



**UNIVERSITY
AT ALBANY**
State University of New York

Planning Studio

Fall 2009

Albany, New York

Arbor Hill Partnership Feasibility Study



Prepared For:

Arbor Hill Implementation Team

Prepared By:

University at Albany

Department of Geography and Planning

Fall 2009 Planning Studio

Graduate Students

Alison Bates

Tim Malone

Paula Gilbert

Jennifer Murray

Chris Grant

Linda Trombley

Kyla Haber

John Westenberg

Phirom Khun

Daniel Zhang

Oleg Kotov

Professor

Corianne P. Scally, Ph. D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special Thanks To:

Community and City Stakeholders

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Albany Center for Economic Success | Equinox |
| Albany Barn | Healthy Capital District Initiative |
| Albany Housing Authority | New Covenant Charter School |
| Albany Housing Coalition, Inc. | Trinity Institute |
| Albany Planning Department | Underground Railroad History Project |
| Capital District BOCES | United Tenants of Albany |
| Capital District Community Loan Fund | WAMC |
| Catholic Charities | |

University Stakeholders

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Department of Biological Sciences | School of Business |
| Department of Geography and Planning | School of Education |
| Healthy Hearts on the Hill | School of Public Health |
| Associate Vice President for Community Engagement, President's Office | School of Social Welfare |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | III |
| LIST OF TABLES | IV |
| LIST OF FIGURES | IV |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | V |
| PURPOSE AND METHODS | 1 |
| THE ARBOR HILL NEIGHBORHOOD | 6 |
| EXPLORING EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS | 10 |
| COMMUNITY PARTNERS | 19 |
| UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY PARTNERS | 22 |
| DEVELOPING A PARTNERSHIP | 25 |
| NEXT STEPS | 30 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 32 |
| REFERENCES | 33 |
| APPENDIX I – MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING | 35 |
| APPENDIX II – STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL | 38 |
| APPENDIX III - CASE STUDIES | 41 |
| APPENDIX IV - STAKEHOLDERS AND CONTACT INFORMATION | 45 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|---|
| Table 1: Select Demographic Characteristics, Albany & Arbor Hill..... | 9 |
|---|---|

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 1: Albany And Arbor Hill Neighborhood Boundaries | 6 |
| Figure 2: Benefits Of Partnership To The Community & University | 10 |
| Figure 3: Summary Of Partnership Case Studies..... | 16 |
| Figure 4: Potential Relationships Between University Departments & Community Stakeholders | 27 |
| Figure 5: Community-University Partnership: Existing Versus Ideal | 32 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this study is to identify resources within the Arbor Hill community and the University at Albany, and find ways that they can be leveraged and enhanced in mutually beneficial ways. Our purpose is to lay the groundwork for future collaborative efforts between the Arbor Hill community and the University at Albany that reinforce, not replace, both group's assets. To that end we are examining: models of already established community-university partnerships; the level and nature of interest within both the community and the university; the existing services being provided within the community; and existing relationships between Arbor Hill organizations and the University at Albany. We also determined a menu of possible forms a future partnership could take; the associated costs and resources needed to establish each possible form; and finally, steps that would need to be taken to move towards these options.

METHODS

The work performed for this study can be divided into four parts: establishing parameters and the scope of work; performing background research on community-university partnerships; conducting community and university research and outreach; and developing scenarios based on our research. The first task that we completed was the drafting of a Memorandum of Understanding, which defined the responsibilities of both the studio team and the Arbor Hill Implementation Team. This document established the scope of work to be completed by our team and defined a timeline for its completion.

To identify potential university partners we researched the departments listed on the new community outreach website. After a brief survey of the activities performed by each department, we evaluated them based on: geographic focus, type of community interaction they engage in, and the types of communities they work with. Each department was contacted via email or phone call, and interviews were conducted via phone or in person with a standardized script.

Research into potential community partners proceeded in a similar manner, though our focus changed midway through the project. We had originally planned to create, distribute and analyze a community survey for purposes of assessing the needs of the community. However, after lengthy discussions and preliminary work to develop the survey, it was decided that stakeholder outreach would better lend itself to the desired outcomes of the community-university feasibility study.

After completing our research we developed a scenario to guide future collaboration efforts. To ensure that our work was moving in the right direction, and that our findings were reliable and valid, we sought feedback in a number of ways. The first method was through the establishment of our MOU, outlining the scope of our work. The next was our progress report, presented in October to members of AHIT. To get an academic perspective we presented our findings to the university community on December 2nd. They gave us a number of useful suggestions on how to focus the presentation of our results. Finally, on December 8th, we presented our findings to AHIT members and other community stakeholders. The feedback obtained has been helpful in producing our final product.

COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

The benefits received by communities from university partnerships include sharing information, taking advantage of university resources, political support, influence, and protection. Research provides the institutional support and validity that community groups may lack and is needed to get buy-in from their constituents in the community, financial institutions, and government. The availability of increased financial, human, and physical resources is another benefit that universities can bestow upon communities. University faculty and students can directly supply expertise and work that community groups can use to carry out their mission.

The benefits that a university receives from a community partnership include rewarding service based learning experiences for students, the opportunity for faculty to do applied research in their field, and an opportunity for the university to improve its reputation with the local community. Research has found that students benefit from better test scores, increased social and cognitive outcomes, and that they typically give better evaluations to courses that include service learning components. Communities provide human resources to universities by playing the role of guest lecturers, faculty mentors, professional training, and advisory committee and joint task force members. University faculty also find the practical use of their research in the community rewarding professionally.

Regardless of their configuration, all parties in a community-university partnership should share a common vision of community building and collaboration such that the relationships that develop between them are healthy and two way. The Empowerment-Capacity building model clearly embodies the goals set forth above in term of long term partnerships and is the model that most influenced our recommendations.

To better understand how community-university partnerships work, we extended our research to existing partnerships throughout the country. In order to narrow down the host of varied examples, the following factors were used to ascertain those most relevant partnerships to explore for our study: public or private university status; university size; city size and other demographic information; location of the university within the city; and programs offered, conducted and overseen by the partnership. Based on these criteria, we determined the following five examples were most applicable to the

potential of an Arbor Hill-University at Albany partnership: University of Arizona, University at Buffalo, SUNY, San Jose State University, Syracuse University, and University of Washington.

PARTNERS

We collected direct input from six university departments in an effort to identify university needs, to learn about existing outreach programs, and to identify potential stakeholders in a Community/University partnership. We developed fourteen questions inquiring about existing outreach activities and the administrative structure of such activities, and perceived barriers to enhanced community outreach. All members of the university that we spoke with had been in the past, or were currently involved in outreach programs. They were also enthusiastic about the notion of an enhanced partnership with the community. We found that there are opportunities for University students, faculty, and departments to either maintain their current outreach programs with increased assistance, or to engage in new cooperative programs in Arbor Hill.

An important part of this feasibility study included collecting direct input from the community. Input came from members of the AHIT team, who attended our first class, our progress report presentation, and our final project presentation. Members of the studio class also attended an Arbor Hill Neighborhood Association meeting in September 2009 to gain a better understanding of the issues facing the community. Finally, interviews were conducted with representatives of fifteen community organizations. All service providers interviewed expressed interest in working with student volunteers and interns from UAlbany, although some have limited capacity to coordinate and manage such efforts. Community stakeholders would like to see more continuity from student volunteers. They would like community involvement from students that lasts beyond the end of the semester, picking up old projects and plans, and seeing them through implementation. Some persons interviewed thought it important for UAlbany to have a physical space and increased exposure within the Arbor Hill community.

DEVELOPING A PARTNERSHIP

Our observations lead us to conclude that there is both the desire and the potential for a deeper community-university partnership between Arbor Hill and UAlbany. Moreover, past and existing partnerships can form the basis for future collaboration. Therefore, we believe a long-term goal of the Arbor Hill Implementation Team should be to foster a more formal partnership between UAlbany and community organizations in Arbor Hill. To be successful, the partnership must adhere to a number of principles: be interdisciplinary; be service-oriented; focus on empowerment and capacity building; employ shared decision-making; be financially sustainable; and be continuous.

The first phase of developing the community-university partnership should be to further develop the communication among University departments and with the Arbor Hill community. The objective is to document, publicize and build upon activities formerly

or currently undertaken between the University and the Arbor Hill community. The second phase of the partnership development should be to form multidisciplinary and multi-organizational partnerships to address more complex and broader-ranging community issues. The objective is to partner within the University and community, as well as between them. The desired outcome is the creation of a new, independent entity that balances the interests of the University and community partners.

PURPOSE AND METHODS

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

The goal of this study is to identify resources within the Arbor Hill community and the University at Albany, and find ways that they can be leveraged and enhanced in mutually beneficial ways. Our purpose is to lay the groundwork for future collaborative efforts between the Arbor Hill community and the University at Albany that reinforce, not replace, both group's assets. To that end we are examining: models of already established community-university partnerships; the level and nature of interest within both the community and the university; the existing services being provided within the community; and existing relationships between Arbor Hill organizations and the University at Albany. We also determined a menu of possible forms a future partnership could take; the associated costs and resources needed to establish each possible form; and finally, steps that would need to be taken to move towards these options.

PREVIOUS STUDIO

The Fall 2008 Graduate Masters of Regional Planning Studio laid the groundwork for future collaborations between the Arbor Hill community and the University at Albany. Working with the Arbor Hill Implementation Team (AHIT) - a diverse group of community stakeholders working towards the implementation of the City of Albany's Arbor Hill Neighborhood Plan - and based on extensive interactions with community members, this 2008 class decided to pursue three projects: a design study for a community park, a website providing a centralized repository of neighborhood information, and an indoor mural project. The park and mural projects directly related to ideas encompassed in the Arbor Hill neighborhood plan. The hope was that each of these projects would serve as springboards for further planning efforts in the neighborhood: the park was conceived of as part of a larger green space plan, the website was designed to collect and disseminate information about the neighborhood, and the mural was to be part of community wide mural project.

The Fall 2008 studio paved the way for our own work, but in so doing they discovered a number of limitations. Establishing lines of communication was found to be especially challenging early on. Despite the challenges they were able to successfully reach out to community members and work with them to implement their projects. The lessons learned in this project were that engagement, communication, and scheduling are some of the most critical aspects of a partnership. To that end, the final studio report recommended that future studios continue with the partnership to build on the lines of communication already established, and the sense of trust they were able to build. It is for this reason that the Fall 2009 studio is taking a step back, to further explore what makes a partnership successful. They found that communication was necessary, that trust had to be established, and that roles must be clarified. It was the 2008 studio's hope that the Department of Geography and Planning at UAlbany would continue to

work with the Arbor Hill community for future studio projects. It is our hope that this project will help to facilitate the creation of a partnership that will advance that goal.

