement) is a philosophical choice that
carries with it assumptions for how the IHE views the community and the IHE’s role in
partnership with the community. IHEs that embrace the term civic engagement often
embrace the role of advocate, facilitator of democratic participation, and/or social justice
activist. There is a strong match in the philosophical underpinnings related to advocacy
and social justice between the social work profession and the civic engagement
movement, and this link will be explored later in this chapter as well as within the
literature review. Despite this linkage, it is important to recognize that one cannot
assume that most or all IHEs promote this specific philosophy for engagement. Instead,
the perspective taken in this study is that civic engagement is a specialized type of community engagement with a distinct set of values and ethics. In order to be inclusive of a broad scope of partnerships that represent a variety of lived experiences anywhere on the 'community engagement continuum', this study will utilize the term community engagement to refer to the diverse array of activities, pathways, and relationships that occur when communities and IHEs collaborate. Despite the strong arguments made later in this study regarding the linkages between social work values, civic engagement, and social justice, it is important for this study to recognize the role that subjectivity and meaning-making plays when considering dynamics of organizational culture that are experienced differently by stakeholders.

A community-campus partnership can be both a specific form of community engagement or something that one can be in (i.e., ‘Our department is currently in a partnership with a local nonprofit’) and a process of an overall community engagement initiative and something that one does as a precursor to other community-based initiatives (i.e., ‘Our agency is partnering with area colleges and universities to recruit volunteers’). For the purposes of this study, a community-campus partnership is defined as an informal or formal relationship between one or more community-based organization(s) (nonprofit, for-profit, governmental) and one or more higher education organizations that is formed around the goal of a community engagement program, activity, initiative, or pedagogical exercise.

Why participate in community engagement initiatives?

As explored by Fisher, Fabricant, and Simmons (2004), the community engagement trend experienced growth in awareness during the 1980s and 1990s when
leaders in higher education such as Derek Bok and Ernest Boyer explicated the philosophical and theoretical rationales for the short and longer term benefits of an engaged university. Aside from the clear link between the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Community University Partnership Center (COPC) (discussion of which is found in Chapter Two) and the trend for an increase in funding availability for community engagement activities, there are three additional factors related to the IHEs’ individual missions that have contributed to the increased visibility of community engagement in the past few decades: Physical and symbolic dynamics of location, reassessment of teaching and learning goals, and knowledge generation for ‘real world’ application (Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004).

Physical and symbolic dynamics of location.

From small college towns to large metropolitan areas that serve as home to multiple colleges and universities, there is great diversity among IHEs in relation to the geographic size, population dispersion, and both the physical and symbolic borders between the campus and the surrounding community. Looking back a half-century or more it might have been a simple task to identify an IHE operating within a ‘bubble’, an environment within which the students, faculty, and staff were contained and sustained within the campus itself. Technological advancements in transportation and communication have impacted IHEs and surrounding communities in such a way that decreases the physical distance between campus and community. Rural campuses found themselves surrounded by suburbs and small towns. Urban campuses, already situated in cities, found themselves to be in the burgeoning centers of commerce of
growing metropolitan areas. In light of the phenomena of ‘white flight’ and ‘suburban sprawl’, urban IHEs have also found themselves located in the recesses of metropolitan areas marked by deteriorating buildings and dwindling tax revenues (Fisher, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004). Regardless of the specific situation for a given IHE, one can deduce that few contemporary IHEs operate in an environment that is void of interaction with a local community.

For some IHEs, the ‘bubble’ of isolation from years gone by has been replaced with strategic placement of barriers to separate the campus from the outside environment. Especially seen in urban areas with declining economic viability and increasingly visible poverty, the solution for many IHEs has been to “[p]ut up walls. Expand police forces.” (Fisher, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004, p. 15). Surely campuses argue that some walls exist to serve a practical purpose related to public safety and that a police presence is aimed at attending to legitimate emergency preparedness and response functions, and it would be rash to ignore or write off these functions. Instead, it is useful to interrogate the symbolic meanings as well as the day-to-day impressions that are made in relation to keeping the community and its problems ‘out’, and keeping the members of the campus ‘in’.

It is not farfetched to imagine that tensions between the community and the campus will arise as manifestations of the tactile and symbolic barriers between them. Communities are accused of negatively affecting IHEs by allowing the social, economic, and ecological problems such as crime, homelessness, poverty, and pollution to bleed onto the campus community. IHEs are accused of not being good neighbors who put up walls to keep the community out instead of being a part of the community and
sharing responsibility in problem-solving. Commonly referred to as town-gown tension, the inevitable battle of 'us vs. them' emerges. The visibility of the tensions that result from the physical and symbolic dynamics of location has provided an increased awareness both on campus and in the community that something must be done to begin healing the figurative wounds and re-building the relationship foundation upon which future interactions and partnerships can be built.

**Reassessment of teaching and learning goals.**

Across the country there are exemplar IHEs that have remained steadfast to institutional missions regarding commitment to the ideals of civic participation, community engagement, and outreach services (examples of those IHEs commonly referred to in this way include Berea College, Springfield College, and Mercer University). Such institutions have served as the exception to the rule as social, political, and economic forces transformed the actions of many IHEs away from imbedded missions and values (see Chapter Two for historical perspectives on community engagement at IHEs). While the degree of departure from missions of engagement is varied among these IHEs, it is notable that over the past two decades there has been a rejuvenated dedication to these same missions. Most commonly seen through the promotion of initiatives and activities through campus print and electronic publications, a trend exists among IHEs to promote the ways in which their curricular and extracurricular offerings serve as a link between academic actions and the mission of active civic participation and action-oriented recognition of social justice among students (Foreman Kready, 2008).
Over three decades ago and about one decade prior to Ernest Boyer’s seminal piece that termed the now-common phrase *scholarship of engagement*, the President of Harvard University, Derek Bok, challenged IHEs to become more engaged with their communities and “play a role in societal moral development” towards the goal of actively participating in problem-solving within the society (Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004, p. 14). In the decades that have followed Bok and Boyer’s shared message that ‘called to task’ IHEs, the culture and climate in academia has shifted gradually yet significantly. Perceptions on the *scholarship of engagement* as something done by only rogue scholars who hold extremist and liberal agendas that do not adhere to traditional academic values has shifted to the point that engagement, as a form of scholarship, has become a mainstream reality among faculty in an increasing number of academic disciplines. Legitimacy has increased to the point that commitment to scholarship activities under the umbrella term of community-based research have been institutionalized through tenure and promotion policies at many IHEs (see Barker, 2006; Boyer, 1990, 1996; Schomberg, 2006; Trowler, 1998).

Clearly the trend toward increased community engagement among IHEs endorsed by educational leaders and visionaries such as Bok and Boyer has not been comprised solely of research efforts. In addition to the increased inclusion of engagement-centered research activities as meritorious in the eyes of promotion and tenure, the *scholarship of engagement* trend is inclusive of progressive teaching and learning styles that follow a model of experiential and transformative learning. Timmermans and Bouman (2004) delineate that there are seven styles of teaching and learning from an engaged scholarship standpoint: “one-time service, work study,
residence hall partnership, service learning courses, and academically-based service-learning" are included in the *partnership driven* classification used by the authors, while “practicum/internships and independent studies” are classified as *curriculum-linked* engagement efforts (pp. 94-95). In the context of identifying what trends most-affected the increased visibility of community engagement efforts within the teaching and learning arena, it is service-learning that arguably has influenced the greatest impact and garnered the most recognition and in conjunction with volunteerism appears to be the most publicly visible initiative at IHEs (Foreman Kready, 2008).

While a complete account of the history of service-learning is outside the scope of the present discussion, it is important to recognize and explicate the power that the service-learning pedagogical approach (both in theory and practice) has had on the overall community engagement movement in the United States (Chapter two will discuss the placement of service-learning within the community engagement movement in the United States). Service-learning is often credited as being the most recognizable forms of community engagement, and there is widespread recognition of positive outcomes (empirical and anecdotal) related to student participation in service-learning (for recent examples of such studies see Brown & Wise, 2007; Conrady, 2009; Dooley, 2007; Doolittle, 2007; Flinn, Kloos, Teaford, Clark, & Szucs, 2009; Foreman Kready, 2008; Hirschinger-Blank, Simons, & Kenyon, 2009; Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue, & Weimholt, 2007; Natvig, 2007; Olney, 1995; Taylor & Pancer, 2007; Tomkovick, Lester, Flunker, & Wells, 2008; Witmer, Silverman, & Gaschen, 2009). In addition to assertions that service-learning is associated with positive student outcomes of the standardized and subjective nature (i.e., test scores and self-report data on civic
participation), members of the academy contend that the inclusion of service learning in the curriculum is also an imperative community engagement activity because it facilitates the corralling of students' knowledge in such a way that moves beyond consumption of information and into a realm of civic minded thought that requires the application of theoretical wisdom to palpable situations in the ‘real world’. And in the same way that praise for the way that community-based research activities provide a way to link academic research efforts to the places where the knowledge can be applied has increased visibility of community engagement, the successes of community-based approaches to teaching and learning have increased awareness of the potential for facilitating exposure to the ways that topics covered in an academic course are demonstrated within the bigger picture of society as a whole.

Knowledge generation for ‘real world’ application.

The experiences of many IHEs leads to a generalized observation that by engaging in community-campus partnerships IHEs find a means by which to gain access to funding opportunities through community-based research initiatives while simultaneously answering the call to reconnect with missions that charge organizations to instill a sense of active participation within the community. Members of the academic community who are at the forefront of the movement for increased respect for and attention to action research, community-based participatory research (CBPR), and community-based research (CBR) as well as those involved with service-learning and experiential education have recognized the crucial nature of a shift away from ‘knowledge for the sake of knowledge’ to ‘knowledge for the sake of a contributing to society’.
This is not at all a new idea or a contemporary critique of higher education. Instead, the push for knowledge generation for the purpose of ‘real world’ application can be traced to a time well before the popularity of ideals were set forth in the 1980s and 1990s by scholars such as Bok and Boyer. Jane Addams’ work at Hull House in the early 1900s established her as a co-founding, yet often overlooked, contributor to the development of the philosophy, pedagogy, and practice of service-learning. Addams’ frustration regarding the purposes of knowledge generation at IHEs is clear in her writing (Daynes and Longo, 2004, p. 7):

As the college changed from teaching theology to teaching secular knowledge the test of its success should have shifted from the power to save men’s [sic] souls to the power to adjust them in healthful relations to nature and their fellow men. But the college failed to do this, and made the test of its success the mere collecting and disseminating of knowledge, elevating the means to an end and falling in love with its own achievement.

Over a century later, this very debate over the ‘real world’ applicability of knowledge generated in IHEs continues and criticisms do not stop at research, but extend to teaching and learning efforts (see in particular AASCU, 2002; Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009; and Chapter Two). Given the century-old dialogue around applicability of activities in higher education to the social issues of everyday life, it is clear that the visibility of the community engagement movement has been amplified by proponents of democratic community engagement. Whereas the previous issue of the need to reassess teaching and learning goals is mainly an issue for those in the higher education community, the element of community engagement related to the ‘real world’ application of knowledge is similar to that of the previously discussed issue of barriers insofar as it addresses a topic of interest to stakeholders within the academy and the community.
In recent decades, the need to look for opportunities to increase organizational capacity has become a desperate one especially for nonprofit organizations. Community-based nonprofit organizations have increasingly struggled with dwindling resources that are financial, material, and volunteer in nature; given that a significant number of community-based organizations are indeed nonprofits, this will be discussed more fully in Chapter two. In consideration of this critical need developing in the same context of IHEs setting forth to re-envision institutional missions that are often related to facilitating student development as civically minded and socially responsible citizens, it becomes apparent why these two types of organizations are seen as being a perfect match for one another. The university comes to the table with access to research capacity and resources that are human, financial, and mechanical in nature. The community-based organization brings access to a specialized service sector and element of community authenticity that is imperative for linking academia to the ‘real world’.

Community-based organizations have found that by partnering with institutions of higher education they are able to tap into resources that are both in-kind (labor, donated goods) and financial in nature towards the goals of increasing the feasibility and quality of services to the community. Given the diversity of strengths being brought to the table in a given partnership, it is not difficult to imagine that the organizations represented in the partnership might also differ in the sense of the organizations’ cultures. Conceptually, the partnering of IHEs with community-based organizations is a ‘perfect match’. In practice, however, there is the reality that no relationship can persist without difficulties and growing pains.
The Rationale for a Focus on Partnership Process

Based on the preceding sections of this chapter, the groundwork is provided to explain what community engagement is, why higher education and community-based organizations would enter into a community-campus partnership, and how key issues embedded within a larger social, economic, and political context have contributed to the increased visibility of and interest in this phenomenon. In determining whether a partnership activity has been successful, it is important to look beyond the typical outcome measures that assess learning outcomes, increase in client satisfaction, development of critical thinking skills or interest in future volunteerism. These are all important dynamics, and it is critical to recognize that these outcome measures are imperative lines of inquiry for continued study in the field. But from where do these data originate? Where were learning outcomes explicated and where were the indicators of these outcomes experienced? What determined how we would know if client satisfaction increased? When did ‘ah-ha’ moments occur to stimulate critical thinking skills and pique interest in future volunteerism? The answers to all of these questions are embedded within the process.

If process is such an important part of the overall community-campus partnership experience, then one might assume that the partnership process is an area of intense study among scholars. There are an abundance of empirical studies (in particular case studies) in the interdisciplinary literature on community-campus partnerships that disseminate data on the outcome measures as a result of these partnerships, and within these studies there is useful knowledge or at least anecdotes to be gleaned related to the partnership process. However, few studies seek to study process as a unique
phenomenon in such a way that uses the organization as a unit of analysis and presents the organizational behavior of partnerships in such a way that involves systematic scrutiny (see Gilchrist, 2006; White-Cooper, Dawkins, Kamin, & Anderson, 2009; Denard Goldman & Schmalz, 2008; Greenwood & Whyte, 1993; Nadel, Majewski, & Sullivan-Cosetti, 2007).

In conference presentations and scholarly journals, the partnership process might be discussed as an ephemeral encounter that happened serendipitously and, in retrospect, could have been ‘done’ better; as a side note of an outcome-focused report; or as a cautionary tale associated with how outcomes suffered because not everyone was on board. In each of these scenarios the process is viewed as a barrier, impediment, or ‘lesson learned’. Alternatively, the partnerships that yield effective outcomes might not attend to the issue of process at all since (on the surface at least) the partnership activities yielded positive outcomes. The partnerships that are not written up or presented, or those that are summarized and disseminated by only one of the partner organizations, might tell a different story. It is likely that this story will center on the process of partnering.

Instead of looking at process as a byproduct, it is important for the future of scholarship in the overarching area of community engagement to develop a line of inquiry that focuses on the processes through which partnerships develop, sustain, and terminate. Those familiar with the community engagement research trajectory will recognize that the state of the current literature is replete with studies that explore and describe a partnership activity or series of initiatives. Interest in dissemination of research on community engagement is intense, and practice knowledge is evident,
albeit implicit, within studies of initiative outcomes. Despite the second string status that is often bestowed upon the partnership process, the literature is rich with information on what works and what does not, but scholars usually have to dig deep within non-peer reviewed venues to locate it or interrogate the sporadic mention of process (again, this is often one-sided) within articles and presentations that report on outcome measures. In order to move research forward in a way that enriches and contributes to the community engagement knowledge base, the time has come to recognize that process is a topic that must start to take top billing, and that theory is the missing link between practice knowledge and research on community-campus partnerships. These missing elements beseech scholars to look at what is at the common thread between process as a concept and theory as an approach for organizing thoughts, experiences, relationship of concepts, and future research – the phenomenon of organizational culture, and the ways that organizational culture is experienced by community-campus partnership stakeholders.

The Rationale for a Grounded Theory Methodology

In order to link practice, theory, and research in a meaningful way that is argued as being an ethical conduct of research, it is important to consider the uniqueness of this specific type of partnership. In the development of this study, the goal was to identify a platform on which to investigate the partner organizations’ cultural interactions, changes, and patterns of domination and/or acquiescence. Given that there is a sense of ambiguity on the relationship between community-campus partnerships and theory, an initial thought was to broaden the theoretical and
conceptual scope. In doing so it became clear that the literature on collaborations, coalitions, mergers, and a variety of multi-sector partnerships might be helpful towards the goal of informing the study of community-campus partnerships. Although many of these studies demonstrate a sound theory-research-practice linkage and the unit of analysis is appropriate, the lack of attention to dynamics pertinent unique to community engagement partnerships between the community and IHEs is a barricade that obstructs the framing of a study from an existing theoretical framework.

Thus, reflection on this barrier led to the determination that the adaptation of an existing theoretical framework or model was not an option. Community-campus partnerships and the other ‘cause-based partnerships’ described in the literature are separate and distinctive concepts. The adaptation of a framework for use with this type of partnership without consideration of the voices and stories of community-campus partnership stakeholders would raise issues related to measurement validity. In other words, the adaptation of a model designed for community-corporate, joint ventures, or government-corporate partnerships for an empirical study of community-campus partnerships would raise serious questions around whether a study is measuring what the researcher says is being measured. Organizational culture theory and an acculturation framework will be treated as important features of the prior ethnography landscape. The grounded theory approach respects the unique qualities of community-campus partnerships.
Relevance of the Social Work Profession’s Core Values and Ethics

As mentioned earlier in this chapter in the section discussing the role that service-learning has played in the overall community engagement movement, a brief yet pointed homage was paid to Jane Addams. Social work students, practitioners, and scholars immediately recognize Addams’ name as one of the founders of the social work profession, and even outside of the profession her name is synonymous with social work. A cornerstone contention at the crux of this rationale is that by virtue of her life’s work in the settlement house movement, Jane Addams rightfully holds the distinction of being the founder of two separate yet distinctively intertwined areas – the social work profession and the community engagement movement.

During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, John Dewey and his colleagues have been credited as the pioneers who developed key theories linking experience/social interactions and education/schooling. Through these ruminations and eventual publications, Dewey gained the recognition as the pioneer of service-learning who developed the “intellectual foundations of service-learning” (Titlebaum, Williamson, Daprano, Baer, & Brahler, 2004, p. 2). Given the social and political status of women during this time and in consideration of the reality that these inclinations transferred into academia, it is not surprising that the impact that Jane Addams’ work in the settlement house movement had on service-learning has garnered her with posthumous recognition. Setting this issue of an unjust intellectual eclipse, the theory (Dewey) and practice (Addams) of service-learning can be traced to the turn of the century and thus took place during a time when most community engagement activities were extension
service based and consequently focused on agriculture (Carriere, 2004; Harkavy, 1992; Harkavy & Puckett, 1994; Titlebaum et al, 2004).

By examining the origins of service-learning through a lens of the interplay between practice and theory, one might argue that those who followed the work of Addams continued on a trajectory that focused on social justice, advocacy, and civic engagement while those who followed the work of Dewey tended to focus on the academic side of engagement that is most consistent with a more generalized trajectory of community engagement. This rumination, coupled with the first-string billing that Dewey often receives in the service-learning and community engagement literature, bolsters a contention made earlier in this chapter that the difference between civic and community engagement is not at all something that can be chalked up to semantics because the lines of lineage can be traced between Dewey and community engagement and likewise between Addams and civic engagement. Dewey’s line of inquiry around pedagogy and practice borrowed greatly from what he learned from his time with Addams, but do exhibit a shift in focus away from the philosophical underpinnings of Hull House and other settlement houses of that day in such a way that placed the needs of the academy ahead of those within the community. Addams’ beliefs and practices are more in line with the civic engagement movement, and her contributions to the movement can be seen through her perspectives on civic responsibility, democratic education, and citizenship (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007; Daynes & Longo, 2004; Fischer, Nackenoff, & Chmielewski, 2009; Griffith, 2009; Shepler, 2009). While Dewey’s work contributed to and is recognized for the development of the ‘umbrella’ of community engagement, it is argued that Addams’
conceptualization of education in the community is more consistent with the values and principles that serve as the standard for good partnership and engagement practices.

As argued before, the concept of civic engagement can be viewed as a specific type of community engagement which is marked by a strong philosophical commitment to the role that an organization (in this case, the IHE) plays in the community. The role is that of advocate and activist and seeks to go beyond ‘doing for’ and ‘doing with’ the community, focusing instead on actions related to consciousness-raising, transformation, and working as an agent of change. In review of Addams’ work and the basis of civic engagement practice, it appears that this is the form of community engagement that is most closely tied to her work. While this study seeks to include partnership voices from a variety of community engagement experiences, it is this specific brand of engagement that is most closely linked to the profession of social work. A common set of ethical principles unify the social work profession, and these same principles make civic engagement form an ideal type of community engagement.

Throughout the remainder of this section, the terms ‘values’ and ‘ethics’ will be used. These represent the “common set of professional values” (Galambos, 2009, p. 345) shared by social workers, which is a phenomenon that has been described empirically and conceptually by scholars (see Abbott, 1988, 1999; Bartlett, 1965; Chau, 1980; Congress, 1993; Haynes, 1999; Healy, 2007; Meinert, 1980; Mezirow, 1981; Perlman, 1975; Pumphrey, 1959; Reamer, 2001; Siporin, 1982). It is important to point out that these terms are not used haphazardly or interchangeably. As explained by Congress, Black, and Strom-Gottfried (2008), “[v]alues are beliefs of right and wrong: good and bad conduct. Values serve as beliefs of the profession. Social worker values
have been defined as the relatively enduring beliefs of the profession… yet when values are translated into practice, ethical dilemmas often arise. When this occurs, social workers are encouraged to use a model of ethical decision-making” (p. iv). Thus, the term ‘values’ is used to describe the beliefs held dear by a profession or movement and are useful in exploring how these beliefs are applicable to the study of community-campus partnerships. The term ‘ethics’ is used to describe the application of values (in this case, those of the social work perspective) to problem-solving situations or the application of the beliefs to practice scenarios (for more on social work values and ethics, see in particular Anderson, 1996; Congress, 1999, 2000; Dolgoff, Loewenburg, & Harrington, 2008; Reamer, 2001, 2006, 2009).

The primary professional organization of the social work profession is the National Association of Social Workers (NASW). Social work professionals work in an array of practice areas that range the lifespan (from prenatal care to gerontology), geographic areas (from urban to rural), levels of practice (the interdependent micro, mezzo, and macro levels), and a spectrum of specialty practice sections (among which the following nine sections are recognized by NASW: aging; alcohol, tobacco, and drugs; child welfare; children, adolescents, and young adults; health; mental health; private practice; school social work; and social and economic justice and peace) (NASW, 2008). It is argued that the social work profession’s set of values and ethics is what unifies this diverse group of professionals (Abbott, 1999; Asamoah, Healy, & Mayadas, 1997). In lieu of one single practice area that defines this profession, social workers are defined by an approach to practice and an extraordinary mission to approach all practice areas from the same perspective that focuses on social justice
and empowerment. The preamble of the NASW Code of Ethics states that “[t]he primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human wellbeing and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty” (2008, p. 2).

Unlike the social work profession, the area of study and practice under the general umbrella of community engagement (inclusive of areas such as service-learning, civic engagement, community-campus partnerships and community-based participatory research) has historically not been affiliated with or unified by one particular set of guiding principles. Instead, there are implicit references in the bodies of work in this area and explicit statements from various professional and government organizations that indicate the core values associated with the work done through community engagement initiatives and activities. The latter is an area in which there appears to be an emerging sense of unity (and within one group, professionalization) among those who work in a range of organizations connected with community engagement work. While on the surface one might feel that to compare social work and community engagement would be a task of comparing ‘apples to oranges’, it is the position taken within this study that evidence in the literature points to a great deal of similarity between the values inherent to the community engagement movement (and likewise, the movement’s apparent progression towards professionalization) and the ethics and values orientation of the social work profession.

The International Society of Community Engagement Professionals (ISCEP) (ISCEP mission page, 2008) asserts that it is the “preeminent organization in the field of
Community Engagement” and presents its members with a Code of Ethics and a pledge, which reads as follows: “To conduct myself professionally and to serve the public interest; To act with truth, fairness, and responsibility in all that I do; To continuously work to improve my individual competence and knowledge through continuing education; And, to adhere to the Code of Ethics of the International Society of Community Engagement Professionals” (ISCEP ethics page, 2008). This organization espoused that professionalization of the movement is important, and even offers a certification (for a fee) for professionals who work in a variety of organizations. The ISCEP Code of Ethics (2008) is brief in comparison to the NASW Code of Ethics, and reads as follows:

Ethical practice is the hallmark of those involved in the Community Engagement movement. As Community Engagement professionals, we recognize that we serve our communities, our organizations and the public interest. In so doing, we will strive to exemplify the honesty, loyalty and fairness that we expect of others and that is expected of us. We will acquire and wisely use the specialized knowledge that will ensure the success of our efforts. We will promote the public interest and Community Engagement while building understanding, credibility, and relationships among stakeholders and institutions in the communities we serve.

A second professional organization leading the community engagement movement is the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE). A relatively new organization, the IARSLCE incorporated in 2007 after a two year period of transition when it grew out of a separate organization that focused on primary and secondary education issues related to community engagement (IARSLCE About Us, n/d). Unlike the parent organization from which IARSLCE was formed, the IARSLCE seeks “to advance the fields of service-learning and community engagement research across the educational spectrum (primary, secondary, post-secondary, and further education)” (IARSLCE About Us, n/d).
The organization’s mission is “[t]o promote the development and dissemination of research on service-learning and community engagement internationally and across all levels of the education system” (IARSLCE About Us, n/d), and while the organization does not have a code of ethics readily available to those visiting their website there is strong evidence through their publicly available materials that the organization’s values and principles are consistent with the ISCEP. The IARSLCE’s list of organizational goals is extensive and comprehensive, and is provided below given the cumulative impact these goals have on the current discussion on values and ethics:

- to promote the exchange of ideas, experiences, data and research among its members;
- to disseminate knowledge and research on service-learning and community engagement;
- to encourage continually improving the quality and rigor of research in these fields;
- to provide a forum for the presentation of research findings, ideas, methods and opinions across educational systems;
- to facilitate the exchange of information and creation of collaborations among scholars and practitioners around the world;
- to support and facilitate the development of new scholars entering the fields of research on service-learning and community engagement;
- to create venues for ongoing learning and communication among the members;
- to establish communication strategies that facilitate the dissemination of research beyond the members to other communities of scholars and practitioners;
- to initiate other activities and programs that support the interests of members and advance the fields of service-learning and community engagement; and
- to conduct all activities in a self-supporting, fiscally accountable and ethical manner.

(Bulleted format consistent with original source) (IARSLCE About Us, n/d)

The third organization representing the community engagement movement is Campus Compact, which is “a national coalition of more than 1,100 college and university presidents - representing some 6 million students - dedicated to promoting community service, civic engagement, and service-learning in higher education” (Campus Compact Home Page, 2009). This organization has a rich history within the movement, and is perhaps one of the most recognizable organizations in the movement. The organization’s website is recognized in the field for providing a number
of useful resources for those involved with community engagement. The mission of Campus Compact is that the organization “advances the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility”; and states their vision as one that “envisions colleges and universities as vital agents and architects of a diverse democracy, committed to educating students for responsible citizenship in ways that both deepen their education and improve the quality of community life. We challenge all of higher education to make civic and community engagement an institutional priority” (Campus Compact Who We Are, 2009). Campus Compact does not have a code of ethics, however, the organization developed in 1996 a comprehensive set of principles that are supported by the presidents of all member organizations in a way similar to that of a professional oath (Campus Compact Presidents' Statement of Principles, 2009). These principles state that “Campus Compact presidents…

- … strongly advocate the participation of students, faculty, staff, and higher education institutions in public and community service. Such service may range from individual acts of student volunteerism to institution-wide efforts to improve the social and economic well-being of America’s communities.
- … share a resolute commitment to speak out on issues of public concern and to articulate ideas that contribute to the common good of American and global society. Campus Compact member presidents strive to influence the quality of civic discourse and to ensure that key issues of civic concern are fairly discussed in impartial forums.
- … support initiatives that promote productive collaborations between colleges and communities. Such initiatives seek to create opportunities for renewed civic and community life, improved educational and economic opportunity, expanded democratic participation by citizens and the application of the intellectual and material resources of higher education to help address the challenges that confront communities.
- … support the development of opportunities that increase student, faculty, staff and alumni involvement in citizenship-building service activities. Community and public service, especially when linked to the core educational mission of the college and university, are powerful vehicles for developing citizenship skills—including participation in the political process — and the spirit of civic engagement required for life in a democratic civil society.
... support service learning because it enables students and faculty to integrate academic study with service through responsible and reflective involvement in the life of the community.

(Original version is numbered, and restates “Campus Compact presidents” at the start of each numbered statement, replaced here with ellipses)
(Campus Compact Presidents’ Statement of Principles, 2009)

Given the values perspectives expressed by the three leading professional organizations in the community engagement movement, common themes emerge from analysis of these three organizations. These themes are inclusive of service to the community, recognition of social and economic justice issues, commitment to capacity building and sustainability, importance of relationships among stakeholders, adherence to ethical standards, and professional competence encompassing lifelong transformative learning, practice, and dissemination of research. Guided by the six core values of social work from the NASW Code of Ethics (NASW, 2008), Table 1.1 provide a visual representation linking the central themes of values and ethics among the community engagement movement as facilitated by the previous discussion and the ethical principles of social work as expressed through the NASW Code of Ethics.
Table 1.1: Central Themes of Values and Ethics Among the Community Engagement Movement and the Social Work Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Values and Ethical Principles of the Social Work Profession</th>
<th>Central Themes from the Community Engagement Movement</th>
<th>Evidence of Themes from ISSCP, IASCE, and Campus Compact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value: Service Ethical Principles: Social workers’ primary goal is to help people in need and to address social problems. (NASW, 2008, pp. 4-9)</td>
<td>Service to the Community</td>
<td>“It is the ethical responsibility of the community engagement professional to recognize that we serve our community, our organizations, and the public interest.” (ISSCP Code of Ethics, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value: Social Justice Ethical Principles: Social workers challenge social injustice. (NASW, 2008, p. 9)</td>
<td>Recognition of social and economic justice issues</td>
<td>The annual IASCE conference asks that presenters “go beyond” research basics and interrogate the underlying issues that they are studying, and the majority of which are directly related to social and economic justice issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value: Dignity and Worth of the Person Ethical Principles: Social workers respect the inherent dignity and worth of the person. (NASW, 2008, p. 9)</td>
<td>Commitment to capacity building and sustainability</td>
<td>“The International Society of Community Engagement Professionals (ISSCP) is made up of individuals building communities.” (ISSCP Home Page, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value: Importance of Human Relationships Ethical Principles: Social workers recognize the central importance of human relationships. (NASW, 2008, p. 9)</td>
<td>Importance of relationships among stakeholders</td>
<td>The ISSCP is currently accepting submissions for a Best Practices publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value: Integrity Ethical Principles: Social workers behave in a trustworthy manner. (NASW, 2008, p. 5)</td>
<td>Adherence to ethical standards</td>
<td>“We will strive to enforce the honesty, loyalty, and fairness that are expected of others and that is expected of us.” (ISSCP Code of Ethics, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value: Competence Ethical Principles: Social workers practice within the areas of competence and develop and enhance their professional expertise. (NASW, 2008, p. 5)</td>
<td>Professional competence encompassing lifelong transformative learning, practice, and dissemination of research</td>
<td>“We will assess and widely use the specialized knowledge that will ensure the success of our efforts.” (ISSCP Code of Ethics, 2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the strong similarities in values shared by the community engagement movement and the social work profession, a cogent argument is made for the application of a social work perspective in the practice and study of community engagement (Nadel, Majewski, & Sullivan-Cosetti, 2007; Wertheimer, Beck, Brooks, & Wolk, 2004). The
shared interest in social justice and service are elements that, standing alone, seem to be enough to tie these two areas together as partners in common interest. The additional likenesses among core values and ethics strengthen this claim. Ideally, all of the topics and issues discussed in this section on values and ethics would be at the forefront of stakeholders’ minds when engaging in partnership activities. Research on the community voice of community-campus partnerships tells an alarming story that is contradictory to this belief (see Ferrari & Worrall, 2000; Gilchrist, 2006; Ndirangu, Yadrick, Bogle & Graham-Kresge, 2008; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Sullivan, Kone, Senturia, Chrisman, Ciske, & Krieger, 2001; White-Cooper, Dawkins, Kamin, & Anderson; 2009; Worrall, 2007).

Problems arise when one or more stakeholders involved with the community-campus partnership feels that the nature of the partnership is inconsistent with the core values and ethics of responsible practice. Oftentimes this centers on a sense that there is partial or complete lack of equality in communication, decision-making, or ownership of activities. This power differential creates an atmosphere of distrust within the partnership. Using a critical lens through which to interrogate the nature of the community engagement phenomenon, there is alarming potential for exploitation of an organization and the population they serve if lines of communication and problem-solving energies are not applied in the partnership process (Nadel, Majewski, & Sullivan-Cosetti, 2007; Soska & Johnson Butterfield, 2004). It has become a favorable trend in academia to say that there is a strong community engagement presence on the campus, and in academic circles there is a sense of being intellectually and morally in vogue to discuss the good work that one is doing through teaching and scholarship for
the benefit of individuals and communities that are ‘in need’. In order to ensure that community engagement is more than a hot topic on a conference program or a craze that may pass when something else more alluring comes along, it is important for scholars to interrogate the nature of the relationships between higher education institutions and community-based organizations in such a way that asks critical questions about the dynamics of power and trust within the partnership (Snarr, 2003).

Introduction of the Study

As was introduced earlier in this chapter and will be discussed further in Chapter Two, there is a gap in the current literature around theoretical models that facilitate a better understanding of the dynamics of organizational culture and partnership processes specific to community-campus partnerships. The purpose of this study is to explore the meanings of community-campus partnerships among stakeholders in the community and in academia towards the goal of generating a theory grounded in these data that will concomitantly contribute to the social work profession and the community engagement movement. Using as its foundation the shared interest among the social work profession and the community engagement movement on values and ethics, this study utilizes a traditional grounded theory methodology as a means to systematically examine the question “What does it mean to be involved in a community-campus partnership?”
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

An array of activities, projects, and initiatives are included under the umbrella of community engagement, and involvement in any of these community-campus programs implies that an IHE has entered into some sort of partnership with the community. Just as there is variation in the types of programs, there is also great diversity in the types of partnerships that an IHE has with the community. Likewise, variables related to the development of and processes through which the partnership are sustained (and terminated) are not consistent among all community-campus partnerships. This complex variation is attributed both theoretically and in practice to organizational culture dynamics at the organizational level of the IHE and community partner agency, and at the level of the partnership formed by these organizations. While these elements of variation are immense indeed from partnership to partnership, the phenomenon of partnership process ought not be viewed as immeasurable when one employs a framework for analysis that takes into account a postmodern understanding of organizational culture (Parker & Selsky, 2004; Tierney, 2001).

The review of the literature begins with an historical survey of the complex socio-political-economic contexts surrounding the development of the community engagement movement in the United States that provides the reader with context on the ebb and flow of the connection between the academy, the meaning of engagement, and society over more than three and a half centuries. Within this section, particular attention is given to the three trends that have emerged in the past 35 years and have impacted the movement greatly. Next, an examination of the literature around the philosophical foundations of community engagement begins with discourse on the legitimacy of
service as one of the core missions in higher education, which is followed by an argument supported by the scholarly literature that the service mission of higher education is grounded in the democratic civic engagement movement that started with the settlement house movement in the early 1900s. The third section of the chapter begins with a review of the literature on the contemporary partnership challenges. Then, an assessment of the best practices literature on partnership processes supports the position that partnerships be conceptualized as relationships given that a successful relationship serves as the crucial foundation upon which meaningful and mutually beneficial partnership is based. The final section of the chapter centers on the study of organizational culture as a pathway to understanding elements at the core of partnerships such as acculturation. A survey of the literature in this area reveals gaps in the current literature base that will be addressed by this study and establishes the sensemaking approach to understanding culture as a clear link between organizational culture and a grounded theory methodology given the postmodern and interpretive underpinnings.

Multiple Meanings of Engagement and Partnering: History of Higher Education

Community Engagement in the United States

The historical context provided in contemporary scholarly discourse on community engagement often focuses on the development of the movement in the late-nineteenth century, throughout the twentieth century, and focuses heavily on the service-learning trends in the 1980s and 1990s. In many cases scholars begin with the Morrill Act of 1862 when discussing the history of the movement. The enactment of the
Morrill Act is most certainly a milestone within the community engagement movement, and joins the likes of the establishment of the Office of Community Partnerships (OCP) and publication of Bower’s *Scholarship Reconsidered* as one of the major shifts in focus among IHEs in the United States during the twentieth century. In order to appreciate the interdependent nature of IHEs and the community, it is important to interrogate historical trends within higher education and community engagement in such a way that sheds light on the nuances associated with the intersectionality of economics, politics, war and peace, social movements, and education. The community engagement movement is as old as the practice of higher education, and throughout this time the stories of higher education and community engagement have been interwoven with one another in the context of political, social, and economic influences.

Kerr (2002) utilizes six phases as a mechanism to provide readers with context for understanding the history of higher education in the United States. Within each phase, a unique set of forces internal to the higher education setting and environmental influences external to the IHEs provides a foundation for understanding the relationship between IHEs and the community (or society in general). Given that the sixth and final phase unfolded over thirty years ago, this chapter will introduce a new seventh period in order to provide a more detailed assessment of the history of the community engagement movement in higher education during the past three decades. It is important to note that these phases are not to be seen as finite stages with concrete start and end dates on a timeline. There is overlap among the phases, and it is important to conceptualize these phases as trends that emerged in response to and relation with one another within overarching sociopolitical contexts. The following
sections summarize the major events and trends that impacted the development of community engagement and shaped the contemporary meaning of community-campus partnerships.

Phase One

"Accommodating the English and Scottish models of the college to the circumstances of a frontier society, beginning with the founding of Harvard in 1636" (Kerr, 2002, p. 1)

According to Boyer (1996), the aspiration of IHEs in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was to educate and train leaders for positions of leadership in the community and in the church. Among the United States' IHEs with histories dating back to this time, many are linked to or founded as seminaries. Combined with the nuances of society in general at that time, a strong focus within higher education was the incorporation of religion, spirituality, and moral sensibility within the curriculum (Wilhite & Silver, 2005). The inclination toward blending church and education was not a unique American phenomenon. Given the status of the United States as a young nation, this trend was an extension of the higher education practices in Europe, and in particular in Scotland and Great Britain. Students embarked on an educational experience with the goal of becoming leaders in public or secular arenas, and the roles of "[f]aculty were to be teachers and mentors, responsible for the intellectual, moral, and spiritual development of their students" (Wilhite & Silver, 2005, p. 46). Interactions between IHEs and the community were based upon the missions of IHEs at this time, which were more often than not closely tied to religious organizations or specific denominations. By educating the civic and religious leaders of tomorrow, colonial IHEs utilized curricula and messages of the relationship between morality and charity with the hopes that this would translate to the betterment of society once these educated individuals became public or religious leadership figures. During this time, “a university education [was] not
professional or vocational, rather it [expanded] one’s outlook and capacity for social and civic interaction” (Maurasse, 2001, p. 13). Teaching, mentoring, and serving the community through the education of students were common goals and were integrated in the missions of IHEs (Wilhite & Silver, 2005). Overall, the Scottish and British models of higher education dominated the IHE landscape during colonial times was adapted to fit well with the overall culture of that time in the United States, but with the turn of the century a new model of education was embraced and adapted to fit the needs of the growing nation.

**Phases Two and Three**
Phase Two: “Introducing the German model of the research university after 1800 and abandoning the Bible as the main source of knowledge” (Kerr, 2002, p. 1)
Phase Three: “Accepting the land-grant model of providing service to the nation and all its people after the Morrill Act of 1862, starting with agriculture and later extending to the legal, medical, and engineering professions, to business and industry and the military, and other segments of society” (Kerr, 2002, p. 1)

Kerr’s second and third phases are combined in this section in order to highlight the impact that these co-emergent trends had on higher education in the first half of the 1800s. The dawn of the nineteenth century marked a time of transformation within higher education characterized by a shift in curriculum focus, an increased concentration on the importance of research, and an explicit policy-driven focus on service within the missions of IHEs. The impact of these trends reached beyond the classroom because they influenced the way that communities and IHEs viewed their associations with one another, and beginning with rural America the phenomenon of the formalized community-campus partnerships was born (Maurrasse, 2001).

Replacing the Scottish and British model of education that focused on religion-centered education and service to society through education of religious and civic leaders, the adoption of a German model of higher education in the early 1800s shifted
the objective of higher education to that of truth-seeking and scientific inquiry. “This new model viewed the academic enterprise as most properly devoted to the positivist pursuit of truth through research and intellectual inquiry” (Wilhite & Silver, 2005, p. 47). Not only was the philosophy of education shifting, but the mission of the IHE was changing as well. Faculty members no longer held the sole role of ‘teacher and mentor’ once the functions of research and publishing took precedence (Wilhite & Silver, 2005).

Also impacted by the introduction and adoption of the German model of education was the curriculum. It is at this point in history that civic education, moral and civic responsibility, and public servitude transformed, becoming more compartmentalized and less organic in nature. In colonial times, these three terms were essentially gradations of the same color: faculty taught material that linked morality and civic-mindedness together in such a way that enabled the teachers themselves to be servants of the community and society by the simple act of engaging with the students and modeling the overarching messages they were teaching. Wilhite and Silver explain that in the nineteenth century the “[s]tudy of the classics and religious themes was supplanted by an emphasis on discipline-specific, specialized knowledge” (2005, p. 47).

The focus on service and the civic responsibilities of educated citizens remained an undercurrent within IHE missions during this time; however, the religious explanation or charity compulsion for why one would be a citizen servant was no longer the guiding force. The new home for civic education and community engagement activities was located within the recently formed disciplines generally referred to under the umbrella of social sciences where there was a shift in viewpoint from charity to service (see Maurasse, 2001). During this time the primary purpose of higher education became
research with a secondary focus on teaching; awareness of and scholarly pursuits pertaining to social issues were devalued to placement as the ‘third mission’ of service within IHEs as the nation’s policymakers pushed for a model of community engagement with the purposes of meeting the technical training needs of the country and conducting research (Kerr, 2002).

The American interpretation of the German model of higher education included the call for an increase in technical prowess among the populace because there was a need across the country for individuals skilled in areas such as farming, urban planning, and manufacturing (Wilhite & Silver, 2005). To meet this need, there was an increased amount of political and social support for the federal government to help with the establishment of agricultural and technical institutions of higher education in each state of the United States. Commonly referred to as the Morrill Act, the Morrill Land Grant College Act was introduced by Congressman Justin S. Morrill (Vermont) and passed by Congress in 1859, but was vetoed by President James B. Buchanan. In 1862, President Abraham Lincoln passed the Morrill Act and with this legislation the landscape of higher education in the United States changed drastically.

The primary focus of the Morrill Act was to create public colleges and universities for the purpose of increasing education opportunities in the agricultural and technical (referred to in some manuscripts as mechanical) sciences. As explained by Alperovitz and Howard (2005), the Morrill Act was meant to extend beyond the enhancement of agricultural practices and training. The Morrill Act specifies that:

… an amount of public land, to be apportioned to each State a quantity equal to thirty thousand acres for each Senator and Representative in Congress to which the States are respectively entitled by the apportionment under the census of 1860 … each State which may take and claim the benefit of this subchapter, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the
leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professional in life. (7 U.S.C.A. Section 301 and 305, as quoted in “Historical Virginia Tech: The Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862”, 2002)

The creation of land-grant institutions was based on the philosophy that, by conducting the daily duties tied to an objective of educating and training student, the IHE would engage students in such a way that would cultivate an interest in civic issues and enhance one’s sense of civic responsibility (Wilhite & Silver, 2005). Thus, the goals of the colonial and land-grant institutions were quite similar because of this shared interest in an approach to education that was to promote civic engagement (Wilhite & Silver, 2005). Scholars argue that the Morrill Act made the service mission in higher education explicit for the first time in the nation’s history because it enacted a policy stating that IHEs serve as a place where democratic ideas such as interest in civic leadership and sense of civic participation and responsibility would be disseminated among a populace who had previously not had access to higher education (Alperovitz & Howard, 2002).

