

Community-Campus Partnership for Tomorrow
July 30, 2008

Additional Written Feedback

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?

- Multiple ways to define community – town, county, region. A single town may offer less difficult to organize. However, county or region of counties offers greater “resources”/involvement for both citizens and campus. A region can be drawn around several areas of NC comprised of Tier 1 counties. The process for selecting must involve community folks as real partner. Criteria to include 1) need of community, 2) desire of community, 3) prior relationship with UNC, 4) geographic location.
- State committed to UNC-T? Geographic community, already committed to a project somewhere, understand community issues, use money to advertise town meetings – mayors. Needs? Realistic to do? Resources? Focus Tier 1? Golden Leaf. Chapel Hill can't do it alone. United Way – companies (along the way- not up front).
- Build enduring partnerships, respect continuity, urban and rural sites – Tier 1 designation is only rural. Not necessarily geographical definition of community.
- When I think of improving things for tomorrow, education seems to be an important factor. Is there a way to tap into efforts already underway (Earn and Learn, etc.)
- Consider existing UNC projects with community partnerships to take advantage of relationships and trust that have already been built.
- Criteria: use some existing relationships
- Consider two pilot sites using data re: public health, etc.
- At what point is it no longer considered a pilot and it starts being replicated (if it works)?
- Talk to: NC Center for Nonprofits, NC Public School Forum, NC Assn. of County Commissioners, NC League of Municipalities.
- For selection, don't use an application or call for proposals. Narrow the universe of communities, then inquire further using social/professional networks; take an anthropological approach, taking advantage of the ties that faculty, staff and students already have to those communities.
- Start with a region.
- The place where we live – our home, our work, our play, where we shop, our schools, our businesses. Community is where a group comes together normally in physical proximity.
- Select two areas of the state.
- Ask communities to define themselves.
- Use a selection process that invites expressions of interest from communities.
- Develop selection criteria and publicize these in RFP. Decide on number of communities based on submissions – be flexible.
- Geographic location relative to Chapel Hill – should be convenient to campus
- Diverse – reflective of the state in its challenges if not its demographics
- Use government boundaries (county, municipality) because of established structures, clearly identified leaders, established data sets, etc

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?

- Success must include sustained relationships between community and campus. Better quality of life for all citizens of community.

- Ask the people. Quality of life improved? Pilot to produce replicated and sustained program – duplicate. Inter-institutional collaboration. Collaboration with community colleges. All aspects of community – help needed – greater access to Chapel Hill and its resources. Cut across silos. Concrete exams – betters schools, increased college going rate, better healthcare.
- Capacity incorporated in communities and improved quality of life. Involve students across disciplines and faculty. Include scholarship of engagement. Reward faculty who work on this.
- Empowered and engaged citizens. I know this sounds very broad. Communities could determine specific projects but could we develop a community model of educating and engaging citizens (especially students) to improve and guide their own lives/communities (Paolo Friere)
- Depends on what you say you want to accomplish!
- Are you looking at measurable or anecdotal evidence? If you're using data on education, health, etc., as criteria, you'd want to use these as indicators of success.
- We shouldn't even try to articulate "success" until our community partners are involved.
- Partnerships/ collaborations are established for the long-term between universities, community colleges, communities. The community embraces the presence of faculty/ staff/ students involved in assisting to resolve their problem.
- Campus silos (?) come down and people are working together to engage appropriately (without politics) with the chosen communities.
- Community has moved in the direction it defined as goal and has developed the capacity to keep on moving forward.
- Improvements are sustainable
- Measurement is designed into the project and is ongoing.
- Lessons learned are disseminated throughout the state.
- Will produce measurable outcomes to address rising challenges that are present throughout NC communities.
- Can be replicated in other communities
- Increases coordination/communication across campus silos.
- Cross-departmental ongoing partnerships
- Builds capacity in community to move forward.
- Clear identification of community priorities and solutions.
- Community ownership of ongoing community transformation.
- Template for replicating partnerships with other communities.

