Improving Community-Campus Partnerships: Assessing the Needs, Qualities, and Impacts of

UCLA's Partnerships from the Community Partner Perspective

Shalom Staub, PhD, Director of the UCLA Center for Community Learning

Victoria Lewis, Graduate Student Researcher

June 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study Overview
UCLA's Center for Community Learning designed a research project to understand the quality and impact of UCLA's community-campus partnerships. The goal of the study is to foster more community-engaged courses that benefit our community partners and the communities they serve as much as the courses benefit our students.

Study Findings
Community-Engaged Course Partnerships
- Alignment of course objectives with community-engaged work
  - Community partners are committed to providing students with a civic engagement experience that benefits their careers and personal growth. Alignment of the course objectives with the organization's work helps to ensure the best community-engagement experience.
- Relationship with faculty
  - Community partners shared that a positive relationship with UCLA faculty and staff is essential to any community-campus partnership. Community partners recommended for faculty to have at least one in-person meeting with the organization to discuss goals and visions for the partnership.
- Student tasks based on community organization projects and needs
  - Many community partners shared that student community-engagement tasks are often dictated by the organization's current projects and needs. Community partners stressed the importance of discussing placements and student tasks early in the quarter.
- Effective communication & coordination
  - Community partners predominately communicate with UCLA faculty and staff through email and suggested check-ins at the beginning, middle, and end of the course.

Community Partner Needs & Goals
- Direct service capacity
  - All community partners shared that students are essential to increasing their capacity for providing direct client services.
- Student education and inspiration
  - Many community partners shared the goal of educating students about the work they do and the communities they serve.
- Student civic engagement
  - Community partners expressed the goal of providing students with relevant work experience and with an authentic civic engagement experience.
- Campus collaboration and community building
  - Community partners described wanting to broaden their university networks and increase the organization's presence in the community.

Qualities of a Successful Partnership
- Communication
  - The best communication is consistent, efficient, and honest. Community partners like being informed about student needs and having honest conversations about partnership goals and expectations.
- Coordination
  - Community partners discussed the importance of accurate information regarding student requirements and concerns, and recommended ways to improve student hour coordination. Recommendations included having a calendar to easily view all student weekly availabilities, ensuring student commitment to weekly hour requirements, and implementing weekly hour guidelines to prevent stacking of hours at the end of the quarter.
- Student engagement
  - All community partners would like to have students who are interested in their organization, knowledgeable about the work of the organization, and willing to actively engage with clients.
- Shared vision
  - Community partners reflected on the importance of having a shared vision for the partnership in order for it to be successful and meaningful for all involved.
- Positive outcomes
  - Many community partners shared that a successful partnership is one that has positive benefits for clients, students, and the organization.

Impact
- Organizational capacity
  - All community partners shared that community-campus partnerships increase organizational capacity to provide direct client services.
- Program development
  - Community partners stated that student input and feedback is important for their program improvement and development.
- Role models
  - UCLA students often serve as positive role models for community partner clients.
- Positive client outcomes
  - Many community partners discussed the positive client outcomes associated with the partnership including increased client confidence and socialization.
- Community building
  - Several community partners shared that community-campus partnerships help to increase the organization's reach in the community.
- Mutual learning
  - Community partners shared that the partnership facilitates mutual learning among the organization's staff, UCLA faculty, and students.

- Partnership models

- One community partner shared the value of having a model for community-campus partnerships that can be used when building partnerships with other universities.

Future Partnerships
All community partners expressed interest in developing new partnerships for community-engaged courses. Potential partnership activities include:
- Research projects, social media and promotion, multi-quarter placements, advocacy, and curriculum development.

Recommendations
The insights learned from UCLA's community partners provide invaluable perspectives for faculty, staff, and students to consider when participating in community-engaged courses. The major theme throughout all of the interviews was the importance of relationships. The community organizations with the most successful and meaningful partnerships have strong, consistent, and positive relationships with faculty, staff, and students. Faculty planning to participate in community-engaged courses are recommended to include community partners in discussions about partnership values, goals, expectations, and coordination. The UCLA Center for Community Learning plans to utilize the above findings to improve their community-campus partnerships and community-engaged courses.

INTRODUCTION

UCLA's Center for Community Learning designed a research study to understand our community partners' experiences with community-campus partnerships and to improve the quality and impact of UCLA's community-engaged courses based on their feedback. The goal of the study was to foster more community-engaged courses that benefit our community partners and the communities they serve as much as the courses benefit our students. Additionally, we sought to increase the representation of community partner perspectives in the service-learning literature. The research questions addressed in this study are:

- What is the community partner experience with community-engaged course partnerships?
- What community partner needs and goals are fulfilled by community-engaged course partnerships?
- What are the qualities of a successful community-campus partnership?
- What is the impact of community-campus partnerships for the community partners and the communities they serve?
- How can the Center for Community Learning improve UCLA's community-engaged course partnerships?
  What types of future community-engaged partnerships are community partners interested in creating?

DEFINITIONS

Client: The community partners interviewed for the study consisted of both nonprofit organizations and schools. Throughout this study "clients" refers to individuals served by the nonprofit organizations and to students at the schools.

Community: The definition of "community" remains contested in service-learning literature (Sandy & Holland, 2006; Cruz & Giles, 2000). When designing the study, we conceptualized community in several ways: geography, neighborhood, relationships, shared identity, and shared social issue. In this study we considered all definitions of community as valid so the results should be considered within this context.

Community Engagement: The Carnegie Foundation's Elective Classification for Community Engagement defines community engagement as "the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (College & University Engagement Initiative (CUEI), n.d.). The Elective Classification further defines the purpose of community engagement as "the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good" (CUEI, n.d.).

Service-Learning Courses: Bringle and Hatcher (1995) define service-learning as a "course-based, credit bearing educational experience" during which students engage in service activities that address community needs and reflect on their service activities in order to better understand course content and civic engagement responsibilities (as cited in Bringle & Hatcher, 2002). UCLA's service-learning courses to date have embraced this pedagogical approach. The courses are associated with a minimum number of "contact hours" at a community organization in addition to classroom requirements.

Community-Engaged Courses: The UCLA Center for Community Learning has proposed a shift from the narrowly-drawn category of service-learning to a more encompassing category: *community-engaged courses*. Instead of measuring community engagement through a set number of hours worked at a community organization, community-engaged courses will focus on principle-based criteria as detailed below.

Community-Campus Partnerships: Community-campus partnerships refer to partnerships between academic institutions and community organizations for community-engaged courses. Community-Campus Partnerships provide the means of actualizing engaged scholarship that "engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration" (CUEI, n.d.). In the literature these partnerships have been referred to both as community-campus partnerships and campus-community partnerships. Though both terms refer to the same partnerships, we use community-campus partnerships to highlight our goal of placing community partners first.

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

This study took place during a period of transition at the UCLA Center for Community Learning. As noted above, the Center has proposed a move away from the traditional service-learning model toward a more broadly defined community engagement pedagogy. The proposed change represents a shift to community engagement that is measured by principle-based criteria rather than direct service contact hours. If approved, this change is scheduled to take effect in Fall 2020.

Background: The Current Policy

Operating under a policy adopted by the Undergraduate Council in 2008, faculty across the university have developed courses designated as "service-learning" courses, enabling students across a variety of disciplines and inter-disciplinary fields to connect their classroom learning with community experience. The Center for Community Learning was designated as the campus unit to support faculty to develop such courses and to determine the eligibility of courses proposed for this designation.

