

CHAPTER 7

Building Sustainable Community/University Partnerships in a Metropolitan Setting*

*Alan Bloomgarden, Mary Bombardier,
Myrna M. Breitbart, Kiara Nagel,
and Preston H. Smith II*

The Pioneer Valley in Western Massachusetts is home to the Five College consortium, which includes three small private liberal arts colleges, Amherst, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges; an innovative and experimental institution, Hampshire College; and the state's flagship campus, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. For nearly 40 years, the consortium has served as a vehicle for collaboration and resource sharing among the five colleges, including in the field of community-based learning (CBL).

Interest in CBL intensified locally and nationally in the mid-1980s. Individual faculty and staff at each of the colleges began to adopt CBL into their teaching, research, and community service in the Pioneer Valley. Since each of the schools brings a unique culture and set of resources to community outreach and practice, the nature of conversations and the infrastructures developed to support such work looked very different from campus to campus. In 1995, the Five College CBL Committee, composed of faculty and directors of CBL programs, was formed to jointly gain more visibility and legitimacy for CBL work on the campuses and to address the weaknesses that prevented the work from having the most positive and sustainable impact on community needs.

*The authors express their gratitude to Sara Littlecrow Russell for her editorial contributions to this chapter.

Although some reciprocal projects had been created over the years between the area colleges and community organizations, up to that point the majority of relationships were imbalanced, providing more benefits to student learning and college public relations than to community organizations. Community partners faced constant requests from colleges for research sites, short-term internships or orientations to the community, yet our institutions remained ill-prepared and ill-equipped to respond to requests for sustained assistance. Poor communication among the colleges duplicated efforts and demanded even more from already overburdened community organizations.

In its first years, the CBL Committee hosted several faculty workshops, introducing concepts and successful models in CBL to encourage more faculty members to get involved and to foster relationships among them and non-profit leaders. In 1999-2000, Hampshire College hosted a Five College seminar funded by the Teagle Foundation, providing course development grants for faculty at all five institutions. Collaborative facilitation and teaching in the seminar helped to solidify common goals, yield future projects, and foster community/campus dialogue. In January 2001, a forum that was specially designed to further dialogue featured Ken Reardon, a professor of urban planning at Cornell University who has done groundbreaking work in this field (Reardon, 1994, 1998).

More than 50 community leaders came to Hampshire College's events venue, the Red Barn, to share with an equal number of faculty and staff from the colleges the message to "get our act together" with regard to collaboration. Carlos Vega of Nueva Esperanza, a community development corporation in Holyoke, recounted how he had spent many hours being interviewed by students not connected with each other or each other's work, who time and again reinvented their inquiry into Holyoke's history and the city's Latino community. While he generously provided the students with time as a long-term investment in his organization's relationship with the area colleges, when he asked the students for their papers at the end of the semester, "about half of them gave me the paper and the other half, I never saw again." Participants in the forum responded by calling for the design of more efficient and effective means of college and community interaction and greater transparency in the processes and opportunities for accessing college resources, such as internships, faculty research, and collaborative grants. We asked Nueva Esperanza and other community-based organizations (CBO's) how we might make better use of student research hours for community needs, without compromising students' achievement of their academic goals. Could such processes simultaneously value and strengthen the knowledge and skills of community leaders? Could we find ways to better coordinate the CBL efforts for a higher degree of community benefit? Ultimately, we were led to question what we were seeking to achieve by this college/community collaboration.

COMMUNITY/COLLEGE PARTNERSHIPS: GUIDANCE FROM THE LITERATURE

Much of the literature on college/community partnerships begins by defending and promoting the idea of an “engaged” institution of higher learning and the practice of “civic responsibility” as an *institutional* rather than individual obligation to enhance community capacity (Dugery & Knowles, 2003; Holland, 2001; Ramaley, 2000). If one of the aims of a partnership is to enhance community capacity, we would ask, “capacity to do what?” Is the goal to enable community partners to enter more effectively into service-learning partnerships with institutions of higher learning or to meet some other criteria with respect to addressing critical local needs? Are those goals mutually exclusive or dependent upon one another? Literature on community/college partnerships is rarely explicit about the goals (suggesting mainly that partners agree on them). Yet goals can range from creating opportunities for students and faculty to become better citizens while communities better understand their problems, to striving for full-scale societal change and social justice.