3. What are the risks to be avoided in this project? What factors must be present for success?

- Failure to provide support needed. Failure to partner with community.
- Too much emphasis on Chapel Hill, didn't actually help people, come in on white horse. Talk to people – what do they need – not what we think they need. Staff needing too much recognition – this is not the focus.
- Forgetting existing partners. Doing "add-on" programs that aren't integral to UNC. Not respecting community as central. Listening well. Sustaining partnerships is critical.
- Selection process becomes part of public criticism. Ongoing evaluation process and feedback loop as partnership can be organic and there is a means to inform future work.
- Who's driving the agenda: UNC or the communities?
- Raising expectations and then not meeting them.
- Be sure the community wants us there. The people interacting with the community need to be well-trained with exceptional people skills.
- Caution with making the partners look like a research project.
- Don't over commit.
- That faculty does its thing, rather than what the community needs.
- That the community fails to come together to work together on common goals.

- Lack of buy-in from selected community.
- Resentment from other communities.
- Lack of sustainability.
- Lack of measurable outcomes – creates projects that can be effective but are not sustainable.
- ‘who gets credit?’
- University telling community what they need instead of listening to them.
- Don’t do a report that doesn’t get implemented.
- Need benchmarks along the way.

4. What process should we consider using to involve members of the community in the partnership?

- Look at process used by HPDF, Public Health, Child Development Institute, RENCI
- Use students, all 16 campuses, public interest meetings, needs identified. Town hall/mayors/Board of health meetings
- Community advisory boards, leadership councils, need to engage community before selection is made.
- Don’t make assumptions about who wants to be involved. Provide means to involve people (e.g. send out school buses to pick up parents who don’t have transportation, etc.)
- You need to travel to the tier 1 counties and hold similar meetings, inviting key folks whom you would need for a successful partnership – school superintendents, mayors, county commissioners, principals, public health officials, soil and water folks, etc.
- Snowball selection: taking advantage of existing social and professional networks. Don’t rely on the usual suspects—county commissioners, legislative delegation, mayors, chambers of commerce—to identify participants.
- Depends on the community. Talk with folks on campus who are already working with the selected community.
- Perhaps hold town hall meetings.
- Create a communication plan that is structured to involve the players and tasks that need to take place.
- Inform and invite communities to submit proposals from diverse, representative “steering committees.”
- Facilitate discussions like today with organizations that represent community groups/nonprofits.
- Stakeholder ID – not just the usual suspects.

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?

- Today starts the process. All should be offered opportunity to partner.
- Involve AHEC regions, focus on places we already have relationships with.
- Bring together UNC people currently working on community projects to learn from them and their experiences.
- Be open. Small, diverse, but open group to be involved.
- Diversity of faculty/staff/student participants
- Identify existing good partnerships
- Facilitate development of interdisciplinary teams. Have small teams on the ground who act as liasons to main campus.
- Provide facilitators (pt. 3 of question)
- Broad appeal to campus partners.

6. What conditions must be present for you to be actively involved in this project? Community members? Faculty? Staff? Students?

- Resources to make partnership work. Recognition by campus/school as to importance/quality of efforts.
- Buy-in from all 16 campuses.
- Needs to be genuine and community must come first. Outcomes must be measurable and tangible.
- A separate description of related work – Tar Heel blue in color – issued by Mike’s office and placed in my tenure/ promotion file.
- Resources, campus recognition.
- If mass media involved as partners, JOMC can help educate/train journalists via ‘webinars’, a low cost accessible method.
- Training on how to approach work with communities
- Clear communications mechanisms and leadership.
- Support for doing the work from our departments.

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?

- Many have been identified in our UNC-T initial response.
- AHEC, ECHO programs, Project East (Giselle Corbie-Smith), Tri-county community health center/Golden Leaf project
- FPG has several projects that are partnerships with NC communities.
- The Duke Endowment had a rural initiative a few years ago. Leslie Boney can offer more details.
- South Carolina is in the process of piloting the Rural Area Leadership Initiative (RALI) that does capacity building among leaders in three poor rural counties and then provides funding and support for community development ideas that those leaders generate. I believe RALI is run out of Francis Marion University.
- Wilson 20/20 (SOG) Rick Morse
- Cooperative Extension
- Institute of Health
- SBTDC
- RENCI
- SPH

Top Two Critical Points:

- Need for true partnership between community and campus. Development of appropriate recognition/reward of faculty, staff, student, efforts.
- UNC’s assets match community needs (including health care). Proximity is good/must have physical presence – select more than one pilot community site that are close
- Multidisciplinary model that could be used in any community. Strong education component – including children.
- Must have integrated communications plan at both the university and community level. Listening to community.
- There must be a realistic time horizon. Seems to me that it will require five years or more to accomplish anything meaningful.
- Ensure that true partnerships with all involved are made.
- Base on realistic expectations.
- Don’t start too big – keep initial pilot effort manageable
- Manage expectations from the start and remain focused on UNC mission – don’t over promise
- Pilot must be applicable and sustainable to/in other NC counties.