At the time of the Undergraduate Council's adoption of the current policy, the Center for Community Learning focused its efforts on supporting faculty interested in developing community-engaged learning courses that utilized the prevalent service-learning model of the time. This had grown out of UCLA's active participation in a nation-wide effort, evidenced by

UCLA's institutional membership in Campus Compact, to reconnect institutions of higher education to their public purpose and to the communities in which they operate. The service-learning model sets a minimum number of community partner contact hours for the course to be designated as a service-learning course. The model also outlines required elements of the course: preparation of students for community service, identification of community partners, expected activities of students on site, and how the community service will be connected to course assignments.

This type of course has been successful at UCLA. In the last 5 years, over 33 departments have taught such service-learning courses including the College of Letters and Science, School of the Arts and Architecture, Education, Engineering, Public Affairs, and Music.

New Policy Rationale
The current service-learning policy has not kept up with the creativity and community-engaged interests of UCLA's faculty, nor has UCLA kept up with changes in the field of community engagement in higher education. Despite the number of faculty and lecturers who have taught service-learning courses over the years, there are yet more faculty who have developed new models of active learning with community partners, thinking beyond a "service" model to create mutually valuable community-campus partnerships. Their courses do not just use the community settings as sites for student learning, but rather they work with their community partners in ways that create value for the community organizations beyond the short-term volunteer labor of service-learning courses.

UCLA faculty are currently teaching courses, not recognized by the current service-learning designation, in which student research has direct value for community organizations. In other courses, students co-learn with community members or co-create artistic work. None of this exciting community-engaged pedagogy can currently be recognized under the current service-learning course policy. The field of higher education and community engagement has moved on to a more sophisticated articulation of community engaged scholarship than the early focus on *service-learning*.

The Proposal: Principles of Community-Engaged Pedagogy
Instead of imposing a minimum number of community site contact hours, the Center has proposed four principle-based criteria to guide faculty interested in adopting this pedagogy. The principle-based criteria focus on:

1. The integration of community-engaged work in the course design.
2. Sustained community-engaged work with value for both students and community partners.
3. Assessment of student learning based on their integration of community-based experiences with academic content.
4. Opportunity for student reflection that actively connects a students' community-based experiences with their academic learning.

The Center seeks to shift from a policy that faculty members perceive as creating a barrier to their adoption of community-engaged pedagogy or as irrelevant to the kind of community engagement that is meaningful in their field. Instead, the Center believes that the proposed community-engaged course policy will foster faculty interest and creativity, and will result in faculty transforming the above principles into authentic community-engaged experiences that promote meaningful learning in their own disciplines. This new policy will signal that UCLA values teaching built on community *partnerships*, furthering the university's core public mission through the central activity of undergraduate education.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Background

The principles of service-learning have roots in education and social reform movements that have taken place for centuries (Worrall, 2005, p. 23). However, service-learning in the higher education space appeared in the 1970s and became prominent in the literature in the 1990s (Worrall, 2005, p. 26). Campus Compact, a national coalition of colleges and universities of which UCLA is a member, was founded in 1985 with the goal of promoting service-learning and community partnerships in higher education (Campus Compact, n.d.; Worrall, 2005, pp. 23-24). Boyer (1994) described many of the principles of service-learning when he called for universities to connect theory to practice through undergraduate field projects, faculty partnerships with community, and incorporation of community work into the classroom curriculum. Boyer (1996) felt that institutions of higher education should be sharing resources with communities to help solve social problems (as cited in Bringle & Hatcher, 2002, p. 504). These initiatives and calls for action sparked a movement for community-campus partnerships and community engagement scholarship in higher education (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002, p. 504).

Effective Community-Campus Partnerships

Existing literature on community-campus partnerships has described qualities of effective partnerships from the community partner perspective. These qualities include developing meaningful relationships, communicating expectations, ensuring ongoing communication, understanding community partners' perspectives and mutual goals, working with community partners on coordination and planning, sharing accountability for the partnership, prioritizing equity in leadership, ensuring access to higher education resources, regularly evaluating the partnership, and preparing students for the experience (Sandy, 2007; Sandy & Holland, 2006). With respect to relationships, Bringle and Hatcher (2002) detailed effective practices for community-campus partnership initiation, development, maintenance, and termination.

Leiderman and colleagues (2003) also found that responsibilities and partnership roles should take into account a community partner's capacity and resources, and that partnership benefits should be sufficient enough to justify the cost of participation for each community partner (pp. 6-7). Leiderman and colleagues (2003) also noted areas of disagreement among community partners in relation to whether or not community engagement activities should be required of faculty and students in higher education and whether it is the community partners' responsibility

to create student projects and to educate students and faculty on best community engagement practices (p. 8).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study seeks to understand our community partners' experiences with and perspectives on community-campus partnerships. Therefore, we used a qualitative methodology based in community-based research principles and grounded theory.

Community-Based Research

Community-based research methods place community at the center of the study and seek to create knowledge that advances social change and positively benefits communities (Marullo et al., 2003; Stoecker, 2009). The community *in this study* was the community-based organizations and schools that have partnered with UCLA faculty for community-engaged courses. The social change that we sought to co-produce was improving community partners' experiences with community-engaged courses based on their feedback and needs. The intended outcome was to change UCLA's community-engaged course practices based on this feedback. Marullo and colleagues (2003) state that community-based research should be collaborative, community-driven, guided by grounded theory, multi-dimensional, and systematic with room for flexibility based on community context (Marullo et al., 2003, p. 59). Likewise, research methods should be attentive to community understandings of social issues and the results should be connected to community interventions (Stoecker, Loving, Reddy, & Bollig, 2010, p. 283).

Community participation in this study took place during the interview process and during data interpretation. The interview protocol remained flexible to ensure that community partners were able to establish their own priorities and share their unique partnership experiences. Community partners were also consulted in the process of data analysis and thematic interpretation. It was important to ensure that our community partners were in agreement with thematic interpretations and that their perspectives were accurately reflected.

The social change aspect of this work is already taking place in the form of altering community-engaged course policies and creating new partnerships that advance community partners' needs and goals (Stoecker, 2012, p. 85). Likewise, the recommendations for change that are presented in this study will be presented to both community partners and to faculty. We hope that UCLA faculty will consider the findings in this study when creating community-engaged courses. Future research in this area should seek to include community partners in identifying the research questions, deciding on the research methods, gathering data, interpreting findings, and enacting change based on the findings as community partner capacity allows (Stoecker, 2009, p. 392; Stoecker et al., 2010, p. 283).

Grounded Theory

The aim of grounded theory is to develop a theoretical explanation of a social phenomenon or process (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Petri, 2012). For this study, we sought to describe the

experiences of UCLA's community partners with community-campus partnerships for community-engaged courses. The data for our study came from interviews with community partner staff who serve as coordinators for community-engaged courses. In addition, background data was obtained from informal interviews with community-engaged course faculty and from the community organization's website. Corbin and Strauss (1990) state that data analysis begins when data is first collected (p. 6). This held true as we sought to develop themes across interviews guided by each community partner's unique experiences.

In our data analysis, we also drew from Charmaz's constructivist grounded theory. Charmaz describes the researcher as coproducing meaning with the research participants (as cited in Mills, Bonner, & Francis, 2006, p. 31). During our data analysis and interpretation, this meant ensuring that the community partners' experiences were shared in their own words and that the emergent themes were developed with their input (Mills et al., 2006, p. 31). Constructivist grounded theory also involves summarizing the research findings into language that is accessible to the research participants (Mills et al., 2006, pp. 31-32). Community partners were provided with a summary of emergent themes void of research jargon and with a copy of their direct quotes for comment and editing. In this way, we sought to include the community partners in interpretation and meaning creation.