This solidification of the three IHE missions of teaching, research, and service was established through the Morrill Act and the relationship between research and service was explicated further in 1887 with the Hatch Act, which “extended the ideals of the Morrill Act by giving additional resources to land-grant colleges so they could conduct applied research and experimental work aimed at improving the condition of larger society” (Ross, 2002, p. 2). A second Morrill Act was passed in 1890, and this legislation supplied land-grant institutions with additional funds tied to the increase of research on agriculture. These policies established the public purpose of higher
education, and highlighted the goal that IHEs be “[vehicles] for reshaping communities” (Boyer, 1990; Ross, 2002, p. 2). Overall, the three IHE mission components of teaching, research, and service were redefined in the nineteenth century in such a way that allowed for congruence, connectedness, and relatively equal importance; however, external forces experienced in the twentieth century elevated research above the other mission components and despite two major movements of social awareness the service mission took on tertiary importance at most IHEs in the twentieth century.

**Phase Four**

"Moving from education for only the elite to mass access, again after 1862, and later moving to universal access with the development of community colleges after 1900, with the G.I. Bill of Rights after World War II, and especially with the passage of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California in 1960” (Kerr, 2002, p. 1)

The first half of the twentieth century was a time when college enrollment rose sharply as accessibility increased and, with the onset of the Progressive era, the community-campus partnership phenomenon (started in the late 1800s as a trend among agriculturally-focused partnerships formed in rural areas) extended to urban areas (Maurrasse, 2001). In terms of increased enrollment, the community college system is credited as being a major contributor to the spike due to the increased accessibility that these institutions provided to community members (Geller, 2001; Maurrasse, 2001). Geller (2001) explains that while there is not agreement among scholars on the original two-year college, it is generally agreed upon that the trend began in California and the mid-western United States at the turn of the century. The perceptions and functions of community colleges have changed during the past century (for a comprehensive history of community colleges see Geller, 2001); however, what has remained consistent is the significance of this higher education trend from a community engagement standpoint. This trend is important to the overall community
engagement movement because community colleges have earned a reputation of a trusted neighbor providing individuals in local communities with accessible and affordable educational and training opportunities, which situates these IHEs as a vessel through which average Americans have an opportunity to connect with one another and engage in discourse on issues pertinent to society at a time when other four-year institutions were distancing themselves as elite research-focused institutions (Gellar, 2001; Maurrasse, 2001).

In addition to the community college phenomenon, other factors impacting college enrollment trends during the early twentieth century include the economic impact of the Great Depression and Second World War. During the Great Depression, students were less apt to have additional monies to put towards a college education, but the passage of the GI Bill of Rights in 1944 is credited with providing “a ticket of entry for vast numbers who would have otherwise been unable to attend college” because the financial support became available from the federal government, which led to an estimated eight million veterans entering IHEs (Wilhite & Silver, 2005, p. 47). While accessibility among non-elite social classes is the primary focus of Kerr’s fourth phase in higher education history, precipitating events (war, economy, social struggle) concurrently impacted the perception of the purpose and mission of higher education.

Shifting pedagogical foci away from education of civic leaders towards professionalization and technical training left an unmet need at IHEs for the continuation of the service mission, and that void was met during the Progressive Era (1890-1913). This period has been credited by scholars as shaping the contemporary conceptualization of community-campus partnerships (Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmon,
2004). The settlement house movement occurred during this era, and directly influenced the ideals of what would emerge as the ‘engaged university’ mission. Ross (2002) cites this movement as beginning in 1887 at Smith College (Massachusetts), and recognizes Hull House in Chicago as the “notable exception” to a trend that often resulted in the settlement houses doing work ‘to’ instead of ‘with’ the community. The impact of the reform movement on higher education can best be seen in the cities of Chicago with the partnership between Hull House and the University of Chicago, and New York with the partnership between Columbia College [sic] and New York settlement houses (Ross, 2002; Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004). The settlement house movement was primarily an urban phenomenon, yet partnerships flourished between land-grant IHEs and rural communities through the establishment of the cooperative extension system with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 (Ross, 2002). Accounts of the interactions between IHEs and communities during this time highlight settlement houses and early cooperative extension programs as the pioneers of community-campus partnerships; the relationship between the settlement house movement, community-campus partnerships, and democratic education is expanded upon later in this chapter.

**Phase Five**

“Accepting assignment of responsibility by the leading universities for advances in science rather than by government laboratories or by industry, during and after World War II” (Kerr, 2002, p. 1)

At a time when enrollment in IHEs was at a high, “the civic mission of the academy was narrowing” and the spirit of the Progressive Era waned as “[u]niversities, credited with fostering the scientific know-how that supported the Allied victory were more than ever seen as the key to the technological and scientific advantage that could secure the country’s economic and political hegemony” (Wilhite & Silver, 2005, p. 47).
After World War I, the shift in focus in higher education toward the pursuit of government-funded research opportunities led to a decreased focus on community engagement, and “the tradition of separating scholarly research from the work of improving the human condition became stronger” (Ross, 2002, p. 5). The academy encouraged the professoriate to engage in research towards the pursuit of knowledge that was considered ‘pure’ in nature and was sought for the benefit of the discipline, and all but abandoned the “earlier tradition linking higher education to civic and moral goals” (Wilhite & Silver, 2005, p. 47). Research was remarkably disconnected from the practical application of findings and implications in society, and the ideal for integrating democratic education fell to the side. Likewise, faculty who engaged in community-based research and promoted democratic education were not taken seriously and thus began the value-laden labeling of the ‘hard’ sciences, filled with the pursuit of knowledge that was pure and concrete, and the ‘soft’ sciences, with their interest in the complexities of the human experience (Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004; Ross, 2002; Wilhite & Silver, 2005).

This trend grew even more pronounced during World War II, and by the time that the Cold War began there were numerous opportunities for student funding for college attendance as well as federal funding for research (Harkavy, 1996). These dynamics solidified the almost inevitable departure of civic engagement from the mission of higher education. The democratic, civic-minded IHEs of the Progressive Era were few and far between and even the religiously-affiliated institutions with missions of morality and social justice took on “an arms-length relationship with immediate social concerns” (Wilhite & Silver, 2005, p. 47).
Phase Six: 1960s and 1970s
“Adapting to the student movements in the 1960s, including responding to tactics of civil disobedience and to the themes of the counterculture” (Kerr, 2002, p. 1)

The federal government’s social policy initiatives of the 1950s, particularly the Great Society programs of President Johnson, set the stage for the acknowledgement among the public that the federal government initiate programs and services related to social issues as well as hold a responsibility for financially supporting these projects (Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004). Fueled initially by college students’ call to action directed at IHEs in the 1960s around issues of poverty and continuing in the 1970s with student initiatives associated with the civil rights movement, the sixth phase of higher education history was a time when community engagement and civic participation re-entered the mainstream dialogue of higher education. Unlike the previous phase that was instigated by economic and political forces, the focus on service in the 1960s and 1970s was almost solely initiated by college students and faculty members. Essentially, the frustration around the detachment between academe and society intensified and “this context of ferment and change pushed discourse on campuses towards a focus on the public realm and the public good” (Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004, p. 21).

A virtual explosion of funding opportunities related to community engagement and service took place during this phase, including “Peace Corps, Volunteers in Service to America… National Student Volunteer Program (NVSP)” (Ross, 2002, p. 6). As summarized by Fischer, Fabricant, and Simmons (2004), “[s]purred on by the civil rights, new left, antiwar, and emerging women’s movements and coupled with massive Federal funding for faculty projects, college campuses were increasingly dominated by an interest in public issues and social change” (p. 21). Students were engaging in
community volunteerism opportunities in great numbers, and faculty research of community-based and translational nature was increasing in acceptability in most of the social science disciplines. In the classroom, this phase was marked by the increased use of critical pedagogy, often seen as the vessel of democratic civic education. Perhaps due to its association with the counterculture movement and associated political agendas that were opposed to those typically held by more seasoned members of the academy, this pedagogical approach was accepted among the student population but did not receive wider acceptance until these methods were re-packaged at the start of the service-learning movement in the 1980s (Fischer, Fabricant & Simmons, 2004; Ross, 2002). Despite the resistance received from members of the IHE establishment who held tight to the traditions of the previous era and sought conformity to those ideals, the 1960s and 1970s were a time in higher education history when students and faculty pushed the academy to reconnect with their service missions in a way that was comparable to (and certainly not experienced since) the Progressive Era at the turn of the twentieth century.

*History being written – 1980s, 1990s, and a new millennium*

For the community engagement movement, the 1980s was a time of contrasting opinions and preferences among key stakeholder. The myriad of social movements and push for increased social responsibility became passé in many higher education environments after the 1970s, and ushered in a return to the ivory tower mentality for many in academe. Government support diminished for many of the social justice-focused service programs supported by policies of the 1970s; a trend toward self-interest took over among student populations; and the faculty trend in many IHEs was to
recoil from the community and enter back into laboratories and clinical settings (Ross, 2002). During the Cold War era there was a fall in interest around institutional commitment to community engagement activities in most of academia and, until the return to such a focus within the last 15 years, town-gown tensions intensified with the caricature of academics high up in their ivory towers being alive and well (Fisher, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004). Academia turned away from the tower windows, trading in the focus on the injustices and perils of society for a new reality of classrooms and laboratories where order, sanitation, and safety abounded.

Among the signs that community engagement efforts might lose its footing in the 1980s was the gradual termination of the National Student Volunteer Program (NSVP) that transpired early in the Reagan presidential administration as well as the replacement of images of socially conscious college activists by powerful pop culture representations of self-absorbed young adults comprising the “Me Generation” during much of the 1980s (Ross, 2002). Faculty members’ interest levels in service-related activities diminished during this time as there was a national push within higher education to increase scholarship productivity. Community-based scholarship efforts were seen as inferior research endeavors given the push for clinical-based and micro-focused (research on individuals) research often resulting in community-based research agendas being taken less seriously and faculty members feeling it necessary to ‘fly’ their community-based research ‘under the radar’ of administration given the new climate, and the effects of this trend can be observed at IHEs in the twenty-first century (Fisher, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004; Ross, 2002).
A group of scholars who argue against the democratic education movement make up a backlash to the social responsibility movements of decades before. These individuals suggest that higher education needs to be realistic about limitations on an already overloaded professoriate (Butin, 2007). “You might just make them into good researchers… You can’t make them into good people, and you shouldn’t try”, is the sentiment espoused by Fish (2003, p. 2). Fish reflects on how his experiences in academe have led him to be skeptical to the ‘mixing’ of civic responsibility in the classroom and basic classroom instruction from the standpoint that the instructional pressures of large class size, increase in amount of material covered in a course, and tightening of budgets make it so that faculty must focus only on teaching the material and do not have time to engage in additional efforts related to civic education (Fish, 2003). While this side of the argument is present, it is far overshadowed by the line of reasoning in support of democratic civic engagement practices in higher education.

Considering that the popularity of community-engaged teaching and learning techniques known as service-learning was exploding in popularity across the country in the late 1980s and 1990s, the push for democratic education and social responsibility was re-emerging into the mainstream practices of higher education (an historical account of service-learning in America is beyond the scope of this review of the literature, for more historical references on service-learning please see Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Butin, 2005; Butin, 2007). The push for reinvesting in the service mission of higher education had begun, and has continued to grow into the new millennium. However, community-based activities such as service-learning join with community-based research in a trend that has carried over from the
post-World War II era, which is to focus on a scientific-minded desire to seek or create order in the community that results in the treatment of the community as a place to conduct educational and research experiments instead of a place in which to partner as equals. Two main trends contributed to the continuation of this power imbalance in community engagement: the emergence of the load-shedding trend and the application of a business model to community-campus partnership activities.

_Load-Shedding._

Credited as having its roots in the Reagan administration and being perpetuated by the administrations of Presidents George W. and George H.W. Bush, load shedding placed the formerly held social welfare responsibilities of the state onto both not-for-profit and public institutions, which has in turn served as widening the gap between those in the community and those in institutions of higher education who act as proxy enforcers of social control (Fisher, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004). The Clinton years provided a brief yet productive time that was instrumental in reversing the agents of social control movement by the implementation of more progressive policies and models toward civic engagement; however, with the return of a conservative congressional climate in 1995, there was a return to the morality and charity models of service reminiscent of the colonial IHEs shaped by the pre-nineteen century Scottish and British models of education (Zlotkowski, 1995).

Accompanying this trend was also the global push for privatization, which is characterized in this context as being reflective of “a society dominated by a culture of private individuals, a physical world of private spaces, and a political economy of private institutions” (Fisher, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004, p. 23). Fischer, Fabricant, and
Simmons explain that “[o]ne cause of the interest in IHE civic engagement is the broader privatization (or corporatization) of the political economic which ‘load sheds’ the social welfare elements of the state onto non-profits and community institutions, including universities, many of which are situated in or near communities that are collapsing under current neo-conservative policies and politics” (2004, p. 22). The load-shedding phenomenon that emerged in the 1980s, intensified during the 1990s, and continues into the new millennium might not appear on the surface to promote less than ideal partnering strategies and behaviors; however, new responsibilities taken on by IHEs as a part of load-shedding impact organizational capacity (staff, resources, time) in such a way that puts a strain on either or both partner organizations and thus negatively effects the capacity to partner successfully (Wichinsky, 2008).

Load-shedding thus represents a ‘means to an end’ conundrum. Under an intense political and economic environment that pushes for the decrease of government involvement in the lives of citizens, the responsibility of delivering social welfare services was ‘shed’ onto non-profits and private institutions and the strain of doing more work with fewer resources resulted in compromised processes – if not in the delivery of services than oftentimes in the organizations’ ability to partner successfully with one another (Fischer, Fabricant & Simmons, 2004). In an effort to offset this strain, IHEs often find that funding is available for community-based work that meets the needs of the load-shedding agenda as well as the IHEs agenda for faculty research. It is this phenomenon of financial motivation for community engagement combined with unique histories in different communities regarding relationships with local IHEs that contributed to a climate of guarded optimism about the meaning of community engagement in
modern American society (Fischer, Fabricant & Simmons, 2004; Maurrasse, 2001).

Fischer, Fabricant, and Simmons (2004, p. 30) skillfully outline the causes and potential effects surrounding financial motivations for partnering:

Clearly some part of the incentive for forging such relationships and developing collaborative programming is that it opens up new revenue streams for the IHE, both public and private. As public and private sources of funding realize that problems and solutions rest more in communities than they do within single individuals and families (preferred foci of funding in the 1980s and early 1990s), there are increasing revenue sources for community-based initiatives. The pursuit of such resources is the name of collaboration but without attention to power imbalance and without a clear understanding of university role and community contribution can temper the development of dynamic, authentic relationship of partnership. Financial incentives for collaboration are of course both necessary and expected, but they cannot be the singular or even primary reason for pursuing such relationship.

Load-shedding has contributed to an increase in the number of community-campus partnerships, and a surge such as this surely increases interest in the scholarly community. Clearly stakeholders in academia, the community, funding organizations, and the government have become interested in research on community engagement efforts because of the interest in effectiveness and efficiency. An area of scholarship that has been under-researched is the study of how the partnership functions from the viewpoint of multiple stakeholder groups, which necessitates that researchers dig below the outcomes and look at issues such as exploitation and inequality in community-campus partnerships that might impact outcomes and interorganizational relations.

The application of a business model to community-campus partnerships.

The push for partnerships started in the 1980s with collaborations between IHEs and the corporate sector when the IHEs moved from a model of making university advancements “freely disseminated to the public… as a part of an institution’s service mission” to a “profit-generating activity in partnership with the corporate sector” (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Partnerships were increasingly developed in the 1980s and 1990s
between IHEs and national corporations in order to increase IHE profit margins and provide an avenue for disseminating research products in areas such as medicine, technology, and economics (see Roper & Hirth, 2005; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Walshok, 1995; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). As established in the previous section on load-shedding, this trend coincided with a time when IHEs were financially motivated to and rewarded for engaging in initiatives focused on pertinent social issues (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008, p. 76).

IHEs in these partnerships often assumed the business model of operations when partnering. The question arises as to whether a new partnership model ought to be employed in community-campus partnerships that involve non-profit organizations that mainly serve individuals, families, and communities. The literature in human service organization management is rich with discussions around the pros and cons of managing non-profit agencies from a corporate model, and many such arguments point to the ‘human factor’ as a reason to develop models that do not view clients, communities, and citizens as commodities (for multi-paradigmatic views on non-profit and human service organizations, see Kettner, 2002, Kotler & Andreasen, 1996; Netting & O’Connor, 2002). Likewise, scholars argue that a different approach and engagement model is needed to address the uniqueness of differential distribution of resources as well as to take into account the components of humanity, public service, and societal needs that underlie these types of partnerships. This includes the call for the study of community-campus partnership processes, which is the focus of this study and a topic that will be discussed further in this chapter.
The Future of Engagement in Higher Education

As illustrated throughout this history of the campus-community engagement phenomenon, shifts in institutional commitment to and student interest in civic engagement and social responsibility mimics the overall context of the social, political, and economic climate (Zlotkowski, 1996). The beginning of the contemporary movement to reinvest in engagement initiatives and service missions occurred simultaneously with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, which is an historical landmark credited with raising awareness in social issues and provide hope for social change among students as well as faculty (Benson & Harkavy, 2000; Ross, 2002). In the past two decades, a great amount of positive progress has been made through the work of partnerships between communities and IHEs, the advocacy for the scholarship and pedagogy of engagement by faculty members, and the support from both IHE administration and the government for community-based and justice-focused activities. The enhancement of government funding opportunities, support, and resources for partnerships can be seen through the creation of government offices and programs such as the National Community Service Act of 1990, the U.S. Department of Education’s Urban Community Service (USC) program, the Community Partnership Act of 1992, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of University Partnerships (OUP) (Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004; Ross, 2002). The efforts among leaders in education and other public sector specialties actualized the creation of organizations that support, evaluate, and mentor partnership activities such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s Community Engagement Classification, Campus Compact, the Association for Community-Higher
Another reflection of the strengthening of commitment to community engagement and support for community-campus partnerships is the increase in scholarship on engagement-related topics and activities such as service-learning and social justice pedagogy, community-based research, the evaluation of outcomes related to community-based projects, and the nature of the partnership relationship and processes. Social work scholars are at the forefront of this burgeoning area of scholarship, and join an interdisciplinary group of faculty members, community professionals, and students who contribute to the literature on community engagement initiatives (Rogge & Rocha, 2004).

Philosophical Foundations of Community Engagement

As explained by Roper and Hirth (2005), the description of what constitutes an engaged IHE with an actualized service mission has transformed over the past century and moved from "serving the community, to extending and reaching out to it, to engaging it in bidirectional relationships and interactions" (p. 16). Contemporary discourse on what constitutes ‘real’ community engagement includes questions surrounding the accountability of and translational nature of faculty research and concerning of placement and primacy of service within the IHE mission (AASCU, 2002; Fish, 2003; Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009). The settlement house movement is
recognized for establishing the contemporary conceptualization of community-campus partnerships.

The original purpose of the settlement house movement (1887-early 1920s) was to provide students with contact with those less-fortunate than themselves within the community surrounding the IHE; however, the early settlement house partnerships with IHEs did not result in true engagement with the community and instead gave opportunities for students to see, as if looking through a fishbowl, into the lives of the poor and disadvantaged members of the community (Fischer, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004; Ross, 2002). What was missing from these early efforts was an action-focus to collaborations and mutuality of purpose among the partner organizations.

Characterized by Daynes and Longo (2004, p. 5) as “pioneering work”, Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr started a Chicago settlement house, Hull House, in 1889. The settlement house model employed at Hull House was unique in that it represented a bidirectional learning modality in which the expert might be the teacher in one instance, but the student in the next. While other settlement houses and community-based education models of this time fell susceptible to becoming the playground for the local IHEs, Hull House and a select other settlement houses set out as harbingers of service-learning in its purest, grassroots form. Two key features set Addams’ and other early community organizers’ work apart from the mainstream service-learning movement. First, the focus of partnership activities was on the needs of the community identified by those in the community and those who would participate in the partnership. Second, Addams is recognized for developing “service-learning as a practice, as opposed to theory” (Daynes & Longo, 2004, p. 5).
This positions Addams’ work apart from the educational theory contributions made by John Dewey. While Dewey’s scholarship is often credited as paving the road for service-learning as a sustained movement among IHEs, it is important to recognize that (given their relationship as colleagues and co-learners) Addams cleared the path upon which the road was to be paved. The grassroots community organizing and community education efforts developed by Addams and demonstrated by the settlement house movement are examples of how democratic civic engagement functioned in practice; and along with the theoretical contributions made by Dewey, a foundation for contemporary democratic civic engagement was formed. While the settlement house movement eventually declined into virtual non-existence, the spirit of Addams’ practice model and sentiments on the purposes and roles of academia continued to grow strong among those in future generations.

Beyond Outcomes: The Process of Partnering

Partnership Challenges

Kearney and Candy (2004, pp. 183-184) describe ‘the partnership paradox’ as the situational phenomenon that emerges when “…skilled in other areas, people involved in convening may lack abilities in facilitating participation, which, in turn, can lead to misunderstanding and failure… either a great deal of time and energy is spent in trying to deal with difficulties and conflicts that have been brought forth, or alternatively, one of the stronger groups decides to take control and directs the way the partnership should go.” In the first scenario, stakeholders from partner organizations run the risk of reaching a state of burnout with the activities of the partnership, and even the partnership itself. For example, community partners might become frustrated with the
need for additional planning and supervision of students involved in a service-learning project that could have been avoided through more open communication with faculty members, and the result of this might be a decrease in the time spent with clients and ability of non-profit staff to perform regular job duties (Ferrari & Worrell, 2000; Sandy & Holland, 2006). With the second scenario, dissolution of the partnership is the extreme end result. Literature on failed partnerships is scarce, and perspectives on ‘what went wrong’ are most often gleaned through personal communication.

Ferman and Hill (2004) use an exploratory case study methodology to investigate the perspectives of community leaders involved in community-campus partnerships. The findings indicate that conflict exists among community and campus stakeholders in the partnership around key areas of incentives and motivations for partnering; intentions and expectations for the partnership; scheduling challenges and conflicting timelines; and infrastructure dilemmas (Ferman & Hill, 2004). The study found that community-campus partnerships occur in a multifaceted context in which stakeholders and organizations have differing motivations for entering into the partnership, ideas around what the partnership ought to be focusing upon, and organizational cultures (Ferman & Hill, 2004). Despite these challenges and the frustrations that confront community partners, the study findings support the idea that with the rapid growth of partnerships and the interest in multiple sectors (educational, government, nonprofit, corporate) with the concept of partnerships, strategies for better partnership practices are being developed and disseminated rapidly in such a way that inculcates a sense of hope among participants for developing strategies for addressing issues related to
organizational capacity to partner and divergent motivations for partnership initiatives (Ferman & Hill, 2004).

Many of the dynamics cited as challenges to partnerships bring to light the delicate interplay of power and trust within the partnership. Power can be exerted implicitly or explicitly in a covert or overt nature by an entire partner organization, specific stakeholders, or stakeholder subsets which in the case of community-campus partnerships might be managers, faculty members, or administrators (Netting & O’Connor, 2002). Power differentials are argued to be strongly associated with the development of trust among partner organizations and the stakeholders within these organizations (Cobb & Rubin, 2006; White-Cooper, Dawkins, Kamin, and Anderson, 2009). Findings from a study by White-Cooper, Dawkins, Kamin, and Anderson (2009) suggest that community members’ sense of distrust of the IHE was rooted in the reality that the IHE held power and control over the flow of financial and other resources important to the success of the partnership. Using an analogy from the world of gambling, it is helpful to imagine the IHE as the player who holds all of the chips and therefore has the control needed to call the shots. The scholarly discourse on the potential challenges and pitfalls involved with community-campus partnerships extends beyond description and exploration of the problems, and includes a growing area of scholarship that is solution-focused and makes recommendations for partnership practices.
Best Practices for Partnerships: Moving from a Planning Model to a Relationship Process

To avoid challenges and pitfalls common to community-campus partnerships, Kearney and Candy (2004) suggest that partnerships seek an alternative for the traditional way of viewing partnerships from a planning model that is linear and rational in nature. This alternative method is to view the partnership as a process. By viewing partnerships in this way, a partnership is defined as being “…reflexive… [focusing] both on the process of collaborating and on its [partnership] outcomes, and sees the two as interconnected in a reciprocal relationship” (Kearney & Candy, 2004, p. 184). Worrall (2007) posits that viewing partnerships as relationships is the key to a sustainable and successful partnership. Likewise, one of the key findings of Sandy and Holland's (2006) study on community partner perspectives was that the foundation of the partnership is the relationship. Tice (1994) recommends that a good way to start this relationship is for stakeholders from the community and the IHE to gather and draw up a ‘partnership guide’ that identifies social issues to be addressed by the partnership, expectations, and communication standards.

Assorted conceptual and empirically-based resources have emerged in the scholarly literature in the past ten years that espouse the best practices for community-campus partnerships. Worrall (2007, p. 5) asserts that a democratic relationship among partners organizations is key, and that these relationships are built on a foundation of “trust, respect, mutual benefit, good communication, and governance structures”. In their study of community partner perspectives on service-learning initiatives, Vernon and Ward (1999) found that community partners were mostly happy with partnership
dynamics but that many individuals conveyed frustration surrounding breakdowns in communication, the capacity to coordinate resources, and management of program. Vernon and Ward (1999) recommend that IHEs welcome community partners into their physical spaces because this will provide community members to be more visible to campus stakeholders. Inviting the community onto the campus is also a good way for an IHE to engage in resource-sharing (i.e., offering classroom or office/work space) and might involve the inviting of community partners into the campus community through specific assignments and opportunities such as “adjunct appointments, participating in faculty meetings, participation in student reflection sessions and involvement in evaluation/assessment activities” (Gelmon, Holland, Seifer, Shinnamon & Connors, 1998, p.153).

Also important to the conversation on best practices are contributions to the scholarly literature that highlight the inclusion of social justice-focused practices in partnership dialogues. Suarez-Balcazar, Harpter, and Lewis (2005, p. 97) developed a model for use in partnerships that focuses on ‘research and action’ and uses a social justice perspective framework that is cognizant of “respect for human diversity” and endorses strategies for addressing inequalities of power between the community and the IHE. Price, Foreman Kready, Filipic, Mogul, and Davey (under review) employ a social work perspective based on core values of the profession related to social justice in order to develop a set of partnership process guidelines. This compilation of best practices represents contributions from the community as well as multiple perspectives from academe inclusive of faculty, student, and administration voices. Price et al (under review) assert that community-campus partnerships are vehicles for social justice, and
the partnership guidelines include recommendations that explicitly address social justice themes such as power and privilege, minority populations, and the use of a strengths-based approach to capacity-building.

In the past decade, interdisciplinary groups of community members and scholars have collaborated on the development of best practices for partnerships. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) developed and published an entire issue of the organization’s journal *Partnership Perspectives* to make explicit nine principles deemed crucial for the wellbeing and sustainability of community-campus partnerships (CCPH, 2001). The nine principles include the importance of partner organizations having “agreed upon mission, values, goals and measurable outcomes”; “mutual trust, respect, genuineness and commitment”; shared power and resources; “clear, open, and accessible communication”; mutually agreed upon “roles, norms, processes for the partnership”; and shared responsibility for a cycle of constructive feedback and credit for successes (Siefer & Maurana, 2000, p. 7). These guiding principles provide stakeholders with a useful starting point for conversations around expectations of the partnership. Campus Compact (2001) provides a more comprehensive compilation of best practices and evaluation-focused dynamics in their organization’s publication *Benchmarks for Community/Campus Partnerships*. While the aggregation of best practices for partnership process are relatively recent to the scholarly literature, the language used and ideologies advocated within these resources have long been studied by researchers in disciplines such as management, organizational behavior/psychology, and human services. This area of study is organizational culture.
Organizational Culture

A lack of consistency among or understanding of the differences between elements of organizational culture often causes the partnership to experience disruption in the basic partnership behaviors and function. This leads to a disruption in the partnership’s capacity to fulfill goals and tasks, a process marked with confusion about the activities and agendas, and/or a sense of animosity that develops when severe mismatches occur. When indicators of organizational culture are left unexplored or underexplored the partnership’s goodness of fit cannot realistically be assessed since there will be expectations, desires, needs, and values that loom on either or both sides of the partnership. In order to analyze the areas of mismatch in a partnership, therefore, is important to study the organizational culture elements of both organizations involved in the partnership.

In the same way that scholars argue that a relationship is the foundation of a partnership, an assumption of this study is that the partnership process builds a foundation for the entire engagement experience. Many of the questions that arise at various stages during the partnership process go beyond inquiries about the nature and significance of the project’s intermediate and final outcomes. Centering instead on ways that the partnership process might have impacted outcomes, these sorts of questions interrogate how a different approach might have made a difference.

- Did our clients' needs really match up with what the professor wanted to study?
- Were agency staff following the interview protocol or should I have had someone on my team there?
- What could we have done if the dean hadn’t pulled the plug on the funding she promised?
- I did the ‘service’, but when was I supposed to be learning?
- What would have happened if all the decisions were not so one-sided?
• Who was supposed to benefit from this? Did anyone?
• And the data you promised us are where?
• You came, you measured, you left – what happened to that six-month follow up?
• Why did this crumble? What could we have done different?

In each of these questions, there appears to have been an internal (among those directly involved with the partnership) or external (influence of those indirectly involved with the partnership) dynamic affecting the goodness-of-fit between the expectations and actualities of the partnership. Indicators of organizational culture such as *leadership, mission, values, decision-making, structure, and communication* serve as the focus within the previous example questions. By translating these sentiments and speculations into organizational culture terms, it becomes clear that the concept of organizational culture provides a mechanism through which the link between process and product can be better understood.

In this study, *culture* is defined as…

…a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (Schein, 2004, p. 17)

Edgar Schein’s definition of *culture* was selected not only because of the general recognition of Schein as a leading theorist in organizational culture, but also given that the definition provides a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon that is thorough and yet at the same time succinct enough to implicitly reference the concepts that are used elsewhere in the literature to describe organizational culture. Schein enumerates eleven general categories that together compose and can be used to explore, illustrate, and examine a group’s *culture*. These categories are summarized in Table 2.1, which is an adaptation of Schein’s original “Exhibit 1.1” (2004, pp. 12-13; all boldface emphases
Table 2.1: Categories of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Shein’s Description of this Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed behavioral regularities when people interact</td>
<td>“the language they use, the customs and traditions that evolve, and the rituals they employ in a wide variety of situations” (p. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group norms</td>
<td>“the implicit standards and values that evolve in working groups…” (p. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espoused values</td>
<td>“the articulated, publicly announced principles and values that the group claims to be trying to achieve…” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal philosophy</td>
<td>“the broad policies and ideological principles that guide a group’s actions toward stockholders, employees, customers, and other stakeholders…” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of the game</td>
<td>“the implicit, unwritten rules for getting along in the organization…” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>“the feeling that is conveyed in a group by the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact with each other, with customers, or other outsiders” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded skills</td>
<td>“the special competencies displayed by group members in accomplishing certain tasks, the ability to make certain things that gets passed on from generation to generation without necessarily being articulated in writing” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habits of thinking, mental models, and linguistic paradigms</td>
<td>“the shared cognitive frames that guide the perceptions, thought, and language used by the members of a group and taught to new members in the early socialization process” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared meanings</td>
<td>“the emergent understandings created by group members as they interact with each other” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Root metaphors” or integrating symbols</td>
<td>“the ways in which groups evolve to characterize themselves, which may or may not be appreciated consciously but become embodied in buildings, office layout, and other material artifacts of the group. This level of the culture reflects the emotional and aesthetic response of members as contrasted with the cognitive or evaluative responses” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal rituals and celebrations</td>
<td>“the ways in which a group celebrates key events that reflect important values or important ‘passages’ by members, such as promotions, completion of important projects, and milestones” (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between climate and culture is an often discussed topic among organizational studies scholars. In the organizational behavior literature, scholars urge that these two terms not be used interchangeably since they are separate concepts. Glisson and James (2002) use confirmatory factor analysis to interrogate these two concepts using a Likert-type scale assessment tool with a sample of case management
teams in the child welfare and juvenile justice organizations (n=283 case managers from 33 teams of eight to 12 members each representing urban and rural locales). The results of the study suggest that, among the teams in the sample, the concepts of *climate* and *culture* are “different constructs”; “[c]limate therefore defined as a property of the individual (that may be shared with other members of a work unit) and culture is defined as a property of the work unit” (Glisson & James, 2002, p. 788). While not representing the same phenomenon, there is a sense in arguments such as those made by Glisson and colleagues that *climate* and *culture* are mutually exclusive. This argument is in contrast with Schein’s work because Schein makes a case for *climate* being an indicator of *culture*. Schein’s assertion is based on an assessment of the relationship between these constructs positing that an individual’s perceptions of the organization does contribute to the overall culture (Schein, 2004). Given the strength of Schein’s line of reasoning for including *climate* as an indicator of *culture*, for the purposes of this study the terms *climate* and *culture* will not be used interchangeably and the relationship between the concepts will be made using Schein’s explanation that *climate* is a component of *culture*.

As seen in the language used in Table 2.1, Schein’s references to organizations is often couched in terminology more closely resembling the language of corporate and for-profit groups, and his theoretical assessment of organizational culture and partnerships is not an exception (Schein, 2004, pp. 413-414). Indeed, this is reminiscent of the trend in community engagement to impose a business model approach to partnerships between IHEs and non-profit organizations. These traditional conceptualizations of culture have been expanded upon by scholars studying the
dynamics unique to IHEs and non-profit organizations (within higher education organizations, see Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008; Kezar & Eckel, 2002; Masland, 1985; Smart & St. John, 1996; Tierney, 1988, 1997, 2001; Trowler, 1998; and, within nonprofit organizations see: Blau, 1960; Cooke & Szumal, 2000; Glisson, Dukes, & Green, 2006; Glisson & Green, 2005; Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998; Glisson & James, 2002; Hemmelgarn, Glisson, & Dukes, 2001; Hemmelgarn, Glisson, & James, 2006; Hoy, 1990; Jaskyte & Dressler, 2005; Johnson & McIntyre, 1998; Martin, Peters, & Glisson, 1998; Rentsch, 1990).

Gap in the Literature: Organizational Culture Theoretical Framework for Partnership Process

Despite the reference to elements and characteristics of organizational culture within the current community-campus partnership literature, there is not a discernable consensus among these studies for the use of a specific perspective, model, or framework from which the study of organizational culture is undertaken. Given this ambiguity around the dynamics and interplay of organizational culture categories in the context of partnerships, there is a gap in the literature that this study aims to address. The majority of the literature on community-campus partnerships from an organizational culture focus or framework concentrates on the culture, climate, and experiences within the IHEs; the current literature base is argued as being too one-sided in telling the story of the partnership and thus lacks a focus on the true spirit of collaboration, organizational intersectionality, and partnership process (Alperovitz & Howard, 2005; Boyer, 1990; Campus Compact, 1996; Holland, 1997; Lynton, 1995; Lynton & Elman, 1987; Ward, 1996; Zlotkowski, 1995).
One subset of the partnership literature focuses on the way that IHE organizational culture factors impact IHE participation in partnerships (Alperovitz, & Howard, 2005; Holland, 1997; Maurrasse, 2002). One particularly helpful framework for understanding the dynamics of organizational culture in IHEs is offered by Tierney (2001). This framework focuses on critical questions about the organization related to six cultural dynamics: environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership (Tierney, 2001, p. 30). A second subset of the literature focuses on how organizational culture dynamics are linked with organizational capacity among partnerships between multiple nonprofit organizations (Florin, Mitchell, Stevenson, & Klein, 2000; Schneider, 1990; Wichinsky, 2008). A third portion of the literature focuses on the impact and interplay of organizational culture among cross-sector partnerships that are usually classified as either corporate-private, for-profit and not-for-profit, or public-private (Acar, Guo, & Kaifeng, 2008; Armistead, Pettigrew, & Aves, 2007; Hemphill, McGreal, Berry, & Watson, 2006; Selsky, & Parker, 2005; Vangen, & Huxham, 2003; Weiss, Miller Anderson, & Lasker, 2002). The gap in the literature centers on the study of organizational culture dynamics and processes associated with the community-campus partnership from a perspective that highlights the interplay between and among cultures and how this impacts the overall partnership process.

A Postmodern Approach to Studying Partnerships: Acculturation and Sensemaking

As described by Netting and O’Connor (2002), organizational culture theory is an “interpretive approach to understanding organizational culture” that takes into account the “humanity of the person working in the structures” (192). A sensemaking approach to organizational practice, sometimes referred to as sensemaking theory, is an
interpretive and reflective approach that involves first “assessing, understanding, and collaborating” followed by a time in which the organization will “engage consumers with staff in a joint process of making sense of difficult situations, finding meaning in their lives, or working toward a more in-depth understanding of their conditions” (Netting & O’Connor, 2002, p. 223; Weick, 1995). The sensemaking approach serves as a link between the recommendations for best practices in partnership process and a non-linear management strategy for considering organizational culture dynamics. As indicated in the next chapter, the sensemaking approach is central to one of the study's hypotheses and was a consideration in the selection of the study's research methodology.

Parker and Selsky (2004) posit that there are three main ways to approach partnership or collaboration studies: to “diagnose problems in terms of preexisting demographic, task, or process differences between the partners”, to “explore more than surface differences and diagnose cultural differences as the reason for problems between partners”, or to adopt a non-a priori approach that takes an “interactionist perspective… understanding partnerships and their mismatches/matches in terms of emergent culture” (pp. 464-465). The latter perspective is the approach endorsed by the authors. Parker and Selsky offer an alternative model for the study of partnerships because their “emergent-culture” approach takes into consideration the reality that two organizations do not typically come into a partnership with a “common culture” (2004, p. 465).

An acculturation framework provides a lens through which the interplay of organizational culture elements can be assessed on a deeper level and thus allows for
a better understanding of the impact that partner organizations’ cultures have on the partnership process (Parker & Selsky, 2004). Instead of imposing an agenda stating that one organization is ‘right’ and the other is ‘wrong’, an acculturation framework affords a neutral scaffolding from which to suspend individually complex variables for the purpose of assessing the mode of acculturation that is being actualized in the partnership (or in the case of pre- or mid-partnership assessment, the mode of acculturation desired by stakeholders). In consideration of existing theoretical frameworks and models, the work of Parker and Selsky (2004) appears on the surface to be a good fit for adaptation for the study of community-campus partnerships.

The Parker and Selsky (2004) acculturation framework was developed through the study of caused-based partnerships between community and corporate stakeholders that take place under the social responsibility movement in corporate America. While the framework appears equipped to explain, describe, and eventually predict the dynamics of organizational culture in partnerships, it would be shortsighted to proceed with such an adaptation given the plausibility that the organizational culture dynamics demonstrated within a community-corporate partnership are quite divergent from those of a community-campus partnership. Five acculturation modes are discussed by Parker and Selsky (2004, p. 469): integration, assimilation, separation, deculturation, and reculturation. The work by Parker and Selsky (2004) is helpful in informing a better understand of acculturation but is not robust enough for application to community engagement work involving nonprofit organizations and IHEs.

Conceptual models that consider the organizational culture dynamics of community-campus partnerships have emerged within the literature in recent decades;
however, these discussions more often than not make implicit reference to organizational culture. While these models often include discussion on dynamics such as leadership, mission, and values, there is often little (if any) explicit connection to a unique theory specific to community-campus partnerships and community engagement or an organizational culture theory that attends to the role of organizational sensemaking in describing partnership process. The lack of a theoretical framework comprehensive enough to include the nuances of community-campus partnerships is a gap in the literature on partnerships, organizational culture, and community engagement; this gap in the literature is directly linked with the choice of grounded theory as the methodology for this study.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Purpose of the Study

Community engagement and higher education have shared history in the United States that spans over three centuries, and a renaissance of interest in community-campus partnerships has emerged over the past three decades. A concomitant surge in efforts to reinvest in the service mission at many IHEs has been impacted by societal, political, and economic factors. As the push to partner has increased, there has been an intensification of interdisciplinary scholarship around community engagement outcomes, case studies of exemplar or showcase partnerships, and recommendations for best practices. What is deficient in the literature base is a theoretical model grounded in data that are rigorously collected and analyzed; a theoretical model that attends to the uniqueness of partnerships between IHEs and community organizations, particularly non-profit organizations.

The state of the literature around community-campus partnerships is largely descriptive in nature. Creswell (2007) asserts that the goal of grounded theory research is to interrogate the processes associated with a given phenomenon in such a way that goes further than an explanation that illustrates or describes. The purpose of this study is to systematically explore community-campus partnership perspectives held by key stakeholders in the community and in academia towards the objective of generating a theoretical model grounded in these data that provides empirical support for the development of practical, real-world guidance community-campus partnerships and contributes to the scholarly literature. This chapter provides a discussion on the study’s
research question and hypotheses; the ontological and epistemological assumptions of grounded theory; and the traditional grounded theory methodology inclusive of the purposive sampling process, the iterative data collection and analysis process, and the nature and intent of the interim and final products.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions that guided this study are: “What is the experience of community and academic stakeholders involved with community-campus partnerships?”, and “How are organizational culture dynamics, power, and trust experienced by community and academic stakeholders in community-campus partnerships?” Hypotheses emerged and were modified throughout the data collection and analysis process. This is in keeping with the characteristics of the grounded theory methodology, and the generation of hypotheses was tracked through the process of memoing (Glaser & Strauss, 1999).

Ontology and Epistemology

A key assumption of this study was that, despite immense variations in organizational culture and community engagement activities among contemporary IHEs and non-profit organizations, there are core dynamics, behaviors, activities, and concepts common to and shared on some level by all community-campus partnerships. Given this assumption, partnership process was viewed as a phenomenon that can be studied systematically so long as the analysis allows for variations in experience and meanings related to the core dynamics. Organizational culture was viewed as a
phenomenon best studied using an interpretive research methodology guided by philosophical underpinnings that recognize and value subjectivity. The nature of the research questions necessitated the use of qualitative methods because of the interest in gathering word data. Creswell’s (2007) discussion of the philosophical foundations of qualitative research addresses five major assumptions, summarized in Table 3.1 (columns one and two are taken from Creswell’s original “Table 2.1”, p. 17).

Table 3.1: Philosophical Foundations of Qualitative Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical Assumption</th>
<th>Philosophical Question</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>“What is the nature of reality?”</td>
<td>Focus on <strong>subjective reality</strong>: Participants experience reality differently, resulting in a variety of viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>“What is the relationship between the researcher and that being researched?”</td>
<td>Focus on <strong>participant as expert and researcher as collaborator</strong>: Minimize researcher-participant detachment and develop a collaborative spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axiological</td>
<td>“What is the role of values?”</td>
<td>Focus on <strong>recognizing and addressing bias inherent in research</strong>: Use of field notes and memoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical</td>
<td>“What is the language of research?”</td>
<td>Focus on <strong>terminology and standards unique to qualitative research and discuss findings using authentic voice</strong>: Maintain authenticity with the language of qualitative research, do not compare to other methodological standards for research rigor, use participants’ voices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological</td>
<td>“What is the process of research?”</td>
<td>Focus on <strong>inductive process that is emergent, organic, and dynamic</strong>: Use ‘bottom-up’ framework; modify guiding questions based on participants’ stories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As explained by Creswell (2007), there are two distinct forms of grounded theory – constructivist and traditional. Both approaches are interpretive in nature and involve qualitative research methods; however, differences in philosophical underpinnings highlight the better fit for the study is the traditional approach. These philosophical differences and the selection of the traditional approach to grounded theory are best explored through a brief discussion of sociological paradigms.

In their book *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*, Burrell and Morgan (1979) provide a framework for describing and understanding social phenomena using four distinct lenses referred to as paradigms. The Burrell and
Morgan paradigmatic framework came out of the authors’ work studying the organizational practice from a sociological perspective, and is a very helpful tool in guiding organizational practice, research, and interventions. A visual representation of these paradigms is provided in Figure 3.1. The horizontal continuum represents the view of reality (ontology) – ranging from absolute subjectivity on the left to absolute objectivity on the right. The vertical continuum represents the view on the goal of analysis activities – ranging from the objective of radical change on the top to the purpose of regulation on the bottom (referred to in the original text as the ‘sociology of radical change’ and the ‘sociology of regulation; see Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

![Figure 3.1: Visual Representation of the Burrell and Morgan (1976) paradigms](image)

Both the constructivist and traditional grounded theory approaches are placed along the regulation and subjective reality portions of the paradigm continua. The constructivist approach to grounded theory (sometimes referred to as the interpretivist approach) is highlighted by an increased focus on the story of the multiple realities expressed by participants as told through the voice of the researcher who is seen as a
co-creator of the story and a decreased focus on methodological procedures and the push for creating a mid-range theory (Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007; O’Connor, Netting, & Thomas, 2008). The traditional approach to grounded theory (sometimes referred to as the systematic or classical approach) focuses on the use of methodology as a way to ensure that the subjective experiences of the participants are integrated systematically within an inductive process towards the goal of generating a theory (Creswell, 2007; O’Connor, Netting, & Thomas, 2008). In Figure One, the ‘C’ and ‘T’ shapes indicate approximate placement of these two perspectives along the continua within the interpretive paradigm and the shapes symbolize the variation along the continua within these approaches.

