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Abstract

Individually and collectively, institutions of higher education possess considerable resources—human, fiscal, organizational, and intellectual— which are critical to addressing the fundamental need for healthier communities in the United States. It is essential for communities to feel, and be involved, in making the decisions to improve their health status. Higher education-community partnerships can satisfy this necessity and are a viable solution to improve community health. In an effort to encourage and expand the growing number of partnerships formed between colleges and universities and their communities, Campus-Community Partnerships for Health (CCPH) was founded in 1996. CCPH is currently a growing network of over 1,200 communities and campuses across North America, Canada, and increasingly the world. The rapid expansion and public outreach of CCPH indicates the momentum of the partnership strategy.

Archway Partnership, as seen by the community, administration, students, and faculty, exemplifies the specific qualities that sustain and promote success in its partnerships with its communities and directly correlates with the ten CCPH Principles of Partnership. Due to Archway Partnership’s accomplishments, structure, and culture, as well as its adherence to CCPH’s Principles of Partnership, it is recommended that it be used as a best practices model for other higher education institutions to adopt. The university should access additional skill sets and resources from corporations and other stakeholders within the community. Researchers should invest funding on assessing outcomes from partnerships as well as compare and contrast other sources of community involvement.
Health is not an intervention. Health is a by-product of a community working.

-Tyler Norris

1.0 Introduction

Our society is in a period of dramatic change with the transition from an industrial-based to a knowledge-based economy, as well as technological advances, fiscal challenges of higher education, and cultural shifts in society as a whole. This period of change has directly affected the field of public health requiring solutions for health needs to be more overarching, diverse, and innovative. Research has shown that in order to influence public health, partnerships between communities and universities are vital during this time of dramatic change. Few social institutions are better situated than higher education to fuel community improvement. Individually and collectively, institutions of higher education possess considerable resources—human, fiscal, organizational, and intellectual— which are critical to addressing significant social issues.

One significant social issue is a fundamental need for healthier communities in the United States. Community health is a product of many factors. Multiple segments of the community can contribute to and share responsibility for its improvement. Despite mixed opinions on how to improve community health, there is consensus that communities play a central role in their own health status. Consequently, it is essential for communities to feel and be involved in making the decisions to improve their health status. Higher education-community partnerships can satisfy this necessity and are a viable solution to improve community health.

Higher education and community partnerships, as defined by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), are defined as collaborations to promote health through service-learning, community-based participatory research, broad-based coalitions and other partnership strategies. These partnerships are powerful tools for improving higher education, civic engagement and the overall health of communities. This type of partnership intends to leverage the knowledge, wisdom, and experience in communities and in academic institutions. The central goal is to
solve pressing health, social, environmental and economic challenges, ensure that community-driven social change is central to the work of community-academic partnerships, and to build the capacity of communities and academic institutions to engage each other in partnerships that balance power, share resources, and work towards systems change.\textsuperscript{5}

The power of shared ideas, resources, and experiences between communities and higher educational institutions is insurmountable.\textsuperscript{3} Crafting healthier communities and surmounting complex societal problems require collaborative solutions, which bring communities and institutions together as equal partners.\textsuperscript{3} They develop and empower the assets, strengths and capacities of each. Trends show universities and colleges increasingly investing in partnerships with their local communities.\textsuperscript{4} This is a testament to their success.

\textbf{1.1 Defining Health, Higher Education, and Community}

To understand the concept of this type of partnership, the terms health, community, and higher education need to be defined. Health is defined broadly as physical, mental, environmental, social and spiritual well-being.\textsuperscript{5} The partnership’s approaches to health should focus on changing the conditions and environments in which people live, work and play in order to uphold and strengthen the health status of the community.\textsuperscript{5} Higher education is any educational institution offering degrees or programs beyond high school.

The description of community is not as simple as the previous two terms. The characterization of community is dynamic and inclusive; there is no one definition. Community is not defined solely by geography. It may also refer to a group that self-identifies by age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, illness or health condition.\textsuperscript{5} It can refer to a common interest or cause, a sense of identification or shared emotional connection, shared values or norms, mutual influence, common interest, or commitment to meeting a shared need.\textsuperscript{5} Defining community in a higher education-community partnership is more about the process of asking and answering key questions than about a strict definition of what is
community or who represents that community. Critical questions that help a partnership to define what it means by community include: Are those most affected by the issue being addressed at the table? Are those who have a stake in the issue being addressed at the table? Are community members at the table? What is their role in decision making? By addressing these questions, the partnership will be more transparent and effective in solving complex societal issues in the community.

1.2 Origins and History of the Higher Education-Community Partnership

Collaborations between the community and academia began in 1993 when Randy Zuckerman, a medical student and community health advocate, proposed the idea of a national service-learning program in the health professions. He approached the Pew Health Professions Commission at the University of California-San Francisco (UCSF) Center for the Health Professions to serve as its headquarters. A proposal for the Health Professions Schools in Service to the Nation (HPSISN) program was then submitted to The Pew Charitable Trusts (Pew) and the Corporation for National Service (CNS). This program was the first step of many towards creating one of the largest organizations to support higher education-community partnerships, the Campus-Community Partnership for Health (CCPH).

