1. Community Impacts of Research Oriented Partnerships. "Community Impacts of Research Oriented Partnerships Measure."   Retrieved November 27, 2009, 2009, from http://www.impactmeasure.org/.

   > The Community Impacts of Research Oriented Partnerships (CIROP) Measure is a 33-item, generic measure of community members' perceptions of the **impact** of research partnerships addressing social and health issues. The CIROP is a tool to inform research partnerships about the extent of their impact in the areas of Personal Knowledge Development, Personal Research Skill Development, Organizational/Group Access To and Use of Information, and Community and Organizational Development.

2. Campus Compact. "Campus Compact: Educating Citizens, Building Communities." Retrieved November 30, 2009, 2009, from http://www.compact.org/.

   > Campus Compact is an American coalition of more than 1,100 college and university presidents - representing some 6 million students - dedicated to promoting community service, civic engagement, and service-learning in higher education.
   >
   > Campus Compact is engaged in a number of initiatives to 'entrench' engagement in American universities, including the development an 'Indicators of Engagement model for use by universities, and a 'toolkit' for promoting engagement in research universities.

3. (2006). "Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching." Community engagement classification.

   > The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (American) offers the following, widely used definition of community engagement, "Community Engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity".
   >
   > Since 2006, the Carnegie Foundation has been collecting data on community engagement in institutions of higher learning. Participation in the program is elective (unlike the Carnegie Basic Classification) and interested organisations complete a survey that assesses various aspects of their community engagement. The Foundation identifies three elements of community engagement: curricular engagement, outreach and, partnership. Institutions can be classified as exhibiting one or all of these elements of engagement.
   >
   > The work of the Carnegie Foundation assesses community engagement on an institution-wide basis (i.e. not only focused on community engagement in research relationships)

4. CUExpo. (2008). Community-University Parternships: Connecting for Change: Proceedings of the Third International CUExpo. Community-University Exposition 2008, University of Victoria.

These are the proceedings of the Community University Expo '08. The conference includes a thematic area on Community-university engagement, partnerships and ethics.

5. The Office of Community-Based Research. (2009). "Office of Community Based Research, University of Victoria." Retrieved November 30, 2009, 2009, from http://web.uvic.ca/ocbr/index.html.

    The Office of Community-Based Research at UVic (OCBR-UVic) is a community–university partnership which supports community engagement and research to create vibrant, sustainable and inclusive communities. It officially opened in January 2007 and is supported through the UVic Office of the Vice-President of Research.

    The OCBR websites includes an extensive resource list and links to other organizations engaged in CBR worldwide.

6. Balcazar, F., R. Taylor, et al. (2004). Chapter 1: Participatory Action Research: General Principles and a Study with a Chronic Health Condition. <u>Participatory Community Research: Theories and Methods in Action.</u> In L. Jason, C. Keys, Y. Saurez- Balcazar, R. Taylor and M. Davis (eds.). Washington, American Psychological Association.

    Participatory action research (PAR) is defined and the scope and limits of the term are explored according to a continuum of control, collaboration, and commitment in the research process. Some researchers are committed to what appears to be a purist ideological paradigm of PAR that wholly locates control in the hands of participants and produces higher order social action and change. Others appear to endorse a more inclusive vision of PAR that can be defined by any number of approaches to involving community members in research. Acknowledging these differences, this chapter attempts to represent a diverse range of projects and theoretical approaches to participatory work. Other aspects of PAR are explained, including researcher reflexivity and redefining the researcher's role as a catalyst for social change, empowerment, learning how to learn, social change and transforming social realities, and approaching data collection and interpretation using multiple epistemologies. The authors discuss the relevance of PAR to community psychology, cover general principles for implementing PAR in community research, and share their experiences using this research approach with people with chronic illness and disabilities. (from PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2009 APA, all rights reserved)

7. Barker, D. (2004). "The Scholarship of Engagement: A Taxonomy of five emerging practices." <u>Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement</u> **9**(2): 123-138.

    The author draws on Boyer's (1996) conception of the 'scholarship of engagement' and argues that this form of scholarship is characterizes by a number of overlapping practices. Based on a literature review, interview data and web searches the author develops a taxonomy of different approaches to the scholarship of engagement: public scholarship, participatory research, community partnerships, public information networks, and civic literacy scholarship. While overlapping, each of these practices has unique theoretical underpinnings, addresses different types of problems and employs different methods.

