The Keys to University–Community Engagement Sustainability

David Clifford, Claudia Petrescu

Eastern Michigan University

For universities to create beneficial and sustainable engagement with the community requires attention to three dimensions: internal (politics, organizational dynamics, and culture interior to the university); external (relationships and dynamics of the community, management of power and resource imbalances, and development of a community identity); and personal (the psychology, competencies, and career issues of the faculty). Sustainable types of engagement are those that lead to valued capacity building for the community and positively address each dimension. We offer illustrations of the challenges and strategies for building successful university–community relationships.

Keywords: *collaboration, nonprofit management, community engagement*

THE INSTITUTE FOR THE Study of Children, Families and Communities (ISCFC), founded at Eastern Michigan University in 1979, began with a focus on foster care, doing early research and development in that area. Over the years it evolved to focus more broadly on community and human service challenges. The commitment to community engagement grew out of a combination of the university's interest in creating new academic programs for students focusing on the community and nonprofits and the personal

Correspondence to: Claudia Petrescu, Eastern Michigan University, 601 Pray Harrold, Ypsilanti, MI 48197. E-mail: cpetrescu@emich.edu

interests and commitments of individual faculty members. It also grew out of a response to Ernest Boyer's challenge to American higher education to re-embrace its roots of "practicality and reality and serviceability" in service to the nation and to create a scholarship of engagement (Boyer, 1990). Creating and sustaining an enterprise such as ISCFC, dedicated to Boyer's vision, is fraught with challenges—because it runs counter to the direction, values, and ambitions of much of contemporary higher education in the United States. This article captures the challenges and lessons learned from the past dozen years of pursuing this agenda. In particular, it focuses on the difficult challenge of sustaining such an enterprise.

Literature Review

The reason for the existence and the work of an applied research institute cannot be understood unless it is placed in an organizational context. The literature review provides this context along with an understanding of the external and internal factors in the university and the community that have had an impact on ISCFC's work.

The Relationship Between Universities and the Community

There is a growing movement and pressure on universities and colleges to rethink the purpose of institutions of higher learning, focus on the well-being of society, and address economic, social, and environmental problems at the community level (Dempsey, 2010; Morris, Schindehutte, Edmonds, and Watters, 2011). Through activities labeled "community engagement," "scholarship in action," and "intellectual entrepreneurship," these institutions are developing partnerships with the community (Hogner and Kenworthy, 2010; Morris and others, 2011). The relationship between universities and their immediate community is complex and interdependent. Universities contribute to regional growth and economic development and to social and cultural development; they boost human capital in the region and create opportunities for reciprocal learning (Beer and Cooper, 2007; Goldstein and Drucker, 2006; Paules, 2007).

There are many approaches and strategies for implementing university–community engagement partnerships, such as internships, academic service projects, applied research, organization and community capacity building, and collaborations through grants. The centers or applied research institutes engaged in this kind of work typically have missions that emphasize civic engagement and are often freestanding entities within a university, doing other work than academic-service learning projects (Barker, 2004).

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (n.d.) has created the Community Engagement Classification to acknowledge the community engagement efforts of institutions of higher learning. Although this is an elective classification, it seems that a large number of higher education institutions seek to get this acknowledgment, indicating a need for these institutions not only to create and sustain partnerships with the community but also to be acknowledged for it.

The Benefits and Challenges of University–Community Relationships

The bulk of the literature on community engagement addresses the type and benefits of the universities' community engagement actions for both parties (Beer and Cooper, 2007; Dempsey, 2010) but largely falls short in addressing the challenges of these relationships. Dempsey (2010), building on existing literature and her own research, identified a series of critical concerns in establishing, developing, implementing, and sustaining university–community engagement activities, highlighting those issues that can lead to "harmful power imbalances [between the university and community] that undermine the goals of community engagement" (p. 360). In analyzing the role of communication in university–community relations, Dempsey's work contributes to "ongoing efforts to understand how meanings of community are defined, contested and sustained through discursive practices" (Dempsey, 2010, p. 361). These challenges can be divided, in our opinion, into three categories: internal (university organizational issues), external (community and community-based partner issues), and personal (individual faculty member and career issues). We use these categories to discuss and give examples of the range of challenges inherent in doing and sustaining this kind of work and to illustrate the strategies that ISCFC used to respond to and cope with them.