Although there is little attention focused on specific goals, partnership literature does identify institutional practices that both create obstacles to and further college-community relationships (see for example, Leiderman et al., 2003; Perkins & Wandersman, 1990; Silka, 2001). For example, academic cultures that marginalize applied research and learning outside the classroom and the distinct cultures of institutions of higher education and the communities that surround them, are frequently cited as obstacles (Ramaley, 2000; Sandmann & Baker-Clark, 1997). Focusing our attention on the power and resource discrepancies between academic institutions and community entities, Compton critiques this idea of borders, believing that it obscures recognition of unequal distributions of resources and power among partners (2003, pp. 10-11).

Based on Cruz and Giles’ understanding of partnerships as a means to a larger end—greater social justice—one of our goals is to increase community access to resources to address the inequities in resource distribution between colleges and community-based organizations serving low-income populations. Resonant with Cruz and Giles, we assess the success of partnerships by asking two key questions: Is the service, the learning, or the ability to address local needs better because of the partnership? And has the community identified more assets and acquired greater access to resources (Cruz & Giles, 2000, p. 31)? By attempting to correct the imbalance of resources in our partnership relationships, we consider how participatory regional community development might enable a community-defined agenda to emerge and accommodate diverse priorities among our CBO partners and among our diverse institutions of higher education.

Much of the literature focuses on markers of good CBL practice, such as relationship and trust building at all stages of the process (but especially in the

earliest stage of partnership development); shared control of the partnership and its continual reassessment; respect for diverse knowledge (academic/theoretical vs. practical/experiential); accountability on the part of academic partners in working with the community; the integration of community partners into campus life and preparation of faculty and students for community-based work; a long-term sustainable commitment of resources and positive outcomes for all parties involved (Campus Compact, 2003).

The adoption of these markers suggests that more institutions of higher education are seeking greater reciprocity and are abandoning the practice of imposing academic-defined problems on communities or utilizing the resources of community-based organizations without providing much in return. However, even this literature on relationship development tends to focus on the construction of limited partnerships between a single institution of higher education and a single (or a few) community-based organizations. In contrast, the Five College consortium is a "loose" collaboration in which institutions retain distinct authority over policies and the commitment of resources. The recent addition of Holyoke Community College (HCC) into this planning group introduces even more complexities for what has become known as the Holyoke Planning Network (HPN).

Currently, HPN involves six institutions of higher learning (all but one of which reside outside the geographic limits of the community) and a multitude of community-based organizations. As we move beyond a phase of initial relationship development to utilizing the best practices of CBL in the construction of alliances among the colleges and CBOs, this situation presents many challenges and opportunities. Addressing the power differentials in terms of access to resources occupies a considerable amount of our time even while we seek ways to generate more resources to address critical community needs. Our interest in considering how community/college partnerships might promote greater equalization of power and resources through joint research, projects, and social actions, leads us to the primary issues we address here:

- How do we build a regional coalition among institutions that support varying levels and types of activity in the city of Holyoke?
- How can we most effectively pursue institutional buy-in from institutions at different levels, through different processes, and within different time frames?
- How can partnerships promote the acquisition of resources for community partners and further community control of those resources while also promoting the campus acquisition of new knowledge and innovative pedagogical practices?
- How can we create mechanisms for college administrators, development officers, and potential partnership funders that acknowledge the provision of community resources that will enrich student learning and faculty research?

INITIAL EFFORTS TO FORGE COLLEGE/COMMUNITY LINKAGES

Since addressing CBL problems of practice was a parallel priority to advancing CBL as a component of campus teaching and research, we began early on to design concrete projects that would create a more coordinated infrastructure among our institutions. They included coordinating training and transportation for students, creating community access and transportation to our campuses, and increasing outreach. As an additional measure, a CBL Web site was designed. Our next priority became the development and implementation of good practice with an appropriate subset of community partners.

