dev

6. Bec   nt, how might
you   ent program?

Thank   their teaching
and schola   hat embraces
disciplinar   approached
educationa   scholarly pur-
suit by fac   way in which
students and faculty are the prime beneficiaries of authentic experiences in the community. At times, these benefits are unintentionally at the expense of, and sometimes to the detriment of, members of the community who may receive little or no benefit from the experience. Engaged teaching and scholarship represents a significant paradigm shift from unilateral scholarly expertise and benefit to include public expertise and benefit through what Saltmarsh (2010) characterizes as democratic-centered engaged epistemology. CEPs must carefully and diplomatically introduce and promote the mutual benefits of the public purpose of higher education. Although community engagement is potentially transformative, CEPs must work with faculty to create an intentional awareness of the inherent power and privilege in higher education through self-reflection and self-critique to recognize unintentional and intentional racism and classism that may influence their behavior (Ross, 2010).

CEPs assist faculty and students in forming community partnerships, especially those located in diverse and underresourced geographical locations, with an appreciation of and respect toward those who have invited them as guests into their communities (Mattar, 2011, 2014). This promotes democratic, nonauthoritarian trust and collaborative relationships. It is critical for a CEP to have an understanding of the dynamics of power and privilege in faculty roles in moving toward emancipatory and democratic practices.

1. Given the autonomous culture and expert model in academia, how would you articulate the nature and importance of the countercultural democratic-centered framework (Saltmarsh, 2010) for engaged pedagogy and scholarship to faculty? How would this be integrated into faculty development efforts?
2. How might you use faculty development to broach the subject and issue of power and privilege?
3. What materials, if any, might you consider incorporating? Who might be guest speakers?

Chapter Nine

CULTIVATING HIGH-QUALITY PARTNERSHIPS

Partnership is both the norm and an aspiration within higher education civic engagement practice today. Books, journal articles, organizational mission statements, and student learning outcomes routinely feature the language of partnership, collaboration, and co-creation in descriptions and discussions of civic work. . . . Notwithstanding the best intentions, the smartest program design, the most committed collaborators (among faculty, staff, and community colleagues), the best institutional support, and so forth, partnership is an essentially elusive thing. Why? Because rather than being primarily an exchange or an agreement, partnership within the context of civic engagement is fundamentally relational, and a relationship is always a work in progress. (Ray, 2016, p. 8)

The language of partnership is threaded throughout the work of community or civic engagement. In our experience, the word *partnership* becomes a blanket term, sometimes inappropriately. We have observed many instances in which community engagement professionals (CEPs), faculty, and students refer to any sort of relationship or interaction between on- and off-campus stakeholders as a partnership. For example, placements and partnerships are different things. There is an operational difference between placements and partnerships and a difference in the ends that are served by placements and partnerships. Amid an array of relationships and interactions, the concept of partnership means something very specific, and CEPs need to differentiate among the various kinds of relationships and interactions. We feel there is a pressure in our field and on our campuses to use the language of partnership. We

encourage you to call things by their right names; sometimes stakeholders simply want or need an interaction or a transaction and aren't looking for a partnership. Other times, a partnership is the right vehicle. In Bringle and colleagues' (2009) work to promote a "richer, more nuanced, more precise, and more useful conceptual framework for the analysis of relationships and partnerships" (p. 3), the authors suggest characterizing partnerships as having three qualities: closeness, equity, and integrity.

Bringle and colleagues (2009) also advance the SOFAR framework of engagement relationships, which identifies five key constituencies—S (students), O (organizations), F (faculty), A (administration), and R (residents)—and shows that partnerships happen among different configurations of stakeholders. A campus-community partnership between the institution, centrally, and a community, across organizations, has a different complexity from a CEP-organization partnership, in which a CEP and a community organization staff member form a partnership that students and faculty plug into. Partnerships can be informal, in which two or more people (such as a faculty member and community agency staff) choose to work together independently of their organizations and in typically informal ways. Partnerships can also be formal with goals, responsibilities, and financial commitments in accordance with some kind of organizational policy (Eddy, 2010). Again, we feel it is helpful to be specific about the kind of partnership a CEP is talking about.

As part of its Community Engagement Classification, the Carnegie Foundation defined *partnerships* as, "ongoing, long-term relationships in which each partner brings individual goals, needs, assets and strategies, and through collaborative processes blends them into common goals and outcomes" (as cited by Northern Illinois University Office of Outreach, Engagement, and Regional Development, 2018, para 2). A number of professional associations (e.g., Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Campus Compact, and the Council of Independent Colleges) have explored the qualities of effective partnerships and offer various frameworks whose characteristics overlap considerably. Mutual authority for decision making, aligning partnership efforts with community goals and assets, and balancing benefits with costs are hallmarks across frameworks (Community Campus Partnerships for Health, 2006; Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2003; Torres & Schaffer, 2000).

