Assessing the Performance of Higher Education Institution (HEI) – Community Partnerships

Ryan Plummer [a], Samantha Witkowski [a], Amanda Smits [a], Gillian Dale [a]

[a] Environmental Sustainability Research Centre, Brock University

Abstract

As partnerships between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and communities have taken on increased importance, greater attention has been paid to how these partnerships are formed, the manner in which they operate, and what they can accomplish. Assessing the performance of these partnerships is critical for accountability, transparency, and understanding their value. However, no performance assessment framework exists of HEI-community partnerships. In this paper we summarize scholarship on HEI-community partnerships and present a conceptual framework to assess their performance. The assessment framework provides a mechanism for continuous improvement. Practical considerations and future research directions conclude the paper.

Keywords

community engagement; continuous improvement; HEI-community partnerships; performance assessment

1.0. Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) have long engaged communities. This has occurred in several ways, such as: cooperative and continuing education; pre-professional programs; administrative and academic units with outreach mandates; professional service provisions; student volunteer initiatives; access to facilities and events; service learning; and community in the classroom (Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Mosier and Ruxton, 2018; Thomas, 1998). Whereas communities were historically considered passive recipients of knowledge or sources for experimentation (Bringle et al., 1999), HEIs in the 1990s were challenged to innovate and elevate their approach (Boyer, 1996). As Fitzgerald et al. (2012) argue, "today and in the future, public universities need to build on their experience of university–community relationships and transition to making engagement more central to the core of the institution" (see also Bawa and Munck, 2012; Holland and Malone, 2019; Weerts and Sandmann, 2010).

Within the broader community engagement movement, we specifically focus on HEI-community partnerships. In literature and practice, there is often little agreement about the meaning of the term 'partnership'. While it is often used to signal collaborative efforts to advance mutual interests, multiple different definitions exist. In an effort to be transparent and clear about the way in which we use the term throughout the paper, we follow the articulation put forth by Brinkerhoff (2002, p. 21), who comprehensively describes a partnership as a:

> *"...dynamic relationship among diverse actors, based on mutually agreed objectives, pursued through a shared understanding of the most rational division of labour based on the respective comparative advantages of each partner. Partnership encompasses mutual influence, with a careful balance between synergy and respective autonomy, which incorporates mutual respect, equal participation in decision-making, mutual accountability and transparency".*

Although the techniques and strategies used in the formation of HEI-community partnerships are well-understood, the manner in which they evolve is less clear given that these partnerships are dynamic and may involve multiple pathways (Anderson et al., 2018; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Dorado and Giles, 2004; Levkoe and Stack-Cutler, 2018; Thune and Gulbrandsen, 2014).

Partnerships can be positioned along a continuum of formalization (Hall, 1999; Plummer and FitzGibbon, 2004), but there is a clear distinction between those which are formal (i.e., a joint entity or process has been established and codified) as opposed to informal (i.e., the entities behave as partners but without explicit arrangements; Reuschke, 2014; Smith and Wohlstetter, 2006; Wildridge et al., 2004). In this paper, we focus primarily on the former because of the implications for HEI accountability (e.g., Holton et al., 2015) as well as the shift towards performance-based funding (e.g., de Boer et al., 2015; Jongbloed et al., 2018).

As HEI-community partnerships are gaining priority for both entities, it is becoming increasingly important to develop a mechanism to assess their performance (Hart and Northmore, 2011; Holton et al., 2015). The importance of recognizing the perspective of community partners in the partnership assessment process is critical (Srinivas et al., 2015) and the assessment framework proposed incorporates the perspective of both the HEI and community partners. There are multiple potential methods for assessing performance including self-assessments, basic checklists, and indicators (Busch et al., 2019; Furaco and Miller, 2009; Hart et al., 2009; Langworthy and Garlick, 2008; McClenney, 2007). In some instances, case studies have also been used to advance the understanding of the operation and contributions of HEI-community partnerships (see Bowen and Martins, 2006; Holton et al., 2015; McNall et al., 2009; VanDevanter et al., 2011).

Despite the informativeness of case studies to date, there is currently no existing framework for systematically assessing the performance of HEI-community partnerships (Bowen and Martens, 2006; Brinkerhoff, 2002; Holton et al., 2015; Rubin, 2000; Srinivas et al., 2015). As such, the purpose of this paper is to advance understanding of HEI-community partnerships, specifically the desirable conditions of their performance, and develop such an assessment framework. We start by synthesizing scholarship on HEIs and community partnerships. The manner in which these partnerships develop provides an entry point from which we explore their formation, functioning, and impacts. In drawing upon theoretical and applied scholarship, we then conceptualize a framework for assessing the performance of HEI-community partnerships. Practical considerations and future research directions conclude the paper.