Some scholars would place all studies labeled as traditional grounded theory in the functionalist paradigm given the positivistic overtones of objectivity and the discovery of reality in the early work of Glaser and Strauss (see Charmaz, 2006). It is the argument held by this study that such a viewpoint is made from a discrete and rigid view of the paradigms as boxes with thick and impermeable borders. The Burrell and Morgan (1976) paradigmatic framework continua allow for variation within paradigms and conceptualization of different approaches to the grounded theory (for examples of various approaches to grounded theory, see Morse, Noerager Stern, Corbin, Bowers, Charmaz, & Clarke, 2008). A traditional grounded theory study can be positioned within the interpretive paradigm so long as the philosophical assumptions of the paradigm and methods are consistent. The traditional approach to grounded theory was chosen for this study because the goal of the research study is to develop a theoretical framework grounded in the qualitative data that represents the shared and negative case
experiences of participants, and given the desire for a rigorous research methodology with established analytic procedures including parameters for evaluating the quality of the research process (Creswell, 2007; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Assessing Quality in Grounded Theory Research

The assessment of quality in ground theory research (and qualitative research in general) is discussed at length in the literature. At the core of the assessment of quality is the argument that qualitative research must be evaluated using standards and terminology unique to the methodology given that the process is not comparable to quantitative methods (Corbin & Strauss, 2007; Creswell, 2007). Contributions to this literature include procedures for ensuring quality in the research process as well as criteria for evaluating quality. While a variety of approaches exist, the set of criteria proposed by Corbin and Strauss (2008) for evaluating the quality of grounded theory research is paramount given the authors’ comprehensive way of linking the traditional grounded theory process with the methodological nuances of qualitative research (for a discussion on other approaches to evaluating quality in qualitative research see Creswell, 2007; Corbin & Strauss, 2007). Table 3.2 follows Creswell’s (2007) summary of the criteria for determining the quality of the research process. These criteria will be explicitly addressed with study data in Chapter four and are listed here to establish the framework for evaluating the credibility of this study and expectations around this study’s methodology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: Criteria for Evaluating Quality in the Grounded Theory Research Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Research Process</strong>¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1: “How was the original sample selected? What grounds?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2: “What major categories emerged?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3: “What were some of the events, incidents, actions, and so on (as indicators) that pointed to some of these major categories?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4: “On the basis of what categories did theoretical sampling proceed? Guide data collection?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5: “What were some of the hypotheses pertaining to conceptual relations (that is, among categories), and on what grounds were they formulated and tested?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6: “Were there instances when hypotheses did not hold up against what was actually seen? How were these discrepancies accounted for?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 7: “How and why was the core category selected (sudden, gradual, difficult, easy)?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Quality of the Study (theoretical grounding in the data)**¹ |
| Criterion 1: “Are concepts generated?” |
| Criterion 2: “Are the concepts systematically related?” |
| Criterion 3: “Are there many conceptual linkages, and are the categories well developed? With density?” |
| Criterion 4: “Is much variation built into the theory?” |
| Criterion 5: “Are the broader conditions built into its explanation?” |
| Criterion 6: “Has process (change or movement) been taken into account?” |

| **Quality of the Research Findings**² |
| Criterion 1: Fit – “Do the findings resonate/fit with the experience of both the professionals for whom the research was intended and the participants who took part in the study?” |
| Criterion 2: Applicability – “Do the findings offer new explanations or insights? Can they be used to develop policy, change practice, and add to the knowledge base of a profession?” |
| Criterion 3: Concepts – “How the findings are presented is not what is relevant. What is important is that the findings have substance, or that they must be something more than a mass of uninterpreted data that leave the reader trying to figure out what to make of it… should be developed in terms of their properties and dimensions so that there is density and variation.” |
| Criterion 4: Contextualization of Concepts – “Without context, the reader of research cannot fully understand why events occurred, why certain meanings and not others are ascribed to events, or why experiences were one way and not another.” |
| Criterion 5: Logic – “Is there a logical flow of ideas? Do the findings ‘make sense?’” |
| Criterion 6: Depth – “[I]t is the descriptive details that add the richness and variation and lift the findings out of the realm of the ordinary.” |
| Criterion 7: Variation – “Has variation been built into findings, meaning are there examples of cases that don’t fit the pattern or that show differences along certain dimensions or properties? By including variation, the research is demonstrating the complexity of human life.” |
| Criterion 8: Creativity – “Are the findings presented in a creative and innovative manner?” |
| Criterion 9: Sensitivity – “Did the researcher demonstrate sensitivity to the participants and to the data? ... In other words, did the analysis drive the research or was the research driven by some preconceived ideas or assumptions that were imposed on the data?” |
| Criterion 10: Evidence of Memos – “Memos should grow in depth and degree of abstraction as the research moves along. Thus, there should be some evidence or discussion of memos in the final report.” |

¹ Creswell, 2007, p. 216  
² Corbin & Strauss, 2007, pp. 305-307

**Accountability**

As a part of the overall plan for ensuring quality in this study, an auditing protocol was in place. Rodwell (1998, p. 199) explains that the auditor’s role is to provide an assessment of the “methodological processes, the data collected, and the subsequent
reconstructions derived from the analysis.” The auditor selected for this study has experience as an auditor, and is trained in qualitative methodology. The audit process commenced once the final report had been written. The researcher prepared all research materials for the audit including deidentified transcripts (with codes), artifacts (with codes), researcher's assessment of quality (as outlined in Table 4) and methodological notations that were made throughout in the analysis in the form of memos. These materials were provided to the auditor. The auditor started with an investigation of the raw data in order to certify that the audit trail exists and that it is sufficient (Rodwell, 1998). In doing so, the auditor was equipped to testify that the methodological procedures of the study are in keeping with the expectations for a grounded theory study (as established in Table Four). After the primary assessment of the existence of sufficient data and proper methodological procedures, the auditor followed the audit trail (which was established through the coding process) from the final report format back to the raw data unit. This process of reconstruction of data is essential in assessing the quality of the study since it interrogates the final product from a critical perspective that seeks to establish that the assertions made in the study are those of the study participants and not simply assumptions or opinions held by the researcher (Rodwell, 1998). In other words, the auditor set forth to interrogate that the theory developed in the study is indeed grounded in the data gathered through the interviews. Lastly, the auditor prepared a written report in which she outlines the steps taken during the audit, discusses the findings of the audit process (specifically as related to the assessment of sufficient data, methodological procedures, and reconstruction of data), and testifies to how well the results of the study represent the
sentiments conveyed in the raw data (Rodwell, 1998). The auditor’s report is included as Appendix F. The lead researcher’s assessment of quality in this study was submitted to the auditor as a part of the audit trail, and is provided below in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Researcher’s Assessment of Quality of the Research Process¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1: “How was the original sample selected? What grounds?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The study population includes partnerships formed between a public institution of higher education (IHE) and a community-based organization (non-profit, for-profit, or governmental) in which the IHE provides the start-up funding through an established grant process. In this study, the theoretical sampling process started with the identification of a set of established community-campus partnerships that each received grant funding during the time period of 2007-2009. There are two funding streams – one for community engagement projects/activities and one for community-based participatory research (CBPR) activities related to women’s health. The funding was granted by the IHE, required an application process, and was conceptualized as seed money for specified community-based program, service, research, and/or project. The IHE partner is a large, urban, Research I institution located in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The initial sample is theoretically relevant because of the diverse projects and topics, disciplinary/professional representations on partnership teams, and location of the project in urban, suburban, and rural areas. In addition to the diversity among projects represented by these partnerships and given that the unit of analysis in this study is the partnership itself, the researcher seek maximum variation by making sure that a variety of stakeholders from partner organizations are represented in the sample (i.e., faculty members, students, agency directors, service providers). It is important to clarify that only partnership representatives from the IHE and the community organization are included in the study, which means that service providers will be invited to participate but service recipients will not be included in the sample. One partnership was excluded from the sample due to conflict of interest because the faculty partner is the researcher’s dissertation chair and principal investigator on this study. Though theoretical saturation did occur within the realm of the stated initial sample, the original data plan allowed for extending sampling to partnerships involving other public IHEs and community-based organizations that receive initial funding from the IHE. The sample was extended in order to incorporate data from three such partnerships and thus strengthen rigor of the study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 2: “What major categories emerged?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were 47 categories that emerged from the axial coding phase of analysis. During the constant comparison process of selective coding, the number of categories was reduced to 36. The final stages of selective coding led to the emergence of five core themes. These themes are: A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built; Navigating the process of a partnership project; Goodness-of-fit for all involved; Resources; and Impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 3: “What were some of the events, incidents, actions, and so on (as indicators) that pointed to some of these major categories?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The major event that led to the emergence of these major categories was the discovery of the subject of the theory. The theory is about what it takes to sustain a partnership. Once this realization was made, it became clear that the five themes are the main categories that contribute to the understanding of what it takes to sustain a partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 4: “On the basis of what categories did theoretical sampling proceed? Guide data collection?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The theoretical sampling proceeded and data collection was guided by the categories that emerged during analysis and are documented in the memoing portions of each Contact Summary Sheet. Examples: “When a project is not sustained” encouraged the inclusion of participants who did not receive funding but did submit proposals, and “Student involvement” led to the inclusion of students as participants in the study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 5: “What were some of the hypotheses pertaining to conceptual relations (that is, among categories), and on what grounds were they formulated and tested?”

The hypotheses related to conceptual relations among categories were formulated during the analysis process (including in between interviews). These hypotheses are not listed here because they are included in the memoing included on the Contact Summary Sheets and the analysis tracking charts (contained in Sections Four and Five of this booklet). The hypotheses were tested by the researcher asking relevant questions in future interviews (see Contact Summary Sheets).

Criterion 6: “Were there instances when hypotheses did not hold up against what was actually seen? How were these discrepancies accounted for?”

Yes, there were instances when hypotheses did not hold up against what was actually seen. In those instances, the discrepancies were accounted for through the memoing process as a way to differentiate between hypotheses that ‘held up’ and those that ‘fell through’.

Criterion 7: “How and why was the core category selected (sudden, gradual, difficult, easy)?”

How: The core category (sustainability of a partnership) was selected gradually and the process was what I would describe as being moderately difficult. Once it became clear, though – it was a sudden and easy ‘moment’ in which the rest of the categories fell into place and made sense.

Why: The core category was selected because that is what the data support. The data do not support a theory about anything else such as any of the other categories. It the common thread that flows between the 29 interviews. It is the theme that pulls together all 1017 data units.

Quality of the Study (theoretical grounding in the data)

Criterion 1: “Are concepts generated?”

Yes. See Sections Four and Five of this booklet.

Criterion 2: “Are the concepts systematically related?”

Yes. See Section Four of this booklet and final report.

Criterion 3: “Are there many conceptual linkages, and are the categories well developed? With density?”

Yes. See Section Four of this booklet and final report.

Criterion 4: “Is much variation built into the theory?”

Yes. The study achieved maximum variation in numerous areas, including but not limited to: Variation among institution; community; profession/disciplinary affiliation; years of experience with and/or amount of time with any given partnership(s); satisfaction with any specific project, relationship, or funding process; and subject/topic of work done through partnership.

Criterion 5: “Are the broader conditions built into its explanation?”

Yes. When appropriate, notations are made in the final report in regards to the ‘big picture’ or broader conditions. Examples include the uniqueness of the IHE seed grant funding, discipline/profession specific expectations or requirements, and possible socio-political-historical contexts unique to time and place.

Criterion 6: “Has process (change or movement) been taken into account?”

Yes. Process is at the core of this theory. In terms of change and movement, notations are made in the final report in regards to relevant issues that might impact process as they came to light during this study.

Quality of the Research Findings

Criterion 1: Fit – “Do the findings resonate/fit with the experience of both the professionals for whom the research was intended and the participants who took part in the study?”

Yes. The audit trail establishes that the findings can be directly linked to the experiences of the participants who took part in the study. The final report establishes arguments regarding the fit among professionals for whom the research was intended (individuals and organizations involved with community-campus partnerships).

Criterion 2: Applicability – “Do the findings offer new explanations or insights? Can they be used to develop policy, change practice, and add to the knowledge base of a profession?”

Yes. These explanations and insights are included in the final report.

Criterion 3: Concepts – “How the findings are presented is not what is relevant. What is important is that the findings have substance, or that they must be something more than a mass of uninterpreted data that leave the reader trying to figure out what to make of it... should be developed in terms of their properties and dimensions so that there is density and variation.”
Yes. The final report contains a thick, rich description of the theory. The findings are developed, and are to be seen as dense descriptions of, and with variation found therein, the categories, sub-themes, and themes that contribute to the theory.

**Criterion 4: Contextualization of Concepts** – “Without context, the reader of research cannot fully understand why events occurred, why certain meanings and not others are ascribed to events, or why experiences were one way and not another.”

Comprehensive contextualization to facilitate the reader’s conceptualization of the concepts is provided in the written version of the dissertation research study (in particular, the first two chapters).

**Criterion 5: Logic** – “Is there a logical flow of ideas? Do the findings ‘make sense’?”

Yes. There is a logical flow. The findings do ‘make sense’. The thick, rich descriptions of the theory provide this flow, and the final report’s diagrams enhance the understanding of flow.

**Criterion 6: Depth** – “[I]t is the descriptive details that add the richness and variation and lift the findings out of the realm of the ordinary.”

There are great amount of descriptive details provided in the thick, rich description of the theory and its components. Quotations are provided when appropriate to illustrate the findings in order to ‘lift the findings’.

**Criterion 7: Variation** – “Has variation been built into findings, meaning are there examples of cases that don’t fit the pattern or that show differences along certain dimensions or properties? By including variation, the research is demonstrating the complexity of human life.”

Yes. There are examples of cases that don’t fit the pattern or show a difference along the dimension supported by the majority of the cases. This sort of variation is indicated in the audit trail through memoing and is disseminated as a part of the thick, rich description of the theory. There is no variation so disparate or divergent, though, to justify the creation of a minority report or negative case study.

**Criterion 8: Creativity** – “Are the findings presented in a creative and innovative manner?”

Yes. While this is a subjective parameter for quality, it is the lead researcher’s contention that the “Sustaining the Partnership” workshop is a creative way to further describe the findings. By designing the intervention based on the study’s findings, the lead researcher has completed the methodological requirements of a traditional grounded theory study because she has provided a thick, rich explanation of how the theory concepts (themes, sub-themes, categories) are related to one another.

**Criterion 9: Sensitivity** – “Did the researcher demonstrate sensitivity to the participants and to the data? ... In other words, did the analysis drive the research or was the research driven by some preconceived ideas or assumptions that were imposed on the data?”

Yes. The analysis was the driving force behind the research process. The research was not driven by preconceived ideas or assumptions imposed on the data. When necessary, the lead researcher would memo and/or talk with the dissertation chair to discuss any notions that might impact this.

**Criterion 10: Evidence of Memos** – “Memos should grow in depth and degree of abstraction as the research moves along. Thus, there should be some evidence or discussion of memos in the final report.”

Yes. Memoing is demonstrated in the Contact Summary Sheets and tracking chart provided in this booklet.

¹ Creswell, 2007, p. 216
² Corbin & Strauss, 2007, pp. 305-307

**Traditional Grounded Theory Methodology**

An overview of the methodological processes of this study is provided in Figure 3.2. As indicated in the visual representation, three processes are interrelated and inform one another. Sampling, data collection and analysis, and the development of provisional categories are concurrent activities in grounded theory. Once the data
reach a point of saturation, an interim product of grounded theory is developed through the explication of robust categories. Lastly, the final product of grounded theory is the explication of a theoretical framework that describes the relationship between these categories.

**Figure 3.2: Visual Representation of the Methodological Processes of the Study**

*Theoretical Sampling*

The sampling process in grounded theory is *theoretically driven* (analogous with *purposive sampling*). The sampling process was driven by the emerging theoretical framework, and the researcher began the sampling process by asking herself *where will I get the best information possible that has the greatest potential for developing theory in this area of study?* (Locke, 2008). As the data were being collected, the researcher refined the sampling process in direct response to what was being learned from these data as it relates to developing themes, concepts, and theory (Locke, 2001a, 2001b, 2008; Creswell, 2007; Glaser & Strauss, 1999). *Maximum variation*, the search for a diverse assortment of different experiences related to the area study, was desired given
that a goal of the grounded theory study is not to generalize the phenomenon and express as a universally experienced one. The goal of sampling was to gain information on the variation of experiences in such a way that highlights the complex dimensions of the phenomenon. Sample size was not a set value because the researcher collects data until theoretical saturation has been reached. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) submission paperwork required a sample size value, and as such the researcher listed the value as approximately 20-60 along with a notation referring to the methodology section of the submission. The final sample size for this study was 29 individuals.

The study population included partnerships formed between a public IHEs and a community-based organization (non-profit, for-profit, or governmental) in which the IHE provided the start-up funding through an established grant process. In this study, the theoretical sampling process started with the identification of a set of established community-campus partnerships that each received grant funding during the time period of 2007-2009. There were two funding streams – one for community engagement projects/activities and one for community-based participatory research (CBPR) activities related to women’s health. The funding was granted by the IHE, required an application process, and was conceptualized as seed money for specified community-based program, service, research, and/or project. The primary IHE partner was a large, urban, Research I institution located in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The initial sample was theoretically relevant because of the diverse projects and topics, disciplinary/professional representations on partnership teams, and location of the project in urban, suburban, and rural areas.
In addition to the diversity among projects represented by these partnerships and given that the unit of analysis in this study is the partnership itself, it was crucial that the researcher seek maximum variation by making sure that a variety of stakeholders from partner organizations are represented in the sample (i.e., faculty members, students, agency directors, service providers). Only partnership representatives from the IHE and the community organization were included in the study, which means that service providers were invited to participate but service recipients were not included in the sample. One partnership was excluded from the initial sample due to conflict of interest because the faculty partner was the lead researcher’s dissertation chair and principle investigator on this study. While it was not initially anticipated, it was determined that should theoretical saturation not occur within the realm of the stated initial sample, then the original data plan involves the possibility to extend sampling to partnerships involving other public IHEs and community-based organizations that receive initial funding from the IHE.

The sample includes representatives of four IHEs, which are classified as: Four-year public university with very high research activity and graduate programs (two IHEs), four-year private not-for-profit college with only undergraduate programs (one IHE), and four-year public university with undergraduate and some graduate programs (one IHE). Some participants spoke of their experiences with other partnerships, which resulted in some data reflecting participation in partnerships while affiliated with another IHE. The community organizations represented in this study consist of non-profit community-based organizations, educational organizations (for profit and non-profit), and governmental units. The campus departments and units represented in this study
include disciplines from the humanities, visual and performing arts, engineering sciences, medical sciences, health sciences, and social sciences; and professional programs represented include social work, nursing, education, business and management, and public health.

Upon human subjects approval through the IRB, initial contact letters were sent to the potential participants (Appendix A). These letters were sent electronically using contact information provided by the research team that recently conducted an internet-based impact study with this population. The present research study was referenced at the end of the internet survey, and this link to another university-sponsored study was indicated in the recruitment letters. In keeping with the goals of theoretical sampling, participants throughout the study were asked if they were aware of other individuals who might be interested in the study and/or might provide a different viewpoint on the partnership experience. The individuals referred to the study were contacted using the same letter. The initial plan included the provision that if the researcher felt that additional clarification or information was needed from a participant already interviewed, then a follow-up interview would be scheduled using a mutually convenient modality (in-person, telephone, internet).

There was minimal risk to participating in this research study; however, a request was being made to the IRB to waive documentation of consent. The waiver of documentation of consent was granted for the associated approved IRB protocol for the previously mentioned impact study, and as explained in the approved protocol this request is justified because “...[t]here is minimal risk to participating in this study, It is understood that community partners may be hesitant to provide less than satisfactory
reports of [institutional] involvement in their community, as they may be concerned about future funding potential, but the potential for learning better ways of engaging the community is far too valuable to not ask [sic] for this information” (IRB# HM12700, Version #2, 2.22.10, p. 8). Since there was a waiver of documentation of consent, the researcher did not send an electronic thank you for participation in the study. Instead, the researcher provided a pre-printed thank you letter to each participant at the end of the interview (in-person or via postal mail if interview is not conducted in person). The actual thank you letter did not have the participant’s name on it (see Appendix A for thank you letter text).

The researcher knew that she was approaching theoretical saturation when she began to sense that participants were no longer providing new information and contributions to the developing categories. When the researcher felt that she was approaching theoretical saturation, she initially consulted with her dissertation chair to discuss the process. She then contacted other members of the dissertation committee to notify of the theoretical saturation process.

The Iterative and Recursive Process of Data Collection and Data Analysis

The data in this study were gathered through observations, interviews, and artifacts. Observations were made during interviews, and recorded through field notes. Participants were able to select between in-person interviews or web-based interviews made possible through the use of webcams and free web programs. A third interview modality, phone interview, was not preferable since nonverbal cues cannot be assessed, but it was offered as an option when in-person and web-based interviews were not possible for or convenient to the participant. As indicated in the consent form,
the participants were asked if the interview could be digitally recorded, and taping of the interview could be denied by participants at any point. Participants were also given the option to have the recording stopped (and restarted if desired) at any point during the interview with the understanding that the researcher would continue to record via note taking. The researcher had experience with interview note taking (of unrecorded one-on-one interviews and focus groups) from previous qualitative research and evaluation studies. These experiences strengthened her skill set with the process, so if participants did not authorize recording then note taking did ensue in lieu of taping.

The interview in a grounded theory study must allow for emergence of topics and ideas necessary in a recursive process, and should not be prescriptive or rigid because doing so would bound the participant’s experiences (Corbin & Strauss, 2007; Rodwell, 1998). The interview protocol for each interview contained a series of open-ended guiding questions that were accompanied by prompts. Participants were engaged in a conversation regarding their community-campus partnership experiences through an interview process that was guided by open-ended questions. These guiding questions were formulated to be value-neutral so as to not influence participant subjectivity. As discussed by Rodwell (1998), the interview itself is to be conversational in nature in order to allow for fluidity in dialogue, and the interview protocol is viewed as an interview or conversational guide. Given the emergent research design necessary in a grounded theory study, the interview guide was emergent in its composition since the concurrent processes of data collection and analysis necessitate changes, additions, and subtractions to be made to the original protocol. The initial interview guide is included
as Appendix C to reflect initial guiding questions and prompts, and the record of how the interview guide evolved (including memos) is included as Appendix D.

After each interview, digital recordings were transcribed by the researcher in order to stay close with the data and field notes (of observations and notes of any unrecorded interviews) are extended. If the interview was not recorded, then the researcher would extend the field notes. A contact summary sheet was developed for each data source (Creswell, 2007; Locke, 2001a, 2001b, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rodwell, 1998). The purpose of the contact summary sheet is indexing, or to begin the process of summarizing key themes and issues (Locke, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994). The contact summary sheet became a vessel for the analytic memoing process. Memoing consisted of thoughts, ideas, notes, and reflections regarding methodological decisions, category formation process, and interview guide changes (Locke, 2008). Given that some of the interviews were conducted via internet web-camera conference and by telephone, it is recognized that a potential limitation of this study might be the inability for the lead researcher to pick up on non-verbal cues, responses, and gestures that might have been useful if noted in a face-to-face interview.

As sources of data were collected, the data analysis cycle included the recurrent processes of unitizing, naming, and categorizing. The process of unitizing involved the researcher reading through field notes of the interview to identify units that “[could] be understood by someone with minimal knowledge or experience with the phenomenon under investigation” (Rodwell, 1998, p. 155; referred to as “chunking” by Locke, 2001a, 2001b, 2008). In other words, a unit provided a unique sentiment, thought, or idea
about the topic being discussed by the participant that could be understood when taken out of the context of the remainder of the interview while at the same time being understood by a person who is not familiar with the context. In grounded theory research the general rule is to ‘chunk’ out a unit that encapsulates a single action or thought (Locke, 2008).

The *naming* of the units took place during the ‘first pass’ with the data units, which is referred to in this study as *open coding*, when names/labels were developed to stand for the sentiment, idea, thought, or topic being expressed in the raw data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Locke, 2001a, 2001b, 2008; Rodwell, 1998). The participant identification portion of the coding system was structured in a way that references the partnership and stakeholder type, as well as the topic label. The coding key for the partnerships is known only to the researcher in order to protect confidentiality. A ‘second pass’ of the data and codes is referred to as *axial coding*, which took place as the researcher categorized named units into general groups representing the emerging themes of similar sentiments (Glasser & Strauss, 1999; Rodwell, 1998). The ‘third pass’ at the data is referred to as *selective coding*, and this involved the process of comparing and contrasting the relationship between and among categories. This process is conducted through *constant comparison*, which involved placing related units within the same grouping of emergent theme categories (*lumping* process), evaluating the data units and names in relation to one another (*sorting* process), and then repeating the *lumping and sorting* process until the categories’ relationships with one another becomes clear and the core categories emerge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1999; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Locke, 2001a, 2001b, 2008; Rodwell, 1998). It is
at this point that the researcher revisited the *provisional categories* to ensure that the categories do not repeat one another in terms of content and that the themes themselves are not redundant and do not take place at multiple levels of abstraction; this process led to the collapsing of some emergent themes into subcategories within the dominant categories in such a way that illustrates the relationship between core categories and subcategories (Locke, 2008; Rodwell, 1998).

As grounded theory methodology involves an iterative process, the analysis did not occur in one ‘sweep’ and there were times when the data categories were revised and reconceptualized during the constant comparison process. Assisting in this process was the previously referenced *analytic memos*; these notes helped guide the researcher because they indicated the ‘where, when, why, who, etc.’ of methodological decision-making (Locke, 2008).

Some researchers find it helpful to enter field notes and memos into qualitative data analysis software to aid in the constant comparison process. There is a misconception among some unfamiliar with these programs that these types of software enhance or otherwise improve data analysis because the computer ‘does’ the analysis for the researcher. Instead, software is a way to use technology to facilitate the corraling of data during a process guided by the researcher. In this study, several qualitative analysis programs were considered as aids in analyzing and visualizing interview data, artifacts, observations and memos. After careful consideration, the determination was made by the researcher that the best fit for the study was the use of Atlas.ti software because of the beneficial functions related to transcription, memoing, coding, and the networking function related to category development and
conceptualization. Table 3.4 summarizes the use of Atlas.ti functions during the analysis process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Phase</th>
<th>Atlas.ti Function Utilized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open coding</td>
<td>&quot;Code&quot; function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial coding</td>
<td>&quot;Family&quot; function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective coding</td>
<td>&quot;Family&quot; and &quot;Super Family&quot; functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>&quot;Networking&quot; function used to assist with building diagrams based on researcher-defined parameters, but Microsoft Publisher was used for final display because it allowed for more flexibility and customization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of Robust Categories and the Theoretical Model – Interim and Final Products

As the provisional categories develop in a grounded theory study, increased clarity took place regarding what the developing theory was about and how the categories might be related to one another (Locke, 2001b). Once solidified, the researcher referred to these categories as themes, to the categories that contribute to the major themes as sub-themes, and to the categories that contribute to the sub-themes as categories. Through the practice of constant comparison, the researcher knew that she had reached the point of theoretical saturation when new data did not yield new contributions to the categories (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1999; Locke, 2001a, 2001b, 2008; Rodwell, 1998). Upon discussion with the dissertation chair, the researcher expanded the sample to make sure that the provisional categories ‘held up’. The additions to the sample did contribute to the existing provisional categories and did not introduce new or contradictory information. At this point it was considered that the robust categories had formed, and the sampling process came to an end (Locke, 2001a, 2001b, 2008; Rodwell, 1998).
The interim product of this study is a description of the robust categories that is illustrated by specific examples from the data (Locke, 2008). A grounded theory study falls short if the process ends at this point because it is not enough to simply develop categories. The researcher must undergo a separate analysis process in order to describe how the categories relate to one another, and the researcher completes this process in order to produce the grounded theory (Locke, 2008; O'Connor, Netting, & Thomas, 2008). The final product of this study conveys the story of the data as expressed by the robust categories and their relationships with one another. In grounded theory, the final product format honors the emergent design process and is not determined a priori. In whatever form it takes (such as a story or diagram with discussion), the final product must articulate the theoretical framework through illustration of the nuances, propositions, and relationships between concepts within a theoretical model that are grounded in the data. The next chapter begins with the interim product through the discussion of the themes (robust categories) that make up the theory; followed by the final product which explores the relationship among the themes that make up the theory as expressed in the format that emerged as appropriate for honoring these data.
Chapter Four: Findings

Interim Product: The Grounded Theory and Description of the Five Themes

Introduction to the Grounded Theory

The theory that emerged from the data in this study is about what it takes to sustain partnerships between community and campus organizations. A sustained project, collaboration or relationship should not be confused with a sustained partnership because the data from the study indicate that a partnership encompasses the totality of interactions between partner organizations over time while the use of terms such as project, collaboration and relationship might only refer to a specific encounter that is oftentimes time limited and/or specific to an initiative. Surely a partnership can be time-limited and initiative-specific; however, the majority of participants in this study indicate that the partnership between community and IHE organizations is similar to looking at the big picture and as such provides a context within which projects, collaborations and relationships occur. In other words, the data do suggest that projects, organizational collaborations and relationships between individual partners are oftentimes important element of a sustained organization-level relationship. Nonetheless, instances occur when an individual participant indicates his/her intent not to pursue the project or the relationship with the particular community organization or organizational representative. In these cases there is always a caveat that there is still a desire to partner with other individuals and groups within the department, unit, institutions or organization.
The paramount concern among those who participated in this study is sustaining the partnership between the partner organizations. *Sustainability* was a category in the data analysis until this revelation occurred. Once it was determined that this was a theory about sustainability best told as the story of what it takes to sustain partnerships, the category was collapsed into component categories. Appendix G tracks this and other analytical decision making as it relates to the development of the final categories and the position of these categories as the final themes, sub-themes and categories of this theory. The final five themes found in this theory are: A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built; navigating the process of a partnership project; goodness-of-fit for all involved; resources; and impact. The themes are listed and discussed in the order in which they were discovered within the grounded theory process. Appendix H provides the full list of codes that contribute to each theme.

*Theme One: A strong Foundation Upon Which the Relationship is Built*

This theme was the first to emerge from the data analysis process because it became clear that participants perceived that a strong foundation that focuses on the quality of the relationship between the partners is critical to the work done between partnerships organizations. The theme addresses the question, “What does it take to sustain a partnership in terms of having a strong foundation upon which the relationship is built?” There are two main components, or sub-themes, within this theme: relationship building and relationship dynamics. There are two main contributing categories for the sub-theme *relationship building*, and there are three main contributing categories for the sub-theme *relationship dynamics*. Figure 4.1 provides an overview of
the components of this theme, including the relationship between categories and sub-themes that make up theme one.
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**Figure 4.1: Diagram of Theme One**

*Relationship building.*

*Relationship building,* which sets the stage for the *relationship dynamics,* is at the core of the foundation for partnerships as it is a core contributor to this foundation. This is the getting-to-know-you stage of the partnership. Entry to the community or campus is the first step in building the relationship. Some partners take the initiative to do the connecting and introductions, “I already knew the community partners. And they are people I have worked with. So it didn’t stimulate me to get to know community partners because I already knew that - I already knew them.” Many times, third parties introduce community and campus partners.
I went to them because someone from my department asked that I contact them because they were interested in what we did and what our model was all about and they really identified [specialized area] as being a real big issue for them.

Regardless of the modality of introduction, the process of entry into the community is facilitated by partners getting to know one another through expressing common interests and establishing intent for working together around this interest. Relationship building clearly does not happen overnight, and gaining entry into the community often involves more than a simple expression of interest. “I had to foster a relationship with the community stakeholders… and it took time.” As the campus partner indicates, saying that one is interested in partnering is not sufficient when there is a need to discuss intent. Because of this, it is clear that relationship building is not a simple or fast process. But it is worth the effort for partners who have a strong and genuine intent to work together: “I really care about [research trajectory] among [this population] so it is worth it to me to take the time.” As another campus partner explains,

The first couple times you do it there seems to be a lot of footwork up front and a lot of other work up front. But once you have the initial relationship established - I mean, I know that for me this project took a lot more work than I thought to set up, but now that we have the relationship established, I know that we have been back to work with them several times.

The sense of history shared between the partner organizations impacts the foundation of a partner relationship because it provides a framework for partnering. When partners express a sense of history with the other organization they do so in a way that describe what it means to share a history. “Well, we have a very long and still growing relationship with [the university]. So this partnership has been going for a long time. It is an example of an above-and-beyond commitment.” As another community partner explains, “Oh yeah, oh yeah. The university has been a partner with us from the beginning almost.” Regardless of the duration, the important element to consider when
looking at the sense of history is the meaning of that history. One participant describes that earlier partnership initiatives were not as meaningful for the community organization:

…other involvements we've had with [the university] have been perhaps more research oriented in nature such as clinical trials for experimental drugs, you know, like that goes back to the late 80s and early 90s… that was not as well suited I think… so it was really a mismatch but they were very nice.

Another account of history between organizations that was not always meaningful explores how, “we were like window dressing - we were brought in when [the university] would get a grant and it would be like… a thrown together advisory group, then [the university] gets the money, and then that’s it.“ The participant went on to discuss how much more impactful the more-recent initiatives were because the modern history now being written is built on the type of mutual benefit discussed previously.

It is interesting to note that very few campus partners talk about having a sense of history with the partner organization. For community partners, a shared history is often part of a strong foundation for a relationship and it is often shared with the university and is not always shared with only one individual on the campus. Community partners who had negative experiences with a campus partner in their organization’s partnership history were quick to note that there had also been successes in their history, and as such the overall impact of the history was positive.

Another important element in building a strong foundation for a partnership through relationship building is the conceptualization and approach to partnering, which is an element that campus and community partners describe as being one of a ‘reality check’. The approach to partnering informs the building of a strong relationship. Campus partners discuss the importance of conceptualizing and approaching
partnerships in a way that employs a community-based mindset or model. There is not a specific, definitive name or terms that is commonly used to describe this approach, but ‘community based research’ and ‘community partner model’ were most common. What is important in relation to the strong foundation upon which the relationship is built is to recognize that, just as history has value for a community partner, a specific approach to partnering has value for campus partners. Part of this approach is about being up front regarding the intent to partner.

They were able to understand the community partner model and so while it wasn’t something that was purely driven by them and asked for… in order to get as much community engagement and input as we could they made recommendations for things… and so they were very, very good about trying to engage the community at every level to make sure that we could do the research.

As illustrated in the previous quotation, some partnerships are more participatory than others in terms of the involvement of the community partner in developing a project. The approach to partnering is about the community being involved in planning and decision-making as a negotiation process, and is also a matter of approaching the partnership with a mindset that something new can and will be learned. As one campus partner describes,

[campus partners] may be the expert on the research side of things but they are not the expert on the community side of things. So you need to show respect and recognize that you are going to learn something whether you plan to or expect to or not.

An approach to partnering that facilitates building a strong foundation for the partner relationship is one that is characterized by being realistic in one’s conceptualization of the project and even of the future initiatives that might unfold later in the partnership. In terms of research initiatives, a community partner points out the ways that a realistic mindset interplays with a community-based research model:
One of the biggest barriers to replicating this program is the medical model of how you are supposed [participant puts fingers into ‘quotes’] to do research. Even working with the [specific] department at [the university] there is a sense of it being a barrier when we talk about other volunteers. Like they can’t control our volunteers coming in from the [community] so they’re not so interested in continuing because of that. So there may be some resistance from [the campus partners] when we start to bring in some volunteers from [the community]...

Just as the realistic approach to partnering encourages campus partners to realize the loss of control that comes with the territory of conducting community-based research, there might be a reality check needed in terms of a specific project or study,

I would say that you need to be realistic about the scope of the study, what you hope to accomplish... you need to plan for unexpected things, like the funding getting cut and having to take time to rework the project before you get started.

Another component of the conceptualization and approach to partnering has to do with the responsibilities of campus partners to be mindful of and realistic about their impact on the organizational level in terms of promoting positive interactions with community organizations:

I do think that the [university] researchers who are doing this type of research do have an obligation to foster good relationships. Whether that is a continued relationship or whether it is to kind of recognize that this isn’t working out and just kind of leave with a mutual respect and a mutual understanding - I think that’s an obligation that the researchers have because they are members of the [university] research community. So I think that’s an important thing to have. And see this is more theoretical than about my actual type of the experience.

By keeping in mind the importance of positive interactions for the benefit of the overall university, campus partners adopt an approach to partnering that enables them to engage in individual level relationship building that also can impact the organizational level relationship.

Throughout the relationship building process, the way that partners interact on the individual level is oftentimes the deciding factor for success. “The people are what makes it successful - who they are and how they connect.” When there is an
interpersonal connection, there is space for a strong foundation to be built for the partnership. This human connection factor is described by partners as “a natural fit” among individuals with “a special set of personality traits”. Not surprisingly, the essence of the human connection factor is impacted and facilitated by the other elements of this theme. For one community partner, the relationship was built on positive experiences up front with the campus partner: “[T]he professor was very supportive, very energetic, and very interested”. In that example, the campus partner’s approach to partnering, communication, and cooperation contributed to the relationship building efforts.

Community partners want more than pleasantries for a strong relationship. It is important to set the stage about the balance of control from the start. Relationship building activities ought to provide indications of intent for the project and open-mindedness to share the responsibilities of the future projects or initiatives.

I think I would just stress the importance of relationship building with the community group. That is so important. Because if they had listened to my expertise about this population and these services, then the project would have been more successful and might still be going on. But they didn’t ask me. They just had an idea, decided to do it here, asked for permission, I signed the form, and then found out that we got [funding to support project]. There should have been some consultation prior to [writing funding proposal]. And maybe there was room for more assertiveness. It just seems like that is the way this whole thing works - and there’s not much control on our end.

The issue of balance is made possible through the open communication previously discussed. For example, a campus partner explores the active and concerted effort taken in one partnership in regards to relationship building:

There is a lot of respect in the partnership, and the dynamics work well. We have a vision and mission statement for the partnership, and we know that we need a conflict resolution piece but we haven’t done that yet. But the vision and mission have been established for the partnership. We have a shared passion for this population and the services being provided.
There is not a specific moment when the relationship is no longer being built, but as the preceding quotation might suggest, there is a point in time when the stage has been set so that the dynamics of the relationship are put into play.

*Relationship dynamics.*

The focus of *relationship dynamics* is on how the intangible elements established in relationship building are acted out vis-à-vis tangible, demonstrated elements. After the initial period of getting to know one another, partners indicate that a sense of comfort emerges that allows the partnership to proceed. “You could be doing this for twenty years and it is just that people sense that people get about your comfort level with this work.” Campus partners without a large number of years of experience engaging in community-based work express that there are ways to enhance this comfort level through interactions with others on campus with similar interests. “I felt like it was a really positive and natural fit for the project, and so I felt positive with it moving forward. It was scary enough [getting started]... it was especially good to have him involved because he has so much experience, he is such a great [professional] and a good person.” It is important that partners demonstrate comfort with the prospect of partnering as well as with the potential tasks and initiatives associated with partnering. Frequently, partners express their own comfort and get cues regarding their partner’s level of comfort through communications with one another.

*Communication between partners* is part of the relationship dynamics in a partnership, and contributes to the strong foundation for partnerships because it provides an opportunity for partners to explore project expectations and discuss dynamics of the project. Open communication and listening are core components of a
successful approach to communication within the partnership because it provides a framework for future interactions. A community partner explains how listening is key when a faculty partner enters the community, “they need to listen to us because we are here every day.” While campus partners may know a great deal about and be viewed as experts on the population or phenomenon that is at the core of the partnership project, they must listen to the community partners who are working within the community. The partner organizations’ leaders are not the only individuals who need to be included in the communication. It is important to make sure that pertinent information be communicated to direct service staff, practitioners and students. While it is an important consideration for project consistency and success, it is also a way to make sure that the partnership leaders are listening to feedback that might improve the project.

We were good at handling communication issues between the administration at the agency and our research team, but staff communication with research study staff was not handled well. The staff were not always understanding what we were doing and how that impacted what they were doing. If there were more regular staff meetings, that would have helped… that is an example of how better communication between the research team and the staff would help.

The time to begin listening and communicating openly among all members of the partnership team is right away. “Make sure that you have conversations up front with your partner - have these conversations early.” Since expectations are formulated before the project or initiative may even start, it is crucial to have an open discussion about the partnership before these expectations become unmet objectives. “[M]ake sure up front that you talk with everyone and know where they are up front, what they’re thinking. Because we thought we were on the same page with [campus partner], but apparently we weren’t.” The goals of effective communication are numerous, “keeping
everybody on board, making sure you’re addressing the needs of all of your partners and constituents.” Another participant concurs,

I think being absolute [sic] open… also each partner’s interest in each bit - they’re in it for a reason and so they’re interested in ‘that’ and so when you talk to that partner you need to talk to them about ‘that’… they had different goals from each other. And that was okay because the same program met both goals.

So long as the partners utilize open communication, the needs and expectations can be out in the open and can help inform future communication about the status of a project or the next step for an initiative. The communication can be of excellent quality but is of no use if it is not timely, as one participant explains: “there was open communication for the most part, but it was oftentimes delayed in getting to us.” The frequency and timing of communication is as important as the delivery and style. “Constant communication is always something great to have.” Similar to the sentiment that staff members ought to be included in communication efforts, it is important that communication be disseminated in such a way that it allows for participants to feel as though they are ‘in the loop’. “[Make] sure that the people that you are having involved in this are aware of what’s going on and know what to expect.” Communication makes it possible to take the relationship and/or project to the next step, and ultimately is a tool for building the foundation for a sustainable relationship.

Quality and frequency of communication in the partnership are expressions of the level of reciprocity and cooperation found in the partnership. Indeed, frequent communication facilitates the flow of information regarding needs of the partners. Once the needs are communicated, a solid foundation for a sustainable relationship necessitates attention to the give-and-take aspect of the relationship and project. Reciprocity and cooperation are a part of the dynamics of the partnership relationship.
represented by the give-and-take. Sometimes it is as simple as sharing responsibilities for traveling to each other’s location for partner meetings. Other times the give-and-take is more conceptual in nature. As a campus partner describes, it can be challenging on an individual level to navigate what to give and what to give up in terms of the focus of the partners:

> [I]t is very important from the beginning to have a very clear focus on what it is that you are trying to do in community engagement and recognizing that the focus is different than the focus really is on a research process.

At other times, the give-and-take is very tactile and has to do with discovering ways that the same role or activity can meet multiple partners’ needs.

> It is a give-and-take process. What I mean by that is… an example would be the students. Sure, we get a lot of benefit from them being here and they do a lot of wonderful work for us; but the students get a lot out of being here too. You know, I’ve read some pretty powerful reflection papers and just end-of-semester papers from students they’ve written because of the experiences that they have had there have been some very transformative experiences that they have had here. That feels to me like it is a two-way street.

If one partner organization is giving and the other partner organization is not receptive to what they are giving, then there is most certainly a breakdown in the basic reciprocal agreement. An example of a time when cooperation and reciprocity do work well is explained by a community partner, who explores the relationship with medical campus partners,

> It works both ways – [faculty partners] know about us and when they have a patient that could benefit from our services then they will refer to us. So we’re helping [partner institution] by decreasing the number of uninsured patients who come to their hospital and physicians who help us do so by volunteering their time and expertise to our causes.

Part of give-and-take is making sure that all partners benefit from the partnership endeavors. Making mutual benefit part of the foundation for the relationship might be a surprise for some community partners. As this campus partner expresses, it can
sometimes be a paradigm shift for community partners to be pushed toward a framework of mutual benefit:

[W]ell I know that one thing I really stressed out a lot about up front when we first started working was “how is this going to help you?” and you know “this is community based participatory research and so you need to be getting something out of it too!”. And so when we started it was like “whatever you want to do that’s okay with us so do whatever you want to do” and then… it was like “whatever you want us to do” but then we were like “no, no, it is community participatory research and you’re going to get something out of this!

The idea that mutual benefit and reciprocity is a given and that these are core components of the partnership is not always included in the expectations held by partners. Sometimes this can be attributed to the actual or stereotypical way that partnerships have played out the past between communities and campuses.