After completing this chapter, those working in the field of community engagement or currently working as a CEP will be able to reflect on the areas in which they are competent (see Table 9.1) and identify areas they would like to develop further. Those who are new to supporting community engagement or who aspire to enter the community engagement

TABLE 9.1

**Competencies and Critical Commitments Associated
With Cultivating High-Quality Partnerships**

9.1. Knowledge of self: self-awareness 9.2. Knowledge of local community, history, strengths, assets, agendas, goals 9.3. Able to initiate and maintain effective partnerships 9.4. Able to connect campus and community assets	9.5. Able to communicate across boundaries and roles, between internal and external stakeholders 9.6. Able to involve partnership members in reflection on and assessment of partnerships 9.7. Able to resolve conflict	9.8. Embrace passion for and commitment to community engagement 9.9. Desire to participate in the ongoing life of the community, participating in community-building events, serving on boards, being aware of and invested in community concerns

Critical Commitments
- Conscious of power relations inherent in partnerships
- Committed to cultivating authentic relationships with communities

profession will demonstrate awareness and emerging understanding of these areas of competence.

Knowledge of Self: Self-Awareness

Walking into partnership work without a sense of who you are and what assumptions and needs you are bringing with you, seen and unseen, is problematic. Further, if you are not from the community your partner is from, walking into partnership work without familiarity about that community or the intention to learn about it is arrogant. If CEPs choose to do partnership work without critically considering themselves, the partner, and the communities that surround the potential partnership, this suggests the CEPs assume the relationship will unfold according to their own ways of partnering, their own cultural contexts, and in accordance with their assumptions about the community. The relationships might proceed, but we believe the CEPs are primed to misstep and will likely encounter many surprises that may derail the engagement.

As Bringle and Hatcher (2002) stated, "Campus-community partnerships are complex, in part, because of the cultural differences that exist

between higher education and the community in terms of how each generates knowledge and solves problems" (pp. 505–506). To effectively navigate, appreciate, and honor the cultural crossings in partnership work, CEPs need to begin by knowing themselves as cultural beings. This requires being aware of your cultural contexts, personal and professional, and their inherent orientations, pressures, and goals. Opportunities to learn about your potential partner's specific orientations to partnership, pressures, and goals are critical.

What lens do you see things?

Knowledge of Local Community

Many of us come from the communities where our partners are located. Some of us do not. A CEP must also have knowledge about the broader community where the partnership is situated. It is vital for you to become familiar with the community's cultures and histories, its past experiences with your institution, the network of assets that exist to promote the community's strength and functioning as well as your particular focus area (e.g., assets that support entrepreneurship or assets that support food security), and the short- and long-term agendas and goals of the community. We offer one strategy we particularly enjoy, visiting with community elders, for learning about a community in Box 9.1. *Lie this!*

Able to Initiate and Maintain Effective Partnerships

Torres and Schaffer (2000) describe the stages of partnerships as designing the partnership, building collaborative relationships based on trust and mutual respect, and sustaining partnerships over time. The role of the CEP can vary in these stages from being the campus stakeholder who initiates or is the primary university partner in the partnership to being supportive of campus stakeholders who occupy these roles. Knowing the role of the CEP in the partnership and the stages of partnership work is important for CEPs. The stages described next assume the CEP is the leader or holder of the partnership, but the material will also help a CEP to be an effective coach to others doing partnership work.

Eddy's (2010) change model for forming a partnership lays out the tasks when initiating and maintaining a partnership:

- Verbalize motivation and context for partnering
- Align the social capital of the champion and organizational capital of partners

- Establish partnership goals and team governance
- Frame the partnership to stakeholders
- Negotiate conflicts
- Frame outcomes
- Evaluate the process
- Institutionalize the partnership (p. 25)

In Eddy's (2010) model, potential partners should discuss whether the motivation for partnering is intrinsic (a shared concern) or extrinsic (opportunity to garner funding or a mandated collaboration). They should also discuss the context and ask if the environment surrounding the partnership is stable and predictable or shifting. Motivation and context influence each partner's goals for the collaboration.

A champion advocates for a partnership to happen and brings together the people who should be involved. That champion needs to take advantage of his or her social capital, that is, the people who know and trust the champion who will help the partnership. The partners involved need to use their organizational capital, that is, the resources such as space, funding, technology, information, and human resources available to the partnership through members' organizations.