Holyoke was the obvious location for our coordination efforts because it was the city where each of the Five Colleges and HCC had placed hundreds of student interns, launched several large research projects, and interviewed many community members and organizations. Countless research papers had been written about Holyoke on subjects as wide ranging as analyses of asthma prevalence and mental health issues, assessments of affordable housing and healthcare access, and investigations into the impact of systemic racism and multigenerational poverty. In spite of this research and the efforts of individuals on the various campuses to address the issue of reciprocity, Holyoke nonprofits continued to struggle for survival in an environment of fiscal cutbacks. At its most fundamental elements, the process of researching the Holyoke community remained inequitable.

Holyoke is a compelling place to research and serve because it is one of the poorest cities in Massachusetts, yet has many untapped assets. It currently provides jobs for many residents who live (and pay taxes) in bordering towns and is a resource to area colleges (who also do not pay taxes to the city). From our perspective, there was and is a potential for natural reciprocity, as yet unrealized. Area educational institutions already had a stake in Holyoke's economic health, and an economically healthy Holyoke would reward these institutions by greatly enhancing the colleges' attractiveness as institutions of higher learning. In a successful community/college partnership, we would play a crucial role in lending intellectual and human capital to economic development efforts. HPN's role would be to help our educational institutions understand that sharing resources with Holyoke's CBOs is working toward a common goal of revitalization, addressing the city's problems and building upon its assets.

Planning the Planners Network Conference

HPN wanted to evolve from holding seminars to effecting similar changes to what Ken Reardon and the University of Illinois had spearheaded in East St. Louis (Reardon, 1994, 1998). Reardon was also a member of the national steering committee of the Planners Network, an association of professionals, activists,

academics, and students who use planning as a tool for strategically allocating resources to promote fundamental change at the urban basis of our political and economic systems. When he approached Hampshire College's Community Partnerships for Social Change Program (CPSC) to host the 2002 Planners Network conference in Western Massachusetts, CPSC director Mary Bombardier, Professor Myrna Breitbart, and CPSC Program Coordinator Kiara Nagel saw the conference as a springboard for current community-based learning efforts and as an opportunity to create an innovative model of accountability and collaboration among members of the academic community and representatives from the Holyoke nonprofit community.

With its strong history of social commitment, Hampshire College supported CPSC, to lead in the creation of this innovative model of educational partnership in conjunction with leaders from Holyoke's nonprofit community, the Holyoke Office of Planning, and faculty and staff from area colleges. Nueva Esperanza, a community development organization in Holyoke with a long-standing relationship to CPSC, was approached to be the lead community organization and work with academic partners to create a steering committee. The steering committee created a conference vision and planned the details for a national gathering in Holyoke.

From the outset, our organizing circle sought to break down traditional community/campus boundaries. We worked daily to develop a decision-making process that respected each person's opinions with equal weight without being influenced by the notions of status or power that exist in academia, city governments, and most nonprofits. Our meetings often began as brainstorming sessions and ended up as graphic depictions of the intense struggles that community leaders have faced in the last 20 years of working in Holyoke. These conversations were critical to rebuilding trust and establishing relationships among socially and economically disparate groups; they also forged a unified vision for change. Under this vision, we hoped to use the conference to:

- Explore new solutions to old problems, address barriers to change, and create a collaborative new vision for the city of Holyoke and its surroundings.
- Showcase Holyoke and the innovative work of community-based organizations, articulate their specific planning and organizing needs, and engage in dialogue about these self-identified needs with local and national consultants.
- Develop effective working relationships.