Building on the literature on the benefits as well as the challenges of university–community engagement, we analyze the work of an applied research institute at a midsized, regional university that is not a research university. We look at the lessons learned from twelve years of community partnerships in order to address the challenges of survival and institutionalization of community engagement within the university.

ISCFC: "The Applied Research Institute"

The Institute for the Study of Children, Families and Communities has consciously worked on issues of improving the effectiveness of the university as a collaborator with the community, government,

and nonprofit organizations, and in particular on building the capacity of these organizations to better serve and meet the needs of their communities. Presently, twenty faculty from three colleges—Arts and Sciences, Health and Human Services, and Education—and more than forty staff members work with more than one hundred community or government agencies, schools, and nonprofit organizations through several funded programs.

As a regional university, Eastern Michigan University (EMU) has found its own niche. EMU's mission provides room for the development of community engagement as a legitimate, modestly supported, and institutionalized enterprise. In part, the university says that its mission is to provide a "student-focused learning environment . . . that positively impacts the community" through "service initiatives, and public and private partnerships of mutual interest addressing local, regional, national and international opportunities and challenges" (EMU Mission Statement, n.d.). The university's community engagement work was recognized by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching with the Carnegie Engagement classification in 2008.

Twelve Years of ISCFC Engagement with the Community

Started by four faculty members with an interest in foster care, ISCFC evolved over the years based on the associated faculty's research interests, fields of study, and connections with the community. In the past twelve years, the following projects have been developed by the faculty members associated with ISCFC, defining the institute's identity and building its core competencies over time.

- *Research Action Seminar (university funded)*. Two years of discussions in a biweekly seminar format brought together community and nonprofit leaders and faculty to explore issues of university–community collaboration while building relationships and joint projects. Projects have included faculty working with the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS) on program development and a successful federal grant proposal for a psycho-social rehabilitation center for survivors of torture.
- *Community Outreach Partnership Center (HUD funded)*. With a large three-year grant from HUD (and substantial local match), six major collaborative projects were developed between Ypsilanti government and community groups under ISCFC leadership. Projects included creation of an intergenerational project for a local senior center and neighborhood organizations that worked with the local city's community policing council.

- *Community Fellows Program (DOJ funded).* For three years, emerging leaders in community-based groups were teamed with faculty to develop and implement capacity-building projects for their agencies, such as developing and improving after-school and non-school day programs for children of families living in shelters and transitional housing in Ypsilanti, and engaging youth in community decision making in order to reduce and prevent crime and violence among Hispanic youth in Detroit.
- *Southeast Michigan Stewardship Initiative (Great Lakes Fisheries Trust funded).* This initiative created an ongoing center that integrates school curriculum with issues of eco-justice and stewardship through partnerships among schools, environmental nonprofits, and the university. For example, faculty worked with a Detroit school on a mapping project of their local community, through which they identified environmental problems such as the dumping of tires in their neighborhood. The students partnered with other local community and enterprise groups to pick up tires and recycle them into floor mats.
- *School Improvement: GEAR-UP and Bright Futures (federal and state DoEd funded).* This program—involving partnerships among schools, community nonprofits, and the university—improves educational achievement through weekend and summer programs.
- *Autism Collaborative Center (foundation and donor funded).* This center within the ISCFC delivers treatment to people with autism, as well as student education, professional training, research, and advocacy. The center involves nine academic and professional disciplines and numerous community partners.
- *Nonprofit Capacity Building Project (DHHS funded).* This project involved working with eleven community organizations to build their capacity through intensive assessment, planning, technical assistance, consultation, and training—along with a significant cash award. These organizations built their capacity through projects such as community collaboratives, improved infrastructure for service delivery, strategic planning, young adult literacy programs, and the restructuring of accounting and financial systems.
- *Other Action Research Projects (agency funded).* A variety of action research projects with ACCESS, United Way of Southeast Michigan, Ann Arbor Area Community Foundation, and Michigan Department of Community Health focused on decision making, planning, and capacity building.

