



Community-Higher Education Partnerships: Community Perspectives Annotated Bibliography

Compiled by:

Chris Hanssmann, Graduate Research Assistant 2005-2006

Jessica Grignon, Graduate Research Assistant 2006-2007

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health

www.ccp.h.info

Introduction

There is a substantial and growing body of literature geared toward colleges and universities involved in service-learning, community-based participatory research and community-campus partnerships. However, there is a dearth of published literature that speaks from a perspective of communities and community organizations that partner with higher educational institutions in these activities. Many of the difficulties that arise in community-higher education relationships pertain to the power differential between community and academic partners. This power differential is only reinforced by academic partners' ready access to information about community-higher education partnerships that is developed and disseminated with them in mind. This can undercut or gloss over community partner experiences in these partnerships, and can potentially limit both academic and community partners from learning useful lessons from community partner perspectives.

Purpose

With the guidance of a planning committee comprised of community leaders from around the United States, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) convened a Community Partner Summit in April of 2006. The Summit was held at the Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, WI and cosponsored by CCPH, the WK Kellogg Foundation, the Johnson Foundation and the Atlantic Philanthropies. The purpose of the Summit was to advance authentic community-higher education partnerships by mobilizing a network of experienced community partners. The Summit agenda emphasized dialogue around case studies and lessons learned in partnerships to generate individual and collective strategies and concrete actions for community partners to take to advance authentic partnerships.

One of the goals set by Summit participants was to build an inventory of resources for use by communities or community-based organizations partnering or wanting to partner with higher educational institutions. To this end, we have compiled this annotated bibliography primarily with community partners in mind. That being said, we hope it will serve as a resource to anyone who is interested or involved in community-higher education partnerships.

Scope

We have attempted to locate references for a wide array of articles, toolkits, websites, books, and monographs. Nevertheless, this annotated bibliography is neither exhaustive nor comprised entirely of resources authored or co-authored by community partners. While we believe that academic articles and resources are important to include in this context, we recognize that community partners may benefit most from reflections on partnerships that originate from experienced community partners. Thus, we hope that an increasing number of future publications about community-higher education partnerships are written from and focus on community perspectives.

The majority of references fall under the following categories:

- General resources for community partners
- Policies and guidelines structuring community-higher educational institution engagement
- Case studies of past or ongoing partnerships
- Benefits to community
- Funding
- Challenges/conflicts in community-higher education partnerships

Resources and references were found by conducting literature searches on major databases (e.g., PubMed, ERIC, ProQuest). We also searched the bibliographies of references we located through literature searches. Requests for relevant articles were also posted on a number of electronic discussion groups (e.g., service-learning, community-engaged scholarship and community-based participatory research). Lastly, we browsed websites cited in publications and websites that were hyperlinked to websites cited in publications.

For More Information

For more information about Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, visit www.ccph.info

For more information about the Community Partner Summit and the ongoing work of the Community Partner Network that formed from it, visit <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/cps.html>

To suggest corrections and updates to this bibliography, email CCPH at ccph@mcw.edu

Index

General Resources for Community Partners

1. Beach, M.C., Cooper, L.A. et al. (January, 2004). Minority Healthcare Quality, Improvement Strategies, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Evidence Reports, Numbers 61-120. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.ahrq.gov/downloads/pub/evidence/pdf/minqual/minqual.pdf>
2. Barnett, L. (1995). A Climate Created: Community Building in the Beacon College Project. Washington, DC, American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/00000000b/80/25/be/ca.pdf
3. Benson, L. and Harkavy, I. (2000). Higher Education's Third Revolution: The Emergence of the Democratic Cosmopolitan Civic University. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/benson.pdf>
4. Campus Compact: Action for Change, Raise Your Voice. Student Action for Change Website, Glossary of Higher Education. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.actionforchange.org/getinformed/glossary.html>
5. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Definitions, Tools & Resources, Web Links. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/partnerships.html>
6. Community Standards for Service Learning (n.d.). Community Organizations and Service Learning Website: the worksite for Madison community organizations and service learning. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from <http://comm-org.wisc.edu/sl/news.php>
7. Connecting Communities with Colleges & Universities: Strategies to Strengthen Local Promise Efforts Through Higher Education Involvement. (2004). America's Promise--The Alliance for Youth. Alexandria, VA. Retrieved on July 30, 2007 from http://www.compact.org/media/americas_promise_EU04.pdf
8. Cox, D. (2000). Developing a Framework for Understanding University-Community Partnerships. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1), 9-26. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/cox.pdf>
9. Gambone, M., Fulbright-Anderson, A. K., et al. (1998). Challenges of Measurement in Community Change Initiatives. *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives, Vol. 2: Theory, Measurement, and Analysis*. Washington, DC, The Aspen Institute. Vol. 2 of 2.

10. Hall, B. L., Gillette, A. et al. (1982). *Creating knowledge: a monopoly?* New Delhi, Society for Participatory Research in Asia. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/6/684>
11. Harkavy, I., Puckett, J. et al. (2000). Action Research: Bridging Service and Research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue (Fall), 113-118.
12. Harvard School of Public Health. The Public Health Disparities Geocoding Project Monograph. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/thegeocodingproject/>
13. Knapp, M. S., Ed. (1998). *Paths to Partnership: University and Community as Learners in Interprofessional Education*. Boulder, Rowman and Littlefield.
14. McNicoll, P. (1999). Issues in teaching participatory action research. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 35(1), 51-62.
15. Report on Madison Community Organizations and Service Learning (n.d.). Community Organizations and Service Learning Website: the worksite for Madison community organizations and service learning. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from <http://comm-org.wisc.edu/sl/page.php?4>
16. Research Ethics in Environmental/Public Health. (2003). Conference Plenary Discussion: Outcomes & Recommendations. *Research Ethics Conference, May 30-June 1 2003, Brown University* in Providence, RI. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.researchethics.org/ConferenceFinalRep2003.pdf>
17. Rubin, V. (1998). The roles of universities in community-building initiatives, *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17(4), 302-311.
18. Rubin, V. (2000). Evaluating University-Community Partnerships: An Examination of the Evolution of Questions and Approaches. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.community-wealth.com/pdfs/articles-publications/universities/article-rubin.pdf>
19. Sandy, M. & Holland, B. A. (2006). Different Worlds and Common Ground: Community Partner Perspectives on Campus-Community Partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(1), 30-43.
20. Seifer, S. D. and Calleson, D. C. (2004). Health professional faculty perspectives on community-based research: implications for policy and practice. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 18(4), 416-27. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/media/hf0blhlxtq7xqyjvudu7/contributions/p/n/q/j/pngj7qrwt0ll0hl9.pdf>

21. Shroder, M. (2000). Social Experiments in Housing, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/shroder.pdf>
22. Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A. et al. (July, 2004). Community-Based Participatory Research: Assessing the Evidence. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Evidence Reports, Numbers 61-120. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.ahrq.gov/downloads/pub/evidence/pdf/cbpr/cbpr.pdf>
23. Walshok, M. L. (1995). *Knowledge without Boundaries: What America's Research Universities Can Do for the Economy, the Workplace, and the Community*. First Edition. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
24. Wiewel, W. and Knaap, G. (2005). *Partnerships for smart growth : university-community collaboration for better public places*. Cambridge, Mass., Lincoln Institute of Land Policy: Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Policies, Expectations, and Guidelines Structuring Community-Higher Education Institution Engagement

25. Baker, E.A., Homan, S., Schonhoff, R., & Kreuter, M. (1999). Principles of practice for academic/practice/community research partnerships. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 16(3 Suppl), 86-93.
26. Baum, H. S. (2000). Fantasies and Realities in University-Community Partnerships. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20(2): 234-246. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://jpe.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/20/2/234>
27. Chen, D. T., Jones, L. et al. (2006). Ethics of clinical research within a community-academic partnered participatory framework. *Ethnic Disparities*, 16(1 Suppl 1), S118-35.
28. Cherry, D. J. and Shefner, J. (2004). Addressing Barriers to University-Community Collaboration: Organizing by Experts or Organizing the Experts? *Journal of Community Practice*, 12(3/4), 219-233.
29. Dugery, J. and Knowles, J., Eds. (2003). University + Community Research Partnerships. Pew Partnership for Civic Change. Retrieved July 30, 2007 from http://www.pew-partnership.org/resources/university_community.html
30. Freeman, N. L. (2003). A Meeting of Minds: A Handbook for Community-Campus Engagement. *Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Fellows Program*. Seattle: 1-18. Retrieved October 24, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Nola_Freeman_Project04.pdf

31. Grégoire, H. & Ying Yee, J. (2007). Ethics in Community-University Partnerships Involving Racial Minorities: An Anti-Racism Standpoint in Community-Based Participatory Research. *Partnership Perspectives*, IV(I), 70-77. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Gregoire.pdf
32. Harkavy, I. (2006). The role of universities in advancing citizenship and social justice in the 21st century. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1(1), 5-37.
33. Keating, L. and Sjoquist, D. L. (2000). The Use of an External Organization To Facilitate University-Community Partnerships, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/keating.pdf>
34. Kone, A., Sullivan, M. et al. (2000). Improving collaboration between researchers and communities. *Public Health Reports*, 115(2-3), 243-8.
35. Kretzmann, J. P., J. L. McKnight, et al. (1998). *A Guide to Creating A Neighborhood Information Exchange: Building Communities by Connecting Local Skills and Knowledge*. Evanston, IL: Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University.
36. Leiderman, S., Furco, A. et al. (2002). *Building Partnerships with College Campuses: Community Perspectives: A Monograph*. Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education (CAPHE)'s Engaging Communities and Campuses Grant Program. The Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, D.C.: 1-25. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://www.cic.edu/caphe/grants/engaging_monograph.pdf
37. Mayfield, L. (2001). Town and gown in America: some historical and institutional issues of the engaged university. *Education for Health (Abingdon)*, 14(2), 231-40.
38. Minkler, M. (2005). Community-based research partnerships: challenges and opportunities, *Journal of Urban Health*, 82(2 Suppl 2), ii3-12. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/714rh0726x643h31/fulltext.pdf>
39. Minyard, K.J., Anderson-Smith, T., Brand, M., Owens, C.F., & Selgrath, F.X. (2007). Triple-Layer Chess: An Analogy for Multi-Dimensional Health Policy Partnerships. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 114-124. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Minyard.pdf
40. Nyden, P. and Wiewel, W. (1992). Collaborative Research: Harnessing the Tensions between Researcher and Practitioner. *The American Sociologist*, 23(4), 43-55.
41. Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education. The Community IRB Member: Neighbor & Partner. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.ornl.gov/communityirb/>

