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The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of African-Americans and university collaborators regarding their experiences with community-university partnerships and to suggest possible strategies to strengthen these working relationships. By drawing on the responses of eighteen community and university representatives, this study sought to answer the following three questions: (a) Do African-American residents and academics perceive the benefits and challenges of participating in community-university relationships differently? (b) In what context do African-American residents and academics agree on the benefits and challenges of community-university relationships? (c) If there are differences, do these differences create barriers to engagement efforts? Significant findings in this study revealed that university partners generally perceived relationships as a way to access the community. On the other hand, community participants viewed relationships as a resource to exchange and share resources with the university but perceived the lack of sustained efforts from the university as a challenge. Both community and university partners perceived institutional protocol and the demand for tangible outcomes in the community as challenges. Furthermore, findings also revealed that the history of race relations and the nature of a college-town community influenced the views and experiences of the participants.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Forms of community-university partnerships have existed since the passing of the Morrill Act of 1862 (Mayfield, 2001). However, there has been an increase in engagement activities in the past decade as promoted by Boyer (1996), who calls for more responsive and engaged scholarship. Although there have been several manifestations of the term “engagement,” it has been often associated with Boyer’s (1996) definition “a new twist for higher education: the two way street of interaction or partnerships between the academe and the outside world” (p.12). In other words, engagement is a reciprocal relationship between institutions of higher education and the public that is mutually beneficial. Commentators have suggested that universities are suited to engage local communities because they serve as anchor institutions in their own communities, are geographically located in the communities, and possess useful resources and prestige among nongovernmental employers. Furthermore, institutions of higher education partner with local communities because it also fulfills the mission of the Morrill Act, which includes the delivery of services, knowledge, and research (Carr, 1999).

Universities play an influential role in the communities in which they are located, and this influence can be integral in addressing issues relevant to marginalized communities. Partnerships between institutions of higher education and African-American communities are particularly needed. Referencing the 2008 National Urban League’s annual report, Orelus (2009) states, “Unemployment increased for all groups, but continues to impact Blacks and Latinos the most. Whites saw their unemployment increase from 0.4% to 7.3%, Blacks 0.8% to 13.4% and Latinos saw their unemployment rate increase from 1.2% to 10.9%” (p.194). These staggering statistics, particularly among African-American communities, illustrate the critical need for
institutions of higher education to share their resources to help eradicate issues in their neighboring marginalized communities.

It appears that as unemployment increases, other social issues affecting the community may worsen, as well. This may lead to an increased interest from universities in the benefits of community partnerships. Such partnerships have received financial support from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (through the Office of University Partnership), W.K Kellogg Foundation, and the Campus Compact and Carnegie Foundation to address community issues such as poverty, home ownership, health, and education through service-learning and other forms of engagement. These partnerships need to increase community-university interactions in light of recent economic crises. Given the increased attention engagement, research must critically explore the perceptions of those involved in community-university partnerships to gain insight for improvement. Therefore, this research seeks to understand how such partnership and engagement efforts are perceived by academics from a research-intensive land-grant university and by local African-American residents.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Terms such as service-learning, civically engaged campus, and university-community partnerships have become familiar in scholarly literature. Such concepts have been used to synonymously to describe collaborative efforts between institutions of higher education and surrounding communities. These partnerships between the university and community have attempted to address numerous complex social issues, ranging from educational reform to health disparities (Harkavy, 1999; Metzler et al., 2003). Boyer’s (1996) proposal for more engaged scholarship has galvanized national interest and heightened attention on scholars’ responsibilities to fulfill the mission of civic engagement (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002). Funding from both public and private sources has accelerated the community-university partnership movement by supporting collaborative social interest initiatives between institutions of higher education and local community organizations (Ostrander & Portey, 2007). Community-university partnerships that aim to improve the quality of life in local communities have used various disciplinary approaches including service-learning and community-based participatory research.

Available within the proliferation of literature on community-university partnerships are descriptive accounts from the university partners’ perspectives concerning the impact of community-university engagement on students, faculty, and the communities (Hart, Northmore, Gerhardt & Rodriguez, 2009; Buys & Bursnall, 2007; Timmermans & Bouman, 2004). While some have also used an evaluative research approach to suggest ways academic professionals could improve their relationship with communities (Rubin, 2000; Spoth, Greenberg, Bierman & Redmond, 2004), others Barnes, Altimare, Farrell, Brown, Burnett, Gamble & Davis (2009), Creighton (2006), Hollander, Saltmarsh & Zlotkowski (2001), and Lamb-Parker, Greenfield, Fantuzzo, Clark & Coolahan (2000)—have identified characteristics of effective partnerships
and made recommendations in order to cultivate, maintain, and sustain relationships. Despite the
attention to community-university partnerships, very few research studies have explored
perceived benefits of both the community and university partners; the majority of research to
date has focused primarily on either one or the other’s perspective.

To date, extensive literature from a variety of disciplines has indicated the strengths and
weaknesses of community-university partnerships. Whereas some studies have focused on
factors of success and failure as experienced by the researcher, others have emphasized the
benefits and challenges as perceived by the community partner. Few studies have captured the
narratives of both community and university representatives in the same partnerships. Although
there is a growing interest in academic engagement with local communities, most studies focus
on the university side of the story. This is surprising, given that community-university
partnership is supposed to be a collaborative, two-way effort. Boyle and Silver (2005) suggest
that partnerships may appear to be inclusive in theory, referring to these initiatives as
“community empowerment” in order to maintain legitimacy of the community partner. To
address this, Sorenson (2007) suggests that acknowledgment of power disparities and expected
benefits could encourage the community to voice their expectations and demands. This narrative
is often excluded in the literature yet is as valuable as the university partners’ experience.
Perspectives from community members about their experiences should be included in order to
provide a more complete amount of their concerns and their experiences of the partnerships
(Strier, 2010). For this reason, an analysis of these perspectives is relevant in this study, as it
provides insight into how individuals’ experiences with these partnerships are shaped both by
their cultural, historical and by their own participation in and interpretation of this process.
Furthermore, the perspectives of both community and university partners could provide an
understanding of the power disparities that play out during the community-university partnership experience.

Although a fair amount of the studies focused on service-learning projects as examples of community-university partnerships, this literature review will provide a general overview of studies that have captured the perspectives of both community-university partners. Literature selected for this review focuses on studies that have paid special attention to benefits and challenges as perceived by either university faculty, community residents, or both. Appendix A provides a summary of each partnership discussed in this literature review and includes the perspectives studied in the research, the nature of the partnership, the sample, and the methods employed. The following review of the literature explores benefits and challenges of engagement as perceived by university partners, followed by the community partners’ viewpoints, and lastly the perceived benefits and challenges by both community and university partners.