Applying Barker's Taxonomy to the ISCFC's Community Engagement

Barker (2004) defines the scholarship of engagement as "a movement [that] reflects a growing interest in broadening and deepening the public aspects of academic scholarship. Reacting to the

disconnect between academics and the public, in somewhat dialectical fashion scholars are finding creative ways to communicate to public audiences, work for the public good, and, most important, generate knowledge with public participation" (p. 123). Going further, Barker identifies a scholarship of engagement taxonomy of five emerging practices:

1. *Public scholarship:* Academic work that incorporates practices such as forums and town meetings to enhance scholarship and address public problems
2. *Participatory research:* Citizens playing an active role in the production of academic knowledge
3. *Community partnership:* Focus on social transformation, power, resources, and building social movements
4. *Public information networks:* Help communities identify resources and assets
5. *Civic skills or civic literacy:* Engaged scholars ensuring that their disciplines are supplying people with the knowledge necessary for reflective judgments on public issues

The dominant mode of activity at ISCFC has been participatory research and community partnerships.

Evaluations of the ISCFC projects indicate that all five elements of the taxonomy are met, with good results for faculty and the community. But clearly the dominant mode of activity at ISCFC has been participatory research and community partnerships, a focus we believe is more likely to lead to sustainability. Measuring the community and university's satisfaction with partnership projects, Krajewiski, Wiencek, Clifford, and Edgren (2003), Wiencek and Benci (2005), and Wiencek (2011) found that the participants acknowledged and valued this focus in terms of benefits to their organizations.

To obtain these results, we did not create any project or program just because we needed to (via university mandate) or because we could (having the structure and the funding). We launched a project only if a community organization requested it, a faculty member championed it, community partner support or a grant opportunity presented itself, and one of the other criteria was also present. All these reasons manifested themselves in a culture of partnership and mutual community–university benefit.

About the challenges of creating university–community partnerships, Dempsey (2010) argues that discussions of community engagement do not pay enough attention to and downplay the complexity of the community and the divisions and power structures of the partnerships. We tried to avoid making this mistake by developing partnerships that Bernal, Shellman, and Reid (2004) define as "sharing and joint responsibilities" through which both parties "while coming from a different context, share an interest that allows them to work together for their mutual benefit and for the 'larger good'" (p. 33). To address this mutual benefit, before initiating any

project we asked ourselves two sets of questions—the first of which tests the quality and value of the work for the external partners, and the second of which tests the value of work for faculty:

1. Are we giving our clients or partners something useful? Are we enhancing their capacity in some way?
2. Are we giving the faculty an opportunity to learn something? Do the faculty members further their research agendas in some way?

Careful planning and attention to both the partnership process and the benefit/cost position of all parties provides us with a way of addressing these critical test questions. While evaluation reports indicate that all our projects satisfy the needs of the community and faculty, aspects of these partnerships remain challenging, and we need to continuously seek solutions. We divide these challenges into three dimensions: internal, external, and personal. These dimensions are consistent with the models found in the literature (Beer and Cooper, 2007; Dempsey, 2010; Hogner and Kenworthy, 2006; Morris and others, 2011).

Internal Dimension. This is formed of the relationships, organizational dynamics, and culture that are interior to the university. We faced several challenges, such as balancing the expectations of multiple stakeholders; keeping university leadership continuously engaged and committed to the existent partnerships with the community, and building new partnerships; connecting these partnerships and activities to teaching and learning; and maintaining the ISCFC infrastructure to support projects in a "politically" neutral place.

External Dimension. This involves managing the relationships, organizational dynamics, structures, and culture that are exterior to the university. We have been challenged by perceived power "imbalances," as Dempsey (2010) describes them, between university and community, between expert knowledge versus community knowledge, and by establishing equity of contribution and return between community and university partners.

Personal Dimension. This dimension is formed by the psychology, identity, and internal conflicts of the individual faculty member engaged with the community. It includes issues such as advancement in the academic career versus community engagement, recognition by academic departments of this work, and recognition by the community for doing good.

In the confines of this article we cannot address in detail all the challenges or elements of each dimension. Instead, we focus on the challenges with which ISCFC faculty and staff struggled most, while highlighting a few of the strategies and lessons learned.