42. Partnership for the Public's Health Collaboration of the California Endowment and the Public Health Institute (2003). Community-Based Public Health Policy & Practice, Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/pph.pdf
43. Plowfield, L.A., Wheeler, E.C., and Raymond, J.E. (2005). Time, tact, talent, and trust: essential ingredients of effective academic-community partnerships. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 26(4), 217-220.
44. QUILT (Quality in Linking Together Early Education Partnerships) Project (2002). A Checklist for Developing a Partnership Agreement/Contract. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from <http://www.nccic.org/quilt/partnership-checklist.pdf>
45. Seifer, S.D. (2007). Walking the Talk: Achieving the Promise of Authentic Partnerships. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 1-12. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Seifer.pdf
46. Seifer, S. D. and Krauel, P. (2001). Toward a policy agenda for community-campus partnerships, *Education for Health (Abingdon)*, 14(2), 156-62.
47. Stoecker, R. (1999). Are academics irrelevant? Roles for scholars in participatory research. *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(5), 840-854. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://abs.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/42/5/840>
48. Torres, J. (2000). *Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships*. Providence, RI, Campus Compact.
49. Vidal, A. C. (1997). Can community development re-invent itself? The challenges of strengthening neighborhoods in the 21st century. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(4), 429-438.
50. W.K. Kellogg Foundation (November 1, 2001). Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from <http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/CustomPubs/CPtoolkit/CPToolkit/default.htm>
51. Wiewel, W. and Lieber, M. (1998). Goal Achievement, Relationship Building, and Incrementalism: The Challenges of University-Community Partnerships, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 291-301.
52. Wiewel, W., Gaffikin, F. et al. (2000). Community-University Partnerships for Affordable Housing. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).
53. Zlotkowski, E., Jones, R. J. et al. (2005). *One with the Community: Indicators of Engagement at Minority-Serving Institutions*. Providence, RI, Campus Compact.

Case Studies of Past or Ongoing Partnerships

54. Adams, A., Miller-Korth, N., & Brown, D. (2004). Learning to work together: developing academic and community research partnerships. *Wisconsin Medical Journal*, 103(2), 15-19.
55. Amuwo, S. A. and Jenkins, E. (2001). True Partnership Evolves Over Time. *Collaborative Research: University and Community Partnership*, M. Sullivan and J. Kelley. Washington, DC, American Public Health Association: 25-43.
56. Armstrong, C., Becker, K., Berg, K., Hilton, T.S.E., Mowry D., & Quinlan, C. (2007). Community-University Partnerships to Bridge the Non-Profit Digital Divide. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 86-94. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Armstrong.pdf
57. Axel-Lute, M. (1999). Town & Gown: Making Research Serve Communities' Needs. *Shelterforce Online*, (National Housing Institute) November/December (108). Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/108/towngown.html>
58. Bassman, M.F. & Harris, K.E. (2007). Narrating the Journey: Immersion Learning in the Migrant Latino Community. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 62-69. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Bassman.pdf
59. Beversdorf, S., Ahmed, S., & Beck, B. (2007). Community-Academic Partnerships and Institutional Review Board Insights. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 95-104. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Beversdorf.pdf
60. Chrisman, N. J., Senturia, K. et al. (2002). Qualitative process evaluation of urban community work: a preliminary view. *Health Education and Behavior*, 29(2), 232-48.
61. Community-Institutional Partnerships: Understanding Trust Among Partners. Prevention Research Centers, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from <http://www.cdc.gov/prc/partner-communities/trust-among-partners.htm>
62. Davies, S., Williams, A., Horton, T., Rodgers, C., & Stewart, K.E. (2007). Coming Together in the Fight Against HIV: MOMS' Principles of Effective Community Partnerships. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 105-113. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Davies.pdf
63. Dean, B. V., Burstein, J.S. et al. (2000). Incubator Without Walls (IWW): A University-Business Partnership for Neighborhood Redevelopment, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

64. Family Involvement and University-School-Community Partnerships: A Case Study of the Jane Addams Institute of Democracy. *Fine Forum e-Newsletter*, Issue 5 (Fall 2002). Family Involvement Network of Educators (FINE), Harvard Family Research Project. Retrieved on July 30, 2007 from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/fine/fineforum/forum5/spotlight.html>
65. Freeman, N. L. (1996). Senior Center in Seattle Applauds Service Learning. In Taylor, B. (Ed.), *Expanding Boundaries: Serving and Learning*, (pp7 – 9). Washington, D.C.: Corporation for National Service.
66. Hyland, S. (2000). Issues in Evaluating Neighborhood Change: Economic Development and Community-Building Indicators. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).
67. Lantz, P.M., Viruell-Fuentes, E., Israel, B.A., Softley, D., and Guzman, R. (2001). Can communities and academia work together on public health research? Evaluation results from a community-based participatory research partnership in Detroit. *Journal of Urban Health*, 78(3), 495-507.
68. Lardon, C., Drew, E., Kernak, D., Lupie, H., & Soule, S. (2007). Health Promotion in Rural Alaska: Building Partnerships across Distance and Cultures. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I): 125-132. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Lardon.pdf
69. LeGates, R. T. and Robinson, G. (1998). Institutionalizing university-community partnerships. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 312-322.
70. Maslia, M. L., Reyes, J. J. et al. (2005). Public health partnerships addressing childhood cancer investigations: case study of Toms River, Dover Township, New Jersey, USA. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, 208(1-2), 45-54.
71. Mayfield, L. and Lucas, E. P. J. (2000). Mutual Awareness, Mutual Respect: The Community and the University Interact. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/Periodicals/CITYSCPE/VOL5NUM1/mayfield.pdf>
72. Meyer, D., Armstrong-Coben, A., & Batista, M. (2005) How a community-based organization and an academic health center are creating an effective partnership for training and service. *Academic Medicine*, 80(4), 327- 333.
73. Minkler, M., Fadem, P. et al. (2002). Ethical dilemmas in participatory action research: a case study from the disability community. *Health Education and Behavior*, 29(1), 14-29. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/29/1/14>.

74. Motton, V., Baker, E. A., Branch, A., Motton, F.L., Fitzgerald, T., & Barnidge E. (2007). Men on the Move: A Partnership to Create Educational and Economic Opportunities. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 54-61. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Motton.pdf
75. Natale, D., Brook, K., & Kelshaw, T. (2007). Critical Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships: Promise and Performance. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 44-53. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Natale.pdf
76. Reardon, K.M. (1998). Enhancing the Capacity of Community-Based Organizations in East St. Louis, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 323-333.
77. Reardon, K.M. (2000). An Experiential Approach to Creating an Effective Community-University Partnership: The East St. Louis Action Research Project, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).
78. Schumaker, A., Reed, B. J. et al. (2000). Collaborative Models for Metropolitan University Outreach: The Omaha Experience. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).
79. Sclove, R. E., Scammell, M. L. et al. (1998). Community-Based Research in the United States: An Introductory Reconnaissance, Including Twelve Organizational Case Studies and Comparison with the Dutch Science Shops and the Mainstream American Research System. *The Aspen Institute's Nonprofit Sector Research Fund*. Amherst, Massachusetts: 1-131. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://www.mapcruzin.com/download/loka_report.pdf
80. Seanhk-Ka, S. & Axtell, S. (2007). Sharing Intellectual Authority. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 78-85. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Seanhk-ka.pdf
81. Smith, M. and Vetica, T. (2000). Youth, the Arts, and Community Outreach. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).
82. University Partnerships Clearinghouse (1998). *Colleges & Communities: Partners in Urban Revitalization: A Report on the Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program*. Rockville, MD. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/0000000b/80/11/44/eb.pdf
83. Wallerstein, N., Duran, B. M. et al. (2003). Jemez Pueblo: built and social-cultural environments and health within a rural American Indian community in the Southwest. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(9), 1517-8. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/picrender.fcgi?artid=1448002&blobtype=pdf>.
84. Wilson, R. and Guajardo, M. (2000). Capacity Building and Governance in El Cenizo, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

85. Ybarra, V. & Postama, J. (2007). El Proyecto Bienestar: An Authentic CBPR Partnership in the Yakima Valley *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 34-43. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Ybarra.pdf

Benefits to Community

86. Hahn, A., Coonerty, C., and Peaslee L. I. Colleges and universities as economic anchors: profiles of promising practices. Brandeis University: Heller Graduate School of Social Policy and Management, Institute for Sustainable Development/Center for Youth and Communities, and POLICYLINK. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from <http://www.compact.org/news/story/133>
87. Perry, D. C. and Wiewel, W. (2006). Conference: The College/University as Urban Developer. Worcester, MA. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from http://www.nerche.org/campus_community/perry_wiewel/perry_wiewel.html
88. Scheibel, J., Bowley, E. M. et al. (2005). *The Promise of Partnerships: Tapping into the College as a Community Asset*. Providence, RI, Campus Compact.
89. Wiewel, W. and Guerrero, I. (1997). Long-Term Collaboration--Building Relationships and Achieving Results Through a Neighborhoods Initiative Program: The Resurrection Project. *Metropolitan Universities*, 8(3): 123-34.