Conference Highlights

"New Visions for Historic Cities: Bridging Divides, Building Futures" took place in June 2002. It included no scholarly lectures or theoretical papers. Instead,

there were vibrant panels, workshops, and activities, each carefully structured to balance the representation of academics and community organizers. A bus tour oriented participants to Holyoke and its diverse neighborhoods and issues. Site visits allowed participants to dialogue with community members and see innovative neighborhood projects firsthand. A local theater group performed a play on the industrial history of the city and its canals. A featured artist introduced the keynote speaker with a poem. A local teen sang the U.S. and Puerto Rican national anthems. Throughout the conference, national perspectives and issues were balanced by local ones, academic standpoints with community views. The dialogue was rich and multilayered. Late one evening, as an 11-piece salsa band played, the relationships that the conference had renewed and revised between the academic community and the people of Holyoke erupted into an enthusiastic intergenerational version of the Electric Slide, and the dance floor was filled with laughing steering-committee members, urban planners, college professors, students, teens, and Holyoke families.

The most important long-term effect of the conference was a powerful demonstration of coalition building supported at its foundation by a commitment to an equitable planning process. By collaboratively creating a conference of many voices, the very planning process presented a model for how we wanted our academic institutions to engage with the Holyoke community. As such, the conference not only laid a foundation for increased cooperation among Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Amherst and UMass Amherst, but also provided a model for these institutions to work collaboratively in the community of Holyoke.

The visible success of the National Planners Network conference inspired many people to harness the momentum and incorporate lessons into new models of community-based learning and partnerships. The steering committee continued to meet and was joined by representatives from other local colleges, the university, and Holyoke-based organizations. The profound and lasting partnerships with community-based organizations in South Holyoke have continued to evolve under the name of the HPN. As the Network seeks to secure funding and academic administrative commitments to this planning work, tension is fed by competition for resources, lack of focus, unclear priorities, and the dismal economic climate. The challenge of reconciling the priorities of academic institutions with those of the community still remains large and threatens the fragile trust that the conference planning was able to create.

As Five College CBL faculty and staff continued to explore metropolitan issues with community partners, questions of resources and institutional buy-in for enhanced community partnership in Holyoke came up in two related contexts. These contexts were the development of a HUD Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) grant and building the relationship between HCC and the Five College consortium.

THE HUD COPC PROPOSAL PROCESS

HPN began planning for a HUD COPC grant to focus our community/university dialogue on the partnership goal of creating a permanent physical presence in Holyoke as a means to sustain reciprocal community and educational programming. From the perspective of community organizations, COPC funds and the accompanying structural relations between higher education and community partners mandated by the grant's operating environment (a solid, matching-funds supported infrastructure) promised real cash and partnership activities with equally real potential to address community challenges by building on Holyoke's assets. From the perspective of academic partners, a COPC framework promised a focal point for an institutional/city partnership on which we could further the wide range of small-scale partnership activities in which we were engaged. To HPN as a whole, the COPC was seen as a vehicle to overcome the geographic divide between Holyoke and our various institutional settings in Amherst, South Hadley, and Northampton. It could address the logistical and infrastructural challenges in our construction of programming for students, faculty, staff, and community members in Holyoke. We believed that Holyoke's demographics made the argument for external support in both the grant's and our own identified areas (education, economic development, and community capacity building) especially compelling to our institutions and prospective funding sources. We hoped to create a model similar to the outstanding UMass Lowell community outreach partnership center and to advocate for HPN faculty to be given release time to teach CBL courses and/or do community-based research in accordance with the needs of the Holyoke community.

In Fall 2002, we began the discussion of applying for the HUD COPC grant. Despite strong enthusiasm, we faced two major challenges. First, seeking institutional cash commitments to meet federal matching requirements would be difficult during a period of budget cutbacks, and some colleges were uncertain about institutional commitment to a college/community partnership with Holyoke. Second, we believed our consortial approach to a COPC grant would pose practical challenges to HUD grantors and invite skepticism. Yet we felt that our metropolitan approach to urban issues could better address community issues while providing a vehicle for academic institutions from more affluent towns and cities to share their resources with Holyoke. Under this model, metropolitan and regional collaboration held the promise of creating institutional/community partnerships that allowed institutions too small to independently venture large-scale community collaboration to pool intellectual, human, and financial resources.