Trust is a relationship dynamics that is attributed to continued open dialogue, and the impact of trust is immense: “If we, if we destroy the trust between the college and the community, then there is no partnership.” For some partners, building trust is a relationship dynamic that means reaching outside of the partner-to-partner relationship and being willing to extend goodwill on behalf of the organization and partnership if that is what is needed for the continued success of the partnership. “[The population of interest in the partnership] is a collectivistic culture and so it was important that I be involved with the community leaders as well as with the community.” In this case, the partnership could not achieve full potential without the faculty partner reaching out beyond the walls of the community organization and into the community. By being flexible and open-minded about what it takes to grow the partnership, partners are able to build trust among key stakeholders and make sure that the needs of the partner organization continue to be met.
We try to be very pliable here and very open - yeah, we try to be very flexible with the exception of the hours we have to offer. And those are what they are. But otherwise we try to be very flexible and work with individuals.

Being cognizant of the individual partner follow-through is an important component of trust within the relationship dynamics. “As things are developing, you might settle it in your mind that you are going to do “x”, but [sighs] you can often get sidetracked.” Being sidetracked is oftentimes a normal and even expected occurrence, though it is important to address and rectify any deviation that becomes a detrimental element to the partnership. In the same way that the level of comfort with partnering fosters trust in the relationship, so does a track record of following through with commitments. It is not reasonable to think that all partners will be working on partnership tasks at all times and with a consistent amount of attention. As with most relationships, there comes a time in partnerships when partners lose steam. “It is really hard to keep up motivation and to keep the group motivated when you are also trying to keep yourself motivated.” In cases like these, it is important that there is a balance in the relationship.

In a partnership project or initiative, dynamics related to trust are important elements to cultivate given the reality of responsibilities for the partnership. “[I]t wasn’t all about what we were doing for coordinating the partnership it was about us overseeing what was going on layers down. And so we couldn’t manage, necessarily, every aspect of the project.” When one partner needs to be away from the partnership or is overwhelmed by the partnership, all is not lost. Refining the dynamics of the relationship throughout the course of a project or initiative is a way to address the inevitable ebb and flow. “We trust each other - we’re very aware of each others’
agendas and we’re respectful of that whenever we discuss something. We have a negotiated agenda.”

Equality among partners is an imperative relationship dynamic to consider when building a strong foundation for the relationship. One community partner illustrates the differential that is often the case in these partnerships: “[T]hey were the “800 pound gorilla and we’re a little agency.” The differential in size, financial resources, and influence in the community are some of the dynamics that make partnering with a campus both appealing and intimidating to a community partner. The feeling of disparity is reduced when steps are taken within the relationship to highlight the uniqueness and essentialness of what each partner brings to the partnership. “The one big thing [that made a difference] was just having that awareness going in that we were both equal partners and that we both had something to bring to the table.” For some partnerships, what is being brought into the partnership is not always a tangible resource such as money or products. Services and access to a specific community or population are equally as important dynamics in a partner relationship.

So this was really different. He was the one bringing almost everything to the table. But even though he had the access to the literature, the research, the resources and the money - I never felt like I was being taken advantage of or anything like that. Even though he brought so much to the table, it really was a mutual-feeling thing.

I had the teachers, students… I had the human subjects. He had the materials and the access to the money, the resources and the panel of people who could give us the authority to do the type of work we were doing.

The relationship dynamics related to equality in the partnership oftentimes evolve over time, especially for those partnerships that have spanned years, if not decades. As a long time community partner explains, equality in the partnership is not always an
expectation. However, equity in the form of respect and collegiality are desirable dynamics for a successful and sustainable relationship.

Do I feel equal uh, uh... well, I dunno, I guess I would never think of myself as an equal, like equal in terms of myself. But this [current project] is the closest we’ve ever been to being equal. You know, I’ve gotta be honest - we’re a small, renegade non-profit and so I’d never expect to be an equal with an academic [specialty] center and you know I think that this is the closest. And I think that the [campus partners], because of their [work and experiences], make the difference because of their level of involvement and the way that has evolved has made it um you know really kind of flat kind of grant situation where people are more collegial than hierarchical. We don’t feel dictated to at all.

Community partners recognize the dynamics related to equality and reciprocity.

I think it is important and incumbent on the organization and the individuals like myself whose job it is to maintain these types of relationships with colleges and universities to be very open and proactive with those relationships. And to accommodate requests as often as we can. Not to just go to them and tell them when I need something and then turn my back on them the rest of the time. And so many times that is the nature of the business and that’s the way it works, but to try and maintain a really open and friendly relationship with all of the contacts so they don’t hesitate to contact me when they need something.

The elements of relationship building and relationship dynamics contribute to the building of a strong foundation upon which the partner relationship is built. Each element is a continuum and no two partnerships will fall into the same place on all of these multifaceted continua. The commonality lies in how the foundation that is built plays a role in establishing the sustainability of the partnership. Once the strong foundation is built, community and campus partners are equipped to move forward to navigating the process of a partnership project.

*Theme Two: Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project*

While the previous theme focuses on sustaining a partnership through relationship skills and techniques, this theme focuses on the processes that the individual partners must learn to navigate in order to sustain a partnership project or initiative. The focal point in this section is on the organizational level dynamics. The
theme addresses the question, “What does it take to sustain a partnership in terms of navigating the process of a partnership project?” There are two main components, or sub-themes, of this theme. *Navigating the organizational cultures* focuses on what it takes to traverse multiple organizational cultures during the process of a project, and there are six categories that contribute to this sub-theme. *Collaboration* stands for the state of being a collaboration as well as the act of collaborating, and this sub-theme is supported and described by five contributing categories. The relationships between the components of theme two are provided in Figure 4.2.
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**Figure 4.2: Diagram of Theme Two**

*Navigating the organizational cultures.*

The *navigating the organizational cultures* sub-theme incorporates six categories that represent processes and phenomena unique to one or more organizations involved with the partnership. These processes and phenomena impact the partners’ progress
toward the project or initiative. Partners are most successful in the project and in the longer term relationship when they are able to recognize, discuss and work together in addressing these process-related dynamics.

The **climate and culture of academia** is a multifaceted topic referred to equally by campus and community partners as a part of the process of navigating organizational cultures. Initially, the phenomenon of ‘climate’ was included as a part of the overall culture. It became apparent that ‘climate’ relates more to how it feels to be a community-based researcher, scholar and/or partnership member at a specific institution; the matter of ‘culture’ has more to do with perceptions about academia as an entity much larger than any one institution, and while that might be defined by an individual in a geographically or temporally-bound sense it is still a larger scale or aggregate phenomenon.

Just as in any other setting, the culture of an organization takes getting used to when one joins the organization. For new faculty, the culture of academia is usually something that the campus partners were prepared for and knowledgeable about prior to joining the faculty. For others, there may be an element of culture shock involved in joining the faculty.

Well, I think another thing for me has been that in the academic setting… how competitive it is. It has just taken a lot of getting used to on my part. And I think it is something that I was very naïve about when I got here. I've learned the hard way. And I've learned more about why things are the way they are. But I think it is the culture. It might be everywhere, not just [this university].

The campus partner is not the only one impacted by nuances such as the competitive nature of faculty life. Competition among faculty regarding tenure and promotion emerged as an element of organizational culture at universities that ought to be addressed. It is not in the sense that faculty felt that they were overtly competing for
promotion and tenure. Instead, it was the idea that in academia the culture is such that some faculty members’ work is valued higher than others’ work when it comes to promotion and tenure. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of campus partners who addressed issues about promotion and tenure did so off the record. A related topic that is also a part of the organizational culture in academia is the recognition that faculty obtain from the university for community-engaged work, and this is a topic that campus partners seem more open to discussing.

The one negative thing about this is that I did the community engagement [project] um… a lot of people thought it was cool, but in terms of me getting any sort of scholarly activity, it didn’t really help with anything because [it was funded internally] so I didn’t help to bring in any sort of money into [the university] because it is no external funding. So it’s not a research grant. Now if I publish a research grant from it, then I’m cool. But if I don’t publish a research grant from it then I get nothing, you know. So yeah, I did some really cool university and community service. I also already do a whole bunch of service in other ways so I took my life’s shining service record and polished it some more [laughs]. Right?!

But if I’d gotten [a grant] from [local corporation known to provide grant funds] for this, then I would have been patted on the back because I’d brought in research money, well scholarly activity money because it wouldn’t really have been research money, but then there would have been all of this wonderful ‘we’re bringing external funding to do this exciting thing’ but since it was internal funding - no such thing.

What is most relevant in regards to partnership sustainability about the way that these institutional norms are being experienced and perceived by partners is the idea that campus partners lack the motivation to continue partnering if there is a lack of balance in the way that they are rewarded and recognized based on whether they partner with the community or not for scholarship and teaching. Though it does not thoroughly counteract the forces of the academic culture, community partner knowledge about and support for the requirements and expectations for faculty does help navigate the academic-culture-around-community-engagement path by padding the walls so to speak for what might otherwise be a bumpy trail that, if not supported, faculty might not
choose to go down much longer. As a campus partner shares, the community partners involved with an ongoing initiative have provided the faculty member with a sense of support and guidance that was not found on campus.

...[T]hey know what I need in order to succeed. They have all been very supportive. You know, right from the start some of them were like ‘Well, we can’t get her too involved with service because she really needs to publish so that she can stay here’. So there has always been this sense of understanding around what I need to do and them supporting it. It may have just been one or two people reminding the others of what I needed to do to be successful here at [the university], but that was all it takes to keep them remembering my roles as a faculty member. I always felt supported. And I can sometimes get into a research mindset where all I want to do is research! And in cases like that - they keep me honest. They keep me remembering about the other areas that I need to be involved with. So I feel like all things flow together like that.

While not totally exclusive to the campus side of partnerships, partners point to bureaucratic issues as elements of the organizational culture that can impede or delay community engagement work. Community partners indicate that there is often a stark difference found at large institutions between the policy and procedure issues faced by partnerships based on which unit one must work with during the process. These units are not academic units such as departments or disciplines. The bureaucratic issues seem to vary according to larger administrative unit (such as a college or school within a university) or by campus (such as multi-site, specialty or satellite campuses of a university).

So since it is such a bureaucracy, same thing- this wasn’t so much getting approval thing [sic] but a thing of figuring out who to go to for what, how to communicate with them, how to get them to communicate with us. So I think the big part of it is the number of layers and the number of different responsibilities... [t]here were these layers - so there were horizontal layers and vertical numbers of people in departments that I had to just deal with.

Once partners are aware of the bureaucratic issues associated with the institutional units that will be involved in the partnership project, solutions emerge for navigating the process in a way that allows for tasks to be accomplished in a more efficient manner.
When you need something from the university, there is so much extra time and red tape that gets in your way. So I learned quick when it was easier to go to the community first for what I needed instead of going to the university. Now, the university was a great resource for other things. Like with any issues or questions I had about real estate domain, liability and things like that - they were always quite proactive about that sort of thing! They were good at things like that. But for other things I needed, I just went straight to the community.

Campus partners choose to go into the community for more reasons than to avoid the red tape found on campus. Campus partners who engage in community-based research and scholarship are eager to spend time in the community because it is a crucial component of truly engaging with the community and experiencing first-hand what it is like to be a part of the community and a part of the partner organization. The acceptance of spending time outside of the campus varies by unit or department within a university, and it is clear from listening to partners’ stories that some units or departments are far more supportive of allocation of faculty time for off-campus business.

The norms that define acceptability and feasibility of engaging in community-based work among faculty members are largely defined by the sense of importance of the type of work that has been embedded and enforced by the leaders of a program, department, unit and even institution. Some campus partners describe going around potential challenges caused by lack of support from upper level administrators for community-based work by targeting low-to-mid level administrators for their support.

What we’ve decided to do about that is that the faculty have decided that we would do community engagement work by hook or by crook or however we can do it since the administration will not support it. We have kept the partnerships going - and that is only to the point that the partnerships can grow and stay sustained. But it is not difficult to maintain them and keep the lines open on the faculty side because the community partners want to be involved with the faculty, not necessarily with the administration. We tried to do a [formalization of partnership] a couple of times with our major partners and it has not been very successful because there really has not been an institutional commitment… And I don’t think it is on the radar screen for so many people in that administrator
world - I don’t think they see that community engagement leads to so many good outcomes including those directly linked with making the school more money. And that’s not to say that this is how we should look at community engagement, but if that is what it takes to get their buy-in, then we need to make it clear that making the school look good to the public increases enrollment and increases fundraising and so on... So [administrator] does try to support us when [administrator] can, but you have to make [administrator] think it is [administrator’s] idea. [Administrator] has definitely got a commitment but to institutionalize it [administrator] just doesn’t have the political or social capital or [administrator] is not choosing to spend [administrator’s] capital on this sort of thing but [administrator] will support it quietly as [administrator] can from [administrator’s] coffers when [administrator] can – [administrator has] got to play [administrator’s] cards right with [upper level administration]. So I guess it does always come back to administrative support. I mean because with the partnerships there is the thing that they can be maintained and sustained pretty easily and effectively by faculty members so long as you have an administration that does more than just pay lip service to community engagement and service learning. Otherwise, you have to have an understanding that you will just keep it going as a faculty by flying it under their radar. And in the meantime we’ve got to work really hard to find a way to present all that we do to the administration and make it clear to them that if we stop doing it because they don’t support us - just how horrible that would be for the institution - make them see that things would fall apart here without us doing what we do.

Faculty and community members, regardless of partnership status, who directly experience or are close enough to the community engagement efforts at a given campus time that they can cultivate an informed perceptiveness about organizational culture can easily sense when mixed messages like these come across.

The idea of an institution paying lip service to community engagement is a legitimate concern at some institutions, and partners share that these sorts of mixed messages about community engagement are indeed becoming the culture among some institutions. Partners recognize that nationally the culture in academia is for acceptance of and equity for this type of work and the national trend is to encourage faculty to do this sort of work. But they also admit that when one looks at the individual institutional level, community engagement is often encouraged but only to a certain point. This is a point where some universities celebrate and tout engagement efforts when public
relations opportunities are optimal, but the celebration is not reflected in the policies and procedures of the institution. Faculty are told or given the idea that they can ‘do it’, but that they should make the choice carefully because they will not receive the same level of support that is provided from the university in terms of infrastructure for traditional research (research that is not community-based) or the same level of attention for community-based work during the promotion and tenure process.

Demonstrating a genuine commitment to community engagement by entrenching it as a core component of what it is that the institution values... how is that done? Partners express that there are some forces in the culture of academia that impede this commitment. Lack of acceptance and tolerance of new ways of doing faculty work is an individual level dynamic that campus partners describe having to navigate.

But as for [the university]? Some value the work done through CBPR but others don’t give credence to it. That's just the way it is everywhere with something like this. If people get it, then they see value in it. But if they don’t get it, then they don’t give credence to it. The successes are celebrated though, and they have awards and recognitions that tell me that the university views this sort of work positively.

From conversations with campus partners, it seems that there is a shift occurring in the climate at some institutions. In the same places and spaces where faculty describe individual-level issues related to acceptance of community engagement, campus and community partners describe that the university as a whole is working to redefine priorities to include community engagement.

[the university] has the big picture of having community engagement be part of one of the missions of the strategic plan to have statements about like service learning, community engaged research... it has been helpful to me to go back to those statements and say 'you know, [the university] as a whole supports this'.

This shift is seen by some as an indication of a change in the overall academic culture. Community and campus partners point to the increased push among major
national foundations and government grantors for community-engagement to be a part of grant-funded activities as an encouraging signal that the culture of academia will have to change to be more supportive of community-based work. Another national trend seen as facilitating change in the culture of academia around community engagement is that of national accreditation standards increasingly requiring students to do community-based work, which in turn allows many faculty members to chart the course for students by establishing relationships in the community, as well as facilitating or supervising these experiential education experiences. A campus partners shares that this was the way that she found entry into the community, and explains that “[i]t was more of a support for the fact that our students were going to be going out and doing this, so more power to me for going out and being supportive for my work.”

Campus partners are optimistic about change in the academic culture, “I think that we haven’t gotten there yet but I think that there is a change going on based on what I see going on… I think that there is change going on.” For those institutions that are not ‘there’ yet, campus and community partners find it helpful to work together to navigate the complex, sometimes contradictory and occasionally confusing elements of the climate and culture in academia towards the goal of partnership sustainability. While much of the navigation is facilitated by the strong relationship that serves as the foundation in the partnership, partners do explain that academic institutions must step up and be agents of change on the institutional level in order to make change possible at the national level. When thinking about how to embed community engagement as a priority within the organizational culture at institutions, partners suggest numerous resources that would be helpful. Specific resources include community engagement
advising and consulting; increased staff support for engagement efforts; involvement of community partners and community-engaged campus representatives on advisory groups, boards, committees and task forces; and enhanced opportunities for faculty to work one-on one with other faculty who are interested in community engagement.

Mentoring for faculty is a part of navigating the organizational cultures during the process of a partnership project. For those campus partners who express a desire to be mentored, most claim that it has been helpful in their journey of community engagement. In particular, campus partners explain that mentoring is a useful component for navigating the balance necessary when considering that there are two organizational cultures involved with partnership work. “I had mentorship from within my department with how to make this sort of community-based service project work in my career in terms of scholarship and tenure.” In this campus partner’s case, mentoring was a practical way to get guidance around maintaining equilibrium between community-based work and the requirements of a faculty career. For those campus partners who did not receive or did not take advantage of available mentoring resources, many regret not having a mentor because, in retrospect, they could see how mentoring would have been helpful. “…[I]t is hard and at times frustrating to do these things without a mentor. And I’ve said… when talking to my department chair and I’ve said “you know, I’m really still looking for a mentor research-wise.” Another campus partners shares that, “…I think that there is a lack of mentorship in my area about this, no doubt.” These faculty voices are representative of the larger group of campus partners who cite that a lack of mentorship exists in many disciplines that can provide a specific focus on community engagement and community-based research topics.
Having a point person, sympathetic ear, safe place to seek advice and guidance – all of these components are attributed by campus partners to the mentoring relationship as a way to navigate organizational cultures. Campus partners reach a consensus around another matter related to mentoring, and this has to do with the required nature of mentoring. Campus partners are not interested in any sort of formal mentoring program for community engagement unless it is an optional experience. For many, this is due to the existence of mentoring relationships for faculty that are either already required or strongly encouraged by individual units and departments. It is important to note that while mentoring is not an element that community partners indicate an interest in for themselves, community partners do recognize the importance of mentoring for their campus partner counterparts. As with the organizational culture of academia, community partners cite that it is important that they have an awareness of how mentoring is important for campus partners and recognize that there are ways that this awareness can be facilitated by direct action. Increasingly, campus partners are looking to the community for mentorship. One campus partner explains that a community member as a mentor has been helpful, and encourages others to look outside of departmental walls and even the walls of the campus, “[y]ou need to be proactive in connecting with people who might become your mentors.”

Among the partnerships receiving grant funding for a partnership project, partners discuss the trend among funders to require campus partners to work in interdisciplinary teams. Community and campus partners are impacted by this requirement for Interdisciplinarity as this is a part of the organizational cultures that must be navigated and adds a layer to the navigation of the project. Campus partners
describe that because this is a national trend among external funders it is important to
get practice on working interdisciplinarily when engaging in internally-funded projects,
“…because they are requiring this sort of interdisciplinary collaboration with other grants
was key because it was helpful to get us out there and collaborate.” Campus partners
indicate that interdisciplinary teams present an opportunity to divide up project tasks
and accomplish more. This can be very helpful to campus partners who might
otherwise become overwhelmed by the responsibilities involved with partnership project
tasks, “[interdisciplinary partner] was my sort of soul mate during that whole process
because she really came in and took over that part.”

The theory and practice behind introducing interdisciplinary teams to community
engagement models are seen by many to be out of sync. Navigating interdisciplinary
teams is a work-in-progress, organizationally speaking. There appear to be few models
available that inform and model effective interdisciplinary teams within the context of
community-campus partnership projects and research. Campus partners felt frustrated
if there was a requirement for funding for them to work with a faculty member in another
department or unit because there is a stereotype that this is a secondary partner who
does not need to be as involved in the project and in some cases even act like a silent
partner who provides resources but does not truly invest in the partnership.

The weakest part for me from the community engagement grant was the
requirement for work to be done between programs - so there was times when
they’d send students and we’d email back and forth, but there really wasn’t any,
um, co-planning or anything like that. So that was the part that was really not
very developed as it could have been.

Additionally, campus partners assert that the interdisciplinary requirement can be
excellent for students who are coming from both disciplines to do work in the
community. Nonetheless, there remains a remorseful tone when campus partners
reminisce on the project and the potential that could have been, “…the students connected but as faculty, we didn’t do much more than just email.” In terms of suggestions on how interdisciplinary teams can be better navigated, campus partners suggest making sure that campus partners are up front about roles and tasks,

... a big piece of it is in determining who your other faculty partner is going to be kind of doing a little skills assessment and role, you know, clarifying roles... That might be a way to prompt and prime them for what they’re going to have to do.

Community partners look at interdisciplinary teams as something that has the potential, if navigated properly and executed successfully, to benefit and enrich the partnership project. As community partners shared, the interdisciplinary teams can open doors for the community organization in terms of exposure to new ways to serve the community while also providing a way for the community organization to positively impact the campus organization:

We were introduced to a new discipline... we were exposed to a new discipline, and developed an appreciation for the work that [those in the newly introduced discipline] do in the [community]. Before we had not been exposed to working with school counselors. They brought a lot to the program and we learned a lot from them... There was a feeling of give and take, of mutual exchange. We provided training for the students and a place where they could fulfill the practicum, volunteer, or internship requirement; and they contributed to our program.

In other instances, community partners seem to be confused by, indifferent to or even frustrated with funders’ requirements for community engagement projects to involve interdisciplinary campus teams because of the challenges involved with navigating the relationships. This highlights a point made in the discussion around theme one. The importance of having the strong foundation upon which a relationship is built includes connecting with all stakeholders involved with the planning, execution and evaluation of the partnership. Among the community partners who work or have
worked with interdisciplinary teams mention that there is usually one campus partner who is not as engaged, from the start, as the other campus partner(s). These community partners share that in these cases, the goal of including more than one discipline was not actualized because there is an imbalance.

And it is like three kids playing, like three little girls playing - we can’t hardly play with each other at the same time, we have to play together two at a time - and it wasn’t that way at all the way… it was just the nature of coming into it so strong with [primary campus partner]. And so we had already done this before, it was rehearsed. And the other part with [secondary partner] was very new - we didn’t have that relationship yet… And sometimes we couldn’t get that level of attention from them that we needed to. So don’t get me wrong - if we had whined and complained and gone to [secondary partner’s administrator] with an issue I know [administrator] would have stepped in and done something, but to us it was like ‘hey everything is going okay and nothing is wrong’. And when we needed something from them or they were supposed to give us something they agreed to, they would do it no problem. But it wasn’t an equal partnership - it didn’t impact the program but if it had been there it would have surely improved the program.”

Based on the campus and community partners’ sentiments about the inclusion of and requirement for interdisciplinary teams, it is clear that navigating this element of organizational cultures is crucial to the betterment of community-based projects and initiatives and that improvements in defining the relationship up front would enhance chances for sustaining and even improving partnerships.

The outcomes of partnership projects are important to disseminate, according to campus and community partners. There is potential for innovative practice and informative research findings to positively impact those outside of the immediate partnership realm. Dissemination is seen as an important part of the partnership project that must be navigated within the partner organizations considering the way in which requirements around research and dissemination vary from organization to organization. Some community organizations do not have policies and procedures around research and dissemination, while others have advisory board approval
requirements and even community-level Institutional Review Boards (IRBs).

Successfully navigating these ethical protection requirements will set the stage for the post-project dissemination.

Community and campus partners report that it is common to disseminate separately in the context of national conferences due to financial constraints.

We have not presented together at national conferences because really there is just no way to get my community partners funding to travel to the conferences to present together. So, I’ve presented our work at national conferences - so I have represented them there nationally.

Local level dissemination efforts are more likely to be done together: “Yes, we have presented together. We have presented together in classrooms here at [the university], we’ve presented at conferences in the community.” Likewise, collaborative efforts to disseminate in written format are a more practical effort than presenting nationally, “…we’ve had some success with publishing our findings, and they [community partners] are on the publications as well.” Partners suggest that it is very important to have opportunities to disseminate partnership project findings in on-campus venues.

Campus partners are vehement in the assertion that they need to have the foresight and know-how to plan ahead for dissemination requirements for their career. Navigating the organizational cultures in the community and university organizations is an essential piece of planning because it will solidify that all parties are on board with what products are planned and what supplemental work (outside of the partnership project or initiative) may be required of the campus partner to satisfy position requirements. As one campus partner asserts, “…of course it will lead to a publication lag and if you are in an area where publications are huge, then that is not a good thing.” Thus it is important for campus partners to chart the course for dissemination efforts in
the early stages of partnership project planning, and to “do a better job of saying ‘what are going to be the scholarly products produced from this?’.”

Navigating forces that impact methods of and planning for dissemination must take into account another component of organizational cultures that impacts the partnership process and sustainability of the partnership process. The element of time has the potential to thwart even the best-laid plans among partners for the project or initiative. Consideration of time is a part of the process of navigating organizational cultures and refers to tangible (timetables) and intangible elements (timing). In general, participants feel that community-based projects and initiatives take a longer time than other collaborative pursuits when the relationship does not already exist between the individual partners. This is an element of organizational culture, the time it takes to get to know one another and the organizational dynamics, experienced on both sides of the partnership. The timelines seem to increase when partners are entering into a specific type of project, the community-based participatory research (CBPR) project: “As with all CBPR projects, it took a lot of persuading to the community so that I could do the work in the community that I wanted to do and to negotiate what that would look like.”

As one campus partner explains, it is important that community partners and funding organizations recognize that regardless of the type of project (research, programming, service or pedagogically-based), “it really takes more than a year to figure out what to do… [because] the IRB process was required and how many hours were required at the community site to build a relationship with them.” Campus partners see this as a necessary inconvenience, “So it took some additional time, but it wasn’t a huge amount of time.” Campus partners consistently cite one year as a realistic
A campus partner shares that,

[National Institutes of Health] actually re-did the research timeline with a roadmap for CBPR and having [NIH] endorse it helps. [The university] might benefit from looking at that and maybe decided that… maybe [internal funding for CBPR] be made available for a two-year period.

The length of time it takes to conduct a community-based product is complicated for many campus partners by the unique aspect of organizational culture in academia that impacts faculty availability. Navigating the academic calendar can be a challenge for partners. As some partners point out, many tenure-track faculty who wish to be involved in community-based projects and initiatives are nine-month faculty, and the three months in the summer can be detrimental because partners might lose steam.

An intangible component related to the dynamics of organizational culture that has to be navigated is that of timing. Partners cite numerous occurrences of partnership stakeholder leaving a partner organization at a critical time. Rarely is this a primary partner, but nonetheless the campus and community partners indicate that changes in leadership in either partner organization can cause significant setbacks for the partnership project in terms of the time and effort already put into the project. For some partners, lack of a transition plan or lack of project priority among new leaders impacts the time factor to the point where partners feel as though they have wasted time. In some cases this caused the partnership project to be changed drastically over time such that it was altered beyond the point of recognition. Timing of organizational changes such as these are beyond the control of the campus and community partners, and navigating challenges related to timing requires that partners maintain open communication and realistic expectations.
When allowing for the amount of time it takes to build, actualize and execute a partnership project, one must also consider the process of connecting on an organizational level with the partner organization because it is a part of the process of navigating the organizational cultures. Regardless of the mode of acculturation that is at play, an additional culture is created within the partnership itself once the project planning commences that impacts how the partner feels about the ‘other’ organization. Overwhelmingly this is a matter for consideration in regards to community partners. When the experience is positive, the community partners indicate an interest in the university as a whole: “[W]e look forward to continuing to work with [the university] in whatever capacity that is.” Community partners are always cognizant of the way that interactions with one campus partner can lead to opportunities to engage in future partnership activities with the university.

I view maintaining relationships with those contacts in the organizations with the sustainable part of the volunteer relationship with the organizations instead of with the [individuals] themselves… So if we can establish a long term relationship with an individual then I certainly wouldn’t discourage that, but I really see our relationship as being with the individuals that we contact for that at the university.

With the suggestion that navigating organizational cultures involves constellations of connections within a partner organization that are important for the long term wellbeing of organizational relations, participants stress that it is imperative that efforts to navigate the process of a partnership project with an eye toward sustainability of the overall partnership be concerned with the dynamics and needs of a collaboration once the project is underway.
Collaboration.

As a community partner explains when recounting the forms of projects and different campus partners involvement that the community organization has encountered over time, “[w]e really are an organization that depends on collaboration and it is important in everything that we do, so we really hope to keep collaborating with the university.” A differentiation between ‘partner’ and ‘collaborative’ emerges when talking to campus and community partners. Community partners describe the way in which a partnership is a longer term relationship that can oscillate among campus partners within and among departments over time, whereas a collaboration is less about the amount of time spent in the relationship and more about the quality of the connections built therein. This sentiment is represented in the stories told by many community partners, and it reveals that community partners are searching for more than just a partner-in-name. Collaborations are representative of partners-in-action. Community partners are searching for a community and campus team that works together so closely that its collective power has the potential to transcend negative or challenging dynamics for the individual partners’ home organizations.

Community partners consistently indicate that a collaboration helps the community organization work more effectively with campus partners on specific projects or initiatives because they have redefined allegiances. This is not to say that campus partners have forsaken the university- not in the least. It means that the campus partner recognizes that this partnership and this project are worthwhile of their attention, dedication, passion, problem-solving and advocacy. Indeed, there must be “a sense that we [are] working together, not that we [are] here to provide them with a place to do
an exercise or practice some new idea.” Another community partner concurs: “And that's what I think it is really all about - all these [professionals] working together to support an educational endeavor. We’re all doing the same thing - we need to help each other!” The bottom line is that working together gets results for the partnership project. Working disjointedly does not facilitate the navigation of a partnership project. As a campus partner explains, collaborative work involves a combined effort during all stages of a project:

Again, working collaboratively. I mean, again, I had my own ideas and my own areas of expertise. And then it was really trying to understand and helping them to understand what I can offer and then after that them helping me to understand what they can offer and how I can help them. And finding a good middle ground for that. Because some of the things that community partners need are things that I cannot do. It is not in my expertise area and it would be ridiculous for me to do that. To try to say ‘oh, I can do it’ would not be right. But if they get stuck and don't know where to go, of course I'm going to help them figure out where to go and who to go to and who can help. But really it is just a basic situation of getting to know each other and figuring out how to sit together and work. Our process is very much ground-up… I mean I sat with them through multiple meetings with all of us sitting at a table together talking about what type of project we wanted, what type of methodology we would use…

So what does a collaboration look and feel like? What is it like to be collaborative? In short, it is about demonstrating over time a pattern of behaviors and actions that make the organizational alliance feel like a team. The sense of collaboration is such that partners feel like their home organizations are in it together-for the project and for future endeavors. Collaborations are described by campus and community partners as being equipped to successfully navigate the process of a partnership project when these qualities are present: mutual efforts in looking out for one another's best interests; shared control of the project; parallel interest in addressing challenges, including joint efforts to problem-solve; and combined efforts to attend to the need to conclude a project before expected. As the discussions of these qualities
convey, participants see this collection of elements as describing an ideal collaboration. Many partners are able to provide examples of when these qualities could have been present or improved upon, thus solidifying the argument that a strong collaboration contributes to facilitation of the navigation of a partnership project.

Successful collaborations are those in which the partners will look out for one another when opportunities arise that will benefit the project and the partners. Connecting and networking with others impacts collaboration because it can facilitate new projects and enhance relationships:

And so I knew who to contact and who would be interested in this sort of stuff. So when I contacted them they just jumped all over it... so I essentially took ideas from all these people and put it all together.

As is the case in a number of collaborations, individual partner’s willingness to share contacts and connections enhances the ability to make a project successful. Partners are not working in a vacuum because they are working together collaboratively to connect and network for the betterment of the partnership and the project. Sometimes this element takes on a focus for long term benefit:

[I]t has been great to expand my contacts and network with people at [the university]. I have met with some of the highest administrators there... I have relationships with the next highest people [at the university]. So personally for me it has opened doors for networking.

Community partners are not the only ones who benefit from the networking function of collaborations. Community partners are able to identify and connect faculty members who are doing the same work in order to build larger and strongly collaborative teams. Efforts on both the community and campus partner sides converge to become collaboration-based efforts, and these connecting and networking activities lead to new ways to navigate a partnership project and result in a positive impact on the project.
Collaboration is impacted by the balance of control over decision-making and elements of the project. Community partners recognize that this is an area that is most often lacking in their relationship with the campus partner: “…we had no control. Maybe if there had been a deeper and longer collaboration. But there was really no control over the project on our part.” Community partners explain that it is a challenge for campus partners to recognize that community partners are oftentimes the appropriate parties to take the lead in the community context and that control should be shared accordingly. As one community partner describes it, “[t]hey didn’t get that they were not in charge here.” Campus partners admit that there is a tendency among many individuals who are drawn to careers in academia to instinctively take charge. Much of this tendency can be linked to experience in the field prior to the academic career and/or the campus partner being seen as an expert in the partnership project subject area. This can make it hard for a campus partner to deal with not having control when something going on in the community organization feels like a red flag issue: “And like I said, one of my biggest frustrations was that I don’t run these agencies.” In this particular case, the campus partner is very aware of the internal struggle that is going on within, and has cultivated the ability to recognize that control is an issue. Once this occurs, campus partners who are conscious of their own internal conflict linked to control issues can be upfront with the community partner and use it as an opportunity for growth. Addressing control issues towards the goal of rectifying strife will positively impact the collaboration.

Sometimes efforts to limit control are more intentional and partners do not wish to be transparent with one another about how hard it is to give up and/or share control. In the case of partnership projects funded by the campus organization, the tone is set
early on regarding who has control in the partnership project because oftentimes those opportunities are only publicized among faculty members:

And I can see how some people who aren't as lucky as me would work with a faculty member who sees that one-way promotion as an obvious indication that they are in control. So maybe there is a need to tell the faculty that it is a two-way street and that the whole purpose is to work together.

Collaborations without shared control are not really collaborations. Community partners who have had positive and negative experiences with campus organizations point out that a campus partner's lack of willingness to concede control is a manifestation of the overall culture at the campus organization level.

Not all of our experiences with [the university] have been good. We had a partnership with [a specific unit of the university]... and the issues of control were very big... Some of the systematic issues at [the medical campus of the university] were barriers to us.

In order to have a true collaboration that will be a constructive and helpful part of navigating the process of a partnership project, campus and community partners find it essential to discuss, negotiate and even give up control in order to create an equitable balance.

When partners describe working through partnership challenges by engaging in the process of problem-solving, the conversation usually begins with hesitation among faculty partners and an apology upfront from community partners. These challenges and how they are handled are a part of the overall process of collaborating towards the goal of navigating the project. Faculty partners tend to hesitate to discuss challenges with the partnership project because they feel like it highlights what they could have done better or wish they had done differently. Community partners apologize from the start to make sure that the complaint or account of a challenge is not seen as an indication that they do not appreciate the campus partner or campus organization's
support; and of utmost concern is an underlying anxiety that a complaint lodged about the campus partner will result in isolation of the community organization from future opportunities. The types of challenges that are faced in the process of the partnership project are as diverse as the projects themselves because most are very specific to the needs of the project. The commonalities among the conversations with partners about challenges lie in the problem-solving strategies employed.

Four main problem solving strategies emerge as the most supportive modalities for building a strong collaboration and aiding in the navigation of the process of a partnership project. First, partners find creative ways to work within and around flawed or challenging systems in order to achieve desired outcomes. As one community partner who was working on a partnership project within the context of a highly bureaucratic organization describes,

…this was a layered project with… a layered partnership, which has its own disease and challenges… we’re not in a position or authorized to change anything about [policies] so we just did what we could. And what that meant was that we identified [individuals impacted by the policies], and we had some really good training opportunities and we could connect them [with other resources]… which I kind of think they already had some inroads with but we helped make it more formal.

From time to time, events will occur that are outside the realm of control of the core community and campus partners. These events may have far reaching effects, including jeopardizing the future of partnership project. For times like these when a ‘deal breaker’ challenge is introduced and might change the face of the partnership project, another helpful problem solving technique to employ is a common sense approach to conflict resolution – getting the core partners together (in-person) to share information, provide support, brainstorm around how to proceed and develop a plan of action. Or as a campus partner summarizes the strategy, “We had a meeting, and
talked about it. It was easy to discuss and we changed our plans as needed and moved on from there.” While it sounds like a common sense and simple problem solving strategy, a campus partner describes that in the moment it was not considered and discusses how, in retrospect, this approach could have helped them out of what felt like a helpless situation:

… I wonder if maybe [community partner] sort of knew all along that once [community leader] was gone that it wasn’t going to work. But maybe we could have sought [community partner] out and gone around the [new community leader] and said to [community partner] - hey, here’s what’s going on, do you have any advice for us?

A problem solving strategy shared by numerous partners has to do with the individuals involved with the partnership project. When there are hurdles, a collaboration is strengthened by the existence of a champion who is willing and able to take on the cause and advocate for the partnership project. Ideally, there is a champion present within the campus and community organizations. These champions facilitate the problem solving process by knowing who to reach out to, what processes to follow and how to adapt if needed.

We found out the further we went with the project that we needed more and more expertise. And [a community member involved with the project] took the lead on that. She was amazing. She just knew everyone and knew what to do and who to contact for everything. And if she didn’t know, she knew who to ask to find out.

The fourth problem solving strategy most indicated by partners as positively impacting the collaboration is much more conceptual in nature. In order to have a strong and impactful collaboration that is well-suited to navigate the processes of the partnership project, partners must accept the idea that one cannot plan for all contingencies. Through that acceptance, partners recognize and trust in the idea that solutions to these unforeseen challenges will emerge during the process.
Yeah, I understand that you don’t want to be too rigid because that could stifle creativity… I do think that there is a benefit to the light bulb going off during the process - there is something about learning something as a part of the process instead of being told it up front.

Despite efforts to engage in problem solving, sometimes there are instances when the project cannot be continued. Also, there are some projects that are not intended to continue. In these sorts of instances, the way that project termination is approached has a significant impact on the collaboration.

Throughout the discussion of theme two, there has been an assumption that continuation of the project is desired or intended. There are times when this is simply not the case, and the project is not sustained. It might seem counterintuitive to assert that projects and initiatives that are not sustained could contribute to the collaboration in a way that helps to facilitate the partnership project. As partners indicate, it is actually quite helpful to be upfront about partnership project expectations for the future whether it is known all along by one or more partner that the project will not be sustained or it becomes apparent in the process that sustainability for that particularly project is not feasible because this impacts the quality of the collaboration. Navigating the partnership project includes navigating project termination. If partners are honest from the start about expectations for continuation of the project, then the partners are able to address issues related to ending the project.

Some projects are special events and are designed to be offered just this one time. To make sure that community and campus partners are on the same page, discuss the possibility that stakeholders may wish to put on the event again in the future. Partners who have been in this position explain that while those initially involved in the project could not or did not desire continued involvement, it was essential to
devise a plan for what individuals or organizations might be approached to take the reins after the initial event was over. By approaching this with a collaborative spirit, partners do not mislead one another about intentions for the future. Another special situation is that of a community-based research project or pedagogical experience that is seen as a one-shot deal. A pilot study is a good example of this sort of situation; and as this community partner openly discloses, “[the project] hasn’t [been sustained] and I didn’t expect for it to.” Regardless of the situation, partners express that the quality of the collaboration is impacted by the honest and open communication about the future of the project. One community partner conveys that while it was unfortunate that the program did not continue, “[w]e have provided letters of support for [faculty partner’s grant] applications now and then…,” which is perceived as a way that they were able to continue a relationship with the campus partner and sustain the collaboration.

As the discussion moved from theme one to theme two, it was clear that much of what it takes to successfully navigate the process of a partnership project presumes that there is a strong foundation upon which the relationship is built. Likewise, there is an association between what it takes to successfully navigate the process of a partnership project and the overall fit of the project for the key stakeholders. The strong foundation for the relationship and the work done to navigate the process of partnering are both contributing factors to the overall sustainability of the partnership. The bigger picture of the sustainability of community-campus partnerships incorporates a dynamics that is a crucial denominator for and contributor to the success of the relationship and navigation work, and that is the goodness-of-fit for all involved in the partnership.
Theme Three: Goodness-of-Fit for All Involved

This theme addresses the question, “What does it take to sustain a partnership in terms of achieving a goodness-of-fit for all involved?” A goodness-of-fit is important for the overall sustainability of the partnership because it establishes buy-in as a way to find common ground and create a basic framework for partnership endeavors and begins the partnership activities in such a way that keeps the focus on the primary goal to meet community need. Figure 4.3 provides a visual representation of the sub-themes and categories that contribute to theme three.

Figure 4.3: Diagram of Theme Three

*Buy-In from all stakeholders involved.*

Having genuine buy-in from all stakeholders is a part of the overall goodness-of-fit necessary to sustain a partnership. Buy-in indicates that the individuals and
organizations involved with, represented by and impacted through the partnership projects and initiatives are in agreement about the desirability of the partnership itself and the worth and value of the projects and initiatives that emanate from the partnership. As the following quotation from a campus partner illustrates, various types of buy-in come into play in order to impact the sustainability of a project.

…I really do think that there has been equal buy-in from the leadership on both sides of the partnership… I mean, we can't back out of this. There is no way to end the partnership. If we backed out then the [community organization] would be left hanging. And if the [community organization] backed out they would be missing out on this amazing resource. So on both ends I think they know that there is a lot at stake, which is good.

Before discussing the specific types of buy-in, it is important to consider why buy-in is important and how multiple levels of buy-in (individual or organizational) make a difference. Without buy-in from key groups or individuals, the partnership will be faced by issues that prevent forward movement towards the goal of sustaining the partnership. In the worst case scenario, partners who come up against insurmountable barriers due to lack of buy-in might have to discontinue a project altogether. In the best case scenario, the buy-in is so strong that it creates a buzz among stakeholders about the idea of community engagement in addition to excitement about the partnership and its projects:

Everybody is very excited, yes, everyone is very excited and one of the reasons being that you know we’re starting as a school to learn more about community engagement and that sort of model of how you do research, um, it's not traditionally the way that we have done research and so because of that everyone is interested in learning more about how that looks

Organizational level buy-in has a lot to do with how the partnership and its project will impact the organization’s bottom line in fiscal, public relations, personnel and/or service delivery sense. While the organizational level buy-in is important, the buy-in on the part
of individuals who are involved is also crucial. Much of the individual-level buy-in has to do with the value and meaning of importance that is attached to the idea of the partnership. Many partners describe this quality is that of “passion” and sense of genuine dedication to working with a specific population around a specialized cause or purpose. As a campus partner explains while talking about a community partner, gaining individual buy-in allows for the partnership’s efforts to align and fit together successfully: “Well and I’ve been lucky because I have worked with people that care about the same things that I care about… She is completely on board.”

There are six core areas where buy-in is necessary, and each of these areas is described in this section. Buy-in can exist along a continuum within each of these categories. Just as the community and campus partners in the previous example seem so in-sync with one another, there are just as many examples of how lack of buy-in on the individual level can be detrimental to the partnership because it disturbs the equilibrium. A community partner describes how lack of buy-in at the start of the partnership project quickly led to increased interest in buy-in from a campus partner once the discussion turned to funding. By suddenly wanting to increase the campus partner’s ‘cut’ of the funds for the project, there was an equilibrium introduced into the mix because up until that point the goodness-of-fit was built around the campus partner’s desire for minimal involvement.

So we sent all of our information and [grant materials] to [faculty partner] and that was apparently the first time [faculty partner] really paid attention to it and [faculty partner] was like ‘wait, I’m not even in this’ - and we had already told [faculty partner] that [faculty partner] was going to have to put in there what [faculty partner] was going to do and stuff. And um so [faculty partner]… changed [grant materials] at the last minute before it got submitted [to include more funding for faculty partner].
This is indeed a very unique situation; however, it illustrates quite well the effect that individual level buy-in has on a partnership. In this instance the campus partner’s sudden interest in the project was suspected by the community partner to be in direct connection with a desire to increase the amount of funding to be allocated to the campus partner. Whether it was an action that indicated a sudden yet sincere interest in the partnership project or not, this change in buy-in made the community partner uncomfortable and in the end the partnership project did not come to fruition. A campus partner describes how the project started with both levels of buy-in, organizational and individual, on both sides of the partnership; however, a change in leadership on one side drastically changed the face of the project to the point where there was no longer a goodness-of-fit for all stakeholders for this project.

[Community partner] just wasn’t very into it. And I think partly, I mean, [community partner] had other responsibilities and I just don’t think at an individual level [community partner] just didn’t strike me as someone who would be well, um, committed to [helping a vulnerable population]. [Community partner] just wasn’t that into it... I mean, I knew the people, but even then each time [personnel change] happened I had to reintroduce the whole thing and so some of the - each time it got diluted I guess.