8. Barnsley, J., and, Ellis, Diana (1992). <u>Research for Change: Participatory Action Research for Community Groups</u>. Vancouver, The Women's Research Centre.
    This guide explains the goals and processes associated with undertaking a Participatory Action Research Project. The guide is written for the use of community-based organisations interested in conducting research with marginalized groups. PAR is explained as an inductive proces in which theory and analysis are developed from the experiences of people's everyday lives. This PAR model favors strong participation throughout all aspects of the research project.

9. Boyer, E. (1990). <u>Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.</u> New York, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
    This report, prepared for the Carnegie Foundation reframes and expands on the core functions of academia ('research, teaching and service') to include the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching. Discovery affirms the important role of university-based research, integration is a call for interdisciplinarity, application is a call for academics to think of themselves as reflexive practitioners, moving between theory and practice, practice and theory. Finally, the scholarship of teaching affirms the important role of teaching in academia. The report also notes that this reconceptualization cannot happen solely on an individual basis, it is a call for a shared visions and a to community of scholars.

10. Boyer, E. (1996). "The scholarship of engagement." <u>Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences</u> **49**(7): 18-33.
    In this speech, given to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Boyer draws out the key themes highlighted in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. The scholarship of teaching is reframed as the scholarship of 'sharing knowledge' in this speech. Located the need for a new conception of scholarship in the changing role of the American university and in the need for universities to remain relevant.

11. Boyte, H. C. a., Kari, N. (2000). Renewing the demographic spirit in American colleges and universities: Higher education as public work. <u>Civic responsibility and higher education</u>. T. Ehrlich. Phoenix, The American Council on Education and The Oryx Press**:** 37-59.
    This book chapter discusses the historical and contemporary role of PSE institutions in citizenship and civic education. Notes that as many third sector organisations have taken responsibility for service provision, they have been less able to fill citizenship education roles. As a result it is more important than ever that PSE institutions take up this role. The authors argue that "public work" should be a framing principle in PSE.

12. Brisbin, R. J., and, Hunter S. (2003). "Community Leaders' Perceptions of University and College Efforts to Encourage Civic Engagement." <u>The Review of Higher Education</u> **26**(4): 467-486.
    This article aims to expand on the work of the Kellogg Commission by exploring the effects of student participation in community-based organisations (CBOs), from the

perspectives of organizations themselves. The authors note that despite heightened interest in the role of PSE institutions in civic renewal and community engagement relatively little concrete information about the relationship between PSE institutions and CBOs is available.

The authors make a number of recommendations to support positive outcomes in experiential learning programs including stressing the importance of a single point of contact for CBOs working with PSE institutions.

13. Bussieres, D., L. Dumais, et al. (2008). Research Partnerships: The ARUC-ES and RQRP-ES model. Montreal, Alliance de recherche universites-communautes en economie sociale (ARUC-ES) and Research quebecois de recherche partenariale en economie sociale (RQRP-ES).

This document is an explanation and guide for parties interested in implementing the ARUC-ES and RQRP-ES model of community-university research partnership. The model identifies a number of steps, beginning with the joint definition of the research problem or question and concluding in an evaluation of the research and partnership. The model then, does not address the role of pre-existing partnerships nor the conditions necessary to develop partnerships prior to the identification of a research problem (i.e. by implication partnerships form in response to a specific question or problem). The guide also identifies the entrenchment of partnership practices in the governance model as important to its success and details the organizational structure stemming from this principle and employed by ARUC-ES.

14. Bussieres, D., L. Dumais, et al. (2008). Guide for knowledge mobilization in the context of research partnerships. Montreal, Alliance de recherche universites-communautes en economie social (ARUC-ES) and Reseau quebecois de recherche partenariale en economie sociale (RQRP-ES).

This is a companion guide to *Research Partnerships: The ARUC-ES and RQRP-ES Model* and discusses the importance of, and suggestions for, effective knowledge mobilization in research partnerships. Knowledge mobilization extends research beyond its 'natural audience'. The question of how to best mobilize knowledge is given particular attention and is identified as a three part process, including: the transformation of results (into an appropriate presentation), dissemination (to the public) and transfer (a targeted practice with the goal of changing practice or policy). Further, the authors stress the joint responsibility of community and university partners in knowledge mobilization.

15. Buys, N. and S. Bursnall (2007). "Establishing university-community partnerships: Processes and benefits." Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management **29**(1): 73-86.

This article is based on data from interviews with seven Australian academics who initiated a Community-University research partnership. The findings of these interviews are used to assess the applicability of Sargent and Water's (2004) framework of academic collaboration (i.e. university-university collaboration) to community-university partnerships. The model, which includes 4 phases: initiation, clarification, implementation, completion, is found to be broadly applicable but

community-university partnerships are found to be less linear and more iterative than the model allows.