Challenges and conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships

90. Amborski, D. (2005). Ryerson University and Toronto's Dundas Square Metropolis Project. In David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel (Eds.), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E Sharpe and Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
91. Amuwo, S., Scrimshaw, S. et al. (2006). Chicago Health Professions Partnership Initiative. *Academic Medicine*, 81(6 Suppl), S21-4.
92. Avila Hernandez, J. (2004). "Blood, Lies and Indian Rights: TCUs Becoming Gatekeepers for Research." *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, 16(2).
93. Boyle, M.-E. and Silver, I. (2005). Poverty, Partnerships, and Privilege: Elite Institutions and Community Empowerment. *City & Community*, 4(3), 233-252.
94. Cruz, N. I. and Giles, D.E. Jr. (2000). Where's the Community in Service-Learning Research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue (Fall), 28-34.
95. Cummings, S. Rosentraub, M.S. Domahidy, M. and Coffin, S. (2005). University Involvement in Downtown Revitalization: Managing Political and Financial Risks. In David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel (Eds.), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E Sharpe and Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Retrieved July 30, 2007 from
http://www.lincolnst.edu/docs/221/340_9.%20Cummings_et_al.doc

96. Deitrick, S. and Soska, T. (2005). The University of Pittsburgh and the Oakland Neighborhood: From Conflict to Cooperation or How the 800-Pound Gorilla Learned to Sit with—and not on—Its Neighbors. In David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel (Eds.), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E Sharpe and Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
97. Dewar, M. E. and Isaac, C.B. (1998). Learning from Difference: The Potentially Transforming Experience of Community-University Collaboration, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 334-347.
98. Edelman, D. J., Gilderbloom, J.I. et al. (2006). Promise and Betrayal: Universities and the Battle for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28(2), 191-193.
99. Nyden, P. W. & Wiewel, W., Eds. (1991). *Challenging uneven development : an urban agenda for the 1990s*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
100. Prins, E. (2005). Framing a Conflict in a Community-University Partnership, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 25(1), 57-74. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://jpe.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/25/1/57>
101. Sullivan, M., Kone, A. et al. (2001). Researcher and researched--community perspectives: toward bridging the gap. *Health Education and Behavior*, 28(2), 130-49. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/28/2/130>
102. Wiewel, W. and Perry, D.C. (2005). Ivory Towers No More: Academic Bricks and Sticks. In David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel (Eds.), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E Sharpe and Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Lessons Learned in Community-Campus Partnerships

103. Boyte, H. *A Different Kind of Politics: Interview with Susan Gust*. 2006. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.publicwork.org/pdf/interviews/gust.pdf>
104. Ferman, B. and Hill, T. L. (2004). The Challenges of Agenda Conflict in Higher Education Community Research Partnerships: Views from the Community Side, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 26(2), 241-257. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/j.0735-2166.2004.00199.x/abs/>
105. Flicker, S. (2006). Who Benefits From Community-Based Participatory Research? A Case Study of the Positive Youth Project, *Health Education and Behavior*. May 31, Epub Ahead of Print. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/rapidpdf/1090198105285927v1>

106. Fulbright-Anderson, K., Auspos, P. et al. (2001). Community Involvement in Partnerships with Educational Institutions, Medical Centers, and Utility Companies. *Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives for the Annie E. Casey Foundation*: 1-27. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/INSTITUTIONS.PDF>
107. Minkler, M., Thompson, M. et al. (2001). Contributions of community involvement to organizational-level empowerment: the federal Healthy Start experience, *Health Education and Behavior*, 28(6), 783-807. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/28/6/783>
108. Minkler, M. (2004). Ethical challenges for the "outside" researcher in community-based participatory research. *Health Education and Behavior*, 31(6): 684-97. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/6/684>

Funding

109. Seifer, S. D., Kauper-Brown, J. et al. (2004). *Directory of Funding Sources for Community-Based Research*, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health: 2006. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/directory-062704f.pdf

General Resources for Community Partners

1. Beach, M.C., Cooper, L.A. et al. (January, 2004). Minority Healthcare Quality, Improvement Strategies, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Evidence Reports, Numbers 61-120. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.ahrq.gov/downloads/pub/evidence/pdf/minqual/minqual.pdf>

Report published by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) under the Evidence-based Practice Program. Examines quality improvement strategies with respect to increasing quality of care to ethnic minority patients, with specific emphasis on cultural competency of providers and health care organizations.

2. Barnett, L. (1995). A Climate Created: Community Building in the Beacon College Project. Washington, DC, American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/0000000b/80/25/be/ca.pdf.

Book describing case studies on an American Association of Community College project on building community both within community colleges and between colleges and the communities in which they are situated.

3. Benson, L. and Harkavy, I. (2000). Higher Education's Third Revolution: The Emergence of the Democratic Cosmopolitan Civic University. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/benson.pdf>.

Article outlining several case studies that exemplify "civic responsibility" in university educational structure. Suggests that higher education institutions set civic engagement as first priority, and that American research universities are in a position to revolutionize the schooling system at large in this capacity.

4. Campus Compact: Action for Change, Raise Your Voice. Student Action for Change Website, Glossary of Higher Education. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.actionforchange.org/getinformed/glossary.html>.

Glossary is aimed at students interested in creating change in their institutions. Defines common terms used exclusively in academia. Useful resource for community partners in removing some of the barriers to shared understandings of language.

5. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Definitions, Tools & Resources, Web Links. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/partnerships.html>.

Set of resources, definitions of commonly used terms, and tools for individuals involved in or planning to work in community-campus partnerships.

6. Community Standards for Service Learning (n.d.). Community Organizations and Service Learning Website: the worksite for Madison community organizations and service learning. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from <http://comm-org.wisc.edu/sl/news.php>

Standards for service-learning in higher education developed by community partners.

7. Connecting Communities with Colleges & Universities: Strategies to Strengthen Local Promise Efforts Through Higher Education Involvement. (2004). America's Promise--The Alliance for Youth. Alexandria, VA. Retrieved on July 30, 2007 from http://www.compact.org/media/americas_promise_EU04.pdf

Connecting Communities with Colleges & Universities was created to assist Communities of Promise in connecting with higher education resources to build and strengthen their competencies and deliver the Five Promises to more children and youth. This easy-to-use toolkit will familiarize you with the service structure and philanthropic culture of colleges and universities. You will gain the insight needed to initiate, foster and sustain effective campus-community partnerships. Regardless of your current level of involvement, this toolkit can enhance your partnerships by providing specific examples of how resources can be utilized to benefit young people. And as your partnership develops, it will bolster your local collaboration and advance your Community of Promise.

8. Cox, D. (2000). Developing a Framework for Understanding University-Community Partnerships. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1), 9-26. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/cox.pdf>

Article offering a general analysis of community-higher education institution partnerships, specifically those supported by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)'s Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program.

9. Gambone, M., Fulbright-Anderson, A. K., et al. (1998). Challenges of Measurement in Community Change Initiatives. *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives, Vol. 2: Theory, Measurement, and Analysis*. Washington, DC, The Aspen Institute. Vol. 2 of 2.

Report based on a roundtable of researchers and evaluators convened by the Aspen Institute to discuss issues around measurement of change and success in community change initiatives (CCIs). Addresses questions that range from methods to theory. Discusses some of the factors that contribute to sustainability of change and community capacity.

10. Hall, B. L., Gillette, A. et al. (1982). *Creating knowledge : a monopoly?* New Delhi, Society for Participatory Research in Asia. December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/6/684>.

Publication with thirteen papers about theory and practice of participatory research in development research. Papers are international in scope, including case studies from Senegal,

England, Chile, Canada, and India. Relatively early publication on the topic (early 1980's). (Cross reference with Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships.)

11. Harkavy, I., Puckett, J. et al. (2000). Action Research: Bridging Service and Research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue(Fall), 113-118.

Article outlining the goals of action research as an approach to service learning. Discusses history, challenges of the approach, and ways to deal with challenges in practice.

12. Harvard School of Public Health. The Public Health Disparities Geocoding Project Monograph. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/thegeocodingproject/>.

Information and instructions for use on a method to combine geographic socioeconomic data with public health surveillance data using Geographical Information Systems (GIS). "Geocoding" provides a way to merge these data to more accurately track health disparities by socioeconomic status, race, and ethnicity. May be useful to community-based organizations doing their own work on health disparities or in collaboration with an academic research partner.

13. Knapp, M. S., Ed. (1998). *Paths to Partnership: University and Community as Learners in Interprofessional Education*. Boulder, Rowman and Littlefield.

Edited book including eight chapters focusing on relationship-building between universities and communities and building infrastructure for collaborative programs in universities and academic curricula.

14. McNicoll, P. (1999). Issues in teaching participatory action research. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 35(1), 51-62.

Article about teaching participatory action research (PAR) in social work. Discusses author's experience in challenges to class and curriculum design.

15. Report on Madison Community Organizations and Service Learning (n.d.). Community Organizations and Service Learning Website: the worksite for Madison community organizations and service learning. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from <http://comm-org.wisc.edu/sl/page.php?4>

Report on standards for service-learning in higher education developed by community partners.

16. Research Ethics in Environmental/Public Health, (2003). Conference Plenary Discussion: Outcomes & Recommendations. *Research Ethics Conference, May 30-June 1 2003, Brown University* in Providence, RI. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.researchethics.org/ConferenceFinalRep2003.pdf>

Conference proceedings from the plenary discussion at the Research Ethics in Environmental/Public Health in 2003. Break-out groups were organized by topic and included

the following: Community Research Protections and Community Rights; Reshaping Science: Integrating Community Values and Multi-cultural Knowledge Systems; Institutional Review Boards; Funding Needs; Community Partnerships: Development and Resources; and Institutional Change for Research Ethics. Break-out groups discussed central issues raised during the conference, needs and next steps, and possible solutions to problems. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Campus Partnerships)

17. Rubin, V. (1998). The roles of universities in community-building initiatives, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 302-311.

Article discussing community-building initiatives and the role universities can play in cultivating and maintaining partnerships with communities around community-building projects. Discusses challenges, potential pitfalls, and lessons learned from several community-university partnership-based initiatives in Oakland, CA over five years. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Campus Partnerships)

18. Rubin, V. (2000). Evaluating University-Community Partnerships: An Examination of the Evolution of Questions and Approaches. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.community-wealth.com/pdfs/articles-publications/universities/article-rubin.pdf>

Article outlining the need for a rigorous framework of evaluation for collaborative partnerships. Asserts that development of indicators of effective process or outcomes are not enough. Argues that framework must be founded in core objectives of the partnership and that questions must be formulated accordingly.

19. Sandy, M. & Holland, B. A. (2006). Different Worlds and Common Ground: Community Partner Perspectives on Campus-Community Partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(1), 30-43.

This qualitative study includes focus group research involving 99 experienced community partners across eight California communities using community-based research techniques to capture community voices about their service-learning partnerships with different colleges and universities. Partners commented on their perspectives regarding motivations, benefits to the academic institution and to their own organization, impacts on student learning, and areas for improving partnerships. The analysis affirms the characteristics of effective partnerships of multiple well-established models of effective partnerships developed by higher education, but reveal that community partners have a specific sense of prioritization among partnership factors. In addition, partners revealed a surprising depth of understanding and commitment to student learning, the "common ground" of the service-learning experience. Community partners also voiced challenges and recommendations for their higher education partners to transform service-learning partnership relationships to bridge their "different worlds," and enhance learning, reciprocity, and sustainability.

20. Seifer, S. D. and Calleson, D. C. (2004). Health professional faculty perspectives on community-based research: implications for policy and practice. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 18(4), 416-27. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/media/hf0blhlxtq7xqyjvudu7/contributions/p/n/q/j/pnqj7qrwt0ll0hl9.pdf>

Article based on results on national survey about community-based research (CBR) completed by health professional faculty from 18 schools in the U.S. that were identified by deans as being CBR leaders. Survey sought to determine supportive factors for faculty doing CBR. The authors conclude that tenure and promotion policies, community relationships, and funding access were central to supporting faculty doing work in CBR.