A search of scholarly literature was conducted on the subject of performance assessment for HEI-community partnerships for the purpose outlined above. The search focused on assessing HEI-community partnerships more broadly, as well as specific aspects relating to the qualities of successful HEI-community partnerships. Databases of scholarly literature were searched using terms relating to performance assessment, HEI-community partnerships, and qualities of success. All materials were carefully reviewed in order to provide a comprehensive summary of the salient points in this paper.

2.0. HEIs and Community Partnerships

2.1. The Lifecycle of HEI-Community Partnerships

As partnerships between HEIs and communities have taken on increasing importance, greater attention has been paid to their lifecycle (Amey and Brown, 2005; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Hart and Northmore, 2011; Holton et al., 2015). Several frameworks exist that outline the stages of HEI-community partnerships, with subtle differences relating to context (e.g., resources, precipitating circumstances, interpersonal factors). Notwithstanding the importance of context, Sargent and Water's (2004) framework of academic collaboration is frequently employed to capture the development and evolution of HEI-community partnerships (Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Lewinson, 2014). Their framework takes into account contextual and interpersonal factors, and sets out four phases of collaborative partnerships, as identified and described in Table 1.

Although the lifecycle of formal partnerships by Sargent and Waters (2004) aptly captures the phases through which HEIs and communities progress, it is not without criticism. The linear manner of the phases is frequently cited as a shortcoming (Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Lewinson, 2014), as HEI-community partnerships develop and evolve in a variety of ways (Anderson et al., 2018; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Dorado and Giles, 2004; Thune and Gulbrandsen, 2014).

Amey and Brown (2005) depict this maturation process in their model of interdisciplinary collaboration, which draws attention to four evolving dimensions of partnerships: discipline orientation, knowledge engagement, work orientation, and leadership (see also Bensimon and Neumann, 1993; Bolman and Deal, 1997; Tuckman, 1965). Consequently, Amey and Brown (2005) suggest that a partnership can be identified as being at an early, moderate, or mature stage of development. HEI-community partnerships may also not reach a completion phase. Rather, they may be non-linear, iterative and ongoing (Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Lewinson, 2014). As such, we use Sargent and Water's (2004) life-cycle of academic collaboration due to its wide application in academic partnership literature, while addressing the critiques made above.

2.2. Unpacking HEI-Community Partnerships

In this section, we deconstruct HEI-community partnerships according to the circumstances of their formation, the manner in which they function, and what they may accomplish. In synthesizing scholarship related to each aspect we give a succinct description, highlight important considerations, and offer examples cited in the literature to embody high-performing HEI-community partnerships. Table 2 provides a summary of this synthesis.

2.3. Inputs of HEI-Community Partnerships

Like any other relationship, HEI-community partnerships commence for various reasons. The initiation phase often focuses on the inputs dedicated by the two or more parties that contribute to the formation of the partnership. In order to self-disclose effectively during the early stages of a HEI-community partnership, each entity must effectively communicate their interests, motivations, and resources to the other party. Therefore, the four primary input qualities are: motivation for the partnership, transparency, financial resources, and human resources.

Entry into a formal partnership requires a shared commitment to agreed-upon aims. Relatedly, an important aspect for the formation of the partnership are the contributions that the HEI and community dedicate to the partnership. These contributions should be congruent with the aims of

the partnership as they shape the process by which it unfolds and influence what can be achieved.

Understanding each entities' motivations for the partnership, and being transparent about respective strengths, limitations, and expectations is essential at the outset of a partnership (Amey and Brown, 2005; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Sargent and Waters, 2004). For example, community partners may not be fully aware of the requirements in the day-to-day operations of academia. Conversely, academics may value scholarly peer-reviewed publications and have limited understanding of impactful outcomes for a community partner. Mutual understanding of what constitutes value or usefulness is paramount (Buys and Bursnall, 2007). Differing expectations regarding the outputs of collaboration can impact the partnership process (McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004). Transparent and open communication about realistic expectations and values (shared and different) is required from the outset (Table 2).