It is helpful to view the buy-in theme as a puzzle that has six pieces, all of which must fit together within the confines of the puzzle board. In order to view the final picture, these pieces have to fit together well within the horizontal and vertical spaces of the board. In this metaphor, the confining walls of the puzzle represent the continuum of individual level buy-in and the continuum of organizational level buy-in. If the pieces are placed at the right places along these continua, then there is an overall goodness-of-fit. The pieces have a higher likelihood of staying together if disrupted than if they were put together disjointedly. The take away message is that both organizational and individual levels of buy-in are important in order for this buy-in to have maximum potential and
impact the overall goodness-of-fit for the partnership. By establishing why buy-in matters and how individual and organizational buy-in impacts the goodness-of-fit for a partnership, the framework is established for discussing the six types of buy-in that emerges from these data.

**Leadership** buy-in is twofold. First, it refers to the contribution made by getting an endorsement and support for partnership initiatives from administrators. This often allows partners to move ahead with seeking funding and securing resources necessary for a partnership project or initiative. It is also an important contribution to the potential for longevity for the partnership. Consistent support for partnership efforts is a way that organization leaders endorse the ideals of community engagement, spirit of collaboration and value of the work done through as an important contribution to both organizations involved. In other words, buy-in from the organization’s administration can ‘make or break’ a partnership:

Because the whole issue of the administration at the school and the overall attitude toward community engagement is a whole other entity in and of itself that impacts how the partnerships go or don’t go. It's another important piece because we have gotten thwarted on a number of partnerships because of lack of vision and support of the administration around the impact that community engagement activities can have the college as a whole, not just a few individuals, but the overall fabric of the college.

The partnership is not a good fit if one or more partner feels like there is a lack of buy-in from the individuals who run the partner organization. This is also the case if there is a sense that those within the organization do not respect the leader who is tasked with granting support and expressing buy-in.

... I also think it has something to do with how effective that person is as a leader. If the organization respects the leader then there will be buy in for whatever they say. But if they organization does not respect the leader then the
leader can say whatever ‘we’re going to do this, we’ll do that’ but then really nothing ever really gets done.

This describes how a breakdown in buy-in among staff members that revolved around lack of efficacy of the organization leader impacts the partnership such that there is no longer achieved a goodness-of-fit. Since goodness-of-fit is a component of sustainability of the partnership, it is clear that this sort of scenario could impede (if not work against) the sustainability of the partnership.

Leadership buy-in also refers to the leadership found within the partnership. When the collective of individuals involved with the project agree on who should take the lead on the project, there is a higher likelihood that these individuals will agree with the decisions and action of the leader. Partners overwhelmingly cite that shared leadership is the most effective form of leadership for community-based projects and initiatives. “I mean, the model I use, I don’t even know what the name is for it, but the model I like to use is one where everyone has equal leadership. Where the leadership is shared.” Another partner exclaims, “Me?! No!” when asked if they were the leader of the project. This partner continues on to explain that, “Well, here at [the university] - yes, I was the leader on this end but for the whole project? No! I wasn’t the leader of the whole thing because everyone was equal. It was something that we all did.” These examples show how leadership buy-in is not just about the administrators giving their blessings for partnership work. Indeed, there is a layer to leadership buy-in that is unique to the partnership unit. That element is just as important to the success of the overall goodness-of-fit for all involved in the partnership towards the ideal of sustaining the partnership.
As alluded to in previous sections, the personal-professional affiliation with the partnership project is a fundamental component of a successful and effective partnership. This element refers to the level of connection that an individual feels both personally and professionally to a particular cause. One common sentiment shared by partners is that while there were positive benefits for the individual partners and partner organizations, the primary benefits of the partnership projects are “for the greater good” in the community. This is an example of how partners can demonstrate their personal awareness of social need and utilize their professional skills to contribute to the betterment of society. Campus partners regularly shared that this mindset toward service and civic mindedness might be unique to them, using statements similar to “I’m not your traditional faculty member who is research-orientated.” Perhaps there is something to the idea that these campus partners are faculty member who are “against the literature” when it comes to their personal affinity for community engaged work; however, that sort of conjecture would be far beyond this scope of this study. What can be said for these partners, community and campus partners, is that they feel a personal connection to the work that they do in their professional lives.

Buy-in from someone who has such a strong personal-professional connection is oftentimes a positive aspect for the partnership and partner organizations, and is largely seen the same way on the individual level. One community partner jokes that, “…you can quote me on this - I have no personal social life! Because my personal life involves talking to people about what I do with [community organization].” This participant quickly clarifies that this is not a negative thing, and indeed that, “…on the other hand, I have made so many personal friends through the professional relationships I have
made.” A campus partner describes how becoming more involved with the community partner from a professional standpoint has enhanced the personal realm:

[I]t was also that really amazing surprise that I don’t think I’ll ever not be involved with [community] in some way. I mean, I go there... so there are just these ways that I have gotten attached to the [community] and think about their wellbeing...

Examples of the personal-professional connection that partners have with their community engaged work illustrate how this component contributes to the overall goodness-of-fit within the partnership. It also might bring to mind questions about whether all elements of buy-in appear so selfless and altruistic.

In a word, ‘no’; and in a longer explanation, partners are frank about the idea that it is okay to get something out of a partnership that contributes to one’s own professional development. Professional development is described by partners as being a type of buy-in; both community and campus partners explain how the elements of professional development available through partnerships present a special type of incentive for them. Campus partners explain that their level of buy-in is largely because of the way that community engagement work directly impacts their development as academics, and above that the involvement enhances their development and skills set as community-based academics. Professional development for campus partners is about growing one’s skills and talents in a specialized approach to research and teaching, and ought not be confused with promotion and tenure since that topic emerged as a separate category discussed later in this section.

... [Community partners] have been with me from the start and they are the reason for me being here. And to me they are just as important as anything else in terms of my development as a professor and as important as anyone who I have worked with in other departments here because I have worked with them so much. And really there are products in each area: there are publications; there are teaching opportunities; and then there are service opportunities. So it is all there for me when it comes to community partners.
Community partners point to partnerships as ways to enhance professional development and thereby increasing personal buy-in for the partnership. As one community partner explains, “[f]or me, just having the connections with [the university] has been a big aspect of growth for my professional life that has been impacted by the partnership… I think personally that has been a furthering to my professional development.” In instances where the community-based project is funded through a grant, community and campus partners express that professional development was achieved by engaging in grant-writing activities. The opportunity to apply for a grant, especially among early-career partners applying for internal funding, is a major incentive contributing to the initial buy-in for the project and partnership. One campus partner shares the professional development contributions made by the training opportunities provided by the grant funding group:

…we were educated much more heavily on that process… it was a great educational experience for me because I had never really thought about it much as a research model for me because you know you have traditionally been trained that you identify a population and then generate a sample by just generally recruiting as opposed to approaching an entire community.

Buy-in by way of professional development incentives is one way to increase the goodness-of-fit among those involved in the partnership because it establishes one of the reasons why one or more of the partners finds it constructive as well as meaningful to participate. It is important to recognize that a larger scale buy-in, representative of a collective endeavor, is facilitated by the quality of the match between partners.

If a partner feels that there is a problem with the basic fit or match between the individuals and/or organizations involved in the partnership, then the goodness-of-fit of the partnership will not be optimal. Partners describe an ‘it-factor’ of sorts, whereby individuals just instinctively have the qualities necessary to be a good match for one
another. As a campus partner describes, this is not something that can be forced because not everyone is equipped to be a good match for community-based work.

This type of research might not be for everyone. Just like how not every researcher is equipped to be a good teacher, not every researcher is meant to be engaging in CBPR. We still need those people who can work in the labs and test chemicals and do lab analysis and things like that. One is not less than the other. What we need to do is determine what is best for the partner.

The match between partners also matters on an organizational level. Partners express that there needs to be a match of mission, vision and general acknowledgement of the priorities for the partnership project. As one community partner explains,

…this is a better match [than past partnerships] because the focus is on [specialty area] and that is what we do here at [community organization]. it is what we thrive on. And the people that have been involved have been very similar in terms of core values with [community organization]. A passion for working with underserved populations struggling with [specialty area].

Community partners in particular describe how sometimes the best match for one project is a different match than for another project. Most often these matches are found in different academic units and sometimes in different institutions. At the same time, community partners express how a good match between the community organization and a campus unit can lead to multiple ongoing partnership projects and initiatives that address different community engagement realms such as service-learning, practicum/internships, community-based research and workshops for community organization staff led by campus partners. In the end, it is about the quality of the match and fit between the key people working on the project and the sense of match between the organizations. The highest level of match between individuals and organizations represented within a partnership is when the lines between the separate unit begin to blur, and the partnership project constituents reach such a level of mutual buy-in that they identify as a part of the partnership.
The most noticeable way that a campus partner can express buy-in through identity is to make a clear statement that she or he is a community-based scholar, community-based researcher or community-engaged faculty member. One faculty member claims the identity by sharing that being a community-based research is something that is intrinsic to the individual. “It is also just my personality. That’s just who I am… that’s just who I am. It is not necessarily what academia is, but it is who I am.” Another faculty partner extends this idea of identity by revealing: “I consider myself to be a part of the community organization because I work so closely with them. And I think that the meaning is huge for them.” The level to which a community partner identifies as a member of the community, wishes to be recognized as a faculty member who specializes in community-based work and/or expresses connectedness with the community organization directly contributes to the level of buy-in for the partnership that the campus partner is demonstrating.

Clinical faculty members who are campus partners in partnership projects describe their level of buy-in coming from a feeling like they were coming home, “I have always been a clinician - and so getting the opportunity to do participatory research was something that I said “oh goodie” to right away!” Clinical and practice-based faculty also convey that it is more acceptable for them to identify as being a community-based faculty member,

…for me, as a clinician, I think it is a little bit easier for me to you know, it is a little more value when I’m seen [in the community] whereas if I were a researcher trying to base my career on community-based research I think it would be more challenging. I don’t know, I think it might be more challenging. I don’t know if it is a challenge or not.

To what extent and in what ways are community-engaged work considered being acceptable components of the faculty career? Answering this question is surely a task
for a completely separate study; nonetheless, this question offers as an illustration of the core conundrum faced by faculty who consider taking on the identity of community-based scholar. The faculty career is a reason for buy-in on the part of campus partners because the interplay of one’s career and community engagement work is very much focused on issues of acceptability, feasibility and recognition. A faculty member might have a sense of personal connection to a project, view the professional development opportunities as remarkable, identify as a community-based researcher, feel a strong match with the community organization and even have signals that buy-in from leadership exists for this work; but if the faculty member conducts a cost-benefit analysis and realizes that her or his career will suffer a setback, then the buy-in for the project will not be strong enough to warrant the robust level of goodness-of-fit necessary to make the project successful and sustain the partnership.

The main issue of concern among campus partners is promotion and tenure. Partners explain that the pursuit of tenure is more challenging for those who engage in community-based research because the tenure timeline and review process are not as conducive to or considerate of the unique dynamics of community-based research. There appears to be a mystique and even a negative undertone around the plausibility of ‘getting tenure’ or ‘getting promoted’ if one commits to a career rooted in community-based work.

…[tenure] can be a hard process for a community-based researcher because the products that you need to secure tenure are not always that quick in obtaining when you are a community-based researcher, mainly because it just takes longer to build that good, strong community connection and build trust in a community.

Campus partners explain that faculty members ought to have other irons on the fire, so to speak, in order to make sure that they are meeting the requirements for tenure while
building relationships in the community towards the goal of engaging in a partnership. Campus partners assert that this might be difficult for some faculty because it could require work outside of community-based settings. The danger for a faculty career is that too much attention might be put on building a relationship and not enough attention put on other project, “…I have done more of these type things for my own good than I should have - I mean, for tenure… I have not been disciplined enough.” Campus partners who have been successful in navigating the tenure process while engaging in community-based work reflect on the importance of being aware of tenure requirements from the start and chart a path that will allow for both to occur (community-based work and achieving tenure). The key is to have all the work in the faculty career trajectory make sense and flow, “The theme throughout my scholarship is on this topic area so it is a good confluence for me to have this partnership.” In other words, for the fit to be successful and acceptable it has to make sense. But if the costs of being a community-engaged faculty member, particularly during the pre-tenure years, outweigh the benefits then the buy-in from the campus partner will be nonexistent or slight.

When a cogent argument is made for how this partnership fits into one’s career, campus partners cite that it is important to be realistic and proactive about how this partnership can and cannot provide opportunities to engage in work for the key areas of tenure. A campus partner who was very frank about how to mold community-based opportunities into tenure package contributions explains that,

…when you do these sorts of projects you have to remember that it is considered service. And tenure isn’t based on service. So you need to make sure that your research question is well-defined going into it because that is the only way you can have the project count for anything besides service. Overall, it is important to make sure you don’t spread yourself too thin - in the project and in your faculty appointment.
Buy-in for community partnerships based on the dynamics of the faculty career is bolstered even further when a faculty member fully utilizes the connections and diversity of opportunity that might be available through the partnership but separate from whatever project or initiative serves as the primary focus. For instance, numerous campus and community partners mention the serendipity of a community-based project leading into the development of workshops for staff, service-learning or elective courses, special events and secondary data analysis.

[Community-based projects] have provided me with so many opportunities to fill the other areas of my tenure portfolio… I think that had I not had these collaborations I would have been actively seeking things to put in these areas, but I didn’t need to actively seek activities because I was already connected and already doing it.

Another component of buy-in for the partnership that is rooted in the faculty career experience involves the messages a faculty member receives from the university and the academic unit in regards to what elements are important for and what type of activities take priority in the tenure and promotion process and how equivalencies are determined between community and non-community based work.

…are [community engagement projects] considered service? Are they considered scholarship or research? I mean, there are elements of scholarship and there are also elements of service. But it’s service in my view way beyond sitting on a board or serving on a committee. How does that end up when you put all that into the formula for tenure and you turn the crank? It could be that this comes out you know, recognized, but not weighted enough. And I think that has a lot to do with how we see our purpose. In my view I think I’ve benefitted people more. If you said ‘you didn’t do these other projects that you’ve done and you got three articles written instead’, my response would be to say that that would been [sic] less of a benefit than what I have actually done.

It can be seen how a faculty member might find it challenging to buy into the idea of engaging in community-based research because it would be counterproductive to their career. Campus partners paint a picture of the current context of academia and faculty careers as such that counts the majority of community engagement work as service.
Campus partners point out that, so long as this is the case, faculty need to be proactive about ways to make the community engagement work look and feel like research, scholarship and/or teaching in order to receive the credit that they are due. Otherwise, the buy-in for the project or initiative is at risk of diminishing on the campus partner side because the realities of the faculty career will pull them away.

When you have faculty using their service time for these sorts of community-based research projects, it really cuts into the viability of the project. If we're not publishing off of these projects then this work is seen as service. So if you cut the budget, the faculty member has to do more leg-work to get it figured out - and that is service time. Which impacts the viability of the project itself because then the faculty member will have to use even more time from service time to make up for whatever didn’t get funded.

Another sentiment shared among campus partners is the assertion that increased opportunities sponsored by a university for community-engaged work offers is a sign that universities are trying to change the level of credence for this work in academic units. Theoretically, this adds value and credence to the work being done by the community-engaged faculty member because of the positive internal and public relations built around such programs.

I feel like the university values community engagement as a concept so long as it doesn’t get in the way of what they consider to be your real reason for being here - research and scholarship. What I mean is that they like to say a lot about community engagement but don’t want to give you credit for doing CBPR - and it’s like, ‘hello?!’, I mean, are you going to build partnerships just for the sake of building them? But anyway, I think that the acceptance of this type of work as scholarship is getting better seeing as how there are [increased university support sources] available. Now it just needs to translate down from the administration to the deans and department chairs. I mean, you simply cannot compare me in the tenure process to someone who never sets foot into the community for their research.

Despite the increased opportunities to receive university support for community engagement work and internal and external publicity about these initiatives, campus partners convey that it is not enough to significantly enhance buy-in among the majority
of faculty members because the momentum around the importance of community engaged work has not trickled down to the level that would impact the faculty career. Campus partners cite areas such as course release, allocation of graduate teaching and research assistance and other forms of buy-out as being the indicators of inequity among faculty depending on the type of funding they have received for their research and scholarship.

Well, [community engagement] is certainly part of the [university’s strategic plan] and the [academic unit’s] vision and mission, but when it comes down to it - research is research is research is research - if you can’t publish off of it then it is really not… well, if it is not clean cut and easy to publish on then it is something that doesn’t get recognized. But I do think that the [academic unit] is behind this type of work. Um, but I’m not sure it’s as recognized as peer reviewed publications.

Another layer to the issue of how much faculty members will buy into community engagement support from the university when it is not reflected in performance reviews has to do with the message conveyed at institutions that community-based projects and initiatives are nice window dressings for the university and are ‘less than’ other types of scholarship. Some campus partners purport, with a strong majority doing so off-the-record, that the mindset that community-based work is less important than laboratory-based research stems from the dominant ideology set by the leadership and administration of an institution, which is reported to be a philosophy that bringing money into the institution is what is valued as most important for a faculty member.

Overwhelmingly, campus partners indicate that internal funding mechanisms and small community-based grants for community engagement projects do not receive nearly the same amount of recognition and credit in the tenure equation as a grant from an external funding source for the same amount of money would.
Much like the discussion around the change in culture of academia, campus partners seem hopeful that the landscape is changing in academia. As more tenure-track faculty members seek partnerships and are successful in community-based projects in their pre-tenure careers, campus partners are hopeful that a normalizing effect will occur in which it becomes more acceptable and feasible to engage in this work as a positive and useful component of a strong tenure package. Campus partners indicate that this trend has the potential to decrease concerns around goodness-of-fit among faculty members who want to dedicate their careers to community-engaged scholarship.

*Community Need.*

In order for there to be an authentic goodness-of-fit among all involved in the partnership, it is necessary that the partnership projects and initiatives be framed around meeting community need. A consistent message from community and campus partners is that community need is something that ought to be at the core of a partnership. As a community partner explains, the way that the partnership defines the project has long-reaching effects for the future of the partnership and the overall relationship between the community and the university:

> [F]irst of all, the key thing is always to be targeting the needs of the community first, and not the needs of the campus or faculty member. This point actually takes a long time, in my experience, for some faculty members to ‘get’. When we talk about community-based learning and community-based research, faculty sometimes have a little trouble reframing themselves away from the status quo forms of teaching and research toward a real community first focus. So what works best is to have that community focus. We never want to impose ourselves on the community or community organization - it is important to view the community like a [specialist] would view any group with minority group status. When you get faculty to think this way, that the community is a protected group with minority group status, then you see that the last thing that you want to do is perpetuate oppression and exploit the community for campus gain. If we, if we destroy the trust between the college and the community, then there is no partnership. And there’s no place for students to go in the future. And there’s not
a good feeling between the college and the community, period, which is the opposite of what I think you’re trying to get. So, so just to make the community first and foremost is the key.

Community need is something that must be defined by those who are in the community. In order to have a truly engaged community partnership, the partners will work together to have the needs for the project be community-defined. Instead of having the campus partner come to the community to ask a specific question, this model of community-defined need put the community at the core of defining the focus of the research. “So the community partner is bringing the research questions to the table and then we’re able to come full circle by having a conversation about how to build upon an already strong relationship to make this project work.” Certainly the campus partners will contribute valuable information and insight to the project, but these contributions should be made in ways that do not superimpose something from the literature onto a specific community or otherwise overlook aspects unique to the community.

As one community partner laments, a project fizzles it there is no interest in seeking community need, “So it was challenging at times; [campus partners] had good intentions but did not ask what our needs were.” The majority of the background information and core characteristics of the community that are used to inform the project design will need to come from the partners who work closely with the community. In some cases, campus partners are already engaged with the community and can formulate suspicions about what might be pertinent to address in the community through a project or initiative, “…we saw as a need and what we heard from people out in the [community]… was that we were right about what we suspected from our work.” As another campus partner explains, finding common ground around the importance of
community-defined need is a way to maximize potential for utilizing the community and campus partners’ expertise:

[Community partners] know the priorities in the community which is a big deal from my standpoint. When it is not particularly my area of expertise that we’re dealing with I know where to go in the community to get help with that area for them, and they do the same thing with me.

In the same way that community-defined need is a part of the overall goodness-of-fit for a partnership; there are specialized skills and resources that campus partners can offer to the community organization that contribute greatly to the good match between the partners. One area of need that many community partners refer to often is that of consultation on and assistance with research and evaluation efforts. Needs assessments and evaluation projects are mentioned by community partners as areas of need among community organizations because these organizations do not generally have the funding necessary for hiring a dedicated person for these efforts. Similarly, numerous community partners cite funding and financial resources as a large area of community need. It is important to note that defining community need has to do with more than the problem statement or research questions; it has to do with formulating a greater understanding for the context in which the community agency operates. There is also a strong need in the community for it to feel as though the campus partner is present. The community needs to feel like the campus is a true partner, and this is most tangibly demonstrated through the campus partner’s physical presence in the community:

And, you need to SEE [participant emphasizes word] the needs here. We can tell you about the community needs, about our clients’ needs. But you need to come here and see it. You need to go in the field and shadow our practitioners and get your hands dirty in order to see the needs. Only then will you really be ready to partner.
A less tangible community need that is part of the goodness-of-fit for the partnership has to do with what it means to a community organization to partner with a particular institution of higher education. The image, visibility and prestige associated with a partnership is a central consideration that community and campus partners refer to as impacting the overall assessment of community need. This is because it addresses the questions, ‘Will partnering with this institution positively impact the community and will it be seen positively for us to associate with the institution?’

If the university is viewed positively within the community or among the stakeholders associated with the community organization, then the partnership is seen as a way to affirm the existing views through projects that will be constructive in meeting community need. “Well, and [the university] has a good reputation in the community, so I think it helps them that much more.”

Partnering with an institution that has a positive image within the community is also considered to provide an endorsement for the work done at the community organization.

Well I think that for me, at uh, um it’s been kind of an endorsement of what I’m doing. If [an academic unit] thinks I’m worthy of the students’ educational time then I feel like this is an official stamp of approval that, yeah, we’re doing a pretty good job here and we’re doing the right thing. You know, this is good, it is the right thing that we’re doing here - it is validating.

The prestige of partnering with a university does not only meet the community organization’s needs. The community members impacted though partnership projects also need to feel as though they are benefitting from and positively influenced by the affiliation. “For [underserved population] to have a connection with [the university] - it is huge, I don’t think many people understand that. When [underserved population] know that they are part of a [university] study it infuses them with energy.”
Community and campus partners alike are interested in how success stories from community partnerships can be made more visible in order to raise awareness in the community about the good work being done to meet community need by these collaborations. In the community organization circles comprised of those who work in similar areas or with the same population, word of mouth causes stories of successful partnering with the university to travel fast. Likewise, campus partners feel that increasing visibility of partnerships that are valued in the community as a way to enhance university buy-in and support community engagement and even contribute to the bottom line of the university’s financial base by encouraging donors to contribute to an institution that contributes to the community.

...I see that the only way that we will get on the map and stay on the map is excellence in community engagement and partnerships. Now I don’t know if I can blow up these programs and offerings that involve community engagement and multidisciplinary work into being seen as the best thing ever - but I know someone in PR could do it. I think that it is a huge money maker for the college if people can see us as educating through work in the community - it is a triple bang for your buck really because you’re helping the community, you’re helping the students imagine themselves as community leaders, and people see what we’re doing. What more could you ask for?!

The positive perceptions held in the community about the university appear to bolster the overall sense that there is a goodness-of-fit in a partnership. It seems logical then that a bad history between the campus and community would lead to pessimistic and negative impressions of university, and as such would have adverse effect on the goodness of fit. Nonetheless, there are no data in this study upon which to make such a statement or support claims of poor relationships between the university and the community. Suggestions for areas where the university and community could improve their associations focus instead on the ways that these entities can work together to
garner additional resources to continue to increase opportunities to partner, and consequently seek to achieve greater impact in the community.

*Theme Four: Resources*

Community and campus partners unanimously indicate that it takes resources to sustain a partnership. This theme addresses the question, “What does it take to sustain a partnership in terms of resources?” To address this question, the discussion of resources is explored through three sub-themes: *resource development,* which symbolizes the contextual dynamics and resource efforts necessary for a partnership; *student involvement,* which signifies the educational and human capital aspects of partnerships; and *grant proposals and funding,* which represents the financial resources needed to actualize partnership projects and initiatives. As established through the other themes of this theory, it is critical that the partners agree upon the resources needed for the partnership and contribute equally to the tasks associated with acquiring those resources. Figure 4.4 provides a diagram of the sub-themes and categories that contribute to theme four.
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Resource development.

Campus partners discuss how their efforts in community-based work are facilitated or would be made more effective if they were able to cultivate more resources within their academic unit in terms of the amount of time that they are allocated to or able to spend connecting with community partners. Similar to the sentiments shared regarding the buy-in associated with the faculty career, campus partners share that a helpful resource is finding a way to get their community-based work to ‘count for’ something besides service.

And so to be seen as a positive thing we as faculty need to do that kind of thing - we need to do things like create electives for the work instead of just saying ‘I just want to have students come with me to do service-learning’, you know? You have to think of those avenues to find out how you can make it into something official and structured in a way.

In order to develop the sorts of skills that are necessary to be an effective community-engaged scholar, campus partners find that it is important that the university recognize their work and reward it with the appropriate resources.
Campus and community partners feel strongly about their ability to engage in partnerships as a way to contribute to capacity building within the community organization as well as in the community as a whole.

So what we’re really looking at with that is to see if there could be any sort of capacity building in a sense, because we’re there and training people around the diabetes model and going to provider meetings and saying “these are the guidelines you should use” - is there, if we left tomorrow, would diabetes care be better at the site with the providers currently there because we were able to train them and go over this with them.

While the term ‘capacity building’ is not used often among campus and community partners, the approach is described by numerous partners as that of building a framework and cultivating sustainable resources that make it possible for projects and services to continue after the initial impact period and in many cases expanding the reach beyond the initial community partner site. As a campus partner explains, this approach is not about co-opting or taking charge of an organization; it is about working together to identify and develop resources so that the partnership can grow in new ways. “[W]e see it as a good thing to say that they can do it without me. We want to build their confidence and we want them to be able to do it.”

On both sides of the partnership, a core area in need of development is that of the organizational infrastructure. This element refers to the capacity of the infrastructure at the partner organizations as well as within the partnership itself because of the interrelated nature of the structures. Having a robust infrastructure means more than having buy-in from key players. In addition to endorsing the partnership, actual resources must be offered and organizational procedures must be assessed and reviewed to ensure that the context is conducive to the community-based project or initiative.
On the university side of the partnership, five main areas emerged as key dynamics related to what a strong infrastructure helpful in sustaining partnerships would look like as a part of the capacity building process. Sometimes partners would say something to the effect of, ‘maybe this does exist’ or ‘I know they do this already but it is not convenient for me.’ In some cases suggestions were to improve existing elements of infrastructure. The following quotation illustrates the importance of incorporating two of the key elements into the infrastructure.

I think [there is] some infrastructure, right? But I do not know if for [academic unit] faculty who are doing so much teaching and so much service - I don't think there’s a lot of support and infrastructure for us to collaborate with researchers at all. And I don’t think that there is any sort of forum where we’re at, even among my own faculty. I have no clue what people are doing until I start working with them on a project. And they don’t have any clue with what I do. Uh, and I’m not picking on my department because I think that other departments have the same issues. And I really think that is something that is missing. It was something that was really highlighted to me at [community organization], I was talking to the director of the [organization] and she was like [Campus partner], are you going to be around later? And I was like ‘yeah’ and she said ‘good because [faculty group from another university department] is coming over later to talk to us about an initiative they want to get started with us and they want to do this, this, and this’. And I had no clue... there is that aspect with the community partner was, I think, getting a little annoyed with [the university] coming in from like ten different places. It would have been better to have come to them with a collaborative effort. I mean, they’re happy to have us, but it’s just beyond them to see how there could be three different colleagues from [the university] coming in saying ‘I wanna do this and this and that’ and you know they don’t know each other, but it is all related and they’re like ‘you don’t know this?’ But once we did learn this we did collaborate and we’ve done work together and it has been great.

First, in order to encourage collaborations the university must find a way to facilitate a clearinghouse or database so that campus and community partners can easily access information on who is doing what kind of community-based work. Doing so could help faculty in avoiding embarrassing situations and assist community organizations from feeling overwhelmed. Secondly, a core element of infrastructure is to provide opportunities for those involved in community engagement work to attend
meetings or roundtable discussions about topics related to community-campus partnerships. While the projects might be very different, there are aspects of partnerships that would translate across experiences. Partners indicate that in the cases where these sorts of meetings are already offered on campus, it is important to enhance the meetings by opening them up for community partner attendance.

A third element of the infrastructure is the establishment of a centralized office and/or point person at the university, perhaps also within the individual academic unit, to go to with questions about partnerships and community engagement. One campus partner explains that, in the case of internal funding, partners would have enjoyed additional involvement and input from a third party. Once there is a presence of an office or point person, partners feel like it is important to get the sense that these individuals are available to assist and support them.

I think it would have been a good thing to have had a liaison for the partnership who could have come to our meetings and be there as a resource and could have made the university more active in our partnership and helped them to actually know what we were doing. I mean, it is not enough to give a bunch of money and then be so hands off. It would have helped to integrate the project at the university in a meaningful way. It didn’t need to be a full-time employee to work with us, but just someone assigned to us to check in and see if we needed anything. A graduate assistant would be a great idea - that would be a good setup too. Just someone to check in with us.

Whether within or separate from the centralized community engagement infrastructure, partners find it important to have a designated point person or office to assist with research topics, especially dynamics of IRB submission, that are unique to community-based research. This fourth element of infrastructure emerges from sentiments indicating that some faculty involved in community-based research projects are not as familiar as they would like to be with university regulations and processes around research. There are nuances to community-based research that do not always fit in
neatly with the traditional models of research around which the university policies and procedures are built. While sharing impressions from a recent project that received internal grant funding, a campus partner highlights that there are elements of the university infrastructure that could be strengthened in order to impact the sustainability of partnerships.

And I do want to say, and I don’t want to sound like a criticism, but I have been working with some of my [colleagues] for a while now… there wasn’t, there weren’t a lot of infrastructure or resources to help us with this sort of research. So there are three [faculty members] going and doing a grant. We’re expected, well, we’re told we can get help with the IRB process but that’s not built into the grants so now that we already had our first event and now we have the data that we’re going to be looking at, the IRB… I mean, we should know how to do IRBs, but when you are a [non-research focused faculty] person it is so different. So I feel like there should have been or well that there could have been a better way of facilitating that process. It is just that there are [non-research focused] faculty or other faculty there that really need more advisement or, uh, more expertise about how to develop this into more of a research project, that would have been beneficial for me on most of the grants.

The final area of infrastructure emerging as a core resource that helps with sustainability of partnerships is the way that university and individual academic units actualize the vision and mission statements related to community engagement. A campus partner illustrates key points related to this in her explanation of what makes their academic unit so dynamic in providing adequate infrastructure for the community-based research in which the campus partner is engaged:

Well, we’re very fortunate here. We are very fortunate in the [academic unit] here. We’ve got everything we need here. We’ve got the ability to produce our own posters, so we reach outside of the building to create those interdisciplinary teams but when it comes to the infrastructure, the support that you really need to get [community-based research grant] out the door - we have all those people in the building, which is nice. And that was a conscious focus of the [academic unit] over the past fifteen or twenty years. It was to really put us on the map in terms of being able to increase funding and in order to do that there needed to be a structure that would enable us to do that and also still make it possible... see they really thought very clearly about how do we structure this so that people can really do what it is that we are asking them to do.
When university leaders and academic unit administrators take action and provide the types of resources that are necessary to facilitate community-based projects and initiatives, the importance of community engagement is no longer an ideal because it is a reality. This adds an interesting layer to the idea of resources because it ties together the types of resources needed in the specific area of infrastructure while it also illustrates the type of goodness-of-fit that ought to exist between the stated values of the institution and the ways and means expressing how these are actualized and embedded in the organization. Much of the infrastructure elements are related to the areas in which the university is expected to have an infrastructure sufficient to sustain partnerships. There is not sufficient consensus among campus and community partners related to community organization infrastructure. While it would be nice for community organizations to have the sort of infrastructure to affect change in these areas (and some do), there are not nearly the expectations for community organizations as there are for campus organizations.

*Student Involvement.*

One of the major resources for community-based projects and initiatives that influence sustainability of the partnership is student involvement. While it is clear that the level of student involvement varies greatly from project to project, there is among the vast majority of partners that student involvement is a critical and advantageous resource. Some partners describe that student involvement was an add-on component to a project or initiative because of funding requirements for students to be involved, while others indicate that student involvement is a given for any community-based project as they are a part of the campus community.
Another element that varies from partnership to partnership is the ways that students are involved in the project or initiative. Numerous community partners indicate that students engage with their organization in a variety of capacities and not all are tied directly to a specific project, which adds complexity to the idea of what it means to be a community partner in a partnership with the university. “Well, we signed up and did what we needed to do to get set up as a site for their students to come and do internships. But not a real partnership. Just an internship site.” There are layers to partnerships, and the topic of student involvement as a resource for the partnership exposes the diversity of involvement and experiences.

Student involvement includes students in service-learning and other experiential learning courses, students engaged in internships and practica experiences, students serving as research and teaching assistants and students who are volunteers. Despite the different types of ways students become involved in community-based work, there is agreement among community and campus partners about the key features of student involvement that bolster potential for sustainable partnerships. Partners agree that key to understanding the idea that students are resources and increasing the likelihood that students will be effective resources for the partnership center on three main areas: the ‘how to’ of managing student involvement, the impact of student involvement on the student and the impact of student involvement on the community organization.

Managing student involvement on community-based projects starts with taking the time to set the stage for the students in such a way that provides them with the opportunity to think about, discuss and ask questions related to the upcoming experience. Among those who have observed student involvement experiences that
take place through a course, partners explain that it is important to provide students with context during the first week or two of the semester. This will ease the students into the experience, providing them with the information necessary to prepare for going into the community. In some instances, partners find that not all students are civic-minded or have fully developed the analytical skills necessary to think critically about the type of work around which they will be engaging with the community. This context, facilitated by some mindset activities, helps students see the big picture while still attending to the specific details of what sorts of tasks and activities will be done in the community. As a campus partner explains, it is helpful for faculty to keep in mind that a lot of the students will be going into a community that is very different from the community in which they grew up and around which they have built a worldview:

[W]e hope that it is a valuable experience but we don’t expect them to get all sorts of different types of learning out of it. I’m hoping that they get the multicultural piece. The diversity piece… you have to be culturally sensitive too… Though they are getting the diversity piece, maybe they’re not as comfortable talking about that in their journals… And I have a few that say, ‘you know, this is what I have going on at home - I’m a single parent, I’m a person of color, I come from a background with limited economic and financial resources; I’m not sure I really need this experience to get this because I’ve lived this’, and I’m okay with that. What I do with those students is I push them, I say ‘why don’t you work with [an international client]… [a different age group]… a recent immigrant… someone other than your own background.

Community partners and students who are involved as campus partners agree that this is a critical area that can impede or amplify a student’s potential to be a resource for the partnership. Once the contextualization piece is integrated and students are aware of the issues pertinent to their involvement in the partnership, the supervisory campus partner (such as a faculty member) and community partner must conduct an informal assessment of how to best utilize student talents.
Simply put, not every student is equipped to do every task. A basic example would be that a student not trained to use the arm cuff would not be sent to take a patient’s blood pressure in a clinic setting. A campus partner explains that it is important to be attuned to “recognizing where your students are in their abilities and their motivation to serve in the community.” While the example of the blood pressure reading has to do with skill level, the motivation issue is less tangible and can serve as a source for faculty gatekeeping around student involvement.

Well, I will say that since I am so community oriented and because so much of my success in what I can do in my work depends on these partnerships, I am really picky about students. I don’t know how to say that in a more polite way! I mean, yeah, there are some students that I just won’t send out to do stuff. Not that I don’t believe in them, but it is more that there really is this skill set that you need to go out and be a good community member and partner. And not offend people when you go into the community.

Students are seen as ambassadors of the academic program, the partnership and the university. Having supervisory campus partners and community partners confer about student motivation and skill are directly linked to assessing upfront how to involve the student in a project toward the intermediate goal of optimizing resources and the ultimate goal of maintaining a successful partnership that can be sustained.

Campus partners of all rank and role as well as community partners ought to be on the same page about the expectations for student and around student involvement. This includes communication about grading in the instances where a student is engaging with the community for course credit. Without clear parameters, students might not be rewarded or recognized for their positive contributions to the partnership. Likewise, without boundaries there is a risk that students will not be accountable for instances where they do not contribute the type and level of resources expected. As a
community partner recounts, it was important to be apprised of the expectations and be in agreement with the campus partner about the consequences:

We shared responsibility with student volunteers. As the professor, she gave a grade but there were professional boundaries when it came to the work they did here. A few years ago there was that intern I mentioned who just stopped doing what they were supposed to do - who dropped off the face of the earth essentially. There’s no absolute but it is worth the risk. In that case I think she failed the student. I hope she did! I’m pretty sure she did. In the end, when you are affiliated with a course and a professor, you have added credibility to what the students are doing. And that helps.

Community partners stress the importance of the work done by students once they are in the setting, by expressing that “this is a professional, serious job… a major responsibility that they are taking on… being a volunteer is a job.” Not all students are involved on a voluntary basis or solely for course credit. In the case of students who are involved in community engagement for pay, there is a different level of responsibility placed on them by partners. As a campus partner explains, “there was that level of accountability that I had that other projects might not have… I felt like I could lean on them a little bit more because they were being paid.” For students whose involvement incorporates compensation, it appears that there is a give-and-take in relation to the financial resources being allocated for them being translated into accountability for the labor and skill resources that the students are putting back into the partnership.

The second main area of consideration related to conceptualizing student involvement as a resource for the partnership is the impact that the partnership has on the student. How might this be a resource? Campus and community partners explain that common impacts on student involvement such as cultivating professional skills, encouraging the development of civic mindedness and piquing a student’s interest in the local community are directly related to the resource gained from students who are
inclined to continue their involvement in the community and continue to give back.

Campus and community partners lament that these conjectures are oftentimes unsubstantiated because efforts to assess student learning and the impact of student experiences fall short of providing meaningful opportunities to inform the partnership and knowledge base related to community engagement and student outcomes. A campus partner shares that while one might get the sense that the students are getting something out of the experience, the assessment of this sometimes falls by the wayside:

I did get some qualitative I guess data about the impact on the students based on the impact on the students from [the experience] but we really haven't looked at that yet because I wasn't really sure that [assessment activity] was going to happen.

This and similar sentiments suggest that in order to fully understand how student involvement serves as a resource to the partnership, it is important to incorporate assessment in the initial plan for the project or initiative and allocate time and attention accordingly.

Perhaps equally as anecdotal in nature, partners agree that the third area of consideration for how students are resources for partnerships is to look at the impact of student involvement on the community. This matter is more complex than simply stating that the students helped on a project and so they served as a resource because it increased human capital. For community partners, the impact is instead something that looks more like a cost-benefit analysis. It takes time, money, commitment and expertise to train and supervise students who become involved with a community-based project or initiative. A community partner explains a community agency conundrum of wanting to gain the resources that surely would be provided by student involvement but
lacking the agency resources necessary to support the involvement and make it a positive experience for the stakeholders:

I am at a grant funded program and I am the primary fundraiser - and I am constantly being asked to house a [undergraduate] or [graduate] student and I have said ‘no’ to that constantly because I don’t have time for it. And I’m just being honest about it. Because I don’t think they would have a good experience. And so with these partnerships it really needs to be well thought out who is going to supervise - I mean, with use of these students, I am just saying, if you’re going to use internship students which a lot of these partnership do in order to save money - you really need to put a lot of thought into who is going to supervise the student, who will take care of them because not every student can go in and do it themselves. You know, there are some horror stories. But I do think that done correctly - you know, supervision and training is done effectively - then it can be a really big asset. And so that’s something I’m trying to work in with my organization, but I’m constantly saying ‘no’ right now because right now it is just not an option.

For other community partners, this is not as much of an issue and therefore the benefit outweighs the cost, so to speak, because “[m]uch of the work the students do here can be done with minimal training but the work is essential to our operation.”

There are elements of the student involvement impact on the community organization that can be seen as a beneficial and sustainable resource. Having a strong volunteer base is a core resource for many of the community partner organizations. Students are not the only types of volunteers involved with community organizations. As a community partner explains, student volunteers are treated like any other volunteer and their contributions to the community are seen as equal to that of any other volunteer:

Our clients don’t care. We have the students tell them up front, to disclose, that they are students. So everyone is understanding that. But not from a perspective that they are less qualified to provide services or are not prepared. Which might be the way [the university] sees them! But we see them as professionals who are learning every day in the classroom about the latest theories and best practices for our clients - why wouldn’t they be good volunteers?! We tell them to tell the clients that they are students so that the clients are aware of the uniqueness of their schedules and the demands that may be on their lives. We have seen no resistance at all from our clients to working with a student. None!”
As this sentiment illustrates, student involvement in the community through partnership activities is seen as a resource for the community. Community organizations are oftentimes willing to work with campus partners in a number of areas to optimize the resource potential for student involvement. Even then the resources provided through capacity building, strengthening infrastructure and student involvement are not always enough to guarantee that a partnership project or initiative will be successful and sustainable.

Grant Proposals and Funding.

Without funding, many community-based projects and initiatives cannot come to fruition. In order for partnership activities to take place, funds need to be secured to support the project because community organization financial resources alone are more often than not spread too thin already to cover the expenses. The majority of partners in this study have experience with partnerships projects and initiatives funded through university funding streams, which are also referred to as internal funding streams. Through conversations with campus and community partners around the resources necessary for a successful project or initiative, funding is often cited as the most critical resource.

Generally, community partners share that they heard about funding opportunities through a campus partner with whom they were already connected. Some had only just recently been acquainted with one another prior to seeking funding together, but the majority of partners have collaborated before on projects. Among the campus and community partners who have experience applying for grant funding, the general consensus is that internal funding proposal submission and review procedures are less
demanding than those required by foundations and national funders; however, numerous partners assert that the internal funding proposal, application and review procedures they encountered were “appropriate” for the amount of money they were seeking. Partners cite working together as a team as an imperative component of the proposal process because it is part of the context upon which the tone of the relationship is set for the project as well as for the relationship. A campus partner shares how well an intensive workgroup session informed the proposal being submitted for a community-based project grant: “That meeting gave us a concentrated amount of time to plan and talk through the [proposal] and the project design. So then it made it easy to apply for the [grant].” While there might be one partner who takes the lead in writing the actually proposal, it is important to be clear about what is to be included within the proposal. As a community partner shares, not discussing the contents of the proposal can lead to misunderstandings before the project is even able to start.

But here is something I’d tell [people applying for funding], and I tell my interns this all the time, make sure up front that you talk with everyone and know where they are up front, what they’re thinking. Because we thought we were on the same page with [primary faculty partner], but apparently we weren’t.

In terms of the process of proposing a project or initiative within the context of seeking internal funding, community and campus partners find that the process is overall quite positive and seamless.

Since the foundation of the partnership is based on relationship building and the cornerstone of a successful partnership is comprised of the relationship dynamics, it seems fitting that the grant funding proposal process be cognizant of the ‘equal partners’ mindset. Those charges with selecting finalists for grant opportunities can honor the community-campus equality objective by communicating with the individual
listed as the primary campus partner and the individual listed as the primary community partner.

I think the biggest thing was the feedback we didn’t get. And that there is really no place for community partners to go to get information. I think it would be really helpful for the [grant reviewer] to send a letter to the community partner to say ‘hey, you’re a community partner, if you have questions or need help feel free to call us.’ But I don’t know if they want to do that. It helps, even if you just know the timeline - tell us to feel free to call our partners because they’re the ones who will get the information. Just something. I felt like I really didn’t get any information as a community partner.

In instances when there is an in-person meeting to discuss the proposal with a selection committee, directly inviting the primary partners from the community and the campus helps to set the tone of equality (instead of assuming the campus partner will invite the community representative, for instance).

I did go to the panel interview thing [for the grant proposal]. Because I remember now that we prepped for it and I was expecting something like when I go to foundations for money. But it was so friendly. They really seemed to care about who we are as an agency and what we do.

