Community-Campus Partnership for Tomorrow
Breakout Session I

Facilitator: Jesse White
Note-taker: Claire Lorch

Attendees:

Debashis Aikat	Victor Marshall
Harriet Boone	Polly Mitchell-Guthrie
Jim DeCristo	Ted Morris
Dottie Holland	Gary Pollack
Tom Kelley	Tom Ricketts
Darcy Lear	Christy Silbajoris
Jennifer Leeman	Marie Weil

1. How should we define community? What process should we use for selecting the community? What criteria should we use? Should we work in more than one community as a part of the pilot?

   - The group wanted to know right from the start about the timeline and concluded if it is not more than a year, CCPT is not worth doing. *(Mike Smith was able to clarify this point and indicated that this would be a multi-year commitment.)*
   - There seemed to be consensus that we should identify at least two communities, if not three. Perhaps, one community where we have strong ties and one where we don't. It was also suggested that we consider one community located in the east, one in the west and one close by, so that it will be accessible to student involvement.
   - We may want to consider a community in the northeast because there is not a lot of university involvement in that region of the state.
   - We need to be sure the process of identifying a community will not leave out disenfranchised groups. We don't want to find ourselves just working with the good ol' boys.
   - We also need to be sure we include the community's youth as part of the conversation.
   - It may make sense to identify a county to work with because of the political structure they provide, in addition to the all of the services-health, social, mental health, etc. which may be natural partners.
   - We could also choose a smaller community in addition to a county.
   - The group also discussed where on the spectrum of distressed communities we should focus our efforts on. There seemed to be a consensus to select two communities on different ends of the spectrum as long as there is a decent chance of succeeding.
   - A point was made that communities need to select Carolina, not just the other way around.
   - There was caution expressed in using an application process because there will always be losers.

1

- The group agreed that whatever community we select, we make a point to connect with the grassroots organizations.
- We need to be prepared to consider big issues, such as race.

2. What will success look like at the end of our work with a community? What might it look like from the community perspective? What might it look like from the campus perspective?

- We need to be very cautious about defining success without the community partners at the table.
- Success from the community's perspective may be that the University has delivered.
- We determined that success will be defined differently throughout the project. Initially, it may be that there is a trusting relationship between the community and university partners.
- Some successes, such as social capital may be hard to quantify.
- Success for faculty and staff will be an appropriate reward for their efforts which will likely mean a change in the reward system.
- May want to change the question from "What will success **with** a community look like?" to "What will success **in** a community look like?"
- We decided that whatever we take on, it should be sustainable.
- We need to figure out how to bring money into communities—fundraising partnerships for sustainability.
- We may want to consider whether or not a community has sustainable funding sources in the selection process. (For instance, Caswell County is an eligible recipient of grant funds from a new foundation in Danville headed by a Carolina alum.)

3. What are the risks to be avoided in this project? What factors must be present for success?
- We can't go in to a Community with a prescribed research agenda. We will need to persuade faculty that this is a long term strategy and that it may take some time before we will be able to do any traditional research.
- We need to be inclusive.
- There needs to be the potential for sustainable funding.
- We need to be sensitive to turf issues with other universities.
- We need to avoid making a Community overly dependent on the University. The Community must have capacity and self-confidence.

4. What process should we consider using to involve members of the community in the partnership?
- We may want to consider using students to develop a communication plan. School of Journalism students are already doing this.
- We could review the community assessments prepared by School of Public Health's Health Behavior Health Education students to find out who the gatekeepers are.
- We could do a series of focus groups/town meetings.
- We could tap into faculty, staff, and students who already have connections to the community to get their ideas.
- It may be important to start off talking with discreet groups before brining everyone together in order to get different points of view.

5. What process should we use for involving campus partners in this project? How do we involve people in the process of identifying the community's interests? How do we involve people in helping to address community needs once they have been identified?

- The group seemed to feel that an interdisciplinary effort at UNC and sister institutions will be essential.
- It would be helpful if a place-based data base existed.   Andy Johns is creating a database using Ramses that will profile research being conducted.

6. What conditions must be present for you to be actively involved in this project? Community members? Faculty? Staff? Students?
   - Financial resources is a key condition.
   - We need to get buy-in from faculty member's chair, etc.
   - We should start by focusing on service to the community and focus on research later but we cannot be blind to the headwinds of tenure.
   - We may need to redefine research so that it includes community-based research.
   - It was suggested that we need to create a group (that might include faculty from other universities as well), a new professional climate, and a journal where faculty can get credit for this type of work.
   - It was pointed out that many faculty may not have the expertise to evaluate community-based research.
   - If we want Centers and Institutes to be involved, they will need the necessary resources.   They may be a sourse of key partners.

7. Can you identify similar projects from this campus or from any other organization that might provide useful guidance in developing this project and share the lessons learned? Can you identify other people with relevant experience who might provide helpful guidance?
   - HPDP's work in Sampson and Duplin Counties
   - School of Education- Research Triangle Schools Partnership
   - CIRA-Center for Integrating Research and Action
   - School of Nursing- Mulit-institutional Center working with HBCU's
   - Dept of City and Regional Planning; Bill Rohe's "Urban Revitalization" students work with community partners
   - Working Group on Economic Development
   - Translational Research
   - School of Government's workshops, and projects in Cumberland County and the Fayetteville area and in Greene County
   - MDC's work through the Duke Endowment program in distressed counties
   - State Department of Commerce's 21st Century Communities

For the Plenary Session: Top two critical points from your discussion for us to keep in mind as we develop the CCPT.

1. Success cannot be defined without the all of the partners at the table. In the first phrase of this process, success may well be developing a trusting relationship between the Community and the University.
2. Resources, rewards and the internal structure must be in place in order for Carolina to do this work over time. There must be tangible benefits to the Community and to faculty, staff and students for everyone to be willing to take these risks.