The benefits and challenges from the perspectives of the university partners has been well documented. Buys and Bursnall (2007) conducted in-depth interviews with seven academics nominated from a metropolitan university in Australia to examine their experience with health, law, business, arts, and education community-university partnerships. Findings revealed that faculty members perceived research benefits, additional funding, international research collaboration opportunities, increased publication output, development of cutting-edge research, enhanced research skills, opportunities for applied research, and teaching and learning outcomes as benefits.

In addition to these academic-related benefits, research has also shown that faculty perceived engagement, mainly service-learning activities, as having both institutional benefits and challenges. This was evident in another study of 368 faculty members in human service
disciplines across the United States that compared faculty involved in service-learning to those who did not participate (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). This study indicates that encouragement from a department chair is a significant factor in motivating faculty to become involved in service-learning activities but also that funding, logistical support, and the difficulty of balancing service-learning to professional responsibilities were major barriers (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). Banerjee & Hausafus (2007) and Buys and Bursnall (2007) both contribute to our understanding of the perceived benefits from the university’s perspective. These studies focused on benefits and the relevance of community-university partnerships through service-learning projects and their impact on academia. However these studies lack community perspectives.

A few recent studies provide on the community perspective of community-university partnerships, indicating that community partners see strong interpersonal relationships, the opportunity to educate students and faculty, and access to university resources as benefits. For example, Bruning, McGrew & Cooper’s (2006) quantitative study of members of a metropolitan Midwestern university and community residents’ perceptions and their attitudes toward the university located in their community. Findings from their 194 surveys show a significant difference between those who had been on campus and those who had not been on campus within the last six months. Those who had been on campus perceived the university more positively on relational dimensions of trust, openness, investment, and commitment whereas those who had not been on campus felt the university was not an asset.

Likewise, Sandy & Holland (2006) build on the idea of interpersonal relationships. Using focus groups of community partners from eight California campuses, they discovered that community partners valued the relationships that extended beyond a collaborative activity and project. Community partners also stressed the need for their university counterparts to
understand community perspectives, build personal connections, and exercise collaborative planning, training, and orientation with community partners. Follow-through and accountability from university partners were also listed as community desires.

Comparatively, Worrall (2007) conducted a qualitative study of 40 key decision makers in various community-based organizations that partnered with DePaul University’s Stean’s Center and found that community partners viewed the partnership as resourceful because they gained access to a reliable source of student volunteers and potential role models for community clients. Once again, community partners also stressed the importance of relationships. In this case, although challenging, the interpersonal relationships were important as they pertained to the university’s responsiveness, consistency, accessibility, and communication (Worrall, 2007). Interestingly, findings also revealed that the community partners perceived the partnerships as beneficial because they provided an opportunity for community partners to educate university students and others about issues of socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic disparities (Worrall, 2007).

Similarly, Tryon and Stoecker (2009) found that community representatives were motivated to partner with the university because they viewed the partnership as an opportunity to educate college students and the public. However, results from interviews conducted with 67 community-based organizations and representatives from 20 nongovernment organizations showed that the challenges outnumbered the benefits.

Some of the challenges included a short time commitment of a semester and demographic barriers of university participants; and university representatives were usually white females from privileged backgrounds who exhibited discomfort with the organization’s clientele. Moreover, respondents consistently revealed that trust and communication were problems when dealing with university partners. Focusing on the community perspective helps to provide a
deeper contextual understanding of the benefits and challenges of community-university partnerships.

Fewer studies focused on both community and university perspectives, demonstrating yet again a gap in addressing the interaction between community and university partners. Previous studies focusing on the views of both community and university partners provide a contextual basis for understanding engagement and community-university relations. For example, Gallo and Davis (2009) examined perceptions of faculty and staff from 10 historically Black colleges and universities and of local residents of predominately African-American urban communities across the United States and found that faculty perceived community and university relationships as being effective in enhancing home ownership. However, community and university relations did not influence employment and job training, educational benefits, or graduation rates within the community. Residents perceived community and university relations as effective in increasing the earnings potential in the community more so than did the university staff. Although this study examined both community and university perspectives, by its quantitative nature, it lacked actual narratives which could otherwise be captured in qualitative methods.

Sullivan (2008) attempted to capture both community and university partners’ voices. By conducting 41 semi-structured interviews with organization staff, community residents, Department of Public Health of Seattle-King County staff, and academic staff from the University of Washington, the collaborators identified a series of problems and solutions for community-university partnerships. The problems identified range from: stereotypes of the community to power imbalances, lack of trust and respect, lack of community benefits, and lack of feedback. According to responses from both partners, possible solutions include the need for researchers to develop cultural competency and sensitivity toward the community. Additionally,
to equalize power by sharing decision making and control over funds, developing transparency and trust through acts of honesty, respecting the expertise of the community partner, providing benefits, assuring that research is flexible, and providing feedback and support. All together, these findings indicate ways in which community-university partnerships have been beneficial and challenging. Generally, university partners have benefited academically, while community partners have benefited relationally.

The studies reviewed in this section describe many benefits as well as many challenges from the community and university perspectives, but typically, the two perspectives are considered separately. The studies that investigate the perspectives of the university faculty focus primarily on institutional benefits, such as future research opportunities and potential funding. The impact of community-university partnerships on the community is captured in separate studies that investigate the experiences of the community partners. By focusing on the community’s experience separately, we find that communities view their experience as relational, emphasizing the importance of trust, communication, and transparency. By considering both university and community perspectives, the researcher can examine power relations that would otherwise be overlooked when the perspectives are studied separately. The community and university perspectives together contribute to a deeper discussion of the partnership experience, which warrants further investigation.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The city of Champaign is located in central Illinois with a population of about 67,500. Whites make up 73 percent of the population, African-Americans comprise of 15 percent, Asian-American 7 percent, and Hispanic or Latino represents 4 percent of the population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Home to both Parkland College and the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Champaign is characterized as a college town, dominated by the university population. Employing more residents than any other area business, the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign provides 10,900 jobs to the community. Champaign Unit 4 School District (1,378 employees) and Kraft Food (1,325 employees) are next on the list (Champaign County Economic Development Corporation, 2010). However, despite the prestige brought by the university, Champaign is also known for its long-standing issues on race relations.