Aside from cultivating a welcoming environment that is genuinely interested in equality within the partnerships that it funds, partners express that grant funding entities can maximize the influence that they have to set the tone for how the resources will be utilized within the partnerships by remaining unbiased during the selection process and being as transparent as possible about the final selection results. Unless the grant opportunity is targeted to partnership projects or initiatives that are focused on a specific population, community or problem area, it is important that those who are reviewing grants keep an open-mind about the types of projects that are proposed in order to make sure that all proposals are reviewed uniformly and justly. A campus partner’s account of interactions with a grant review committee represents a voice about which
very few of the community and campus partners who have shared the experience wish to go on-record to discuss:

We just didn’t feel welcomed. And it made me wonder - who are these people on the [review committee] that decide these sorts of things? Do they have a strong history with the community and therefore know what the heartbeat of the community is on? Because if so, it didn’t sound like it. I didn’t know who these people were and they were very condescending, some of them. And I was like ‘who are you?!’

For those partners whose projects are not funded through a specific funding source, it is greatly appreciated when the final decision is disseminated to the main contacts in the community and on campus. Community partners overall, regardless of funding decisions, felt that funders rely too heavily on the campus partner to share information with the community partner and wish that they could be kept in the loop equally. In regards to projects that do not receive funding, partners do express that a brief explanation around the reason why the project was not funded is very much appreciated because it helps the partners revise their proposals for submission in the future.

Despite negative feelings about the grant proposal process, the vast majority of partners express that they would pursue the same opportunity if given the chance because financial resources are financially scarce. While some partners express concern over the grant review process and the tone that is set by grant reviewers in terms of partnership dynamics, the majority of partners agree that the processes they encounter are largely considered to be “appropriate.”

One community partner’s comment conveys a concern shared by many stakeholders who are involved with community-based projects and initiatives: “I really worry about what will happen as grants come and go, you know, about the partnerships. Like, will they continue?” Some campus and community partners express emotions of
bitterness and abandonment toward funders who did not grant a continuation of funding after the initial grant period.

Um, we went back for additional funding. And we only got a small amount of funding initially... I had to go to the other agency’s community partners and a lot was given in kind, our time, and the agencies’ activities and those sorts of things. So then we went back to expand it and asked for funding to include [a piece of the project initially cut due to funding]... We didn’t get future funding at the time. It was at a time when there were a lot of funding cuts going on, you know, big time cuts with the state. The group itself wanted to sustain it but there were so many cut backs.

This sentiment represents the frustration that some partners express when additional funding cannot be secured and they have to discontinue project efforts. Among those partners who were recipients of internal funding opportunities, the majority share that they would have benefitted greatly if there had been encouragement and support upfront around the topic of how to use the momentum created through the use of internal funds in order to successfully compete for external funding opportunities. Community and campus partners stress that each partnership project or initiative ought to be conducted in such a way that the findings and implications put the partnership in a position to leverage for additional funding.

In the case of internal funding, partners suggest that the university could assist with the process of leveraging for additional funding.

You know you get that internal grant and there’s a lot of excitement about the grant, you do the study, but really you need that extra step in there to help you move from internal funding to really being competitive for external funding. Yeah. You know. It would be not necessarily an easy thing for them to do, and I’m not exactly sure how I would suggest that they do it. And it is such a tough thing because they could say that it sounds like a good idea, but then when it gets to the point of implementation you know, like I said, there are a million things to do then.

Most partners feel that the plan to leverage for additional funding ought to be something that partners talk about immediately once they receive a grant. One campus partner
shares that the mindset from the start was about how to use internal funding to leverage for external funding:

I feel like in my case I fulfilled the [internal funding stream] mission by using the results from the seed grant project as leverage in applying for another grant. I used the findings from this study to apply for a [federal grant] that I received and that is now funding me for [current research study].

Campus partners convey that oftentimes internal funding streams are most useful for junior faculty members and doctoral candidates to utilize as pilot programs or initial studies as a part of “a very logical chain of events that [are] influential to securing a grant” that facilitates the next step in the research trajectory for campus partners. While community partners do not describe the research trajectory in the same way that faculty might, many community partners are concerned with the ability to leverage for additional funds. Community partners indicate that when there is success with a project or initiative, they are eager to continue working with the faculty member to apply for additional funding opportunities in the future. Securing financial resources through the process of applying for grant funding to support projects and initiatives is a major contributing factor in the overall constellation of what it takes to sustain a partnership because these and other resources make the project move from conceptualization to actualization.

*Theme Five: Impact*

The projects and initiatives associated with a community-campus partnership are deemed to be appropriate and full of promise if they are seen as viable options for addressing a community issue in a way that is beneficial to the community. The key is in making authentic growth toward the goals set forth in the project proposal. Indeed, aspects of much the partnership impacts the community are only theoretical in nature
until the partnership yields evidence that establishes the project or initiative as one that makes a difference within and positively impacts the community. This theme addresses the question, “What does it take to sustain a partnership in terms of the impact?” Partners are consistently frank about one thing – it is not realistic at all to think that any community issue or social problem can be solved or fixed through a single community-based project. As a community partner explores, the campus partners must be realistic about expectations for the feasible and reasonable impacts of a project.

[Funders] need to tell the campus people, the faculty and the students, that they are not coming out into the community to play the role of savior. That is not how it works… We don’t expect you to come in and save the world - and people who come into here either to volunteer or do a study or work here, they realize that quick. The best way to make a difference is to take the time to get to know us, what we do, what we need, and then work with us.

This realistic mindset is a helpful contribution to keep in mind in establishing the types of impact that are realistic to expect from a partnership. There are two sub-themes that represent what partners consider to be the two crucial areas of impact for a project or initiative that are necessary for sustaining the partnership. The first is the cultivation of a sense of appreciation, worth and value in regards to the partners, organizations, partnership and project. The second is support for the idea that the project or initiative has in some way been successful in effecting change and progress in addressing a problem in the real world. Figure 4.5 provides a visual representation of the relationships within theme five.
Appreciation, worth and value.

First and foremost, community partners express *appreciation* toward the university and the campus partners for wanting to work together to address pressing issues found in the community. As one community partner shares, “Well, it is always nice when you look at fighting [a specific social cause] and someone wants to work with you towards improved [services]. So we are appreciative.” Admitting that there are parts of the partnership process that are not ideal, another community partner discusses that the positive aspects outweigh the off-putting ones: “I have to say, and stress, that I am very appreciative to [the university]. It can certainly be frustrating at times, but we are very appreciative.” Likewise, campus partners are appreciative to the community partners for the opportunity to come into their organizations in order to better understand a phenomenon, learn how to help a specific population around a specific issue and/or enhance educational efforts for students while working directly with community stakeholders. As a campus partner reveals,
It is hard to put into words because it is so personal. I mean, I have to pinch myself because it is so perfect. I am learning so much better in this environment then if I was stuck in my office studying the topic of [specialty area]. This is a complex issue that lends itself well to CBPR. It means so much to me to be able to be involved.

The partnership impacts around the concepts of *worth* and *value* refer to the importance and merit that is perceived as being a result of the work done together in the partnership project or initiative. Partners use both terms to refer to the personal, interpersonal, organizational and community significance of the partnership endeavors. For some partners, one result of the partnership is a very personal and emotional connection to the community and the partners involved in the partnerships, as a campus partner describes:

> Overall, it has been a tremendously enriching experience to work with the agency. I am still invited to events there! [participant tears up; takes a moment to compose]... And so it has been quite meaningful to have a relationship with the agency and the people there.

Another impact that these sorts of community-based projects have is to provide the community partners with “a better idea about [the university’s efforts around] research, and how it can help them and how we can benefit from that.” As the campus partner conveys, there is worth in a project impact that is not at all related to the primary goals of the project. Other unanticipated outcomes are valued by campus and community partners. Many community partners did not anticipate that an impact of the project would be that they feel like a part of the partnership that is valued by the university.

And there is something about it when you work with that university person, that representative [referring to her faculty partner] who treats you like you matter, like you can call on their cell phone, and that what you’re doing together is a priority. I mean, without that, I would have never fought the traffic to the [university] campus, fought to find parking on that god-awful campus, and found the conference room in a busy hospital after already working a full day unless I felt like I was a part of something that was important and was a priority to the school.
This sentiment is not a one-way expression of value. Campus partners feel that a crucial aspect of the outcomes of the project is feeling as though one has made a difference. A campus partner conveys a sentiment shared by many individuals related to the value of the work done through the partnership as it relates to the purpose of community engagement efforts:

[I]t was a great way for me to really feel like I was getting out of my office and getting into the community and really doing something that would make a difference. And so I think we all strive to and think we do that as researchers but when it is at the community engagement level it really makes you get back into a specific type of community in a very different kind of a way. And so I really enjoyed it.

This reaction to what the value and worth of a partnership is, especially for campus partners, leads to the exploration of how having a real world experience is such an important element of the way that impact of a project helps to sustain a partnership.

Real world.

The real world impact of a partnership is referred to by partners as critical element of the partnership that contributes to sustainability of the partnership because it represents the idea that it is not enough to simply do a project and see if it went like it was supposed to. Instead, having a real world impact means that there are lessons learned about the phenomenon or issue being studied and that the stakeholders involved from the campus and the community are able to utilize these lessons as they move forward as organizations, partnerships and individuals.

The real world impact for organizations has to do with enhancing the ability to address core goals and missions of that organization. For campus partners, that oftentimes has to do with impacting student’s educational experiences. A campus partner explains that,
…it was a big benefit to the department and to my [class] because we teach our students the value of translational research and community-based research and training. It allowed us to diversify the types of experiences that we expose graduate students to. So there was more diversity in our offerings to them for their [class] assignments because of this partnership.

Community partners recognize the need for there to be an impact of the partnership in the area of contributing to furthering the university’s mission to educate. The community partners see this sort of impact as being an important way to build a stronger partnership because it allows multiple stakeholder groups and organizations to benefit from the partnership. In a sense, the community organization has the power to share the real world with campus partners and they are oftentimes eager to do this even when they know that the real world might provide campus partners with a harsh reality about what concepts covered in the classroom look like in the community. A community partner explains the importance of sharing these real world issues and the impact this has on the partnership in terms of comprehension of how community-based work can be messy:

I think for whatever reason we have served a need that perhaps faculty and students have for an in-the-trenches educational experience away from the academic campus. Kind of where real [specialty area] hits, especially poor and low-income and uninsured patients. And that is what we do. I think that the faculty really appreciate what we do even as imperfect as we do it because it is imperfect and it is with a lot of flaws. You know, I’ve felt encouraged by that and by the reception we’ve received - very positive.

The real world impact for partnerships might also include the defining of new relationships and paving the road for new partnerships. As a campus partner explains, a partnership project can have an unanticipated impact on the appeal of the university within the community. While unexpected in the initial project design, the partnership is strengthened because there was a display in the ‘real world’ of the university’s commitment to the community:
Well my partnership was with [local school systems] so I think to the university as a whole that strengthened that tie between the university and the school systems that feed into the university and attracted um potential students to the university specifically because we were doing [specialized] stuff it attracted students into the [specialized] areas.

Perhaps the one aspect of real world impact of partnerships that emerges as the most powerful contributor to increased interest in sustaining the partnership is the personal impression that was made about the work done together. The individual impact has far reaching effect. A campus partner explains the power of the learning that occurs in the context of partnerships:

You know and I feel like I’ve come out of this really knowing a lot more about how the interact with the community or with a community organization than I did going in. You know I feel like I knew the textbook definition of what I should be doing going in, but I think that there is a big difference between that and the real life thing. It is just that you need to realize that not everything works along with a plan, and that there is a lot to realize about being able to change. It has been a really great experience and I really have learned a lot from it.

Community partners share that the real world impact can be seen in the effect that the project has on the clients and communities involved with the projects. Partners stress that these are the outcomes of the projects that partners stress should not be overlooked when considering the impact of the partnership because the community-based impact is that of a real world impact.

While students might move away from the community and never directly work with the organizations or partnership again, a significant impact of the partnership is the way that it can provide the student with context for how skills and activities described in the classroom might look in the community and what effect theories and policies have in the real world. As a community partner explores, this represents a cornerstone of the purpose of education and ought to be recognized as such when considering the impact of a project.
I mean, preparing the workforce to become engaged leaders for the future - that is what education is about! And [the university] is doing it through things like service learning and student involvement on these projects. It is a fabulous, rare opportunity to work with academics and make a substantial impact on student’s development and clients.

As one community partner explains, the impact of a partnership simply cannot be minimized when considering the potential force behind each project or initiative because the impact can be greater than that of the partnership itself:

I always take things to another place - I like to take things to a global level and ask what we can do next. That's in my nature. But when you’re asking about this partnership - it was great. I wouldn’t trade it. [The university] needs to know that they are not just preparing students for the real world, but are preparing students to change the world. That's a good quote to end on, right?!

Indeed, it is a fortuitous way in which to surmise the theme constructed from sentiments related to what it takes to sustain a partnership in terms of impact. Just as the big picture is important in understanding how each sub-theme and category contributes to each of the five themes, these data tell a story of a big picture in which these five themes are interrelated. In order to truly understand the theory of what it takes to sustain a community-campus partnership, the relationships among themes must be illuminated.

Final Product: The Grounded Theory and Relationships among the Five Themes

In the preceding sections, relationships among components of each theme are discussed in order to facilitate understanding of the grounded theory that emerged during this study. An analysis of the grounded theory falls short if it lacks an additional analysis that is aimed at exploring the relationships between and among the five themes. Figure 4.6 provides a visual representation of the relationship among the themes of the ground theory. The discussion of these relationships completes the
analytic cycle of the grounded theory process, and provides a comprehensive framework that is helpful for building, understanding, facilitating and evaluating community-campus partnerships.

**A Grounded Theory of Partnership Sustainability**

What does it take to sustain a community-campus partnership?

---

**Figure 4.6: Diagram of the Relationship among Themes of the Grounded Theory**

As the diagram suggests theme one is at the base of the grounded theory, which is because the strong foundation provides the groundwork for not only the relationship itself but also sets the stage for partnership projects, process and products. Just as any relationship evolves and is impacted by changes in the environment, it is important to note how the partnership project processes and the goodness-of-fit among partners contribute to the ongoing maintenance of the relationship foundation. Navigating the process of a partnership project might provide opportunities for the relationship to grow stronger and become resilient. In this case, the partnership sustainability is enhanced.
On the other hand, the process of a partnership project might introduce challenges that negatively impact the relationship and in those cases the foundation of the relationship might become fractured in some way. This might negatively impact the sustainability of the project if the relationship base is then not strong enough to support this fracture; however, the sustainability of a partnership might also be improved if the partners have a strong enough relationship foundation to support problem-solving efforts. One campus partner explores how maintaining ties with the community partners over time even in light of recent lack of buy-in from administration has helped partnerships to be sustained:

We have kept the partnerships going - and that is only to the point that the partnerships can grow and stay sustained. But it is not difficult to maintain them and keep the lines open on the faculty side because the community partners want to be involved with the faculty, not necessarily with the administration.

This quotation illustrates how a partnership can be maintained over time when encountering challenges fueled by external forces. The willingness to continue to collaborate and partners’ mutual interest in the partnership is sufficient to stimulate the partnership in spite of challenges.

The goodness of fit for all involved contributes to the strong foundation for the relationship because it provides a context for the foundation. If the pieces of a puzzle fit well together, then there is less of a chance that there will be cracks or holes in the surface. The connection between these two themes demonstrates how long-term maintenance of the relationship foundation can improve the chances for a sustainable partnership. As a community partner explains that “[y]ou are always fine tuning and adding to your partnership base - that’s how I see it. That is the key to sustaining your program.”
A strong foundation strengthens the capacity that the partnership has for navigating the process of a partnership project. Having already established effective communication strategies and sense of reciprocity, the key stakeholders are better equipped to manage the complexities of the partnership project and thereby bolster the sustainability of the partnership. A campus partner explains how one cannot know upfront about everything that will impact the process, and thus how sustainability has a lot to do with how the unanticipated aspects of a partnership project are navigated:

“…be open to the many ways that you can approach sustainability and know that it can come in ways that you cannot anticipate in the beginning.”

Another element that provides an input to navigating the project process is the goodness-of-fit for all involved. A strong match within the partnership facilitates the navigation of project processes because the buy-in from all stakeholders and the concentration on community need will keep the partners focused on the core goals of the project. In doing so, the partnership is sustained because there is consistency in focus and consensus in decision-making. If this strong match among partners is present, then there is also a greater chance that the impact of the partnership projects and initiatives will be robust. As a campus partner explains, the partnership match contributes to the navigation and sustainability of a project because of the way that it increases buy-in:

I think that what really made a difference here was that it really wasn’t my idea and that I wasn’t the only one that could make it happen. Because if it was only my idea and I was the only one who could make it happen then I would have to make it happen once, then make it happen again, and again, and again [laughs]. It was an idea that came from outside and it was an idea that was attractive to the [campus partner’s departmental] administration, and so that makes it easier to sustain because there are people expressing an interest and so really all I had to do was listen to everyone and then pull it together into a shape. And so that
means that it is something sustainable because there are other people besides me who want to do this.

The goodness-of-fit creates a sense that all members of the partnership are in agreement; when this is the case with a specific partnership project, the consensus leads to enhanced buy-in and drive for maximum impact. Partnership sustainability does not rely solely on results or outcomes, so the combined effect of being on the same page and striving for optimal impact results in a more sustainable partnership.

While navigating the partnership project process, partners are often in need of resources. Much of the time, the resources are financial in nature and are needed to support the staffing, materials and other elements of the project. Resources are quite possibly the most intuitively linked elements to the sustainability of a partnership. It is important that the partners focus on securing resources prior to the onset of the project, and the sustainability of a partnership often relies on the way in which partners navigate the project so as to capitalize on outcomes and findings to secure future funding or additional resources. As one campus partner explains, the link between resources and impact can be charted with sustainability in mind, “...what we did as part of the study was to train two individuals from the community to [provide the service] and then they turned around and [provided the service] to the members of the community, and they were paid to do that.” The resources available for the project contribute to the impact because they make it possible to seek optimal conditions for the project.

The processes associated with navigating the project and the resources for a partnership are mutually dependent. As a campus partner explains when describing how interim findings from a partnership project were leveraged for additional funds for a community agency, “…what we have more is a way for sustainability to happen through
increasing partnerships with [the university] for more funding where that didn’t even exist in the first place.” Partnerships that excel at the interaction between project outcomes and funding are those which appear to have a stronger potential for sustainability.

The core themes of the grounded theory rely on one another directly or as facilitated by another theme. The grounded theory about partnership sustainability takes into account a vast amount of conditions and unique situations, and the basic tenets of the theory are replicable despite vast differences between individual foci of partnership projects or initiatives. This grounded theory argues that partnership sustainability takes a strong foundation, navigation of project processes, goodness-of-fit for all involved, resources and an impact.
Chapter Five: Implications

This study contributes to the advancement of knowledge around what it takes to sustain a community-campus partnership by presenting a grounded theory consisting of five core themes that contribute to a better understanding of the issues surrounding the way that community-campus partnerships function. In their study, Ferman and Hill (2004) assert that new information about partnership and strategies for navigating challenges are emerging in the literature as the topic of community engagement gains visibility and importance as a core focus of higher education. Responding to the call for more studies, this grounded theory study is an example of one of these sources for new information on partnerships, and in particular it is important to recognize the focus on sustainability embedded within this study. The findings represent a theory about sustainability, and each of the themes includes content related to the dual focus that guided this study – organizational culture and partnership process.

The core best practices principles for the wellbeing and sustainability of community-campus partnerships set forth by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH, 2001) are all present in this study’s findings as being important components of the theory of partnership sustainability. Table 5.1 provides a synopsis of the core CCPH principles and how these are represented in the findings of this study.

**Table 5.1: Comparison of CCPH Best Practices Principles for Sustainability and the Grounded Theory Study Findings of Key Elements of What it Takes to Sustain a Community-Campus Partnership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCPH principles for sustainability</th>
<th>Corresponding Grounded Theory Study Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“[A]greed upon mission, values, goals and measureable outcomes”</td>
<td>Part of the <em>conceptualization and approach to partnering</em> category, which informs the <em>relationship building</em> sub-theme of the theme <em>A Strong Foundation Upon Which a Relationship is Built</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"[M]utual trust, respect, genuineness and commitment" | All are components of the *trust* category, which is a part of the *relationship dynamics* sub-theme of the theme *A Strong Foundation Upon Which a Relationship is Built*.

Shared power and resources | Power is part of *control*, which impacts the *collaboration* sub-theme of the *Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project* theme; *Resources* is an entire theme in this theory.

"[C]lear, open, and accessible communication" | All are included within the *communication between partners* category of the *relationship dynamics* sub-theme of the theme *A Strong Foundation Upon Which a Relationship is Built*.

Mutually agreed upon “roles, norms, processes for the partnership” | These are established as a part of the *relationship building* stage, which is a sub-theme of the theme *A Strong Foundation Upon Which a Relationship is Built*; and these elements are demonstrated throughout the theme *Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project*.

Shared responsibility for a cycle of constructive feedback and credit for successes | These elements are mainly expressed in this theory within the *Impact* and *Resources* themes, but it must be recognized that the tone for these elements is set in the theme *A Strong Foundation Upon Which a Relationship is Built*.

All quotes from Siefer & Maurauna, 2000

The implications for the constellation of these principles is that the key to sustainability is to navigate the partnership processes involved with building a relationship, making an impact and garnering resources while also attending to management of external forces imposed upon partnerships by the organizational culture dynamics of the partner organizations and partnership collaboration in order to navigate a project or initiative in such a way that fits with the needs of all the stakeholders involved in the process.

**Organizational Culture Implications**

The implications of this study that are related to the organizational culture dynamics are dispersed throughout the themes of the theory. Sustainability really is a story of how two or more organizational cultures come together around a topic or cause
and engage in a process together. The greatest concentration of content related to
organizational culture is found within the second theme, and the implications for that
specific theme have to do with the ways that cultures are navigated in the partner
organizations and managed as a new entity represented by the collaborative. In other
words, the second theme represented within this grounded theory has to do with
organizational culture in action or in practice. In order to frame the entire discussion
around partnership process, it is important to discuss the study’s key implications
related to understanding how organizational culture is defined in community-campus
partnerships.

Schein’s (2004) definition of culture was used in this study to help frame the
understanding of organizational culture dynamics. Many of the categories of culture are
highlighted in the study, and there are implications related to those represented and
those not represented within the findings. Overall, the findings of this study suggest that
sustainability be viewed as an expression of the partnership process and organizational
culture. Indeed, the core categories of Schein’s (2004) definition of culture are
represented within the content of the theory of partnership sustainability. During the
relationship building phase, partners learn about these core categories of organizational
culture by observing the other organization and organizational representatives.
Partners also use this time to begin to establish their own organizational culture
elements for the partnership. The organizational culture elements of one organization
do have the potential to impact the partnership immensely. Norms, rules of the game,
language and traditions are all examples of elements of organizational culture that
contribute to a partner’s conceptualization and approach to partnering.
The findings of this study suggest that organizational culture dynamics are central elements that allow for a clear understanding of the process of partnering. As such, elements of organizational culture unique to, divergent from and shared within the partnership ought to be discussed between and among partners in a transparent and open-minded way that will allow for a sustainable organizational and partnership practice.

Organizational and Partnership Practice Implications

*Building a relationship*

Consistent with the key finding of studies conducted by Sandy and Holland (2006) and Worrall (2007), this study found that relationships are at the core of successful and sustainable partnerships. Partners must recognize that the relationship building process takes time, and that this ought to be taken into account when planning partnership projects or initiatives. The findings of this study suggest that partners who are introduced by a third party are just as in need of time to get to know one another as partners who met in other ways.

Two main contributing elements to successful relationship building are a perceived sense of history between the partner organizations on the part of the community organization and an approach to partnering that focuses on community-based models of practice. This highlights the value of community and campus organizations paying attention to the informal and formal conveyances of images and communications related to the organizations. Even if not currently and actively engaged in a partnership, a sense of history can exist based on informal interactions and
perceptions. Due to this, university and community organization administrators ought to pay attention to the messages being transmitted about how their organization relates to other organizations since it is this reputation that can lead to interest or disinterest in future partnerships. Likewise, the approach to partnering does not have to be experienced by an individual within an organization for a perception to be formed about the organization’s approach to partnering. If an organization is perceived as being a poor partner, then there may be trepidation about partnering based on that reputation.

To make sure that positive perceptions are cultivated and maintained, organizations also must make sure that the approach to partnering is sincere. Projects and initiatives may not go as planned, but a genuine and trustworthy intent to partner can overshadow those details because of the strength of a relationship.

Consistent with Roper and Hirth’s description of what it means to be an engaged IHE in modern times, the findings in this study suggest that “engaging in bidirectional relationships and interactions” (2005, p. 16) are the optimal types of relationships for sustainability of partnerships. The sense of reciprocity ought to pervade all areas of the partnership. This does not mean that every aspect of the partnership is done together or even that the partners take on equal amounts of responsibility. Instead, it is about the cooperation between partners as it relates to areas such as decision-making, planning and problem-solving. This study highlights the crucial nature of reciprocity within a partnership.

In their study, Ferman and Hill (2004) found that campus and community partners differ in their motivations to partner and expectations for the partnership. For the majority of participants in this study, these two elements were not drastically
different among partners. These data suggest that this is due, at least in part, to the affiliated dynamics of communication between partners and reciprocity. While it cannot be said definitively that all partners interviewed did not differ in these areas, it can be said that it was of utmost importance to have a presence of consensus about motivations to help the community around a specific area of need, as well as transparency about partners’ expectations. This means that the partners came to the table with a genuine interest in meeting a community need and were not motivated solely by self-serving motives. It also means that the partners were honest with one another from the start of the relationship about what the secondary and tertiary motivations were for partnering.

Trust and equality surfaced as contributing categories to the theme regarding building a strong relational foundation for the partnership. Trust has to do with being realistic about what needs to be done as a part of the partnership project or initiative, and who is best suited among the partners and stakeholders to take charge over that particular task. Partners trust one another to be upfront about what they are bringing to the table and what they can realistically handle as a part of the partnership arrangement. In contrast with White-Cooper, Dawkins, Kamin and Anderson (2009), there was no indication in this study that the community partners felt distrustful toward the campus partners on the basis that the funding for partnership projects or initiatives might be coming from the IHE. Overall, community partners expressed appreciation for financial support provided for the partnership through the IHEs and saw those as critical resources for the partnership; however, there were indications that resources and equality were tied together.
Equality was seen as something that did not have to happen in every realm of the partnership relationship. For instance, partners did not have equality in the financial and staffing resources that could be brought to the table. And that was okay with the partners; they did not expect to be equal in that regard. Instead, equality was important when it came to the way that the relationship was structured and the way it played out during the partnership project or initiative. Equality in a relationship is indeed somewhat similar to what was found to be most important about trust. Equality stems from each partner bringing the best of what they can offer to the table, being respectful of one another’s strengths regardless of the financial aesthetics of the partnership and recognizing that give-and-take of the relationship is what makes it equitable.

Kearney and Candy (2004) suggest that community-campus partnerships be viewed as reflexive relationships instead of as linear projects that can be planned and predicted. The grounded theory that emerged from this study does support this stance because it is clear that a strong foundation is essential for a partnership. Indeed, the majority of participants in the study did not see the partnership project or initiative as an isolated incident. These activities were viewed as collaborative pursuits that could be located at any place along a given partnership’s relationship continuum. Even among those who saw a particular project or initiative as being time-limited or the sole interaction with a specific contact person at the partner organization, there was a greater context within which the activity occurred. The organizational relationship, while built upon interactions with individuals, enhances the sense of reciprocity within the relationship. The importance of planning was not minimized, and the development of an agenda or strategy was seen as a positive part of the partnership; however, the partners
who expressed satisfaction with their partnerships highlight the important of building a relationship that allows for flexibility and acknowledges value in the process of partnering.

Tice (1994) suggests that partners draw up individualized guides that outline parameters for relationship dynamics and establish partnership practice guidelines; this was only explicitly done in a small number of partnerships in this study. In those instances where it was enacted, partners expressed great satisfaction with the process of getting everything out in the open upfront regarding expectations for the relationship. Others indicate that these sorts of standards for the relationship evolved over time and through informal conversations about what works best for the partners; in the vast majority of cases, this resulted in the development of informal yet desirable norms. This suggests that relationships indicative of those found in sustainable partnerships are established through open dialogue about the expectations for the relationship.

In this study, communication between partners was found to be a crucial contributor to the relationship dynamics sub-theme, which overall is a factor in the relationship foundation. Consistent with findings of a study conducted by Vernon and Ward (1999), communication breakdown was found to be something that could cause frustration for partners. However, this was not found to be a major issue for many of the partner relationships. Instead, communication was something that the majority of partners perceived as having been done well within the partner relationship. This study supports an approach to communication that is tailored to meet the needs of the individual partners in the given partnership. For example, some participants made it clear that email was the best way to communicate, and these individuals were satisfied
so long as that was respected by the other partners. Other participants enjoyed meeting face-to-face. Whatever the modality, the trademarks of communication that partners ought to follow are to be open and transparent, transmit messages in a timely fashion and establish upfront what partners’ expectations are for communication.

As a part of the relationship dynamics, participants discussed the cooperation and reciprocity between partners as a core contributor to the overall relationship foundation. This extended beyond the area of expression of expectations and motivations, as previously discussed in this section. Consistent with findings from Gelmon, Holland, Seirfer, Shinnamon & Connors (1998), CCPH (2001) and Vernon and Ward (1999), the findings of this study convey that reciprocity was also seen as a positive element of the relationship in more tangible ways such as when partners are open to things like taking turns with meeting locations on campus and in the community and involvement in strategic planning. Cultivating these sorts of effective and reciprocal relationship dynamics is the way that partners build a strong foundation, and this makes it possible for the partnership to have a meaningful impact.

Making an impact

An important implication of the study related to the impact that is made by a partnership is that partners frame the impacts into outcome and process oriented categories. When asked what the partnership means to them, participants sometimes talk about the outcomes of the study. However, the majority of partners talk about these outcomes in relation to an overall process of partnering that is tied to how they factor in with the sustainability of the partnership over time. As such, the sustainability of a partnership does not rely solely upon measurable outcomes. One aspect of impact that
emerged from this study provides support for the assertion made in the CCPH (2001) best practices principle stating that there ought to be a shared responsibility for a cycle of constructive feedback and credit for successes in order for there to be a sustainable partnership. The aspect of impact that provides support for this is the sense of appreciation, worth and value of the partnership activities that partners exhibit. Participants conveyed that by having a realistic mindset about what could be accomplished in a partnership project or activity, the partners are able to open themselves up to a deeper level of meaning about the long-term nature of the partnership. When partners look past being outcome oriented and accept that impact can be just as effective when it comes from a process-focused orientation, then the partners open themselves up to being sincere with one another about the ways that the relationship can grow, the advice or criticisms about ongoing collaborations and the ebb and flow of projects and initiatives.

In this theory, the strong foundation for the relationship is at the core (or, literally, at the foundation) of the theory, and is related to the other themes either directly or through another theme. In the case of impact, it is important to note that this theory suggests that if there is a strong foundation for the partnership and if there is a goodness-of-fit for all involved, then there is a stronger potential for enhancing the meaningful impact of the partnership. The positive perception among participants about a process-oriented model is consistent with the push for partnerships to utilize a different model than the traditional business model for operations (see Roper & Hirth, 2005; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Walshok, 1995; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Further study around the process-oriented model for partnerships will help to unveil the
intricacies of the way that partnerships look beyond outcomes to gauge the importance of things like the real-world impact, partner relations and the overall ‘human factor’ impact involved with partnering.

The greatest implication of this topic for partners is that the process should not be overlooked. Building the strong foundation is a start, but the impact of the partnership clearly relies on there being maintenance within the relationship especially as it relates to open lines of communication, verbalizing appreciation, encouraging sense of worth and value of the partnership and providing honest and constructive feedback. The implications of this finding for university and community organization administrators have to do with the framework used to view community-campus partnership projects and initiatives as well as the levels of support that are provided for these activities towards the goal of impacting the partnership process in a positive way. Many of the ways that these needs can be met by administrators are actualized through the provisions and resources that are made available for the partnerships.

Garnering resources

Garnering resources is a critical area for partnerships because there is oftentimes not a consistent, long-term funding source for partnership activities. The majority of participants in the study have experience with at least one partnership project or initiative being funded by an IHE internal funding mechanism. When developing parameters for these sorts of internal funding awards, university administrators need to be educated on the continuum of community engagement activities, knowledgeable about the reasonable expectations for conducting research and other projects in the context of the ‘real world’ and cognizant of the amount of time
it takes for partners to build a relationship. Using organizational culture terminology, administrators and other decision-makers must be apprised of the norms of community engagement.

The capacity-building elements of the theory have implications for understanding of the shared meaning that many partners develop throughout the process of the partnership. As Schein (2004, p. 13) explains, this is an example of the “emergent understandings created by group members as they interact with each other.” The participants in this study, in sharing their interest in effecting self-sustained change and support in the community, indicate that together they were able to build an approach to resource development that took capacity building into consideration. A huge part of building capacity is to utilize the existing data from partnership projects and initiatives to leverage funding for future partnership activities. This study demonstrates how the need for funding is critical to the partnership process because of the direct tie-in with resources.

The theory of partnership sustainability provides support for the points made by Fischer, Fabricant and Simmons (2004) related to the financial motivations for partnering and the load-shedding phenomenon because the use of initial start up funds from the university as leverage for future funding was a strong incentive for partners to work together in the first place. This theory demonstrates that there are many other motivations for partnering that are far more altruistic sounding, but partners were clear that the desire for additional funding is part of the unselfish focus of the partnership. The receipt of a grant or award for community-based work is not viewed by partners as a prestigious personal acquisition. Although there may be positive impacts for the
individuals involved in terms of professional development, the focus is on the cause and community need. Indeed, the implications for partnerships related to financial resources and leveraging center on the idea that partners can have many wonderful thoughts about how to help the community but if funds are not available then these thoughts cannot be put into action. Therefore, a key implication of this study is that the pressure for continued funding is a strong force in the overall schema for sustainability of the partnership.

Infrastructure issues are cited by Ferman and Hill (2004) as being a key area of contention and conflict among community and campus partners. In this study, infrastructure did not emerge as an area of disagreement, but rather one that could limit the potential to garner resources. Participants who discussed infrastructure issues indicate that while they did discuss the issues with their partner, they did not have conflict amongst partners over infrastructure issues. It is important to note that infrastructure is viewed as an element that could impede the resource development efforts on the part of the individual partners or the partnership as a whole. Two elements that are particularly useful in relation to resource development from an infrastructure standpoint are support from leadership in partner organizations and institutional policies that do not impede or complicate community-based collaboration work.

Student involvement is a unique aspect of the study insofar as this was an element of partnerships mentioned in a variety of contexts; however, the bottom line was that students were viewed mainly as resources for the partnership. Identifying the implications for this requires community and campus partners as well as university
administrators to interrogate the motivations for, expectations around and anticipated outcomes about student involvement in partnerships. Some participants indicated that internship and practicum students were not viewed as a part of any particular partnership. Does this mean that student involvement in community partners’ organizations is not mutually exclusive with the ongoing partnership efforts between the community and the campus? On the other hand, this could suggest that more attention ought to be placed on how students are perceived within community organizations as a part of the bigger picture of university-community relations and also how they are perceived within the university and the partnership in terms of being viewed as stakeholders. Research on student interest in involvement and learning outcome associated with community engagement efforts (see in particular Benson & Harkavy, 2000; Ross, 2002; Zlotkowski, 1996) often focus on social justice awareness and do not address the linkages between students and roles, and so this is an area where this study indicates a need for further research.

**Navigating organizational culture dynamics**

While organizational culture elements are found throughout the theory of partnership sustainability, this area is unique insofar as it attends to the way in which partners go about navigating organizational culture dynamics. In some cases, it is sufficient enough for the partners to talk about the importance of an element so that the group is aware of potential benefits or other repercussions. An example of this is the need for mentoring for faculty members. Unless the faculty member is seeking a community mentor, these findings suggest that it is adequate to inform the community partner of there being a mentor and having a brief discussion on how this person might
impact the partnership. In other instances, there is a stronger chance that the partnership will be impacted by an organizational culture element and so the partners need to discuss more in depth how that element will impact their work together within the partnership. For example, if a faculty mentor is going to become involved with a partnership, then it is important for the original partners to be in agreement about the mentor’s level of participation and role within the partnership.

The organizational culture of academia is quite different than that of most community organizations, and participants indicate that there are processes and norms associated with IHEs that had to be discussed so that the community partner would understand how these might impact their partnership together. When it comes to navigating these sorts of cultural differences and culture-based issues, the sustainability of the partnership rests on the extent to which the partners are committed to the relationship and are willing to adapt as needed.

These findings support for the use of a sensemaking approach when learning about and navigating organizational culture (Netting & O’Connor, 2002). Participants in this study discussed how a sustainable partnership is one in which they would get to know one another’s organizational culture elements in order to engage in group problem-solving and group decision-making as a way to navigate any challenges. The support for this approach implies that partnerships ought to be seen as unique entities that unfold and grow in a way that is not parallel to any of the partner organizations but instead is cognizant of the way that partner organizations impact the partnership.

Parker and Selsky’s (2004) acculturation framework is helpful in illustrating and understanding the dynamics of navigating partnership process and organizational
culture elements. This study does provide support for the framework because the participants overwhelmingly support the argument that the best approach to partnering is one in which there is a sense of being on neutral ground from the start so that interactions are respectful of and take into account the organizational culture dynamics and process of the partner organizations. Despite the support for the framework’s principles, there is not sufficient evidence from this study to support or refute the five acculturation modes identified by Parker and Selsky (2004). Further study is needed to explore the specific modes of acculturation within community-campus partnerships since acculturation did not emerge as a theme within the theory of partnership sustainability.

Organizational culture dynamics of the partner organizations might be imposing if the partnership does not work collaboratively in their efforts to face challenges and explore new opportunities. Just as the sensemaking approach helps the partners get to know the details of the partner organizations, this approach seems to accurately describe the method that is taken by partners to work together in a collaborative spirit. In order to make sure that partners work as a team with a true collaborative spirit, participants indicate that the partnership needs to be one in which all stakeholders feel is relevant and applicable to their needs and/or the needs of those who they represent.

Fitting the needs of all stakeholders

A partnership is not likely to be sustained if there is not a good sense of fit or match between the partners. While individual match is very important, the organizational match is a critical element for the success and sustainability of partnerships. Part of the goodness-of-fit for a partnership rests on there being equal
levels of buy-in from the stakeholders involved with the partnership. The implication for this is that the leadership from the partner organizations, including university leaders, needs to buy into the value of community partnerships as well as support the partnership. Sustainability suffers when there is only verbal buy-in without support and/or support for the partnership without the overall buy-in indicating that community engagement efforts are a priority.

In terms of the individual-level match, the findings of the study imply that partners need to be upfront about their career needs, potential for professional development contributions from the partnership and personal-professional ties to the partnership cause(s) because this will strengthen the partners’ assessments of one another’s fit and match. Next, the study findings indicate that the goodness-of-fit must incorporate the partners being on the same page about the needs of the community. The implication for practice is that partners must come together and discuss these elements, and agree on the focus of the partnership projects and initiatives being on the community need first and then taking into account how other needs will fit into this framework. These implications are suggestive of the assertion made by Kearney and Candy (2004) about the ‘partnership paradox’. Participants in this study describe that the paradox does not occur or show up as drastically as described by Kearney and Candy (2004) when partners are able to come together early to discuss the strengths being brought to the table and the areas of match among them. And while participants share information about instances when one partner takes control, the issue is not about power but instead about the partnership’s decision based on goodness-of-fit for that partner to take the lead.
Social Justice Implications

The elements that contribute to the theory of sustainability focus on the ways in which partners handle the relationships and processes involved with the partnership. When looking at the findings and asking the question of ‘what does it take to encourage sustainability?’, the deeper meaning behind each theme is that of fairness and selflessness on the part of the partners and the partner organizations. In the instances where participants indicated that they question a partner or partner organization’s motivations for partnering, it was indicated that the partnership might not have been sustained nor as successful as it might have been had there been an unselfish approach to community engagement.

One might summarize this approach as ‘partnering for the greater good’. Using Chapter one as a reference point (see Table One), the grounded theory of partnership sustainability was compared to the central themes of values and ethics among the community engagement and the social work profession. Five of the six core values are represented in this study’s findings as being important parts of the theory of partnership sustainability: service to the community, commitment to capacity building and sustainability, importance of relationships among stakeholders, adherence to ethical standards, and professional competence. The core value that is not represented in the theory of partnership sustainability is the recognition of social and economic justice issues.

As such, a major element of community engagement found in the literature did not emerge as a theme in this study – social justice. There are moments of social
justice within the theory (equality, community need, trust), but the issue is whether social justice is a reason for doing community engagement work. Given this, a question emerges, “How does long term promotion of social and economic justice relate to the service mission of an IHE?”

Upon reading the history of higher education and community engagement up to the twentieth century, one might begin to question whether service meant the same thing in the nineteenth and early-to-mid twentieth as it does in contemporary (twenty-first century) contexts. A mission of service is a subjective expression. The contemporary state of affairs in IHEs centers on the privatization of higher education that results in a cookie-cutter model for education that values “binary thinking” over engagement, such that “social justice goals are rarely or easily institutionalized” (Butin, 2007, p. 2). In essence, IHEs are outputting efforts into the community in order to get some sort of input back. The question remains, ‘From an organizational standpoint, what is the input from community engagement? Is it aimed at meeting the service mission of an institution or is it aimed at meeting other needs?’

Marullo and Edwards (2000) argue that the banking model of higher education emerged in the 1990s and has taken over as the leading modality for an educational process. This process is mechanistic and robotic in nature; in this model students have been trained to ‘borrow’ information from textbooks and instructors, ‘withdraw’ what is needed at the given time with a sense of immediate gratification toward a time-bound and classroom-based goal, and simply ‘deposit’ a restated version of this information without any ‘investment’ or application outside of the context of the course assignment (Wallace, 2000). The end result is students’ perceptions of the classroom and higher
education in general as a place where critical thinking and application is irrelevant because “students are alienated from themselves, their intellectual work, other learners, from place, and from a sense of generativity” (Marullo & Edwards, 2000, p. 749). An illustration of the result of this commodity model of education is provided by Karabell (1999, p. 6):

In contrast to students of the 1960s, who, when surveyed about their goals, routinely answered that they want to make the world a better place, today’s students are far more likely to say that their goal is jobs, jobs, jobs. In a recent survey, 75 percent of college students said that being well off was their primary goal, as opposed to 40 percent who hoped to use their college years to develop a meaningful philosophy of life. A college degree has always been perceived as a ticket to a better life. But never before has it been so perceived as a ticket to a better career.

Perhaps is this part of the reason why students are seen in this study as resources for the partnership but not particularly (or at least consistently) as actual partners? And, is there something about the lack of inclusion for social justice in the theory of sustainability that speaks to the state of student engagement in contemporary higher education?

Statistics like those provided by Karabell (1998) indicate that college students are increasingly more interested in making a better life for themselves, and this observation makes one wonder if this means that college students are less concerned with the wellbeing of others and are apathetic about social perils in their society. Given that this survey was conducted in the mid-to-late 1990s, it seems as though the “Me Generation” trend illustrated through popular culture in the 1980s was not a complete misrepresentation of the young adults in America and that the banking model of education prevalent in the United States has had a negative impact on students’ awareness of and action on issues of injustice and the greater good. As such, it is not
farfetched to delineate that college students in the 1980s and 1990s were engaged in the privatization of higher education insofar as the goals and purposes of the institutions were for the private wellbeing of those enrolled and not inclusive of the community and society. There are examples of how social justice and service learning pedagogies are thriving in some institutions where the students who seek immediate gratification and a commoditized education are engaging in transformative consciousness-raising activities (see in particular Baldwin, Buchanan, & Rudisill, 2007; Butin, 2005; Nadel, Mahewski, & Sullivan-Cosetti, 2007); however, student apathy related to service and civic responsibility emerged as a pervasive trend at the turn of the twenty-first century and this impacted the interest among scholars in the study of community engagement and the role of community-campus partnerships in shifting students’ perceptions of social concerns.

This brief discussion offers two potential responses to why social justice is the only core value shared by the community engagement movement and the social work profession that is not represented in the theory of sustainability. Another possibility has to do with a limitation of the study. The majority of community and campus partners interviewed for this study were located within a specific geographic region and was affiliated with a small number of institutions. Organizational commitment to social justice and the institution’s service mission may vary greatly from institution to institution and thereby impact the findings in this study. Other possible limitations of this study related to the sample include the drawbacks of not being able to assess non-verbal cues for the web-camera and telephone interviews, lack of participation among individuals recruited for the study who might have provided addition information, and
possible limits on participants' full disclosure given any affiliations with dissertation committee members and/or the research team. The implications for further research, therefore, include testing the grounded theory of partnership sustainability to find out if this theory is representative of additional partnerships in other contexts.