AHIT INTEREST IN A FEASIBILITY STUDY

Following the successful completion of the Fall 2008 Arbor Hill Studio, interest was expressed from both the community and university for a more formalized, long-term partnership. During the 2008 studio, the idea of having a community-university center was informally explored. While interest in the general concept was strong on both sides, it was determined that the idea needed to be explored in more detail. Potential programming, costs, time commitments, organizational structure, and partners needed to be identified. In an effort to sketch out in more detail what this partnership would look like, and how it might materialize and evolve, the Fall 2009 studio class engaged in this feasibility study.

METHODS OF THIS STUDY

The first task we undertook was to review previous planning studies focusing on the Arbor Hill neighborhood. We looked to the Arbor Hill neighborhood plan, two subsequent progress reports, and the North Swan Street study. These documents gave us a better idea of where the neighborhood hopes to be heading. These neighborhood-led planning documents also provided an overview of the assets the community wants to build on in the future. Also, we saw in these documents the potential for many different partnerships between the community and university departments.

The Arbor Hill Neighborhood Plan identifies a number of areas of critical concern to neighborhood residents. The four main areas of concern are: housing; arts, culture, and heritage; business and job development; and quality of life. A strong desire was expressed to improve housing affordability, ensure a healthy mix of incomes, and preserve neighborhood character. Community members also emphasized the rich history of the neighborhood and chose to craft strategies that build upon their historical and cultural assets. The idea of reusing historic buildings was repeated throughout this plan and important progress has been made toward this goal, with two prominent buildings identified in the plan receiving significant investments. The Academy Lofts project, which will rehabilitate St. Joseph's academy into artist lofts and exhibition space, recently received a large RestoreNY grant. Also, the nearby King building has undergone extensive structural rehabilitation work to salvage as much of the building as possible.

Other principles in the plan were in support of economic development and quality of life improvements. The plan supports the strengthening of existing commercial areas, with streetscape improvements and the creation of new retail sites. Strategies are also identified to support small businesses through workshops and, by working with existing organizations like the Albany Center for Economic Success and the Capital District Community Loan Fund, start-up loans and space. In an effort to increase public safety

strategies are identified to foster a more trusting relationship with the police department. The need for physical improvements to lighting, traffic flows, and in this plan we understood the diversity of concerns that have been identified by residents. While we instantly saw a number of individual areas that could easily translate into project-based partnerships, we also saw that each concern was interrelated with others.

The work performed for this study can be divided into four parts: establishing parameters and the scope of work; performing background research on community-university partnerships; conducting community and university research and outreach; and developing scenarios based on our research. The first task that we completed was the drafting of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which defined the responsibilities of both the studio team and the Arbor Hill Implementation Team. This document established the scope of work to be completed by our team and defined a timeline for its completion.

After meeting with the Arbor Hill Implementation Team and agreeing on our MOU, we began work on our background research in three areas: community-university partnerships, community groups and service providers in Arbor Hill, and departments within the university doing community outreach activities. Community-university partnerships were researched and analyzed according to a matrix we developed. This allowed us to distinguish themes and common features of these partnerships. Information from this research helped us devise criteria for identifying potential partnerships within the University at Albany. This research also helped us to craft interview scripts to guide our conversations with community groups and university department representatives.

Additionally, in order to get a better sense of previous community-university interactions, we reviewed the progress report and final report from a Graduate Planning Studio from a previous year, and spoke to one of the students. A walking tour of the neighborhood was conducted by our Studio class, and students attended an Arbor Hill Neighborhood Association meeting in order to get a better insight into the neighborhood and its stakeholders.

To identify potential university partners, we researched the departments listed on the new community outreach website. After a brief survey of the activities performed by each department, we evaluated them based on: geographic focus, type of community interaction they engage in, and the types of communities they work with. Each department was contacted via email or phone call, and interviews were conducted via phone or in person with a standardized script (see Appendix).

Research into potential community partners proceeded in a similar manner, though our focus changed midway through the project. We had originally planned to create, distribute and analyze a community survey for purposes of assessing the needs of the community. However, after lengthy discussions and preliminary work to develop the survey, it was decided that stakeholder outreach would better lend itself to the desired outcomes of the community-university feasibility study. We chose to focus on

stakeholders and service providers rather than individual community members for a number of reasons: 1) due to time and logistical limits we felt we would not be able to ascertain a true cross-section of the community, 2) we felt that the existing, well established community groups would provide a more overarching view of the community as a whole, 3) we did not want to ask questions that could in any way mislead community members about the end results of the study, and 4) we did not want existing groups to feel as though we are trying to compete with their programs.

This decision was guided by two principles that came out of our research: trust must be established with residents and other stakeholders; and an assets-based, not needs-based, approach would best serve the process. In a needs based approach, the focus is on what is missing, or what is deficient. This approach lends itself well to a paternalistic, or university as expert model. It flows naturally when the University comes in to a community, looking for a project, a need they can fulfill. In contrast to this approach is an asset, or capacity building approach. This approach begins with what the community has: skills, assets, and capacities. As discussed above, this shifted the focus of our outreach from a resident survey to a stakeholder survey. It also shifted our focus from looking for projects that could be undertaken, to looking for true partnerships that could be formed.

After completing our research we developed 3 scenarios to guide future collaboration efforts. The 3 data sources were analyzed to identify common themes related to: challenges, successes, funding, staffing, organizational structure, communication, student involvement, geographic focus, physical presence in the community, and timeframe. To ensure that our work was moving in the right direction, and that our findings were reliable and valid, we sought feedback in a number of ways. The first method was through the establishment of our MOU, outlining the scope of our work. The next was our progress report, presented in October to members of AHIT. It was from this progress report presentation that the idea to shift the focus of our outreach efforts took form. To get an academic perspective we presented our findings to the university community on December 2nd. They gave us a number of useful suggestions on how to focus the presentation on our results. Finally, on December 8th, we presented our findings to AHIT members and other community stakeholders. The feedback obtained has been helpful in producing our final product.

WALKING TOUR AND ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

To gain first-hand experience with the neighborhood, we took a walking tour in late September. During this walking tour, our class was able to experience the diversity of housing types, business types, and other community features in this neighborhood. We were able to identify several community assets such as historically valuable architecture, a vibrant community of caring people with strong family connections and connections to place. We also observed several areas in need of improvement, such as the need for general cleanup of litter and garbage, the need to cover up broken windows and

abandoned buildings, "holes" in the streetscape caused by missing buildings, a need for traffic calming, and the lack of a local grocery/produce market.

We were able to observe and appreciate the efforts of community partners within the neighborhood. We observed the Albany Housing Authority's work rehabilitating homes throughout the neighborhood as well as several commercial structures along North Swan, and lingered over the possibilities that lay ahead for that portion of North Swan Street. We were able to observe the physical layout of the neighborhood and where community partners are situated within the community they serve including: the Arbor Hill Community Center Inc., ACES, the New Community Charter School, the new branch of the Albany Public Library currently under construction, the St. Joseph's Academy and the historic St. Joseph's Cathedral and Ten Broeck Mansion.

Members of our team attended an Arbor Hill Neighborhood Association meeting that deepened our understanding of Arbor Hill and better informed our project. Specifically, we gained a better understanding of safety issues facing the neighborhood, and were able to share this insight with the studio as a whole. Additionally, three members of the team attended a seminar on Arbor Hill at the Upstate NY APA Conference. This seminar provided more background information on Arbor Hill's history and the processes and issues that led to the Arbor Hill Neighborhood Plan. Of particular note was that Arbor Hill has been without a library for 40 years. We also learned more about the Saint Joseph's school development plans and city initiatives to stabilize abandoned buildings and vacant lots. A great deal of work is going into stabilizing the neighborhood so that new development can come in and thrive. A Community-university partnership could work together with the community stakeholders in order to facilitate such development by building upon the existing assets and contributing to revitalization efforts, by helping to identify and overcome the existing and future challenges.

THE ARBOR HILL NEIGHBORHOOD

NEIGHBORHOOD BOUNDARIES

The Arbor Hill neighborhood is located on the northwest side of Albany (See Figure 1 below). On the east side it is bounded by Henry Johnson Boulevard, on the south by Sheridan Ave, on the west by Broadway, and on the north by Interstate 90. The neighborhood is primarily residential with homes built in the 19th and early 20th centuries, though the area north of Livingston Ave was constructed in the 1960s. The main commercial strip is along Henry Johnson Boulevard.



FIGURE 1: ALBANY AND ARBOR HILL NEIGHBORHOOD BOUNDARIES

NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY

Much of the development of the neighborhood occurred between 1825 and 1900, when it served as a residential area for wealthy business owners. This aspect of the neighborhood's past left it with many assets like the impressive architecture, the pedestrian friendly grid pattern of its streets, and many significant buildings such as the Ten Broeck Mansion and the King building. While much of the neighborhood dates from the 19th and early 20th centuries, the area north of Livingston Avenue is more typical of 1960s suburban development. As with many American urban areas, the neighborhood has experienced decline over the past few decades. North Swan Street was a vibrant commercial district up until the 1960s, and many of the storefronts are now abandoned and neglected.

The neighborhood's rich history is the basis for important cultural assets. Prior to the Civil War, the Arbor Hill was a stop-over for the Underground Railroad. Stephen Myers, a black abolitionist who lived in the area, helped thousands of slaves on their way to freedom. His house, the Stephen and Harriet Myers residence has been recognized by the national register as an Underground Railroad Historic site.

During the last half of the century, Arbor Hill has experienced disinvestment, followed by crime and abandonment of dwellings. Deteriorating conditions and demolitions left several hundreds of properties and lots vacant throughout the community. A high concentration of public housing, problems with drug dealing and gangs has helped create a negative perception of the neighborhood and has weakened the real estate market. The construction of I-90 and I-787 has only contributed to the neighborhoods isolation from the Hudson River and the rest of the city, enclosing Arbor Hill on north and east, while Sheridan Hollow separates it from the city's Central Business District to the south.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSETS

Arbor Hill's key assets, which hold much potential for its future revitalization, are the neighborhood's history and geographic location. Despite the decade-long erosion of its historic fabric, many architectural styles popular among Albany's wealthy and upper-middle classes have been preserved in sections of Arbor Hill. The area also contains some significant local landmarks, such as St. Joseph's church, the Stephen and Harriet Myers Residence, the recently renovated Palace Theater, and historic houses along Clinton Avenue and in the Ten Broeck Triangle. Original grid street lay-out and short blocks, make the community very walkable and pedestrian friendly. Arbor Hill is only 1 mile away from downtown and many of the region's largest employment and cultural centers.