Issues of discriminatory practices toward minorities in Champaign have been a part of critical debates taking place both on campus and in the African-American communities for years. The racial climate has been a major concern of Champaign’s education system in particular. The historic, decade-long struggle to eradicate the consent decree that mandated the assignment of minority students in predominately White schools by way of busing is just one telling example of the educational repercussions and burden African-American students have suffered. Although the consent decree was legally lifted in 2009, issues of race and educational equity remain a major concern (Champaign County NAACP, 2009).

Issues of race have also spilled over to relations between the police and Black youth in Champaign. Community residents, local leaders, and activists have been actively seeking justice to put an end to racial profiling. For example, in 2009, when an unarmed 15-year-old Black male
was shot and killed by a Champaign police officer, the incident ignited a public uproar against discriminatory, racialized practices by police toward minority groups (Dolinar, 2009).

Discriminatory practices are not isolated to the community. Discriminatory practices at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign have been challenged by both minority groups on campus and by the Champaign African-American community. In the 1960s, African-American students and residents mobilized and fought against educational and housing discrimination. During that time, African-American students who attended the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign were forced to live with African-American residents in substandard housing segregated from the White community, with the exception of those who lived in fraternity and sorority houses (Franke, 1990). Today, while students are no longer forced to live in the segregated part of the Champaign African-American community, there is currently a sense of distance between those who attend the university and long-time residents. This town and gown divide reinforces the disconnection between the university affiliates and community residents.

Given the nature and history of race relations in Champaign–Urbana, there have been attempts for improvement. For example, Project 500 was an effort to increase enrollment of students traditionally underrepresented on campus. This initiative was a collaborative effort between students and residents in the late 1960s. Furthermore, to address the injustices in the community, concerned citizens formed informal neighborhood organizations composed of residents, local leaders and activists, and even faculty and students to address issues of economic and education disparities, police brutality, and racial profiling, as well as housing discrimination. Since then, there have been university engagement initiatives implemented to address concerns
in the African-American communities. These community-related projects have dealt with topics ranging from the racial climate and information technology to the preservation of local history.

Moreover, in an effort to address the growing concern of the community and university divide, The Office of Vice Chancellor for Public Engagement established the Campus Community Interface Initiative (CCII) to address the needs of specific Champaign–Urbana underserved communities, with the purpose to serve:

…as a resource and point of contact to bring together the civic interest of University of Illinois faculty, staff, and students with local community organizations and agencies working to improve the quality of life for underrepresented individuals and groups through programs focused on education, health and wellness, and the arts. The office seeks to build strong connections between the local community and campus (The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Public Engagement, 2010).

Although coordinated efforts between the university and community-based organizations to address issues of race and conditions in underserved communities have been in existence, historic and ongoing race relations continue to affect interactions between the university and surrounding communities. Therefore, this research is unique in that it prioritizes personal stories and lived experiences of both university representatives and local community residents, particularly those in African-American communities. This study answers the following questions: (a) Do African-American residents and academics perceive the benefits and challenges of participating in community-university relationships differently? (b) In what context do African-American residents and academics agree on the benefits and challenges of community-university relationships? (c) If there are differences, do these differences create barriers to engagement efforts?
Rationale for Exploratory Research

Embedded in a qualitative framework, this study was best situated in the exploratory research approach. According to Babbie (1986), exploratory research develops a broad understanding of a particular phenomenon in order to identify new insights about a research topic. Stebbins (2001) indicated the fundamental objective of exploratory research is to arrive at generalizations about the situation or phenomenon under study. He writes “through exploration [qualitative data], brings to light important recent changes in social process and social structure that the narrower focus of hypothesis confirmation has led researchers to overlook” (Stebbins, 2001, p. 7). The present qualitative research is grounded in the exploratory approach as described by Babbie (1986) and Stebbins (2001) because it seeks to develop a better understanding of the experiences of community-university partnerships and to yield new insights into this phenomenon as perceived by both community and university partners.

Sampling

Purposive sampling is a method commonly used in qualitative research that permits the researcher to carefully select participants because it illustrates some feature or process the researcher is interested in exploring (Silverman, 2000). Purposive and snowball sampling methods have been used to identify faculty, staff, students, and community residents who have been involved in a university-community partnership within the surrounding African-American communities. Purposive sampling “demands that we [the researchers] think critically about the parameters of the population we [the researchers] are interested in and choose our sample case carefully on this basis” (Silverman, 2000, p. 104).

In addition, the researcher sought key informants who could provide rich information on this topic. Snowball sampling is also referred to as chain sampling because of the chain of
recommended informants who are accumulated (Patton, 1990). Thus, snowball sampling was employed to locate information-rich key informants by asking each participant for names of individuals who would be knowledgeable, available, and willing to partake in this research. Specifically in this study, as a researcher and nonresident, snowball sampling was especially useful for access to the African-American community.

The university representatives were carefully selected after reviewing several departmental websites, faculty and staff profiles, and curricula vita posted on the university’s website. The researcher identified specific faculty, administrators, and students involved with outreach/engagement projects involving the local African-American community and issues of education and employment.

Many of the university participants were involved in similar partnerships with the community representatives but in different capacities. The community resident sample was selected on the criteria that they were at least 18 years of age, residents of local African-American communities, and had experience with a partnership or engagement initiative with the university related to education or employment.

*Characteristics of Research Participants*

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 18 community and university representatives. In the first category, there were eight community representatives, five of whom were women, and three of whom were men; all were considered African-American/Black with the exception of two women—one Asian and one Caucasian. In the second category, there were nine African-American male university representatives, one African-American woman, and two Caucasian men. However, there were four participants who overlapped within these categories
because they were long-term residents and were either employed at the university or were enrolled as students (see Appendix B).

*Interview Protocol*

The purpose of interviewing is not merely to answer questions, test hypotheses, or evaluate; rather, interviewing aims to understand lived experiences and the meaning people attach to those experiences (Seidman, 2006). Furthermore, interviews (as opposed to surveys) allow both the researcher and participant to explore the meaning of the questions and answers involved (Brenner, Brown & Canter, 1985). Therefore, the participants in this study answered questions according to an interview protocol. The interviews served to explore the participants’ subjective experiences with university-community partnerships and engagement.

