Community-Engaged Pathways and Partnerships (P2): A Collective Scholarship Fellows Program

Hosted by the Institute for Community and Economic Engagement and the Office of Research and Engagement at UNC Greensboro

Evaluation Report

May 1st, 2019

Prepared for:
Dr. Emily Janke
Lori Kniffin
Institute for Community and Economic Engagement
UNC Greensboro

Prepared by:
Catherine Goetz
Educational Research Methodology Dept.
UNC Greensboro

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Community-Engaged Pathways and Partnerships (P2) program is a three-year grant-making pilot that supports interdisciplinary teams comprised of personnel from community organizations and UNCG to work on community-identified initiatives. A core tenant of the program is to build capacity for collective leadership that will sustain partnerships to make lasting impact on the Greensboro community.

Evaluation Purpose and Scope

A process evaluation was conducted to offer insights into the effectiveness of communication to the P2 teams and deepen understanding around how professional development activities outlined by the grant support collaboration and the creation of pathways for sustainable partnership. The findings are intended to be used by the Director and Assistant Director from the Institute for Community and Economic Engagement, to inform decision making around program improvement.

Methods

A qualitative methodology was employed in order to capture the nuanced experiences of participants serving in key roles within P2 teams in the second cohort. Sources of information included program artifacts, informants in PI, university partner and community partner roles, and survey data collected by the Assistant Director for ICEE. Narratives were collected through semi-structured interviews, and a review of supporting program documentation and program staff reflections were synthesized to draw out reflections providing indications into how communication and professional development activities are working to promote a culture of collaborative leadership among participants.

Key Findings

Overall, participants are satisfied with the level and mechanism for communication both to the P2 staff and within their respective teams. A meaningful attributing factor is the existence of strong relationships established within teams, as the work being done across all P2 teams pre-dates acceptance into the P2 program. Additional overlap exists for many P2 team members because of engagement in similar research efforts or community-engaged activity.

There are opportunities to revisit the structure of the professional development activities, to find a compromise that offer teams the opportunity to engage across teams and cohorts, and still attend to the priorities specific to their respective teams.

The structure of the P2 grant is supportive of establishing pathways for sustainable partnership and allows for the opportunity for relationships to develop organically.

Key Conclusions

- The current approach to communicating to P2 teams by the program staff is viewed as helpful and effective. In addition to being timely and comprehensive, P2 participants recognize that patience and persistence is needed in efforts to build lasting relationships.

- Communication within teams is heavily influenced by pre-existing relationships. This may pose a challenge for future cohorts interested in engaging in new initiatives.

- While the programs represented partnerships that pre-date the grant, participants view the Launch Meeting as the impetus for P2 participant cohesion. Participants appreciate the opportunity to connect across teams and learn from each other but struggle to negotiate team priorities with those of the professional development activities.

- The scope of this evaluation was limited to participants representing three key roles in the P2 team structure. While insightful, this narrows the ability to fully understand how collective leadership is experienced by the P2 team. Each team is unique and experiences individual sets of advantages and challenges.

I. Introduction

Background

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) is nationally recognized as an institution dedicated to advancing scholarship and community engagement. Classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a high-activity research and community-engaged campus, this distinction posits UNCG in the company of only 49 other institutions nationwide (Janke & Medlin, 2017). UNCG's Institute for Community and Economic Engagement (ICEE) within the Office of Research works to build synergies between community, economic development and research initiatives to produce broad and lasting impact. The Community- Engaged Pathways and Partnership (P2) program created by the ICEE supports the "visioning and planning needed to develop sustainable and reciprocal community-university partnerships" by prescribing a collaborative partnership and professional development model for interdisciplinary grant-seeking teams (P2 Fellows Call for Proposal, 2018).

This evaluation offers insight into how participants in the second cohort are experiencing the program. Specific attention is paid to perspectives on communication and professional development activities. Findings highlight areas for future inquiry.