Within the author's framework, community participation and partnership are elements of engagement. Engagement is 'intended to characterise the whole orientation of the university's policy and practice towards strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction with the non-university world' (p. 74). In this construct engagement is the context in which partnership occurs.

16. Cunningham, J. B. (1993). <u>Action Research and Organizational Development</u>. Westport, Praeger.
    Publishers Abstract: Action Research and Organizational Development describes a process of change that encourages research and consulting skills. In this process, research data about an organization or culture is systematically collected to develop an understanding of the needs, issues and problems. The information provides the impetus for focusing the change and making discoveries. This work describes the characteristics of the action research process and the procedure for its implementation. This particular type of applied social research differs from other varieties in the immediacy of the researcher's involvement and collaboration in each stage of researching, focusing, and implementing. The work describes the continuous process of research and learning in relation to the researcher's long-term relationship with a problem or issue.

17. Dilts, A. and F. Westley (2009). <u>Case study- Knowledge Generation: Community-University Research Partnerships, Social Innovation Generation</u>. Waterloo, University of Waterloo.
    This is a composite (referred to as a case study in report) and accompanying teaching guide on how to deal with common problems in community-university research partnerships. The composite is based on interview data from 35 community or university representatives from across 12 partnership projects. The case study includes a number of recommendations from participants (provided almost exclusively by participants who had successful partnership experiences) on how to ensure successful community-university partnerships in research. Recommendations include: make time for visioning, reach joint agreement on research questions, set shared timelines, agree on dissemination methds, agree on ownership of results, be aware of resource limitations, foster good communication, and 'get it in writing'. That these recommendations are drawn from those interviewees who indicated they had had a successful partnership experience may suggest that it is difficult to rectify tensions and resulting problems once they occur.

18. Dumais, L. and S. Vaillencourt (2008). <u>Cues and Tools for fruitful university-community research partnerships</u>. CU Expo 2008, Victoria, BC.
    This is a short powerpoint presentation that reflects on the community-research partnership model evidenced in the cases of ARUC-ES and RQRP-ES. The presentation highlights two key principles to successful partnership: mobilization of researchers and practitioners to combine their knowledge, methods and resources and, shared responsibility throughout all phases. Further the presenters draw special

attention to the need for partnership and planning in knowledge mobilization phases of the research. Lastly, the presenters highlight two area not addressed in the other literature: the need to promote partnership among community groups in research as well between community and university actors and, the need to consider whether different types of research projects (action research, mapping, etc.) benefit differentially from partnership.

19. Fielden, S., M. Rush, et al. (2007). "Key considerations for logic model development in research partnerships: A Canadian case study." <u>Evaluation and Program Planning</u> **30**: 115-124.

> In this paper the authors discuss the development of a logic model to represent a community-university research partnership, in which they were partners. The model includes inputs, program activities, immediate outputs, outcomes and long-term impacts key to a successful partnership. (Further differentiates between predisposing (e.g. positive attitudes towards research and partnership), enabling (e.g. increase skills) and reinforcing (sustained links, career opportunities) outputs). Key considerations in the model's development are discussed in the context of an ongoing research partnership; namely, the complexity of the research partnership, power and accountability, alignment with health promotion policy, and the iterative nature of program design. The limitations of logic models in capturing partnership dynamics are also discussed.

20. Firehock, K. (2003). <u>Protocol and Guidelines for Ethical and Effective Research of Community Based Collaborative Processes</u>. Community Based Collaboratives Research Consortium, Virginia, USA, University of Virginia.

> This guide, produced by the Community Based Collaboratives Research Consortium, it deals with research ethics in community-university partnerships and provides a suggested protocol for this type of research. The guide includes a checklist of factors to address in developing a research agreement with community partners and a number of factors to consider in preparing to conduct the research, develop a research design and, research validity and publication. The importance of a "consensual, negotiated and flexible approach" is stressed.

21. Flicker, S. and B. Savan (2006). <u>A Snapshot of Community Based Research in Canada</u>, Canada, Wellesley Institute.

> This report presents the results of a web-based survey of 308 community members, academics, funders and policy makers involved in the practice of community-based research. The survey results indicate differing degrees of participation between university, community and 'service provider' participants at various stages in the research process, with community representatives reporting the lowest level of involvement overall. The authors also note that resource and time constraints may make it difficult for community partners to participate throughout all statges of the research and that attention to where participation is both possible and desirable is needed. Despite challenges identified in the literature on community university partnerships, survey respondents reported a high overall satisfaction with their partnership experiences.