Prior to taking part in the interviews, all participants signed consent forms to authorize the use of an audio recorder (see Appendix C). All participants willingly volunteered to share their perspectives and experiences regarding community-university engagement. The interviews conducted were recorded digitally unless the participant decided otherwise. Participants were assigned pseudonyms to conceal their identity and to protect their privacy. The participants were assured that the information recorded and collected would remain anonymous. Interviews were conducted in quiet places, such as a café, library, office, home, or place of work. The duration of each individual interview ranged from 30 to 45 minutes and was scheduled on the participant’s terms.

Participants answered questions based on an interview protocol. The interview protocol was designed to include open-ended questions in an attempt to “establish the territory to be explored while allowing the participant to take any direction he or she wants, it does not presume an answer” (Seidman, 2000, p. 84). There were two interview protocols: one for community
representatives and one for university representatives. Both covered the same topics and asked the same questions; however, they differed so that the views of academics and local residents could be compared and contrasted (see appendix D).

The interview protocol attempted to gain new insights into community-university partnership experiences by comparing and contrasting perceptions. The goal was to yield an understanding of the context of the partnership perceptions and to identify ways to improve community-university relations, as recommended by the participants.

Participants were asked general questions such as, “What is the history of the relationship between the University of Illinois and local African-American residents?” and “What is the nature of the relationship between the University of Illinois and local African communities?” Lastly, the participants were asked questions specifically about their experiences—challenges they have experienced, lessons they have learned, and recommendations they could suggest to improve these experiences. Data collected from the interviews helped to paint a picture of how community and university representatives perceive the partnership.

Analysis

The purpose of the analysis is to enhance the level of understanding of community-university partnership experiences through the perspectives of the participants. As such, this study coded the findings for analytical depth through thematic analysis. Coding is generally referred to as a term to conceptualize data (Straus, 1987); the analysis process in this study was adapted from the procedures used by Miles and Huberman (1994). After the interviews took place and were transcribed, codes were assigned to the meaning of the data, not the words themselves.
The coding process allowed the researcher to code for perspectives held by the participants. Coding for perspectives includes codes “oriented toward ways of thinking all or some subjects share that are not as general as their overall definition of the situation but indicate orientations toward particular aspects of a setting…” [P]erspectives are capture[d] in particular phrases subjects use” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.163). Grounded in the coding scheme, this research attempted to identify salient partnership themes that emerged from the interviews about the perceptions and the context of partnership experiences.

The codes were then revised and clustered while maintaining the conceptual orientation. The next level of the coding process involved coding for patterns, which was useful for identifying emergent themes, configurations, or explanations by aggregating the narratives into a smaller number of set themes or constructs (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Throughout this process, memoing, a strategy used to keep a record of the researcher’s thoughts and insights that were stimulated while analyzing the data, took place (Strauss, 1987).

Limitations

The limitations of this study are those commonly found in qualitative research. In terms of the sample, this research relied on participants who willingly volunteered and responded to flyers, emails, and phone calls requesting participation in this research. Additionally, data relied on self-reports derived from memories, which may not be reliable. The sample size was also relatively small compared to previous studies; the 18 participants may not represent a full range of perspectives in the midwestern twin cities and the university.

The sample was taken from a college town community in which the participants may have been skeptical of the researcher’s intentions. The history of race relations in the town coupled with negative attitudes toward research may have been barriers for participants to
disclose information. Specifically, the use of an audio recorder may have appeared to be obtrusive and may have disrupted the natural flow of the interviews to the extent that some participants may have been guarded in their responses.

Another limitation lies within the method used for analysis. Although all data collected were important, the researcher had to be selective in deciding what to include and what to dismiss. With qualitative data, this researcher tended to focus on verbal data which does not include the context along with nonverbal data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Furthermore, the nature of qualitative research can raise concerns regarding this researcher’s bias or subjectivity through the researcher’s past participation in community-university engagement as a graduate student.

In spite of these limitations, the choice of methodology was an asset in this study. Using the exploratory approach to capture experiences of various engagement efforts from both university and community representatives allowed the researcher to collect information about the participants’ lived experiences and the meaning of those experiences within community-university partnerships.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The findings in this section are organized in three categories: perceived benefits, perceived challenges, and contextual influences. Appendix E lists the research participants and summarizes the interview themes into categories and respective subcategories.

Participants emphasized the perceived benefits of partnerships and engagement efforts. In this study, perceived benefits represent desirable effects that emerged from the partnerships. Perceived benefits range from economic and human resources (and the exchange of these resources) to academic/educational and non-academic/educational benefits. Academic benefits include professional advancements linked to the university, whereas educational benefits include positive learning outcomes for the beneficiaries of the engagement initiative. Interestingly, there is a higher percentage of community participants who focused on perceived benefits than the university participants.

While community participants focused on perceived benefits, there were more university participants who generally emphasized challenges—especially those linked to institutional structures and practices, which refer to formalities of research requirements and the culture of the academy that impedes the progress of engagement initiatives. University participants also raised the issue of a lack of tangible outcomes, which primarily includes visible, measurable outcomes of the engagement effort. In addition to these challenges is the lack of sustainability, which is identified as insufficient ongoing opportunities to protect projects and relationships for future engagement efforts. Collectively, these challenges were perceived as a hindrance for engagement practices and partnership relationships.

One of the core categories that emerged from the responses is identified as contextual influences. Contextual influences refer to an array of socioeconomic positions of partners, such
as race, class, educational attainment, power, and spatial positions, as well as previous research-oriented relationships that shape the participants’ views of the partnership. University participants focused more on past research relationships than did community participants.

Community Participants’ Perceived Benefits

Community representatives indicated that the partnership was a beneficial relationship that provided opportunities to share resources to address issues in the community. Five of the nine community residents emphasized the value of maintaining relationships meaningful to sharing and exchanging resources, such as human (i.e. volunteers) and cultural (sensitivity towards other racial and ethnic groups). It was important for community participants to have relationships that were not strictly professional but that extended to friendship. Rachel Crown, founder of a grassroots organization, best captured this sentiment. For almost seven years, faculty from the School of Social Work and the School of Education have worked with her. Through her close relationship with the faculty, Ms. Crown, faculty partners, students, and her clients have benefited from the partnership. Ms. Crown shared:

So then I begin to look at what she taught me, we kept in contact with each other over the years, and I have worked on my own program, and this past fall, she [the university partner] provided a student for me to do some preliminary research on my program to research how effective my program is working with African-American students in a rural community, and it has given me a great basis, a baseline as to knowing what I need to do to improve my program and how to engage the community people. And it comes from a fresh perspective, not someone engaged in the process, and I can’t go buy that anywhere. I don’t have money for that, I mean it’s [the research] a 55 page paper about our program. She helped with that, and I don’t have the background or the expertise to produce that. The research part really helped me…so she benefits whether she gets something out of it, but I, for me, whether I work, it gives me a tangible product that I can look at and point to and say this is what they found… I can refer back, and so you don’t have to take my word for it, take the word of someone who knows what they are talking about.
In the above statement, Ms. Crown demonstrates how she benefited from the personal and professional relationship with university faculty and how that relationship helped her and her organization. This was also the case with educational benefits. Ms. Crown benefited from the intellectual resources of the university and the expertise of her university partners.