METHODS

We reviewed a database of existing UCLA Center for Community Learning community partners to identify highly active partners with extensive community-engaged course experience. We identified seventeen partners across different sectors and emailed them regarding their willingness to participate in the study. Community partners were asked to participate in an approximately 30 minute – 1 hour in-person or phone interview. In-person interviews were conducted at the community partners' organizations in order to ensure ease of participation for our partners.

Utilizing community-based methods, we gave community partners the opportunity to add topics of interest to the research if not already included. We tailored the interview questions based on the partners' responses to open-ended questions. Thirteen of the seventeen community partners agreed to participate in the interview. We conducted two out of the thirteen interviews in-person and conducted the remaining interviews by phone. We recorded and transcribed in-person interviews and recorded notes during each phone interview. In order to create an environment that encouraged honest community partner feedback, we anonymized all community partner quotes and provided an opportunity for community partners to approve and edit the direct quotes included in this report.

We analyzed and coded interviews using Atlas.ti software and grounded theory methods. As we analyzed the interviews, we developed themes within each interview category and across the interviews broadly. We summarized preliminary themes and shared these with community partners for comments and suggestions. We then edited themes and interpretations based on community partner input. We sent direct quotes that exemplified interview themes to community

partners for review and editing to ensure accuracy of transcription and thematic interpretations. We also provided community partners with the final report for review and comment.

The original interview protocol asked community partners about their interest in a follow-up interview regarding future partnerships and a conference to discuss emergent interview themes. All community partners expressed interest in both activities if their schedules permitted it. However, due to time constraints these activities were not scheduled by the original graduate student interviewer. Instead, another UCLA Center graduate student followed-up with potential new partnership opportunities based on the community partner's interview responses. In addition, we offered to receive community partner feedback on preliminary themes via phone or email.

Limitations

Despite the many important insights gained by this research with our community partners, the study has some important limitations that should be acknowledged.

Time

One of the most significant limitations was time. The study took place on a five-month timeline which limited the number of community partners that we were able to interview and did not permit enough time to schedule a community partner conference to discuss emergent themes as a group. This represents a missed opportunity for additional depth and insight on the community partner experience. However, we attempted to address this limitation by obtaining community partner feedback on emergent themes, selected quotes, and the final report recommendations.

Sampling

UCLA Center for Community Learning Staff selected community partners based on their extensive experience and their level of involvement with community-engaged courses. Therefore, the community partners selected represent a convenience sample. Likewise, the results may not be representative of the experiences of newly established community partners.

Community-Based Methods

We sought to design a study that utilizes community-based research methods and includes our community partners in the research process and data interpretation. However, a limitation to the study is that community partners were not involved in the initial study design, research question selection, and interview protocol creation. Likewise, while the study was conducted by two researchers, the data coding was performed by one researcher and therefore codes were not cross-checked by another peer reviewer. We sought to address this limitation by sharing themes with the community partners and eliciting feedback to ensure that the findings accurately represented our community partners' perspectives.

UCLA Community-Engaged Course Partnerships

The UCLA Center for Community Learning has a diverse range of community partners throughout Los Angeles County focused on a variety of social issues and target populations. The community partners interviewed for this project included one elementary school, one museum,

and several non-profit organizations dedicated to serving youth, adults, families, and seniors. Many of the organizations are focused on improving the lives of youth and communities through basic needs resources, education, social capital development, after-school programming, urban farming, adult day care, and intergenerational programming.

Each community partner assigned students to a variety of activities and/or projects. Among the community partners interviewed, student activities and projects included: tutoring elementary, middle, and high school students, classroom teacher assistance, workshop development and delivery, research projects, support for youth leadership programs, technology and career after-school programs, urban farming, food justice and environmental sustainability learning projects and curriculum development, senior services support in adult day care and senior center settings, oral histories, community outreach, and program evaluation.

During the interviews, some community partners referred to community-engaged students as interns or volunteers. However, the focus of these interviews was on UCLA community-engaged students who worked with the organization in the context of a quarter-long community-engaged course. Community-engaged students are distinct from interns because they integrate their community engagement work with a course curriculum.

FINDINGS

The findings are organized into five main sections:
- Community Partner Motivations, Needs, and Goals
- Community-Campus Partnership Experiences
- Qualities of a Successful Partnership
- Partnership Impact
- Future Partnerships

'Community Partner Motivations, Needs, and Goals' explores community partners' motivations for participating in community-campus partnerships, the needs being fulfilled by the partnership, and the goals that the partnership is helping community partners to achieve.

'Community-Campus Partnership Experiences' details community partners' experiences with community-engaged courses. Community partners discussed their knowledge of course objectives, student activities and projects, relationships with faculty, staff, and students, student supervision, student evaluations, and partnership challenges.

'Qualities of a Successful Partnership' reviews the qualities that community partners felt were essential for a successful partnership experience and whether UCLA's partnerships have embodied these qualities.

'Partnership Impact' explores the impact of community-campus partnerships for community partners. Community partners discuss the difference that the partnership has made to their organization and whether the partnership has helped to achieve larger organizational missions.

Community partners also shared ways for the partnership to have an even greater impact on them.

'Future Partnerships' details the types of community-engaged partnerships that the community partners would be open to exploring. Community partners also discussed new types of student activities and projects that they would be open to implementing at their site.

Community Partner Motivations, Needs, and Goals

Many community partners shared that their motivations for participating in community-campus partnerships overlap with the needs they are looking to address and the goals they hope to accomplish through the partnership. Several distinct themes emerged as detailed below.

Community Partner Motivations: Student Education and Inspiration
Many community partners were motivated by the desire to educate and inspire young people. The following quotes illustrate our community partners' desire to educate and inspire students rather than having students merely completing hours with meaningless work and projects that do not promote learning.

> "I don't need someone to just come do hours. I think we should look at this and make it more intriguing. Make the work relevant to the course and to their lives, not just getting hours doing weeding."

> "Come with a curiosity and an interest and participate. I don't need a product since I'm trying to inspire and motivate and educate. I'm totally into this but I want everyone to benefit. I don't want people to come all the way over here to weed a garden."

> "We want to inspire young people and share this amazing history. We get to impact students who are choosing their life path and how wonderful to be able to use history to inspire lives."

Community Partner Motivations: Community building
Many community partners shared that they were interested in building community through the partnership and in expanding connections with college campuses.

> "I am always open to community coming into the school when it has been a win-win for both. I love to have students come in and see students learn hands on. Our school is collaborative and community-based."

Community Partner Motivations: Increase volunteer numbers
One community partner stated that they were initially motivated by the desire to increase the number of student volunteers.

Community Partner Needs: Increase Organizational Capacity
The need for increased organizational capacity to provide direct client or student services was the main need identified by many community partners.

Community Partner Goals: Student Education and Career Development
Many community partners stated that their main goal in community-campus partnerships is to provide students with valuable educational experiences and to impact a student's life and career path.

Community Partner Goals: Student Community Engagement
Community partners expressed the goal of providing students with relevant work experience, an opportunity to engage with community, and an increased understanding of community needs.

