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Understanding Partnership Contexts

• Socio-economic, cultural, geographic, political-historical & environment

• National & local policies/trends/governance

• History of collaboration: trust & mistrust

• Community and university capacity, readiness, reputation, & experience

• Perceived severity & importance of issue

Adapted from: C. Pearson, B. Duran, D. Martin, J. Lucero, J. Sandoval, J. Oetzel, G. Tafoya, L. Belone, M. Avila, N. Wallerstein, & S. Hicks (2011). CBPR Variable Matrix: Research for improved health in academic-community partnerships. From: NARCH V (Indian Health Service/NIGMS/NIH U261HS300293 2009-2013), a partnership between the National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center (Hicks, PI); the University of New Mexico Center for Participatory Research (Wallerstein, PI); the University of Washington Indigenous Research Institute (Duran, PI); and CBPR projects nationwide.
Sockett’s Partnership Types

- Service relationship: fixed time, fixed task
- Exchange relationship: exchange information, access for mutual benefit, specific project
- Cooperative relationship: joint planning and sharing responsibilities, long-term, multiple projects
- System and Transformative relationship: shared decision-making/operations/evaluation intended to transform each organization.

H. Sockett, 1988
Understanding Partnership Group Dynamics

Adapted from: C. Pearson, B. Duran, D. Martin, J. Lucero, J. Sandoval, J. Oetzel, G. Tafoya, L. Belone, M. Avila, N. Wallerstein, & S. Hicks (2011). *CBPR Variable Matrix: Research for improved health in academic-community partnerships*. From: NARCH V (Indian Health Service/NIGMS/NIH U261HS300293 2009-2013), a partnership between the National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center (Hicks, PI); the University of New Mexico Center for Participatory Research (Wallerstein, PI); the University of Washington Indigenous Research Institute (Duran, PI); and CBPR projects nationwide.
• Diversity
• Complexity of the structure
• Formal Agreements
• Real power/resource sharing
• Alignment with participatory principals
• Length of time in partnerships
• Practices

Adapted from: C. Pearson, B. Duran, D. Martin, J. Lucero, J. Sandoval, J. Oetzel, G. Tafoya, L. Belone, M. Avila, N. Wallerstein, & S. Hicks (2011). CBPR Variable Matrix: Research for improved health in academic-community partnerships. From: NARCH V (Indian Health Service/NIGMS/NIH U261HS300293 2009-2013), a partnership between the National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center (Hicks, PI); the University of New Mexico Center for Participatory Research (Wallerstein, PI); the University of Washington Indigenous Research Institute (Duran, PI); and CBPR projects nationwide.
Understanding Partnership Group Dynamics

- Core values
- Motivations for participating
- Personal relationships
- Cultural identities/humility
- Bridge people/boundary spanners
- Individual beliefs, spirituality, meaning
- Community reputation of team lead

Adapted from: C. Pearson, B. Duran, D. Martin, J. Lucero, J. Sandoval, J. Oetzel, G. Tafoya, L. Belone, M. Avila, N. Wallerstein, & S. Hicks (2011). CBPR Variable Matrix: Research for improved health in academic-community partnerships. From: NARCH V (Indian Health Service/NIGMS/NIH U261HS300293 2009-2013), a partnership between the National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center (Hicks, PI); the University of New Mexico Center for Participatory Research (Wallerstein, PI); the University of Washington Indigenous Research Institute (Duran, PI); and CBPR projects nationwide.
Understanding the Approach to Partnership Activities

Has the activity been designed to fit the local culture?

Does the process reflect reciprocal learning and sharing of knowledge?