Lessons Learned by Managing the Challenges of the Three Dimensions

In developing his framework for university–community partnerships, Cox (2000) asserted that each partner "enters the partnership with individual interests that are specific and more important to itself than to others" (p. 9). Analyzing the challenges of the partnerships between research universities and the community, Dempsey (2010) takes this idea further by saying that "members of the campus–community partnership experience a range of competing motives and constraints on their participation" (p. 363). At ISCFC we strove to identify the interests of each member before creating the partnership and making that part of the conversation. In this section we discuss motives, interests, and constraints such as power and resource imbalances between community partners and the university, turf battles across disciplinary and departmental lines, and traditional promotion guidelines governing the academic advancement of faculty members, and then identify ISCFC's strategies for addressing them.

At ISCFC we strove to identify the interests of each member before creating the partnership and making that part of the conversation.

Internal Dimension: The Value the University Places on Partnerships and Commitment to Community Engagement

All the challenges discussed in this article play out in the context of the university's mission. Although universities in the United States have a long history of seeing their identities in practical service to the community, this identity has waned over the decades, as Ernest Boyer (1995) observed in his impassioned speech arguing for a rededication to that mission. As Boyer astutely pointed out, the focus, the leadership, and the reward system of American higher education work to create disengagement from the community, with tenure and promotion being the ultimate tool of enforcement.

ISCFC Strategy: Tie the Institute and Engagement to Multiple Programs on Campus. ISCFC has had an impact on the creation and work of EMU's Academic Service Learning Program, Nonprofit Leadership Alliance program (formerly American Humanics), graduate certificate programs in nonprofit management and in community building, and graduate certificates or concentrations in the treatment of autism. We also involved large numbers of students in our projects, leading to increased student learning and volunteering efforts (substantiated through student surveys), and assisted colleges to secure funding through grants, contracts, and gifts. Overall, ISCFC is linking the university to community organizations, and one academic program to another, and providing a contact point and brokering function between the community and university resources.

Internal Dimension: Turf Wars and Placement of Interdisciplinary Applied Research

Working across disciplines and across the silos of academic departments and colleges is a hazardous business. The competition for resources, endemic to all types of organizations, is compounded by disciplinary rivalries for intellectual primacy in explaining phenomena and solving problems. Perhaps the most challenging situation for the institute was the launch and first few years of the Autism Collaborative Center, when arguments over multidisciplinary treatment approaches and what constitutes evidence of effectiveness arose periodically and challenged the multidisciplinary team's espoused commitment to learning from each other and serving the clients. The task here is to create a neutral turf, a place of "hospitality" where everybody feels welcomed, respected, and supported and where personal and tribal stories are exchanged until the parties are no longer strangers (Meagher, 1976). Accompanying this is the need for leaders and respected colleagues to display an essential humility in the face of working together on applied community problems.

ISCFC Strategy: Location of the Institute in a Turf-Free Zone. From its beginning, ISCFC has been located outside a college or department and reported to the Office of the Provost. This helps to buffer the participating faculty from the need to negotiate their way through the political maze of sharing indirect costs, credit, control, and budget allocations. This organizational location serves as a setting where faculty, staff, and people from the community can come together to talk about issues, problems, and projects that focus on the tasks at hand and not on academic issues, generating outside-the-box ideas. We found that ISCFC's "objective location" fosters some level of honesty and humility in the face of the demand by community organizations to solve problems and not "advance generalizable knowledge" or win academic arguments.

External Dimension: The Power Imbalances Between the University and Community Partner

Most community partners we have worked with over the years have at least one horror story about an experience working with a university. Without addressing what each partner does—their roles, the nature of the relationship, and how we will operate together, including power imbalances related to control of resources—there is no sustainable partnership.

ISCFC Strategy: "Partnering in" of Community Members. University–community relations are often characterized as being "clouded by processes and circumstances that result in outcomes not meeting the

expectations" (Beer and Cooper, 2007, p. 1064) because "community partner representatives enter into these relationships with a deep distrust of the underlying goals of their academic partner" (Hogner and Kenworthy, 2010, p. 249). It is common knowledge that faculty members are seen by the community as living in an ivory tower (Dempsey 2010; Hogner and Kenworthy, 2010) and that there is a strong power struggle when setting up a partnership. We tried to address these matters by "partnering in" with the community, giving leadership positions to community members in the shared project.