The report focuses also focuses on institutional barriers to CBR and notes that the two most cited barriers to effective community-university partnerships were: funding issues and lack of appropriate partnership and reward structures within universities. This report also notes that respondents identified a number of positive outcomes associated with CBR, including: increased community capacity, plans for future projects, cordial working relationships, new coalitions, changes in agency programming and changes in government policy.

22. Flicker, S., B. Savan, et al. (2007). "A snapshot of community-based research in Canada: Who? What? Why? How?" <u>Health Education Research</u>. February 25, 2007.
    This article presents a truncated version of the results from the study called *A Snapshot of CBR in Canada.*

23. Gass, E. (2008). Crossing the threshold: Developing a foundation for university-community partnerships. Paper presented at <u>Community-University Exposition 2008</u>. In D. Clover and C. MGregor (eds.) University of Victoria**:** pp. 83-87.
    The author notes that there a few models that address partnership development processes in community university partnerships. The author surveyed participants in active partnerships to examine their perspectives on effective partnership processes. Results show trust, respect, communication, and mutual understanding form the foundation of partnerships, and predict successful partnership progress.

24. Halfon, N. and R. Travis (2003). Multi-university coalitions. <u>Handbook of applied developmental science: Promoting positive child, adolescent, and family development through research, policies, and programs, Vol. 4: Adding value to youth and family development: The engaged university and professional and academic outreach</u> R. M. Lerner, D. Wertlieb and F. Jacobs (eds.). London, Sage Publications. **4:** 115-137.
    This book chapter describes the benefits of multi-university collaboration in community based research. Notes that multi-university collaboration allows universities to share common experiences, best practices and learnings, can help to institutionalize a new relationship between the university and community and, will contribute to the overall sustainability of community-university partnerships by increasing their visibility and legitimacy. Also discusses common barriers to institutional change and methods to overcoming these barriers.

25. Hall, B. T., C., Downing, R. (2009). <u>Funding and development of community university research partnerships in Canada: Evidence-based investment in knowledge, scholarship, innovation and action for Canada's future</u>. Office of Community Based Research, University of Victoria.
    This report provides a 'scan' of the various funding arrangements in place at the levels of government, government-supported agencies, philanthropic and civil society organizations, and universities to support community-university partnerships. The report describes a typology of partnerships by scope (ranging from individual faculty to community relationships that have been created without systematic institutional

support to multi-higher education institution and community partnership to engage in research at a regional, national or international level on an ongoing basis). The report further notes that despite increased support for community-university partnerships "there has been no systematic comprehensive research and knowledge mobilization initiative that focuses on the lessons learned and the application of best practices in community based research in Canada" (p. 13). Lastly, the report concludes with a number of recommendations to funders, including that SSHRC engage stakeholders in a consultation process to inform a policy commitment to community university partnerships in SSHRCs mandate.

While the report identifies various different types of community university partnerships (e.g. community-university research partnerships, community service-learning, extension programs and knowledge mobilization), it does not clearly distinguish the unique policy supports that may be required for each of these types of partnership.

26. Harkavy, I. (1998). School-Community-University Partnerships: Effectively Integrating Community Building and Education Reform. Paper presented at <u>Conference on Connecting Community Building and University Reform: Effective School, Community, University Partnerships</u>. Washington DC.
> These are Harkay's opening remarks to the "Conference on Connecting Community Building and University Reform: Effective School, Community, University Partnerships". The remarks primarily provide a scan of key moments in the history of community engagement by American universities. He notes in particular, the influence of Jane Addams, Dewey and later, Ernest Boyer; the aftermath of Cold War era policies with respect to research and current 'real world' pressures that are "forcing" PSE institutions to "become genuinely civic institutions devoted to solving the pressing problems of our society (p. 21). The author also notes that universities are subject to a number of competing demands that limit their ability to focus on community engagement; key among these is the pressure for 'excellence', still narrowly defined.

27. Hart, A., S. Northmore, et al. (n.d). <u>Audit and evaluation: demonstrating the worth of engagement.</u> Community University Partnership Programme (Cupp), University of Brighton**.**
> This powerpoint presentation compares various U.S. and U.K approaches to evaluating community-university partnerships.