Some community participants generally felt that the collaborative efforts with the university, such as tutoring, helped the students improve in the subject matter, boost their self-esteem, and receive the reassurance that they did not receive in the classroom and at home—especially for those whose tutor was consistently invested. In addition to the educational resources and the relationship as a resource, some community participants experienced benefits that were not related to education. For example, Samantha Railer, a former teacher who worked in a school district of mostly African-American and Hispanic students, has been involved in several partnerships with different university units over the last ten years. She shared how her experience with university partnerships has provided cultural awareness for the teachers with whom she worked. Samantha Railer illustrates how the partnership allowed for opportunities to learn about culture and race:

> All the teachers that participated in the project over the years have been white beside myself. I’m Asian, and I think it helps them act differently with African-American youth, to see them in a different light, to see them accomplish something great and when these relationships change how they can work with kids, so I think it has changed the teachers. That was an incredibly positive outcome.

Overall, the community partners perceived many benefits from relationships as a result of community-university partnerships. Generally, relationships were important in exchanging intellectual, educational, and cultural resources. Although there were several benefits of the partnerships, there were also challenges that are worth discussing.
Community Participants’ Perceived Challenges

Community participants also shared challenges of the partnerships as they experienced them. It was common among the community participants to perceive institutional barriers, lack of sustained efforts, and lack of tangible outcomes as challenges of engagement. Some viewed institutional practices, such as university expectations for faculty and students, as barriers for projects. Rachel Crown describes how university departmental requirements and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) were obstacles:

Because of their limitations on what they have to do for their own, whatever it is, research, they would want to help me at times but couldn’t because they had to meet their requirements for their departments….IRB can be very challenging as far as that, and the amount of paperwork… I don’t want to ask people to do things that are not aligned with what the university standards are, but if you don’t know what the standards are or if you don’t know that IRB process, I think IRB are barriers. I’m sure they are necessary.

Although only two community participants specifically expressed how the university demands on faculty and students could potentially strain the partnership, twice as many community participants shared how the inability to maintain ongoing engagement efforts had been problematic. Many referred to this as “drive-by” engagement, in which the duration of the engagement effort was a few months or a semester. Anthony Adams, who managed a program for low-income youth of color and has received support from the university for over 10 years, expressed:

It’s hard to implement and sustain all at the same time, so keeping that going is tough, I think the challenge is timing because we work on real time, month to month, the university has a different timetable of cycle, so there has to be something that is mutually created where everyone has the same sense of timing.

This sentiment, as well as sustaining financial support from the university, was common among all four of the community representatives interviewed.
Community partners also expressed that engagement efforts fail to produce tangible outcomes. Tangible outcomes are measurable, positive changes that occur as a result of the partnerships. Some community partners felt that the local community has been overly researched and has not benefited from the research they have been part of compared to a 20 year old partnership between the University of Illinois and East St. Louis, which produced measurable improvement in their communities. Anthony Adams expressed this concern:

What happens here is that you interview, the questions, the videotaping, there is no byproduct, but in East St. Louis, there is a byproduct. There are actual tangible products that exist… If you are always being interviewed, or you are doing a kinesiology study, there is very little in return, people are used as token, for a lack of a better word, where I’ll give you $100 for this interview, or here is $50, that is tokenism and that is not something that is not economic development.

Other community participants who shared this sentiment referred to being used as human guinea pigs to express how they felt, based on their previous experiences. They described the university representatives as “using” the community as a lab without “giv[ing] something back to the community.”

*University Participants’ Perceived Benefits*

Fewer community-university partnership benefits were discussed by university representatives compared to community partners. Interestingly, nonacademic benefits outnumbered academic benefits. Michael Ashton, an instructor who specializes collaborative efforts that address race in the public school setting and the achievement gap, suggests that academics who partner with the community to address social issues and are able to connect their scholarly work to public engagement or public action benefits by being able to contribute to scholarly literature and to advance in the professional trajectory.

Although one university participant referred to academic benefits for engaging in community-university partnerships, three others discussed nonacademic benefits, including
personal benefits, such as understanding real world issues. This was evident in the interview with Nick Lever, a graduate student who has been actively involved in an effort to bridge the gap between the university and community. In addition to being inspired by the people he met in the community, he considered himself “privileged.” He stated, “As I benefited on a personal level, I feel like African-American history in general is just absolutely helpful to understanding modern America, so I feel like local history and history of communities are key to understanding how society works.”

Throughout the university narratives, personal benefits, whether academic or nonacademic, were commonly credited with helping to advance one’s profession or educational enlightenment. This finding differs from community perspectives on benefits, which focused instead on relationships and the sharing of resources through these relationships.

Additionally, relationships were generally perceived among university partners as a channel to tap into the extended community network. Relationship building was discussed in this context as a way for university representatives to access the community. Name-dropping and consistent visibility in community activities were methods that often emerged when university participants discussed relationships. These techniques were often discussed in the context of building trust to counter the perceived distrust held by the community. To put it simply, from the university perspective, it is all about who you know in the community and whether he or she can vouch for you. The benefits of relationships with key community members can help overcome potential barriers such as distrust and skepticism.

University Participants’ Perceived Challenges

University representatives focused more on the challenges of engagement rather than the benefits. It was common for university participants to express assumptions about what the
community has experienced in past partnerships with others. The challenges that emerged were largely related to institutional practices and to the lack of tangible outcomes in partnerships with African-American communities. When discussing challenges of community partnership, seven out of the ten university representatives felt that both community and university participants view engagement approaches and research practices as exploitative. The following quote by Keith Smith, an instructor in the College of Fine and Applied Arts who has worked extensively with local African-American community organizations, represents the views commonly expressed by university representatives concerning the effects of institutional practices and previous research relationships that did not produce tangible outcomes:

I think there is a long history of the university essentially using the community and giving very little back, so I think the predominate model of how the university base their research and engage the local African-American community, they go there to do a research study, and they collect their data and leave, and they don’t even leave anything behind, anything of value to the community and very often, and they go off and characterize the community in ways that pathologize the community and that disempowers the community more than it helps. That’s not true of all engagement obviously, thank goodness, but much of it, and that history, I think is long and deep, and I think it is beginning to be redressed, but it is very slowly being redressed, so I think that is part of it.