A major resource affecting partnerships is funding (Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Holton et al., 2015; Levkoe and Stack-Cutler, 2018; Sargent and Waters, 2004). For example, the type or source of financial support can affect the scope of the project in terms of duration or the type of data collected. Moreover, these types of resources can also dictate the roles that different collaborators engage in, depending on who secures research funding (Sargent and Waters, 2004). Adequate human resources are just as important to the success of a partnership. These can include available experts, faculty members, students, information technology staff, administrative staff, and other colleagues. Access to these types of supports and creating a collaborative network is also integral to partnership success (Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Hall and McPherson 2011; Harper et al., 2004; Holton et al., 2015; Levkoe and Stack-Cutler, 2018; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Schulz et al., 2002; Walsh, 2006). In HEI-community partnerships specifically, it is important to identify different types and sources of support, as both entities can contribute and involve many different actors to facilitate the success of the partnership.

2.4. Processes of HEI-Community Partnerships

6

The process by which the HEI-community partnership operates is a second salient aspect of HEI-community partnerships. The process influences a number of measures of partnership success, such as perceptions of group effectiveness and perceived benefits of participation (McNall et al., 2009). A process that cultivates respectful and positive relationships is especially critical for successfully moving the partnership beyond the initiation phase and towards effective implementation (Sargent and Waters, 2004). The five primary process qualities are: shared-decision making, communication, trust, mutual respect, and adaptability. These qualities largely focus on the interpersonal dynamics between the individuals involved in a partnership, such as fostering good relations and breaking down barriers arising from different institutional contexts (Buys and Bursnall, 2007).

Although the motivations for engaging in a HEI-community partnership may vary, it is important that the process includes their integration - the development of both shared understanding and decision-making among the partners (Amey and Brown, 2005; Hall and McPherson, 2011; McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Schulz et al., 2002). This allows the partners to feel a collective responsibility for their work, adds to academic synergy, and accounts for the shared experiences from a multidisciplinary point of view (Amey and Brown, 2005; Hall and McPherson, 2011). Shared decision-making has been a point of difficulty and contention in HEI-community partnerships, as the hierarchical status of "expert" that researchers tend to hold may intentionally and/or unintentionally influence the partnership agenda. This results in HEIs acting as detached experts and treating the community as a laboratory, thus leaving the community distrustful and dissatisfied with the partnership (Hall and McPherson, 2011; Reinke and Walker, 2005). When all members share responsibility for their actions and make decisions collectively, power is also shared, thereby leading to mutual trust and respect (Buys and Bursnall, 2007). Often, formal partnerships allow for shared decision-making to be addressed in the partnership agreement to aid in this process.

Effective communication is paramount to the successful operation of a given partnership (Amey and Brown, 2005; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Curwood et al., 2011; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Holton et al., 2015; Maurrasse, 2002; McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Schulz et al., 2002; Walsh, 2006), and open communication helps to clarify

the roles and objectives associated with each party (Buys and Bursnall, 2007). For example, there may be divergent or contrasting interests among HEI-community partners that require discussion and resolution at the forefront of a new relationship in order to minimize misunderstandings during the implementation phase (Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Rubin, 2000). Additionally, maintaining the energy and commitment of partnership members is fostered through regular contact and communication in the form of meetings, email, lunches, etc. (Buys and Bursnall, 2007). Therefore, effective communication is not only concerned with the extent to which team members feel comfortable and able to express their opinion or clarify matters, but also the appropriate frequency of communication efforts (Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Schulz et al., 2003).

Trust is another quality necessary to the functioning of a successful partnership. Trust is the "willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of another, based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action despite one's lack of control over the situation" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 729). Within a partnership, each party must feel a certain level of trust towards one another in order to, for example, give constructive feedback, be honest about respective abilities or capacities, and so on (Amey and Brown, 2005; McNall et al., 2009; Schulz et al., 2002). Trust can be fostered through open communication and respect for one another's skills, roles, and abilities (Amey and Brown, 2005; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Walsh, 2006).

Reciprocity, or mutual respect, is also necessary for successful partnerships, but exchanges do not need to be identical in order to be mutually beneficial. For example, in HEI-community collaborations, academics tend to initiate partnerships to assist community agencies while also improving the quality of research and student learning (Furco and Miller, 2009; Hart and Northmore, 2011; Mosier and Ruxton, 2018; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Savan, 2004; Weerts and Sandmann, 2010). At the same time, community partners are often interested in initiating partnerships with academic institutions as a way to gain expert or evidence-based knowledge that will inform decision-making processes and lead to improved community services (Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Holton et al., 2015; Walsh, 2006). As such, it is critical to recognize that each partner offers unique perspectives and skills, allowing the

partnership to be strengthened through the application of diverse resources towards a common goal (Schulz et al., 2002).