28. Holland, B. (2001). <u>Characteristics of 'Engaged Institutions' and Sustainable Partnerships, and Effective Strategies for Change.</u> Office of University Partnerships, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
> This is a two-page document in which Holland synthesizes much of her previous work into a definition and key characteristics of the 'engaged institution' and 'sustainable partnerships'. Holland defines the 'engaged institution' thusly, "the engaged institution is committed to direct interaction with external constituencies and communities through the mutually-beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, expertise and information. These interactions enrich and expand the

learning and discovery functions of the academic institution while also enhancing community capacity. The work of the engaged campus is responsive to community-identified needs, opportunities, and goals in ways that are appropriate to the campus' mission and academic strengths. The interaction also builds greater public understanding of the role of the campus as a knowledge asset and resource. (p. 1).

Holland identifies several characteristics of 'sustainable partnerships' that may be useful for future CSERP purposes. These characteristics include: joint exploration of separate and common goals and interests; creation of a mutually rewarding shared agenda; articulation of clear expectations, capacities, and consequences for each partner; success measured in both institutional and community terms; shared control of partnership directions, and/or resources; focus on strengths and assets of each partner; identification of opportunities for early success and regular celebration; focus on shared (two-way) learning and capacity building; attention to communications and open cultivation of trust; commitment to continuous assessment of the partnership itself, as well as outcomes.

29. Holland, B., and, Ramaley, Judith (2008). Creating a Supportive Environment for Community-University Engagement: Conceptual Frameworks. <u>Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) Annual Conference</u>

Holland and Ramalay make a distinction between more traditional types of university-community relationships such as, public service, outreach and extension and, 'community engagement'. The former examples, they argue, are important but continue to place the university in the position of expert. Community engagement on the other hand "a distinctive approach to teaching and research" that is characterized by reciprocity and mutual benefit (p. 33). Within a framework of engagement, the community is positioned as 'knowers', as much as the beneficiaries of knowledge.

The authors note that there is a scale of engagement that includes: volunteerism, engaged learning, engaged scholarship, engaged institutions; all of which are necessary. In order to develop engaged relationships with community, the authors note that a number of conditions may be necessary, including: (1) the possibility of reward or benefit for all participants; (2) individual influence and inspired leadership throughout the institution, not just at the top; (3) an institution that is responsive to the needs of the community it serves; (4) educational planning and purposefulness that recognizes the value of active and responsible community service that has a real community impact; (5) a willingness to adopt a shared agenda and a shared resource base over which the institution has only partial control; and finally, (6) the capacity to change" (p. 41). However, the authors do not detail which strategies may be more appropriate to different types of partnership activities (i.e. engaged learning, research, etc.)

Finally, in the last section of the article the authors draw on theories of change in institutions of higher education to argue that a number of different strategies are required, these strategies they classify as routine, strategic and transformational. They conclude with a series of questions for use by institutions seeking to better

understand the current level of, and future potential for, community engagement (p. 46). Some of these questions may be useful in informing evaluation processes for CSERP.

30. Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Institutions. (1999). <u>Returning to our roots: The Engaged institution.</u> Washington, DC, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

> This is the third report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, funded by the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. The Commission defines engagement as "redesigned teaching, research, and extension and service functions that are sympathetically and productively involved with the communities universities serve, however community is defined" (p. 27). Engagement is characterized by two-way partnerships, reciprocal relationships between university and community, and, sharing.
>
> The reports authors draw on 12 institutional portraits the develop 7 characteristics of an 'engaged institution', these are: responsiveness, respect for partners, academic neutrality, accessibility, integrating engagement into institutional mission, coordination, and resource adequacy. The report also includes a 7-part questionnaire based on these characteristics that institutions can draw on to assess their own degree of engagement.

31. Israel, B., A. J. Schulz, et al. (1998). "Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health." <u>Annual Review of Public Health</u> **19**: 173-202.

> This article discusses the key principles of, challenges associated with, and facilitating factors for, CBR. The author identifies the development of CBR as part of a broader epistemological challenge to positivism.
>
> The discussion of challenges and facilitating factors is organized around three broad themes: partnership-related issues, methodological issues and broader social, political, economic, institutional, and cultural issues. Strategies to mitigate or address issues arising in CBR are offered- these may be useful in developing a reflective tool for use by the CSERPs.

32. Lall, N. (2009?). <u>Assessing the Impact of Community-University Research Partnerships: A case study of the Office of Community-Based Research at the University of Victoria</u>. Victoria, Office of Community-based research, University of Victoria.

> This literature review focuses on community-university partnerships that include the activities of research, teaching and service. The literature review documents the need for strategies that evaluate the impact of community-university partnerships and provides an overview of several evaluation models, internationally. The author distinguishes between evaluation, assessment, audit, monitor, and benchmark as different approaches to assessing community university partnership impacts.