Summary of Implications and Next Steps for Research

**Practice implications**

As demonstrated in the preceding sections, the theory of partnership sustainability that emerged from the grounded theory study provides suggestions for organizational and partnership practice as well as implications that inform organizational culture and social justice frameworks. Each of the five themes from the theory of sustainability informs the efforts of community-campus partnerships, and provides recommendations around what it takes to look beyond a successful project or initiative and focus instead on the bigger picture of sustaining relationships that thrive off of successes and continue despite challenges. Table 5.2 summarizes the implications of each of the five themes of the theory of sustainability.

**Table 5.2: Summary of Key Implications from the Five Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key Implications Related to Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A strong foundation upon which a relationship is built</td>
<td>Relationship equality has more to do with decision-making and planning, not resources and funding. To be sustained, relationships ought to be viewed as reflexive, emergent and bi-directional. Relationships take time to grow and open communication to sustain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Approach impact as a process that includes more than measurable outcome measures. This is the ‘process impact’, and it is tied to sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Building capacity is a core component of sustainability. Administrators must buy into the philosophy of community engagement and purpose of partnerships in order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Navigating the processes of a partnership project

IHEs are unique types of organizations and as such the culture of academia takes getting used to. The level of discussion within partnership about organizational culture dynamics rests on the level to which the dynamics will impact the partnership. Challenges can be surmounted or efforts adapted as long as partners work together to navigate.

Goodness-of-fit for all involved

Use of a strengths-based framework allows for partner to overcome the partnership paradox. Buy-in must be genuine and match is important on the individual and organizational levels.

Just as the grounded theory methodology requires an intermediate product to discuss the themes and a final project to discuss the relationships among themes, it is important to take a step back from the individual themes and look at the theory of partnership sustainability as a whole. This allows for the summation of core propositions about community-campus partnerships that emerged from this study that are of importance for the practice, policy, and research realms.

Overall, the theory of partnership sustainability draws the attention of partnership practitioners and stakeholders to the importance of relationships as being the core for any partnership activity. When contemplating how a particular resource, impact, process-related challenge and issue of partner match was addressed within their partnership, the partners interviewed as a part of the grounded theory study continually came back to the idea that partnership sustainability can be traced back to the relationship between partners. This provides clear evidence for the argument that partners ought to allocate time and genuine attention to the relationship. Helpful resources related to building strong relationships among partners are emerging in the literature, and the findings of the grounded theory study show that guides like these ought to be valuable for partnership practice (for an example see Price, Foreman Kready, Filipic, Mogul, and Davey, under review).
Policy implications

The vast majority of the policies impacting community-campus partnerships are at the mezzo-level (or organizational level) unit of analysis. Partnership practitioners from the community and the campus organizations must utilize the growing amount of scholarship around community-campus partnerships and community engagement in efforts to advocate for policy changes within their organizations. Aggregate data, particularly from empirical studies, are able to provide support for arguments like those made through the grounded theory study’s implications. For instance, university and community leaders cannot simply say that they support community engagement efforts. This sort of lip service is not supported by these data as being enough to lay the buy-in groundwork necessary for a sustainable partnership.

Through the use of scholarship to support their arguments, partnership advocates will be able to articulate the why’s and how’s of creating supportive policies and procedures for sustainable community-campus partnerships. The policies that are deemed to be the most crucial for community-campus partnerships are funding regulations, research support (including IRB), and regulations around faculty scholarship requirements as well as promotion and tenure decision-making. These and other related policies developed at the organizational level ought to be cognizant of the uniqueness of community-engagement; mindful of the timeframe issues that come hand-in-hand with building relationships; and selfless and respectful of the primary focus being on the needs of the community.
Research implications and next steps

The overarching purpose of a grounded theory study is to formulate a theory about a phenomenon that is grounded in the data that are provided by participants in order to develop and articulate a better understanding of that phenomenon from the lived experiences of the participants. A goal of this study was to utilize the knowledge about partnerships that emerged from conversations with participants as a starting point for a research trajectory related to community engagement. Emergent research designs require the researcher to trust in the process and accept the idea that a researcher will not know upfront where the study will take her/him. In doing so, the researcher recognizes that the grounded theory of partnership sustainability presents five leading inquiries for future study. These inquiries are related to the findings and implications of the grounded theory study and comprise the next steps for continuing research in this area of scholarship. These implications for further research involve a deeper study of the nature of relationships within community-campus partnerships; the organizational culture dynamics that are unique to academia; the nature, value, and perceived importance of research done in the community; and the intersectionality of student engagement and community engagement, particularly in an age of assessment and benchmarking.

The first area of inquiry for further study is relationship directionality in community-campus partnerships. The findings of the study suggest that there are multiple aspects of the partner relationship that are important for sustainability of the partnership, but are more important for one partner group over the other partner group(s). Two standout examples of this are the sense of history between the
community organization and the IHE as well as the importance of the image of the partner organization. In both of these examples, the significance is one-sided because the community organizations and community partners appear to rely more heavily than their campus partners when explaining the impact that these dynamics have on the sustainability of the partnership.

To execute a study of this topic, the research would begin with the data from the grounded theory study related to relationship building and relationship dynamics, and closely inspect instances where relationship directionality is experienced or evidenced. The initial analysis would be an intriguing study in and of itself, and the initial findings from this sample could then be tested in other environments. Audiences that would be interested in a study of relationship directionality include non-profit and volunteer sector administrators, community and campus partners, university administrators, and scholars who study organizational relations.

While the second area of further research has to do with the relationship between partners, the second area proposed for further research is specifically about the campus partner because it centers on the fit and match between the organizational culture of academia and community engagement initiatives. Participants in the grounded theory study provided a great deal of information regarding faculty career issues, stories of infrastructure success and challenges within academia, and resources provided by IHEs for the purpose of community-based research and activities. Throughout the analysis process for the grounded theory study, the researcher became curious about how these data might inform a better understanding of the culture of academia if the departments, schools, colleges, or other units within the university had not been deidentified. While
this sort of an analysis was beyond the scope of the grounded theory study, the researcher’s interest was piqued and as a result some informal hypotheses have been cultivated.

The primary contention is that certain social and health science disciplines and professions provide distinctly different levels of support for and philosophical buy-in around community engagement work than medical and bench science counterparts. Clearly this hypothesis cannot be addressed directly by the grounded theory study; however, these data can be reanalyzed by matching the home department or at least discipline/profession groupings in order to gain a better understanding of the culture of academic towards the goal of identifying the approaches, processes, and support mechanisms that are particularly helpful in sustaining partnerships. This sort of a study could lead to the development of a needs assessment tool that can be used in IHEs. Information gleaned from a study such as this would be useful to university administrators and staff (particularly those who work directly with community engagement initiatives and programs) because it could highlight the differences among campus partners’ approaches to community engagement, identify the strengths of specific departments or units, and provide a starting points for addressing how well the IHE’s units and departments are actualizing and supporting the institution’s vision and mission related to community engagement.

The third area of inquiry also centers on the culture of academia, but has implications for multiple audiences both within and outside of campus walls. When participants in the grounded theory study talked about community-based research, there was a sense that community-based activities were seen as ‘less than’ types of research
that are controlled, clinical, or laboratory based. This makes one think, “Research is research… or is it?” The grounded theory study suggests that there is differential support provided for community versus non-community based research initiatives, especially in terms of the IRB and research infrastructure. Some participants noted that this issue has become less challenging in recent years as more and more faculty members engage in community-based research. One area that did not sound like it was changing, at least for the majority of participants, is that of the requirements for promotion and tenure.

There seems to be a differential between the support being provided through research divisions and community engagement offices and the messages transmitted in academic departments and units around the acceptability and feasibility of community-based research for tenure-track faculty. One approach for the further study of this issue is to conduct a content analysis of websites for multiple IHEs to identify resources and messages related to faculty careers and community-based research. This would likely not provide the insider perspective on the perceptions formulated and messages transmitted within these contexts. This would require a second component to a study that would most likely take place via interview. These inquiries could also be made through a series of case study analyses. As previously mentioned, campus partners and university officials are not the only audiences that would gain insight through a study like this. The study of the research and scholarship component within the culture of academia would also be pertinent to funders (foundations, governmental, internal university) and community members who seek to partner with IHEs.
In a partnership that involves an educational institution as one of the partner organizations, it is worth noting when it seems like a big piece is missing from the conversation about the partnership. In the grounded theory study that missing piece was oftentimes the ‘student factor’, which is why the fourth area of further research centers on the interface between student and community engagement.

During the course of the grounded theory study, it was interesting to note the point at which the participant mentioned college students because this was sometimes an afterthought. It was even more interesting to observe those interviews in which student involvement appeared to have been an afterthought, burdensome requirement for a project, or a nonexistent component. Some participants indicate that student involvement was a requirement for their projects or research studies because it was a condition of their funding. For every participant that did not mention student involvement or mentioned it in a negative or nonchalant fashion, there were two more participants who would discuss the transformative power of community engagement for students and the essentiality of the students within the partnership project or initiative. Some participants indicate that they are being asked more and more to measure and evaluate dynamics related to student learning.

If student learning is occurring in the community context, then it seems logical that it ought to be assessed. Standardized measures are commonplace tools used for assessing student learning; however, a study of this topic must also incorporate an outlet for students to share their personal stories because the grounded theory study findings suggest that student involvement may provide transformative life and educational experiences. This is an area of research of interest to multiple audiences.
Nonprofit and volunteer service sector administrators as well as line workers in community and governmental organizations would be able to contribute to the conversation on and glean useful information from studies about student learning outcomes in the community context because these are the individuals who not only serve as community partners in official partnerships but also who play the role of supervisor for students’ internships, practicum experiences, and community-based clinical rotations. Aside from the faculty who are campus partners, the administrative and professional faculty who work in student affairs and student engagement divisions are among the university audiences who would appreciate dissemination of information about the intersectionality of student and community engagement.

The *fifth area* of interest for further research focuses on gaining a deeper understanding around the motivations for engaging in community-campus partnerships. While there was agreement among the participants in the grounded theory study around the idea that the community needs would define the projects and initiatives of the partnership, there was inconsistency and even ambiguity among partners about the context surrounding the community needs. Were social and economic justice issues not raised by many participants in the grounded theory study because the guiding questions were about organizational and individual meaning? To what extent do partners think about and discuss the social and economic justice issues related to the partnership projects and initiatives? How might this be linked to or reflect the overall focus and mission of the partner organizations? These are just three of many questions that are raised by the researcher in reflection on the findings of the grounded theory study. The next step for a study of this topic is to review the literature, analyze the
pertinent passages within the grounded theory study data, and work towards the
development of a tool that could assess perceptions and actions related to the topic
within community-campus partnerships.

Further study on the dynamics of commitment to social and economic justice
among the stakeholders involved with community-campus partnerships can draw from
as well as inform the service learning literature because this is a well-developed area of
scholarship that highlights the relationship between a specific form of community
engagement and the analysis of social and economic justice issues and contexts. In
addition to this audience, a study of community-campus partnerships and justice topics
would also be of interest to those engaged in partner relationships because it could
inform their ongoing practice. Likewise, administrators in the community and at IHEs
would benefit from such a study because it could identify strengths within the
organizations that would help bolster the focus on justice. At the same time, it could
also highlights areas of mismatch between organizational focus and partnership context
related to social and economic justice issues.

These five areas of study related to the implications of the grounded theory study
findings represent the most pressing issues surrounding community-campus
partnership sustainability. Each area of inquiry would greatly enhance the
understanding of what it takes to sustain a partnership while concurrently contributing to
the knowledge base for associated areas of scholarship such as assessment and
benchmarking, student engagement, and organizational culture. In light of the
intricacies of the theory of partnership sustainability demonstrated through the
intersectionality of themes, it is clear that the grounded theory study that resulted in the
emergence of the theory of partnership sustainability provides a valuable, revealing, and useful contribution to the growing body of scholarship on the dynamics and processes associated with community-campus partnerships.
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APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT LETTER AND THANK YOU LETTER

Virginia Commonwealth University
School of Social Work

Sharon Foreman Kready, M.S.W.
Doctoral Candidate
1001 West Franklin Street
P.O. Box 842027
Richmond, Virginia 23284-2027
804.852.1195; sbforeman@vcu.edu

Date

Participant Name
Participant Title and Organization
Delivered Electronically + E-mail Address

Dear Potential Participant,

You are invited to participate in a dissertation research study that focuses on community-university partnerships. You were identified as a participant in partnership funded through a Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) Council for Community Engagement (CCE) or VCU Institute for Women's Health (IWH) seed grant. This study is being conducted separate from but in conjunction with the on-line survey you or another member of your partnership organization may have already completed, and you will be asked different questions. In addition to contributing to the dissertation research study, the findings from this study will help the CCE and IWH better support community-university partnerships.

The purpose of this study is to learn more about how partnerships are working and what could be done to help partnerships work better. The findings from this project may be used for publication and/or presentation in professional venues. Your name will never be used in these publications or presentations. Your participation in the dissertation research study is completely voluntary. Participation in and the information you share during this study will not have any bearing on future partnership opportunities with VCU. If you participate, you will be offered an opportunity to waive documentation of your consent to participate since this would be the only record linking you to the study.

The lead researcher, Sharon Foreman Kready, will contact you within the next two weeks to learn more about your interest in participation and to answer any questions you have. You are welcome to contact her directly to schedule an interview. Interviews will be scheduled based on your availability and will take place in-person or via webcam based on your preference.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, please contact the lead investigator, Sharon Foreman Kready, doctoral candidate, at 804.852.1195 or sbforeman@vcu.edu or the principal investigator, Dr. Sarah Kye Price, doctoral dissertation chair and Assistant Professor, VCU School of Social Work at 804.828.0579 or skprice@vcu.edu.

Sincerely,

Catherine W. Howard, Ph.D.
Sarah Kye Price, Ph.D., M.S.W.
Sharon Foreman Kready, M.S.W.
Vice Provost, Division of Community Engagement
Assistant Professor
Doctoral Candidate
VCU School of Social Work
VCU School of Social Work

237
APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT LETTER AND THANK YOU LETTER

Confidential and Anonymous Correspondence

Dear Study Participant,

I would like to thank you participating in the dissertation research study and sharing your experiences with community-university partnerships. This study is being conducted separate from in conjunction with ongoing impact study research efforts sponsored by the VCU Council for Community Engagement (CCE) and VCU Institute for Women’s Health (IWH). In addition to contributing to the dissertation research study, the findings from this study will help the CCE and IWH better support community-university partnerships. The findings from this project may be used for publication and/or presentation in professional venues.

Please remember that any data pertaining to you as a participant will be kept confidential. **Your name will never be used in these publications or presentations. Participation in and the information you share during this study will not have any bearing on future partnership opportunities with VCU.**

As discussed at the conclusion of your interview, please contact me via e-mail or telephone if you would like to refer an individual to the study. To protect your confidentiality, I will not identify you when I contact any individuals you refer.

If you are interested in receiving more information regarding the results of this study, or if you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at either the phone number or email address listed in this letter. If you would like a summary of the results, please let me know and when the dissertation study is completed I will send instructions for how to access electronically.

As with all Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) projects involving human participants, this project was reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the Office of Research at VCU. Should you have any comments or concerns resulting from your participation in this study, please contact the VCU Office of Research, 804-827-2157, 800 East Leigh Street, Suite 113, P.O. Box 980568, Richmond, Virginia 23298.

Sincerely,

Sharon Foreman Kready, MSW
VCU IRB #: ________________
Study Title: **Organizational Culture and Partnership Process: A Grounded Theory Study of Community-Campus Partnerships**
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RESEARCH PARTICIPATION INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM

TITLE: Organizational Culture and Partnership Process: A Grounded Theory Study of Community-Campus Partnerships

VCU IRB NO.: HM12982

This consent form may contain words that you do not understand. Please ask the study staff to explain any words that you do not clearly understand. You may take home an unsigned copy of this consent form to think about or discuss with family or friends before making your decision. You are not required to sign this consent form – permission has been granted by the VCU IRB to waive documentation of consent for this study since this will be the only document linking you to the study.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of this study is to explore the meanings of community-campus partnerships among stakeholders in the community and in academia towards the goal of generating a theory grounded in these data.

You were identified as a participant in a partnership funded through the Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) Community Engagement Council or the VCU Women’s Institute Community-Based Participatory Research Seed grants. Information from this study will serve as the second phase of the VCU Division of Community Engagement’s Impact study. You or another member of the partnership team may have already participated in the online survey during phase one.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AND YOUR INVOLVEMENT
If you decide to be in this research study, you may be asked to sign this consent form as evidence of your agreement to participate after you have had all your questions answered and understand what will happen to you.

In this study you will be asked to participate in an interview. The interview will last approximately one hour. You will be asked questions about your experiences with and opinions on the community-campus partnership process and aspects of organizational culture related to the community-campus partnership.

The interview will be recorded by a digital recorder so that all aspects of our dialogue are preserved. If you feel strongly about not being recorded, then you may indicate that on the last page of this form and instead of recording I will take handwritten notes during the interview.

If I have additional questions or need clarification about something we talked about in the interview, then I will contact you to request a follow-up interview. If this occurs, we will discuss the best way to conduct the follow-up interview (in-person, e-mail, phone, webcam).

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
Sometimes talking about subjects such as organizational culture and partnership process causes people to become upset. Our interview dialogue may involve you talking about things that have happened in the partnership that may have been unpleasant. You do not have to talk about any subjects you do not want to talk about, and you may end the interview at any time. The study staff will make available names of counselors to contact for support and advice.

BENEFITS TO YOU AND OTHERS
You may not get any direct benefit from this study, but, the information we learn from people in this study may help us design better programs, services, and processes for supporting community-campus partnerships.
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COSTS
There are no costs for participating in this study other than the time you will spend in interview(s).

ALTERNATIVES
The alternative to the research study process described in this form is not to participate in the study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Potentially identifiable information about you will consist of audio-recording and/or handwritten notes from interview(s), data abstracted from VCU Council for Community Engagement (CCE) and VCU Institute for Women’s Health seed grant funding records of your community-campus partnership, and documents received or retrieved about your partnership. These data are being collected for research purposes for a dissertation research study and will inform the ongoing impact study efforts being conducted by VCU CCE and IWH. Your data will be identified by codes, not names, and stored in a secure and locked research area. All personally identifying information will be kept in password protected files and these files will be deleted one year after the conclusion of the study. Other records such as transcripts of interviews, handwritten notes, and documents from which data are collected will be kept indefinitely. Access to all data will be limited to study personnel. A data and safety monitoring plan is established.

We will not tell anyone the information you give us; however, information from the study, information from VCU records of your partnership records (including project descriptions and grant funding amounts), and the consent form signed by you may be looked at or copied for research or legal purposes by Virginia Commonwealth University.

Participation in and the information you share during this study will not have any bearing on future partnership opportunities with VCU. If you agree to participate, you will be offered an opportunity to waive documentation of your consent to participant since this would be the only record linking you to the study. This means that you are not required to sign this consent form if you do not wish to since it is the only documentation that will link your name to the study. Personal information about you might be shared with or copied by authorized officials of the Federal Food and Drug Administration, or the Department of Health and Human Services (if applicable).

What we find from this study may be presented at meetings or published in papers, but your name, the name of your organization, and the name of your partnership project/study/activity will not ever be used in these presentations or papers.

If a participant of this study discloses that they may cause injury to themselves or others, members of the research team are required by law to report that information to the appropriate authorities. While children are not part of this study, if information provided by participants during this study indicates accusations of child abuse or neglect then the members of the research team are required by law and/or professional code of ethics to report suspected abuse to external organizations including but not limited to the police and child protective services. If elderly individual are participants of this study or if information provided by participants of this study pertains to elderly individuals, and information is provided during this study indicates accusations of elder abuse or neglect then the members of the research team are required by law and/or professional code of ethics to report suspected abuse to external organizations including but not limited to the police and adult protective services.

Unless permission to audiotape the interview(s) is denied by the participant on this form, the interview(s) will be digitally recorded. If names are recorded, the researcher will de-identify this information when transcribing the data. The digital recorder, associated files, and any handwritten notes will be stored in a locked container or stored electronically with password protection. After the information from the audio-recording is typed up (transcribed), the digital files will be erased.
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IF AN INJURY HAPPENS
Participation in this study carries little to no risk of injury. Virginia Commonwealth University and the VCU Health System do not have a plan to give long-term care or money if you are injured because you are in the study.

If you are injured because of being in this study, tell the study staff right away. The study staff will arrange for short-term emergency care or referral if it is needed.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL
You do not have to participate in this study. If you choose to participate, you may stop at any time without any penalty. You may also choose not to answer particular questions that are asked in the study. Your decision to withdraw, participate, or not participate in this study will not positively or negatively impact any current or further grant funding, service delivery, or program support from VCU.

If you decide at any time during the study, even in the middle of an interview, that you do not want to participate, then please tell the researcher. You will be withdrawn from the study and will be able to decide what to do with any information you have provided up until that point (for example, you may ask the researcher not to use your interview material at all, or you may let her use the information she has gathered up until that point, or some other negotiated outcome). Due to the emergent nature of the research process, the researcher conducts data collection and analysis at the same time and this may make it difficult to remove the data provided by you. If you participate in the study and later decide that you wish to withdraw your contributions to the research (have the data you provide removed from the study), then the researcher will take all efforts possible to remove your contributions if analysis has already occurred.

Your participation in this study may be stopped at any time by the study staff without your consent. The reasons might include:
- the study staff thinks it necessary for your health or safety;
- you have not followed study instructions; or
- administrative reasons require your withdrawal.

QUESTIONS
In the future, you may have questions about your participation in this study. If you have any questions, complaints, or concerns about the research, contact:

**Lead Researcher:**
Sharon Foreman Kready, M.S.W.
Doctoral Candidate
VCU School of Social Work
804.828.1195; sbforeman@vcu.edu

**Principal Investigator:**
Sarah Kye Price, M.S.W., Ph.D.
Dissertation Committee Chair
Assistant Professor, VCU School of Social Work
804.828.0579; skprice@vcu.edu

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact:

**Office for Research**
Virginia Commonwealth University
800 East Leigh Street, Suite 113
P.O. Box 980568
Richmond, VA 23298
Telephone: 804-827-2157

You may also contact this number for general questions, concerns or complaints about the research. Please call this number if you cannot reach the research team or wish to talk to someone else. Additional information about participation in research studies can be found at [http://www.research.vcu.edu/irb/volunteers.htm](http://www.research.vcu.edu/irb/volunteers.htm).

CONSENT
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4-9-10 / [Signature]
I have been given the chance to read this consent form. I understand the information about this study. Questions that I wanted to ask about the study have been answered. My signature says that I am willing to participate in this study. I have indicated below whether I allow the interview to be digitally recorded. I will receive a copy of the consent form once I have agreed to participate. I understand that I may waive documentation of my consent, which means that I do not have to sign this consent form since it is the only document linking my name to the study. I will verbally indicate my consent for digital audio recording of the interview.
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Introduction:

I know that you or someone at your organization may have already answered questions about the partnership when completing the online survey. I have had the opportunity to review the initial analysis of the online survey, and I am not asking you to repeat basic information unless you feel it is important to bring up. I am hoping instead that we can pick up where the online survey left off. The goal of this study is to gather rich descriptions of experiences with these partnerships from a variety of key stakeholder perspectives. In other words, our conversation today about your experiences will allow us to “dig deeper” toward the goal of assessing what works well and what could be done differently in partnerships like yours.

This study uses a methodology called ‘grounded theory’. A grounded theory interview asks broad, open-ended questions that allow you, the participant, to co-create the course of our discussion. I have three main questions. Don’t worry – if you are not sure how to respond to one of these questions, I do have some additional questions that will help us get started. If you do not have any questions for me, then I would like to begin...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does this partnership mean to your organization/agency?</td>
<td>How did your organization benefit from the partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sorts of organizational challenges emerged during the partnership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think was done best by your organization during this partnership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about what could have been done better – by your organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does this partnership mean to you personally?</td>
<td>At the onset, what was most appealing to you about the partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the most appealing aspect of the partnership to you now?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your expectations for the partnership at the beginning? Did these expectations change throughout the course of the project? How so?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What stands out to you as the most positive impact that the partnership had on your work as a ______ (researcher, teacher, student, agency director, service provider, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How might this partnership change your professional development or the way you approach your job?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has your experience with the partnership been like?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did the leadership of the partnership look like?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please tell me more about the communication among partnership stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the partnership generated any tensions or conflict? How were these addressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you characterize the level of trust among stakeholders in the partnership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you could go back and change one thing about the partnership, what would it be?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there anything about the partnership that you wish you did differently or was done differently by someone else? If so, please tell me about that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think was done best by the partner organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could that organization have done better?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about support or resources from the institution (VCU)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did that impact your experience? Is there anything that could have been done better in terms of support from the perspective of grant oversight?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else about the partnership that you would like to share with me? Is there any additional information that you think would be helpful to this study?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know of others involved with the partnership who you think would be interested in and have helpful contributions to the study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anyone else that you can think of who were involved in the partnership and might have a perspective different than yours? (If an agency director, ask about staff member(s) who worked directly with project/study; if a faculty member, ask about student(s) who worked directly with the project/study.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction, after review of the consent form and discussion around waiver of documentation of consent:

I know that you or someone at your organization may have already answered questions about the partnership when completing the online survey. I have had the opportunity to review the initial analysis of the online survey, and I am not asking you to repeat basic information unless you feel it is important to bring up. I am hoping instead that we can pick up where the online survey left off. The goal of this study is to gather rich descriptions of experiences with these partnerships from a variety of key stakeholder perspectives. In other words, our conversation today about your experiences will allow us to “dig deeper” toward the goal of assessing what works well and what could be done differently in partnerships like yours.

This study uses a methodology called ‘grounded theory’. A grounded theory interview asks broad, open-ended questions that allow you, the participant, to co-create the course of our discussion. I have three main questions. Don’t worry – if you are not sure how to respond to one of these questions, I do have some additional questions that will help us get started. If you do not have any questions for me, then I would like to begin...

*If participant spoke to a topic that addressed by an existing prompt, then the prompt was not used. Prompts were only used as necessarily to generate conversation around the guiding questions. Notations are made in italics to indicate additions to or changes in the delivery of guiding questions and prompts that resulted from participant interviews. This indicates that the researcher paid more attention to this topic in future interviews for related content and in some cases asked the question directly. Variations in asking questions are not included in this document. There were no new prompts introduced after the thirteenth interview.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What does this partnership mean to your organization/agency? | • How did your organization benefit from the partnership?  
• What sorts of organizational challenges emerged during the partnership?  
• What do you think was done best by your organization during this partnership?  
• What about what could have been done better – by your organization?  
• What about the partnership do you feel is important for the university to consider in the future of funding such partnerships and projects? (introduced in the second interview)  
• What do you think your organization has learned from this partnership/project? (Introduced in interview seven)  
• Has your agency been successful with using this project/study to leverage for other grants? (Introduced in the eighth interview)  
• How have you been able to sustain the partnership? (Introduced in the eleventh interview, though it was mentioned before but not ‘named’ until this stage)  
• Sometimes when I ask about the meaning of the partnership to the organization, it is helpful for the participant to tell me what entity or department they consider as their ‘organization’ so feel free to include that if you feel it is important. (Introduced in the thirteenth interview) |
### APPENDIX D: EVOLUTION OF INTERVIEW GUIDE

| What does this partnership mean to you personally? | • At the onset, what was most appealing to you about the partnership? What is the most appealing aspect of the partnership to you now?  
• What were your expectations for the partnership at the beginning? Did these expectations change throughout the course of the project? How so?  
• What stands out to you as the most positive impact that the partnership had on your work as a ______ (researcher, teacher, student, agency director, service provider, etc.)?  
• How might this partnership change your professional development or the way you approach your job?  
• What were your relationships like with community/campus partners [partners from the other side of the partnership]? (introduced in interview three)  
• What has your involvement around this area of study been like before this project/study? (Introduced in the fourth interview)  
• Tell me (more) about promotion and tenure as it relates to your work in this and other community-based partnerships. (Introduced in the eighth interview)  
• Did you have someone to mentor you in this process or would you have liked to have had someone mentor you around community-campus partnerships? (Introduced in the thirteenth interview) |

---
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| What has your experience with the partnership been like?  
[Sometimes this question was asked at the beginning of the interview. This is because I learned around interview five that some participants really seemed to start off by giving information about the partnership, so it made me sense to start with something such as “tell me about your experience with the partnership”, and then ask about meaning. If I got the sense that this was where we should start, then I did. But if it sounded like organizational meaning was the best place to start, then I would go there. In some instances, it ended up serving as an ice-breaker of sorts to have the participant talk about themselves for a few minutes, and it also allowed for more in depth questions about the experience to come out later.] | • *How would you characterize the relationship between your organization and the partner organization? (introduced in the second interview)*  
• What did the leadership of the partnership look like?  
• Please tell me more about the communication among partnership stakeholders.  
• Has the partnership generated any tensions or conflict? How were these addressed?  
• How would you characterize the level of trust among stakeholders in the partnership?  
• *Have you felt that there has been equal buy-in from the leadership on both ends of the partnership? (introduced in the third interview)*  
• If you could go back and change one thing about the partnership, what would it be? OR *If you were to do it again, what would you do differently (with the application and/or the partnership itself)? (Introduced in the ninth interview.)*  
• Was there anything about the partnership that you wish you did differently or was done differently by someone else? If so, please tell me about that.  
• What do you think was done best by the partner organization? What could that organization have done better?  
• What about support or resources from the institution (VCU)? How did that impact your experience? Is there anything that could have been done better in terms of support from the perspective of grant oversight?  
• *Tell me more about student involvement in your project/partnership. (Introduced in the third interview)*  
• *Tell me more about the grant application process and what that was like for you. (Introduced in the fourth interview)*  
• [Beginning in the fourth interview, if a transition in staff/faculty working on the partnership was mentioned, then this area would be probed further through a prompting question.]  
• *What’s next for you and your [partnership partner]? (Introduced in the fifth interview)* |

---
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| Is there anything else about the partnership that you would like to share with me? Is there any additional information that you think would be helpful to this study? | • Have you had other partnerships with the university, either formally through a grant or a class, or informally through something like volunteering? (introduced in the second interview)  
• What are your thoughts on how these sorts of partnerships impact the image of your organization and/or the partner organization? (Introduced in the eleventh interview) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you know of others involved with the partnership who you think would be interested in and have helpful contributions to the study?</td>
<td>Is there anyone else that you can think of who were involved in the partnership and might have a perspective different than yours? (If an agency director, ask about staff member(s) who worked directly with project/study; if a faculty member, ask about student(s) who worked directly with the project/study.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: TEMPLATE OF CONTACT SUMMARY SHEET

Contact Summary Sheet

Contact Data Source:  
- Interview, initial  
- Interview, follow-up  
- Document  
- Other: ________________________________

Code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Details</th>
<th>Key Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of key themes for this contact:

Memoing related to emerging hypotheses:

Minority report / Negative case indications:

Memoing related to next steps with the data collection:

Memoing on coding system:
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Audit Report

This audit report is prepared for Sharon Foreman Kready to examine her grounded theory study, which was carried out as her dissertation. The purpose of the audit is to examine the methodological process, the data collected, and the subsequent reconstructions of the data to assess inquirer bias and to verify consistency, appropriateness, and accuracy of the content and the procedures for analysis. The researcher provided the auditor with deidentified transcripts, artifacts, researcher’s assessment of quality, and memos that included methodological notations that were made throughout the analysis for the audit trail. The audit was conducted on March 4, 2011.

I first examined the raw data to assess if the audit trail and sufficient data exist. The memos included methodological decisions, category formation process, and interview guide changes, including sampling decision, hypotheses, and foreshadowed questions as well as decisions made during the data collection and data analysis. The decisions made throughout the inquiry were sound and in accordance with the expectations for a grounded theory. In addition, transcripts, records of data analysis process, and themes, sub-themes, and categories and decision rules complemented to establish methodological soundness of the inquiry. Categories, sub-themes, and themes and decision rules were clear, nonredundant, and exhaustive. The process of data reduction (data units to categories, categories to sub-themes, and sub-themes to themes) and conceptualization of relationships among categories, sub-themes, and themes through conceptual models were logical and well documented. Finally, I followed the audit trail from the final report back to the raw data to examine what is presented in the report is linked to the raw data. The findings were grounded in data, and inferences.
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drawn from the data were logical. Therefore, it is of the auditor’s opinion that the theory
developed in the study is well grounded in the data gathered through the interviews.

I hereby affirm that an audit was conducted for Sharon Foreman Kready’s grounded theory
research to assess methodological procedures, the data collected, and reconstructions of data.
It is of the auditor’s opinion that all three dimensions audited were well established in this
inquiry and that the results of the study represent the sentiments conveyed in the raw data.

Y. Joon Choi  
Date

03/04/11
Grounded Theory Tracking Chart

Used to track the constant comparison efforts executed using Atlas.ti for each category that contributed to the final themes, sub-themes and categories. Themes are listed in underlined, boldface type; sub-themes are listed in italicized, boldface type; categories of the sub-themes are listed in grey italicized boldface type; and parenthetical references in grey type are the number of quotations that contribute to that particular theme or sub-theme.

A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built (182)

- **Relationship building** (45)
  - Sense of History (16)
  - Conceptualization and approach to partnering (9)

- **Relationship dynamics** (58)
  - Communication between partners (32)
  - Reciprocity and Cooperation (22)

Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project (273)

- **Collaboration** (68)
  - Connections and Networking (22)
  - Working through partnership challenges (25) and engaging in the process of problem solving (14)
  - When the project is not sustained (8)
  - Control (9)

- **Navigating the organizational cultures** (83)
  - Climate and culture in academia (47)
  - Interdisciplinarity (17)
  - Importance of a mentor for faculty, Mentoring (16)
  - Connecting on an organizational level (3)
  - Dissemination (18)
  - Time (26)

Goodness-of-fit for all involved (232)

- **Buy-in** from all stakeholders involved (27)
  - Leadership (30)
  - Personal-Professional (12)
  - Relevant to faculty career (39)
  - Professional Development (7)
  - The Fit/Match between individual partners and the organizations (18)
  - Identity (15)

- Meets Community Need (64)
  - Image, Visibility, and Prestige (20)

Resources (216)

- Financial, Grant Proposal and Funding (84)
  - Leveraging for additional grants (20)

- **Student Involvement** (61)

- **Resource Development** (17)
  - Capacity building, in a human capacity sense to (as in they increased their capacity to partner on different things and in different ways) (17)
  - Infrastructure (17)

Impact (114)

- Appreciation, Worth, and Value (32); and
- Real World (27).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Code Family Name (n=49)</th>
<th>Original Quote Count for Code Family</th>
<th>Memos related to constant comparison outcomes</th>
<th>Final Quote Count for Code Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation, Worth, and Value</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the &quot;Impact&quot; theme; relationship is: Appreciation, worth, and value is associated with impact.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy-In</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the &quot;Goodness-of-fit for all involved&quot; theme; Relationship is: Buy-in is part of goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme &quot;Resource Development&quot; of the &quot;Resources&quot; theme; Relationship is: Capacity building is part of resource development.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and Culture of Academia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme &quot;Navigating the Organizational Cultures&quot; of the &quot;Navigating the process of a partnership project&quot; theme; Relationship is: Climate and culture of academia is part of navigating the organizational cultures is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the &quot;Navigating the process of a partnership project&quot; theme; Relationship is: Collaboration is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in the Partner Relationship</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme &quot;Relationship Dynamics&quot; of &quot;A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built&quot; theme; Relationship is: Communication in the partner relationship is part of relationship dynamics are part of a strong foundation upon which the relationship is built.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kept as is; became a sub-theme of &quot;Goodness of Fit for All Involved&quot; theme; Relationship is Community need is part of the goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization and Approach to Partnering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme &quot;Relationship Building&quot; of the &quot;A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built&quot; theme; Relationship is: Conceptualization and approach to partnering informs relationship building contributes to building a strong foundation upon which the relationship is built.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting on an Organizational Level</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Created in selective coding. A category of the sub-theme &quot;Navigating the Organizational Cultures&quot; of the &quot;Navigating the process of a partnership project&quot; theme; Relationship is: Connecting on an organizational level is part of navigating the organizational cultures is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections and Networking</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme &quot;Collaboration&quot; of the &quot;Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project&quot; theme; Relationship is: Connections and networking impact collaboration is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Collaboration” of the “Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project” theme; Relationship is: Control impacts collaboration is part of navigating the process of the partnership project.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating a Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quotes (impact, conceptualization and approach to partnering, relationship building, climate and culture in academia).</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quotes (buy-in, infrastructure).</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Navigating the Organizational Cultures” of the “Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project” theme; Relationship is: Dissemination is part of navigating the organizational cultures is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Process of Partnering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quote (relationship building)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in Problem Solving</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Collaboration” of the “Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project” theme; Relationship is: Engaging in problem solving is part of collaboration is part of navigating the process of the partnership project. Presented together with “Working Through Partnership Challenges” by Engaging in the Process of Problem Solving.” This was done because the actual partnership challenges were very unique and it emerged that while the types of challenges were not similar, the way that the challenges were handled were similar... thus informing the way that collaborations can be used to navigate the process of a partnership project.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality of Partnership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quote (relationship dynamics)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Career Issues</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Renamed “faculty career” because this family really represents a myriad of topics related to the faculty career; this is a category of the sub-theme “Buy-in from all stakeholders involved” of the “Goodness-of-Fit for all involved” theme; Relationship is: Faculty career is a reason for buy-in is part of goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit/Match</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Extended name to “Fit/match between individuals and organizations”; a category of the sub-theme “Buy-in from all stakeholders involved” of the “Goodness-of-Fit for all involved” theme; Relationship is: Fit/Match between individuals and organizations contributes to buy-in is part of goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interrogated this category alongside “Sustainability”. There ends up being more about this category within “Sustainability”. Both quote references were moved over to ”Sustainability”..</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give and Take</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Changed name to better-reflect contents: “Reciprocity and Cooperation”</td>
<td>N/A, see “Reciprocity and Cooperation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Proposal and Funding</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the “Resources” theme; Relationship is: Grant proposal and funding is part of resources.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Relationship Building” of the “A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built” theme; Relationship is: History impacts relationship building contributes to a strong foundation upon which the relationship is built.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Buy-in from all stakeholders involved” of the “Goodness-of-Fit for all involved” theme; Relationship is: Identity impacts buy-in is part of goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image, Visibility, and Prestige</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Meets Community Need” of the “Goodness-of-Fit for all involved” theme; Relationship is: Image, visibility and prestige is a component of meeting community need is part of goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>A theme.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Resource Development” of the “Resources” theme; the relationship is: Infrastructure facilitates resource development is a resource.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quotes (impact, dissemination)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinarity</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Navigating the Organizational Cultures” of the “Navigating the process of a partnership project” theme; Relationship is: Interdisciplinarity is part of navigating the organizational cultures is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT NETWORKED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A; these were quotes superfluous to study.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Buy-in from all stakeholders involved” of the “Goodness-of-Fit for all involved” theme; Relationship is: Leadership contributes to buy-in is part of goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quote (fit/match)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A category of the “Grant Proposal and Funding” sub-theme of “Resources” theme; Relationship is: Leveraging is part of Grant Proposal and Funding is part of Resources.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quotes (student involvement, communication in the partner relationship, community need)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>A sub-theme of “Navigating the Process of Partnership Project” theme; Relationship is: Mentoring is part of navigating the process of partnership project.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal-Professional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Buy-in from all stakeholders involved” of the “Goodness-of-Fit for all involved” theme; Relationship is: Personal-professional is a type of buy-in is part of goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Buy-in from all stakeholders involved” of the “Goodness-of-Fit for all involved” theme; Relationship is: Professional development is a reason for buy-in is part of goodness-of-fit for all involved.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real World</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the “Impact” theme; Relationship is: Real world is part of impact.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity and Cooperation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Created during selective coding; a category of the sub-theme “Relationship Dynamics” of the “A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built” theme; Relationship is: Reciprocity and Cooperation are part of relationship dynamics are part of a strong foundation upon which the relationship is built.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing and Utilizing Partner Strengths</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quotes (grant proposal and funding, communication in the partner relationship, collaboration)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the “A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built” theme; Relationship is: Relationship Building contributes to a strong foundation upon which the relationship is built.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Dynamics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the “A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built” theme; Relationship is: Relationship dynamics are part of a strong foundation upon which the relationship is built.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quotes (both to climate and culture in academia)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the “Resources” theme; Relationship is: Resource development <em>is a resource.</em></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards and Recognition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collapsed and recoded component quotes (both to faculty career issues)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing a Dedication and Passion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Collapsed and recorded component quotes (four to faculty career issues, three to fit/match, three to collaboration, one to relationship dynamics)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Involvement</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>A sub-theme of the “Resources” theme; Relationship is: Student involvement <em>is a resource.</em></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>68</td>
<td><strong>This theory is about sustainability of and support for the partnership. Once this realization emerged, major categories were rearranged, and quotes re-classified as needed. There is a possibility that there will be a minority report – not sure yet. If so it would be for someone who enters a partnership with no desire to sustain the relationship AND no desire to have support for the relationship, project, or collaboration... unlikely!</strong> Buy-In = 2; Capacity Building = 6; Collaboration = 1; Communication in the Partner Relationship = 1; Connecting on an Organizational Level = 3; Engaging in Problem Solving = 1; Faculty Career Issues = 1; Fit/Match = 1; Grant Proposal and Funding = 5; History = 9; Impact = 6; Infrastructure = 2; Leverage = 3; Reciprocity and Cooperation = 3; Relationship Building = 3; Relationship Dynamics = 7; Resource Development = 5; Student Involvement = 3; When the Partnership is Not Sustained = 8.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Navigating the Organizational Cultures” of the “Navigating the Process of a Partnership Project” theme; Relationship is: <em>Time is part of navigating the organizational cultures is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</em></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collapsed and recorded component quotes (all three to relationship dynamics)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the Project is Not Sustained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[Initial assessment: Created to hold quotes about when sustainability of the partnership did not work out or continue, for whatever reason. This will help explain the negative cases and see if they either fit into the theory or form a minority report.] A category of the sub-theme “Collaboration” of the “Navigating the Process of the Partnership Project”; Relationship is: When a project is not sustained impacts collaboration <em>is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</em></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Through Partnership Challenges</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>A category of the sub-theme “Collaboration” of the “Navigating the process of a partnership project” theme; Relationship is: Working through partnership challenges <em>is part of collaborations is part of navigating the process of a partnership project.</em> Presented with “Engaging in the process of problem solving” as a way of “Working through partnership challenges”. This was done because the actual partnership challenges were very unique and it emerged that while the types of challenges were not similar, the way that the challenges were handled were similar... thus informing the way that collaborations can be used to navigate the process of a partnership project.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (minus ‘not networked’)</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td></td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H: COMPILATION OF CONTRIBUTING CODES

The only codes that do not contribute directly to one of the five final themes are those that were coded as “Interview – DO NOT CODE”. These are quotations that would not contribute to the development of the theory because they are either superfluous (such as an apology for an interruption or comment about quality of the beverage/food) and/or reference a matter that has nothing to do with the interview discussion (such as a comment about the fire drill that occurred in the midst of an interview or the weather). The auditor’s report is provided as Appendix F to testify to the accountability of the study. In addition to this testament of accountability, the document entitled Supplemental Resource Booklet: The Audit Trail was made available in hardcopy format during the final oral defense of the dissertation research study for the purposes of demonstrating elements of quality in the research process. Direct access to the audit trail booklet and/or raw data in the form of transcripts will only be granted pursuant to governing policies of and under the research plan approved by the human subjects approval of the Institutional Review Board of Virginia Commonwealth University (includes coded and uncoded; word processing version and Atlas.ti version). If request is granted for review, then the review will take place in-person using the hard-copy format and reviewed in the company of the lead researcher. Requests should be made directly to the lead researcher.