21. Shroder, M. (2000). Social Experiments in Housing, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/shroder.pdf>

Article about the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)'s funded evaluations of partnerships formed around community development initiatives. Discusses the conclusions generated by these evaluations and limitations in methodology.

22. Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A. et al. (July, 2004). Community-Based Participatory Research: Assessing the Evidence. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Evidence Reports, Numbers 61-120. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.ahrq.gov/downloads/pub/evidence/pdf/cbpr/cbpr.pdf>

Document published by the AHRQ that reviews evidence for community-based participatory research (CBPR) as an effective investigative research tool. Answers questions about what defines CBPR, how it has been implemented, what outcomes of CBPR efforts have been, and what criteria should be used in grant review of CBPR proposals.

23. Walshok, M. L. (1995). *Knowledge without Boundaries: What America's Research Universities Can Do for the Economy, the Workplace, and the Community*. First Edition. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Book addressing development of knowledge and the role of research universities in expanding applications and accessibility of knowledge. Takes a historical, social and economic perspective in discussing concept of knowledge and its development. Describes ways that universities use specialized knowledge to support economic and community development. Concludes with a chapter summarizing effective outreach programs in universities, focusing on characteristics common to such programs. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Campus Partnerships; Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships; Lessons Learned in Community-Campus Partnerships)

24. Wiewel, W. and Knaap, G. (2005). *Partnerships for smart growth : university-community collaboration for better public places*. Cambridge, Mass., Lincoln Institute of Land Policy: Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Book bringing together thirteen case studies of community-university partnerships focusing on “smart growth” programs. Initiated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Discusses rural, suburban and urban development in a context of community-university partnerships with a focus on preservation of quality of life and open spaces.

Policies, Expectations, and Guidelines Structuring Community-Higher Education Institution Engagement

25. Baker, E.A., Homan, S., Schonhoff, R., & Kreuter, M. (1999). Principles of practice for academic/practice/community research partnerships. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 16(3 Suppl), 86-93.

This paper describes the different ways in which academics and community groups may work together, including academic/practice/community partnerships. Several principles of practice for engaging in these research partnerships are presented followed by a description of how these principles have been put into operation in a family violence prevention program. The principles presented are: (1) identify the best processes/model to be used based on the nature of the issue and the intended outcome; (2) acknowledge the difference between community input and active community involvement; (3) develop relationships based on mutual trust and respect; (4) acknowledge and honor different partner's "agendas"; (5) consider multi-disciplinary approaches; (6) use evaluation strategies that are consistent with the overall approach taken in the academic/practice/community partnership; and (7) be aware of partnership maturation and associated transition periods. The limitations of these principles and their application in various settings are discussed.

26. Baum, H. S. (2000). Fantasies and Realities in University-Community Partnerships. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20(2), 234-246. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://jpe.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/20/2/234>

Article about the University of Maryland's Urban Community Service Program partnership with a Southeast Baltimore education organization. Explores some of the contradictions between rhetoric and reality in community-campus partnerships. Emphasizes the importance of clarity in expectations around outcomes and resources.

27. Chen, D. T., Jones, L. et al. (2006). Ethics of clinical research within a community-academic partnered participatory framework. *Ethnic Disparities*, 16(1 Suppl 1), S118-35.

Article recommending CBPR approach to reduce racial and ethnic health disparities. Proposes seven requirements for ethical community-based participatory research, using a framework developed by Emanuel, Wendler, and Grady. Requirements set forth by the authors include: social or scientific value, scientific validity, fair subject selection, favorable risk-benefit ratio,

independent review, and informed consent. They adapt the seventh requirement from “respect for potential and enrolled participants” to instead be “respect for potential and enrolled participants, community, and research partners.”

28. Cherry, D. J. and Shefner, J. (2004). Addressing Barriers to University-Community Collaboration: Organizing by Experts or Organizing the Experts? *Journal of Community Practice*, 12(3/4), 219-233.

Reflection on the role of community organizing in community-higher education partnerships. Argues that structural barriers such as class, organizational structure, and other cultural differences must be addressed in order for authentic collaboration to take place, and that community organizing is a means to deal with these. Emphasizes the need for community organizers in community-based organizations to “acknowledge and disrupt structural inequalities” rather than to act as “expert” or to minimize differences. (Cross-reference with Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships)

29. Dugery, J. and Knowles, J., Eds. (2003). University + Community Research Partnerships. Pew Partnership for Civic Change. Retrieved July 30, 2007 from http://www.pew-partnership.org/resources/university_community.html

The Pew Partnership joined with the University of Virginia provost’s office to convene a distinguished cross-section of individuals in October 2002 to discuss the potential for university-community research partnerships. Representatives from higher education, the funding community, nonprofit organizations, and local government offered their reactions to the findings and grappled with a crucial question: What do these sectors need from one another in order to develop more effective university-community partnerships? The discussion was both reaffirming and inspiring. No longer working in isolation, academics and practitioners are forging effective partnerships, often with the help of the funding community. Specific steps and recommendations for enhancing these collaborative research ventures are discussed and summarized within this report.

30. Freeman, N. L. (2003). A Meeting of Minds: A Handbook for Community-Campus Engagement. *Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Fellows Program*. Seattle: 1-18.

Handbook aimed at schools, agencies, and community organizations to facilitate the cultivation of service-learning partnerships. Includes definitions, background, information on how to initiate and sustain the relationship, and guidance for dealing with differences between community and academic culture.

31. Grégoire, H. & Ying Yee, J. (2007). Ethics in Community-University Partnerships Involving Racial Minorities: An Anti-Racism Standpoint in Community-Based Participatory Research. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 70-77. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Gregoire.pdf

The elimination of health inequalities requires collaborative research approaches that are action-oriented and challenge the status quo. Community-based participatory research (CBPR) has

gained recognition as a particularly useful approach for promoting health and reducing disparities. While this approach was developed in large part as an attempt to rectify ethical problems that are common in traditional research (such as the limited relevance and benefits of the research for the community), it continues to pose various ethical dilemmas. In a context where inequalities are racialized, failing to reflectively address these dilemmas can result in furthering the exclusion of racial minority communities. In order to address racial inequities, the authors argue for the use of an anti-racism research methodology within CBPR because of its emphasis on transforming research practices that have historically depended on and perpetuated unequal relationships between the researcher and the researched.

32. Harkavy, I. (2006). The role of universities in advancing citizenship and social justice in the 21st century. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1(1), 5-37.

Article asserting that universities should commit to contributing to “developing and sustaining democratic schools, communities, and societies.” Suggests that universities “return to their core mission-effectively educating students to be democratic, creative, caring, constructive citizens of a democratic society.” Draws on the authors experience in working in partnerships as an academic at the University of Pennsylvania, and sets forth an analysis of the university’s role in civic engagement and responsibility.

33. Keating, L. and Sjoquist, D. L. (2000). The Use of an External Organization To Facilitate University-Community Partnerships, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/keating.pdf>

Case study of an external organization that serves as an intermediary in community-campus partnerships. Discusses partnerships mediated by the Atlanta Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) and suggests that external organizations can diminish inequalities, increase trust, and enable sustainability in partnerships. (Cross-reference with Case Studies of Past or Ongoing Partnerships)

34. Kone, A., Sullivan, M. et al. (2000). Improving collaboration between researchers and communities. *Public Health Reports*, 115(2-3), 243-8.

Case study of Seattle Partners for Healthy Communities. Based on interviews with community participants. Suggests paradigm shift in institutions conducting research. Emphasizes several specific research practices in this shift, including: “acknowledging community contributions, recruiting and training minority people to participate in research teams, improving communication, sharing power, and valuing respect and diversity.” (Cross-reference with Case Studies of Past or Ongoing Partnerships)

35. Kretzmann, J. P., J. L. McKnight, et al. (1998). *A Guide to Creating A Neighborhood Information Exchange: Building Communities by Connecting Local Skills and Knowledge*. Evanston, IL: Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University.

Workbook aimed at community groups and members. Offers suggestions and resources for building a “neighborhood information exchange.” Provides specific information for small community groups about seeking out relationships with academic institutions. Relationships are framed in terms of “college students benefiting from your service.” Does not specifically discuss research relationships and does it imply sustainability of such resources. Most useful for advice on community initiation of relationship with institution of higher learning.

36. Leiderman, S., Furco, A. et al. (2002). *Building Partnerships with College Campuses: Community Perspectives: A Monograph*. Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education (CAPHE)’s Engaging Communities and Campuses Grant Program. The Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, D.C.: 1-25. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://www.cic.edu/caphe/grants/engaging_monograph.pdf

Report from the Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education (CAPHE)’s September 2002 summit of 21 community leaders who were in partnerships with institutions from the Consortium’s Engaging Communities and Campuses grant program. Summit aimed to centralize community experiences in creating and maintaining community-campus partnerships and to use these perspectives to cultivate more effective partnership based on lessons learned. CAPHE also published a brochure summarizing the main topics discussed by summit participants (http://www.cic.edu/caphe/grants/engaging_brochure.pdf). (Cross-reference with Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships; Lessons Learned in Partnerships; Benefits to Community)

37. Mayfield, L. (2001). Town and gown in America: some historical and institutional issues of the engaged university. *Education for Health (Abingdon,)* 14(2), 231-40.

Article exploring the notion of “the engaged university” and the history of the community basis of education systems in the U.S. Discusses resistance to community collaboration on the part of some faculty and administrators, and argues that institutional support for university engagement in community requires greater inclusion of community and a restructuring of current institutional policies and pedagogy. Puts forth possible solutions to some of these issues.

38. Minkler, M. (2005). Community-based research partnerships: challenges and opportunities, *Journal of Urban Health*, 82(2 Suppl 2), ii3-12. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/714rh0726x643h31/fulltext.pdf>

Article discussing ways in which community frustration and articulation of the need for genuine partnerships had led to increased interest in CBPR as a collaborative approach to urban health issues. Explores the concepts of “partnership synergy” and “cultural humility” and the need for structures and protocols that guide ethical research (such as Green et al.’s guidelines). (Cross-

reference with Lessons Learned in Community-Campus Partnerships; Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships)

39. Minyard, K.J., Anderson-Smith, T., Brand, M., Owens, C.F., & Selgrath, F.X. (2007). Triple-Layer Chess: An Analogy for Multi-Dimensional Health Policy Partnerships. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 114-124. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Minyard.pdf.