Adapted from: C. Pearson, B. Duran, D. Martin, J. Lucero, J. Sandoval, J. Oetzel, G. Tafoya, L. Belone, M. Avila, N. Wallerstein, & S. Hicks (2011). CBPR Variable Matrix: Research for improved health in academic-community partnerships. From: NARCH V (Indian Health Service/NIGMS/NIH U261HS300293 2009-2013), a partnership between the National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center (Hicks, PI); the University of New Mexico Center for Participatory Research (Wallerstein, PI); the University of Washington Indigenous Research Institute (Duran, PI); and CBPR projects nationwide.
Understanding Partnership Outcomes

• System and capacity changes
  – Changes in policies/practices
  – Development of culturally-based and sustainable products
  – Changes in power relations
  – Empowerment
  – Cultural revitalization and renewal

• Individual outcomes
  – Reduction of disparities
  – Social justice

Adapted from: C. Pearson, B. Duran, D. Martin, J. Lucero, J. Sandoval, J. Oetzel, G. Tafoya, L. Belone, M. Avila, N. Wallerstein, & S. Hicks (2011). CBPR Variable Matrix: Research for improved health in academic-community partnerships. From: NARCH V (Indian Health Service/NIGMS/NIH U261HS300293 2009-2013), a partnership between the National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center (Hicks, PI); the University of New Mexico Center for Participatory Research (Wallerstein, PI); the University of Washington Indigenous Research Institute (Duran, PI); and CBPR projects nationwide.
• COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Community Engagement—To What Extent?

The maximalist approach, while an admirable ideal, may be impractical in certain circumstances.


## Spectrum of Collaboration: What is the Participation Goal?

### Increasing Levels of Public Impact and Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Participation Goal</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities, and/or solutions.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that the public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of preferred outcomes.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Himmelman’s Strategies for Working Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Coordinating</th>
<th>Cooperating</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging information for mutual benefit</td>
<td>Exchanging information for mutual benefit and <strong>altering activities</strong> to achieve a common purpose</td>
<td>Exchanging information for mutual benefit, altering activities, and <strong>sharing resources</strong> to achieve a common purpose</td>
<td>Exchanging information for mutual benefit, altering activities, sharing resources, and <strong>enhancing the capacity of another</strong> to achieve a common purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partnership Structures

BREADTH AND DEPTH
Individual Partnerships
- Transactional
- Project Oriented
- Time Limited

Team-based Partnerships
- Transactional or Transformational?
- Project oriented or Emergent?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis of relationship</td>
<td>Exchange-based &amp; utilitarian</td>
<td>Focus on ends beyond utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End goal</td>
<td>Satisfaction with exchange</td>
<td>Mutual increase in aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Satisfaction of immediate needs</td>
<td>Arouses needs to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner roles</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of existing institutional goals</td>
<td>Accepts institutional goals</td>
<td>Examines institutional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Works within systems to satisfy interests of partners</td>
<td>Transcends self-interests to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner identity</td>
<td>Maintains institutional identity</td>
<td>Changes group identity in larger definition of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of commitment</td>
<td>Limited time, resources, personnel to specific exchanges</td>
<td>Engages whole institutions in potentially unlimited exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different Types of Teams: Internal & External Teams

• At a network level, decisions need to be made regarding the role for each internal and external team

• Does the team….
  – Fulfill a consultative role?
  – Work as colleagues with an equal voice regarding task or project specific decisions/actions?
  – Work as colleagues with an equal voice regarding overall network management?
Developing Your Team

• Surface Reasons
  – Satisfy community partnership requirements
  – Support the director/PI

• Deeper Reasons
  – Include different perspectives
  – Include more voices, bringing a truer picture
Getting Started

- Work **hard** to include representation from all key stakeholders
  - Attend to ambiguity of group membership (both individual and organizational)

- Start with Strengths
  - Respectful to begin with strengths (as opposed to needs)
  - Consider functions to fill

- Traits to look for
  - Networking
  - Additional perspectives
  - Synergies of the group
Critical Values for Team Members

**Integrity**
- Authentic
- Honest
- Open

**Inclusiveness**
- Set Titles Aside
- Values Diversity

**Community Over Self**
- Listens and Respects Others
- Motivated to Give
- No Agendas

**Reliability**
- Commitment & Capacity
- Accountable
- Dependable
Effective Team Characteristics

- Committed to an agreed upon purpose
- Set clear goals
- Diversity of members
- Effective communication and collaboration
- Trust and commitment
Supporting an Effective Team