In 1994, the HPSISN program was launched with $3 million in grant funding from Pew and CNS. The program was publicly supported by the National Fund for Medical Education and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) to support service-learning as a core component of health professions’ education. HPSISN announced three-year service-learning grants to twenty health professions schools across the country. It is important to note that during this time, Sarena Seifer was hired to provide training and technical support to grantees and strengthen information sharing and mentoring.

Also in 1994, the U.S. department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) established the Office of University Partnerships (OUP) in an effort to encourage and expand the growing number of partnerships formed between colleges and universities and their communities. OUP recognizes the crucial role these
collaborations and partnerships play in addressing local problems and revitalizing the United States’ communities. Additionally, colleges and universities are making future generations aware of these issues by integrating partnership activities into their academic studies and student activities.

In 1996, HPSISN convened its first national conference, “Community Partnerships in Health Professions Education,” in March at Northeastern University in Boston, MA. Scholarships were announced to help support students and community partner participation. Ms. Seifer, mentioned previously as staffed by HPSISN, announced the intention to form an organization to support and advance community partnerships in health professions education during the closing session. Attendees volunteered to serve on the strategic planning committee that ultimately created and served as the founding board for what is now known as the CCPH.

CCPH was officially founded in 1996. Its original mission was to focus solely on service learning. However, in 1997, the CCPH board made a strategic decision to adopt the following broader mission statement: “To foster partnerships between communities and educational institutions that build on each other’s strengths and develop their roles as change agents for improving health professions education, civic responsibility and the overall health of communities.” Most presently, CCPH is characterized as a nonprofit organization that promotes health through partnerships between communities and academic institutions.

At CCPH’s 1997 national conference, John McKnight, a leader in advancing asset-based approaches to community development, concluded his keynote presentation by asking the audience to generate ideas for how higher education can be community-building assets. As a result, nine categories were created: to offer human resources, materials, services, facilities, economic support, emotional support, equipment and technology, policy and advocacy, and/or cultural activities.

McKnight’s insight led to CCPH’s decision in 2003 to articulate the outcomes that the organization was trying to achieve: Community-campus partnerships that improve the health of communities, health disparities are reduced in communities
through community-campus partnerships, and the health workforce, broadly defined, is more diverse and community responsive through community-campus partnerships. This ultimately carved the pathway to a national conversation about the importance of higher education-community partnerships. CCPH’s involvement at the federal level with organizations such as the NIH, CDC, and HRSA bolstered CCPH as a resource and increased funding initiatives. Consequently, funding increased to higher education to work with their surrounding communities. Research and projects have ensued. Essentially, the concept of higher education-community partnerships was adopted and implemented throughout the nation. Originally beginning with as small as two hundred members in 1996, CCPH is currently a growing network of over 1,200 communities and campuses across North America, Canada, and increasingly the world. The rapid expansion and public outreach of CCPH indicates the momentum of the partnership strategy.

1.3 Current Relevance of Higher Education-Community Partnerships

Many social, economic, and political factors have contributed to an increased emphasis on community outreach by community-campus partnerships. Some social factors include decreased access to care for underserved populations or disease/sexually transmitted disease rates. Economic factors include unemployment and populations that have become increasingly uninsured. Political factors are decreased budgets creating stress on states for allocation of their monies. White and colleagues posed a question that emphasized higher education's involvement in their communities. They asked whether academic institutions improved the health of the public and whether their social missions reached underserved populations. Some higher education institutions have responded by implementing more community outreach activities to prepare students to be pioneers in their communities and to fulfill their institutions' social missions.

Federal, state, and private funders are demanding greater institutional accountability. The United States’ economic struggle in recent years has allowed an opportunity for the government and higher education to be more creative in creating solution for community improvements. From the healthcare industry's
perspective, community-campus partnerships may control for the fiscal struggles physicians have experienced. Blumenthal and Meyer have noted that the transformation of health care markets, specifically the decreases in clinical revenue due to increased managed care systems, has influenced higher education to reexamine their community connections.\textsuperscript{10} Additionally, offering care to Medicaid/Medicare recipients has become an increasingly difficult issue for physicians resulting in more limited access to care for this population. By utilizing the services of higher education, communities have an additional portal to access resources and care other than a physician, state agency, and so on.

Universities have been challenged to refocus their efforts from the generation of specialized knowledge to the application of their expertise to address social problems.\textsuperscript{11} This movement is a direct result of the escalating social problems this country is currently facing. Specialized knowledge may be useful for one part of a problem a community is facing. However, to access the overarching issue and be able to implement solutions for every facet, one has to develop skills and be innovative and versatile. This realization has led academia to understand a change is needed in the way students are taught and groomed for life after school. By creating community-campus partnerships, students were able to learn experientially and apply their education to real issues in a community, thereby developing the skills needed to be successful.