BOX 9.1
Compass Point: Cultivating Partnerships–A

We have found it particularly helpful to learn about a community from respected community members. Some of the communities where we work have elders or trustees who have been a part of the community for a very long time. Many of them have helped their community grow and change over a period of many years. Having kitchen table conversations with these elders or trustees can be invaluable. We recommend doing as much footwork as you can to learn about the community in advance of meeting with these elders. We find it encouraging to share our knowledge and perspectives when we know the other person is truly interested and has taken initiative to learn a thing or two. Simple questions, such as the following, can elicit rich information: What was this community like when you first moved here or when you were younger? How has it changed? What have been some of the most important events? What do you like most about this community? What do you think surprises outsiders about your community? Who are some of your community's most important leaders? Whom do you consider to be the glue of your community?

Partnership members develop the shared goals for the partnership as well as their individual goals and discuss how the partnership will be governed, including how power, authority, resources, and decision-making will be shared. Depending on the formality of the partnership and the context of your institution, sometimes a memorandum of understanding is used to specify the goals, governance, the roles of each stakeholder, and how outcomes will be assessed.

Once the partnership's work is under way, maintenance of the partnership becomes important. Ongoing communication and evaluation of the collaboration is important to keep the partnership on track, and when conflicts arise, partners need to work together to resolve them. Maintenance functions are discussed later.

Regardless of whether the CEP is the leader or champion of the partnership or whether or not he or she is consulting with a campus stakeholder who wants to develop a partnership, familiarity with the tasks of initiating and maintaining a partnership is very important. Helping those we support to know there are discernable stages of partnership development and the tasks involved reduces anxiety of the faculty, staff, and community partner about collaborating and can help their efforts go more smoothly. Keith's (2015) book helps democratic civic professionals navigate partnerships using a critical lens, democratic commitments, and authentic relationships.

Able to Connect Campus and Community Assets

Before we move into the sections concerned with partnership maintenance, we feel it is important to stress an asset-based approach to partnership development, which differs from a needs-based approach or deficit-thinking model. It assumes that communities are asset rich and rejects the idea that communities must rely on outside assistance for their development (Garoutte & McCarthy-Gilmore, 2014; Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). The asset-based approach to community development was formalized by McKnight and Kretzmann (1993) and promoted through the work of the Asset-Based Community Development Institute, now headquartered at DePaul University. It promotes a process of community development that embraces a place-based approach, usually a community or neighborhood, where residents identify or map the assets (local knowledge, skills, resources, organizations, and networks) of their community and their history of cooperative problem-solving (Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014). An asset-based approach also includes seemingly

subtle and nuanced language, requiring a shift from deficit-based terms such as *needs, issues, problems,* and *challenges* to affirmative ones such as *goals, aspirations,* and *vision.*

Increasingly, campus leaders are turning to asset-based community development to inform their approaches to community-campus engagement and also their approaches to partnership development. There are two lessons here. First, the assets in a community are identified before the role of outside supportive resources is determined (McKnight, 2017). This fundamentally reorients a conversation about community engagement partnerships from, What do you need and how can we help? to What is this community already doing that we might learn from and then may we join you in these efforts? Second, we can't separate the action of identifying and connecting assets from developing asset-based thinking (Snow, 2014). Because the act of identifying assets leads to asset-based thinking, we feel it is very important to involve the many stakeholders of a partnership in the exercise of identifying the assets that can be connected to reach the partnership's goals.

The result is a constellation of stakeholders who see communities as asset rich rather than need based, who notice resources that could be potentially overlooked (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993) and who recognize the assets of stakeholders (Donaldson & Daughtery, 2011) such as community residents or students, in addition to those of employees of organizational partners such as faculty or community-based organization staff. Hamerlinck and Plaut's (2014) work illustrates the principles and practices of asset-based community engagement, providing an invaluable resource that should be on a CEP's bookshelf and used as source material when coaching others in community engagement.

Able to Communicate Across Boundaries and Roles

Communication is bidirectional: giving and receiving information. When hiring staff, two of the more desirable qualities we look for in candidates are the ability to listen and accurately hear what is being expressed and the ability to clearly convey information in a way that is honest and authentic. When a candidate can do this, we feel he or she will likely do the same in partnership communication, which is so central to this work.