Over the past few years, significant work has been done to revitalize the historic commercial core along North Swan Street, including a proposed conversion of St. Joseph's Academy to artist's lofts, along with exhibition and street level commercial spaces. New developments and revitalized residential properties reflect the block-planning approach employed by the City of Albany, Albany Housing Authority, and the community's strong desire to see vacant historic buildings as assets.

The Housing Authority's plan to provide quality housing and attractive retail space by building new mixed-use structures on North Swan Street, has recently secured a \$5 million RestoreNY grant. The city is also initiating a neighborhood stabilization plan that seeks to acquire foreclosed and abandoned properties so they can be redeveloped and resold. They also plan to offer down payment assistance for low-income purchasers. These larger developments will compliment smaller initiatives that also seek to stabilize the area. One simple action that the city has been doing is painting boarded up windows to give them a more pleasant and less neglected appearance until new tenants can be located. By building on the tight urban form of the neighborhood, these developments will bring increased vibrancy to the neighborhood while respecting the historic qualities that made it a quality place to live.

The community will also be home to the soon to be completed Arbor Hill branch of the Albany Public Library. The first true neighborhood library branch in Arbor Hill in 47 years is scheduled to be open in the summer of 2010. This building, which is being constructed with environmental sustainability in mind, will provide a valuable resource for the community and fulfills a goal expressed in the Arbor Hill Neighborhood Plan.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHALLENGES

In 2000, the Arbor Hill neighborhood (census tract #2) was quite distinct from the rest of Albany, as show in Table 1 below. The most striking difference is in the neighborhood's *median household income*, which was almost 50% less than the city at large. One in three neighborhood residents were living in poverty, compared to one in five citywide. *Homeownership rates* were lower (20.9% versus 37.6%), and vacancy rates 2.8 times as great as the city average of 10%.

Demographically, the Arbor Hill neighborhood had a different *racial composition*, was younger, and had different household characteristics. Most striking was the racial mix: 77% Black, 15% White, and 7.4% Latino in Arbor Hill, compared to 28.1% Black, 63.1% White, and 5.6% Latino for Albany. While the *average household size* was similar (2.35 versus 2.10), the characteristics of those households differed. On average, 10.7% of city households was female headed, but in Arbor Hill the percentage was 31.7%. The median age was only 2.7 years younger than the city's, but the percentage of persons under 18 (35%) was 15 points higher than in the city at large (20%).

Arbor Hill seems not only to be isolated from the rest of the city demographically, but also physically and topographically. Highways and industrial development create the north-eastern boundaries of the neighborhood, while steep grade-change of the Sheridan Hollow creates a physical accessibility barrier between the community and central business district. Some links that do exist between the city and Arbor Hill, such as the north-south arterials (e.g. Henry Johnson and North Swan Street) are over-utilized by commuters who do not live in the neighborhood.

| Demographic Characteristic | Census Tract #2 | City of Albany |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Total Population | 5,491 | 95,658 |
| Population: Black | 77% | 28.10% |
| Population: White | 15% | 63.10% |
| Population: Latino | 7.40% | 5.60% |
| Median Age | 29.1 | 31.8 |
| Average Household Size | 2.35 | 2.1 |
| Female Household Head with Children | 31.70% | 10.70% |
| Renter-Occupied Housing Units | 79.1% | 62.40% |
| Rent Greater than 35 % of Household Income | 43.2% | 36.80% |
| Percent High School Graduate or Higher | 69.9% | 81.20% |
| Age 16 and Over Not in Labor Force | 43.2% | 36.40% |
| Median Household Income | \$16,222 | \$30,041 |
| Individuals below Poverty Level | 34.8% | 21.70% |
| Median Value Single Owner-Occupied Homes | \$68,900 | \$98,300 |
| Housing Units: Percent Homeownership | 20.90% | 37.60% |
| Housing Units: Percentage Vacant | 28% | 10.10% |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100% Data | | |

TABLE 1: SELECT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, ALBANY & ARBOR HILL

EXPLORING EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS

Through researching relevant sources of community-university partnerships, we have uncovered several themes that have guided our thinking in creating a recommendation for a partnership between Arbor Hill and the University at Albany. These include the concepts of service learning, community empowerment, and an interdisciplinary approach. These themes transcend specific structures for partnerships, as they should be thought of as guiding principles in their creation and maintenance. This section will discuss our findings from literature dealing with the concept of university-partnerships in general to specific partnerships we thought were relevant to the context of this study.

BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

The benefits felt by communities from university partnerships include sharing information, taking advantage of university resources, political support, influence, and protection (See Figure 2 below) (Nye and Schramm 1999, 10). Research, including feasibility studies like this, is often viewed as one of the most powerful tools that a university can offer the community. It provides the institutional support and validity that community groups may lack to get buy-in from their constituents in the community, financial institutions, and government agencies. Universities can also assist communities by providing training programs and by helping them evaluate and use their resources more effectively. This kind of assistance is intended to empower community groups to develop their own leadership and capacity. Some methods employed to achieve this are developing best practices, model programs, and data

| Community Benefits | University Benefits |
|---|---|
| Interns and volunteers | Practical real world experience for faculty and students |
| Technical assistance and expertise | Applied research opportunities harnessing community expertise |
| Access to academic community | Access to real world expertise and advice |
| Opportunity for enhanced services | Opportunity for enhanced academic performance from students and faculty |
| Better access to local leaders and institutions | Improved reputation and credibility with community residents |

analysis (Nye and Schramm 1999, 10-11).

FIGURE 2: BENEFITS OF PARTNERSHIP TO THE COMMUNITY & UNIVERSITY

The availability of increased financial, human, and physical resources is another benefit. University faculty and students can directly supply expertise and work that community groups can use to carry out their mission. They can also assist in grant writing and other forms of financial assistance that can fund more human resources or space (Nye and Schramm 1999, 11). Universities have technical resources and expertise with computers, software, and data analysis that community groups would not be able to afford on their own. Lastly, universities can also supply space for meetings, training events, exhibits, performances, and other events.

The nature of influence and protection found within community-university partnerships has many facets. On one level, the university provides credibility and access to community groups, which may be marginalized within a broader city context. A university partnership could, for example, help a community group get an audience with a city official or provide a loan application more credibility with a bank. Universities can also use their influence and neutrality to play a role in fostering collaboration between groups within the community (Nye and Schramm 1999, 11-12).

BENEFITS TO THE UNIVERSITY

The benefits that a university receives from a community partnership include rewarding service based learning experiences for students, the opportunity for faculty to do applied research in their field, and an opportunity for the university to improve its reputation with the local community. Not all student learning experiences fall under the rubric of a community partnership as some view the community as a passive resource and as such entail very little community engagement.

The level of community engagement to which a university commits itself is often indicated in the way they describe their community learning experiences. These descriptions usually fall under three general categories, which describe the way that each student interacts with the community:

- ❑ Internships, workshops, field experiences—a place in the community is provided to students in order for them to apply the theory that they learn in class;
- ❑ Cooperative education—adds a job skill focus to the students learning experience; and
- ❑ Service learning—the university attempts to create a positive presence in the community, developing a sense of social awareness and civic responsibility in students (Forsyth et al 2000, 239).

The service learning model moves toward the idea of a university community partnership as opposed to a simple community 'placement'. The community, itself, has control over the learning process where they had once been treated as data sites or employment centers (Forsyth et al 2000, 239).

A fundamental concept of service learning in the community is that education and participation are tied to democracy (Forsyth et al 2000, 240). Service learning is then a dimension of citizenship in a democratic society because it teaches students about the interdependencies found in each community, how those interdependent relationships foster responsibilities among community members, and how they fit into those roles as students and how they will later fit into them as professionals (Forsyth et al 2000, 240).

Many educators agree that 'learning by doing' produces positive outcomes for students because they are actively participating in their learning process as opposed to simply receiving instruction. When the service learning experience is coupled with a structured reflection process, the theoretical lessons found in textbooks and class lectures are reinforced and augmented. Research has found that students benefit from better test scores, increased social and cognitive outcomes, and that they typically give better evaluations to courses that include service learning components (Forsyth et al 2000, 241).

Communities provide human resources to universities by playing the role of guest lecturers, faculty mentors, professional trainers, and advisory committee and joint task force members (Nye and Schramm 1999, 11). This is consistent with the idea that the flow of resources between the community and the university is two way; that faculty and students have as much to learn from the community as the community has to learn from the university.

University faculty also find the practical use of their research in the community professionally rewarding. The need to form alliances and to reconcile competing interest groups poses challenges to research projects that could not be recreated in a classroom or laboratory environment. Universities can reward faculty by providing tenure incentives for community work and research. The university can benefit by taking advantage of professionals with local experience and knowledge who can take part in research or teach students (Nye and Schramm 1999, 11-19).

Universities often have difficulties in appealing to community residents for support of university-sponsored projects. To help bridge this gap, universities need to make alliances with community groups and stakeholders who have credibility and influence with residents. Such alliances can be beneficial to a university when it seeks the support of local government for zoning changes or building permits, or with foundations with which it seeks grant opportunities (Nye and Schramm 1999, 12).

WHAT KIND OF PARTNERSHIP?