About half of the university representatives perceived the inability to produce tangible or measurable outcomes for the community as problematic for engagement and partnerships. This could be seen in the following quote by Oliver Night, who holds an administrative position as an intermediary:

I think there is some truth to what a community may feel about the university. I don’t think there is an immediate outcome that some individuals in the community require, so for that reason, I can understand why some other perceptions in the community about the university are so negative, but at the same time, I am hopeful that the research that is being done here at this institution would one day help better the situations of communities of color.
As presented in this quote, findings revealed that university representatives tend to refer to engagement efforts as being related to research. However, university representatives commonly perceived the term of engagement as a misunderstanding between the university and community partners.

Comparison of Community and University Perspectives

On the surface, it may appear obvious that a majority of the participants shared common perspectives on engagement and community-university partnerships. Both community and university participants perceived traditional methods of research as a hindrance for engagement. University and community representatives also perceived that community-university partnerships are most beneficial when they produce a measurable or tangible outcome that contributes to the improvement of the community. However, there are some distinct differences between community and university perspectives.

There are some general differences in perception that emerged from the narratives that are worth mentioning. First, university participants perceived socioeconomic differences more so than community representatives. Second, university representatives expressed what they believed community partners felt toward the university. Third, community participants focused more on the benefits of partnerships; conversely university representatives focused more on the challenges of partnerships and engagement. Fourth, community representatives viewed relationships as a way to share resources, whereas university representatives viewed relationships as a way to gain access to the community for partnership or engagement projects. The following section will present excerpts from the data that corroborate these findings.

Major disparities in perceptions lie within the discussion of how the context shaped the perceptions of the participants. Twice as many university participants referred to socioeconomic
differences when discussing the context of these partnerships than did community participants.

For example, Weston Brighton, a university administrator who oversees a particular unit and its involvement and outreach with the community, shared:

> The university typically, certainly the faculty, it’s a sort of highly group of educated people, who have PhDs, graduates; many of our people have bachelor’s degrees. That is not normal or typical in a normal society. Most people in society don’t have bachelor’s degrees, so just having a group of people who have bachelor’s, master’s and doctorates, they are going to be different from the other people, and they will have different tastes. You are going to have different educated types. That is not to say that they are better than or anything like that.

Here we see how Weston Brighton distinguished members of the African-American communities from members of the university based on educational level and taste. He also mentioned that this disparity is very common in town-gown communities.

It was typical for university participants to refer to misconceptions that the community may have of the university. University representatives made several indications that community representatives believe “myths” about the university; approximately three of the ten university representatives made reference to assumptions made by community members about the university. Community representatives however, made no references about any misconceptions that the university partners may have about the community. Oliver Night, a university representative shared:

> I also think that folks in the community look at the university as having a wealth of financial resources and all these grant dollars that are coming to individuals who are actually the heads of these programs and projects and research efforts, and I think sometimes if folks in the community may think that they should give a chance to benefit from some of that, and when that does not happen, it becomes, it tends to create a deeper void as it relates to the relationship. So I wonder sometimes if that is some of the basis of the negative perceptions that happened between the university and the local community.

As implied here, it was common for university participants to suggest what they believed members of the African-American community thought about the university.
Another significant difference between the community and university views was that community participants viewed partnerships as relational, whereas university partners’ viewed relationships as a way to access and gain resources from relationships. While community participants often discussed how resources were shared and were mutually beneficial for all partners and clients, university participants focused on personal gains. According to the narratives, 30% of the university partners referred to relationships as a way to access the community and build trust, which differs from 63% (5 of 8) of community participants who perceived relationships as a way to share and exchange resources. For example, a community participant, Rachel Crown, the director of a community-based organization, stated:

I’m very relational, so everything has to be real personal for me, and so if I can’t connect with you, then I don’t want to work with you. And so every person that I have connected with I have been able to work with; it was based off the intentional meaning, or they have something we can share with each other. I was able to do something for them and in turn they were able to do something for me. So for me, it was an exchange back and forth process.

Conversely, a university student, Yeshiva Rolands, who has been actively involved with community affairs for two years, stated:

It is more of the approach to getting to know the community. That could be going to a church, going to afterschool program, door to door, those kind of simple grassroots things that would introduce yourself to people, because I think if you make those personal connections, people will know you and say, oh, you can stay at my house, or she called me up, or I saw her at a community meeting. Those kind of personal connections where people can get to know you better.

Here we can see how university partners viewed relationships as one-dimensional, whereas community representatives framed relationships as mutual.

Surprisingly, community participants shared that they feel the university benefits more, while the university stated they lacked academic benefits for participating in engagement. Moreover, it appeared that rigors of academia were challenges of engagement for university
participants. Isabella Bradfield, a long-time educational and youth advocate, shared how she felt the university benefits more from the partnerships than community:

    If we are talking about the ability to strike a balance between how the community benefits versus how the university representative may benefit, certainly in my 20 plus years of engagement across the university avenue divide my observation is that a student get[s] a lot more out of it then the community members do and we want the students to benefit and there is no question about that but we also want the community to somehow be different.

Although Ms. Bradfield perceived the university as benefiting more, only one faculty member, Michael Ashton, explicitly discussed the academic benefits of engaging with local communities to address social concerns as previously mentioned.

    This chapter presented findings that were uncovered by this study and categorized them by contextual influences (research relationships, socioeconomic situations), perceived benefits (resources and relationships, academic/educational, nonacademic/noneducational), and perceived challenges (institutional structures and practices, lack of sustainability, and lack of tangible outcome). Narratives from the participants revealed their perspectives based on their experiences with community-university partnerships. The next section will ground the data in relation to the research questions and will conclude with suggestions for future university and community collaborations.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The first research question sought to answer whether residents and academics perceived benefits of community and university partnerships differently. Participants’ responses showed that there were differences in perceived benefits, especially with regard to relationships between university partners and local communities. Although both university and community partners viewed these relationships as important, they perceived the purpose of the relationships differently. University participants focused on relationships as a way to access to the community to pursue their research or engagement interest, while community participants perceived the relationship as mutually beneficial—primarily as a method of exchanging and sharing resources. On the other hand, there were instances in which the university and community participants did not view benefits differently. For example, there was a general consensus among the community and university participants that producing tangible outcomes is beneficial for engagement.