Other suggestions/comments regarding CCPT:

- Strive for involvement of all
- The “only Tier 1” community decision is a problem – rules out urban areas. Communities are not counties. Look for ability to have citizen participation. There will need to be coordination and oversight.
- In whatever communities the CCPT identifies, make a substantial pot of money available to support community-based projects identified and managed by members of that community.
- Avoid terminology of University-led “needs assessments.” Consider opening with asset mapping instead.
- Make sure transportation from UNC-CH is funded.
- Make sure who’s going into the community/ communities have great human interaction skills, are good listeners, good communicators, etc.
- Involve other campuses with media outreach
- Build on existing successful programs/projects and create broader synergy to expand campus impact.

**Community-Campus Partnership for Tomorrow
July 30, 2008**

**GROUP C
Written Feedback Prior to Discussion**

**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?**

- Since we are working in disadvantaged places, community may not be defined by formal means (e.g. political jurisdictions like county, city, town, etc.). We should be looking for informal ties that link a community together. Informal networks can be defined by church congregations, neighborhood, development/planning work, community centers, etc.
- We should not define community. Let the community define itself. Process should hinge on community readiness, but include site visits. Tier 1, history of outside investment, partner organizations, willingness to invest own resources, commitment to change. Need at least two – one in east and one in west.
- Depends on methodology and questions to be answered. Multiple ways (on basis of geography, problem or need, *i.e.*, need for specialized services like immigrants who are geographically dispersed). Initially select based on our sense of who we can effectively partner with. We should do multiple pilots.
- Near enough for frequent contact, pull with adjacent counties, driving time is key – 90 minutes at the most, pick a county/community that can spill over to adjacent Tier 1s.
- A community does not have to be defined spatially. The community of people with disabilities are in every county in the state as baby boomers age the community will expand.
- Geography, common interest, shared concerns. The community should embody traits that are common across the state and face common problems. Do three communities instead of one chosen as examples of specific problems that beset a variety of locales.
- Selection criteria should include opportunities for involvement by all parts of campus (graduate students, undergraduate students, faculty, staff) and all aspects (research, service, teaching) in meaningful ways. Should have several communities to avoid “overload” of too much attention (*i.e.* Siler City issue), selection of community should include opportunities for diverse groups to be involved (occupationally, racially, socio-economically, etc.). Community should want to partner with us.
- Community should be defined by the community. Could be single jurisdiction, multiple, whole county, multiple counties. We should have an application process where communities lay out their readiness (in addition to need). We should weight heavily the readiness aspects. I think starting with two communities would be best.
- Community = county but could depend on priorities – as the community needed to address a particular need, may cross counties. Start in one community, develop and refine process, figure out sustainability, then offer to other communities. Criteria: voluntary participation, current efforts in that community to address priorities, gives CCPT something to build on.
- Community can be defined as problem(s) of interest so CCPT may not have to have geographic boundaries. Process: identify community contacts in Tier 1 counties already engaged with faculty and students but in need of stronger, more comprehensive partnerships. Need to define team members engaged with pilot and then determine if more than one community depending on community desire for involvement as active partner.

- Let community define community – they know who should be at the table. Listen and learn from community. Will depend on problem. Get movers/shakers at task. A pilot needs a quick success that can be replicated at a bigger scale. Tier 1 county is county unit? Need region?

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?