Regardless of their configuration, all parties in a community-university partnership should share a common vision to community building and collaboration such that the relationships that develop between them are healthy and two way. Because sharing information, resources, and influence requires high levels of communication and coordination, both parties should look to these guidelines to develop a healthy working relationship:

- ❑ A shared underlying philosophy of community development and of the process of collaboration that seeks that end;
- ❑ A relationship among partners that confronts and overcomes differences of race, class, power, culture, and economic status;
- ❑ Recognition of the many interests that all partners may possess;
- ❑ Institutional and leadership involvement of all partners;
- ❑ Appropriate organization to meet partnership goals;
- ❑ Appropriate balance of political, advocacy, and organizing roles of all partners (Nye and Schramm 1999, 12);

With these objectives in mind, it is helpful to look at some of the typical models that community-university partnerships can assume. These four broad categories embody the communication and power dynamics that can occur between parties with or without careful planning:

- ❑ **Paternalistic / Theory Testing Model** -- In this model, the university poses its own questions and has all of its own answers. It uses the community as laboratory to test its theories and to provide students with 'real world' experience. The university knows what is best for the community and has come to fix its problems;
- ❑ **Professional / Expertise model** -- Both the university and the community can pose questions, but only the university has the answers. In this model, the university assumes the role of a teacher and the community as its student;
- ❑ **The University as Resource model** – The community is still dependent on the university for all of the answers, however, the university sees its needs as subservient to those of the community. The community is not viewed as having resources to offer the university;
- ❑ **Empowerment-Capacity Building model** -- The community and university work alongside each other, learning from each other through collaboration on projects. Both gain something from this approach. It involves considerable community control over projects and is often called 'indigenous self-determination' (Nye and Schramm 1999, 12);

The Empowerment-Capacity building model clearly embodies the goals set forth above in term of long terms partnerships. In moves away from the model of the community as a passive recipient of university expertise into one where both parties share equally in terms of work load, shared resources, and influence. It also mandates continual communication and coordination on both sides to reach shared goals.

There are some important challenges that should be addressed in organizing partnerships between universities and communities. First, the relationship will be uneven in terms of the resources that a huge university has compared to a small, resource-constrained community based organization. Even if the university is not funded or if the students come from backgrounds similar to those found in the communities in which they work, the perception may still be that the university has all of the resources. This perceived lack of community resources may insert itself into the power relationship between university and community thereby increasing the likelihood of a dependent relationship (Nye and Schramm 1999, 20).

Second, university faculty, students and staff see things from the perspective of their own academic organization of departments and programs, which may not make any sense from a community perspective. A community group usually has a single focus or issue such as housing or tenant issues. The university may not have a department or program into which that issue fits neatly, so some adjustments need to be made. An interdisciplinary program that includes more than one university department may be the best solution to this challenge (Nye and Schramm 1999, 20).

Based on these considerations, there are five possible organizational structures for Community - University partnerships. A partnership may actually take on more than one of these structures at the same time so they are by no means mutually exclusive.

- ❑ **Centralized at senior level** -- University administration takes a leadership role and strongly supports community engagement and the sharing of university resources;
- ❑ **Decentralized at department level** – Organization of community engagement programs is done at the departmental level. Avoids centralized university direction and overhead;
- ❑ **Within interdisciplinary centers or schools** – This level of organization is appropriate when the scale and complexity of partnership needs goes beyond the resource of a single department;
- ❑ **In a separate non-profit** – This is an effective means to establish joint control of a partnership;
- ❑ **In collaboration with other schools / universities** – This can be done in combination with any of the above, when the addition of another school or university can add to the partnership's potential.

We considered each of these before developing our scenarios, keeping in mind the needs that were expressed by community and university stakeholders whom we interviewed. Using these structures as guidelines helped us develop logical and organic arrangements among parties and possible future outcomes as one structure might lead naturally into another (Nye and Schramm 1999, 21).

CASE STUDY RESEARCH

To better understand how community-university partnerships could and do work, we felt it was important to extend our research to existing partnerships throughout the country. In order to narrow down the host of varied examples, the following factors were used to ascertain those most relevant partnerships to explore for our study:

- ❑ public or private university status
- ❑ university size
- ❑ city size and other demographic information
- ❑ location of the university within the city
- ❑ programs offered, conducted and overseen by the partnership

Based on these criteria, we determined the following five examples were most applicable to the potential of an Arbor Hill-University at Albany partnership. They all strive to benefit both the community and the university through focused efforts of engagement.

- ❑ University of Arizona
- ❑ University at Buffalo, SUNY
- ❑ San Jose State University
- ❑ Syracuse University
- ❑ University of Washington

Studio members examined partnership websites and then emailed or called identified contacts. Throughout the research process, we also focused on the organizational structure of each community-university partnership and how those organizational models might relate to our work. We sought answers to the following questions to identify the best and most relevant practices that could inform a partnership between the University at Albany and the Arbor Hill neighborhood:

- ❑ Was a specific area or neighborhood within a city targeted and for what reason?
- ❑ What start-up and operational funding sources were used?
- ❑ What management system was implemented (i.e. steering committee, paid staff, board of directors, etc.)?
- ❑ Did the partnerships utilize a physical space and, if so, where was it located?
- ❑ What programs were offered and what services were provided?
- ❑ What were the benefits and challenges experienced?

Figure 3 summarizes the collected data on the five partnerships studied, and full reports on each case study can be found in the Appendix. We identified four important partnership attributes: (1) Communication; (2) Coordination; (3) Governance; and (4) Mutual benefit.

| CASE STUDY RESEARCH | University of Buffalo | University of Arizona | University of Washington | Syracuse University | San Jose State University |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Physical Space is Utilized | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Physical Space Location | C | C | U | C | C |
| Public Dollars Used to Fund Start-Up | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Private Dollars Used to Fund Start-Up | UN | UN | Y | Y | N |
| Public Dollars Used in Current Funding | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Private Dollars Used in Current Funding | UN | UN | UN | UN | Y |
| In-Kind Donations are Utilized | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Hands-On Case Studies Utilized by University | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Provides Student Projects such as Neighborhood Clean-Up | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Provides Educational Opportunity to Community | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Fosters University Enrollment | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Provides Focus on Public Health and Related Topics | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Embraces Strategic Relationships with Community Leaders | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Shares Knowledge to Facilitate Entrepreneurial Endeavors | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Partnership Deemed to be Mutually Beneficial | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Administrative Structure of Partnership | E, I, SF | E, I, SF | E, SF | SF | S |
| Stakeholders Involved in Governance | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

Y: Yes

N:No

UN: Unknown

SF: Staff

U: University

C: Community

B: Both University and Community

E: External Advisory Board

I: Internal Executive Committee

S: Steering Committee

FIGURE 3: SUMMARY OF PARTNERSHIP CASE STUDIES

One common theme found during our research is that communication is the key to success. Open communication, both between the community and university partners and also, within the community and university, is important and requires constant nurturing. If the individual partners are not focused on the same goal, the partnership will not be focused. After communication is established and maintained on a regular basis, coordination can begin.

Coordination can take many forms and often becomes more intricate as a partnership progresses. Communication will define goals with coordination required to carry out those goals. Whatever the project, whether it be student placement as manpower or community group leaders speaking as university lecturers, coordination of time, responsibilities, costs, etc. will need to be accomplished. A university point person or a community engagement webpage can benefit the partnership by allowing the community an opportunity to connect with an appropriate university department. Our research suggests that an actual physical location enhances the interaction among students, community leaders, and university staff. Whether this space is on the university campus, within a university department, within an existing community space, or operates as a standalone center, it will inevitably aid in raising awareness of the partnership. This in turn provides a greater sense of commitment to those who visit and staff it.

In addition, we found that once the partnership is formed, a Steering Committee or Board of Directors is recommended. This type of governance is organized to bring the entities together; it helps to foster an ongoing relationship of trust and commitment. With the inevitable turnover of university staff, students, and community organization leadership, the maintenance of these relationships is very important. The need to reorganize, oversee, and to re-train participants as a term, semester, or internship ends, can lead to a high level of frustration.

Lastly, these case studies have reiterated the fact that in order for partnerships to continue long-term, they must be of mutual benefit to both the community and the university they serve. Benefits to the community are often in the form of manpower, technical assistance and fundraising while the university partners generally benefit from service learning initiatives, research and hands-on projects, and internship credits. Clearly, if projects continuously return uneven benefits favoring one side over the other, the stakeholders will lose both interest in and dedication to the effort, damaging the intent of the partnership.

We learned from our research that a myriad of community-university partnerships exist with various costs and a wide range of commitment associated. San Jose State University, for instance, has a fairly simple partnership focused on a specific community within San Jose. In this example, the community can communicate with the established steering committee by filling out an application. The application allows the community to request help for an identified problem or assistance with an event.

An example of this may be a community group organizing a walk-a-thon fundraiser with a need for volunteers to work a registration booth. The community group would file the application, which is available on the partnership website, and request the number of volunteers. The steering committee would approve the request and coordinate the student manpower to assist. Student volunteers receive hours for servicelearning credits while the community benefits from direct assistance. The relationship between the school and the community is further enhanced by being identified and marketed as a "CommUniverCity", their marketing efforts have also included the creation of a colorful logo.

Community-university partnerships are not without difficulty. A Steering Committee or Board of Directors, especially if unpaid, can become overwhelmed with too many responsibilities. As the partnership becomes more advanced, a dedicated staff person or persons may become necessary. The University at Buffalo partnership is overseen by professors in the School of Architecture and Planning acting as directors and research analysts with additional paid staff running the day to day activities and overseeing coordination of the wide variety of programs. The University of Washington established an Office of Community Partnerships and hired a paid director to play "match-maker" between neighborhood needs and university departments. Unfortunately, in recent years the grant moneys used to pay the director were cut by the State and the position no longer exists.

COMMUNITY PARTNERS

EXISTING SERVICE PROVIDERS

One focus of our investigation involved learning more about the existing community service providers (“community stakeholders”) already in place. We conducted research of these organizations from a review of websites, phone conversations and in-person interviews. A complete list of organizations contacted is included in the Appendix.

▣ Faith Based Social Services Providers

Arbor Hill has a very strong network of faith-based service providers. These service providers reach out to community residents through their local churches, as well as through existing family networks. Our interview with Trinity Institute revealed that they will often provide services to one family member (e.g. tutoring assistance) and that the chain of service will often travel throughout the family unit (e.g. dance classes for the elderly, job skills training for adults). The Arbor Hill community has strong family ties within the neighborhood as well as strong connections to local churches, and this appears to be an effective delivery route for many services.

Examples of faith-based service providers we investigated included Trinity Institute, Catholic Charities, Equinox, and ARISE.

▣ Community Centers

Arbor Hill Community Center, Inc. is a community center that is currently active within the community. Community meetings are also held at the Albany Center for Economic Success (ACES). The Trinity Institute uses Arbor Hill Community Center, Inc. for a variety of outreach programming. During this study, the Arbor Hill Community Center held a grand opening of its Family and Neighborhood Resource Center.