33. Lerner, R. M., and Simon, L.K., Ed. (1998). <u>University-Community collaborations for the</u>

twenty-first century. New York, N.Y., Garland Publishing, Inc.

> This is an edited collection that chronicles diverse examples of university-community partnerships in the USA.

34. Lerner, R. M., C. B. Fisher, et al. (2000). "Toward a Science for and of the People: Promoting Civil Society through the Application of Development Science." Child Development **71**(1): 11-20.

> This article discusses Applied Developmental Science as a model of research for child and youth care that can produce important policy-focused outcomes that contribute to the strengthening of civil society. The authors argue this model is uniquely able to contribute to these outcomes by combining the traditional rigour and mixed methods approaches of science and the strength and first hand knowledge of 'community'. ADS is posited as a model of 'outreach scholarship', in which policy development and implementation, and program design and delivery are integral components of the research.

35. Low, D. (2008). "University-Community Engagement: A grid-group analysis." Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement **1**: 107-127.

> This article draws on the study of semiotics to argue that the "the general purpose of university-community engagement is to find ways of linking the new ideas generated by a university into a broader, more complex social system. (p. 124). That is to say that university-community partnerships are always engaged in a process of translation.

36. Maurrasse, D. J. (2001). Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with communities New York, N.Y., Routledge.

> This book considers the historical roots of university-community engagement in the US context, outlines four case studies on community-university partnerships and includes an analytic section comparing the case studies and making several recommendations. The recommendations are largely focused on institution-wide policy amendments needed to support partnership (e.g. funding, tenure). The author identities several factors, key to the success of community-university partnerships: the type of post-secondary institution, historical relationship between the partners, power relations between the institution and the community, the availability of external funding, the capacity of community based institutions and governing structures, the institutional cultural of the college or university, the institutional commitment of the college or university, the backgrounds and demographics of both community and institution.

37. McCall, R., C. Groark, et al. (1998). Challenges of University-Community Outreach to Traditional Research Universities: The university of Pittsburg Office of Child Development Experience. In University-Community Collaborations for the Twenty-First Century: Outreach Scholarship for Youth and Families. R. Lerner and L. A. K. Simon (eds.). New York, Garland**:** 203-230.

> This book chapter discusses the establishment, structure, activities and experiences of the Office of Child Development at the University of Pittsburg. By and large the

article deals with common and previously identified themes (e.g. need for core funding, challenges associated with university reward systems). However, the chapter also includes a short section that discusses some of the benefits and challenges associated with the joint university-community management of the Office. This discussion specifically includes consideration of the challenges of having office co-directors, one drawn from community and one drawn from within the university.

38. McNall, M., Reed, C. S., Brown, R., and, Allen, A. (2008). "Brokering Community-University Engagement." <u>Innovative Higher Education</u> **33**(5): 317-331.

> The authors argue that despite the fairly extensive literature on community-university partnerships, there is little research documenting the "empirical evidence regarding the benefits communities and universities enjoy as a result of engagement" (p. 328). They identify a second gap in the literature concerning the relationship between different partnership processes and positive partnership outcomes. Research into this area is needed, they argue to better support effective partnership practices.
>
> The authors identify five strands in the literature about community-university engagement: (1) universities defining or redefining their engagement missions; (2) community-campus partnerships as a means of enriching the educational experiences of university students (e.g., service learning and internships; (3) universities engaged in community development efforts in partnership with their surrounding neighborhoods; (4) university scholars and community members coming together to address issues of mutual interest (i.e., community-based research and service projects; (5) measurement of the characteristics and consequences of community–university partnership (e.g., group dynamics, degree of collaboration, etc) (p. 319). In this study, the authors are seeking to contribute to the latter strand.
>
> They do so by drawing on a theoretical framework articulated by Schulz (2003) that suggests environmental factors (for e.g. preexisting relationships between partners) influence the structural characteristics and group dynamics of the partnership (e.g. degree of formalization) and that these in turn relate to intermediate and outcome measures of partnership effectiveness (p. 320).

39. Muirhead, B., and, Woolcock, Geoff (2008). "Doing what we know we should: Engaged scholarship and community development." <u>Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement</u> **1**: 9-30.