Community Partner Goals: Direct Service Capacity
Many community partners shared that students provide essential organizational capacity for providing direct client and student services. The following quote illustrates the challenge that many community partners' face in providing essential services with minimal staffing capacity.

> "We have 2-3 staff members in the office and over 300 seniors. Any extra bodies willing to help is extremely helpful."

Community Partner Goals: Improving Client Outcomes
Even if a community partner's initial partnership goal was to improve direct service capacity, many community partners shared that their goals shifted when they noticed the positive client outcomes associated with having students from community-engaged courses. Partners stated that their goal is to continue providing positive client outcomes by supporting students in community-engaged courses.

Community Partner Goals: Community Building
Community partners shared the goal of increasing their community reach by expanding university partnerships, increasing the organization's presence in the community, and developing long-term relationships and networks with former community-engaged course students.

Community-Campus Partnership Experiences
The following findings describe community partner experiences with community-campus partnerships. We asked community partners about their community-engaged course name and objectives, followed by questions about their relationship with UCLA faculty, staff, and students, student activities, supervision, and evaluation, and suggestions for partnership improvement.

Community-Engaged Course Name & Objectives
Community partners were asked to identify the community-engaged course they have partnered with and the objectives of that course. Many partners identified the course by the name of the faculty member they have worked with, followed by the course name or course department.

Knowledge of Course Objectives and Content
Most community partners had generalized knowledge of course objectives. The course objectives most often identified included engaging students in community work and educating students about community needs. Some community partners expressed an interest in learning about

specific course objectives and content, and shared that a student's experience in the community would be improved by alignment of the course objectives with their work in the community.

Course Objective Relevance to Community Engagement Experience
The community partners were divided about the relevance of course objectives to the students' community engagement experience on site. Some community partners felt that the course objectives and content were more relevant in the classroom than within the context of the community organization. However, as noted above, some community partners felt that integration of course objectives with on-site work was essential to a complete community engagement experience. Some community partners expressed not having the time nor the organizational capacity to incorporate course content review and reflection into the student's community engagement experience, and stated that this would be better suited in the classroom.

Participation in Course Development
Five community partners expressed interest in being more involved in course curriculum development and in serving as guest lecturers for community-engaged courses. These community partners shared that they welcome opportunities to be on the UCLA campus educating students about their work and/or working with faculty members to design curriculum that would benefit student community-engaged learning. The remaining community partners stated that limited time and staff capacity makes participation in curriculum development or class lectures unfeasible.

Community Engagement Time Obligations
The community partners with experience partnering with courses or programs that last longer than one quarter stated that longer timeframes give them more time to connect the community work to course content. One such program is the UCLA Center for Community Learning's Astin Scholars Program. The Astin Scholars Program provides a group of undergraduate students with the opportunity to conduct research in partnership with a community organization for one academic year. Community partners with experience working with both year-long and quarter-long student groups shared that they were able to do more discussion, reflection, and relationship building with the year-long students. In contrast, these community partners felt that quarter-long community-engaged experiences were focused more on completing the hour requirement and did not allow for the development of as significant a relationship with these students.

The following quotes illustrate the experiences of community partners who participate in both quarter and year-long partnerships such as the Astin Scholars Program. The community partners share that the year-long programs give community partners the ability to go more in depth with students and provide more opportunities.

> "The quarter system is hard for me because I have students in the daycare but can't have them in programs that require longevity."

> "Astin scholars were working on different research projects involving various programs within our agency. It was great because the students were very self-directed. We did a tour and talked to them about our services. It was a great experience because they were able to take the lead."

"For the service-learning students, my interactions with faculty was mostly check-ins about the students' participation. We have been more involved with the Astin scholars."

Relationships with Faculty and Students
Community partners highlighted the central importance of building relationships with both faculty members and students. The most successful community-campus partnerships, defined by community partner satisfaction with the partnership experience, were those that had a positive relationship with the course faculty member and with the students.

Community partners with positive faculty relationships stated that the faculty member has had at least one in-person meeting with the organization, is invested in learning about the organization, keeps in regular communication about students and student projects, and ensures that community partner needs are being met. Regular communication throughout the quarter and updates about any course changes were important to maintaining a positive long-term relationship. Without a consistent relationship with a faculty member or staff, one community partner stated that their experience did not feel like a partnership. Contributing to this feeling was a lack of organization and limited explanation of partnership expectations. Though the community partner stated that the current structure was sufficient, building a relationship may make the experience feel more like a partnership.

The following quotes illustrate contrasting experiences with faculty members. One community partner describes the importance of a supportive faculty relationship while the other shares that the lack of a relationship with faculty member makes the experience not feel like a partnership.

"Having the strong support of faculty makes a big difference."

"I haven't really thought of it as a partnership because there has been such limited engagement between your organization and mine. I have a relationship with the students and there has not been as much interaction outside of that."

All community partners shared that they have had overwhelmingly positive experiences with UCLA students. Students were described as being engaged, eager to learn, motivated, and passionate. However, when challenges have come up, community partners stated that it was often related to students being hesitant to engage with clients or not building a relationship with the community partner. Community partners stated that the UCLA community-engaged students were often the youngest cohort of students that they work with and have limited or no prior community work experience. Many community partners shared that they may be able to improve both staff and student experiences by educating staff on the varied experience levels of students they are working with and by providing additional support to students who are hesitant to engage. A few community partners suggested that relationship building may be improved by screening students for interest in the community organization.

"I will almost never turn down a partnership with UCLA because I love the students."

Student Activities and Projects
Community partners shared that student activities and/or projects largely depend on the organization's current programming. None of the community partners created new tasks or projects solely for students in community-engaged courses. However, many community partners stated that they are open to students creating new activities and projects if they are willing to create, lead, and pitch the activity to the community partner. Likewise, students interested in pursuing new projects should ensure that they have the resources and faculty support required to complete the project without significant community partner staff time and resources given limited organizational capacity.

Student Supervision
All students receive supervision during their time at the community organization. Supervision is conducted by a variety of organizational staff and often depends on who serves as coordinator for community-engaged courses, where the student is placed within the organization, and what type of work the student is assigned (e.g., research versus direct client services).

Student Evaluations
None of the community partners completed evaluations for UCLA students as it is not a requirement for community-engaged courses. When asked about their interest in implementing a student evaluation, many community partners felt that it would not significantly benefit their partnership experience. Likewise, many community partners were unsure of what metrics to use to evaluate student performance because most of the students are untrained and/or have limited prior community engagement experience. However, one community partner shared that they are currently completing student evaluations for their students from California State University, Northridge. This community partner stated that student evaluations can help to keep students on track with hour requirements and to monitor student performance over time.

Despite not having student evaluations for UCLA community-engaged students, all community partners stated that they talk to students about their expectations for the community engagement experience. Community partners talk to students at the beginning, middle, and end of the community engagement experience in order to ensure that their individual goals are met. During these conversations, community partners also ask students about how the community partner can improve their programs and community engagement experiences. Community partners shared that they have been using student feedback to make positive changes in their volunteer and community-engaged course programming.

If student evaluations are implemented, community partners shared that they would prefer for it to be short, easy to complete, and with Likert scale questions. Community partners shared that qualitative questions are challenging because they require a significant amount of time to complete.

The following quotes illustrate community partner concerns regarding how to evaluate students, their current strategy for assessing student goals and expectations, and the potential value of implementing student evaluations.

"It is hard to evaluate the students because they are not trained. It is not clear what the expectations would be for evaluating students."