The second research question addressed the context in which the residents of African-American communities and the academics agree and whether this context creates barriers for engagement efforts. Given the history and cultural climate of Champaign, it was evident that the context of a research university and college town has shaped the views of the participants in community-university relationships. Previous research experiences that did not produce tangible outcomes have made some community participants feel used. Furthermore, university participants perceived socioeconomic differences—mainly level of education—as a challenge.

Although this context poses various challenges to university-community relationships, the findings also define ways in which collaboration between the university and the community can be meaningful, despite the history of inequality in race relations. Therefore, although the context could be a barrier, once overcome, all parties can focus on the benefits of the partnership.
Limitations

One of the issues discovered from these findings was that the university participants’ direct partners may not have been included as well as the community participants’ direct partners. Another complication was the complexity of the terminology during the interview process. First, participants’ understanding of engagement and partnerships varied by degrees of involvement. For example, some may understand a partnership as an agreement to engage in a research study, while others may understand it to mean volunteerism or to participate in “community service” activities. Second, the terms university and community are rather broad. Although for the purpose of this study, community and university are presented as two separate entities, the university is geographically part of the community, and members of the university are also community residents. Additionally, it is important to note that the university is a large institution made up of many units and departments, each of which includes many individuals. Some of these individuals may conduct partnerships with the communities that are not necessarily representative of the entire university. Furthermore, the community is also a complex entity in which the beliefs of individual residents may not be representative of the views of the entire community. Therefore, it was important to have a common understanding of these terms.

Suggestions and Recommendations for Future Research

University representatives should consider developing interpersonal relationships with surrounding communities, focusing on building trust through transparency. In other words, relationships should be professional and friendly and should facilitate openness and communication in order for elements of trust to transpire. One of the community participants suggested that increasing visibility in the community could achieve this. Visibility involves increasing participation, interaction, and involvement between both university and community
partners. She recommended that visibility and relationship building could be done by attending community, city council, and school meetings and by talking with people about what they need.

University participants suggested coordination within institutional departments, more cross-dialogue about other engagement projects and research initiatives could help avoid duplicate projects and improve collaboration. This could potentially lead to more sustained institutional support and long-term commitment of dedicated people, a desire also expressed by community participants. University participants also recommended more encouragement of and acknowledgment for community engagement work. One university participant suggested that service in community should be counted toward tenure.

Lastly, both university and community representatives stressed the need for tangible outcomes. Specifically, community participants suggest that research outcomes should help change the quality of their lives and help people—individually and as a broader community—to alter their trajectory. Community representatives also shared that tangible outcomes are valued immensely and expressed the importance of participating in decision-making processes that will affect their community. Additionally, it was recommended for future university partners not to follow the traditional research model as “engagement.”

These findings also provide insights for future research. Future research in this area should consider the way in which a community-based research approach and a participatory-action research approach might address some of the recommendations outlined above. Community-based research offers a collaborative framework within which partners forge relationships between collaborators—in this instance, university and community partners. Additionally, participatory-action research promotes inclusion and equality through its research
methods. Methods from these approaches promote equalizing power and producing measurable outcomes for both academics and community partners.

Future research could also build upon the results of this study. Particularly, future studies may focus particularly on university partnerships and the role of African-American residents who are also employed by the university. This information could be used to develop further insights on the role of race and community-university relations.
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## Appendix A: Overview of the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Community Perspective</th>
<th>University Perspective</th>
<th>Scope of Partnership/Research</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buys &amp; Bursnall (2007)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Faculty in the Health and sciences partnership with agencies commonly focusing on research, consultancy and program development; Faculty in Business and Law areas partnering with legal organizations and government agencies to facilitate research, teaching and learning; Research and consultancy regarding promotion of sports, training for volunteers and recruitment/retention; Faculty in the areas of Arts and education partnering with non-government corporation to engage social and practical appeal of area used by public; and partnerships with schools to enhance the educational experience of teachers and students.</td>
<td>7 faculty from a major metropolitan university at Brisbane Australia</td>
<td>Cross sectional surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banerjee &amp; Hausafus (2007)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Faculty who do and do not incorporate a service-learning curriculum in the areas of: apparel and textiles, human development, consumer resource management, family and consumers education, family studies, fashion merchandise, food services production and hospitality management, housing, interior design and other.</td>
<td>368 human service/family and consumer sciences faculty members who do and do not incorporate service-learning in their teaching across the United States</td>
<td>Cross sectional surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Community Perspective</th>
<th>University Perspective</th>
<th>Scope of Partnership/Research</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruning, McGrew &amp; Cooper (2006)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes of historically strained relationship between local residents of a suburb located in close proximity of a major metropolitan mid-western university</td>
<td>194 suburban Community residents near a metropolitan mid-western university</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy &amp; Holland (2006)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing questions concerning their motivations, benefits, challenges and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Community partners with 8 California campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worrall (2007)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steans Center at DePaul University and community based organizations partner to offer educational programs to the larger community</td>
<td>Representatives from 12 Community Based Organizations involved with DePaul University</td>
<td>In-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryon &amp; Stoecker (2008)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>A variety of non-government organization representatives who hosted service-learning at their organizations</td>
<td>67 Community Organization representative from 20 non-government organizations</td>
<td>In-depth interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Community Perspective</th>
<th>University Perspective</th>
<th>Scope of Partnership/Research</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan et. al. (2008)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Partnership between community-based organizations staff, community members and Seattle-King department of Public Health and academic faculty from University of Washington addressed public health topics such as adolescent health, HIV prevention, hypertension among African-Americans, physical activity and environmental health, infant mortality, asthma management, child health status, and addressing needs for refugee and immigration population</td>
<td>41 community based organization staff, community members and organizers, faculty from University of Washington and Seattle-King County department of Public Health involved in all levels of the partnership in Seattle</td>
<td>In-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallo &amp; Davis (2009)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Relationship between HBCU and African-Community residents on issues related to educational benefits, employment and job training, home ownership, earning potential and graduation rates</td>
<td>Faculty and staff members associated with 10 HBCU’s relation with predominately African-American residents in areas with a population of at least 300,000 across the U.S</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Demographic of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Years with University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Adams ( c)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Brown ( c)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 (Staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Crown ( u/c)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2 (Graduate Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Gregory ( c)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Jameson ( c)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Railer( c)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 (Graduate Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casandra Scott ( c )</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Former Masters Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Trevors ( c)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6 (Graduate Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ashton ( u )</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21(Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Bedstow ( u/c)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24 (Resident &amp; Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Brighton ( u)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Gerald ( u)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Lever ( u)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Graduate Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olver Night ( u)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3(Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Rolands(u)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Graduate Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarim Sanders ( u)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Smith ( u)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Watson ( u/c)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43 (Resident &amp; Faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=18

Note: ( C ) is community representative, ( U ) is university representative
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

To Whom It May Concern:

Melissa Pognon and Dr. Janet Reis, of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, are conducting a research project exploring views of the relationship between the University of Illinois and members of local African-American communities concerning issues of education and employment. We hope to have members of the local African-American community, students, faculty and administrators from the University of Illinois contribute stories of their personal experiences with community-university engagement to gain a better understanding of the relationships between African-American residents and University of Illinois.