- Informal, relaxed atmosphere
- Lots of relevant discussion, including expression of feelings and ideas
- Encourages constructive criticism and disagreement
- Provide flexible structure for team leadership
- All individuals contribute
- Establish roles, norms, and processes
- Team processes are reviewed and adjusted
Partnership Stages

Forming
Norming
Storming
Re-Norming
Performing

Leadership
Trust
Norms & Rules
Individual Strengths
Roles & Responsibilities
Purpose
Commitment

Establish and Maintaining Group Norms and Values

- At the onset, establish the ways you want to work together
  - Individual behaviors
  - Group processes
- Develop a written agreement outlining these
- Revisit these on a regular basis to see if change is needed
- Refer explicitly to these in your work together
Communication is critical

- University partners often need to be educated on community cultural norms, beliefs and customs, and community history, and how to partner effectively with community partners.

- Community partners often need to be educated on university norms, beliefs and customs, how research can benefit community, and how to participate in research projects.
Framework for an action-oriented approach to establishing a partnership

- Respect
- Equity
- Empowerment

Adapting Styles of Communication

Gathering Information

Exchanging Knowledge

Negotiating and Establishing Roles

Resolving Differences

Gaining Acceptance and Trust

Establish an Agenda & Parameters

Logistics

- Maintain constant communication between investigators, field staff, and project members
- Understand that communication is enhanced by face-to-face contact
- Meeting with all members of a team on a regular basis influences the effectiveness of reaching resolutions to problems
Levels of Trust Building

• Trust building occurs on 2 levels:
  – First Level: Between an organization and existing community partners
  – Second Level: Between initial partners and the greater community and other organizational partners
Iterative Nature of Trust

- Trust is first established within the internal or core group.
- The external or expanded group members are able to build upon the foundation of trust provided by the internal group.
- The process is repeated again for each new member or group.
“Reflective practice can also help you examine your engagement and the community with whom you work. During the process, you will be able to understand how you can relate to issues of diversity, including those of power and privilege. This can lead you to a desire to change your personal choices and behavior, to have a different outlook, or to encourage you to continue to search for long-term solutions to inequalities.”

Critical engagement reflects profound intentionality—to work with others in ways that are truly participative, critical, transformative, democratic, pluralistic, and systemic or holistic.

It involves making sense of and creating knowledge of the world we experience in a manner that evokes all of the elements of what Bohm (1992) refers to as our “thought system,” which includes thoughts and feelings.

Potential Reflective Critique Questions

Does the student/scholar **critically evaluate** the work?

- Does the student/scholar bring an **appropriate breadth of evidence** to the critique?
  - Debriefing sessions with community partners
  - Evaluations from community partners
  - Changing a course design or research project based on lessons learned

- In what way has the **community perspective** informed the critique?

- Does the student/scholar **use evaluation** to learn from the work and to direct future work?
Common Problems in Partnerships

• Lack of trust and respect

• Inequitable distribution of power and control

• Conflicts over perspective, priorities, assumptions, values, beliefs and language

• Conflicts over funding

• Conflicts associated with different emphases on task and process

• Conflicts regarding who represents the community and how is community defined

• Not understanding small group dynamics
Successful Campus-Community Partnerships

• Share a common vision
• Share agreement about goals and strategies
• Have mutual trust and respect
• Share power and responsibility
• Communicate clearly and listen carefully
• Understand and empathize with one another’s circumstances
• Remain flexible, with eye on the target
• Achieve mutual benefits
• Enhance community partner’s capacity for self sufficiency
• Enhance faculty member’s scholarly career
TECHNIQUE TASTE #1
STRATEGIC DOING
What is Strategic Doing?

- used to develop & implement strategy
- based on collaboration and open networks
- asset based (using what you have)
- leads to shared, measurable outcomes and a roadmap to follow

Strategic Doing is being taught across the nation.
Strategy

Where are we going?