"I never really heard what the expectations are for the Center. I let the students know what my expectations are and I do an intake form for every service-learning student to see what they want out of the experience and to meet their needs."

"I try very hard to spend time and listen to my interns regarding if we are fulfilling their expectations and if we are giving them the education and support they are expecting."

"Evaluations keep the interns on track so they know they are being responsible and completing the required number of hours."

Student Hours
Many community partners stated that the hour requirements associated with service-learning courses have presented a number of challenges. Community partners shared that many students expressed feeling overwhelmed by the 24-hour community engagement requirement on top of their coursework. However, community partners feel that 24 hours is not enough time to allow for a rich community engagement experience.

Community partners also shared that students sometimes stack hours at the end of the quarter which places strain on the organization. The partners shared that their capacity does not allow for all students to complete their hours at once, and that they would prefer for student hours to be spread evenly over the quarter. In addition, an even spread of hours gives students a better opportunity to create relationships. Community partners want to ensure that students are committed to having a meaningful and impactful experience rather than merely checking off hours to complete.

Finally, many community partners shared that students communicate their weekly schedules via individual emails. This presents a coordination challenge for many community partners who work with several students per quarter.

The following quotes illustrate community partner challenges with scheduling student hours and with creating a meaningful community engagement experience with only 20 hours of on-site time. Both community partners present solutions to these challenges which include creating a form or spreadsheet with weekly student hours and creating projects that are limited in scope.

"When the course starts I would get a lot of emails from students. The student hours are hard to manage. It would be better if students put their hours on one form and the form is sent to me. I can then bring that form to the table rather than students sending various emails."

"Having students for 20 hours in the quarter isn't adequate for me unless there is a very specific project with finite, limited expectations."

As noted above, many community partners shared that student hours are currently inconsistent each week, and because of this clients and staff sometimes do not know when to expect students. Some community partners shared that the inconsistency causes clients to miss out on opportunities to connect with and learn from UCLA students. One partner stated that having UCLA students working with the clients is the best part of the partnership and that not having this connection recently has been a huge loss for the students and for the organization.

Some community partners also shared that they would benefit from knowing when to expect community-engaged students throughout the year. Because some of the courses do not take place each quarter, some community partners have an inconsistent flow of students which presents a coordination challenge.

> "Even though there is only a short amount of time with each student, we need consistency across the quarters."

Community partners provided a number of suggestions for improving the student hour challenges. The first suggestion was to reinforce the time commitment for students deciding to take community-engaged courses and to ensure that they are able to make this commitment up front. Likewise, some community partners suggested requiring students to maintain a consistent, weekly schedule that prevents stacking of hours at the end of the quarter. One community partner suggested having required weekly reflection assignments to incentivize consistent participation at the community partner site each week. In order to address weekly hour coordination, community partners suggested for faculty to create a calendar that allows community partners to view weekly student availability on one platform.

Community partners also suggested for students to pick a consistent weekly schedule so that clients and staff know when to expect them. Given student's class schedule requirements, attending the community organization during regular business hours can be a challenge. However, if students are able to schedule a consistent block of time in their weekly schedules they are more likely to build relationships with staff and clients.

In addition, community partners suggested that UCLA faculty and staff communicate with partners at the end of the quarter regarding when the course will be offered again and when the partners may be receiving the next cohort of students.

Transportation
Community partners located far from the UCLA campus stated that transportation was a challenge for some students. Community partners shared that distance and transportation challenges may prevent students from selecting their organization for their community engagement experience and can become a considerable expense for students.

Community partners suggested exploring strategies to reimburse students for travel costs. Likewise, community partners proposed that faculty provide students with public transportation options for getting to the various community partner sites. For students driving to the community sites, community partners suggested coordinating carpooling groups at the beginning of the quarter among students placed at the same organization.

Qualities of a Successful Partnership
Community partners were asked to identify general qualities of a successful partnership and to discuss if and how the UCLA partnership has embodied these qualities.

Communication
Almost all community partners shared that regular and ongoing communication is essential to a successful partnership. Community partners stated that the best communication is initiated early, efficient, and honest.

> "Communication regularly is really important. No matter how small, I want to hear about it. Shoot me an email and I can determine if it is an issue."

Community partners stated that communication needs to be initiated early in order to ensure that community partners are prepared to receive students early in the quarter. Likewise, community partners stated that early communication ensures that faculty have up-to-date information about the organization or school to share with UCLA students.

Many community partners shared that at least one in-person meeting is beneficial to put a face to a name and to discuss course goals and partnership expectations for the quarter. Community partners stated that an in-person meeting is preferred at the beginning of a new partnership or when there is a significant change in the partnership. Meeting in-person gives the community partner an opportunity to ask faculty questions and to ensure that both parties are on the same page. Having this in-person meetings before the quarter starts or early in the quarter also provides an opportunity to discuss student projects, ensure that faculty are up to date on the organization and its current projects, and establish the partner's preference for future communication.

The following quotes illustrate the value that community partners place in having faculty members visit the site, explain the community-engaged course requirements, and learn about the organization in-person.

> "In the past we had site visits where our contact that we were organizing with would come in and get a look at the space and learn about the organization. It is helpful to have a face to the name."

> "[The previous director] was great, very passionate about the work in the community and getting students involved. She really wanted to know what the communities were experiencing and it was great to meet with them. They had really good ideas."

> "Like I mentioned, having [the faculty member] come out and really draw the picture for us about what the program is and what it is going to look like was helpful."

Efficiency
Community partners shared that efficient communication was critical given the multiple competing demands placed on community partner staff. While at least one in-person meeting was preferred by many community partners, the preference for subsequent communication was

short email check-ins at the beginning, middle, and end of the course. Community partners also shared that they would like for the UCLA faculty or staff member who is coordinating the partnership to be quickly and easily accessible for questions and coordination.

Honesty
Many community partners highlighted honesty as an important partnership quality. Honesty was described by community partners as both faculty and partners being able to openly discuss student issues or concerns, expectations of one another throughout the partnership, and unmet needs or barriers to partnership success.

Early Initiation of Communication
Community partners stated that communication needs to be initiated early in order to ensure that the organization is prepared to receive students at the beginning of the quarter.

Coordination
Many community partners shared that partnership coordination requires more than asking community partners how many students they can take on and what days/times they are available. Community partners stated that they also need a way to get students on the same page and to explain partnership expectations. Some community partners have been able to do so through student orientations at the beginning of the quarter. During student orientations, community partners provide students with information about the school or organization, describe student activities and projects on site, and explain their expectations of students and the limitations of the partnership experience from the beginning. Community partners also stated that they would prefer for student tasks and projects to be negotiated in advance and for an easily accessible UCLA coordination contact person to be provided.

The following quotes are all examples of community partners who expressed having coordination challenges and may benefit from implementing a student orientation or having regular meetings with course faculty to discuss goals and coordination needs.

> "It would be easier for me if there was another class where they broke into groups and I can be there even for 20 minutes to tell them exactly what is going to happen. We don't have an orientation with them all at the same time."

> "I haven't had too much to do with the coordination and maybe that's part of the problem. They ask if I'm open and of course I am. Then they ask what days I'm available and that's it."

> "It might be helpful to have an annual meeting with the department where we could discuss what are our goals, what is the wish list, and how we can help each other."

Student Engagement
All community partners shared that they appreciate working with students who are engaged and interested in the work of the organization. Community partners stated that the partnership is more fruitful for students when they educate themselves on the organization prior to starting, ask

questions throughout the experience, take initiative in engaging with clients and students, and are willing to step outside of their comfort zone.