For example, in selecting leadership for the new 21st Century Community Learning Center grant, we turned to a staffer from a nearby school. Similarly, in the nonprofit capacity building project we looked outside the academy for a program manager with broad and deep experience in the nonprofit and public arena. We hired a former Girl Scout executive who also had decades of experience in school governance. The result in both situations has been a stronger connection with the community, an opportunity for us to learn new methods, substantially expand our networks, and gain credibility with a variety of stakeholders who would otherwise have remained skeptics of our motives, skills, knowledge, and reliability as a partner.

ISCFC Strategy: "Partnering Out" with Community Organizations. Another approach to bringing people from the outside to the inside is our practice of partnering with a wide variety of smaller nonprofits to deliver programming in the community. This is driven by three motivations: using the best expertise we can find, providing economic support to community-based organizations, and promoting partnering among local community organizations and public sector organizations. This also contributes to the university's legitimacy in the community.

In the Southeast Michigan Stewardship Initiative, the program is structured such that every site consists of a formal project partnership of the university, a school, and one or more environmental groups. This partnership structure extends to the program and planning steering committee. With these kinds of permeable and fuzzy boundaries, who is on the inside and who is on the outside of the university becomes less clear. This changes the character of the academy's face and behavior, and thereby creates a more effective interface with the community.

External Dimension: Equity in Funding and Decision Making in the Partnership

The university people are "funded" and community members (including nonprofit and government employees) are "volunteering." This common difference in status and sacrifice of time became apparent in our earliest systematic venture into community-engaged

scholarship, the Research Action Seminar (RAS). The goal of the RAS was to learn from our community counterparts how we could work more effectively with them and to develop a project and then write a joint proposal for funding. While the university reimbursed community members' mileage and paid for meals, many of the faculty were still "on the clock," with course releases or other compensation to participate in the RAS. Both parties put in significant time attending the biweekly seminar and working on proposals, but only one side was paid. It was apparent that this was an unequal relationship. For the community partners it also raised the initially unspoken question of how they would be treated as we developed budgets and launched projects.

ISCFC Strategy: Provide Financial Rewards for Community Partners. The experience with the RAS generated a resolve on our part to find funding to compensate community partners and their agencies for participating in a project. For example, in the DOJ-funded Community Fellows Program we created a fellowship program for emerging leaders from the community and paid half their salary for ten months. In developing the proposal for the HUD Community Outreach Center we obtained university funds to hire a community activist to work on the team and develop the proposal and project plan. She served as a community liaison and guide, bringing to the table and into the partnership some folks we would not have otherwise been able to engage. In the recently finalized (DHHS-funded) capacity-building project, we built in the maximum federally funded cash sub-award for the community partners.

> *The experience with the RAS generated a resolve on our part to find funding to compensate community partners and their agencies for participating in a project.*

Personal Dimension: The Identity of the "Applied" Faculty

The prevailing model of academic professionalism is unrealistically individualistic. It is based on an understanding of inquiry that presents scientific discovery as if it were an exercise in cold logic, divorced from the social dimension (Krajewski and others, 2003; Pfeffer, 1993). "The prevailing model rewards research far more than teaching or service. It also encourages specialization, to the detriment of multidisciplinary 'sense making'" (Krajewski and others, 2003, p. 104).

ISCFC Strategy: Support Faculty in Integrating Their Academic Identity with Their Commitment to Community Work. Faculty members who engage in work in the community usually do it out of an emotional or personal commitment to help solve a social problem. This affective dimension runs counter to the usual norms and reward systems of the academy. At ISCFC we work with each faculty member to integrate his or her research and community engagement agenda, helping the faculty member find a sense of identity,

meaning, and professional purpose in this larger work. In such a setting, support from like-minded colleagues helps faculty find new outlets for scholarship, a diversity of potential work partners, and a network of "outside" resources that opens doors to new opportunities.