\textbf{1.4 Principles to Measure a Successful Partnership}

In 1998, the CCPH board of directors embarked on a series of discussions to adopt principles for successful community-campus partnerships.\textsuperscript{5} In retrospect, the board asked the following questions to revise their original principles: Are the principles still relevant today? Do they need updating or revision?\textsuperscript{5} CCPH accordingly created a Community Partner Summit to revise the principles.\textsuperscript{5} In April of 2006, twenty-three community partners, including several CCPH board members, convened to provide a community voice to the advancement of authentic community-higher education partnerships at the Wingspread Conference Center in
Racine, Wisconsin. During the Summit, community partners articulated strengths and weaknesses in community-campus partnerships from their perspective. Hence, a new framework was developed. The CCPH board adopted the revised CCPH Principles of Good Community-Campus Partnerships in October 2006. The principles are seen below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCPH Principles of Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Partners have agreed upon mission, values, goals, and measurable outcomes for the partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The relationship between partners is characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness, and commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The partnership builds upon identified strengths and assets, but also addresses areas that need improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The partnership balances power among partners and enables resources among partners to be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is clear, open and accessible communication between partners. Members make it an ongoing priority to listen to each other. The group has developed a common language that clarifies the meaning of terms, events, or incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Roles, norms, and processes for the partnership are established with the input and agreement of all partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is feedback to, among, and from all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goal of continuously improving the partnership and its outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Partners share the credit for the partnership’s accomplishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Partnerships take time to develop and evolve over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The partnership is a community-campus partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCPH Website
http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/principles.html

Other studies and publications have been in accordance with the principles created and adopted by CCPH. A study conducted in 1999 attempted to determine best practices and principles for community and academic partnerships. They found that academia and community must develop relationships based on mutual trust and respect, acknowledge and honor different partner’s “agendas”, consider multidisciplinary approaches, use evaluation strategies that are consistent with the overall approach taken in the academic/practice/community partnership. These standards are consistent with CCPH principles #2, 4, 5, 7, and of course 10.
An article identified three crucial principles to follow in order for one’s community campus partnership to remain successful. They were (1) For individuals in the community to become empowered to capitalize on their strengths, (2) discuss the major difficulties that the community and the academic institutions encountered and create strategies for meeting them, and (3) Understand the importance of building trust and learning the needs identified by the community partners, not just those identified by the academic partners. These results are specifically compliant with CCPH’s Principles #2, 3, 6, 7, and 10. CCPH’s Principles of Partnership are a great framework to craft the culture of any community-campus partnership because it lies solidly on ethics. CCPH offers an assessment tool for existing partnerships to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses concerning these principles. This tool can be found in the appendix A. To understand a real life application of these principles in a partnership, one may observe the inner workings and accomplishments of University of Georgia’s outreach platform, Archway Partnership.

2.0 Archway Partnership

The Archway Partnership is a University of Georgia community engagement platform created to enhance the land grant mission of teaching, research and service while addressing self-identified community needs in geographically dispersed locations across the state. University of Georgia (UGA) aspires to enhance connectivity between the university and the communities to address the state's critical community needs. The university seeks to provide access to higher education resources to communities throughout Georgia. Communities will gain the skill of faculty and students, who, in turn, gain practical experience outside of the classroom. Collaborative projects are tailored to address priority issues uniquely identified by each community. The Archway Partnership has been the vehicle to bring all of the community stakeholders together to identify and solve community problems, the tool that brings higher education resources to counter those problems, and the platform to utilize UGA’s resources on community needs.

Archway started in 2005 as a pilot in Moultrie/Colquitt County. The
community was going through a major economic development project. It had just recruited a very large chicken processing plant in their community called Sanderson Farms resulting in 1,500 jobs. This was tremendous news for such a rural area of Georgia. Matt Bishop, the Coordinator of Operations at Archway Partnership, commented, “Regardless of chicken processing, you’re going to have 1,500 new families coming into this community. One can only imagine the community development issues that come with 1500 new families. Where are you going to house them? How will you provide healthcare and daycare? From a public infrastructure standpoint, are you going to need new roads, or water or sewer infrastructure so that you have an efficient use government services. The school system, how many more classrooms does that equate to?”

During the same time as this development, the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach asked the question, “How can we, as the outreach arms for the university, respond more effectively to community needs.” Hence, the idea of Archway developed. Archway wanted to put someone in the community who understood how to process the community and work with it to make sure all the stakeholders were represented. For two years, Colquitt was the pilot. It was deemed a successful venture of UGA. Consequently, the Board of Regents provided funding for Archway Partnership to expand into seven communities to give the organization a total of eight. One may find the Archway Map, identifying the location in Georgia where communities are being served, in Appendix B. The counties, in chronological order, served by Archway Partnership as well as the date the partnership was formed are found below:

Colquitt County – July 2005
Washington County – September 2007
Glynn County – July 2008
Clayton County – July 2008
Hart County – October 2008
Sumter County – October 2008
Pulaski County – July 2009
Presently, Colquitt is the sole county to “graduate” from Archway, meaning it is self-sustainable without Archway/University of Georgia’s resources. Thus, funding was available to add Grady County to the Archway Partnership.