HEI-community partnerships are often non-linear and iterative (Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Lewinson, 2014). Following initiation, it is common for issues to arise at any time which require clarification, reflection, and/or adjustment. Adaptability is thus an important quality to the successful functioning of HEI-community partnerships as it allows for the capacity to reflect upon actions, respond to issues, learn from experiences, and make adjustments accordingly (Amey and Brown, 2005; Bowen and Martens, 2006; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Hall and McPherson, 2011).

2.5. Outcomes of HEI-Community Partnerships

The terminology surrounding the accomplishments of HEI-community partnerships is currently inconsistent in the literature (Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Sargent and Waters, 2004). In particular, the use of the terms 'outputs', 'impacts', and 'outcomes' is imprecise. While recognizing their interrelationships in this section, we focus on outcomes (see Table 2, conceptual framework) because it encompasses outputs and types of impacts appropriate to assessment.

Outcomes are the resulting changes or impacts from the partnership (MacPhee, 2009). They include changes over short, intermediate, or long timescales (Koontz and Thomas, 2012; MacPhee, 2009), and largely depend on the effectiveness of the group in using their individual and collective resources to reach their goals (Schulz et al., 2003). Sargent and Water (2004) identify three categories of outcomes: objective outcomes, subjective outcomes, and learning outcomes (Table 2). Objective outcomes, also referred to as tangible outcomes, are products which coincide with impact measures for one or both partners (e.g., publications, reports, presentations, etc.).Subjective outcomes, on the other hand, are intangible outcomes that have value to one or more individuals. For example, overall satisfaction is a subjective outcome relating to the perceptions of those involved in the partnership. Factors influencing, or related to, overall satisfaction may include the level of trust present between collaborators, the performance of activities in relation to overall goals, overall productivity, and so on. Finally, HEI-community

partnerships can result in substantial benefits for learning (Furco and Miller, 2009; Hart and Northmore, 2011; Holland and Malone, 2019; Mosier and Ruxton, 2018; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Savan, 2004; Weerts and Sandmann, 2010). Learning outcomes include: creating new knowledge (through dialogue with one another, or through the research itself), finding integrative and multi-perspective solutions to challenges, and developing new practical skills required for the partnership (i.e., research skills, communication skills, critical thinking, etc.; Amey and Brown, 2005; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Sargent and Waters, 2004).

3.0. A Conceptual Framework to Assess the Performance of HEI-Community Partnerships

As HEI-community partnerships have taken on increased importance, greater attention has also been paid to their formation, functioning, and what they can accomplish. Assessing the performance of these partnerships is critical for accountability, transparency, and understanding their value. In this section, we develop a conceptual framework (see Figure 1) for assessing HEI-community partnerships. It is imperative at the outset to clarify our use of, and approach to, assessment. Assessment, also referred to as needs assessment, is a process for determining how to close a learning or performance gap. It involves identifying what the most critical needs are and developing an approach to address them. The assessment process includes

> *"comparing the current condition to the desired condition, defining the problem*
> *or problems, understanding the behaviours and mechanisms that contribute to the*
> *current conditions, determining if and how specific behaviors and mechanisms*
> *can be changed to produce the desired condition, developing solution strategies,*
> *and building support for action" (Gupta et al. 2007, pp. 14-15).*

Assessment seeks to furnish credible evidence (e.g., resources, actions, outcomes) for the purpose of improving effectiveness in higher education (Banta and Palomba, 2014). In following the work of Brinkerhoff (2002) regarding improving partnership relationships and outcomes, we employ an approach to assessment that is process-oriented, developmental, participatory, and continuous. As such, assessment in this work is employed relative to the stage of the partnership.

Our conceptual framework (see Figure 1) sets out three salient dimensions for assessing the performance of HEI-community partnerships and illustrates their interrelationships. Each

dimension is described and details are provided to explain the overall workings. The conceptual framework is intended to be a general guide with transferability to numerous HEI-community partnerships, as opposed to capturing the particularities specific to any one partnership.

An appropriate entry point is to consider how a HEI-community partnership comes into existence and may evolve over time. An agreement between an HEI and community entity is a formal initiation of a partnership. Commonly, such partnerships are codified in a memorandum of understanding (MOU), as illustrated in Figure 1. In terms of the four stages presented by Sargent and Waters (2004), clarification occurs as the parties consider inputs, with implementation and 'completion' logically following as the process unfolds. The feedback loop in Figure 1 recognizes that HEI-community partnerships often do not have a definitive endpoint, and may be continually refined throughout the life of the project.