Community partners shared that they are better able to support student engagement if the student communicates with the partner about their goals for the partnership. Many community partners also shared that they enjoy working with students who bring a unique skillset to the organization. One example was a student with a background in film being able to assist a community partner with creating promotional material. Students who share their skillsets with the organization were able to engage in a wide range of organizational projects.

Consistency
Community partners shared that consistency is an important quality for a successful partnership. As noted above, community partners frequently shared that they appreciate consistent weekly student schedules. Having a consistent schedule allows for community partners to know when to expect students and to share this information with clients. One community partner shared that their current partnerships are not fulfilling their potential because the organization's clients do not know when to expect UCLA students and therefore do not often get the opportunity to engage with UCLA students. Inconsistent weekly scheduling also increases the coordination challenges for community partners and makes it harder for students to create meaningful relationships with the organization and the communities they serve.

Shared Vision
Many community partners stated that sharing similar goals and visions for the partnership is important to success. Community partners strive to work with faculty members who are interested in enhancing the community organization and benefitting the communities they serve.

The following quote describes the importance of a shared vision between community partners and faculty members in order to create meaningful relationships and partnership experiences.

> "That's how it happened, it happened more because of the relationship I had with the Director. We had very similar visions and understandings of the world, and we had similar visions about the potential of young people to do work in meaningful ways. We aligned really closely and it allowed me to bring people into our work."

Reciprocity
Community partners identified reciprocity as an important quality of a successful partnership and defined this as mutual respect and mutual support. Many community partners shared that both parties need to understand each other's needs and goals, and should support each other in meeting these needs and achieving these goals. Likewise, reciprocity stresses that both parties should be able to have expectations of one another and that these expectations should be equally prioritized.

> "Mutual respect, mutual support, and having these kinds of honest conversations is very valuable. We want this partnership to be successful, so we need to be open and realistic with our respective needs and goals and find a way to achieve a "win-win" for both institutions."

Clearly Defined Student Activities and Projects

Some community partners shared that it is easy for students to complete hours through direct service activities, while other shared that the hour requirement makes meaningful direct service experience a challenge. Therefore, many community partners shared that successful partnerships should have both short-term, clearly defined student projects that produce deliverables for the organization in addition to having opportunities to participate in direct client services.

Community partners also shared that the process of clearly defining student tasks and projects can help to ensure that student activities are meaningful for both the students and organization. Community partners are interested in quality, meaningful work rather than the number of hours worked.

The following quotes illustrate the value of having clearly identified and defined student activities and projects.

> "I would like to say that the partnership works best for our institution when we are able to identify a particular project or goal and have students work on this."

> "Students who only need 20 hours of service-learning in a quarter barely scratch the surface to become trained, but if there is a specific project associated with what needs to be accomplished then there can be greater success and greater usefulness."

Flexibility

Many community partners shared that flexibility is important to creating a successful partnership. Flexibility meant being understanding of community partner time and staffing constraints, being willing to make partnership requirements minimal and easy to complete, and being open to change depending on organizational capacity and need.

Accessibility

Community partners shared that accessibility was important to long-term partnership success. Accessibility included creating connections between community partners, sharing information about the partnership and about the work of other community partners, making the university more accessible to community organizations and their clients, and providing more opportunities for community partners to come to campus and participate in the community-engaged courses.

The following quotes illustrate the value of having the UCLA campus accessible to community partners.

> "UCLA and universities in general are walled castles. I found a way in and I'm not ready to let that go. It would be nicer if it was more open and accessible."

> "I take pride in the relationship with UCLA now. A lot of colleagues in the field are wondering how I got a relationship with UCLA. I get to do guest spots in the classrooms which is really cool and it gives me an opportunity to practice and to reach more students."

Partnership Impact

We asked community partners about the impact of community-campus partnerships on their school or organization. We also asked community partners if they felt that the partnership has made a difference, and in what ways. In addition, we asked if the partnership has helped to advance their larger organizational goals and missions, and if there are any ways for the partnership to have a greater impact.

All community partners felt that the partnership was having a positive difference on the organization and their clients. Likewise, all community partners shared that the partnership was helping to achieve larger organizational goals and missions. However, many community partners stated that partnership impact is difficult to measure. Only one community partner stated that they had years of data collection to show the positive impact of their organization and the community-campus partnership. Nevertheless, all of the remaining community partners described ways that the partnership has been able to "make a difference" on the organization, the staff, and the communities they serve. As detailed below, community partners described partnership impact in terms of increased organizational capacity, social justice, program development, positive client outcomes, community building, mutual learning, and partnership models and leverage.

Increased Organizational Capacity

Some community partners stated that the organization would not be able to function without the assistance of students. Many of the community partners are short on staff and rely on students to deliver core services and programming. Likewise, students bring new energy and ideas into the organization. One community partner shared that a community-engaged student's social media project helped the organization realize the need to hire a social media staff person to build on this work.

The following quote illustrates the essential role that community-engaged students play in delivering services and ensuring that community organizations are able to effectively serve their clients and students.

> "Yes, it makes a difference in our program being able to function. The students provide the extra staff that we need in order to have an engaging program. The UCLA students allow us to provide small group experiences in the garden of 6-10 middle school participants per group. Otherwise it is very difficult to have well-supervised garden activities when there are 35 middle school students, their teacher and me."

Advancing Social Justice

Some community partners shared that the partnership was advancing social justice by increasing youth community engagement, increasing the amount of services provided to the community, making students more educated about community needs, and expanding the organization's connections in the community.

Program Development
Many community partners shared that community-engaged students have the impact of improving program development through providing critical feedback, suggestions, and ideas. Some community partners shared that they have altered and/or expanded their volunteer programs based on student feedback.

Positive Client Outcomes
Many community partners stressed the positive client outcomes that they have noticed as a result of the partnership. These positive client outcomes include having UCLA student serve as role models for youth clients and students, increasing the quality and amount of care provided, increasing the socialization of senior clients, personalizing client services, and giving youth clients motivation for the future.

The following quotes illustrate the impact of positive client outcomes that community partners have witnessed as a result of the partnership.

> "Definitely for the adult daycare having students increases the quality of care and increases senior socialization."

> "It's magical when UCLA students are working with them and they see that UCLA students are human beings. They aren't some lofty thing that's so far above me that I could never achieve, they ask dumb questions too, and that is so empowering for them."

> "I think the middle school students appreciate being able to interact with the students. That's difficult to measure. The middle school students in particular appreciate it when we have male interns. The UCLA interns serve as role models."

Community Building
Some community partners shared that the partnership has improved the organization's community building capacity. The partnership itself serves as an additional community connection, and some student projects gave community partners the opportunity to further engage with the communities they serve.

Mutual Learning
Many community partners shared that the partnership has had the positive impact of increasing their learning. Community partners stated that they learn from students as much as students learn from them. These community partners described the partnership as an opportunity for mutual learning and mutual growth.

Partnership Models and Leverage
One community partner shared that the partnership has been valuable for providing a community-campus partnership model that can be used to create partnerships with other universities. This community partner stated that they have been able to leverage their partnership with UCLA to open doors for partnership opportunities with other universities.

Future partnerships

All community partners stated that they are interested in continuing their community-campus partnership with UCLA. Likewise, all community partners expressed interest in developing new partnerships for community-engaged courses and new student projects within existing partnerships.