In March 2003, HPN held a meeting to invite community-based organizations, social and governmental agencies, and additional educators to participate in this dialogue. Several community, public, and social agencies participated and seemed excited about the prospect of a more fruitful partnership. The meeting

was successful in both communicating the potential of such a partnership and in yielding participation from previously external constituencies. HCC's role in HPN discussions had been rather limited, yet HCC made strides to connect with community-based organizations in Holyoke and sought greater cooperation with area academic institutions involved with Holyoke. Representatives from HCC and from their engaged community partners urged the HPN conveners to adjust both their perspective and language to reflect a strategic vision more inclusive of the efforts and goals of HCC in community partnership. The strong and welcome presence of HCC's direct participation in the March 2003 meeting and more indirectly through the circle of community partners with whom they were becoming actively engaged in a parallel process (the "Avanza" initiative, focused on Latino educational attainment in Holyoke) was a positive, if complicating, development. Through subsequent HPN "summit" meetings in April and May 2003, senior HCC administrators and community members worked hard to bridge historic differences and emerged with a renewed commitment to developing community leadership in educational support programming. As a result, HPN fully became a "six college" collaboration.

While it is unusual to found college/community partnership upon such a consortium, we believe that aiming to coordinate, clarify, and amplify partnership activity across institutional relationships is the best strategy for gaining significant metropolitan impact, despite a period of serious institutional and municipal budgetary constraints. The March 2003 meeting also yielded three core community-driven partnership foci for Holyoke—education, economic development, and capacity building for CBOs. Our COPC framework first connected existing community initiatives with existing college and university teaching, research, and service resources. In its second phase, these groups worked collaboratively to identify unmet community needs as well as potential community and higher education assets that could address those needs. In its third phase, a partnership framework would be constructed, which would allow these and additional collaborations to benefit the community and institutional partners in a more sustained, cost-effective, and mutually beneficial way.

We developed our COPC application by surveying our own institutions' commitments in Holyoke and proposing a COPC-supported framework that would improve Five College/Holyoke collaborations in relationship to these identified programmatic commitments. During our planning, HCC questioned where HPN's Five College participants stood in regard to their own institutional commitments, and it was revealed that senior Five College administrators were only sporadically involved. In response, the Five College staff and faculty worked to secure more explicit commitments from their senior administrators; however, both the economic climate and the lack of in-depth understanding of CBL on the part of administrators left us unable to secure sufficient high-level commitment to proceed with the 2003 COPC grant. This experience demonstrated to us the critical need to educate administrators about the dramatic successes of other

CBL work and to build a greater awareness of the value of CBL work on our respective campuses.

The HUD COPC Proposal Process Revisited

In Spring 2004, HPN members renewed the discussion of a HUD COPC grant. We had recently become aware that the Extension Office at the University of Massachusetts had hired a grant writer to write a COPC proposal. The grant writer originally sought to build a partnership with a rural county north of the university, but was interested in HPN's work in Holyoke. After an initial meeting with the Extension Office, HPN split into two working groups to decide which projects to include in the COPC proposal. It soon became clear that the amount of money was quite small in relation to our goals. Our CBO members felt that obtaining a COPC grant and spreading its resources equitably would attract more CBO interest and lend us greater credibility to apply for other grants. Mindful of past experience, HPN academic members concentrated on eliciting support from senior administrators. As a result, academic partners committed cash and in-kind resources such as significant time commitments from faculty and staff. These direct and indirect matching funds supported a strong COPC application.

RECENT HPN PROJECTS

The core areas that had been identified by the Holyoke community in March 2003 as focal points for partnership were education, economic development, and capacity-building. As HPN continued to focus on these areas, three projects emerged.