In the spirit of continuous improvement, the assessment framework targets the aspects and qualities desirable for good HEI-community partnerships (Table 2). Inputs are the contributions that the HEI and community dedicate to the joint venture. Initial inputs should be identified in the formal mechanism at the outset as they largely inform expectations. While inputs do not directly translate into outcomes, they most certainly have a bearing on what is feasible and can reasonably be accomplished. Inputs take many forms and each may be equally valuable to the HEI-community partnership. As identified in Table 2, these may include financial resources, human resources, motivation, and transparency for entering into joint agreements.

Process refers to the manner in which the HEI-community partnership operates. Formal mechanisms for partnerships, such as MOUs, usually address matters with legal repercussions such as intellectual property, liability, and conflict resolution. While MOUs are signed by individuals with authority to bind the organizations to the partnership, matters of governance and modes of decision-making appropriate for collaborative undertakings may not be addressed. Important process qualities identified in Table 2 include shared decision-making, sound communication, trust, mutual respect, and adaptability.

Outcomes refers to what is produced and the impacts to those directly involved in the HEI-community partnership. While products from each partnership are unique, their state can be heuristically assessed against target outcomes, categorized into objective, subjective, and learning qualities (see Table 2).

The feedback loop in Figure 1 depicts assessment as a continuous practice. It requires regular and systemic attention to aspects of inputs, processes, and outcomes. Information gained is essential for reporting, accountability, and transparency. Assessment, in this manner, provides an opportunity for the partners to regularly consider their performance against the aspects and qualities desirable for good HEI-community partnerships (Table 2). An evidentiary basis is thus provided for making incremental adjustments. In so doing, the HEI-community partnership is engaged in an adaptive approach to management and governance for continuous improvement (cf Lee, 1994; Folke et al., 2005). An adaptive approach is particularly appropriate given the dynamism and complexity of HEI-community partnerships.

4.0. Conclusions

The importance of HEI-community partnerships has steadily increased over the past few decades. Despite this upward trajectory, a rigorous and dynamic framework for assessing the performance of these partnerships does not yet exist (e.g., Holton et al., 2015; Srinivas et al., 2015; Shiel et al., 2016). To address this need, we first synthesized scholarship on HEI-community partnerships and then developed a conceptual framework for assessing performance. The conceptual framework is intended to be a general guide with transferability to numerous HEI-community partnerships

A dynamic conceptual framework for assessing HEI-community partnerships has several pragmatic implications. Assessment encourages HEI-community partnerships to consider their present state in relation to target aspects and qualities. The approach taken to assessment emphasizes process, participation, and continuous improvement. Utilization of the conceptual framework provides HEI and community partners with evidence for decision-making and responding to prevailing trends regarding performance, accountability, and transparency (e.g.,

Austin and Jones, 2018; Hazelkorn, 2018; Ramírez and Tejada, 2018). In addition, governments are increasingly tying funding for HEIs to performance mechanisms (see Jongbloed et al., 2018 for a summary in OECD countries). Given the increasing emphasis on community service and impacts in classifications by HEIs, accurately capturing and systematically reporting the performance of such partnerships will become increasingly important.

The conceptual framework developed in this paper also serves as a departure point for multiple avenues of future research. Fleshing out an accompanying methodology, which makes the proposed conceptual framework operational, is an immediate first step. This is a noteworthy challenge as it requires the creation and validation of an instrument that can fully capture the host of conceptual considerations and address the perspective of both HEIs and community organizations. This will involve a combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques and analyses. Applying the framework and methodology to formal HEI-community partnerships on a range of subjects should follow. The framework put forth in this paper provides a basis for future HEI-community partnership studies that investigate causal pathways of inputs, process, and outcomes, as well as how these aspects (and qualities therein) relate to impacts. Pursuing this research agenda will advance understanding of HEI-community partnerships and ultimately offer tools for enhancing their effectiveness.

References

Amey, M.J., & Brown, D.F. (2005). Interdisciplinary collaboration and academic work: a case study of a university-community partnership. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 102, 23-35. DOI: 10.1002/tl.194

Anderson, G.L., Heller, M., Pulido, E., Williams, P., Orduna, A., Bromley, E., & Booker-Vaughns, J. (2018). Growing a community-academic partnership: lessons learned in forming a qualitative interview team for the community partners in case study. *Ethnicity & Disease,* 28, 365-370. DOI: 10.18865/ed.28.S2.365

Austin, I., & Jones, G.A. (2015). *Governance of higher education: global perspectives, theories and practices.* New York, New York, United States: Routledge.