Many community partners shared that they could develop community-engaged course partnerships with almost any department on campus. Community partners also presented a wide range of new student project ideas including research, social media and promotion, multi-quarter placements, advocacy projects, and curriculum development. The partnerships and projects proposed depended on the capacity and needs of the specific organization.

Community partners suggested that students could pitch a project idea based on their interests and skillset early in the quarter in order to determine the feasibility of the project during that quarter. However, because of limited staff capacity, proposed projects would also need to be supported and facilitated by course faculty. One community partner shared the example of a valuable data mapping project that was possible because of data and resources supplied by a faculty member.

The following quotes illustrate community partner ideas for future partnerships and new student projects.

> "I could use help in a variety of other areas, whether project based or long-term. Working on a project with a deliverable could give the students a more flexible schedule."

> "I could go on your website and look at any department and think of a way to partner with them. There are so many creative ways that we can have students do a project."

> "Research can always be used to more effectively learn about and engage the various diverse communities in Los Angeles."

> "The students presented the idea of the digital map, and they provided the design and strategy for the project. We only had to provide the content and the database, which they were then able to integrate. They were able to create this project and leave us with a finished product. We were very pleased with the final outcome!"

> "What would be helpful with the service-learning courses would be to let the students do some research about our organization and then come up with an idea for a project that they pitch to us."

RECOMMENDATIONS

Community-Engaged Courses: Building Reciprocal Value

- Regularly assess community partners' motivations, needs, and goals for the partnership
- Ask community partners how we can support the achievement of their goals

- Determine and address barriers to community partner goals being met
- Communicate with community partners about the course objectives and course content
- Assess if the course objectives are relevant to the work of the community partners
- Explore community partners' interest in being involved in designing course objectives and course content
- Provide community partners with opportunities to give feedback and input on course content if interested
- Encourage students to integrate course content into their community engagement experience
- Work with community partners to think of ways that the course content can be integrated into the community engagement work (e.g., reflection questions, research-related projects, and student presentations) if organizational capacity allows
- Shift focus away from completing hours and toward improving the impact, quality, and depth of the partnership
- Discuss organization's capacity to incorporate course content into the community engagement experience and explore ways to decrease barriers if organizational capacity is a concern
- Provide opportunities for students to discuss and reflect on their experiences in the classroom if students are not able to do so at their site
- Explore community partner interest in presenting to the class and try to make room for this type of engagement. Bringing interested community partners into the classroom may improve relationships, increase community partner involvement in the partnership, and incorporate important community perspectives from the community partner experience.
- Ask community partners about their current means of student evaluation
- Assess community partner interest in incorporating an additional form of student evaluation
- Inform community partners when the course will be offered in the future and with what frequency

Relationships with Faculty and Students: Faculty
- Prioritize relationship building with community partners and emphasize to students the importance of building relationships with community partner staff
- Schedule at least one in-person meeting when developing the partnership or when any partnership logistics change
- Discuss expectations, visions, and ideas for student tasks/projects with community partners
- Get to know the mission, values, and structure of the organization so that coordination is improved and students have a greater understanding of the organization
- Communicate with community partners at the beginning, middle, end of the quarter and when any issues or changes arise
- Ask community partners about any partnership challenges or unmet needs
- Make coordination check-ins part of the relationship: Ask community partners about experiences scheduling and building relationships with students

Relationships with Faculty and Students: Students
- Encourage students to take initiative to learn about the community organization, the work that they do, and the communities they serve
- Emphasize the importance of being proactive in engaging with community partner clients
- Discuss any student concerns about engaging with clients and explore how these concerns can be addressed
- Encourage students to communicate their experience level with their community partner and identify how staff can support them to improve their skills
- Stress the importance and value of building relationships with staff and with community partner clients
- Inform students that they must avoid stacking hours at the beginning or end of the quarter because community partners and clients value consistency week by week

Addressing Partnership Challenges
- Consider implementing a policy that prevents students from stacking hours at the beginning or end of the quarter
- Consider implementing weekly hour requirements
- Provide community partners with a platform to view weekly or monthly student schedules on one platform
- Emphasize the professional aspect of community engagement with students – consider policies for student cancellation of shifts including requiring at least 48 hours of advance notice
- Inform students that day time shifts will allow them to interact with clients, and that this interaction is valued by community partners and clients
- Encourage students to maintain a consistent weekly schedule so that relationships with clients and staff can more easily be built
- Explore feasibility of providing students with transportation reimbursements or providing students with public transportation options to the various community partner sites
- Provide time in class for students to make carpooling plans and to coordinate schedules

Qualities of a Successful Partnership
Communication
- Prioritize honest, efficient, and regular communication with community partners
- Schedule at least one in-person meeting at the beginning of partnership development and any time there are significant changes in the partnership structure
- Ensure that communication is initiated early in the quarter
- Create a space that encourages honest feedback by both community partners and faculty

Coordination
- Encourage community partners to implement student orientations at the beginning of the partnership to provide details about the organization and to explain student activities, expectations, and coordination details
- Initiate conversations about student tasks or projects in advance
- Ensure that community partners have updated faculty and staff contact information for coordination questions

- Include community partners in discussions about student issues

Student Engagement
- Inform students that community partners want to work with students who will be engaged and interested in their work
- Emphasize the importance of preparation prior to starting working with the community partner
- Stress the importance of professionalism and provide students with information on professional practices (e.g., communication about scheduling, how to interact with clients, and how to build professional relationships)
- Encourage students to share their needs, skills, and learning goals early in the partnership
- If a community partner works with several universities and partnerships with students at different experiences levels (e.g., undergraduate students, master's students, and professional students), communicate with these community partners about the education and experience level of community-engaged students being assigned to their site

Shared Vision
- Talk to community partners about your vision for the partnership and seek to understand theirs
- Think of ways to enhance the community organization and further benefit the communities they serve

Reciprocity
- Ensure that the partnership embodies mutual respect and mutual support
- Understand community partner expectations and strive to achieve these expectations
- Maintain relationships with community partners over time and address barriers to relationship building
- Encourage and practice honest feedback with community partners, and create an environment for them to do the same

Student Activities and Projects
- Deprioritize completion of a set number of hours and instead prioritize quality and impact of community engagement experiences
- Talk to community partners about their interest in having students create new projects for the organization
- Provide students with resources needed to create new activities and projects
- Ensure that student tasks and projects are clearly defined and meaningful for the organization
- Negotiate student activity and project details early in the quarter

Relevant Course Objectives
- Share course objectives with community partners
- Ensure that course objectives relate to students' community engagement work
- Consider ways for course objectives to be integrated into the community engagement experience

Flexibility
- Ensure that partnership requirements are flexible and understanding of capacity constraints
- Minimize time-consuming requirements placed on community partners
- Understand that organizational capacity may change during the partnership and provide support if needed

Accessibility
- Ensure that the university is accessible to community partners
- Provide opportunities for community partners to visit the UCLA campus and speak to the class
- Brain storm ways to make the university more accessible to the communities that community partners serve
- Share community partner information among the partners and assist in relationship building at UCLA and across universities

Improving Partnership Impact
- Ask community partners if the partnership is making a difference and how this difference can be increased
- Brainstorm ways for community partners to measure partnership impact and assess if community-engaged students can assist in these efforts
- Ask about community partner goals and mission, and if the partnership is helping to achieve these goals
- Provide community partners with the resources needed to measure and increase partnership impact

Establishing Future Partnerships
- Talk to community partners about their interest in developing future partnerships and new student activities and projects
- Assist community partners in developing these partnerships and provide resources if needed

CONCLUSION

The information shared by our community partners provides invaluable insight that we can use to improve community-engaged courses at UCLA. We encourage faculty to consider the above findings and recommendations in order to ensure that all community-engaged courses are responsive to the needs of the community partners.