Evidence-based, strategic alignment of health policy agendas and investments across institutional boundaries and local, state, and national policy jurisdictions maximizes resources and strengthens outcomes related to state health policy. Based on this hypothesis, the Georgia Health Policy Center (GHPC) employs an approach to system change, research translation and policy application that is analogous to facilitating a game of three-dimensional chess.

40. Nyden, P. and Wiewel, W. (1992). Collaborative Research: Harnessing the Tensions between Researcher and Practitioner. *The American Sociologist*, 23(4), 43-55.

Article proposing a model that links researchers with community leaders in a way that balances power and challenges the “partisan” approach to community-campus relationships. Discusses the ways that both academic and community partners must rethink their respective paradigms in the process of engaging in collaborative research with a goal of mutually beneficial gains for both parties. Puts forth some of the ways that public and private funding agencies can facilitate the development of equitable collaborative relationships.

41. Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education. The Community IRB Member: Neighbor & Partner. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.ornl.gov/communityirb/>.

Resources for existing Community IRBs (Institutional Review Boards). Also useful for individuals and groups interested in establishing Community IRBs.

42. Partnership for the Public's Health Collaboration of the California Endowment and the Public Health Institute (2003). Community-Based Public Health Policy & Practice, Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/pph.pdf

Newsletter-style policy brief on CBPR practice. Includes short passages on benefits and challenges of partnership, infrastructure needs, locating partners, and capacity-building. (Cross-reference with Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships; Benefits to Community; Lessons Learned in Community-Campus Partnerships)

43. Plowfield, L.A., Wheeler, E.C., and Raymond, J.E. (2005). Time, tact, talent, and trust: essential ingredients of effective academic-community partnerships. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 26(4), 217-220.

Building strong partnerships between academic institutions and community health agencies requires a commitment to time, tactful communications, talented leaders, and trust. The essential elements of partnership building are discussed based on experiences of a mid-Atlantic nursing

center, an academic health center established to provide care to underserved and vulnerable populations.

44. QUILT (Quality in Linking Together Early Education Partnerships) Project (2002). A Checklist for Developing a Partnership Agreement/Contract. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from <http://www.nccic.org/quilt/partnership-checklist.pdf>.

Partnership checklist focused on early education partnerships, but applicable to a variety of community-campus partnerships. Checklist guides partners through generating agreements and assessing roles and responsibilities. Provides a means of making strong commitments early on in the partnership process. Use of checklist includes negotiation of agreements over time, but establishes foundation of trust at inception of partnership.

45. Seifer, S.D. (2007). Walking the Talk: Achieving the Promise of Authentic Partnerships. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 1-12. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Seifer.pdf

Partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions as a strategy for change are gaining recognition and momentum. Service-learning, community-based participatory research and broad-based coalitions are among the methods these partnerships pursue to accomplish their goals. Increasingly, community-campus partnerships are being recommended by national bodies and pursued by funding agencies for achieving a wide range of significant outcomes, from eliminating health disparities to increasing access to higher education to revitalizing urban and rural economies. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health's 9th conference, "Walking the Talk: Achieving the Promise of Authentic Partnerships," took a critical look at these partnerships in all of their iterations. The conference, held May 31-June 3, 2006, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, sought to create a vision for the future of community-campus partnerships as a strategy for social justice. This article provides an overview and presents the major conference outcomes.

46. Seifer, S. D. and Krauel, P. (2001). Toward a policy agenda for community-campus partnerships, *Education for Health (Abingdon)*, 14(2), 156-62.

Article focusing on strategies for supporting community-campus partnerships at a policy level.

47. Stoecker, R. (1999). Are academics irrelevant? Roles for scholars in participatory research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(5), 840-854. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://abs.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/42/5/840>

Article arguing that research is both a goal and a means to social and community change. Discusses four distinct and overlapping roles that researchers take on in doing collaborative work: "animator," community organizer, popular educator, and participatory researcher. Outlines some of the questions to be asked in determining a researcher's role in community-academic partnerships and in attending to the needs of communities.

48. Torres, J. (2000). Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships. Providence, RI, Campus Compact.

Article outlining key characteristics of successful community-campus partnerships. Includes guidelines for creating and maintaining successful, mutually beneficial partnerships, including information taken from case studies.

49. Vidal, A. C. (1997). Can community development re-invent itself? The challenges of strengthening neighborhoods in the 21st century. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(4), 429-438.

Article about the history and current challenges of community development corporations (CDCs) and their move to partner with institutions and organizations to broaden the ways they can meet needs of low income residents in community development. Includes suggestions from the author about ways CDCs can change their practices to better meet some of these needs.

50. W.K. Kellogg Foundation (November 1, 2001). Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from <http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/CustomPubs/CPtoolkit/CPToolkit/default.htm>

Online toolkit geared at institutions who want to partner with communities. Focuses on community assets and contains advice from communities with community-campus partnership experience about building equitable and authentic partnerships. Offers information for academics at various levels in the partnership process, from “picking the right tools” to “mastering the tools.” (Cross-reference with Benefits to Community)

51. Wiewel, W. and Lieber, M. (1998). Goal Achievement, Relationship Building, and Incrementalism: The Challenges of University-Community Partnerships, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 291-301.

Article focusing on building relationships and “incrementalism” in collaborative work. Discusses planning in a context of power-sharing and differing roles and desired outcomes. Uses University of Illinois at Chicago’s Neighborhoods Initiative as a case study of how planning can occur collaboratively. Emphasizes need for planners to develop political and communicative skills. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Campus Partnerships; Lessons Learned in Community-Campus Partnerships)

52. Wiewel, W., Gaffikin, F. et al. (2000). Community-University Partnerships for Affordable Housing. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

Article addressing partnerships formed around affordable housing. Puts forth a model of community-academic partnership, discusses some of the benefits and tensions in collaborative work, and discusses the possibility of such partnerships leading to new models of urban governance. (Cross-reference with Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships; Benefits to Community)

53. Zlotkowski, E., Jones, R. J. et al. (2005). *One with the Community: Indicators of Engagement at Minority-Serving Institutions*. Providence, RI, Campus Compact.

Article presenting the findings of a multi-year research projects about community engagement projects at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs) and tribal colleges. Puts forth a self-assessment for use by campuses to assess engagement practices. Examines organizational structures and discusses innovative models of engagement. This book is the second volume produced as part of Campus Compacts Indicators of Engagement Project. The Community College: Indicators of Engagement at Two-Year Institutions is the first volume in the series. (Cross-reference with Lessons Learned in Community-Campus Partnerships)

Case Studies of Past or Ongoing Partnerships

54. Adams, A., Miller-Korth, N., & Brown, D. (2004). Learning to work together: developing academic and community research partnerships. *Wisconsin Medical Journal*, 103(2), 15-19.

Community-based participatory research (CBPR) has been promoted as an important collaborative methodology for addressing local health concerns. However, academic physicians and researchers usually are not trained to work with communities as partners. Key characteristics of effective community-academic partnerships are examined based on experiences with 2 CBPR projects in Wisconsin. These 2 projects increasingly have involved the respective communities and researchers in a collaboration. The steps they have taken illustrate the qualities of successful CBPR partnerships: ongoing development of joint community and researcher analysis, communication, and mobilization to search for relevant solutions to important community health problems. To sustain this kind of partnership, it is critical for researchers using the CBPR approach to understand how their academic-scientific perspective differs as well as converges with the community members' practical-experiential perspective. Health care researchers can effectively make use of partnerships with communities by following defined CBPR steps for developing mutually agreed upon research agendas, timelines, and goals. This, in turn, builds the capacity of communities to initiate and engage in future collaborative research projects concerning health issues.

55. Amuwo, S. A. and Jenkins, E. (2001). True Partnership Evolves Over Time. *Collaborative Research: University and Community Partnership*, M. Sullivan and J. Kelley. Washington, DC, American Public Health Association, 25-43.

Chapter detailing a long-standing collaboration between the University of Illinois at Chicago and the Westside Association for Community Action (WACA). Co-authored by Shaffdeen Amuwo, associate dean for the School of Public Health at the UIC and Earnest Jenkins, CEO of WACA. Traces evolution of the UIC-WACA Sickle Cell Project, focusing on WACA's design of a partnering approach designed to "counter the paternalistic nature of university-community relations." Describes reasons for partnership's sustainability and details subsequent projects resulting from the relationship.

56. Armstrong, C., Becker, K., Berg, K., Hilton, T.S.E., Mowry D., & Quinlan, C. (2007). Community-University Partnerships to Bridge the Non-Profit Digital Divide. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 86-94. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Armstrong.pdf

The goal of this project was to utilize the expertise of students, faculty and staff of the University of Wisconsin (UW)-Eau Claire, in full collaboration and partnership with staff from community-based organizations, to refocus on organizational mission and goals, develop long range strategic plans for technology, and strengthen the information systems of community-based organizations. The project scope necessitated a multi-semester partnership with successive teams of students providing long-term define-design-build-test-deploy-support information systems services. The project included the development of new applications to better serve the overall community as well as the constituents of the community-based organizations.

57. Axel-Lute, M. (1999). Town & Gown: Making Research Serve Communities' Needs. *Shelterforce Online*, (National Housing Institute) November/December (108). Retrieved August 4, 2006 from <http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/108/towngown.html>

Case study of East St. Louis Action Research Project (ESLARP), a partnership that began in 1987. Describes a community-initiated community development partnership. Outlines the formal agreements proposed by community partners working with a legislator to define terms of university partnership. Agreements involved community control over research agenda, specific time commitments, and support of neighborhood revitalization.

58. Bassman, M.F. & Harris, K.E. (2007). Narrating the Journey: Immersion Learning in the Migrant Latino Community. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 62-69. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Bassman.pdf

A successful Academic Service-Learning program must first provide for students the ability to integrate the classroom experience and the application of theory in practice. While it is hoped that students develop a sense of civic engagement and responsibility, they will need, at the same time, to marry learning abstract academic concepts with solving real community needs. Rural Eastern North Carolina offers a rich abundance of opportunities for students to experience immersion learning while addressing community needs through productive partnerships between campus and community. Through such a partnership with East Carolina University (ECU), a dedicated but underserved elementary school and a rural community join forces with a very special group of students and faculty to address literacy and language barriers, health and safety education, and the development of leadership and civic engagement in future health care and education professionals.