▣ Educational Service Providers

The community feedback we received from attendance at meetings and conversations with community stakeholders indicated a desire to expand educational programs in Arbor Hill to include adult and continuing education, as well as programs for college bound youths to gain exposure to University life. Examples of educational service providers we investigated included Capital District BOCES, ACES job training, and New Covenant Charter School.

▣ Housing and Financial Assistance Service Providers

Adequate and suitable housing continues to be a problem for Arbor Hill residents, as well as the maintenance of the condition and appearance of existing structures. The Albany Housing Authority (AHA) has created new residential and commercial space along North Swan Street and there are more improvements planned for the future. AHA also plans the replacement of the Ida Yarborough homes in the near future. Examples of service providers in the category that we investigated are Albany Housing Authority, Albany Housing Coalition, Inc., Capital District Community Loan Fund, and United Tenants of Albany. Albany Center for Economic Success (ACES) provides office space for a few of these organizations, as well as providing their own business incubator services.

▣ Governmental Service Providers

The Albany Planning Department provides technical assistance to the Arbor Hill Community as needed. The Whitney Young Health Center provides low-cost health services and educational outreach to members of the Arbor Hill Community, and provides HIV screening for University at Albany students.

▣ Arts-based Service Providers

WAMC and Albany Barn were two other community service providers that we investigated. Albany Barn will soon be occupying a recently renovated space on North Swan Street, from which they will continue to provide arts-based outreach programming.

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY FEEDBACK/FINDINGS

The feedback we received from community members revealed several existing issues such as concerns about safety, the appearance of streets and need for trash cleanup, and the lack of adult education classes. Existing service providers in the community are working hard to address these issues, and a stronger community-university partnership would provide additional resources to help these community partners to expand their existing programming. Our interview process was geared at better understanding the needs these service providers have.

Several major themes came out of our interviews and research of existing community service providers:

- ❑ As we begin the first phase of our partnership, it makes sense to tackle the issues facing this community by assisting and collaborating with existing community service providers. All service providers interviewed expressed interest in working with student volunteers from UAlbany.
- ❑ There are a range of positions available for students, providing different levels of community engagement. These positions range in complexity and could include: volunteer laborers at community events, service learning positions offering one-on-one assistance to community members, internships filling semester-long temporary positions within community organizations, and entire “studio” classes taking a team approach toward a specific problem.
- ❑ The majority of persons interviewed agreed that it is important for UAlbany to have a physical space and increased exposure within the Arbor Hill community.
- ❑ For certain organizations, limited administrative capacity means assistance and leadership will be needed from the University in coordinating and managing volunteers and interns.
- ❑ Community stakeholders would like to see more continuity from student volunteers. They would like community involvement from students that lasts beyond the end of the semester, picking up old projects and plans, and seeing them through implementation. This coordination and leadership would be required from the University partners.

UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

Vital to our assessment of a possible partnership between the university and the community is a study of existing university resources. We collected direct input from five university departments in an effort to identify university needs, to learn about existing outreach programs, and to identify potential stakeholders in a Community/University partnership.

We developed fourteen questions inquiring about existing outreach activities and the administrative structure of such activities, and perceived barriers to enhanced community outreach. All members of the university that we spoke with had been in the past, or were currently involved in outreach programs. This outreach was not limited to Arbor Hill, as most programs targeted the city of Albany. Existing programs included matching initiatives where university students were placed in local organizations to receive internship credit and to provide public service, as well as public health programs promoting exercise and clean drinking water. Additionally, in the past, students from the university have assisted local business owners in Arbor Hill in business management,

All university members we spoke with were enthusiastic about the notion of an enhanced partnership with the community. Our Studio project has the benefit of being auspiciously timed at the same time that the University released its *Action Plan to Advance Community Engagement at UAlbany*. We were fortunate to be able to reach out to those already working towards the end of community involvement, and were able to build upon the work already done and the momentum generated by the university.

Perceived barriers to further collaborative projects included access to funding, availability of supporting staff, and the ability to generate requisite interest both on the university and community sides. Some we spoke to noted professional politics and a lack of leadership as roadblocks. University members mentioned that professors are given little if any incentive to take on such leadership roles.

There are opportunities for University students, faculty, and departments to either maintain their current outreach programs with increased assistance, or to engage in new cooperative programs in Arbor Hill. The Appendix of this report contains contact information to allow interested parties to make these connections. The phases recommended for implementation in this report will provide a structural framework for introducing student *assistance* and talent into these programs, in ways that are mutually beneficial for all.

COMMUNITY SERVICE INITIATIVES

Several programs we spoke with are currently, or have in the recent past, actively engaged in community outreach and service learning projects in Albany. These departments are: The School of Social Welfare, The Prevention Research Center, The Department of Geography and Planning, The Department of Biodiversity, Center for Elimination of Minority Health Disparities, The School of Business, and The School of Education.

The School of Social Welfare administers a program where students of all majors are placed in organizations to allow these organizations to better achieve their missions. In the 2008/2009 academic year, 950 students participated in this program. Members of the School of Social Welfare mentioned that increased leadership and coordination would go far toward further improving this program. Our proposed phased approach speaks to the ability to building upon existing partnerships and outreach efforts.

The School of Business mentioned their program, which matches business students with entrepreneurs in Albany. This partnership allows business students to engage in real world business planning, and allows for new business owners to have the help of students with a breadth of knowledge. The School of Business stated that Arbor Hill would be an ideal candidate for this strategic relationship. If greater funding were available, the School of Business would be able to expand its program into Arbor Hill. Phase 2 speaks to this need to acquire additional funding lines to foster collaborative program expansion.

The Department of Geography and Planning has been focusing Studio projects on Arbor Hill, and is also engaged in myriad projects working within the City of Albany such as working to establish a community garden, access vacant housing supply in Albany, and to engage in research projects with local organizations such as the Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA). This Department at its core is dedicated to service learning and community engagement, and a successful partnership between the community and the university would include the participation of the Geography and Planning Department.

The School of Education mandates that students complete a course in Community Engagement, wherein many students tutor area high school students. Within the School of Education students have been placed in local service providing organizations such as Equinox, the YMCA, and local after school programs. These placements are made due to existing long term relationships between the local organizations and the School of Education. Placements are made by a graduate assistant (GA) who is funded through a university GA line. Challenges to this existing program include supervision of students in local organizations and at times transportation has been an issue.

The Prevention Research Center is engaged in a three year ongoing community based participatory research project to encourage walking among adults. The project includes

partnerships in Sullivan County, Dutchess County, Warren County, and each county is governed by a separate advisory board. Grant funding comes from the Center for Disease Control. Challenges include grant funding, and having ample support staff.

The Biodiversity program in the Department of Biological Sciences had a past project investigating the water quality of the Tivoli Watershed. The project paid for three students to investigate the feasibility of opening up the stream bed. Additionally, the department sought to train others to monitor the stream and run-off. Challenges to this program included fostering interest from community members, funding and administrative support.

The Center for Elimination of Minority Health Disparities partners with local community groups to promote equitable healthcare and equitable health outcomes. The Center has forged strong relationships with many existing health providers and advocacy groups in the area. The Center works to engage with minority populations to disseminate health care service provider information.

DEVELOPING A PARTNERSHIP

FINDINGS

Our review of interview responses from University and community stakeholders has led to a number of observations that inform the feasibility of establishing a Community-university partnership in Arbor Hill:

- ❑ There are a number of past and existing partnerships among UAlbany academic programs and community groups.
- ❑ University and community groups are largely unaware of such partnerships other than those in which they are directly involved.
- ❑ There is little to no coordination among University departments with respect to activities or potential involvement in the Arbor Hill community.
- ❑ A "hands-on" approach with students active in the community is preferable to a remote, University-oriented approach with academics conducting research in the neighborhood.

Our observations lead us to conclude that there is both the desire and the potential for a deeper Community-university partnership in the Arbor Hill community. Moreover, past and existing partnerships can form the basis for such a partnership. Therefore, we believe a long-term goal of the Arbor Hill Implementation Team should be to foster a more formal partnership between UAlbany and community organizations in Arbor Hill.

To be successful, the partnership must adhere to a number of principles. Our review of the literature and case studies has allowed us to identify the characteristics associated with successful community-university partnerships. Generally, such partnerships are community rather than university-based and involve multiple departments working with community organizations to research, develop and provide services for community residents. A partnership should therefore be structured so that it is:

- ❑ Interdisciplinary;
- ❑ Service-oriented;
- ❑ Able to share decision-making;
- ❑ Financially sustainable; and
- ❑ Continuous.

CHALLENGES

Establishing the partnership will require more cooperation among University and community stakeholders, as well as eventual funding for programs and administration. Both UAlbany and Arbor Hill are complex entities with a multitude of

constituents, stakeholders and decision-makers. Finding commonalities, building trust and developing working relationships will take time and effort on the part of both partners.

Development of a community-university partnership should therefore be phased to allow time to overcome these challenges. The first phase of developing the community-university partnership should be to further develop the communication among University departments and with the Arbor Hill community. The second phase of the partnership development should be to form multidisciplinary and multi-organizational partnerships to address more complex and broader-ranging community issues. The third and final phase is the creation of a new, independent entity that balances the interests of the University and community partners.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Phase I - Enhanced Communication

The first phase of developing the community-university partnership should be to further develop the communication among University departments and with the Arbor Hill community (See Figure 4 below). The objective is to document, publicize and build upon activities formerly or currently undertaken between the University and the Arbor Hill community. This is critical to the development of a partnership because at the present time there is little awareness among University departments of each other's activities within Arbor Hill or of the potential for developing a multi-disciplinary program focused on the community. One of the most difficult challenges to overcome will be the tendency of University departments to function in isolation due to their desire for autonomy and a perceived lack of reward for cooperation. The best way to break down these barriers is to demonstrate the successes that individual departments are having by partnering with organizations in Arbor Hill, and to reward such cooperation.