> Reflects on the experience of the Community Service and Research Centre at the University of Queensland and their role in the Goodna Area Service Integration Project (SIP)- a community development project aimed at better matching up capacity in the human service sector with the regions needs. From this experience the authors conclude that while there are "significant benefits universities and communities that effectively engage with each other, the political will to recognise engaged scholarship as scholarly excellence is constrained by its definition as 'community service'" (p. 27).
>
> In developing the SIP, the author notes partners drew on literature and 'best practices'

in the areas of: place management, service integration, social inclusion/social capital, local governance and network relations. The literature on network governance (cited in the ANSER paper) identifies collaboration among partners as a form of network structure where "the purpose is specific, often complex and usually long-term". Collaboration is seen as a fully integrated activity and the most stable form of partnership.

40. Prins, E. (2006). "Individual roles and approaches to public engagement in a community-university partnership in a rural California town." Journal of Research in Rural Education **21**(7): 1-15.

> The article discusses a university supported community development initiative in a small rural town in the United States. The principle activity of the partnership being a school-university partnership to support a local resource centre.
>
> The author argues that the literature on community-university partnerships depicts each partner uniform and homogenous entities, thereby obscuring the multiple, divergent roles that different actors may play in a partnership. Attention to individuals' roles in partnerships is important because personal interactions contribute to structuring possibilities for future action. The author agues that in her case study, "lack of ongoing university funding and turnover among community and university personnel deterred institutionalization of the partnership" (p. 5) and as a result the individual styles of various partners became increasingly important to the partnership.
>
> The article also discusses the role of 'power' in community-university partnerships, noting that at their best partnerships exemplify the concept of 'power with' (p. 2) but that disparities of power (and often rooted in class, race, gender, status, and institutional power) mean that community partners may find the experience closer to one of 'power over'. Also draws on Stoecker (1999) to note that often the project initiator will retain more power in the relationship regardless of their position as a university or community member, suggesting the importance of policy initiatives that encourage jointly initiated research projects.

41. Reinke, S. J., and, Walker, Ralph H. (2005). Looking for Oz: Reflections on the Journey Towards A University-Community Partnership. Teaching Public Administration Conference.

> In this article Reinke and Walker reflect on the experience of one university MPA program as it became more engaged in the surrounding community. The authors conclude that the programme's attempts in this regard have resulted in 'involvement' in the community but not 'community engagement' per se. The authors draw on the work of Lawson (2002) to make this distinction, noting that involvement refers to individual efforts to engage, while engagement occurs systematically and at the institutional level. The authors argue that is useful to think of institutions as being on a journey toward community engagement rather than assessing the level of engagement at any discrete point in time.
>
> The article has a short but useful literature review.

42. Reitsma-Street, M. "Processes of Community Action Research: Putting Poverty on the Policy Agenda of a Rich Region." <u>Canadian Review of Social Policy</u> (49-50): pp. 69-92.

> In this article, Reitsma-Street describes Community Action Research (CAR) as a values based approach to research. CAR is characterised by ten processes beginning with the decision to join together and carrying through to 'experimenting with actions'. Strong participation between all partners is encouraged throughout the process. Reitsma-Street describes the application of this research process to a community-university research partnership (The Capital Urban Poverty Project) of thirteen partners in Victoria, BC.

43. Ridley, R. G. (2001) Putting the Partnership into public-private partnerships. <u>Bulletin of the World Health Organization</u>

> The introduction to a WHO Bulletin issue that discusses Public-Private-Partnerships (P3s) with the pharmaceutical industry. The author note that an undue amount of emphasis is often placed on concerns about the 'public-private' aspect of P3s with not enough attention given to the role of 'partnership' in P3s. In speaking about P3s the author notes that "partnership implies a commitment to a common goal through the joint provision of complementary resources and expertise, and the joint sharing of the risks involved" (p. 1, note these elements of partnership are ascribe to university and community partners in the ANSER paper, however, it is used differently in the original).

44. Sanderson, K. (2005). <u>Community University Institute for Social Research: Partnering to Build Capacity and Connections in the Community</u>, Saskatoon, SK, Community University Institute for Social Research, University of Saskatchewan.

> This is a self-evaluative report from the Community University Institute for Social Research, University of Saskatchewan, with findings based on data from interviews with community groups, researchers, staff, and CUISR leaders. The report draws on established frameworks for evaluating processes and outcomes in community-based programs and focuses specifically on six principles of process (inclusiveness, accessibility, transparency, mutual learning, adaptability and collective vision) and several identified desirable outcomes and impacts (including CUISRs contribution to the following capacities: to create change to Create and Maintain a Vital Civic Culture, to Maintain and Enhance Economic Vitality, to take Control and Responsibility for Processes).

45. Shragge, E., J. Hanley, et al. (2006). Community University Research Partnerships: A Critical Reflection and an Alternative Experience. Presented at the <u>Annual Conference of the Research Network on Work and Lifelong Learning (WALL)</u>.