You are especially invited to participate in this study to share your experience with community-university relationship in Champaign. If you agree to participate, we will schedule an interview time and location that is convenient for you. With your permission, this interview will be audiotaped, and will take approximately 30-40 minutes.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There are no risks associated with this project beyond those that exist in daily life. However, you are free not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. There are no direct immediate benefits from participating in the interview and you will receive no compensation for your participation. However, your opinions may help our community understand our past and look forward constructively to the future.

The audio tapes made will have no identifying information except your voice. Your interviews will be strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate, excluding references to any individual responses. With your signed permission below, we may abstract quotes from your interview for inclusion in research reports (thesis and dissertation) and formal presentations (conferences, and invited talks).

This informed consent statement has been approved by the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign Institutional Review Board. You will be given a copy of this statement for your records.

If you have questions at any time about the interview, you may contact me at (516) 987-0848 or email me at mpognon2@illinois.edu, or the responsible principal investigator Dr. Janet Reis, (217)244-0448 or via email jreis@illinois.edu. You may also contact the UIUC IRB office at 217-333-2670 or irb@illinois.edu or call collect with questions about participants' rights.

____ I am 18 years of age or older
(Circle one) I agree / disagree to be interviewed
(Circle one) I agree / disagree to be audiotaped
(Circle one) I agree / disagree to dissemination of quotes

____________________________________  ______________________________
Date                                                                 Participant's Signature
Appendix D: Interview Guides

Interview Guide for University Representative

I want to thank you for participating in this interview. I am going to talk to you about your interaction with local African American communities.

Relationship

- What is the history of the relationship between the University of Illinois and local Black communities?
- What do you think is the nature of the relationship between University of Illinois and local African American communities?
  - Do you think there is tension?
  - Where do you think this tension derived from?
- What efforts have been made to improve relations with local communities?
  Do these efforts still exist? For how long have they been in existence? What are some factors that you think contributed to the success?

Engagement

- What is community engagement/partnership to you?
  - In what ways did you/your department/office engage with local communities of color?
  - In what ways did you address issues of employment/education in the local community?

Elements of Social Capital

Benefits

- Tell me, as a [student/professor/other title] about the benefits you get out of engaging with communities of color when addressing issues with the education system and employment in Champaign? What are some disadvantages?

Trust

- Do people in the community trust you in addressing issues surrounding education and employment? How did you build trust?

Networks

- What are some ways you often communicate with local residents in the African American communities? (Face-to-face? Email? Phone?)
- On average, how often do you interact with local residents in a week, month?
Appendix D: Interview Guides (cont.)

Reflection
For the remaining questions, I would like you to think about specific issues surrounding education and employment in Champaign–Urbana:

- What are some of the challenges you face with local African American communities and their concerns regarding education and employment in Champaign–Urbana?
- What lessons can be learned from your engagement/relations with local residents?
- Looking back at your involvement in the community, is there anything that you would change or do differently?
- In closing, what would you like to share anything that we did not cover during this interview?

I want to thank you for being so patient and thoughtful. Are there any questions you would like to ask? Please feel to contact me if you have any further questions or concerns.
Interview Guide for Community Residents

I want to thank you for participating in this interview. I am going to talk to you about your interaction with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Relationship

- What is the history of the relationship between the University of Illinois and local African-American communities?

- What do you think is the nature of the relationship between University of Illinois and local African-American communities?
  - Do you think there is tension?
  - Where do you think this tension derived from?

- In your opinion, what efforts have been made to improve relations with local communities?
  - Do these efforts still exist? For how long have these efforts been in existence? Do you think it has been successful? What are some factors you think contributed to the success?

Engagement

- What is engagement/partnership to you?
  - Under what circumstance did you “engage/partner” with the University?

- How involved do you believe the University is in addressing the concerns of employment and/or education in the African-American communities in Champaign?

Elements of Social Capital

Benefits

- Tell me, as a [resident of African-American community in Champaign,] what are some of the benefits you have received from engagement/relationship with the university as it relates to employment? Education system in the community? What are some disadvantages?

Trust

- Do you trust members of the University to address issues of education and employment?
  - If so, how was the trust built?
  - If not, what is the history behind your distrust with the university?

Networks

- What are some ways you often communicate with University folks (face-to-face? Email? Phone?)
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- How much time or effort do you feel the university puts into building relationships with local African-American communities?

Reflection

For the remaining questions, I would like you to think about specific issues surrounding education and employment in Champaign-Urbana:

- What are some of the challenges you face with the University of Illinois?
- What lessons can be learned from your engagement/relations with the University?
- Looking back at your involvement, if any, the university has with the Black community, what would you recommend changing or the University does differently?

In closing, would you like to share anything we did not cover during this interview?

I want to thank you for being so patient and thoughtful. Are there any questions you would like to ask? Please feel to contact me if you have any further questions or concerns.
## Appendix E: Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Participants</th>
<th>Perceived Benefits</th>
<th>Perceived Challenges</th>
<th>Contextual Influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources and Relationship</td>
<td>Academic/ Educational</td>
<td>Non-academic/ Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Adams (c)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Brown (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Crown (u/c)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Gregoire (c)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Jameson (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Rafter (c)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Scott (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Trefers (c)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Participants</th>
<th>Perceived Benefits</th>
<th>Perceived Challenges</th>
<th>Contextual Influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources and Relationship</td>
<td>Academic/ Educational</td>
<td>Non-academic/ Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ashton (u)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Bedstow (u/c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Brighton (u)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Gerald (u)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Lever (u)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Nugil (u)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Roland (u)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarim Sanders (u)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Smith (u)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Watson (u/c)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL N= | 9 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 6 |
| TOTAL %  | 50 | 28 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 44 | 50 | 33 |