2.1 Highlights of Archway Projects

Washington County- Medicare Made Easy Program

Medicare enrollees and health care providers in Washington County expressed concern about the difficulties of choosing the proper health care plan. Archway Partnership, in an effort to offer unbiased information about and easier access to Medicare health options, created this inaugural program. Held at Sandersville Technical College, the event attracted more than 70 Medicare patients and health care providers, and was staffed by 30 trained volunteers. Attendees were invited to sit down, one on one, with volunteers to assess health care needs, receive advice about various care options, and enroll in the plan best suited for their personal lifestyle. Washington County, a rural area, may not have had these resources or budget to

Matt Bishop, Coordinator of Operations

Mr. Bishop manages Archway Partnership operations at the state level while directing faculty and overseeing local operations in Clayton County in the metro Atlanta region, Brunswick-Glynn County on the coast, Hawkinsville-Pulaski County in middle Georgia, and Americus-Sumter County in southwest Georgia.

Communities want to be a part of Archway because of our platform for collaboration in the community that had not existed before. If you look at how communities work, you have traditional institutions like local governments or public health organization for an example, that have fairly specific missions with how they interact with citizens and the community at large. Naturally, as a result, these institutions can become detached from one another. Communities can have a hard time breaking down those barriers to be able to communicate. Archway Partnership has been able to serve as a third party and bring the neutrality and objectivity necessary to break down those barriers. Archway facilitates the process work that allows local leaders in their traditional roles to step back and identify bigger and more important issues and opportunities for their community.

When you get all the stakeholders and institutions together, what also comes with that are the constituencies of those institutions. Communities that are successful understand what citizens and voters are feeling. Archway, through their community involvement processes, has designed issue work groups and community meetings that allow for an inordinate amount of people to be involved in comprehensive participation. We do nothing behind closed doors.
implement this project without Archway Partnership at UGA.

Clayton County- FQHC Project

Today, the economic conditions force communities to seek affordable access to healthcare. Hospitals are over-utilized by those who are either under or uninsured and cannot afford to go to a primary care physician. Clayton County has identified this as a health priority for the community. Archway has responded by locating a Federally Qualified Healthcare Center (FQHC) that, by law, provides care to those with little to no insurance and is reimbursed by the federal government for the county. Within this FQHC, Archway Partnership has used its students, faculty, and community stakeholders to apply for a Health Professional Shortage Area designation in order for the FQHC to expand its services, staff, and patient base. This will improve access to and quality of care for the underserved population within Clayton County.

Colquitt County- Renovating the Water Treatment Plant

With an extreme period of growth in Colquitt County, planning for sustainability and future growth had been identified as a community priority. Archway Partnership served as a platform for a citizens’ work group appointed by local officials to draft a land-use plan that could also help the community improve its dated wastewater treatment facility and expand its wastewater treatment capacity.

To expand treatment capacity, community officials planned for a Land Application System (LAS), gathering expertise from UGA’s Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering, Engineering Outreach Service, and the Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources to determine site possibilities. Additional assistance was provided by the Carl Vinson Institute of Government, which helped through its Information Technology Outreach Services (ITOS) division, to map out site possibilities. By utilizing multiple components of UGA, Colquitt was able to strategically develop the area to improve the economy as well as public health with a renovated water treatment plant.

Glynn County- Central Resource System for Senior Care Center

The Glynn County Archway Partnership has focused on its elderly population’s
health issues as one of its key community priorities. The student internship project created a vast amount of information and resources for the Southeast Georgia Health System (SGHS) and its Senior Care Center. This will help future health care professionals and patients better understand aging issues such as Alzheimer’s disease and dementia. SGHS Administrator Tom Cronemeyer comments on the project when he says, “With the complete, centralized resource system of information now in place at the Senior Care Center, thoroughly training new staff and meeting high expectations of patient satisfaction will be that much easier”.

3.0 Archway Partnership as Best Practices Model

Archway Partnership, as seen by the community, administration, students, and faculty, exemplifies the specific qualities that sustain and promote success in its partnerships with its communities. The way the organization conducts business with its stakeholders and community to solve public health issues directly correlates with the ten CCPH Principles of Partnership. In the following, I assess each of the CCPH Principles in terms of observations and interviews I conducted during my research. The scope of my analysis is necessarily limited; a complete assessment of every site and every project would be required for a full study.

**Principle One- Partners have agreed upon mission, values, goals, and measurable outcomes for the partnership.**

Archway Partnership has clearly defined a focus and goals for itself as an outreach platform for communities within the state of Georgia. The Archway Partnership “connects counties facing significant issues related to economic development to the knowledge, expertise and other resources at the University of Georgia. The community determines the needs and Archway facilitates identification of faculty and students with expertise and similar interest”. Archway Partnership has clearly defined who they do and do not serve, who is and is not involved, and how it can work well enough to sustain itself and improve communities. Archway Partnership has yet to provide measurable outcomes put
together in a quantifiable form or data sheet, however success within certain projects have been published to exemplify progress being made in targeting the community’s key priorities.

Principle Two- The relationship between partners is characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness, and commitment.