Enhanced communication could build upon the partnerships that already exist between community groups and University departments by celebrating these successes within the University and the community. Greater awareness of the benefits accruing on both sides of partnerships should help to build trust and foster new relationships. Greater availability of information will allow community groups to learn about the diversity of departments within the University that are working with community groups. The University will gain new opportunities for community outreach work as well as an enhanced educational experience for students. Enhanced communication should work in both directions. On the University side this could be accomplished in part through the existing Community Outreach website (<http://www.albany.edu/outreach>); on the community side, the website (<http://arborhillneighborhood.com>) created by the Fall 2008 studio could be used. By including a contact list with community stakeholder dossiers, faculty will have ready access to real world guest lecturers from the Arbor Hill

community. Inviting people from the community into the classroom exposes students to information that cannot be gleaned from textbooks in a manner that allows for an interactive exchange of ideas and information.

| <i>University Department/Community Organization</i> | <i>Department of Geography & Planning</i> | <i>School of Social Welfare</i> | <i>School of Public Health</i> | <i>School of Education</i> | <i>School of Business</i> | <i>Biological Sciences</i> |
|---|---|---|--|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>City of Albany</i> | Practicum | | | | | Research |
| <i>Albany Center for Entrepreneurial Success</i> | | | | | Internships Research | |
| <i>Albany Barn/St. Joseph's</i> | Internships Volunteers | Internships Volunteers | Research Volunteers | | | |
| <i>Healthy Capital District Initiative</i> | | Research Volunteers | Research Volunteers | | | |
| <i>United Tenants of Albany</i> | Research | | | | | |
| <i>Albany Housing Coalition</i> | | Internships Volunteers Technical- Assistance | | | | |
| <i>Equinox</i> | | | | Internships | | |
| <i>WAMC</i> | | | | | Internships | |
| <i>Albany Community Land Trust</i> | Practicum Research | | | | | |
| <i>Capital District Community Loan Fund</i> | Practicum Research | | | | Internships | |
| <i>Catholic Charities</i> | | Volunteers | | | | |
| <i>BOCES</i> | | | | Internships Technical- Assistance | | |

FIGURE 4: POTENTIAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS & COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS

For the time being, the model for community-university partnerships will continue to be individual departments working with individual community organizations. Existing relationships should be expanded according to mutual interests and needs. From our interviews, we were able to identify a number of potential partnerships based upon expressions of interest on the part of University departments and community organizations. Potential partnerships can involve internships and volunteer programs,

applied research projects generated from the community, service learning projects and practicum, or class work in which the community is the object of study.

The University schools and departments and community organizations that expressed such interest are presented below. Past and existing relationships are shown in bold typeface in terms of the nature of the activities undertaken, e.g. "research". The remaining entities are potential relationships suggested by interviewees. These relationships should be further explored for potential development of partnerships.

The first phase of the Community-university partnership should be managed by a joint advisory committee consisting of University and community stakeholders. Information could be disseminated through a UAlbany website. There would be little to no cost to the University or community. Although there is no fixed time frame, we expect that certain indicators will emerge within the next few years that will signal that it is time to move to the second phase of partnership development. Specifically, community issues that demand the involvement of more than one department will necessitate a coordinated response from the University. At this stage, a move to a multidisciplinary approach is warranted.

We note that UAlbany is already proceeding in this direction with the May, 2008 creation of the Steering Committee on Community Engagement. The Committee is "charged with developing and proposing: (1) a vision and mission statement for community engagement at UAlbany, and (2) an action plan to make community engagement a widely recognized hallmark of the University, with a major goal to strategically enhance and leverage the University's accomplishments and distinctive strengths in community engagement for greater impact at home and abroad" (page 2). To fulfill this mandate, the Steering Committee has outlined a number of action steps. Among the most significant of these is the commitment to establish a Campus Committee on Community-university Engagement (CCUCE) because

"community engagement at UAlbany is by nature a decentralized activity occurring in 9 schools and colleges and their departments, multiple centers and units, and student organizations (and)...a mechanism is needed to help bring the campus together to communicate and collaborate within the wider context of UAlbany" (page 9).

Phase II - Community-university Coordination

The second phase of the partnership development should be to form multidisciplinary and multi-organizational partnerships to address more complex and broader-ranging community issues. The objective is to partner within the University and community, as well as between them. As in the first phase, University and community stakeholders must be sure of the benefits to be gained from such partnerships. Additionally, all

parties must assess their financial and human resources in terms of their capacity to participate.

This phase should be managed by a steering committee of appointed University and Arbor Hill stakeholders. Transitioning from the Joint Advisory Committee envisioned in Phase 1 to a steering committee will allow community stakeholders a greater degree of control over program development. Instead of simply advising each other of what resources are available within the community and university, steering committee members will be charged with establishing new relationships and identifying new resources. Initially these new relationships will likely resemble those that already exist: one department with one or more community groups. The addition of a paid staff coordinator will ease the transition into an interdisciplinary approach. This model was adopted at the University of Washington (ultimately eliminated by budget cuts). The staff coordinator would take ideas formed by the steering committee and shop them around the university departments. Through this office, the activities of multiple departments could be coordinated around a commonly defined community-university goal. Departments within the university are still largely autonomous, working on their part of the project within their own framework. Indicators of success will include cooperation between University departments and pooling of grant money to fund inter-departmental projects.

Phase III: Sustained Cooperation

The desired final phase is the creation of a new, independent entity that balances the interests of the University and community partners. The structure and function of this body should be jointly determined. Several of the case studies discussed here could serve as potential models for the future.

NEXT STEPS

The university and community should begin work by creating a Joint Advisory Committee as called for in Phase 1 of our plan. Every effort should be made to ensure that both parties are equally represented on the committee. Given the impressive work already done by the Arbor Hill Implementation Team, it may provide a natural foundation upon which to build such a committee. At a minimum, we would also welcome AHIT to propose community members that would be interested in serving on the Joint Advisory Committee.

As our research showed, the key to a successful partnership is to begin by building trust between each party. While acknowledging that this task is not easy, we encourage both parties to reach out and communicate with one another to establish trust. Each party should continue to communicate with one another to publicize information about events, meetings and other information, whether by phone, in person or by email. Breaking down institutional barriers and building trust is essential to a successful partnership.

These partnerships must be mutually beneficial and empowering to both parties. Both the university and the community must feel that there is an equilibrium and benefit to engaging in such a partnership. The flow of resources should move two-ways to ensure the success of the partnership. In addition, we would hope that if this were not the case that both parties would feel comfortable to point out these issues and work together to find equally agreeable solutions.

UNIVERSITY ACTIONS

The Community Engagement staff in the President's Office at UAlbany should continue to play a leading role in fostering community outreach by exploring new community contacts, maintaining a centralized database for UAlbany of existing contacts, and acting as a facilitator of meetings, committees, and task forces between the community and the university. The University should also continue to develop its community engagement web presence in such a way as to facilitate coordination and communication between the community and the university.

The website could feature an application form that can be submitted on behalf of community organizations characterizing what kind of assistance or partnership they would be interested in, as well as which department they feel would best suit their outreach. Also, as a way to showcase and further publicize interest of existing partnerships, the website should develop a spotlight section on community organizations, noting their existing partnerships within the university, the community services they offer, the successes of partnering and their community expertise as a way to build trust and publicity between the university and community.

The university as a whole should continue to develop and nurture communication with the Arbor Hill Community. The university should encourage its faculty and staff to engage with the community. This could include inviting community experts into the classroom to guest-lecture, and offering technical or support services to these organizations.

University stakeholders should continue to explore new ways to incorporate service learning into their curriculum. They should also seek out help from university and community resources to that end. The university should acknowledge and encourage their staff to embrace the expertise that the community can offer to the university.

University stakeholders should continue to explore new interdisciplinary learning opportunities with other departments. We understand that community issues often cannot be solved by the actions of one university department and often need the expertise of several university departments. We encourage university stakeholders to reach out to other departments for assistance with these types of problems, not just to improve the community outcome, but also to enhance trust and asset building relationships among university stakeholders.

The university administration should encourage and offer incentives to faculty to engage in community outreach and service learning, and provide opportunities for “real life” learning for students. Many community organizations can offer students wonderful opportunities to engage with the community and become more civically minded.

COMMUNITY ACTIONS

Community stakeholders should think about ways that they can use students and faculty to further their mission and bring benefits to the Arbor Hill community. The university would not want to push agendas upon community organizations. Instead, we would ask that community stakeholders think about ways that the university could help enhance their community services and missions, whether that includes student interns, university technical assistance, or training assistance.

Community stakeholders should consider becoming involved with the university by providing internships and volunteer opportunities, if they are not already, for interested students. This will allow our students to gain real life, practical experience, and provide community organizations with fresh perspectives.

If internships and volunteer opportunities were successful, community organizations should consider furthering their relationship with students by offering mentoring programs. Members of community organizations should accept invitations to become involved at the university level by guest-lecturing and learning in the field opportunities. Students gain extremely positive benefits from these types of interaction.

CONCLUSIONS

At present, the partnership between the University and the Arbor Hill community can best be characterized as "matchmaker". In this type of relationship, the university servers as a broker between its various departments and community groups. Syracuse University's Mary Ann Shaw Center for Public & Community Service uses this type of arrangement to match student volunteers with community organizations. Individual departments design programs to provide academic opportunities for students based on whether there is a particular organization within the community that can provide such an experience.

The processes discussed above should help to transform the partnership into one that is best characterized as "holistic". This type of relationship is comprehensive and community-based, such as that established by the University at Buffalo's Center for Urban Studies. Such a partnership is service-oriented, drawing upon the diverse resources of both the University and community to address real-world issues of concern to University and community constituents alike. This will complete the transition from the status quo to a multidisciplinary community-university partnership.

| <i>Partnership Characteristics</i> | Existing | Ideal |
|---|-----------------|--|
| <i>Model</i> | Matchmaker | Holistic |
| <i>Relationships</i> | One-on-one | Multidisciplinary & Multi-Organizational |
| <i>Orientation</i> | Academic | Service |
| <i>Management Structure</i> | None | Independent Board |
| <i>Decision-Making</i> | University | Shared |
| <i>Funding</i> | By Department | Independent |
| <i>Engagement</i> | Sporadic | Continuous |

FIGURE 5: COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP: EXISTING VERSUS IDEAL

REFERENCES

Neighborhood Plans and Progress Report:

- ❑ City of Albany Department of Development and Planning. 2003. Arbor Hill Neighborhood Plan
- ❑ City of Albany Department of Development and Planning. 2003. Arbor Hill Progress Report for 2003.
- ❑ City of Albany Department of Development and Planning. 2005. Arbor Hill Progress Report for 2005
- ❑ Behan Planning Associates, LLC. 2008. North Swan Street Multimodal Accessibility Study between Clinton & Livingston Ave. Available at: <http://www.cdtcmppo.org/linkage/northswan.pdf>

2008 MRP Studio Reports: <http://arborhillneighborhood.com/studio.aspx>

- ❑ University at Albany Planning Studio. 2008. Arbor Hill Neighborhood Public Arts and Online Community Resources for Community Pride. Albany, NY: University at Albany.
- ❑ University at Albany Planning Studio. 2008. Arbor Hill Neighborhood Public Parks and Open Space. Albany, NY: University at Albany.