Listening is a critical component of communication among boundary spanners (Williams, 2002). Actively listening allows the CEP to understand what another person is really saying and be open to valuing and being influenced by the views of other people. A CEP needs to model the

ability to listen and how to be open to the views and voices of others as they steward campus and community stakeholders in partnership work. Martin and Crossland (2017) suggest that two-way partnership communication is largely concerned with CEPs developing a commitment to include community stakeholder voices in partnership development. Because community engagement activities are often initiated by campus stakeholders as a means to enhance students' education or faculty research or as tools of economic development, there has been a tendency for campus stakeholders to drive the conversation rather than prioritize community partners as equal voices in determining the activities, qualities of interactions, and benefits in partnerships. At times community stakeholders are unfamiliar with the capacities and constraints of faculty and students they wish to work with as partners. Helping to facilitate and model deep listening between campus and community stakeholders is key in helping to build mutual understanding (Furco, 2010) as well as consensus building (Martin & Crossland, 2017) in partnership development.

In addition to listening, inclusive sharing of information consistently and continually is key to partnerships. Effectiveness in oral, written, and presentational communications is foundational to how boundary spanners share information (Williams, 2002) but must be accompanied by transparency, inclusion, and forthrightness. Helping people to communicate openly and transparently share their motivations, expectations, and limitations allows stakeholders to mutually determine the nature of the partnership (Leiderman et al., 2002). Being aware of who receives information, who does not, and who is included in communication efforts is one way CEPs can practice inclusive communication. Finally, being forthright in partnership communications means CEPs are consistent in what they tell to whom, do not shy away from delivering disappointing or negative feedback (but do so with compassion and tact), and build credibility with those involved (see Box 9.2). Direct, clear communication is central to this work. We offer a variety of scenarios in Box 9.3 for your consideration. Take some time to reflect on your approach to communication by responding to the scenarios and prompts offered there.

Able to Involve Partners in Reflection and Assessment

Throughout a partnership, it is important for members to have the opportunity to check in with each other periodically about how the partnership is working and what needs to happen differently. This strengthens the relationship among partners and facilitates a healthy way of working

> ### BOX 9.2
> ### Compass Point: Cultivating Partnerships–B
>
> Communicating clearly and consistently is a fundamental skill for a CEP. Being able to deliver disappointing news or negative feedback is key to partnership communication. Becoming aware of your tolerance to do so is an important aspect of self-awareness.
>
> Can you communicate the rationale for a partnership in three lines of text or less? If you are communicating it orally, can you do so in one minute or less, and if you are using a presentation, in three bullets or less?
>
> In your role as a CEP, do you tend to explain your institution's intentions or the purpose of an initiative two different ways depending on the audience? Is the difference in delivery a matter of style, or are you trying to avoid raising someone's concern?

> ### BOX 9.3
> ### Compass Point: Cultivating Partnerships–C
>
> Consider these cases with a peer or mentor and then discuss the questions at the end.
>
> - The executive director of an organization who works with three of your first-year-experience classes leaves a message for you one day in October saying, "Please give me a call. I have some bad news. The staff person who has been working with your first-year students has gone on medical leave and there's no way we'll be able to continue the projects." You realize that (a) this will affect about 80 students; (b) it's the middle of the semester; (c) it will affect 3 faculty members' teaching plans; and (d) without the students' work, the organization's clients will be impacted.
> - A faculty member sends you an e-mail asking to meet with you to discuss plans to organize a service component to an upcoming study abroad trip to Tanzania. She describes plans for bringing a water purification technology to the community her group will be working in. She has a close colleague who has done a similar project using the technology in Latin America. In the e-mail, the faculty member says she has brought students to Tanzania once before but will be going to a new region and needs help making contacts. You realize that the faculty member (a) is proposing to

BOX 9.3 (Continued)

bring a technology to a community without knowing whether or not it's needed, appropriate, or wanted, and (b) will be looking to you for assistance.

• Your college president announced that the campus will be undertaking a place-based approach to engagement that will help those on campus work more intentionally with one of its nearby neighborhoods. You begin fielding questions and comments from community partners and faculty, for example, (a) Does this mean our partnerships in X neighborhood need to be shifted to Y neighborhood? (b) No one talked with us and now you are publicly announcing that you're going to be doing work in my neighborhood? (c) Does this mean we no longer value global engagement? (d) The recent funding climate has been tough on our organization, and we are so excited for the partnerships that are now possible with your campus. I'd like to discuss how we can arrange a community benefits fund.¹ We can see all the ways this place-based strategy will benefit the campus, and we just want to ensure that the neighborhood will benefit equally.

Questions for Discussion: How does this initially make you feel (emotions)? What stories about the other person's rationale or future reactions are you telling yourself (assumptions)? What more information will you need to clearly understand the situation (clarity)? What information can you supply to help the other person understand the situation (clarity)? What is the best way to have this conversation (mode)? What key messages do you need to convey (goals)? What outcome do you hope for (goals)? What would you say or do in response?