- Two forms of success.
 - o First, improve the strength of relationships within the community and extended beyond the community. Stronger partnerships and trust are essential for sustainable community change.
 - o Second, substantive outcomes are essential in terms of better educational programs, disaster preparedness, improved drinking water quality, and so forth. These outcomes are defined by the community.
- Avoid use of this word (success). Start project, go for a while, look back, talk about what has changed, celebrate good changes.
- Success will look like a series of additional “informing” questions. Although I am not sure we can imagine our work having an end. In fact success will have a distinctive quality of continuity – one of the areas institutions sometimes don’t do well – so from both sides success will necessarily include a refined process for implementing activities.
- Really need the community to tell us what success is for them.
- For us, a home run would be some advance in the research agenda, new avenues to support research in a number of fields.
- The assumption the service has to pay for itself with research projects. Funding limits what we can do. Have to do what funder wants, on funder’s schedule, instead of what community needs. We don’t teach under those rules, why should we serve that way?
- Having a self-perpetuating process in place, having residents who understand and support the endeavor.
- From campus perspective: grad student dissertation projects, undergrad service-learning, faculty applied research grants and publications, staff service project connections. Community should define success for themselves and feel satisfied with interaction. Outcome is sustainable.
- Success would be that a community has realized its vision. That the CCPT was instrumental in that outcome, yet by that point is less necessary because the community has developed capacity along the way. From the campus perspective, I’d say high level of involvement, across campus and a strong research element (*i.e.* faculty able to publish elements of work).
- Positive changes in targeted community with ability to sustain; process developed refined for continuing this service; other communities asking for CCPT involvement.
- Success: improved outcomes as defined by community, could be lower high school dropouts, decrease in gang activity, increase in employment, increase in neighborhood changes to promote health, increased access to health care services, decrease in teacher turnover (shortage, etc.), sustainability. Campus success: increased interest in this work by faculty, opportunity for student involvement, CPAR grants, scholarly products.
- Community perspective: meeting defined community outcomes will be a success but involvement needs to be sustainable, not some fly-by Carolina initiative. Campus perspective: Erskine Bowles is happy, new research data, ideas for research, credit, statewide recognition (especially by General Assembly) of university’s successful engagement.

3. What are the risks to be avoided in this project? What factors must be present for success?

- We at UNC must not assume that the communities are poor, weak and helpless victims of their circumstances. They should be viewed as capable partners with assets to effectuate change.
- Over promising. Pitting counties/regions against each other, creating dependency

- Prematurely defining what success looks like, inaccurate description of partnership, inflexible definitions of terms like “community.”
- Small number of UNC participants, the usual suspects, community hates us because we don’t listen for success, some advance for research.
- Doing the same old thing.
- Risk of top-down management. Lack of strong investment by stakeholders. Success = strong buy-in from the folks who will do all the heavy lifting and perpetuate the program.
- Community “burn out” from too much attention, faculty “burn out” if they don’t get “credit” from involvement, making enemies (especially with a fast timeline) from not developing relationships/trust, unclear expectations, misunderstandings
- Political minefields. Success will require a thoughtful and open selection process, a very good visioning process to begin with, and that CCPT efforts are vision-driven and not campus driven.
- Risks: going in like “know-it-all,” expecting a community will want our help, not taking time to develop relationships in the community – without that we can do nothing. For success: buy-in from the community, stakeholders must want us there, must determine what CCPT is offering, collaborative consultation?
- Unclear project expectations in terms of workload. Need committed partners willing to put in lots of time with the project as it’s very time consuming! Risk: loss of trust, creating dependency, lack of sustainability, lack of capacity building among both partners (community and campus).
- Academic arrogance, not listening, thinking we know better, not truly respecting partners, not walking the walk, lack of continued commitment. Success = rewarding these efforts appropriately within university, open-mindedness, leadership should be good facilitators.

4. What process should we consider using to involve members of the community in the partnership?

- This is a sensitive matter. The process should be all about building trust. UNC needs to identify “trust agents” within the community who also act as leaders. We need to find intermediary individuals who have considerable ability in trust building and working with trust agents. The contemporary term for those individuals is “coach.”
- Many options here, must be inclusive, open, authentic, convenient, comfortable, free.
- Local steering committee, broadly representative.
- Reach out to existing communities and organizations – churches, civic clubs, etc.
- Use some existing structures but reach beyond to include less “powerful” via informal networks, etc.
- Stakeholder committee to guide effort. Vision proves upfront to establish vision and goals for the effort overall. Action teams to work with specific campus projects.
- Start with existing infrastructure related to priorities and expand to include diverse stakeholders.
- Key member interviews; focus groups/community meetings in various locations/time; committed community leaders identified from faculty/student contacts; offering partnerships to community; invited to initiate a partnership with campus.
- Ask community through different forums, who should be involved get key players, movers/shakers at table.