59. Beversdorf, S., Ahmed, S., & Beck, B. (2007). Community-Academic Partnerships and Institutional Review Board Insights. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 95-104. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Beversdorf.pdf

Community and academia co-exist on the same planet, but they operate with different systems of accountability, process and communication. With an intersection of community and academia, a

collision of cultures occurs. Within the scope of community-academic partnerships, the opportunities for culture clash are numerous. One of those opportunities happens when the academic Institutional Review Board (IRB) is involved. With oversight for assuring the safety of human research study participants, the IRB is bound by federal guidelines, institutional precedent, and its own cultural understanding of research. The IRB's guiding principals may not be familiar to or seem reasonable to communities or even to individuals working within the same academic institution. This article begins with a story that outlines what happens when an urban-based IRB intersects with a rural community through a community-academic partnership. The remainder of the article discusses three sets of strategies for increasing the understanding of and communication between communities and academic institution IRBs.

60. Chrisman, N. J., Senturia, K. et al. (2002). Qualitative process evaluation of urban community work: a preliminary view. *Health Education and Behavior*, 29(2), 232-48.

Qualitative analysis of the Seattle Partners for Healthy Communities, a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)-funded Urban Research Center. Reflects on the partnership's role in brokering expertise, and in supporting and evaluating community health projects.

61. Community-Institutional Partnerships: Understanding Trust Among Partners. Prevention Research Centers, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from <http://www.cdc.gov/prc/partner-communities/trust-among-partners.htm>

In 2001 the Prevention Research Centers (PRC) began to identify and describe the program components that are common to all of the PRCs. This information was used to create a national conceptual framework, or logic model. In developing the framework, the project team found that the ability to develop and maintain productive relationships with partners is critical to all centers and that the level of trust between centers and partners affects that ability. In a similar activity designed to obtain partners' views on the PRC program, "trust" was rated as the most important characteristic of an effective PRC from the perspective of both community and academic partners. The project Understanding Trust Among Partners, which began in 2003, builds on this earlier work and is designed to meet the following two goals: 1) To determine the attributes of trust and the partner behaviors that lead to trusting relationships and 2) To explore the feasibility of developing a tool that can assess trust in the PRCs' partnerships.

62. Davies, S., Williams, A., Horton, T., Rodgers, C., & Stewart, K.E. (2007). Coming Together in the Fight Against HIV: MOMS' Principles of Effective Community Partnerships. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 105-113. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Davies.pdf

This article describes a thriving campus-community partnership comprised of the University of Alabama at Birmingham's (UAB) Department of Health Behavior and seven key community-based organizations and healthcare clinics dedicated to serving individuals who are living with HIV. This partnership shares five principles to guide the project's development, implementation and evaluation. Included in the discussion is: 1) how our fundamental goal (to support, empower, and validate our priority population) guided MOMS education and outreach efforts and helped synergize HIV efforts among our partners; 2) how we used several innovative and entertaining

strategies to inculcate our community partners with MOMS' primary messages and aims; and 3) how MOMS used key opportunities to provide reciprocal support to our partners and cultural sensitivity to the community at large.

63. Dean, B. V., Burstein, J.S. et al. (2000). Incubator Without Walls (IWW): A University-Business Partnership for Neighborhood Redevelopment, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

Case study in community development consisting of faculty in a College of Business, student teams, and community businesses. Details the process of setting up a "business incubator" without a central office (an "incubator without walls"). Article discusses community members' satisfaction with the project as well as some of the challenges presented by ongoing partnership.

64. Family Involvement and University-School-Community Partnerships: A Case Study of the Jane Addams Institute of Democracy. *Fine Forum e-Newsletter*, Issue 5 (Fall 2002). Family Involvement Network of Educators (FINE), Harvard Family Research Project. Retrieved on July 30, 2007 from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/fine/fineforum/forum5/spotlight.html>

The Jane Addams School for Democracy is a community-based education and action initiative, located in Neighborhood House, a 105-year-old settlement house in the West Side, a long-time immigrant neighborhood in St. Paul, Minnesota. It was created in 1996 as a partnership among Hmong and Latino leaders at the Neighborhood House, the Center for Democracy and Citizenship at the Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, the University of Minnesota (UMN), the University of Minnesota's College of Liberal Arts, and the College of St. Catherine. The partners envisioned a community center through which neighborhood residents, college and high school students, and immigrants alike could effectively learn and work together. Inspired by Jane Addams' work at Hull House, the School's vision is "to free and cultivate the talents, cultures, and interests of people from diverse backgrounds and traditions in order to add their energy and wisdom to the commonwealth." A guiding principle at the School is that everyone is a learner and everyone is a teacher.

65. Freeman, N. L. (1996). Senior Center in Seattle Applauds Service Learning. In Taylor, B. (Ed.), *Expanding Boundaries: Serving and Learning*, (pp7 – 9). Washington, D.C.: Corporation for National Service.

This article describes how the partnership between the Pike Market Senior Center (Seattle, Washington) and Carlson Leadership and Public Service Office (University of Washington) has benefited the seniors of Pike Market and the learning opportunities of the University of Washington students. What was originally seen as a strictly volunteer venture of the students by the staff at Pike Market evolved to an understanding of how the service at the Senior Center was most applicable to the students' academic course work.

66. Hyland, S. (2000). Issues in Evaluating Neighborhood Change: Economic Development and Community-Building Indicators. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

Case study describing an inner-city community development partnership. Discusses two different approaches to evaluating community change at a neighborhood level: socioeconomic structural change and community-building change. Outlines issues (anticipated and unanticipated) that arose in the course of the partnership. Concludes with an assessment framework.

67. Lantz, P.M., Viruell-Fuentes, E., Israel, B.A., Softley, D., and Guzman, R. (2001). Can communities and academia work together on public health research? Evaluation results from a community-based participatory research partnership in Detroit. *Journal of Urban Health*, 78(3), 495-507.

This article reports the results of a formative evaluation of the first 4 years of the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center (URC), a community-based participatory research partnership that was founded in 1995 with core funding from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Several organizations are members of this partnership, including a university, six community-based organizations, a city health department, a health care system, and CDC. The Detroit URC is a strong partnership that has accomplished many of its goals, including the receipt of over \$11 million in funding for 12 community-based participatory research projects during its initial 4 years. Detroit URC Board members identified a number of facilitating factors for their growth and achievements, such as (1) developing a sound infrastructure and set of processes for making decisions and working together, (2) building trust among partners, (3) garnering committed and active leadership from community partners, and (4) receiving support from CDC. Board members also identified a number of ongoing challenges, including organizational constraints, time pressures, and balancing community interests in interventions and academic research needs. Overall, the Detroit URC represents a partnership approach to identifying community health concerns and implementing potential solutions.

68. Lardon, C., Drew, E., Kernak, D., Lupie, H., & Soule, S. (2007). Health Promotion in Rural Alaska: Building Partnerships across Distance and Cultures. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I): 125-132. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Lardon.pdf

The Center for Alaska Native Health Research at the University of Alaska Fairbanks is working to build health research partnerships with remote Yup'ik communities in southwestern Alaska. Through a closer look at one of the Center's partnerships, this paper addresses the process and importance of developing a mutual cultural understanding among collaborative partners. By mutually engaging in a process of co-learning from the start, community-campus partners can develop a shared understanding of the project goals, the process of decision making and resource sharing, and realizable expectations for building local capacities and sustainable infrastructure.

69. LeGates, R. T. and Robinson, G. (1998). Institutionalizing university-community partnerships. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 312-322.

Case study discussing San Francisco State University's experience with the HUD-funded Bay Area Community Outreach Partnership Center. Emphasizes elements of true, equitable

partnership in terms of respect and mutual compromise. Explores some of the issues particular to locally implemented partnerships through federally funded programs. Focuses on stakeholders and structural needs involved at each level: community, university, and governmental.

70. Maslia, M. L., Reyes, J. J. et al. (2005). Public health partnerships addressing childhood cancer investigations: case study of Toms River, Dover Township, New Jersey, USA. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, 208(1-2), 45-54.

Case study of a community-initiated partnership formed in response to an increased incidence of childhood cancers from the mid 1980's to 1990's in Toms River, located in Dover Township, Ocean County, New Jersey. Describes how public health, community, and environmental agency partners came together to formulate a response plan to address the issue. Author proposes six rules of engagement with regard to partnerships: (1) seek out willing participants, (2) establish an equitable partnership, (3) consider each partner's perspective, (4) define goals and roles for each partner, (5) seek out innovative opportunities, and (6) assure scientific credibility.

71. Mayfield, L. and Lucas, E. P. J. (2000). Mutual Awareness, Mutual Respect: The Community and the University Interact. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1). Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.huduser.org/Periodicals/CITYSCPE/VOL5NUM1/mayfield.pdf>.

Case study discussing a partnership that originated with the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC)'s Neighborhoods Initiative. Written collaboratively by an academic and a community partner, the article explores some of the lessons learned as a result of the UIC Hiring and Purchasing Program. Discusses limitations in program's success and the eventual and unexpected result of administrators taking note of the problem and taking action.

72. Meyer, D., Armstrong-Coben, A., & Batista, M. (2005) How a community-based organization and an academic health center are creating an effective partnership for training and service. *Academic Medicine*, 80(4), 327- 333.

Community-academic partnerships in the training of doctors offer unique learning opportunities of great importance. Such partnerships can induce a paradigm shift such that physicians view community as a teaching resource and partner rather than as a passive recipient of services or solely as a placement site. The authors describe a model of a community-academic partnership in New York City, begun in 1995, in which, for training and service, pediatric residents are integrally involved in a community-based program. Principles adapted from the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health's principles of partnership provide a framework for portraying the essential elements of developing and maintaining the partnership. The authors explain the clashes that may arise between partners and show how the principles of partnership guide partnership members in working and learning within a setting that by its nature entails conflict and inequality. This report is based on the knowledge gained from the structured reflections of both members of this partnership: the residency program at a large academic health center and the community-based social service organization. Such partnerships provide the training ground

for the development of physicians who understand the social and cultural determinants of health and constructively use community agencies' input in promoting child health and well-being. Within this framework, community-based organizations are not solely service providers but become educators of physicians-in-training who, with new knowledge gained through the partnership, more effectively contribute to the overall health of the communities they serve.

73. Minkler, M., Fadem, P. et al. (2002). Ethical dilemmas in participatory action research: a case study from the disability community. *Health Education and Behavior*, 29(1), 14-29. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/29/1/14>.

Case study of a community partnership in the process of grappling with a difficult, polarizing community issue. Discusses the ways in which a community of people with disabilities addressed Oregon's physician-assisted suicide legislation, and the ways in which disagreement within community affected the community's relationship with academic partners in a participatory action research project.