Banta, T.W., & Palomba, C.A. (2014). *Assessment essentials: planning, implementing and improving assessment in higher education.* San Francisco, CA, United States: Jossey-Bass.

Bawa, A., & Munck, R. (2012). Foreword: globalizing civic engagement. In R. Munck, *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives* (p. xixix). New York, NY, United States: Palgrave MacMillan

Bensimon, E.M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: teams and teamwork in higher education.* Baltimore, MD, United States: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: artistry, choice and leadership* (2nd edn.). San Francisco, CA, United States: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, S., & Martens, P.J. (2006). A model for collaborative evaluation of university-community partnerships. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 60(10), 902 -907. DOI: 10.1136/jech.2005.040881

Boyer, E.L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11-20.

Bringle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: the terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues,* 58(3), 503-516. DOI: 10.1111/1540-4560.00273

Bringle, R.G., Games, R., & Mallory, E.A. (1999). *Colleges and university as citizens.* Boston, MA, United States: Allyn & Bacon.

Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2002). Assessing and improving partnership relationships and outcomes: a proposed framework. *Evaluation and Program Planning,* 25, 215-231. DOI: 10.1016/S0149-7189(02)00017-4

Busch, M.D., Jean-Baptiste, E., Person, P.F., & Vaughn, L.M. (2019). Activating social change together: a qualitative synthesis of collaborative change research, evaluation and design literature. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement,* 12(2), 1-25. http:dx.doi.org/10.5130/ ijcre.v12i2.6693

Buys, N., & Bursnall, S. (2007). Establishing university-community partnerships: processes and benefits. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management,* 29(1), 73-86. DOI: 10.1080/13600800601175797

Curwood, S.E., Munger, F., Mitchell, T., Mackeigan, M., & Farrar, A. (2011). Building effective community-university partnerships: are universities truly ready? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 17(2), 15-26.

de Boer, H., Jongbloed, B., Benneworth, P., Cremonini, L., Kolster, R., Kottmann, A., Lemmens-Krug, K., & Vossensteyn, H. (2015). *Performance-based funding and performance agreements in fourteen higher education systems. Retrieved from:* https://ris.utwente.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/5139542/jongbloed+ea+performance-based-funding-and-performance-agreements-in-fourteen-higher-education-systems.pdf (accessed: 1/07/2019).

Dorado, S., & Giles, D.E. Jr. (2004). Service-learning partnerships: paths of engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 11, 25-27.

Fitzgerald, H.E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S.T., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2012). The centrality of engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement,* 16(3), 7–27.

Folke, C., Hahn, T., & Olsson, P. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources,* 30, 441–473. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511

Furco, A., & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education,* 147, 47- 54. DOI: 10.1002/he.357

Gupta, K., Sleezer, C.M., & Russ-Eft, D.F. (2007). *A practical guide to needs assessment* (2nd edn.). San Francisco, CA, United States: Pfeiffer.

Hall, P.V., & McPherson, I. (Eds.). (2011). *Community-university research partnerships: reflections on the Canadian social economy experience.* Retrieved from: http://dspace.library.uvic.ca:8080/bitstream/handle/1828/3878/SE%20Book_print.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed: 1/07/2019).

Harper, G.W., Bangi, A.K., Contreras, A.P., Tolliver, M., & Vess, L. (2004). Diverse phases of collaboration: working together to improve community-based HIV interventions for adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 33, 193-204.

Hart, A., & Northmore, S. (2011). Auditing and evaluating university-community engagement: lessons from a UK case study. *Higher Education Quarterly,* 65(1), 34-58. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2273.2010.00466.x

Hart, A., Northmore S., & Gerhardt, C. (2009). *Briefing paper: auditing, benchmarking and evaluating public engagement.* Retrieved from: http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/EvaluatingPublicEngagementSummary_1.pdf (accessed: 1/07 2019)

Hazelkorn, E. (2018). The accountability and transparency agenda: emerging issues in the global era. In A. Curaj, L. Deca & R. Pricopie (Eds.), *European higher education area: The impact of past and future policies* (pp. 423-439)*.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Holland, B., & Malone, M. (2019). Editorial: institutional engagement- intentional, innovative and rigorous. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement,* 12(2), 1-6. http:dx.doi.org/10.5130/ijcre. v12i2.6984

Holton, V.L., Early, J.L., Jettner, J.F., & Shaw, K.K. (2015). Measuring community-university partnerships across a complex research university: lessons and findings from a pilot enterprise data collection mechanism. *Metropolitan Universities,* 26(2), 99-124.