Archway Partnership embodies this principle completely. During meetings within and outside the community, whether addressing those involved in the partnership in person or in their absence, they are addressed by their full name, title, and given the respect they deserve. Eye contact, open communication, and amicable body language are observed at all meetings. Members at meetings consistently follow through on their tasks and requirements in order to respect their expectations given by the community. At Archway Partnership, the administration has an “open door” policy allowing for constant communication to filter in and out of the office by not only the administration but students and faculty as well. The Partnership takes the initiative to invite its students to events the organization attends and always expressing gratitude for their efforts.

Principle Three- The Partnership builds upon identified strengths and assets, but also

Gail Webb, Clayton County Archway Professional

Ms. Webb is the person in the community who represents Archway Partnership. She provides higher education resources to address community priority issues, promote community economic development, and provides leadership by partnering with other higher education institutions, state agencies and local communities.

“One of the projects that have been very effective in Clayton County is our Teen Summit Project. We wanted to create an event for teens that would help them to identify some of their issues and to provide resources to address some of the teen issues in the eight high schools within Clayton County. The first year, was facilitated by an associate professor here at UGA, Dr. Daryl Bailey, and the summit went very well. We have had the annual teen summit for the past four years, and the program is so great that it actually has been coordinated and hosted by the Clayton County collaborative. So now the community has taken control of the program and it is no longer an Archway program, it is a community program.”

“Some challenges within Clayton County that Archway was able to surmount was bringing local government officials and other stakeholders together in one room and getting them to sit down and talk about the issues in the community. Archway's neutral platform and transparency combined with the community's skillset and passion for improvement has enabled successful collaborative projects for the past four years.”
addresses areas that need improvement.

Archway is able to identify the strengths of the partnership’s projects through meetings, presentations, and tangible documents put together by its’ staff. The partnership is willing to not only examine the issues raised by those in the community, but is willing to readdress any unresolved issues as well. For example, in Clayton County I was given the task of identifying Clayton County’s need for improvement based on health statistics focusing in what disparities lie within the community. A member of the meeting wanted to know specifically about the county’s contiguous areas to locate hospital overutilization. This was addressed in part by my presentation as well as another woman from the Clayton County Board of Health. Meetings are almost always ended with a brainstorming session on what needs to be accomplished in the future and how to distribute expectations accordingly in order to overcome that goal.

*Principle Four- The partnership balances power among partners and enables resources among areas that need improvement.*

Members of Archway, stakeholders, and members of the community all share resources in order to accomplish their goals and projects. In order to ensure equality and dedication to projects, both the community and Archway provides funding for the establishment of the partnership. Archway offers a vast multitude of resources for its communities. The list of UGA schools and colleges working with Archway Partnership can be found in the Appendix C. There have been instances where members access their resources outside of Archway in order to ensure the success of the project. For instance, a stakeholder in Clayton County used resources from Clayton State University that was outside of the scope of Archway Partnership to assist with the FQHC Project.

*Principle Five- There is clear, open, and accessible communication between partners. Members make it an ongoing priority to listen to each other. The group has developed common language that clarifies the meaning of terms, events, or incidents.*
Members within the partnerships made in Archway use similar jargon in meetings and projects because of the open communication that exists. Meetings are structured so that each member feels comfortable to ask questions and provide input. Methods of communication are established outside of meetings as well either through phone conferences or email. Leaders in the meeting are to clarify anything that is unclear and make sure everyone understands their responsibilities toward the partnership before adjourning.

*Principle Six - Roles, norms, and processes for the partnership are established with the input and agreement of all partners.*

Archway Partnership has clearly defined its role within the partnership as the neutral platform to facilitate ideas and resources for the community. The organization values its' transparency to all members and stakeholders that it works with. No idea is implemented unless it is in accordance with everyone involved in the project. The process to ensure this begins with the development of an Executive Committee of community leaders who help guide the process of the partnership. Community leaders from local governments, businesses, health authorities, school boards, chambers of commerce, development authorities and higher education institutions sit on the various Executive Committees. Those members help to create the Steering Committee made up of other community stakeholders willing to commit time and energy to developing and prioritizing community issues. Interested residents are recruited for Issue Work Groups, chaired by Steering Committee members, focused on developing strategies to address specific issues. This process can be viewed visually in Appendix B.

*Principle Seven - There is feedback to, among, and from all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goal of continuously improving the partnership and outcomes.*

The meetings conducted by Archway Partnership reflect an open exchange of ideas, where every member contributes their input and expertise toward the common goal of improving the community. The participants are diverse and represent each part of the constituency involved in the community’s partnership.
For example, Archway Partnership developed what is called the Public Health Issue Work Group where stakeholders from multiple areas of the community gather to solve a common problem. In Clayton County, some members of the work group are comprised of Southside Regional Medical Center (the major hospital), Clayton County Board of Health, and the Board of Education. All voices are heard in the meeting and in accordance with one another to work together to improve the health status of the county. This could not have been completed without the neutral platform Archway provides for them to gather and share ideas.

*Principle Eight- Partners share the credit for the partnership’s accomplishments.*

Archway Partnership provides the credit for those involved in their successful accomplishments in published articles, meetings, and presentations both within and outside of the partnership or group. One can see this on Archway Partnerships’ website when looking under its’ sections labeled *Impact, News,* and *Resources.* Links to these tabs can be found in Appendix D. As stated previously, a value Archway treasures is their transparency. Accomplishments are celebrated with everyone who helped make the project successful.