Note

1. A community benefit fund is a monetary fund set up to support activities or programs that will benefit a neighborhood or its residents. Such a fund is often created when a large entity (e.g., a casino or sports arena) wants to locate in a particular neighborhood. The neighborhood's stakeholders agree to support the location and property development if the entity creates a system to financially support community-benefitting activities that are developed and owned by the community.

together that hopefully produces the benefits desired by all as well as ensures members feel respected and valued. Although this is common sense, CEPs need to be able to guide others in actively planning for and

managing these processes. In the absence of ongoing partnership reflection and assessment, which both of us have witnessed, some members can end up feeling exploited, or a lack of trust or regard among partners emerges, or the partnership gets off track and members feel it is too late to fix it. Partnership reflection can be used for fostering partnerships or to restore and strengthen a partnership (Catholic Relief Services, 2015).

Reflection during the stage of fostering or forming partnerships typically leads to a shared understanding of the purposes the partnership serves and how it will be conducted. This can be done in a variety of ways, but at its most formal a memorandum of understanding or agreement will be issued, which is becoming increasingly common among boards of nonprofit organizations. These memoranda may include topics such as the following:

• Purpose of the partnership
• Proposed activities
• Benefits or outcomes that are expected for each party
• Resource commitments from each partner
• Roles and responsibilities of those involved
• Acknowledgment that risks associated with partnership activities have been mitigated or will be managed following the included outline
• Time frame of the partnership and its subsidiary activities
• Cocreated ground rules to ensure considerate behavior among partners
• Decision-making procedures to determine who is responsible for what
• Agreed-on partnership check-ins
• Outcome evaluation procedures

Some institutions have standardized expectations for partnership agreements or memoranda. In some instances, partners reject the formality of memoranda, and when this occurs we feel that developing an artifact that reflects the understanding and agreements that shape a partnership is very important, but its format should reflect the context and comfort of those involved.

Reflection used to strengthen a partnership could also be considered assessment of the partnership, which offers a "structured framework for self-appraisal" and "legitimizes inquiry" (Gelmon, 2003, p. 42). Despite getting the partnership off to a good start, without the ability to reconvene periodically, the mutuality we so prize in our work can quickly slip away and with it the desired outcomes and regard partnership members have for

one another. Such restorative reflection requires "authentic give-and-take discussion beyond campus efforts where the inclusivity appears contrived or staged" (Beere, 2009, p. 61). If periodic check-ins were included as part of the partnership formation stage, these kinds of conversations should be more comfortable because they are expected and may allow partners to avoid irrevocable difficulties. CEPs must also prioritize community partner participation in the assessment of partnership outcomes and have the ability to guide others to do so. In addition to being considerate of a community partner's capacity and desire to participate in assessment activities, CEPs must also be (or become) adept at creating the conditions in which partnership members can share candid, sometimes critical feedback. CEPs can provide assurance to community partners that sharing negative feedback will not preclude them from other collaborations with the institution, facilitate ground rules for conversations that give participants ample listening and speaking time, and validate the importance of honest feedback. Some examples of frameworks or instruments for assessing partnerships that expressly include community partners in the process include the PAIR (Partnership Assessment in Community-Based Research) measure (Arora, Krumholtz, Guerra, & Leff, 2015) for community-engaged participatory research, which examines elements such as communication, collaboration, partnership values, benefits, and evaluation, and the community-level assessment matrix (Gelmon, 2001, 2003), a framework for assessing variables in service-learning partnerships such as the nature of the partnership, nature of interactions, satisfaction, and sustainability.

Able to Resolve Conflict

When we do partnership work, conflicts will arise and how they are dealt with can either sustain the partnership or destroy it. By nature, partnerships bring together people from different organizational and personal cultures, norms, interests, and operating practices (Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999). These differences, if not acknowledged and mediated, can produce differing expectations of the partnership and behaviors among members. Often, the disagreement isn't about the actual behavior and events but rather what those behaviors and events signify about the way the partnership works, that is, the value and benefit of the partnership to the organizations, the quality of the relationships among partners, and the level of input and authority of each partner. Although conflict is natural in relationships, there are some oversights in partnership development that

can increase the likelihood of disagreements. Confusion and disagreement are more likely to occur when partners do not sufficiently define the partnership's purpose or who is considered a member of the partnership or how decisions will be made (Prins, 2005).