74. Motton, V., Baker, E. A., Branch, A., Motton, F.L., Fitzgerald, T., & Barnidge E. (2007). Men on the Move: A Partnership to Create Educational and Economic Opportunities. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 54-61. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Motton.pdf

As with many other community-campus partnerships for health, this partnership started with a focus on disease, particularly disparities between African Americans and whites in the incidence and prevalence of disease within our community. In our interventions we focused on the risky lifestyle behaviors associated with these diseases (e.g., smoking, physical inactivity, poor nutritional intake). As community members and academic partners learned to listen to each other in new and different ways, the importance of focusing on the underlying factors influencing health and health behaviors began to take precedence. The result of this new focus is the Pemiscot County Men on the Move (PCMOM) program, a program that addresses educational and economic opportunities as they directly and indirectly affect the health of African American men. We hope that by sharing our story about the development of the PCMOM program, we can facilitate other coalitions interested in addressing health disparities in moving from a focus on disease and risky lifestyle behaviors to a focus on the underlying conditions (i.e., social determinants) that act as barriers to change and therefore to health disparities.

75. Natale, D., Brook, K., & Kelshaw, T. (2007). Critical Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships: Promise and Performance. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 44-53. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Natale.pdf

This article assesses a three-year Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funded Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) at Montclair State University (MSU) in Montclair, NJ. With the support of systematic qualitative analysis, it shifts attention from the *execution* of community-campus partnering to practitioners' capacities for *reflection*. Grounded in Sharon Welch's (2000) conception of "risk" as a preferable alternative to "control," this essay explores the MSU COPC project using a framework that, we hope, provides an innovative means for creating, sustaining, and, fundamentally, understanding community campus partnerships. The

essay begins with an overview of the MSU COPC, then summarizes the research methods and conceptual framework for analysis, and finally focuses on one aspect of the MSU COPC that illustrates the utility of adopting an ethic of risk in the partnering process.

76. Reardon, K.M. (1998). Enhancing the Capacity of Community-Based Organizations in East St. Louis, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 323-333.

Article about a community development partnership between the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and community-based organizations in East St. Louis. Discusses the organizing approach, methods, and theory and puts forth a “new paradigm for community planning.” Includes a preliminary assessment of the effectiveness of the initiative. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Campus Partnerships)

77. Reardon, K.M. (2000). An Experiential Approach to Creating an Effective Community-University Partnership: The East St. Louis Action Research Project, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

Article about the East St. Louis Action Research Project partnership. Discusses the 10 year partnership, some of the challenges that arose during that time, and the ways the group addressed these. Focuses on the key elements leading to partnership’s success, including its involvement of university students and faculty, community leaders, and municipal officials. Discusses use of David A. Kolb’s experiential learning theories as instrumental to reinvention phases of the partnership. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Campus Partnerships)

78. Schumaker, A., Reed, B. J. et al. (2000). Collaborative Models for Metropolitan University Outreach: The Omaha Experience. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

Article about a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Emphasizes role of community and governmental partners as key to successful urban outreach around community development. Discusses lessons learned, including positive, long-term relationships, simple organizational structure, trust, communication, shared vision, and linkage and integration with university resources.

79. Sclove, R. E., Scammell, M. L. et al. (1998). Community-Based Research in the United States: An Introductory Reconnaissance, Including Twelve Organizational Case Studies and Comparison with the Dutch Science Shops and the Mainstream American Research System. *The Aspen Institute’s Nonprofit Sector Research Fund*. Amherst, Massachusetts, 1-131. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://www.mapcruzin.com/download/loka_report.pdf

A report detailing twelve case studies of community-campus partnerships in the U.S. Includes an analysis and brief history of community-based research and discusses similarities between this practice and “science shops,” or sites of research benefiting non-academic groups and communities in the Netherlands.

80. Seanhk-Ka, S. & Axtell, S. (2007). Sharing Intellectual Authority. *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 78-85. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Seanhk-ka.pdf

This paper describes a ten-year journey of coming together to teach a course on community organizing for public health students. A critical aspect of this course is the partnership between the instructors and Healthy Powderhorn, which later became the Powderhorn-Phillips Cultural Wellness Center. The mission of the Center is to unleash the power of citizens to heal themselves and build community. The philosophical cornerstone of the Center's work is the People's Theory of Sickness which states that loss of community and loss of culture are the root causes of illness in individuals and decay and violence in communities. The Center addresses health deficits by increasing personal responsibility and group capacity to heal through behavior and lifestyle changes. In this paper, the authors describe the evolution of the course, as well as the story of their personal evolutions. Through these stories emerge the principles and practices of sharing intellectual authority in the classroom.

81. Smith, M. and Vetica, T. (2000). Youth, the Arts, and Community Outreach. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

Case study of a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) at the University of Florida. Article discusses organizing communities by targeting youth and using arts, including the formation of a dance troupe, as a strategy for engaging community.

82. University Partnerships Clearinghouse (1998). *Colleges & Communities: Partners in Urban Revitalization: A Report on the Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program*. Rockville, MD. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/00000000b/80/11/44/eb.pdf

Report of the federal Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) program spanning four funded rounds (1994-1997). Discusses partnerships and the role of federal government, the goals and functions of the COPC program, and some of the different ways in which COPC programs have taken shape nationally.

83. Wallerstein, N., Duran, B. M. et al. (2003). Jemez Pueblo: built and social-cultural environments and health within a rural American Indian community in the Southwest. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(9), 1517-8. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/picrender.fcgi?artid=1448002&blobtype=pdf>.

Case study of a partnership between the University of New Mexico and an American Indian tribal community in the Pueblo of Jemez in rural New Mexico. Article discusses the role of tribal leadership in the university's gaining approval for the project, the approach used by researchers to ascertain community health concerns, and the ways in which housing and built environments became central to the project.

84. Wilson, R. and Guajardo, M. (2000). Capacity Building and Governance in El Cenizo, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1).

A case study of the Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) at the University of Texas at Austin. Article describes a partnership within the center between students in a graduate course and members of a South Texas Colonia. Describes the central role of youth development, local governance, and community capacity building. Article also focuses on the issues of reciprocity and power in partnerships between community and university.

85. Ybarra, V. & Postama, J. (2007). El Proyecto Bienestar: An Authentic CBPR Partnership in the Yakima Valley *Partnership Perspectives*. IV(I), 34-43. Retrieved on August 6, 2007 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/PP-W07-Ybarra.pdf.

El Proyecto Bienestar, or The Well-Being Project, is a community-based research project focused on the health of Yakima Valley agricultural workers and their families. Within El Proyecto Bienestar, environmental justice refers to the equal protection and education of all communities regarding environmental and occupational hazards. The primary goal of the project is to develop strategies that will enable the community of Hispanic agricultural workers to effectively identify, characterize, and respond to the many occupational and environmental health risks they and their families face. El Proyecto's approach is novel in that previous attempts at collaborative agenda setting in the Yakima Valley failed to incorporate the expertise of local agricultural workers, even though they were often subjects of occupational health research in the Valley.

Benefits to Community

86. Hahn, A., Coonerty, C., and Peaslee L. I. Colleges and universities as economic anchors: profiles of promising practices. Brandeis University: Heller Graduate School of Social Policy and Management, Institute for Sustainable Development/Center for Youth and Communities, and POLICYLINK. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from <http://www.compact.org/news/story/133>.

Higher education is relentlessly challenged to change and align its roles to respond proactively to the needs of students, communities and society as a whole. Economic relationships with the community and neighboring families are part of this challenge. Every college and university serves to some extent as an economic "anchor" in its respective community. They create jobs and many offer training and education for local residents; most support local businesses through the procurement of goods and services; some advance community development through real estate projects; others facilitate community service projects that have an economic component; and nearly all partner with government and civic groups to strengthen the economic health of the community. Occasionally, genuine issues arise through economic practices that can lead to strained relationships and destabilizing effects for all concerned. With a little planning and dedication however, colleges and universities can be tremendous economic and social assets for families and neighborhoods. This report highlights some of these "best practices" in the hopes of fostering such relationships.

87. Perry, D. C. and Wiewel, W. (2006). Conference: The College/University as Urban Developer. Worcester, MA. Retrieved on August 5, 2007 from http://www.nerche.org/campus_community/perry_wiewel/perry_wiewel.html.

One-day conference in which the two keynote speakers present two case studies of community development with regard to campus urban development projects. 1) Worcester Polytechnic Institute's Gateway Project, a community development project that is working to create mixed-use space to be utilized by academic and corporate collaborators, and 2) the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Science's role as urban developer in its construction of a downtown Worcester campus.

88. Scheibel, J., Bowley, E. M. et al. (2005). The Promise of Partnerships: Tapping into the College as a Community Asset. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Book that draws on experiences of community leaders and university faculty and administrators in community-campus partnerships. Discusses case studies, offers information about how community members can initiate partnerships, and puts forward specific guidance on how communities can utilize resources and expertise from local institutions of higher learning. Information is aimed at community-based organizations and focuses on long-term relationship and capacity building. Offers concrete advice and strategies for creating authentic, equal partnerships, working with students and faculty, and making contact with "the right people" on campus. Includes checklists, tips and best practices by topic.

89. Wiewel, W. and Guerrero, I. (1997). Long-Term Collaboration--Building Relationships and Achieving Results Through a Neighborhoods Initiative Program: The Resurrection Project. *Metropolitan Universities*, 8(3), 123-34.

Article about the Neighborhoods Initiatives, a partnership between the University of Illinois at Chicago and a community-based development corporation. Discusses issues central to the partnership such as building community capacity around dealing with future neighborhood concerns and deciding on measures of improvement. Also addresses the need for institutional change in the university to better support community-engaged projects.

Challenges and conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships

90. Amborski, D. (2005). Ryerson University and Toronto's Dundas Square Metropolis Project. In David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel (Eds.), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E Sharpe and Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Ryerson University, a public university serving approximately 16,000 students, is located in the central part of the City of Toronto.(1) This case study describes a joint university-city project adjacent to a public square in downtown Toronto: The Dundas Square Metropolis Project. The university became involved because it possesses a key land parcel on the northern edge of the square. Circumstances fostered by the City of Toronto's desire to revitalize a stagnant retail area adjacent to the Ryerson campus presented a unique opportunity for the university to enter into a

public-private partnership with the developer, Pen Equity. The case study examines conditions and negotiations leading to an anticipated mutually beneficial outcome for the three key participants: the City of Toronto, Ryerson University and Pen Equity. The study begins with the context for the project, including the development partners and their motivations, followed by the planning and structuring of the deal and the eventual components of the project, and concluding with the lessons learned from the negotiations and the resulting outcome.

91. Amuwo, S., Scrimshaw, S. et al. (2006). Chicago Health Professions Partnership Initiative. *Academic Medicine*, 81(6 Suppl), S21-4.