*Principle Nine- Partnerships take time to develop and evolve over time.*

The partnership’s intention is to be present for an ongoing and indefinite amount of time. Archway Partnership ensures that meeting minutes are always recorded in order to create an annual report and track the progress of the partnership. Campus and community leaders prove their dedication to the partnership by consistently attending meetings and making financial contributions to support the community’s priorities. Proof that Archway has valued this principle is the fact that one of their communities, Colquitt County, has “graduated” from Archway Partnership and is now self-sufficient. Although this was a long process over a span of six years, the payoff has obviously been positive and rewarding for both University of Georgia’s Archway Partnership and Colquitt County.

*Principle Ten- The Partnership is a community-campus partnership.*
All meetings regarding a project are held in the actual community being discussed. As I am working for the partnership with Clayton County, I have always attended meetings discussing the FQHC project within the county. The leaders within the community are considered leaders in meetings as well. Their input guides the meeting and progress of the project. Once again, Archway’s role in the meetings is not to dominate conversation but rather serve as a neutral platform where community stakeholders can have the space to discuss and solve problems. Archway Partnership continues its’ dedication and commitment to the community by allocating UGA’s resources, staff, faculty, and students throughout the entire duration of it’s partnership in order to emphasize its’ service to the community.

The fact that Archway’s partnerships have expanded from one to nine counties in the past seven years with one to have already graduated is a testament to their success. By following CCPH’s Principles for Partnership and demonstrating a passion for the health and development of its’ communities, Archway Partnership has truly gone above and beyond to honor its’ focus and mission as an outreach platform for the University of Georgia.

4.0 Challenges

The community-campus movement is still in its early stages. As previously mentioned, this model was first introduced by a large organization in the early 1990’s by CCPH. Because this is a relatively new concept, it may be a challenge for partnerships to acquire financial support and sustain themselves. Stakeholders always take a risk when investing money into a project. It can be difficult to persuade someone to invest into a new movement such as this especially with little evidence available to prove the partnerships efficacy and sustainability. Because every partnership varies in the way it conducts projects due to the subjectivity of the client, it is difficult to measure success of the partnerships quantitatively. On a micro level, each individual project can be difficult to measure as well. Some projects cannot be measured quantitatively, some take a long period of time before being able to be measured, and some may have time frames too small to prove
measurable outcomes. This variability may be viewed from a stakeholder or outside perspective as risky or unstable. Investors need to feel secure in they’re investments, so those who rely on numbers, graphs, and statistical analyses for outcome based assessments may have difficulty buying into this type of partnership.

Additionally, a new movement such as the campus-community partnership is going to have to compete with partnerships that have been established previously. Private companies, non-profits, and churches are just a few examples of institutions within communities who have incorporated serving their community into their mission or goals. Campus-community partnerships will be challenged to 1) Refrain from taking away business or time from competing interests and 2) Learn how to work with them effectively.

Because the partnership accesses the university's resources, staff, and faculty, projects tend to abide by the university's academic schedule. For instance, during academic breaks such as spring or holiday break, students leave school and therefore by association leave the project for that time period. If the project has a momentum towards accomplishing its' goal, the students or faculty's absence can hinder its progress. The partnership also has to understand that students involved in the project must put their schooling first before their involvement within their project. Not being able to have students or faculty's complete attention and resources at all times, like a full time employee would, can be a challenge when determining the time frame for completion of projects. Unclear communication of expectations from students, faculty, and staff within the university can cause misunderstanding, thereby hindering the progress of projects as well. Having full time coordinators on both the faculty of UGA as well as at Archway Partnership would aid in handling transitions among students and over the year. Additionally, following the CCPH Principles of Partnership would avoid this challenge.

Partnerships between academia and communities can sometimes overlook a reward system for faculty and staff for their involvement. Many faculty experience disconnect when they assist and/or offer their skill/resources for the partnership, yet receive no incentives. This may deter some faculty from participating or from staying dedicated to the partnership. For instance, faculty may oversee a project
their advisees are participating in and offer their resources and skill set to facilitate their students’ learning experience. However, faculty must set aside their own time to accomplish these tasks and are not reimbursed financially for doing so. If there were an infrastructure in place for faculty to identify a common interest with the partnerships and tailor their curriculum to be more involved, faculty and students could dedicate more time and resources to the partnership’s projects and goals. By creating the opportunity for more communication on academia’s side of the partnership, staff can understand how to engage faculty and students on a more consistent basis. This could not only expand outreach efforts but strengthen those already existing.

A large challenge community-campus partnerships will encounter is how to ensure that in addition to the community, every stakeholder’s priorities are addressed in the community. The fact that multiple entities have specific expectations and requests can create tension or conflict. This may impede the project and/or hurt the partnership. Again, by following the CCPH Principles of Partnership, this challenge can be avoided. However, adequate leadership in academia as well as the community is essential to keep expectations clear and realistic. Every member of the partnership must keep selfish goals at bay and work towards a common interest to complete the project they are participating in.