Bracken (2008) also suggests we need to acknowledge and deal with the "hard stuff" (p. 9) embedded in community-university partnerships. Specifically, she calls attention to the authority norms associated with being a faculty person: Faculty are professionally positioned as being authoritative toward students and as experts in their fields and may unintentionally transfer that expectation of authority into partnership work with others. Many faculty are also under pressure associated with the campus merit system of review, promotion, and tenure. The obligation to produce scholarly work in alignment with a department's expectations may influence the purposes that lead faculty to seek partnerships and outcomes they value. Also, Bracken suggests we need to attend to how differences of gender, race, class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation influence our "approaches, strategies, understandings, and experience of community-university partnerships" (p. 10).

We also feel that efficiency can be the enemy of harmony. Even when partnership conversations have adequately addressed the qualities mentioned earlier, members can sometimes disregard what has been agreed on because it is faster or easier to make a decision by oneself, do the work by oneself, or confine an aspect of the partnership's work to one's own organization because it's easier to navigate one set of organizational rules and norms rather than two or more.

Ignoring conflict is not helpful; it undermines the partnership's chances of success and is associated with lower partnership satisfaction (Mohr & Spekman, 1994). When seeking to resolve partnership conflicts, Prins (2005) provides five lessons she and other members of a school-university-family support center learned:

> First, the case demonstrates how ambiguous purposes and membership can lead to confusion about authority, communication, and decision making. . . . Second, to reduce the possibility of unintentionally misinforming, manipulating, or otherwise creating inequitable relationships, partners should discuss their expectations of each other early on. . . . Third, partners need to discover and acknowledge what matters to others while advocating sensitively for their own concerns. . . . Fourth, members of planning partnerships should balance the individual and the group, recognizing that they exist in "productive tension." . . . Finally, planners should recognize how institutional contexts (organizational

roles and responsibilities) shape how they and others frame problems and define legitimate goals and practices, and how others perceive them. University partners should first examine the basis and consequences of their own actions. (pp. 70–71)

CEPs help faculty, staff, and students develop partnerships with others. CEPs also support partnership members as they navigate conflicts. It is important to help partnership members understand that conflict is natural in partnership work, but it can also be mitigated. Assisting stakeholders to address conflict when it arises is equally important. CEPs can be a supportive, but frank, thought partner to help partnership members see where their expression of cultural and organizational differences, or expectations of authority, are getting in the way of productive collaboration. We offer a series of case studies in Box 9.4. Take a few moments to reflect on the nature of conflict present within each scenario. There are guiding questions at the conclusion of the scenarios for your consideration.

Embrace Passion and Commitment

Just as in the beginning of this chapter we recommend CEPs not call every kind of relationship a partnership, we also recommend that CEPs know the difference between engagement and other forms of involvement. CEPs ought to understand that when we are passionate about and committed to community engagement, we are committed to helping our campuses do work that involves sharing decision-making and power and embracing higher education's civic purposes.

This might be stating the obvious, but community engagement isn't solely a postsecondary education practice. Rather, the higher education sector adopted the terminology from community development and community organizing efforts. In fact, readers who have always worked in postsecondary education might be surprised that some people in community-based organizations are confused by what college folks mean when they talk about community engagement. Typically, it refers to engaging the members of a community in the advancement of their own community. It later becomes used by organizations (government, business, social service systems) that were not part of a particular community to describe their efforts to attract members of that community to work with the outside entity. As you might intuit, when outside organizations seek to engage communities, the nature of community involvement and whether the benefits are truly mutual involve some compromise and power sharing. Also,

<div style="border:1px solid">

BOX 9.4
Compass Point: Cultivating Partnerships–D

Read the following case studies and reflect on the discussion questions provided at the end.

- A marketing faculty member and a program manager from a nearby community organization form a partnership in which marketing students learn about the organization, its mission and clients, and develop a suite of marketing materials for a new program the organization will be launching. The students are scheduled to present their projects at the last 3 class meetings of the semester with the program manager in attendance. These sessions are from 2:00 to 2:50 p.m. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. The program manager sits in the front row and is invited to ask questions and give comments for about 5 to 10 minutes at the conclusion of each presentation. The faculty sits toward the back of the room and grades each presentation. Unexpectedly, the program manager e-mails the faculty member after the second day of presentations explaining he isn't able to return for the third day. When the CEP convened the community and faculty partners at a coffee meeting for a debriefing, both parties expressed frustration with each other. The faculty partner was disappointed that the program manager didn't attend the final set of presentations and felt this was a letdown for the students who had worked so hard all semester. The faculty member was also personally offended that the program manager wasn't able to attend on all three dates even though they were scheduled at the beginning of the semester. The program manager was disappointed that the projects were being presented at the end of the semester with no time left for revisions or additions that would have made the marketing materials more usable for the community agency. The program manager also felt the presentations were difficult to attend given they were in the middle of the day and fell at the same time the organization was preparing a large grant proposal.
- A campus and local middle school are interested in pursuing a federal grant to create a full-service community school.[1] The campus is a comprehensive research university, predominantly White, and the middle school serves a racially diverse student population that the district describes as 53% African American, 26% Latino, 9% Asian or Pacific Islander, 8% nonspecified, and 2% White. School leaders request that university students who will work in the school be reflective of the