ArborHill.In.Formation, An Online Community

Resource: <http://arborhillneighborhood.com/default.aspx>

Blake, S. (2003). Community Design Centers: an alternative practices. Time Saver Standards for Urban Design. D. Watson, A. Plattus and R. Shibley, McGraw-Hill Professional: 4.11-1-8.

Bunnell, G. 2002. Chattanooga, Tennessee, in Making Places Special. Chicago, IL: Planners Press.

Finn, D., & Brody, J. (2009). A Different Kind of Profit: Social Entrepreneurship and Community-Based Design. Unpublished Working Paper.

Forsyth, A. (2006). "Urban Centres in Universities: Institutional Alternatives for Urban Design." Journal of Urban Design 11(1):97-103

Forsyth, A., H. Lu, et al. (2000). "Service Learning in an Urban Context: Implications for Planning and Design Education." Journal of Architectural and Planning Research 17(3): 236-259.

Pew Partnership for Civil Change. No Date. New Directions in Civic Engagement: University Avenue Meets Main Street. Richmond, VA, Pew Partnership for Civic

Change. Sections II and V. Available at
: <http://www.pewpartnership.org/resources/newdirections.html>.

Nye, N. and R. Schramm. 1999. Building Higher Education-Community Development Corporation Partnerships. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research. 2000. Volume 5, Issue 1: Community Outreach Partnerships Centers: Connecting Communities and Institutions of Higher Education. Available at: <http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape/vol5num1/current.html>.

Association for Community Design: <http://www.communitydesign.org>

APPENDIX I – MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

OBJECTIVE

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is executed between the **University at Albany/ Department of Geography and Planning/ Fall 2009 Planning Studio Course (Studio Class)** and the **Arbor Hill Implementation Team (AHIT)**. The goal of this partnership is to evaluate the feasibility of establishing a more formal University/community partnership with the Arbor Hill community, including the potential of a community-university center. The final feasibility report prepared as a result of this initiative, and defined in the list of responsibilities below, will be presented to the AHIT during their final 2009 quarterly meeting on December 15, 2009.

The intent of this MOU is to ensure that the feasibility report is developed in a transparent manner involving community stakeholders, is consistent with previous plans developed for Arbor Hill, reflects community values, and accurately records existing resources. Its purpose is to form a working relationship with the Studio Class and the Arbor Hill community, represented by AHIT.

The MOU establishes the responsibilities of all parties. The MOU identifies the work to be performed by the Studio Class and the AHIT.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Studio Class Responsibilities

1. Evaluate case studies of university/community partnerships
2. Coordinate with previous planning initiatives
3. Conduct neighborhood outreach to determine: potential uses for/nature of the center, community interest in the center, potential community partners, and the availability of resources within the community for the center. Outreach may include, but is not limited to, a community survey and attending community meetings.
4. Conduct outreach to departments at the State University of New York, University at Albany (UALBANY) to determine: potential University partners, the level and nature of interest of potential University partners, and the availability of resources within the University for the Center. Outreach may include, but is not limited to, contacting department heads, faculty, students, and administrative personnel.
5. Research and evaluate a menu of options, which will include, but is not limited to: organizational structure, leadership, staffing, programming, location, and funding sources
6. Estimate startup and operational costs for most feasible alternative(s), where appropriate

7. Develop recommendations on next steps for partnership
8. Maintain communication with client, including presentation of a progress report in mid-October and the final feasibility study in mid-December

Arbor Hill Improvement Team (AHIT) Responsibilities

1. Coordinate and facilitate community meetings with the assistance of the Studio Class
2. Be available to discuss with studio class neighborhood issues and needs
3. Provide timely feedback on deliverables
4. Provide results of previous planning initiatives and studies

TIMEFRAME OF STUDY

Studio class will provide a progress report in mid-October and a final feasibility study, accompanied by a presentation by the studio class, on Tuesday, December 15th at 9:00am, which will be the end date of this project. The work plan in Attachment 1 shall guide the implementation of this study.

MECHANISM FOR CHANGES TO THIS AGREEMENT

Modifications to the responsibilities, or work plan (see Attachment 1), included in this MOU may be made with the approval of both parties. A proposal to amend or modify the work plan or the list of responsibilities shall be made in writing, accompanied by a suitably altered MOU, by the party proposing the modifications. The other party will have one week to respond to proposed changes. Given the short amount of time that this MOU covers, changes can be agreed upon via e-mail. Both parties shall assign an official representative to sign off on these changes.

ATTACHMENT 1: WORK PLAN

| <i>PERIOD OF TIME</i> | <i>ACTIVITIES TO BE ACCOMPLISHED</i> |
|-----------------------|---|
| September | Organize studio class Initial meeting between partners Agree upon and sign Memorandum of Understanding |
| October | Conduct University/Community partnership research Perform community outreach activities Perform university outreach activities |
| October 14th | Present progress report to AHIT |
| November | Develop a "menu of options" for partnership Develop estimates of startup and operational costs for feasible alternatives Evaluate alternatives and make recommendations |
| December | Finalize feasibility study Develop recommendations for continuing partnership |
| December 15th | Present final feasibility study and recommendations to AHIT Termination of project |

APPENDIX II – STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

UNIVERSITY STAKEHOLDERS

Our studio is developing a feasibility study for creating a university - community partnership in Arbor Hill. We are looking for partners within the university to participate in this targeted community engagement.

1. Please describe the work your department / program currently does in the local community.

- internships
- practicum
- students volunteering
- faculty volunteering
- service learning
- community-based research

1b. Prompt: Which communities do these activities take place in?

2. Do you partner with any community groups in that work?

3. Is this work done on a regular basis (by semester / by year)?

4. How are your community projects coordinated?

- a formal contact within group or agency
- a contact person within department your department
- Is there any staffing arrangement either at your department or at the department to coordinate this?
- How do you communicate?

5. Do you currently use any physical sites / facilities in the field? Is this space provided / shared with partners?

6. Where is this located?

7. How is your program funded?

8. What are the obstacles you have encountered in doing community-based programs/research?

- university obstacles
- departmental obstacles

- logistical problems
- issues with the community

9. Would you be interested in participating in such a program?

- What reservations do you have?

10. Do you think your department's goals could be facilitated by having a coordinated, university wide approach to community engagement?

11. What kind of activities would you like to be part of in such a partnership?

- Service learning
- Volunteer activities
- Research
- Studios/practicum
- Non-course specific consulting work with community groups as clients

12. What sort of resources could you contribute to the partnership?

- human
- financial
- technical
- equipment
- space

13. What would you like university-wide coordination of community partnerships to look like if it existed?

- Should it have a physical space? (at the university, in the community)
- Should departments share resources? (training, transportation, curriculum development)
- Should there be a centralized method to develop and coordinate community partnerships?

14. Do you know of any other departments or programs at UAlbany who might be interested in partnering with us?

COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS

1. Please describe your current programs within Arbor Hill.
2. Based on the needs you see in the community, in what areas of service would you like to expand and/or enhance your programming in the future?
 - ❑ What roadblocks, if any, are preventing you from expanding your programming?
3. Do you, or have you in the past, have/had a partnership with any educational institution, either through working with a single class, a department, or the broader University?
 - ❑ If so, when did this partnership occur and how did it begin?
 - ❑ Which institution, department or class was this partnership with?
 - ❑ What was your role, and what was the school's role?
 - ❑ Please share your reflections on what worked well in this partnership and what could have been done differently.
 - ❑ Did the partnership end?
 - a. If so, why do you think it ended? (funding ran out, lack of time, limited timeframe, lack of resources provided by University, change in faculty/staff on either side, lack of community/organizational interest)
4. If not, was there anything specific that kept you from partnering with the University?
5. Are there resources that your group has access to that you think would be of benefit to a Community-University partnership?
6. Would you have the need for UAlbany students to assist your organization with current or future programming?
 - ❑ Would you or someone in your organization have the time / be willing to participate in a service learning program with the university? (e.g. interns, volunteers)
 - ❑ Would you or someone in your organization have the time / be willing to participate in a leadership or coordination role within the university partnership?
7. Would you have the need for assistance with projects in conjunction with a university course?
8. What other resources do you think the University could contribute to the quality and growth of your programming? (e.g. information sharing, grant writing, networking, intellectual expertise and technical assistance)
9. Do you think the University should have a physical presence in Arbor Hill?
 - ❑ If so, where should it be located?
 - ❑ Could you recommend an office space within the community that could be used to coordinate our activities?
10. Assuming that additional funds could be raised, what would you eventually like to see a Community-University partnership do?

APPENDIX III - CASE STUDIES

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

Syracuse University's "Mary Ann Shaw Center for Public and Community Service" (CPCS) provides an opportunity for university students to gain service learning credits by volunteering for local community organizations. The Center opened in 1994 with support from a Founding Partner, the Carrier Corporation. The Service Learning Program is based on idea of matching university students and staff with identified community needs and services. CPCS also institutes various literacy programs allowing for SU students to mentor and tutor local school children in the area.

Syracuse University staff operates the Center and organizes and oversees the various programs. CPCS utilizes a physical space on campus in the Syracuse Student Center. University students can seek out volunteer opportunities by filling out a form on the university website. The Center also takes on interns to perform administrative functions of the program while giving them hands on experience. Coordination is required between the community partners and university departments to allow students to receive service learning credits and to ensure a safe, mutually beneficial partnership that fits in with university curriculum.

Nancy Cantor, Chancellor and President of Syracuse University, states that 6 criteria exemplify Universities at their best: educate fully informed and committed citizens; provide acces to opportunity; strengthen democtratic institutions; create innovations that matter, share knowledge generously; inform and engage public opinion and debate; and cultivate and sustain public intellectuals.

For more information visit the Mary Ann Shaw Center for Public and Community Service website at <http://students.syr.edu/cpcs/index.html>.