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?

- We have some expertise at UNC where there is knowledge and skills on how to build partnerships within disadvantaged communities. However, many faculty and students have considerable skills/knowledge that could be of great use to the community but do not have the training in partnership building (listening, communicating, consensus building, etc.) in disadvantaged communities.
- Identify specific project needs.

- Coalition of the willing, encouraged by research dollars. Tie research grants to some “give back” component, to be designed with steering committee.
- Deans have to commit resources
- Start by listening to community then find mutual interests with campus partners through communication of what campus has to offer and our interests in this, find mutual interests
- Again should start with visioning process. This would be broad-based, inclusive projects of identifying interests, goals, priorities for future.
- I have been told that there are people who know how to do this, how to get the right people at the table to begin these conversations
- Look at community-defined issue from interdisciplinary perspective. Make the sociologists work with the economists, make the health policy workers work beyond SPH, involve people who understand public policy, engagement, reward faculty and staff for doing it. Are there substantive areas of interest from previous UNC Tomorrow work to date – health, education. Will we prioritize or will priorities bubble up organically from community?

6. What conditions must be present for you to be actively involved in this project? Community members? Faculty? Staff? Students?

- I have a long and deep involvement in dealing with disaster preparedness/recovery, water, environment. I would enjoy being involved and applying some of the resources at the Institute for the Environment. Another important condition would be to work with MDC and John Cooper. MDC and UNC Institute for the Environment has been working for four years in disadvantaged settings. (Philip Berke, pberke@email.unc.edu).
- Graduate and undergraduate students are cleared to go already. Driving time is key to continual efforts. University coordinator with support from the top.
- Some way I can contribute. Support. (Gary Bishop, gb@cs.unc.edu).
- Support from the top to enable faculty to take time to participate and give appropriate “credits” to involvement for tenure and promotion, etc. Move outside “silos” to work interdisciplinary.
- Coordinating council or committee on campus with on-the-ground, full-time coordinator/mediator/liaison that connects campus and community.
- Faculty: administrative support, time, possibly money for expenses. Students: may need support for logistics.
- Deans/administrators need to give workload release for engaged scholarship and faculty involvement. Promotion and tenure considerations.
- Coordinating committee – workload release/expectations, consider MOA with expectations written. Need trusting relationships, time, patience.
- Release, cover part of my salary, make me part of a dynamic team with strong leadership, make this rewarded and respected in the same way that having publications in peer reviewed journals is. Reward service.

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?

- UNC Institute for the Environment and MDC (of Chapel Hill) have been working for 4 years in 7 deeply disadvantaged communities with high risk to extreme environmental events. John Cooper (MDC) and Phil Berke (Institute for Environment) are the key leaders in this project. (Philip Berke, pberke@email.unc.edu).
- Look at Danville regional foundation for transformative model, learn from Golden LEAF experience (not all successful).
- Center for Literacy and Disability studies.

- Dress for Success.
- AHEC, graduate students who do community based research with intensive participatory methods have built partnerships over numerous years. Alumni may be great connectors with communities.
- ESLARP, Ken Readorn (Cornell), Roz Lasker – Rick Morse, rmorse@sog.unc.edu.
- Partnerships: East Tennessee State University, Kellogg, community was involved in this with a number of other Kellogg supported universities (UNM/El Paso, Boston, etc.), involved community in projects related to education and economic development (Sonda Oppewal).
- Lots of stuff at Sheps Center, AHEC is a good model.

Top Two Critical Points:

- Faculty have to make some room for others – community, students, staff, didn't happen in Spring 2008.
- Identify mutual interests, via community process, listening with interdisciplinary skills.
- Need to begin with some kind of visioning process – asset-based, and have that guide the process, need coordinating committees in community and campus (or together as one?).

Other suggestions/comments regarding CCPT:

- Community visioning process could really be valuable in starting off, lead to local steering committee
- Identifying successful examples of previous projects beyond UNC and examples of other places.
- CCPT has to be able to define what it is we're offering communities.