</div>

BOX 9.4 (Continued)

racial diversity of the student population. University partners feel unable to fully meet this request because the faculty and students who will be working in the school will be doing so as part of academic programs. As a result, the university staff feel they cannot provide the community-based learning experience to some students while denying it to others based on race. As they begin to outline various disciplinary contributions in academic, social, and health services, university leaders are eager to tie their contributions to a series of research grants to financially support their involvement. As a result, among other services, they identify three grant-funded university initiatives that will supply tutoring, positive behavior support interventions, and dental services to the middle school students and their families. As part of offering these services, the university makes plans to (a) track how the tutoring affects academic performance of Latino students (a priority of their education research grant), (b) involve caregivers in parenting workshops on the topics of managing disruptive behavior and follow up with behavior modification surveys each quarter, and (c) develop a dental intake process that asks for household information including income level, number of dependents, patient citizenship status or Medicaid eligibility, and residential address. School leaders are nervous about what they perceive as overly restrictive and invasive conditions on the services the university will provide. They are also very concerned that the students and faculty who will be working in the school will not reflect the racial diversity of the student body. Very quickly, the budding partnership begins to flounder. The school indicates it is rethinking pursuing the grant with the university.

Questions for discussion: What disagreements are present in these cases? What do these disagreements suggest about the way each organization perceives the value and benefit of the partnership, the quality of the relationships among partners, and the level of input and authority of each partner? What hard stuff (Bracken, 2008) is at the heart of the conflicts? What would you do as a CEP who is supportive to the partners to acknowledge and help resolve these conflicts?

Note
1. For more information about community schools, including the full-service community schools model, see the Coalition for Community Schools, U.S. Department of Education, or the Netter Center's University-Assisted Community Schools initiative.

in those communities where previous community engagement processes used by outside organizations have been exploitative, your school's efforts may be met with skepticism.

We believe CEPs who are responsible for cultivating high-quality community partnerships need to have a passion for community engagement. Those of us who have this passion see community participation in our work and that of higher education as vital, not just nice to have but necessary. And this passion needs to be accompanied by commitment because cultivating engagement with the community and true collaboration means changing the power dynamics of how we configure teaching, research, and institutional business operations. Figure 9.1 shows two different schemas of participation and their associated power dynamics. In the table, the stages in each framework aren't positioned as equal to each other, but they do indicate a separation point when shared decision making starts to happen between Biggs' consultative participation and collaborative participation and between Arnstein's placation and partnership. Apply these frameworks to your work using the prompts offered in Box 9.5.

Desire to Participate in the Ongoing Life of the Community

Can you imagine trying to cultivate partnerships with members of a community you know little to nothing about? It's hard, very hard. In part it's hard because you won't know who is interested in working with you and has the capacity to do so. It's also hard because the approach is one sided. Without knowing the community and its agendas and desires, you come with only the agendas and desires of the campus. If you continue to operate like that, without consideration of the community's assets and agendas, conversations will more likely end with "No, thanks." And yet, some CEPs do their work like this. We feel the field is partially responsible. Much of the early service-learning literature instructed us to use service-learning to meet community-identified needs. Much of the volunteerism literature instructed us to find ways our students or staff volunteers could meet the greatest need. As a result, some CEPs spend their days figuratively knocking on community doors asking people what they need. We say this knowing that a good number of CEPs are from the communities they seek to engage but cede participation in the community to their professional work.

Figure 9.1 Conceptions of participation.