Grant-Writing Workshop in Holyoke

In February 2004, a grants-writing workshop for Holyoke CBOs was coordinated by Alan Bloomgarden, a member of HPN who worked as a development officer at Smith College. CBOs in Holyoke have been hard hit by the fiscal crisis in Massachusetts. In response to the desiccation of state government funds, Holyoke CBOs were turning to grants to prevent severe budget shortfalls. Aware of this circumstance, Bloomgarden organized a workshop for CBO personnel. By combining the assistance of the director of the Western Massachusetts Funders Resource Center in Springfield and the resources of the regional library of the Foundation Center, he hoped to assist Holyoke CBOs to gain better access to the resources that were available to them. Additionally, the development offices from the Five Colleges donated grant directories. Seventeen representatives from thirteen different Holyoke CBOs attended the workshop and deemed it to be very successful. Bloomgarden continues to provide voluntary development consulting to Holyoke CBOs and is a member of the Avanza Resource Development Team.

The Puerto Rican Studies Seminar

The second project originated when a nontraditional Mount Holyoke student who also worked for a community-based organization in Holyoke, expressed concern that faculty who taught CBL classes involving community partners in Holyoke did not know enough about Puerto Rican history, culture and politics, and therefore could not adequately prepare their students to work respectfully and productively in the city. In the 2003-04 academic year, HPN members began a monthly Puerto Rican Studies faculty seminar. The seminar was facilitated by a Puerto Rican Studies professor from the University of Massachusetts, the Director of an adult literacy and popular education CBO, the student from Mount Holyoke College who originated the idea, and Preston H. Smith II, the CBL director from Mount Holyoke College.

The seminar met once a month throughout the academic year and went to Puerto Rico for a week in January. This seminar was unique because it was attended by community members from three Holyoke CBOs and a community liaison representative from Holyoke's mayor's office, in addition to faculty from five of the six colleges. The fall seminar sessions concentrated on readings, films, and speakers both from the academic institutions and from the Puerto Rican community. The spring sessions focused on education, housing, economic development, and the work of Holyoke CBOs in these areas. The highlight was a trip to Puerto Rico in which three-quarters of the seminar participants were presented with an opportunity to understand the island side of the Puerto Rican transnational experience as well as an opportunity to make connections with Puerto Rican-based academic institutions and CBOs for future exchanges and reciprocal visits. The program and trip were immense successes, and the seminar continues to be offered.

The HPN Archive Project

The assistant director of community outreach at Amherst College and two Mount Holyoke CBL students coordinated the HPN Archives project. The project stemmed from the shared concern that academic studies of Holyoke's Puerto Rican community were not benefiting the city. HPN wanted to harvest the benefits of the research by collecting it and making it accessible to members of the Holyoke community. The archive team directed the collection of material and arranged for its deposit and management in the archives section of the Holyoke Public Library. A presentation of the project drew more than fifty people from the Puerto Rican community, elected and appointed officials in Holyoke, and senior administrators from the six colleges. The project was very well received, and the director of the oldest Puerto Rican CBO commented that the project was the first effort to recognize Latinos' contributions to the city of Holyoke.

CHALLENGES TO BUILDING A METROPOLITAN COLLEGE/COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

The process of establishing legitimacy with our community partners was a complex and time-consuming collaboration that did not initially allow HPN sufficient time to simultaneously build legitimacy with our respective upper level administrations. When faculty and staff are unable to make meaningful commitments on behalf of their institutions, CBO partners are reluctant to invest in long-term and more productive partnerships and are understandably wary of overextending even short-term ones. For HPN to maximize the reciprocity in the relationships between the academic and community sides of the partnership, the institutional legitimacy of faculty and staff in HPN have to be examined against the goals of good partnership practice in Holyoke. This immediately raised the question of whether CBL faculty and staff have the authority to represent the priorities and goals of their institutions. For many, formalizing the HPN as a Holyoke/higher education partnership and obtaining official sanction for their work, represented not only a step toward attaining greater authority in representing their institutions but also was an important step toward greater legitimacy for CBL as a whole. Yet it is also significant that not all of the consortia partners were prepared to make this investment or fully acknowledge the HPN partnerships.