Jongbloed, B.W.A., Kaiser, F., van Vught, F.A., & Westerheijden, D.F. (2018). Performance agreements in higher education: a new approach to higher education funding. In A. Curaj, L. Deca & R. Pricopie (Eds.), *European higher education area: The impact of past and future policies* (pp. 671-687). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Koontz, T., & Thomas, C.W. (2012). Measuring the performance of public-private partnerships: a systematic method for distinguishing outputs from outcomes. *Public Performance & Management Review,* 35(4), 769-786. DOI: 10.2753/PMR1530-9576350410

Langworthy, A., & Garlick, S. (2008). The challenge of benchmarking community engagement: the AUCEA pilot project. *The Australian Journal of Community Engagement,* 3(2), 17-28.

Lee, K.N. (1994). *Compass and gyroscope: integrating science and politics for the environment.* Washington, DC, United States: Island press.

Levkoe, C.Z., & Stack-Cutler, H. (2018). Brokering community-campus partnerships: an analytical framework. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement,* 11(1), 18-36. http:dx.doi.org/10.5130/ijcre. v11i1.5527

Lewinson, T. (2014). Building a university-community partnership to explore health challenges among residents at extended-stay hotels. *Metropolitan Universities,* 25(2), 89-106.

MacPhee, M. (2009). Developing a practice-academic partnership logic model. *Nurs Outlook,* 57(3), 143-147. DOI: 10.1016/j.outlook.2008.08.003

Maurrasse, D. (2002). Higher education-community partnerships: assessing progress in the field. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 31(1), 131-139.

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review,* 20, 709–734. DOI: 10.2307/258792

McClenney, K.M. (2007). The Community College Survey of Student Engagement. *Community College Review,* 35(2), 137-146.

McNall, M., Reed, C.S., Brown, R., & Allen, A. (2009). Brokering community–university engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33(5), 317-331.

Mosier, S., & Ruxton, M. (2018). Sustainability university-community partnerships: lessons for practitioners and scholars from highly sustainable communities. *Environmental and Planning C: Politics and Space,* 36(3), 479-495.

Plummer, R., & FitzGibbon, J. (2004). Some observations on the terminology in co-operative environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 70(1), 63-72. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2003.10.005

Ramírez, Y., & Tejada, Á. (2018). Corporate governance of universities: improving transparency and accountability. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, 15(1), 29-39. DOI: 10.1057/s41310-018-0034-2

Reinke, S.J., & Walker, R.H. (2005). Looking for Oz: reflections on the journey towards university-community partnership. *P*aper presented at the 2005 Teaching Public Administration Conference, Troy University, Florida, 10-12 February.

Reuschke, D. (2014). *Public-private partnerships in urban development in the United States.* Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23729936_Public-Private_Partnerships_in_Urban_Development_in_the_United_States (accessed: 1/07/2019).

Rubin, V. (2000). Evaluating university-community partnerships: an examination of the evolution of questions and approaches. *Cityscape,* 5(1), 219-230.

Sargent, L.D., & Waters, L.E. (2004). Careers and academic research collaborations: an inductive process framework for understanding successful collaborations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 64, 308-319.

Savan, B. (2004). Community-university partnerships: linking research and action for sustainable community development. *Community Development Journal,* 39(4), 372–384. DOI:

10.1093/cdj/bsh033

Schulz, A.J., Israel, B.A., & Lantz, P. (2003). Instrument for evaluating dimensions of group dynamics within community-based participatory research partnerships. *Evaluation and Program Planning,* 26, 249-262. DOI: 10.1016/S0149-7189(03)00029-6

Shiel, C., Filho, W.L., Paco, A.D., & Brandli, L. (2016). Evaluating the engagement of universities in capacity building for sustainable development in local communities', *Evaluation and Program Planning,* 54, 123-134. DOI: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2015.07.006

Smith, J., & Wohlstetter, P. (2006). Understanding the different faces of partnering: a typology of public-private partnerships. *School Leadership & Management,* 26(3), 249-268. DOI: 10.1080/13632430600737090

Srinivas, T., Meenan, C.E., Drogin, E. & DePrince A.P. (2015). Development of the community impact scale measuring community organization perceptions of partnership benefits and costs. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 21(2), 5-21.