Biggs' Modes of Participation (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995, p. 1669)		Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation (Arnstein, 1969)	
Collegiate Participation	Researchers and local people work together as colleagues with different skills to offer, in a process of mutual learning where local people have control over the process.	8. Citizen Control	Citizen Power: Ranging from the ability to negotiate (within the partnership rung) to citizen's having full decision-making control (within the citizen control rung). This set of modes indicates the sharing or transfer of power between citizen and traditional power-holders.
		7. Delegated Power	
Collaborative Participation	Researchers and local people work together on projects designed, initiated, and managed by researchers.	6. Partnership	
Consultative Participation	People are asked for their opinions and consulted by researchers before interventions are made.	5. Placation	Tokenism: Participants are invited to hear from power-holders and be heard by power-holders, but there is no guarantee that participants' views will be incorporated into change efforts; power-holders retain decision-making power.
		4. Consultation	
		3. Informing	
Contractual Participation	People are contracted into the projects of researchers to take part in their enquiries or experiments.	2. Therapy	Nonparticipation: Power-holders desire to educate or cure participants.

BOX 9.5
Compass Point: Cultivating Partnerships–E

Review Figure 9.1 and the portfolio of engagements you are responsible for facilitating. Where do they fall in these frameworks? Can you identify when and how decision-making and power have been shared in each activity?

What strategies do you use to persuade campus and community stakeholders that such decision-making or power-sharing is important to community-engaged work?

We recommend for CEPs to take a much different approach. CEPs are invested in the communities they seek to engage. When appropriate, they attend community meetings, frequent businesses, participate in events and festivals, serve on organizational boards, and are plugged into community-planning processes. Of course, this is all assuming that they do so in ways that are appropriate to what the community perceives as authentic participation. In other words, they don't push their way in despite community frustration.

And so, the desire to participate in the ongoing life of the community and the ability to do so require sensitivity and judgment. For many of us, we come from the communities our institutions seek to engage, and we must balance the needs of the organization that employs us with our commitments to our community. Others work with communities they are not from and need to carefully enter the community as a learner, listener, and guest before assuming they can participate. Boyle, Ross, and Stephens (2011) provide a comparative analysis of three community-university partnerships that illustrates how power, legitimacy, and urgency differ among partnership stakeholders and wonderfully describe how they affect partnership sustainability. We recommend for CEPs to take the time to read their work.

Deepening Our Critical Commitments: Questions to Ask

CEPs must be conscious of power relations inherent in partnerships. Likewise, they must be committed to cultivating authentic relationships with communities. In addition to the description of power sharing approaches discussed in this chapter, we also think it is important for CEPs to be familiar with three specific kinds of power: visible power (observable structure, rules, authority, procedures of decision-making), hidden power (who has access to where, when decisions are made, and what is on the agenda), and invisible power (who shapes meaning and whom that meaning favors through socialization, culture, and ideology; Donaldson & Daughtery, 2011). Each type of power can be used to exclude or marginalize, or it can be used to include and enable others' full participation.

1. Think of a community-campus partnership. Describe how each form of power is expressed, who it includes, and who it excludes. How can you work to make that partnership more inclusive?

The concept of cultivating authentic relationships pervades the work of a CEP and is also addressed in chapter 6, which we recommend you review. The ability to develop authentic relationships between campus and community, between CEPs and community leaders, or CEPs and community members depends on the ability to do a number of things covered in this chapter: approach others with an asset-based mind-set, be open to sharing decision making and power, know about yourself and care to know about others (their experiences, histories, realities), and to this we would add, be open to being changed by the other.

2. Think of the most authentic relationships in your life. In what ways has being in that relationship changed you? How does the other person in that relationship offer you feedback, and why are you willing to change as a result of hearing that feedback?
3. Think of a community-campus partnership you've experienced. In what ways did community stakeholders offer feedback? Was it heard by the campus partners? What about the feedback from the campus partners? Was it heard by community partners? Did anything change as a result? Why was change possible? Name the reasons. How can you create the conditions for feedback to be heard and considered?

Chapter Ten

IMPLEMENTING ANCHOR INSTITUTION STRATEGIES

To act is to anchor in an imminent future, so imminent it becomes almost tangible; to act is to feel you are consubstantial with that future. (Cloran, 1960)

The previous chapters of this guidebook describe various roles and responsibilities that generally entail fairly autonomous coordination and oversight by a CEP in collaboration with center staff and other stakeholders on and off campus. Anchor institutions, however, represent a complex, hybrid approach to community engagement that requires considerable commitment and investment of resources by high-level administrators and perhaps trustees and regents on behalf of the institution as a whole. Therefore, the role of the CEP in this context is that of a team member who generally has his or her finger on the pulse of various forms of engagement on and off campus as well as an understanding of the structures and dynamics of anchor programs. The CEP is, in many ways, a consultant for the administration and a liaison with community agencies in the conceptualization, development, and implementation of anchor programs. The CEP is also a potential member of a coordinating committee for shared governance of anchor programs. After completing this chapter, the reader should be able to demonstrate the competencies in Table 10.1 related to establishing anchor programs.