At this point, HPN is still educating senior administrative officials about the core of HPN's vision, while actively pursuing firm commitments to HPN from various deans and presidents. As necessary first steps toward this better practice, we want our respective administrations to see the wisdom in more long-term strategic partnership development and in the immediate investments of institutional and external resources. Administrations are understandably concerned with the matter of raising expectations in communities, yet do not fully appreciate that they are raised anyway whenever our students and faculty enter them to learn or do research. This nearsightedness enables the view that sharing resources is charity, rather than a component of regional partnership that serves both education and development simultaneously. In our outreach to senior officials, we must better communicate this formulation and learn to measure returns from community partnerships. Both efforts will assure them that expectations are being managed responsibly.

The challenge for CBL faculty and staff in working with community partners is to develop ways to adequately measure and articulate the benefits of community-based learning for both students and faculty and also to determine the true costs to a community organization that is accommodating CBL opportunities. On both sides, a fair accounting of the total resources required to create true community-based learning opportunities is a necessary prerequisite for equitable partnerships. We hope that providing administrators with an understanding of the benefits of CBL to their institutions and the related costs to the community will encourage them to commit resources to sustained partnerships. While HPN

academic members have initiated the necessary dialogues, the process of building consensus among our institutional leaders for a plan of sustainable commitment to CBL pedagogy and a long-range, strategic community partnership with Holyoke, is ongoing.

CONCLUSION

In the coming years, CBL faculty and staff will work to demonstrate the academic contributions of past and present CBL work to senior administrative officials. They will also lobby for a permanent community partnership outreach center in Holyoke and work on innovative ways to demonstrate to these administrators that expanding the capacity and effectiveness of CBL opportunities in Holyoke will yield direct benefits to HPN's academic institutions and to the region surrounding these institutions.

As representatives of academic institutions, we must recognize that our fate is intrinsically tied to that of our neighboring communities, and that we share a responsibility for each other. Talk of social justice and social change is meaningless unless we work hard to overcome the barriers to justice and change in our own institutional settings, while at the same time striving to ensure the well-being and sustainability of our community partners. There simply is no room for principle without practice.

REFERENCES

- Campus Compact. (2003). *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty*. Providence, RI: Brown University.
- Cruz, N. I., & Giles, D. E. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. Fall.
- Compton, C. (2003). *Exploring the borderlands of university/community partnerships*. Unpublished thesis, Amherst, MA: Hampshire College.
- Dugery, J., & Knowles, J. (Eds.). (2003). *University + community research partnerships: A new approach*. Charlottesville, VA: Pew Partnership for Civic Change.
- Holland, B. A. (2001, March). *Characteristics of 'engaged institutions' and sustainable partnerships, and effective strategies for change*. (Monograph) Indianapolis: Office of University Partnerships, HUD at Indiana University—Purdue University at Indianapolis.
- Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zapf, J., & Goss, M. (2003). *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives*. Washington, DC: The Council of Independent Colleges.
- Perkins, D. D., & Wandersman, A. (1990). You'll have to work to overcome our suspicions. In *Social policy: Community action*. Summer.
- Ramaley, J. (2000). Embracing civic responsibility. In *AAHE Bulletin*, 52, 7.
- Reardon, K. M. (1994). Undergraduate research in distressed urban communities: An undervalued form of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 1.

- Reardon, K. M. (1998). Enhancing the capacity of community-based organizations in east St. Louis. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17.
- Sandmann, L. R., & Baker-Clark, C. A. (1997). *Characteristics and principles of university-community partnerships: A delphi study*. Paper given at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference and Community Education. Michigan State University, October 15.
- Silka, L. (2001). Addressing the Challenge of Community Collaborations. In *Approaches to sustainable development: The public university in the regional economy*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

THIS CHAPTER IS FROM:

INSIDE AND OUT
Universities and Education
for Sustainable Development

Edited by
Robert Forrant and Linda Silka
University of Massachusetts Lowell

Work, Health, and Environment Series
Series Editors: Charles Levenstein and John Wooding

Baywood Publishing Company, Inc.
AMITYVILLE, NEW YORK

(2006)