5.0 Recommendation

Archway Partnership is a promising example of a higher education-community partnership. Therefore, it should be used as a best practices model for other higher education institutions to adopt. This, in turn, will gain supporters from inside and outside the community in which the university is to be partnered with. Archway Partnership’s growth and success is a testament to how well they have followed CCPH’s Principles of Partnership. Archway’s passion for the improvement of community and public health is noticed through their transparency, dedication, and continuous need for self-improvement.

To strengthen the community and further their improvements in public
health, the university should reach out to corporations and other stakeholders within the community to access additional skill sets and resources. By expanding outreach for the community, additional projects and priorities can be established.

Once universities adopt a partnership similar to the University of Georgia's Archway Partnership, the movement will strengthen and public acceptance of this concept will begin. This can only increase the amount of investors and funding sources. The funding community needs to be more involved. It is one of the roles of an outreach platform such as Archway Partnership to identify those funding sources, and communicate the need for this partnership in order to receive more financial support.

Researchers should invest funding on assessing outcomes from partnerships as well as compare and contrast other sources of community involvement. Results will allow for partnerships to have a solid grounding to support their arguments for more collaboration between stakeholders and academia in a community as well as attract investors and funding sources. Once this movement expands and gains recognition, public health efforts will begin to see positive results.

6.0 Conclusion

Our society is in a period of dramatic change with the transition from an industrial-based to a knowledge-based economy, as well as technological advances, fiscal challenges of higher education, and cultural shifts in society as a whole.¹ This period of change has directly affected the field of public health requiring solutions for health needs to be more overarching, diverse, and innovative. The concept of a campus-community partnership is the innovative solution the field of public health has been searching for to improve the health of communities while being financially reasonable. By accessing a university’s workforce, skills, and resources, the community can receive the assistance needed to address key priorities and maintain their budget.

The bigger policy problem this partnership can address is how our society can improve the health of vulnerable and underserved populations through sources
other than government public programs. A viable solution to this is to create outreach platforms such as an “Archway Partnership” that can use resources and workforce to be utilized by those populations in the surrounding communities. This can ease the burden off of government programs as well as improve the health status of vulnerable populations on a more intimate level.

While there are many challenges in creating a partnership such as this, the rewards seen when a partnership works makes the process worthwhile. Archway Partnership, as documented in this paper, has developed an infrastructure and culture which rewards transparency, ethics, compassion, and passion for its’ communities it has partnered with. Archway’s adherence to CCPH’s Principles of Partnership has allowed the outreach platform to experience the accomplishment of it’s goals and successes throughout the past seven years of its’ existence. In order to expand and strengthen this movement, it is recommended that other higher education institutions adopt Archway Partnership as a best practices model to create one of their own. Funding sources need to invest more into this movement as well as into research to assess outcomes. Community initiatives partnered with higher education’s staff, students, and resources will create sustainable relationships, solutions to improve public health, and ultimately lower health costs.
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Appendix A- This is considered a tool for existing partnerships to measure the CCPH Principles they encompass and where they can improve. I used this assessment as a means to analyze the progress of Archway Partnership.


ASSESSING THE CCPH PRINCIPLES OF PARTNERSHIP IN A COMMUNITY-CAMPUS PARTNERSHIP


Principle One—Partners have agreed upon mission, values, goals, and measurable outcomes for the partnership.

1a. There is a written mission statement that has been agreed upon by all members of the partnership.
   ___ yes ___ no

1b. There is a written mission statement that is accessible to all members of the partnership.
   ___ yes ___ no

1c. Goals of the group are written and have been agreed upon by all members of the partnership.
   ___ yes ___ no

1d. The group identifies measurable outcomes for the partnership on an annual basis.
   ___ yes ___ no

1e. The outcomes are in writing and accessible to group members.
   ___ yes ___ no

1f. Partners verbally reflect a common mission and goals through interactions with other in the community.
The mission, goals, and outcomes are revisited on an annual basis.

Principle Two- The relationship between partners is characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness, and commitment.

2a Members address each other respectfully in meetings by making eye contact with each other.

2b Members refer to each other respectfully in the group by using parallel titles or names. (i.e., everyone uses titles or everyone uses first names).

2c The formal leaders of the partnership addresses group members in a respectful manner by using names or titles.

2d Verbal and non-verbal cues are in synch when talking about others. (i.e., individuals shake their heads in agreement when they verbally say “yes”, etc.)

2e Members consistently participate and follow through on tasks.

Principle Three- The partnership builds upon identified strengths and assets, but also addresses areas that need improvement.

3a Members of the partnership are able to identify the strengths of the group in written documents, interviews, or oral presentations.

3b The group is willing to examine issues raised by members.

3c The group is willing to re-addresses unresolved issues.

3d The group sets priorities for what should be accomplished based on
member needs.
___Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

3e  The partnership works to expand the depth or breadth of what the partnership is good at over time.
___Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

Principle Four- The partnership balances power among partners and enables resources among partners to be shared.