The study took place during an exciting moment of transition at the UCLA Center for Community Learning. Looking to move away from traditional service-learning, the Center is undergoing a policy shift to develop community-engaged based on principles of community engagement rather than completing of a set number of direct service hours. The results highlight the importance of relationship building and ease of partnership coordination. Community partners want to participate in community-campus partnerships and are committed to making the experience valuable for students. However, there are several ways for UCLA faculty and staff to make the partnership experience easier and more meaningful for the community partners. Among these include improving communication, facilitating coordination, encouraging students to engage with community partner clients and to share their skill sets and experience level with community partners, and creating partnerships and student projects that create meaningful outcomes for the community partners and the communities they serve. As the UCLA Center for Community Learning seeks to transition to a broader range of community-engaged courses, we strive to ensure that all such courses are designed to meet the needs of our community partners and are as valuable of an experience for our community partners as they are for our students.

REFERENCES

Boyer, E. L. (1994). Creating the new American college. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 40*(27), A48.

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

Campus Compact. (n.d.). Campus compact overview. Retrieved from https://compact.org/who-we-are/

College & University Engagement Initiative. (n.d.). Community Engagement. Retrieved from https://www.brown.edu/swearer/carnegie/about

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology, 13*(1), 3-21.

Giles, Jr., D. E., & Cruz, N. I. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Special Issue*, 28-34.

Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zapf, J., & Goss, M. (2003). *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives, a monograph.* Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges/Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education.

Marullo, S., Cooke, D., Willis, J., Burke, J., Bonilla, P., & Waldref, V. (2003). Community-based research assessments: Some principles and practices. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*, 57-68. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0009.306

Mills, J., Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). The development of constructivist grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 25-35. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500103

Petri, A. N. (2012). *Reciprocal exchange: Understanding the community partner perspective in higher education service-learning* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UMI. (UMI Number: 3524277).

Sandy, M. (2007). Community voices: A California Campus Compact study on partnerships. San Francisco: California Campus Compact.

Sandy, M., & Holland, B. A. (2006). Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,13*(1), 30-43.

Stoecker, R. (2009). Are we talking the walk of community-based research? *Action Research, 7*(4), 385-404.

Stoecker, R., Loving, K., Reddy, M., & Bollig, N. (2010). Can community-based research guide service learning? *Journal of Community Practice, 18*(2-3), 280-296. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2010.485878

Stoecker, R. (2012). Community-based research and the two forms of social change. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences, 27*(2), 83-98.

Worrall, L. S. (2005). *Discovering the community voice: The community perspectives of the service-learning program at DePaul University*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UMI. (UMI Number: 3175659).

Appendix A

Graduate Student Researcher Victoria Lewis interviewed community partners between March and April 2019. Two community partners were interviewed on site and the remaining partners were interviewed by phone.

826LA (Mar Vista)
12515 Venice Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
T: 310-915-0200
Website: 826la.org

Beethoven Street Elementary School
3711 Beethoven St.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
T: 310-398-6286
Website: https://www.beethovenschool.org

Big Citizen HUB
811 W. 7th St., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Email: info@changeist.org
Website: https://changeist.org

Bresee Foundation
184 S. Bimini Pl.
Los Angeles, CA 90004
T: 213-387-2822
Website: https://www.bresee.org

GrowGood
5600 Mansfield Way
Bell, CA 90201
T: 323-645-0215
Website: https://www.grow-good.org

Kindred Spirits Care Farm
18741 Elkwood St.
Reseda, CA 91335
Website: www.kindredspiritscarefarm.org

Little Tokyo Service Center
213 E. Third St., Suite G-106
Los Angeles, CA 90013
T: 213-473-3030
Website: https://www.ltsc.org

Mar Vista Family Center
5075 S. Slauson Ave.
Culver City, CA 90230
T: 310-390-9607
Website: marvistafc.org

Meet Each Need with Dignity (MEND)
10641 N. San Fernando Rd.
Pacoima, CA 91331
T: 818-897-2443
Website: https://mendpoverty.org

Museum of Tolerance
9786 W. Pico Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90035
T: 310-553-8403
Website: www.museumoftolerance.com

ONEgeneration
17400 Victory Blvd.
Van Nuys, CA 91406
T: 818-705-2345
Website: www.onegeneration.org

OPICA
11759 Missouri Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90025
T: 310-478-0226
Website: https://www.opica.org

Seeds to Plate at Mark Twain Middle School
2224 Walgrove Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
Email: seedstoplate@gmail.com
Website: https://www.seedstoplate.net

Appendix B

Community Partner Interview Protocol

Overview
- Our interview questions are focused on your partnership experience, your organizational needs and goals, qualities of a successful partnership, and the partnership's impact.
- Are there any other topics that you would like to add before we start?

The Service Learning Partnership
- Do you recall which service learning course you were partnered with and the objectives of the course?
- What tasks or projects were students assigned to at your organization?
- What was the nature of your interaction with students, faculty, and UCLA staff?
- Who worked directly with students and in what capacity?
- Were students supervised on site? Were there any challenges with supervision?
- Were students evaluated by your organization during and/or after the course? Did you think this was sufficient?
- Any challenges with the creation of student tasks/projects?
- How often did you check-in with course faculty, if at all?
- Any additional challenges or suggestions for improvement?

Community Partner Needs
- What motivated you to participate in a community-campus partnership?
- What were your needs/goals when entering the partnership?
- Were these needs/goals met?
  - If yes, how so?
  - If not, why not? What was missing?

Qualities of a Successful Partnership
- From your perspective, what are the qualities of a successful partnership? Has your partnership with UCLA embodied these qualities?

Coordination and Planning
- How was the coordination and planning with faculty/staff running the course?
- Did you have input in the planning of the course and development of course objectives? Is that important to you?
- Are there ways that coordination and planning could be improved?

Communication
- How was your communication with faculty throughout the course?
- How was your communication with other UCLA staff throughout the course?
- Did you feel like you could voice comments, needs, questions, and/or concerns throughout the course? Did you have information on who to contact?

Students
- How was the preparation of students when they started? Is there any additional preparation or training needed?
- How was the quality of professionalism among the students?
- Did students seem to know about your organization and the communities you serve at the beginning of the course? At the end?
- Did students demonstrate cultural humility when working with clients?
- Did students demonstrate an awareness of the racial, socio-economic, and political factors impacting the community and your organization? How so? Do you think these topics should be emphasized in service learning courses?
- Did students meet your expectations and objectives by the end of the course?

Impact
- Did you feel that the partnership made a difference? Can you describe what that means to you?
- In what ways did service learning students make a difference?
- Does the partnership help achieve larger organizational goals/missions? Why or why not?
- Is there a way for these partnerships to make a greater difference or have a more significant impact for your organization?

Future Partnerships
- Are you interested in continuing your service learning partnership with UCLA? Why or why not?
- Do you think your organization would be interested in other types of service learning partnerships?
  - Direct, indirect, research, advocacy
- Is there someone else in the organization who may be interested in exploring new types of partnerships in a follow-up interview?

Closing & Next Steps
- Are there any other topics that you would like to address?
- Would you be interested in attending a conference with other community partners in order to discuss and provide feedback on emergent themes?