Outcomes

How will we get there?

Pathways

We are here
Strategic Doing

Where are we going?
Outcomes
Link, Leverage & Align

How will we get there?
Pathways

What could we do?
What should we do?
What will we do?
What's our 30/30?
It’s critical to come back together
TECHNIQUE TASTE #2
FOCUS GROUPS
What are Focus Groups?

- A group interview

- Used alone or combined with other techniques, such as
  - Individual Interviews
  - Participant observation
  - Surveys
When are focus groups used?

• **Generally, to learn more about a topic**, including the relevant issues [to this group of people]

• To learn how to talk about a topic “in the person’s voice”

• To discover reasons behind likes/dislikes

• To discover ideas or issues that couldn’t be unearthed through surveys
Cautions when using focus groups

• Not too small a group; not too big a group (generally 6-10)

• Be careful of power differentials (no bosses with their work groups, for example)

• People may be unwilling to speak in front of others they don’t know (or don’t know very well)

• Hard to generalize from comments made in such a small group
Just because they look easy...

- Focus groups take planning, such as desired level of facilitator involvement

- Leading a focus group requires skill and practice

- Qualitative data takes as long or longer to analyze than quantitative
TECHNIQUE TASTE #3
ASSET MAPPING
What is Asset Mapping?

• A group process for identifying or inventorying resources (and potential resources) that could be mobilized to improve the community

• Starts with identifying what is present and working well in the community

• Concentrates on the agenda-building and problem-solving capacity of the community residents

• Stresses local determinism, investment, creativity, and control
How Asset Mapping Relates to Engagement

**Expert Model**
- Problem focused
- Expert initiated
- One size fits all
- Solutions come from the outside of the community
- Focus on financial and built capital
- Importance of knowledge/expertise

**Engagement Model**
- Solution seeking
- Community-based
- Place specific applications that emerge from community discourse
- Focus on cultural, human, social, and other capitals
- Importance of knowledge management and learning systems
- Privileges local wisdom

Emery (n.d.)
Deficit-based approach: Community partners have deficiencies and needs.

Asset-based approach: Community partners have assets, capacities and gifts.

Kretzmann, J. & McKnight, J. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path towards finding and mobilizing a community’s assets.* Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications. pg. 13.
When is Asset Mapping Used?

• Reframe community development initiatives

• Gather perceptions, raise awareness, or simply identify the strengths or assets in the community
  – Kretzmann & McKnight’s model focuses on individuals, associations, and institutions
  – Flora, Flora & Fey’s model focuses on human, social, political, financial, cultural, built, and natural capitals

• Promote connections or relationships between individuals, between individuals and organizations, and between organizations and organizations

• Create enthusiasm and momentum in the community
Flora, Flora, & Fey Asset Map Template

- Financial Capital
- Built Capital
- Natural Capital
- Political Capital
- Cultural Capital
- Social Capital
- Human Capital
Caution When Using Asset Mapping

• Asset mapping is an identification and inventorying process of local knowledge about resources. It does not necessarily result in a physical map of assets in the community...though making a map can be an additional step if the community desires it.

• Asset mapping is not appropriate for groups who prefer to rely upon experts to tell them what to do (or for facilitators who prefer to be in control of everything).

• Asset mapping is an early step in a process of community development. In and of itself, it does not generate actions or results. It is best paired with other processes to move from ideas to action.
An Engagement Approach Partnerships

- **Becoming Embedded in Communities**: working in long-standing partnerships that are embedded in communities to identify the needs of families, businesses, neighborhoods and community organizations

- **Stressing Asset-Based Solutions**: focusing on asset-based solutions that build on the strengths and advantages of community partners

- **Building Community Capacity**: building capacity within families, businesses and communities to address the challenges and build on the opportunities they face

- **Creating Collaborative Networks**: building networks among communities and organizations that lead to regional collaborations and innovations that are sustainable
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