Article describing the establishment of a pipeline program to increase diversity in the applicant pool for the University of Illinois at Chicago's School of Public Health. Chicago Health Professions Partnership Initiative (CHPPI) was established after efforts to increase diversity without engaging with communities proved unsuccessful. CHPPI worked with multiple stakeholders in community and focused on the preparation of K-12 students.

92. Avila Hernandez, J. (2004). "Blood, Lies and Indian Rights: TCUs Becoming Gatekeepers for Research." *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, 16(2).

Case study describing a 2003 conflict between the Havasupai American Indian tribe and Arizona State University. Examines university's role in breaking trust with tribal research participants by going against informed consent regulations to use tribe members' blood samples for studies besides the ones for which they obtained consent. Resulted in community establishment of tribal Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) to prevent exploitation and to "make themselves gatekeepers" for research.

93. Boyle, M.-E. and Silver, I. (2005). Poverty, Partnerships, and Privilege: Elite Institutions and Community Empowerment. *City & Community*, 4(3), 233-252.

Analysis of community-campus partnerships centering on "community empowerment" models of urban revitalization. Explores some of the factors leading up to partnerships and some of the ways in which academic institutions continue to benefit from privilege while maintaining an image as inclusive agents of change.

94. Cruz, N. I. and Giles, D.E. Jr. (2000). Where's the Community in Service-Learning Research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue(Fall), 28-34.

Article discussing service-learning programs and the lack of service-learning research focusing on community. Suggests that community-campus partnerships are a valuable means to conduct service-learning research and engage community. Emphasizes the importance of a community asset-based approach to partnership and research.

95. Cummings, S. Rosentraub, M.S. Domahidy, M. and Coffin, S. (2005). University Involvement in Downtown Revitalization: Managing Political and Financial Risks. In David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel (Eds.), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E Sharpe and Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Retrieved July 30, 2007 from http://www.lincolninst.edu/docs/221/340_9.%20Cummings_et_al.doc.

University real estate development is a new area of academic and applied inquiry. As discussed in the introductory chapter, these development activities are part of the larger issue of the relations between the university and its city and community, and they raise perennial questions. But these questions have become more pronounced with the increased role of large research universities, in particular, as major employers, generators of economic development, and key components of the local, national and global knowledge economy. This chapter sums up what we have learned about the nature of university development projects—their impact on the university's neighborhood and the city, and on the institution itself. How do universities go about implementing these projects, and what appear to be the best practices? What are the policy, practice and research questions raised by the increasing role of universities as developers in their cities?

96. Deitrick, S. and Soska, T. (2005). The University of Pittsburgh and the Oakland Neighborhood: From Conflict to Cooperation or How the 800-Pound Gorilla Learned to Sit with—and not on—Its Neighbors. In David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel (Eds.), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E Sharpe and Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

This case study analyzes the planning and real estate development processes of the University of Pittsburgh from the 1960s onward and its relationship with its Oakland neighborhood. Relations between the institution and the community evolved over this period, as both underwent a series of changes reflecting different eras and institutional shifts. Two key themes influenced these changes. First, in 1966 the university became a quasi-public institution. This “public-ization” began a gradual process that changed its role and identity from private to public actor in the city and region. Second, the external context of community planning was changing in the 1960s, as cities and communities battled bulldozers and urban renewal. The Oakland community was undergoing its own mobilization toward organizational and political changes like many places in America at that time. The university’s early plans, showcased in “Designing Oakland,” led to conflict then confrontation. Over time the community and university moved through an uneasy and uneven process toward cooperation and collaboration. The Sennott Square dedication represented the culmination of the changes in the university in an era of cooperation, a shift from what Thomas Bender calls “the university in the city” to a “university of the city” (Bender 2002, 150).

97. Dewar, M. E. and Isaac, C.B. (1998). Learning from Difference: The Potentially Transforming Experience of Community-University Collaboration, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 334-347.

Case study of The University of Michigan's Detroit Community Outreach Partnership Center. Outlines some of the conflicts that arise between universities and community organizations. Explores the tensions between the community-driven planning model and the consultant-driven model that often arise in partnerships centered on community development. Suggests that a radical restructuring of the university system and pedagogy is necessary in improving community-campus partnerships.

98. Gilderbloom, J.I. and Mullins, Jr., R.L. (2005). *Promise and Betrayal: Universities and the Battle for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Book about the role of universities in revitalizing poor neighborhoods through partnerships. Discusses the authors' work in a partnership between the University of Louisville and communities in the Russell Neighborhood. Focuses on the ten year community development partnership, and outlines some of the key steps, both within the university and the community, in assembling a sustainable and equitable partnership. Argues that universities have a responsibility to poor neighborhoods in creating community development partnerships, and that in general, universities have betrayed communities by failing to recognize their role in collaborative community development.

99. Nyden, P. W. & Wiewel, W., Eds. (1991). *Challenging uneven development : an urban agenda for the 1990s*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

The editors and contributors to this volume look at two practical consequences of urban growth: the change in residence patterns as neighborhoods gentrify, and the change in employment patterns, as factory workers lose jobs and white-collar workers gain jobs. The editors' goal is to highlight the alternatives to uneven development and to the growth ideology. They outline and advocate specific policies, including affordable housing, changes in taxation, and direct community participation in planning and zoning decisions.

100. Prins, E. (2005). Framing a Conflict in a Community-University Partnership, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 25(1), 57-74. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://jpe.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/25/1/57>.

Article discussing the ways in which tension and conflict in community-campus partnerships can be productive and lead to growth. Examines a case study of a partnership in rural California and the ways in which a dispute was resolved in such a way to clarify expectations about decision-making within the partnership.

101. Sullivan, M., Kone, A. et al. (2001). Researcher and researched--community perspectives: toward bridging the gap. *Health Education and Behavior*, 28(2), 130-49. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/28/2/130>.

Article based on qualitative interviews with participants involved at various levels in several community-based research projects in Seattle. Informants focused on challenges and problems, centralizing communication issues, lack of trust, and imbalances in power. Respondents commented that many problems may have been prevented by researchers collaborating with communities from the beginning about research agenda and priorities and about the development of programs and interventions. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Campus Partnerships; Lessons Learned in Community-Campus Partnerships)

102. Wiewel, W. and Perry, D.C. (2005). Ivory Towers No More: Academic Bricks and Sticks. In David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel (Eds.), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E Sharpe and Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

University real estate development is a new area of academic and applied inquiry. As discussed in the introductory chapter, these development activities are part of the larger issue of the relations between the university and its city and community, and they raise perennial questions. But these questions have become more pronounced with the increased role of large research universities, in particular, as major employers, generators of economic development, and key components of the local, national and global knowledge economy. This chapter sums up what we have learned about the nature of university development projects—their impact on the university's neighborhood and the city, and on the institution itself. How do universities go about implementing these projects, and what appear to be the best practices? What are the policy, practice and research questions raised by the increasing role of universities as developers in their cities?

Lessons Learned in Community-Campus Partnerships

103. Boyte, H. A Different Kind of Politics: Interview with Susan Gust. 2006. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.publicwork.org/pdf/interviews/gust.pdf>.

Interview with community partner Susan Gust about her work with the Phillips Neighborhood Healthy Housing Collaborative and its partnership with the University of Minnesota. Includes reflections on experiences of working within the partnership and on community-campus partnerships in general.

104. Ferman, B. and Hill, T. L. (2004). The Challenges of Agenda Conflict in Higher Education Community Research Partnerships: Views from the Community Side, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 26(2), 241-257. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/j.0735-2166.2004.00199.x/abs/>.

Article is based on interviews with community leaders who participate in community-campus partnerships. Details the reasons they choose to take part in such work, and explores both benefits and challenges for community partners in working with institutions of higher learning. Also considers larger institutional issues involved in community-campus partnerships. (Cross-reference with Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships; Benefits to Community)

105. Flicker, S. (2006). Who Benefits From Community-Based Participatory Research? A Case Study of the Positive Youth Project, *Health Education and Behavior*. May 31, Epub Ahead of Print. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/rapidpdf/1090198105285927v1>.

Article discussing the demands and benefits of CBPR. Uses critical social science analysis to answer the question of who most benefits from the work. Concludes that while benefits are shared, they are not necessarily equitably distributed, and that costs of partnership and participation are demanding. Recommends that research be structured such that partners benefit equitably and in such a way that takes into account community capacities as a concrete benefit to community partners and participants. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Campus Partnerships; Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships; Benefits to Community)

106. Fulbright-Anderson, K., Auspos, P. et al. (2001). Community Involvement in Partnerships with Educational Institutions, Medical Centers, and Utility Companies. *Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives for the Annie E. Casey Foundation*: 1-27. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/INSTITUTIONS.PDF>.

Report based on roundtable discussion convened in the spring of 1999 by the Aspen Institute. Focuses on community partners' positive and negative experiences with community-campus partnerships. Explores and identifies common issues, successes and problems. Concludes with "lessons learned" based on themes from interviews with community partners. (Cross-reference with Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships; Benefits to Community)

107. Minkler, M., Thompson, M. et al. (2001). Contributions of community involvement to organizational-level empowerment: the federal Healthy Start experience, *Health Education and Behavior*, 28(6), 783-807. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/28/6/783>.

Article discussing the use of empowerment theory in community partnership with regard to nine federal Healthy Start Program sites. Based on qualitative data, article explores the ways in which community involvement in partnership affect organizational empowerment. Puts forth conclusions about implications of research findings. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Higher Education Partnerships; Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships)

108. Minkler, M. (2004). Ethical challenges for the "outside" researcher in community-based participatory research. *Health Education and Behavior*, 31(6), 684-97. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from <http://heb.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/6/684>.

Review and analysis of community-based participatory research (CBPR), its history, and some of its major guiding frameworks. Discusses ways that academics and communities can achieve "community-driven" agendas. Explores some of the tensions, difficulties, and limitations of such research, and issues that arise around ownership and use of findings. Outlines case studies and concludes with a discussion of ethical issues that arise in CBPR and some of the ways to address these. (Cross-reference with Policies, Expectations and Guidelines Structuring Community-Higher Education Partnerships; Challenges and Conflicts in Community-Campus Partnerships; Benefits to Community)

Funding

109. Seifer, S. D., Kauper-Brown, J. et al. (2004). *Directory of Funding Sources for Community-Based Research*, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/directory-062704f.pdf.

Document detailing funding resources for community-based research. Offers details about funding agencies and foundations, contact information, restrictions, type of funding offered, deadlines, research agenda, and examples of currently funded projects.