Thomas, N. (1998). *The institution as a citizen: How colleges and universities enhance their civic roles.* Retrieved from: https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nerche_pubs/20/ (accessed: 1/07/2019)

Thune, T., & Gulbrandsen, M. (2014). Dynamics of collaboration in university-industry partnerships: do initial conditions explain development patterns? *Journal of Technology Transfer,* 39, 977-993.

Tuckman, B.W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin,* 6(63), 384–389. DOI: 10.1037/h0022100

VanDevanter, N., Kwon, S., Sim, S., Chun, K., & Trinh-Shevrin, C. (2011). Evaluation of community-academic partnership functioning: center for the elimination of Hepatitis B health disparities. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships,* 5(3), 223-233.

Walsh, D. (2006). Best practices in university-community partnerships: lessons learned from a physical activity based program. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance,* 44(4), 45- 56.

Weerts, D.J., & Sandmann, L.R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 81(6), 632-657. DOI: 10. 1353/jhe.2010.0011

Wildridge, V., Childs, S., & Cawthra, L. (2004). How to create successful partnerships- a review of the literature. *Health Information and Libraries Journal,* 21, 3-19. DOI: 10.1111/j.1740-3324.2004.00497.x

Tables & Figures

Table 1. The lifecycle of formal partnerships (Adapted from Sargent and Waters, 2004).

Phase of Lifecycle	Description
Initiation	The motivation or reasons for engaging in collaboration: instrumental and intrinsic. Instrumental rationales include partnering because of complementary skills, specific knowledge, unique data access opportunities, etc. Intrinsic motivations include the enjoyment of working together and building long-term relationships.
Clarification	The nature and type of collaborative project. In this stage, the partners clarify issues such as duration of the project, scope, number of collaborators required, and establish goals associated with the partnership.
Implementation	The roles individuals play in the collaboration. Within research partnerships, individuals carry out varied roles and it is important to understand each other's role, and how roles may change or adapt, throughout the project lifespan.
Completion	How collaborators rate the success of their project in terms of objective outcomes (e.g., publications), subjective outcomes (e.g., satisfaction with the experience of collaborating), and learning outcomes (e.g., broadening knowledge on a specific topic).

Table 2. Aspects and Qualities for a Good HEI-Community Partnership.

Aspect	Qualities	Citation
Context/Inputs	Transparency (i.e., expectations, goals, strengths, limitations)	Bowen and Martens, 2006; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Curwood et al., 2011; Levkoe and Stack-Cutler, 2018; McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004
	Motivation for partnership	Amey and Brown, 2005; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Schulz et al., 2002; Walsh, 2006
	Resources (financial)	Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Holton et al., 2015; Levkoe and Stack-Cutler, 2018; Sargent and Waters, 2004
	Human Resources (support)	Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Harper et al., 2004; Holton et al., 2015; Levkoe and Stack-Cutler, 2018; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Walsh, 2006
Process	Shared-decision making	Amey and Brown, 2005; Busch et al., 2019; Hall and McPherson, 2011; McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Schulz et al., 2002
	Communication	Amey and Brown, 2005; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Busch et al., 2019; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Curwood et al., 2011; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Holton et al., 2015; Maurrasse, 2002; McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Schulz et al., 2002; Walsh, 2006
	Trust	Amey and Brown, 2005; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Busch et al., 2019; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Curwood et al., 2011; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Harper et al., 2004; Levkoe and Stack-Cutler, 2018; Maurrasse, 2002; McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Schulz et al., 2002
	Mutual respect	Amey and Brown, 2005; Bowen and Martens, 2006; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Curwood et al., 2011; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Harper et al., 2004; McNall et al., 2009; Sargent and Waters, 2004

	Adaptability	Amey and Brown, 2005; Bowen and Martens, 2006; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Buys and Bursnall, 2007; Hall and McPherson, 2011
Outcomes	Objective (publications, presentations, reports)	Amey and Brown, 2005; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Sargent and Waters, 2004
	Subjective (satisfaction with the experience)	Hall and McPherson, 2011; Holton et al., 2015; Sargent and Waters, 2004; Schulz et al., 2002
	Learning	Amey and Brown, 2005; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Hall and McPherson, 2011; Harper et al., 2004; Holton et al., 2015; Sargent and Waters, 2004

Figure 1. A conceptual framework for assessing the performance of HEI-community partnerships.