The career-making decisions on promotion and tenure rest heavily on how a faculty member's work is acknowledged and valued, based on how it is used and disseminated. Thus, research universities value work that is theory building and disseminated in top-tier academic journals. Dissemination and use of community-engaged work often occurs at community levels, and scholarly dissemination is often outside the top-tier journals. But even at EMU, a regional university that espouses community engagement as a value, there is significant variability in how such engagement is accepted in a department's evaluation document—for example, the treatment of grant proposals as scholarly work.

We work with each faculty member to integrate his or her research and community engagement agenda, helping the faculty member find a sense of identity, meaning, and professional purpose in this larger work.

Personal Dimension: The Difference in Work Environment of Academic and Community Settings

University faculty work in a relatively regulated, predictable, and controlled environment. This is very different from the reality of working with executives and staff in community-based nonprofits, government agencies that provide direct service, and voluntary associations, all of which are more dynamic and where the faculty member is continually negotiating his or her role. Our experience is that this is a common, if often unstated, reason why university faculty members avoid community engagement projects that take them out of their comfort zones.

ISCFC Strategy: Working With and Developing Entrepreneurial Faculty. We have become adept at identifying faculty with entrepreneurial talents and professional experience and recruiting them into varying levels of commitment. These are often faculty who either have very strong ties to the community or for whom the academic career follows a significant nonacademic career. We help them to see how they can combine the two and be successful at the academic "game," while also using the strengths and skills they developed in their earlier professional careers. In terms of personal traits, we found that faculty with more gregarious personalities connect more easily to community partners and can handle the unpredictability of working in the community.

Another solution is to create projects like the Community Fellow program in which professional development is the focus—both for the rising community leader and the faculty member. Support and consulting mechanisms are put in place for both parties. Many of these people then grow into project director roles.

Personal Dimension: Recognition and Advancement in Academia Versus Community Engagement

One of the most difficult tasks at both the personal and institutional levels is getting recognition for community engagement work in the tenure and promotion process. The more research oriented the university, the more difficult it is—at both levels. In her analysis of the "engaged campus," Holland (2001) recognizes the following as one of the top six characteristics of the engaged campus: an engaged campus gives recognition and value to community engagement work in tenure and promotion decisions.

ISCFC Strategy: Incorporate Community Engagement Projects into the Tenure and Promotion System. EMU is a unionized institution where the faculty contract provides provision for inclusion of applied research projects into the accepted criteria for tenure and promotion (EMU AAUP Contract, 2010–2012). This criterion gets reflected in some departments' tenure and promotion evaluation documents. However, it is up to each faculty member to demonstrate and justify that his or her work with the community fits the criteria. Therefore, at ISCFC we encourage and support faculty presentations at national and regional meetings. In addition, the evaluation documents for promotion and tenure at EMU allow the reporting of "other dissemination" of scholarly work. With support from ISCFC, faculty have successfully used the argument that utilization by community organizations of the results from their research in creating or changing a program, or in making a critical programmatic decision, constitutes a high-value incident of dissemination and validation of the utility and importance of their work.

An engaged campus gives recognition and value to community engagement work in tenure and promotion decisions.

The Keys to Sustainability: Locally and for Universities in General

ISCFC has struggled since its inception to find a formula that creates sustainable university–community partnerships. We learned incrementally through experience and listening to the people in the community and by identifying and testing a variety of strategies that worked for ISCFC, the university, the community partners, and the faculty.

Each of the strategies we developed maps onto one or more of the three dimensions of challenge: (1) *internal* (value placed on this activity by the university and dealing with disciplinary and organizational turf issues); (2) *external* (power imbalances, equity in funding and decision making); and (3) *personal* (identity of "applied" faculty, community work environment for faculty, and advancement in academic careers). The sum of these strategies covers most of the characteristics of an engaged campus as identified by Holland (2001), which include involving communities in continuous, purposeful, and

authentic ways; a core commitment to learning through engagement; and an articulated and real commitment to improving the community. We still need to do a better job of managing the three dimensions and all their elements.

In the list of major initiatives discussed, we have used all of the practices identified by Barker's taxonomy, usually in combinations. If there has been a dominant thread it would be what Barker labels "community partnerships" and "applied research." The common theme and intent has been to build capacity that would outlive our particular involvement and be sustained without our continued intervention.