4a  Members of the partnership that have resources (i.e., money, equipment, support staff, expertise) share the resources with the group.
___Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

4b  Group members who have contacts and relationships outside the group share these resources with members.
___Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

4c  The campus and the community share power, leadership, and resources.
___Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

Principle Five- There is clear, open and accessible communication between partners. Members make it an ongoing priority to listen to each other. The group has developed a common language that clarifies the meaning of terms, events, or incidents.

5a  Members refer to activities, events, or actions with similar jargon.
___Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

5b  All group members are familiar with the methods to raise issues within the partnership.
___Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

5c  Members have methods of communicating with each other outside the group (i.e., emails, written minutes, phone calls).
___Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

5d  Members ask questions and ask for clarification in the group if
interactions, information, or events are unclear.
__Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

**Principle Six**- Roles, norms, and processes for the partnership are established with the input and agreement of all partners.

6a Members of the group created the leadership of the group (i.e., appointed, elected, chosen).
__Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

6b Members of the partnership have formed group norms about patterns of communication and decision-making.
__Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

6c Group members are familiar with the process of decision making in the group.
__Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

**Principle Seven**- There is feedback to, among, and from all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goal of continuously improving the partnership and its outcomes.

7a Partnership meetings reflect an open exchange of ideas between members.
__Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

7b The goal of the meetings is focused on improving the partnership and its outcomes.
__Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

7c Active members represent various constituencies in the partnership.
__Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

7d A diversity of participants interact verbally at the meetings.
__Never true ___rarely true ___unsure ___usually true ___always true

7e Non-verbal language is consistently reflected with verbal comments, (i.e., members shake head in agreement and then follow-up with verbal comments that support their non-verbal nods of agreement)
Principle Eight- Partners share the credit for the partnership’s accomplishments.

8a When talking about accomplishments with the group, leaders share the credit with members of the group.

8b When formal group leaders talk about the partnership outside the group, credit is shared for accomplishments.

8c When members of the group write about partnership accomplishments, various contributors are listed.

Principle Nine- Partnerships take time to develop and evolve over time.

9a Meeting minutes or other group documents reflect a positive evolution within the partnership.

9b The partnership has been formed to be an on-going group.

9c There is adequate structure and commitment on the part of the community and the campus to maintain an on-going partnership.

9d Campus and community leaders demonstrate commitment to the partnership over time through attendance at meetings, and by making contributions to support the mission of the partnership.

Principle Ten- The partnership is a community-campus partnership.

10a Partnership meetings are held at a location in the community.

10b Community leaders are viewed as leaders of the partnership.
10c  The campus is committed to educating its students to be good neighbors.

10d  Members of the partnership view the group as a community committee not a campus committee.

10e  Formal leadership (mayor, selectman, council members) within the community support the partnership.

10f  The community communicates the importance of forming and sustaining a partnership with the campus through its commitment of resources.

10g  Community and campus leaders allocate resources to collaborate on community issues.
Appendix B

Archway Partnership Map- Allows reader to see where Archway Partnership is working with communities throughout Georgia.
The Archway Partnership Process- Designed to show the public how Archway Partnership makes their decisions and how they are organized internally.

Appendix C

UGA Schools and Colleges Working with Archway Partnership- Including programs and departments affiliated with each school and college that has involvement with Archway. This is to show the amount of collaboration within UGA and Archway to provide communities with resources, staff, and faculty.

Accessed from: http://archwaypartnership.uga.edu/campus/schools.php

College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

- 4-H
- Ag and Applied Economics
- Engineering Outreach Services
- Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications
- Horticulture

Franklin College of Arts and Sciences

- Computer Science
- The Graduate School
- Geography
- Theatre and Film
- Music

Terry College of Business
• Management Information Systems  
• Institute of Leadership Advancement (Leonard Leaders Scholars Program)

**Odum School of Ecology**

**College of Education**

• Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy

**College of Environment and Design**

• Housing and Demographics Research Center

**Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources**

**Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication**

• Knight Health  
• Creative Consultants  
• UGA AdClub  
• Hooper Sanford Baldwin Thomas (HSBT)

**College of Pharmacy**

**College of Public Health**

• Health Promotion and Behavior  
• Health Policy and Management

**School of Public and International Affairs**

• Masters of Public Administration

**School of Social Work**

• Institute for Non-Profit Organizations

**Public Service and Outreach Units**

• Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
• The Fanning Institute  
• UGA Alliance for Quality Growth  
• UGA Sea Grant  
• Faculty of Engineering  
• Office of Service Learning  
  o Small Business Development Center
Other USG Institutions

- Clayton State University
- Coastal Georgia Community College
- College of Coastal Georgia
- Dalton State College
- Darton College
- Georgia College and State University
- Georgia Southern University
- Georgia Southwestern State University
- Georgia Institute of Technology
- Medical College of Georgia
- Middle Georgia College
- Valdosta State

Appendix D

(3) Links to Archway’s News, Impact, and Resources

News- Provides the public with the latest Archway news across the state
http://archwaypartnership.uga.edu/news/

Impact- Provides the public with information regarding the specific projects each county is working on.
http://archwaypartnership.uga.edu/impact/

Resources- Provides the public with community-specific resources for county representatives and residents.
http://archwaypartnership.uga.edu/resources/