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

The San Jose State University established a partnership with the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace community and the City of San Jose known as the San Jose "CommUniverCity". The group maintains a physical space within the community by utilizing existing office space in one of the local community centers. Start-up funds were obtained through a 3-year grant from HUD for a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) and were created as a result of in-kind services provided by California State University in the form of a "system-wide strategic planning process to promote service-learning and community service". Current funding is obtained through private donations, in-kind services and materials, and by utilizing University staff and San Jose municipal staff.

The program institutes a number of service-learning efforts facilitated by university students and community partners. Past efforts have included voter registration days, organizing tours of the University, tutoring local school children, organizing walk-a-thons, cleaning parks, removing graffiti and using GIS to map local walkability. These efforts allow University students to earn service-learning credits and internship credits while giving them hands on experience with real issues. At the same time the program benefits the community by providing manpower for existing programs, promoting health and education and assisting in beautifying the community.

The partnership is managed by a steering committee made up of community residents, university staff, City of San Jose staff and community partners from various civic organizations. Projects and resources are focused in the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Community with project proposals submitted in the form of an application that can be obtained on the partnership website, www.communiversitysanjose.org. The program organizes service learning project that focus on education, community health and improvements to the neighborhood environment. Specific projects are then chosen by the steering committee based on the 10 priorities identified by the neighborhood residents. Priorities range from streetscape improvements and and traffic calming strategies to creating a "College-Going" culture in the neighborhood and increasing healthcare services.

San Jose's CommUniverCity is a benefit to both the University and the community it serves. In its first 4 years of existence CommUniverCity San Jose engaged 13,693 residents of the neighborhoods and nearly 4,495 students performed over 53,654 hours of community service projects valued at approximately \$1,041,330.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PARTNERSHIP

The University Of Washington Office Of Community-University Partnerships began in 2004 in response to frustration resulting from the semester time limits put on previous engagement initiatives. (The University of Washington is on a 10 week quarter system) The goal of the partnership was to allow a more permanent and long-term presence in a community in which larger projects could be completed. The short time-frame also left little opportunity for interdisciplinary projects.

UW partnered with South Seattle (White Center in particular) because of the identified lack of connection between the University and South Seattle and the fact that some local leaders were expressing interest in revitalizing the neighborhood. A second reason for the partnership is that there was a ready partner in the form of the South Seattle Community College who could provide an entree to the community. This partnership was important to UW because they felt that there were too few students going from SSCC, and South Seattle in general, to the University. This provided an opportunity to do something good for the community, give students a chance to learn in the field, and reach out to residents in that community who might be potential students in the future.

In 2004, using grant funds from a local foundation, the Office of Community Partnerships was formed, with a director and community liaison hired as its head. The director served as a matchmaker between university departments and community groups. The community side was organized around a steering committee composed of local leaders, community groups, and businesses. Projects were conceived of by them, brought to the OCP, and were presented around the University through a university advisory committee which was composed of representatives from every department.

Projects were completed as university courses, sometimes extending over more than one quarter. An example of a partnership project is the completion of a neighborhood plan for the White Center conducted by graduate students in the university planning department. Unfortunately, in recent years, state budget cuts eliminated the funding of the director position of the office for community partnerships.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PARTNERSHIP

The University of Arizona is the “leading public research university in the American Southwest” and focuses, through its UAGreen program, on issues related to sustainability through a “multidisciplinary approach to problem-solving”. They strive to harness the “power of basic research to address real-world issues and meet societal needs” and are committed to making their research and resources “available to the community”. Three such valuable and noteworthy UAGreen initiatives are:

- ❑ The “Healthy Lifestyles Program” outreach under which information is provided on nutrition, food safety, disease prevention, exercise, personal and family diet plans, and other educational materials, which strive to “assist individuals, families and communities to lead healthier lives”. (The Department of Nutritional Sciences)
- ❑ The “House Energy” Doctor Program, encourage students to “perform residential energy audits in the Tucson community” in order to promote energy conservation. (The School of Architecture)
- ❑ The “Master Gardeners” program hosts “university-trained volunteers... whom... serve as community educators providing research based information on environmentally responsible gardening and landscaping to the public”. This information is useful to urban garden initiatives as a resource for community sustainability and potential small business development. (Cooperative Extension)

The University of Arizona also has structured an office of “Community Relations” which is responsible for local government and neighborhood relations as well as “coordinating community service projects” and is used as a resource to connect the community to the university.

UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO PARTNERSHIP

The University at Buffalo Center for Urban Studies (UB-CENTER) and the Community Action Organization of Erie County (CAO) partnered to launch the CAO-UB Community Wellness and Neighborhood Development Center, which will focus on the regeneration of the Fruit Belt and Martin Luther King, Jr. neighborhoods in the City of Buffalo. The website states that the purpose of the Community Wellness and Neighborhood Development Center is to “establish a sustainable institution that will provide the neighborhoods with technical support, partnership building, planning, research, community development, and social welfare services, including job readiness and job placement programs.”

The partnership operates under an advisory board consisting of local residents, civic leaders, and representatives from community organizations. Center staff consists of a director, assistant director/research associate, program coordinator, project director and a senior research associate all of which work out of the School of Architecture and Planning at the University at Buffalo. The partnership offers service learning opportunities to BU students allowing them to work under the program coordinator and project director. Partnership projects range from completing neighborhood plans and establishing a new business incubator to community cleanup days and community garden projects. One of the overarching programs within the Center is the East Side

Neighborhood Transformation Partnership which aims to create "safe, clean, healthy, pedestrian, accessible, and thriving communities that are imbued with the values of participatory democracy, cosmopolitanism, reciprocity and social justice".

The ESNTTP is funded through a Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Outreach Partnership Grant. For more information on this program visit the website: www.ub-esntp.com

APPENDIX IV - STAKEHOLDERS AND CONTACT INFORMATION

| University Departments Contacted | | |
|--|---|--|
| Department | Center/Program Name | Contact Information |
| Department of Sociology | Capitalize on Community | Dr. Hayward D. Horton, Project Director (518) 442-4907 hdh@albany.edu |
| Department of Environmental Sustainability | | Mary Ellen Mallia (518) 956-8120 mmallia@uamail.albany.edu |
| College of Arts & Sciences | Leaders in Service | Debernee Privot (518) 442-4646 |
| Department of Africana Studies | Internship Program | Marcia Sutherland ms781@albany.edu |
| Education: Department of Reading | Arbor Hill School Reading Clinic | Cheryl Dozier, Assistant Professor (518) 442-5101 cldnsc@aol.com |
| Center for Elimination of Minority Health Disparities | Center for Elimination of Minority Health Disparities | Lawrence Schell, Professor (518) 442-4714 lmschell@albany.edu |
| Department of Sociology | Capitalize on Community | Hayward Horton, Professor (518) 442-4907 hdh@cnsunix.albany.edu |
| School of Social Welfare & Department of Psychology | Child Welfare, Drug Abuse and Intergenerational Risk | Philip McCalion (518) 442-5347 mcclion@albany.edu |
| Department of Psychology, Department of Education, & Arts & Sciences | The Psychological Services Center | Dr. George Litchford Psychological Services Center (518) 442-4900 (518) 442-4844 |
| Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy | Liberty Partnership Program | Candi Griffin-Jenkins, Director griffinc@albany.edu Brooke Volinsky, Program Coordinator, bvolinsky@uamail.albany.edu |
| Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy | The Center for Women in Government and Civil Society | Alison Olin (518) 442-3898 abs@albany.edu. |
| Education: Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology | Afterschool Program for At-Risk Children | Saddler, Bruce: Associate Professor (518) 442-5062 bsaddler@uamail.albany.edu |

University Departments Contacted

| Department | Center/Program Name | Contact Information |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| School of Public Health | Prevention Research Center | Sharleen Brittell Tel: (518) 402-0344 Fax: (518) 402-0345 scb01@albany.edu David Strogatz Phone: (518) 492-0401 dss01@health.state.ny.us |
| Division of Student Success | Office of Multicultural Student Success | Ekow King, Director (518) 442-5566 involvement@uamail.albany.edu |
| <i>University Counseling Center</i> | Middle Earth in the Schools | M. Dolores Cimini (518) 442-5800 dcimini@uamail.albany.edu |
| Office of Academic Support Services | Academic Talent search | Felicia Collins (518) 442-5180 fcollins@uamail.albany.edu |
| Office of Academic Support Services | Science & Technology Entry Program (STEP) | Etwin Bowman |
| | Center for Urban Youth & Technology (CUYT) | Joseph Bowman, Director (518) 442-5035 Fax (518) 437-3612 |
| | UAlbany - Albany High School Alliance for Young Talent | Edu Hermelyn, Program Coordinator (518) 442-3637 EHermelyn@uamail.albany.edu |
| College of Arts and Sciences | Center for Autism and Related Disabilities (CARD) | Prof. Kristin Christodulu, (518) 442-5132 kvc@albany.edu |
| Department of Epidemiology | Prevention Research Center | Edward Waltz, Professor (518) 402-0344 Ecwaltz@Csc.Albany.Edu |
| School of Social Welfare | Community and Public Service Program | Loretta Pyles, Professor (518) 442-5108 lpyles@uamail.albany.edu |
| Office of Undergraduate Studies | Internships | |
| Department of Computer Science | Internship Program | (518)956.8240, (518) 956-8247 Email: cci@albany.edu |
| Department of Athletics | Student Volunteer Program | Carl Anderson, Assistant Athletic Director of Student-Life Enrichment (518) 437-3788 |

| University Departments Contacted | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| Department | Center/Program Name | Contact Information |
| School of Public Health | Center for Public Health Preparedness | Maggie Watson Skarlis & Cheryl Reeves |
| College of Arts and Sciences | University in the High School | Greg Stevens (518) 442-4651 Stevens@Cas.Albany.Edu |
| School of Education | | Ruth Pagerey, Asst. Dean for Professional Development (518) 442-4986 rpagerey@uamail.albany.edu |
| Department of Geography and Planning | | Dr. David Lewis: dalewis@albany.edu Dr. Corianne Scally: cscally@albany.edu Dr. Catherine Lawson: lawsonc@uamail.albany.edu |

| Community and City Stakeholders That We Contacted for Feedback | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Albany Center for Economic Success | Equinox |
| Albany Barn | Healthy Capital District Initiative |
| Albany Housing Authority | New Covenant Charter School |
| Albany Housing Coalition, Inc. | Trinity Institute |
| Albany Planning Department | Underground Railroad History Project |
| Capital District BOCES | United Tenants of Albany |
| Capital District Community Loan Fund | WAMC |
| Catholic Charities | |