Anatomy of the codes:
Example: P42: P32Co2.tr.rtf, 99-101
P42 = Atlas.ti primary document reference
P32 = Partnership reference
Co2 = Partner type reference
.tr = Transcript (.fn = field notes)
 rtf = Rich text file
, 99-101 = quote is found on line 99 through line 101

The Theory of Sustainability of Partnerships
Theme one: A strong foundation upon which the relationship is built
Family Filter: “Relationship Building”
Code Family: Relationship Building
Codes (30): [already connected with the community] [Building a Partnership Foundation] [building relationships within university] [community partners already connected with university] [connected by third party] [demonstrating genuine intent] [dynamics of relationship building] [Existing Relationship with Community Partner] [foundation for relationship] [growth of relationship with university] [Identifying the Team] [individual on campus makes a difference] [match] [new to partnerships] [optimal relationship status reached recently] [overload on staff] [pre-existing relationship with university] [preexisting personal relationship with community partner] [Primary Importance is the Relationship] [Relationship] [Relationship Building] [relationship development] [Relationship Development] [relationship dynamics] [relationship existed before seed grant] [relationship sustained] [relationships first] [Serendipity of Connecting with Campus Partner] [Sustainability - individual relationship] [word of mouth]
Quotation(s): 45

P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:1
P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:7
P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:16
P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:21
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:11
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:18
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:19
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:25
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:28
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:40
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:20
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:37
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:15
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:17
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:60
P 12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:37
P 13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:1
P 13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:17
P 14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:12
P 14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:24
P 15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:37
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P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:23
P17: P21Co1.tr.rtf - 17:12
P18: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 18:2
P18: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 18:5
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:2
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:5
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:12
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:18
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:36
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 19:20
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 19:6
P21: P24Ca1.fn.rtf - 21:3
P23: P26Ca1.tr.rtf
P23: P26Ca1.tr.rtf
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:17
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:34
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:1
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:2
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:32
P26: P34Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:4
P27: P34Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:6
P28: P35Ca1.tr.rtf
P29: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 29:18
P29: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 29:2
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:42
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:28
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:29
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:24
P31: P11Ca1.fn.rtf - 31:2
P32: P12Ca1.fn.rtf - 32:2
P33: P13Ca1.fn.rtf - 33:2
P34: P14Ca1.fn.rtf - 34:1
P34: P14Ca1.fn.rtf - 34:6
P34: P14Ca1.fn.rtf - 34:9

Code Family: History
Codes (11):
[changes in relationship with university over time] [History] [history of clinical trials at organization] [history of community organization] [History of Seeking Funding with Community Partner] [Long Term Partner with University] [long term personal involvement by community partner] [Long Term Relationship with University] [long term relationships] [Multiple Partnerships with University] [superficiality of past partnerships]

Quotation(s): 16

P9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:35
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:9
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:1
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:7
P17: P20Co1.fn.rtf - 17:10
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:8
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:8
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:12
P21: P24Co1.fn.rtf - 21:3
P23: P26Ca1.tr.rtf
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:17
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:34
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:37
P26: P34Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:4
P27: P34Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:6
P28: P35Ca1.tr.rtf
P29: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 29:18
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:4
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:28
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:29

Code Family: Conceptualization and Approach to Partnering
Codes (9):
[community partner model] [Defining Different Types of Partnerships] [good volunteer experience] [Need for Faculty to Recognize Paradigm Shift with Community Based Research] [parallel between research and service] [realistic] [research vs. service] [Responsible Conduct of Research] [Teaching Students About Community-Based Research Mindset]

Quotation(s): 9

P7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:22
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:26
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:20
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:38
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:57
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:8
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:8
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:29
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:37
P26: P34Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:4
P27: P34Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:6
P28: P35Ca1.tr.rtf
P29: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 29:18
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:4
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:28
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:29

Family Filter: “Relationship Dynamics”

Code Family: Relationship Dynamics
Codes (44):
[CBPR model] [closure] [comfort with community-based work] [Community Partner Expressed Seniority in Field] [dynamics of community-based work] [equal partners] [equal partnership] [expectations] [faculty partner role grows] [Faculty Partner Takes Lead] [faculty unwilling to donate time to project] [feeling supported] [Feeling Welcome] [flexibility] [gatekeeping] [glad for minimal involvement of secondary campus partner] [importance of match] [junior role] [Keep focus] [minimal coordination between faculty partners] [money makes a difference with success of partnership] [motivation] [one campus partner very organized] [participatory] [partner match] [partners complemented one another] [partnership stability] [Power] [Project Leadership] [Relationship Maintenance] [Relationship Management] [respect] [respect for agency staff] [respecting agency staff] [Respecting the Community Partner during Grant Process] [second campus partner was add-on] [secondary contact on other partnerships] [strength of relationships] [success of project lies in people] [sustained relationship] [team was best part] [Trust] [unequal but not subjugated] [Utilizing Strengths of Each Partner]

Quotation(s): 58

P5: O1Ca1.fn.rtf - 5:7
P5: O1Ca1.fn.rtf - 5:21
P6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:2
P6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:10
P6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:14
P6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:24
P7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:10
P7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:23
P7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:26
P7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:36
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:46
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:46
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:6
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:13
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:2
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:14
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:15
P14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:16
P14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:22
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:2
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P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:18
P14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:5
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:29
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:35
P17: P21Co1.tr.rtf - 17:23
P17: P21Co1.tr.rtf - 17:27
P17: P21Co1.tr.rtf - 17:28
P18: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 18:58
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:9
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:43
P20: P23Co1.fn.rtf - 20:4
P20: P23Co1.fn.rtf - 20:15
P21: P24Co1.fn.rtf - 21:10
P21: P24Co1.fn.rtf - 21:12

Code Family: Communication in the Partner Relationship

Codes (18):
- Communication
- Communication about grant proposal
- Communication about Proposal
- Communication About Roles and Responsibilities
- communication with all stakeholders
- [good communication is key]
- [importance of physical presence in community]
- [lack of communication]
- [lack of open communication]
- [listen to community partner]
- [Listening]
- [Misscommunication]
- [Open Communication about Expectations]
- [Positive Communication]
- [regular communication]
- [sustainability]
- [success because of ground-up approach]

Quotation(s): 32

P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:27
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:31
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:4
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:5
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:26
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:47
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:16
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:18
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:29
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:41
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:10

Code Families “Trust” and “Equality” embedded within code family “Relationship Dynamics.”

Code Family: Reciprocity and Cooperation

Codes (17):
- Adapting
- Conflicting Priorities
- cooperation
- Faculty Partner Coming to Community
- [focus on sustainability unique]
- [Give and Take]
- [Informal Partnerships]
- [linking communication with give and take]
- [Meeting at Community Agency]
- [meeting on both sides]
- [Mutual Benefit]
- [Mutually Beneficial Relationship]
- [need in community and need in academia]
- [public school system staff]
- [Reciprocal Impact]
- [Reciprocity]
- [sustained through continued collaboration]

Quotation(s): 22

P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:33
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:42
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:5
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:7
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:41
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:2
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:5
P14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:14
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Theme two: Navigating the process of a partnership project
Family Filter: “Navigating the Organizational Cultures”
Code Family: Interdisciplinarity
Codes (6): [Campus Partner Apathy] [Impact of Interdisciplinary] [Interdisciplinarity] [interdisciplinarty issues] [interdisciplinary] [Requirement for Interdisciplinary Team]
Quotation(s): 17
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:9
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:40
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:3
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:22
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:24
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:23
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:24
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:24
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:23
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:23
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:23

Code Family: Mentoring
Codes (5): [encouragement from mentor] [exposure to new methods while at university] [mentor] [Mentoring] [mentoring story]
Quotation(s): 16
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:72
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:73
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:11
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:30
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:9
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:17

Code Family: Time
Codes (10): [academic calendar issues] [amount of time] [relationship building] [spread thin] [Time Commitment] [timeline] [timeline considerations for campus partner] [timeline for relationship building] [timing] [timing of grant call]
Quotation(s): 26
P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:20
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:46
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:51
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:27
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:16
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:52
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:22
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:42
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:44

Code Family: Climate and Culture of Academia
Codes (46): [accreditation requirement for service learning] [accreditation requirements for students encourage faculty to engage in community-based work] [bureaucracy barriers to service at campus location] [bureaucratic issues within the university] [buzz words] [Campus Partner Expertise] [campus partners with differing missions] [change in academic culture] [change in university’s approach to engagement] [climate and culture in academia] [climate at institution] [climate at university around community engagement work] [climate of support for community engagement] [communication at the university] [Communication Issues with Grant Funding Group] [Community Awareness of Academic Culture] [community partner frustration over direction of university academic program] [competitive university culture] [curriculum and accreditation infrastructure] [Faculty Leadership on Engagement Efforts] [feeling tied-down to one department] [Importance of Faculty Being Involved in the Community] [institutional priorities] [intent of the university] [lack of communication from grant committee with community partner] [lack of communication within university units] [Leadership] [medical versus academic] [organizational messages] [Organizational Messages] [Perceptions of Campus Motivations] [perceptions on resource distribution within university unit] [policies and procedures in higher ed org] [priorities of faculty and
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academic units are on money] [Priorities of the University] [priority of community engagement at university] [relativity of bureaucratic issues] [repairing university-community disconnect] [Representative of the University] [representing the university] [service for department] [titles and expertise] [university commitment to engagement] [University has Power] [University Image] [university units do not communicate]
Quotation(s): 47
P 5: P1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:6
P 5: P1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:11
P 5: P1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:20
P 6: P2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:18
P 7: P4Co1.tr.rt - 7:16
P 7: P4Co1.tr.rt - 7:30
P 7: P4Co1.tr.rt - 7:32
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:23
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:9
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:36
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:40
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:43
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:44
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:48
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:49
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:53

Code Family: Connecting on an Organizational Level
Codes (3): [continued involvement with faculty partner’s department, but not faculty member]
[sustainability - organizational] [Sustainability of the Relationship with University, not individuals]
Quotation(s): 3
P 7: P4Co1.tr.rt - 7:39
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:45
P19: P22Co1.tr.rt - 19:47

Code Family: Dissemination
Codes (15): [Disseminating Separately] [Dissemination] [Dissemination Done Separately] [Financial Barriers to Presenting Together] [innovative practice] [lack of scholarly products associated with this work] [Local Co-Presenting] [participation in special university research events] [Pleased with Oral Defense of Proposal] [Publication Challenges for Community-Based Work] [research] [Scholarly Products] [scholarship] [scholarship concerns] [sharing information about other partnerships]
Quotation(s): 18
P10: P13Co2.tr.rt - 10:11
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rt - 11:12
P12: P16Co1.tr.rt - 12:18
P15: P18Co1.fn.rt - 15:17
P15: P18Co1.fn.rt - 15:23
P16: P19Co1.tr.rt - 16:36

Family Filter: “Collaboration”
Code Family: Collaboration
Codes (49): [acculturation] [Challenges of Multiple Faculty Partner Involvement] [change through collaboration] [Changes in Agency Staff] [collaborating bureaucracies] [Collaboration] [collaboration lends to multiple resources for faculty] [community ownership of product] [community partner’s research knowledge] [Community Partner Okay with Minimal Planning Involvement] [Community Partner Organized Project] [goals] [grass roots] [growth of partnerships] [impact of staffing changes] [importance of shared vision] [interactions between multiple stakeholder groups] [Interest in More Opportunities to Partner] [Know Your Strengths] [level of engagement] [logistical issues] [Logistics] [messy work] [navigating different org cultures] [Need to Recognize Community Expertise] [one-shot deal okay] [one shot deal project] [Other Interactions with Campus] [passion and partnering] [passion within collaboration] [plan from beginning to evaluate project] [project cultivates interest in
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the community] [Project Developed from Existing Model Developed by Community Partner] [Project Development Depends on the Opportunity] [remain flexible] [research and training] [role] [Roles] [same page] [Shared Passion] [shift in involvement] [shift in priorities new for some faculty] [Staff Development] [Staffing at Community Organization] [staffing changes] [strong partnership] [Teamwork] [training for staff] [unsure about number of partners]

Quotation(s): 68
P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rf - 6:17 P16: P19Co1.tr.rf - 16:3 P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rf - 23:30
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rf - 7:35 P16: P19Co1.tr.rf - 16:8 P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rf - 23:54
P10: P13Co2.tr.rf - 10:3 P17: P21Ca1.tr.rf - 17:2 P25: P33Ca1.tr.rf - 25:7
P10: P13Co2.tr.rf - 10:5 P17: P21Ca1.tr.rf - 17:15 P25: P33Ca1.tr.rf - 25:10
P14: P17Co1.fn.rf - 14:1 P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rf - 23:7 P34: P20Ca1.fn.rf - 34:28
P14: P17Co1.fn.rf - 14:20 P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rf - 23:8 P34: P20Ca1.fn.rf - 34:31
P15: P18Co1.fn.rf - 15:5 P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rf - 23:19 P34: P20Ca1.fn.rf - 34:33
P15: P18Co1.fn.rf - 15:13 P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rf - 23:20

Code Family: Connections and Networking

Codes (15): [connecting] [connecting faculty to one another] [faculty connections through grantees] [faculty contacts] [faculty interest in being a connector] [introduced by third party] [introduced through third parties] [introduced to partner by third party] [Introduction Through Third Party] [Networking] [Networking for Community Partner] [Networking in Community] [shared stakeholders] [Third Party Introduction] [Third Party Introduction to Community]

Quotation(s): 22
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rf - 7:4 P18: P22Ca1.tr.rf - 18:11 P25: P33Ca1.tr.rf - 25:21
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rf - 7:17 P18: P22Ca1.tr.rf - 18:43 P25: P33Ca1.tr.rf - 25:31
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rf - 17:14 P25: P33Ca1.tr.rf - 25:6
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rf - 18:6 P25: P33Ca1.tr.rf - 25:19

Code Family: Working Through Partnership Challenges

Codes (17): [bureaucratic barriers prevented reaching most underserved clients] [challenges for community partner] [challenges on the community end] [community bureaucratic issues] [feeling used] [financial issues] [issues with follow-through] [issues with one side of faculty partner] [Issues with Transition] [lack of faculty follow-through] [lack of organization] [making campus visits easier] [mixed feelings about project] [negative alumni
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response to partnership experience] [partnership challenge] [Partnership Challenges] [Realities of Community Agency Research Capacity]

Quotation(s): 25
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:22 P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:9 P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:18
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:11 P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:25

Code Family: When the Project is Not Sustained
Codes (4): [community college partnership fizzled] [Not Sustained] [Sustained Relationship with Faculty Partner] [unsure about sustainability]

Quotation(s): 8
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:22 P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:11

Theme three: Goodness-of-fit for all involved

Family Filter: “Buy-in from all Stakeholders Involved”

Code Family: Buy-In

Codes (25): [affiliation] [buy-in] [Buy-In from One Campus Partner] [Buy-In from Staff] [buy-in from support staff] [CBR and CBPR as a new type of research] [departmental buy-in for community-based work] [departmental support for engagement] [Differences Among Campus Partners] [Equal Buy-In] [faculty partner lacks buy-in] [individual level buy-in] [institutional buy-in] [lack of buy-in] [leadership buy-in for sustainability] [level of buy-in among community groups] [need to get leader buy-in] [Public School System] [recognition and buy-in] [Seeking Buy-In from Campus Leaders] [shared passion and dedication] [staff buy-in] [sustainability through university buy-in] [true intent] [True intent]

Quotation(s): 27
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:9 P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:10 P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:39
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:14 P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:6 P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:24
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:8 P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:36 P34: P20Ca1.fn.rtf - 34:15

Code Family: Leadership

Codes (21): [administration buy-in] [administrator buy-in] [campus partner coordinated networking] [Community Perception of Leadership at University] [faculty initiated project] [impact of changes in leadership] [Impact of Leadership Change on Project] [leadership] [leadership at community organization] [Leadership barrier] [Leadership Buy-In] [leadership challenges] [leadership style] [lip service] [need for “champion”] [Public School Partner] [Relationship Dynamics] [relationship with organization leader] [Shared Leadership] [supervision] [Temporary Shift In Faculty Partner Leadership]

Quotation(s): 30
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P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:5
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:8
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:14
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:18
P 21: P24Ca1.tr.te - 21:8
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:22
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:26
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:30

Code Family: Personal-Professional
Codes (2): [no personal gain] [personal-professional]
Quotation(s): 12

P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:5
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:8
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:14
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:18
P 21: P24Ca1.tr.te - 21:8

P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:22
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:26
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:30

Code Family: Professional Development
Codes (5): [Community at Center of Tenure Package] [Community Awareness of Faculty Research Requirements] [Mapping Out Other Scholarship Products for Tenure Package Since Community Engagement Takes So Long] [practice for future grants] [Professional Development]
Quotation(s): 7

P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:22
P 19: P22Co1.tr.te - 19:16
P 27: P3Ca1.tr.te - 27:9
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:26
P 20: P23Ca1.tr.te - 20:7
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:30
P 24: P30Ca1.tr.te - 24:18

Code Family: Fit/Match
Codes (15): [Faculty Partner has Multiple Partnerships] [fit] [fit with community-based work] [importance of shared passion for the match] [Level of Involvement from Community Partner Varies Depending on Project] [New Partnership with Private Sector] [other engagement] [other partnerships] [Other Partnerships Community Agency is Involved With] [participation in grant funded partnership] [passion for role] [potential for sustainability] [seeking new partnerships] [Types of Engagement] [Variety of Partnerships with Multiple Institutions]
Quotation(s): 18

P 7: O4Co1.tr.te - 7:9
P 7: O4Co1.tr.te - 7:41
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.te - 11:20
P 14: P17Co1.fn.te - 14:2
P 15: P18Co1.fn.te - 15:19
P 16: P19Co1.tr.te - 16:25
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:17
P 19: P22Co1.tr.te - 19:37
P 24: P30Ca1.tr.te - 24:9

Code Family: Identity

Created: 02/02/2011 03:17:28 PM (Super)

Codes (10): [community-based scholar] [defining organization] [faculty identifying with community] [faculty identity] [faculty interest in CBPR] [Faculty Partner Identified as Nontraditional Academic] [Identifying as Community-Based Researcher] [Identity] [identity (faculty)] [Mission]
Quotation(s): 15

P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.te - 11:3
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.te - 11:45
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.te - 11:71
P 13: P17Co1.fn.te - 13:10
P 14: P17Co1.fn.te - 14:25
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:3
P 18: P22Ca1.tr.te - 18:31
P 20: P23Ca1.fn.te - 20:14
P 20: P23Ca1.fn.te - 20:19
P 21: P24Ca1.tr.te - 21:16
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Code Family: Faculty Career Issues
Codes (20):  [Challenges of Tenure for a Community-based Researcher] [Community Work Seen as Rewarding] [Dedication and Passion] [Dynamics of Tenure] [faculty career] [faculty compensation] [Faculty Desire to Go Into Community More Often] [Faculty Embarassed at University Culture] [Faculty Issues] [Faculty Partner Wants to Diversify Focus Areas] [faculty priorities and expectations] [faculty recognition for community-based work] [financial reward] [independence for faculty] [intersection of interests] [multiple partnerships] [Passion for Community-Based Work over Clinical Research] [Priorities of Faculty Member] [service] [tenure]
Quotation(s): 39
P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:9  P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:29  P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:18

Family Filter: “Meets Community Needs”
Code Family: Community Need
Codes (46):  [agency-defined need] [Asking about Community Need] [budget issues] [civic engagement] [community-identified research question] [community agency need] [Community Agency Need for Help with Research and Evaluation] [Community as Experts] [Community Based Work Mindset] [Community Developed Project] [community engagement model not new to some] [Community Engagement Versus Civic Engagement] [Community Expertise] [community first] [community member’s involvement on the IWH/CCE] [Community Need] [Community Need and Community Resources] [community need and partnership match] [community needs] [Community Organization Recognition for Project] [diversity] [diversity training] [establishing need at agency] [expanding project reach to address vulnerable population] [Financial Challenges at Non-Profits] [financial challenges for community agency] [financial challenges for non-profits] [Financial Realities of Non-Profits] [financial strain at community agency] [Financial Strain in Community Organization] [Financial Strain on Community Agency] [Financial Strain on Community Partner] [Growth at Specific Agency] [meeting community need] [meeting community need for underserved populations] [Multitasking] [need for technology support] [Needs Assessment] [Organization Big Picture Context Important] [partnering with public schools] [Perceived Community Need] [Putting Community Need First] [Recognizing Community Need] [Very Specialized Services Offered at Agency] [vulnerable and underserved populations] [vulnerable population]
Quotation(s): 64
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:1  P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:9  P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:1
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P13: P17Ca1.fn.rt - 13:8
P14: P17Co1.fn.rt - 14:21
P14: P17Co1.fn.rt - 14:22
P15: P18Co1.fn.rt - 15:2
P15: P18Co1.fn.rt - 15:24
P16: P19Co1.tr.rt - 16:32
P16: P19Co1.tr.rt - 16:38
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rt - 17:4
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rt - 17:9
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rt - 17:13
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rt - 17:24
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rt - 18:12
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rt - 18:34
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rt - 18:39
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rt - 18:53
P19: P22Co1.tr.rt - 18:28
P20: P22Co1.tr.rt - 18:34
P20: P22Co1.tr.rt - 18:53
P22: P25Ca1.tr.rt - 22:19
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rt - 23:9
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rt - 23:12
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rt - 23:17
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rt - 23:41
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rt - 24:7
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rt - 24:21
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rt - 24:36
P26: P34Ca2.tr.rt - 26:12
P26: P34Ca2.tr.rt - 26:38
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rt - 27:17
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rt - 27:20
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rt - 28:15
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rt - 28:17
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rt - 28:20
P29: P3Ca3.tr.rt - 29:2
P30: P4Co1.tr.rt - 30:57
P30: P4Co1.tr.rt - 30:58
P31: P6a6bCa1.tr.rt - 31:7
P34: P20Ca1.fn.rt - 34:4
P34: P20Ca1.fn.rt - 34:7

Code Family: Image, Visibility, and Prestige

Codes (15): [affiliation with university seen as a good thing] [image] [impact of affiliating with university] [increased interest in involvement] [increased visibility] [informal PR through faculty promotion of project] [lack of community awareness of university opportunities] [lack of public awareness about partnership] [meaning of affiliation] [need for more PR about opportunities to partner] [PR] [PR about partnership] [university reputation] [visibility] [visibility of organization]

Quotation(s): 20

P5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rt - 5:10
P6: O2Ca1.fn.rt - 6:19
P7: O4Co1.tr.rt - 7:21
P9: O13Co1.fn.rt - 9:11
P9: O13Co1.fn.rt - 9:17
P12: P16Co1.tr.rt - 12:27
P12: P16Co1.tr.rt - 12:28
P12: P16Co1.tr.rt - 12:28
P12: P16Co1.tr.rt - 12:28
P18: P22Co1.tr.rt - 18:16
P19: P22Co1.tr.rt - 19:27
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rt - 20:21
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rt - 21:19
P21: P24Ca1.fn.rt - 21:19
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rt - 28:6
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rt - 28:8
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rt - 28:24
P31: P6a6bCa1.tr.rt - 31:5
P34: P20Ca1.fn.rt - 34:4
P34: P20Ca1.fn.rt - 34:7

Theme four: Resources

Family Filter: "Resource Development"

Code Family: Resource Development

Codes (15): [compare to other university] [links between teaching and community-based research] [resource development] [resource development - volunteers] [resources at community organization] [resources offered by university for partners] [resources through grant committee] [sustainability through increased university support] [sustainability through volunteers] [sustained project] [sustained through non-profit's financial support] [sustained through volunteers] [volunteer service activities] [volunteers] [volunteers from community]

Quotation(s): 17

P6: O2Ca1.fn.rt - 6:6
P7: O4Co1.tr.rt - 7:1
P7: O4Co1.tr.rt - 7:2
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rt - 11:10
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rt - 11:54
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rt - 11:70
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rt - 13:4
P16: P19Co1.tr.rt - 16:24
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rt - 17:19
P19: P22Ca1.tr.rt - 19:38
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rt - 25:26
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rt - 28:21
P30: P4Co1.tr.rt - 30:25
P30: P4Co1.tr.rt - 30:43
P30: P4Co1.tr.rt - 30:50
P30: P4Co1.tr.rt - 30:52
P30: P4Co1.tr.rt - 30:56
P30: P4Co1.tr.rt - 30:56

Code Family: Capacity Building

Codes (15): [capacity building] [desire to build capacity] [expanding reach in community] [expanding reach of project] [expanding services] [expanding services in the community] [expansion] [expansion of initial program] [feasibility of sustaining] [formally pursued partnership planning resources] [individual level capacity building]
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[multiple programs and partnerships] [sustainability - of project] [sustainable project] [Sustaining Relationships with Partners]
Quotation(s): 17
P10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:7
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:27
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:28
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:63
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:19
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:20
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:23
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:5
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:20
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:26
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:31
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:4
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:19
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:25
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:32
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:38
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rtf - 28:22
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:37
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:5
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:25
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:32
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:38
P28: P3Ca2.tr.rtf - 28:22
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:37

Code Family: Infrastructure
Codes (11): [differing philosophies] [infrastructure] [infrastructure at school] [infrastructure needed to create communication] [infrastructure support for research] [lack of support from unit] [need for stronger school infrastructure] [strong infrastructure] [support for faculty] [Sustainability in light of crisis] [sustaining the relationship]
Quotation(s): 17
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:4
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:12
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:15
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:17
P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:13
P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:23
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:13
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:34
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:2
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:7
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:10
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:10
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:13
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:15

Family Filter: “Student Involvement”

Code Family: Student Involvement

Codes (35): [assessing students’ strengths for community-based work] [assessment of student impact] [cost associated with having students at community site] [did not include student impact measure in project] [distance from campus] [dynamic student volunteer] [Faculty Gatekeeping of Students] [faculty impressions of students] [Impact of student involvement on community organization] [impact on students] [Impact on students’ professional development] [Intended Student Learning Outcomes] [internship involvement] [measuring student impact] [partnership as educational experience for students] [Potential for Student Involvement] [role of student] [Service Learning] [Shared Responsibility with Student Involvement] [student as liaison between community and campus partners] [student impact] [Student Impact and Learning Outcomes] [Student involvement] [student involvement as a requirement] [student involvement for pay] [student involvement not assessed at community site] [student learning] [student learning around diversity] [Student Learning Outcomes] [student involvement] [sustainability of project] [sustainability of student engagement] [tying partnerships to the academic program] [upfront work with student involvement] [various types of student involvement]
Quotation(s): 61
P 5: O1Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 5:3
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:13
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:15
P 7: O4Co1.tr.rtf - 7:34
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:2
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:7
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:10
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:10
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:13
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:15
P 10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:14
P 10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:19
P 10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:20
P 10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:27
P 10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:33
P 10: P13Co2.tr.rtf - 10:50
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:25
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:26
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:56
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:64
P 11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:65
P 12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:19
P 12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:20
P 12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:23
P 13: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 13:10
P 14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:10
P 15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:15
P 15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:16
P 15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:18
P 15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:21
P 15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:29
P 16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:21
P 17: P21Co1.tr.rtf - 17:5
P 18: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:20
P 19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:26
P 19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:31
P 21: P23Co1.tr.rtf - 21:37
P 21: P23Co1.tr.rtf - 21:40
P 23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:4
P 24: P30Co1.tr.rtf - 24:19
P 24: P30Co1.tr.rtf - 24:25
P 24: P30Co1.tr.rtf - 24:32
P 24: P30Co1.tr.rtf - 24:38
P 28: P3Ca2.tr.rtf - 28:22
P 23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:37
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P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:18
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:21
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:33
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:35
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:14
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:17
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:25
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:28
P19: P22Co1.tr.rtf - 19:36
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:3
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:6
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:12
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:18
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:36
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:38
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:39
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:40

Family Filter: “Grant Proposal and Funding”

Code Family: Grant Proposal and Funding

Codes (76):

- [campus partner heard about grant]
- [campus partner knowledgeable about grants]
- [Collaboration on proposal]
- [community partner initiated]
- [community partner involvement with writing grant]
- [comparing university grant proposal processes]
- [concern over sustainability]
- [decreased funding]
- [Did Not Get Funded]
- [Didn't Receive Funding from Other University Source]
- [discrepancy in funds awarded]
- [ease of working with grant funding group]
- [Encourage More Involvement From Community Partner on Grant Proposal Process]
- [faculty involved with multiple grants and projects]
- [Faculty Member Approached Community Partner about Grant]
- [Faculty Ownership Taken at Late Stage in Proposal]
- [Faculty Partner Bitter over Funding Process Preventing Sustainability]
- [faculty partner experienced with grants]
- [Faculty Partner Upset Over Grant Committee Attitude]
- [feedback from committee]
- [feedback needed from review committee]
- [funding and sustainability]
- [funding dynamics]
- [Funding Fit]
- [funding issues]
- [Funding Issues Restrict Sustainability]
- [grant administration]
- [grant background]
- [grant committee communication]
- [Grant Funding Amount]
- [grant funding group resources]
- [grant funding process]
- [Grant Process]
- [grant proposal]
- [grant proposal process]
- [Grant Proposal Work]
- [Grants Should Be For Longer Period]
- [grantwriting]
- [grantwriting skills]
- [impact of resources provided to faculty by grant committee]
- [importance of funding]
- [importance of seed grants at university]
- [increase awareness of grant opportunities in the community]
- [increase community involvement in process]
- [intent of grant]
- [intensive communication around the grant proposal]
- [involved with grant funding council]
- [lack of feedback from grant committee]
- [More Pleasant Experience with Funder than other Grants]
- [Multiple Awards Through University]
- [multiple grants]
- [need for feedback loop between grant committee and community partner]
- [Need to Promote Grants More]
- [Negative Experience with Grant Review Process]
- [not able to sustain without funding]
- [Not Getting Funded]
- [not sure what review committee is looking for]
- [notification of receipt of grant]
- [overall happy with grant funding process]
- [Perceived Negative Reaction from Grant Committee to Community Led Initiative]
- [positive experience with grant review process]
- [positive feedback on talking to review committee]
- [positive feeling about applying for grant]
- [Pride in Receiving Grant]
- [Processing Money Seen as Issue at University]
- [proposal]
- [proposal not overbearing]
- [proposal writing]
- [Request for Follow Up]
- [resources for partnerships]
- [resources from grant funding groups]
- [Seed Grant Groups Need to Invite Community Partners to Meetings]
- [start up funds]
- [Sustainability]
- [unclear about why not funded]
- [unsure about how the grant funding works]

Quotation(s): 84
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P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:28
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:30
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:34
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:36
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:4
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:5
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:6
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:10
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:11
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:14
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:15
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:16
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:30
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:16
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:31
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:9
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:10
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:21
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:1
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:18
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:1
P21: P24Ca1.fn.rtf - 21:2
P21: P24Ca1.fn.rtf - 21:13
P22: P25Co1.tr.rtf - 23:2
P23: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:2
P23: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:22
P23: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:27
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:34
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:27
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:28
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:20
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:49
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:16
P29: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 29:10
P31: P6a6bCa1.tr.rtf - 31:22
P31: P6a6bCa1.tr.rtf - 31:26
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:25
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:8
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:32
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:7
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:8
P33: P15Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 33:14
P33: P15Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 33:15
P33: P15Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 33:18
P33: P15Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 33:20
P33: P15Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 33:22
P34: P20Ca1.fn.rtf - 34:24

Quotation(s): 20

Theme five: Impact

Family Filter: "Appreciation, Worth, and Value"

Code Family: Appreciation, Worth, and Value

Codes (23): [Appreciation] [Appreciation to University] [Community Sense of Worth] [Faculty Humble Approach] [Faculty Partner Seen as Good Representative of Community Organization] [make a difference] [Overall Positive] [positive aspects] [positive experience] [positive experience with partnership] [praise for campus partner] [praise for colleague] [Praise for Community Partner] [Praise for Faculty Partner] [Praise for Faculty Partner Dedication] [praise for nontraditionally engaged disciplines and professions] [Pride in Partnership] [recognition] [rewarding] [Rewards Different in Academia and Community] [Satisfaction with Personal Involvement with Project] [sense of project worth]

Quotation(s): 32

P 6: O2Ca1.fn.rtf - 6:12
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:3
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:21
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:39
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:42
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:48
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:50
P 9: P13Co1.fn.rtf - 9:52
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:75
P12: P16Co1.tr.rtf - 12:29
P14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:6
P14: P17Co1.fn.rtf - 14:13
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:9
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:26
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:27
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:1
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:27
P16: P19Co1.tr.rtf - 16:40
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:19
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:40
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:11
P21: P24Ca1.fn.rtf - 21:22
P23: P2aP2bCo1.tr.rtf - 23:50
P24: P30Ca1.tr.rtf - 24:3
P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:36
P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:3
P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:36
P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:12
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:7
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:8
P27: P3Ca1.tr.rtf - 27:32
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Family Filter: “Real World”

Code Family: Real World

Codes (18):
- [barriers to service delivery at university-based community site]
- [Benefit for End User]
- [big picture]
- [Challenges in Conducting Research in the Community]
- [Civic Engagement and Experiential Learning]
- [Community as Place to Do Research]
- [educating citizens for careers in the real world]
- [goal to incorporate research]
- [nature of community-based work]
- [real world]
- [real world application]
- [Real World aspect to partnership]
- [real world context]
- [real world exposure]
- [Real World Exposure for Students]
- [real world preparation]
- [researchers’ untold stories about CBPR meaning]
- [translational research]

Quotation(s): 27

P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:6
P 8: P2a2bCo1.fn.rtf - 8:11
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:2
P11: P13P14Ca1.tr.rtf - 11:74
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:9
P13: P17Ca1.fn.rtf - 13:12
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:4
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:32
P15: P18Co1.fn.rtf - 15:35
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:1
P17: P21Ca1.tr.rtf - 17:1
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:36
P18: P22Ca1.tr.rtf - 18:51
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:20
P20: P23Ca1.fn.rtf - 20:20
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:29
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:29
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:38
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:42
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:46
P23: P2aP2bCa1.tr.rtf - 23:48
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:12
P25: P33Ca1.tr.rtf - 25:43
P26: P34Ca2.tr.rtf - 26:31
P28: P3a2.tr.rtf - 28:11
P28: P3a2.tr.rtf - 28:16
P28: P3a2.tr.rtf - 28:18
P28: P3a2.tr.rtf - 28:19
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:5
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:38
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:5
P30: P4Co1.tr.rtf - 30:8
P33: P15Ca1.tr.fn.rtf - 33:16
P34: P20Ca1.fn.rtf - 34:10
P34: P20Ca1.fn.rtf - 34:10
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Sharon Foreman Kready was born on July 30, 1979, in Richmond, Virginia, and is an American citizen. She graduated from Midlothian High School in Midlothian, Virginia in 1997. She received her Bachelor of Arts in Sociology and Criminal Justice from the University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia in 2001. She received her Master of Social Work from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri in 2003. She held positions in student affairs and higher education administration at John Tyler Community College and at both the undergraduate and graduate levels at Virginia Commonwealth University, and she taught Sociology at Virginia Western Community College. In August 2011 she will begin her position as Assistant Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology and Criminology at Lynchburg College in Lynchburg, Virginia. She resides in Bedford County, Virginia.

PROFESSIONAL OBJECTIVE: To enhance students’ academic experiences through the use of a learner-centered approach to teaching; to advance organizational commitment to social justice and community engagement through critically reflective teaching, research, and administration of programs with relevance to and respect for community and campus stakeholders; and to promote the use of a social justice framework towards the goal of personal and structural transformations among vulnerable, underrepresented, and underserved populations.

RESEARCH INTERESTS: Organizational commitment to social justice; organizational culture and climate, particularly in higher education; community engagement and civic engagement; service learning and critical pedagogy; rural social work practice; organizational culture and behavior; program evaluation and assessment; application of the social work perspective and practice orientation in the higher education context; school-based services for vulnerable, underrepresented, underserved, and non-traditional student populations; and the academic and bio-psychosocial-spiritual wellbeing for children of incarcerated parents.

TEACHING INTERESTS: Social Work Practice with Communities and Groups; Social Justice and Social Change; Non-Profit Administration and Management; Social Welfare Policy; Introductory and Advanced Social Work, Human Services, Sociology, and Management courses; Human Behavior in the Social Environment; Organizational Culture, Theory, and Behavior; Rural Social Work Practice; Culturally Competent Practice; Social Theory; Qualitative Research Methods, particularly Content Analysis, Focus Groups, Grounded Theory, and Constructivist Inquiry; Quantitative Research Methods, particularly Introduction courses and Multivariate Analysis; Evaluation of Programs and Services.
VITA, continued

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy, 2011
School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
Dissertation Title- Organizational Culture and Partnership Process: A Grounded Theory Study of Community-Campus Partnerships

Master of Social Work, 2003
George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri
Concentration- Administration of Programs and Services in the Higher Education Community

Bachelor of Arts, 2001
Criminal Justice and Sociology, University of Richmond
Richmond, Virginia
Undergraduate study, 1997-1998
Mary Baldwin College
Staunton, Virginia

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
Adjunct Instructor, Virginia Western Community College, Roanoke, Virginia:
  Fall 2008 (one section) and Spring 2009 (two sections): SOC 200, Principles of Sociology
Instructor, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia:
  Spring 2005 through Fall 2006: Introduction to the University (UNIV 101, formerly VCU 101)
  Spring 2005: Turning Points (VCU 102, for students on academic probation)

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION EXPERIENCE
- Program evaluator and coordinator of assessment as component of Program Coordinator position for the Graduate School Mentorship Program and Preparing Future Faculty Program, Graduate School, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia (June 2007 – present).
- Contracted qualitative analysis researcher for the Qualitative Analysis Subcommittee of the Virginia Commonwealth University Equity and Diversity Committee Climate Survey (December 2007-February 2008).
• Focus group facilitator and evaluation analyst in clinical Master of Social Work clinical course modules on Social Work ethics, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University (Spring 2007).
• Research Assistant to MSW Program Committee, supervised by Beverly Koerin, Ph.D., MSW Program Director, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia (September 2007-May 2008).
• Research Assistant to Karen Rotabi, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia (September 2007-May 2008).
• Research Assistant and Webmaster, Center for Mental Health Services Research, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri (Aug 2001-July 2002).

PROFESSIONAL PUBLICATION

PEER-REVIEWED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS
Foreman Kready, S. (2010, April). Public expressions of commitment to justice principles of social justice by institutions of higher education: A content analysis of institutional website artifacts. Electronic paper presentation at the 13th Annual Graduate Student Symposium and Exhibit, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.
Foreman, S. (2008, April). Moving beyond “don’t…”: Teaching effective boundary development in direct social work practice. Electronic paper presentation at the 11th Annual Graduate Student Symposium and Exhibit, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.
VITA, continued

INVITED WORKSHOP PRESENTATION

HIGHER EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

*Program Coordinator*, May 2007-current
Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program and Graduate School Mentorship Program, Graduate School, Virginia Commonwealth University

- Development and coordination of activities related to assessment plan linking program objectives to course objectives and student learning outcomes using qualitative and quantitative methods;

- Expansion of existing program services and activities to include sustainable and innovative initiatives including blog, social networking site presence, e-newsletter, alumni reconnect initiative, and resource library (web and in-office);

- Provide oversight for and performance of daily functions of programs including recruitment and promotion, regular communication with faculty members and students involved in programs (via telephone, electronic mail and in-person meetings), consultation with faculty and administrators in other departments/schools on preparing the future professoriate and mentorship program models, engage in activities around course scheduling and program planning;

- Serve as direct supervisor for graduate student in program assistant position;

- Facilitate orientations, annual certificate awards ceremony, faculty advisory committee meetings, and other group meetings/workshops for graduate student and faculty audiences; and,

- Provide informal counseling and mediation services for situations in which there is potential for growth or changes in mentoring dyads, and informal advising services for graduate students exploring careers in higher education; and

- Coordination of landmark initiatives and involvement in unique higher education administration opportunities during tenure in Associate Dean’s office, including:
  - Functioning as primary contact person for programs during multiple semester timeframe when direct supervisor was serving as interim dean at another institution of higher education located out of town;
  - Management of three cycles of graduate student position hiring involving the recruitment, interviewing (phone and in-person), and training processes;
  - Performance as integral member of PFF Program curriculum review process prior to involvement as key point person for program-wide enhancement process that included navigation of institutional submission and approval process for program and course changes, and served as point person for publicizing changes to key constituents.
VITA, continued

**Assistant Director**, Jul 2006-Aug 2006
New Student Programs, University College, Virginia Commonwealth University

**Program Manager**, Nov 2004-Jul 2006
First Year Student Services, Virginia Commonwealth University
- Served as instructor for UNIV/VCU 101, *Introduction to the University*, and VCU 102;
- Provided front-line management for academic orientation registration, customer service initiatives, student employees and financial services in daily operations of the department;
- Engaged in planning, implementation and evaluation of department programs: Academic orientation, optional overnight orientation component, Welcome Week (coordinate planning committee), UNIV/VCU 101 and 102 courses and Family Weekend;
- Responsible for all fiscal and personnel operations for department;
- Supervised student office assistants; co-supervise orientation leaders and graduate assistants;
- Served on committee charged with developing new scholarship within Student Affairs division; and
- Designed departmental publications including parent e-newsletter, applications for student employment, registration materials and other department pieces.

**Student Leadership Advisor**, Oct 2003-Nov 2004
Office of Student & Community Activities, John Tyler Community College, Chester, Virginia
- Oversaw functions of student groups, worked with student group leaders and advisors, and served as liaison between student groups and other College departments;
- Worked with students interested in starting new student groups; number of student groups doubled during first nine months in position;
- Developed and produced Student Group Policies and Procedures Handbook and revised forms;
- Redesigned department web pages, developed promotional materials and oversaw on-line Student Job Board;
- Managed student activities and programs, including *Sherwood Forest Literary Review*, Awards Night Banquet; and campus picnics;
- Coordinated on-campus visits by recruiters and assisted in career development initiatives;
- Provided continuous assistance and support for community education programs and facility rental; and
- Committee Involvement: Cultural Awareness Program Committee, International Education Committee, Student Activities Advisory Committee (ad hoc), Who’s Who Selection Committee, and Classified Staff and Wage Employee Professional Development Committee.
Career Advisor, Sept 2002-May 2003
Fontbonne University, St. Louis, Missouri
- Provided career planning and job search assistance to undergraduate students;
- Served as an active member of professional team working with entering students on occupational exploration;
- Administered multiple aspects of specialized professional development program;
- Developed and presented leadership training workshops;
- Evaluated programs and recommended new strategies for service delivery;
- Designed program brochures and promotional materials; and
- Developed and maintained professional contacts database.

Recruitment and Admissions Assistant, Sept 2002-May 2003
Graduate School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
- Planned and facilitated prospective student visits and new student orientation events;
- Served on recruitment team at Council on Social Work Education Annual Conference (Atlanta, Georgia);
- Organized application documents in confidential filing system and computer database; and
- Communicated frequently with prospective and newly admitted students (written, oral and electronic).

Career Services Assistant, Sept 2002-May 2003
Graduate School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
- Designed and maintained computer database;
- Provided data testing and consultation with administrators on new database tracking system;
- Published student biographies on school’s website;
- Organized local social service job opportunities for weekly email list to students and alumni;
- Coordinated job search campaign with Alumni Office; and
- Served as a co-leader for National Association of Social Workers (Missouri Chapter) Professional Development Workshop.

COUNSELING AND SOCIAL SERVICE PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Crisis Counselor, Life Crisis Services, Inc., Jan 2002-July 2002, St. Louis, MO
Volunteer, Cochran Gardens Community Center, Jan 2002-May 2002, St. Louis, MO
Volunteer, Carver Promise Program, Sept 2000-May 2001, Richmond, VA
Volunteer, Central VA YWCA Domestic Violence Shelter, Sept 2000-May 2001, Richmond, VA
VITA, continued

SERVICE AND HONORS

2009  Leadership and Service Award, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University
2008-2009  Graduate Student Association, Executive Council Graduate Research Symposium Chairperson, Virginia Commonwealth University
2008-2009  Doctoral Student Association, President of the executive board, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University
2007-2008  Doctoral Student Association, Student Member-at-Large of the executive board, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University
2007-2008  Graduate Student Association, Executive Council, School of Social Work representative, Graduate School, Virginia Commonwealth University
2007-2008  Honor Council, Graduate Student Representative, Virginia Commonwealth University
2007  Discussion group facilitator for Summer Reading Program (Nickel and Dimed), University College, Virginia Commonwealth University
2006-2007  90th Anniversary Planning Committee, Doctoral student representative; Social of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University
2006  Executive Planning Committee and committee chair: Call for Programs and Community Service; National Orientation Directors Association Region VIII Conference
2004  Awarded honorary membership to Phi Theta Kappa, by Tau Rho Chapter; John Tyler Community College, Chester, Virginia
2001-2003  Student Marshal, George Wiley Scholarship Recipient, Member of Admissions Counselor Interview Committee, Student Government Officer, and Graduate student representative in program exhibition hall; George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
1999-2001  Alpha Delta Kappa (International Sociology Honors Society), Member of Sociology Professorial Candidate Selection Committee, Alpha Chi Omega Executive Council; University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia
1997-1998  Parent’s Council, President’s Society, Student Government Senator and Chairwoman; Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Virginia

Current and past professional affiliations include: Council on Social Work Education (CSWE); International Association of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement; National Association of Social Workers (NASW); Rural Social Work Caucus