> In this article Shragge reflects on his experience working as part of a SSHRC-funded CURA with the Immigrant Workers Centre in Montreal. Shragge discusses power imbalances existing between community and university partners; imbalances that are supported by existing research funding policies. Shragge asks how can research partnerships be built on principles of equality and mutual interest and suggests some policy directions to support these principles.

46. Stoecker, R. (1999). "Are academics irrelevant? Roles for scholars in participatory research." <u>American Behavioural Scientist</u> **42**(5): 840-854.

> Stocker argues that academics general adopt one of three roles in community-based research: initiator, consultant or, collaborator. All of these positions are fraught with challenges and limitations in part because they conceive of the research project as the main goal. Instead Stoecker encourages us to think of CBR as one part of a larger project of community organizing or development. Stoecker encourages that we ask three questions when we enter a CBR project: what is the project trying to do? What are your skills? How much participation does the community need and want? On the last point, Stoecker challenges idea that maximum participation is always the best approach and acknowledges that there can be a trade off between efficiency and democracy. He stresses however, that it is important for community to decide which key decision points they want/need to be involved with.

47. Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies. (2003). <u>Ethical Principles for the Conduct of Research in the North</u>. Ottawa, Ontario, Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies.

> This document outlines 20 principles to be respected in conducting research in the North of Canada. Partnership is the key component of the principles and (is hoped to be of) Northern research more generally. The guidelines include principles of mutual respect and trust, community consultation, informed consent, respect for local culture and language, etc.

48. Temple J., S. A., and, Delaforce W. (2005). AUCEA: An Emerging Collaborative and Strategic Approach Dedicated to University Community Engagement in Australia. <u>International Conference on Engaging Communities</u>. Brisbane, Australia.

> These conference remarks outline the vision and organisation of the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (AUCEA). The remarks point the importance of a national body specializing in community-university engagement in facilitating communication and infrastructure for these partnerships. AUCEA is involved in an initiative to develop a national benchmarking program for community engagement.

49. Toof, R. (2006). <u>Indicators of Community-University Engagement: Comparing University of Massachusetts Lowell with Five Peer Institutions</u>. UML Community Engagement Indicators Peer Analysis. Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts Lowell.

> This report provides the findings of a study undertaken by University of Massachusetts Lowell's Community University Advisory Board that compares the degree of community-university engagement at UMass Lowell to five other 'peer institutions'. The author draws on a review of the literature and on the Campus Compact Indicators of Engagement Project to develop a list of categories and indicators for the study. The four categories considered were—administration, communication, service learning and outreach, and 'community voice'. Indicators were assigned a numerical value and points awarded based on the extent to which each institution met the indicator.

50. Tremblay, C. (n.d.). <u>Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) as a tool for empowerment and public policy</u>. Office of Community-based Research, University of Victoria.

> This article discusses community-based participatory research (CBPR) as a methodological approach. The article focuses on the potential for CBPR to contribute to community-capacity building, engagement, empowerment, and democracy.

51. Vaillancourt, Y. (2005). <u>Democratizing Knowledge: Research Experiments based on University-Community Partnerships</u>. Prepared for the Carold Institute's Building Local Global Democracy Project.

> In this paper Vaillancourt reflects on the 'practices of partnership' in three community-university partnerships: Services aux collectivités (SAC) of UQAM, Laboratoire de recherche sur les pratiques et les politiques sociales, (LAREPPS) and the CURA on the Social Economy, (CURA-SE). Vaillancourt argue that this type of partnership is one way to 'democratize knowledge'. Vaillancourt notes that the partnership between community members and academics is not a new phenomenon, however, the *institutionalization of the practice* in Canada is relatively new. The paper discusses the positive aspects of engaging this type of research as well as several challenges (e.g. tensions arising when partner is also subject of an evaluation, need to maintain a sense of 'researcher independence, tensions arising from 'touchy' findings, etc.) that have arisen in these partnership examples.

52. Walsh, D. and R. Annis (2003). <u>Exploring University-Community Relations: The case of Brandon University's Community Outreach Service.</u> Presented at The Changing and Complementary Role of the University in the Rural Sector: The Future of Rural Peoples: Rural Economy, Health People, Environment, Rural Communities. Saskatoon, SK., University of Saskatchewan.

> This paper examines the example of the Brandon University Community Outreach Service (COS) as a vehicle to facilitate community-university relationships. The various activities of the COS are located along a Community-University Engagement Continuum.