For us, the core of building sustainability of university–community engagement is building relationships with a broad and diverse set of community organizations, people, and institutions. The core is being useful and "doing good" by the standards of the people and communities we seek to help (Kelly, 1971, 2002). And, while we are doing good, we also maintain a high standing and regard among our colleagues as we support them in both academic and community work.

References

Barker, D. "The Scholarship of Engagement: A Taxonomy of Five Emerging Practices." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement,* 2004, *9*(2), 123–131.

Beer, A., and Cooper, J. "University–Regional Partnership in a Period of Structural Adjustment: Lessons from Southern Adelaide's Response to an Automobile Plant Closure." *European Planning Studies,* 2007, *15*(8), 1063–1084.

Bernal, H., Shellman, J., and Reid, K. "Essential Concepts in Developing Community–University Partnerships." *Public Health Nursing,* 2004, *21*(1), 32–40.

Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Stanford, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Boyer, E. L. "Stated Meeting Report: The Scholarship of Engagement." Speech presented at the 1778th Stated Meeting, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Stanford, Calif., October 11, 1995.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. n.d. Retrieved October 9, 2011, from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php?key=1213.

Cox, D. N. "Developing a Framework for Understanding University–Community Partnerships." *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research,* 2000, *5*(1), 9–26.

Dempsey, S. "Critiquing Community Engagement." *Management Communication Quarterly,* 2010, *24*(3), 359–390.

EMU AAUP Contract, 2010–2012. Retrieved October 11, 2011, from http://www.emich.edu/ahr/PDFs/Contracts/AAUP%202010–2012%20Contract.pdf.

EMU Mission Statement. n.d. Retrieved October 1, 2011, from http://www.emich.edu/aboutemu/profile.

Goldstein, H., and Drucker, J. "The Economic Development Impacts of Universities on Regions: Do Size and Distance Matter?" *Economic Development Quarterly,* 2006, *20*(1), 22–43.

Hogner, R. H., and Kenworthy, A. L. "Moving Forward Together in Sustainable, Effective, and Partnership-Oriented Ways: Connecting Universities and Communities Through Global Leadership Service Projects." *International Journal of Organizational Analysis,* 2010, *18*(2), 245–266.

Holland, B. "Toward a Definition and Characterization of the Engaged Campus: Six Cases." *Journal of Metropolitan Universities,* 2001, *12*(3), 20–29.

Kelly, J. G. "Qualities for the Community Psychologist." *American Psychologist,* 1971, *26*(10), 897–903.

Kelly, J. G. "The Spirit of Community Psychology." *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 2002, *30*(1), 43–63.

Krajewiski, E., Wiencek, P., Clifford, D., and Edgren, J. "Reconciling the Cognitive and Affective Dimensions of Community Engagement: A Scholar's Dilemma." *Journal of Metropolitan Universities,* 2003, *14*(4), 102–115.

Meagher, R. "Strangers at the Gate: Ancient Rites of Hospitality." *Parabola,* 1976, 2(4), 10–15.

Morris, M., Schindehutte, M., Edmonds, V., and Watters, C. "Inner City Engagement and the University: Mutuality, Emergence and Transformation." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 2011, 23(5–6), 287–315.

Paules, P. M. "New and Valuable: University Partnerships." *Public Management,* 2007, *89*(10), 18–19.

Pfeffer, J. "Barriers to the Development of Organizational Science: Paradigm Development as a Dependent Variable." *Academic Management Review,* 1993, *18*, 599–620.

Wiencek, P. "Evaluation of Nonprofit Capacity Building Grant Project." Internal document. Eastern Michigan University, Institute for the Study of Children, Families and Communities, 2011.

Wiencek, P., and Benci, J. "Project Evaluation: Center for Community Building and Civic Engagement Community Leadership Fellows Program." Eastern Michigan University, Institute for the Study of Children, Families and Communities, 2005.

DAVID CLIFFORD is a professor of health administration at Eastern Michigan University and former director of the Institute for the Study of Children, Families and Communities.

CLAUDIA PETRESCU is an associate professor of public administration at Eastern Michigan University and director of the Nonprofit Leadership Alliance program.