Community-Engaged Pathways and Partnerships (P2) Description

As stated in a Spring 2017 report from the Institute of Community and Economic Engagement, Greensboro was deeply impacted by the most recent economic recession, creating greater need for focused action in key areas within the community. Further, pockets within these communities are often "underserved and under-connected", creating challenges of great need and limited capacity (Janke & Medlin, 2017, p. 32). As a pillar for growth and innovation in the community, UNC Greensboro seeks to make meaningful connections through scholarship. Purposeful attention from faculty, students and businesses to community-identified needs provide inspiring opportunities for economic recovery and sustainable growth that lifts not only the economy but the community members within it. With that recognition, much scholarly work is done in silos but may have transformational benefit to the broader Greensboro community. The P2 program recognizes the challenges that interdisciplinary teams may face and provides a framework to not only connect community initiatives to university scholarship but develop capacity among community and institutional leaders that fosters sustained pipelines to address evolving community needs (Janke & Medlin, 2017).

The Community-Engaged Pathways and Partnerships (P2) program is a three-year grant-making pilot that supports interdisciplinary teams comprised of personnel from community organizations and UNCG to work on community-identified initiatives. A core tenant of the program is to build capacity for collective leadership. Research done by ICEE Director Emily Janke underpins the program's theory of change, suggesting that transitioning from work being done "for" the community, to that being done "with" the community develops shared priorities and establishes trust that fosters efficiency in solving complex problems, and sustains reciprocal partnerships (Janke, 2004; Janke & Medlin, 2017).

The P2 program is currently in its second year and has engaged four teams to date. Two teams (projects focused on eviction diversion and health equity) were established in the 2018 inaugural cohort, and an additional two teams (projects focused on conflict transformation through health and physical education and a marketing and tourism partnership with the Triad brewing industry) were selected in January 2019.

Selection criteria is based on the submission of an application requiring a three-year vision and plan for the proposed initiative, a description of how pathways to facilitate the partnership will be created, and an articulation of team member roles. Additionally, a project timeline and budget must be provided. Teams may vary in size and composition, but must consist of at least one primary faculty member, one or two additional faculty members, one department, unit or coalition chair, and one community partner. Often, university students are included in the team composition as well but may not be explicitly named on P2 grant applications.

The P2 program professional development structure operates on a calendar-based timeline and creates four moments for meaningful engagement. Participants are expected to attend the launch meeting in January, two strategy sessions in the spring, and a fall kick off meeting in August. This framework is intended to promote collaborative leadership, support program progress, and offer resources to enrich the value of collaboration amongst university and community partners.

As stated in the 2018 P2 Application Guidelines, the P2 Program objectives are:

1. Align scholarship of UNCG faculty and staff with mutually beneficial, community-identified priorities and strengths;
2. Build upon relevant works, initiatives, and/or scholarship to establish collective actions and commitments;
3. Develop sustainable, reciprocal, and collaborative partnerships and approaches to community-engaged scholarships; and
4. Institutionalize sustainable pathways for fostering organizational and cultural practices conducive to community-engaged scholarship.

Logic Model

The logic model (see Appendix A) reflects the activities, outputs and outcomes of the P2 program. Outputs serve as the indicators that guide data analysis and interpretation of the findings.

II. Evaluation Purpose and Scope

Uses and Users of the Evaluation

The findings from this evaluation are intended to be used by the ICEE Director and Assistant Director, to support decision making for current and future grant-making cycles. Specifically, the employed micro-analysis of selected cohort two participants offers evidence of how communication to the P2 teams influences their ability to build sustainable, reciprocal relationships that serve community-identified priorities. The study will also deepen understanding around participant perspectives on the professional development activities currently offered and may support decision making around maintaining or modifying the structure of future offerings. Findings may shape how the Assistant Director chooses to set expectations for current and new P2 Fellows and may impact the application and professional development offerings provided. Additionally, rich understanding generated from the evaluation may identify areas for further consideration.

Evaluation Approach

The practice of evaluation is critical to ensuring that programs reach their defined goals, while identifying ways that programs can better serve their participants. Formative evaluation is useful for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of existing practices, meant to generate learning for program improvement (Stake, 2004). Evaluation literature highlights the importance of understanding program processes, context and participant experiences. Maxwell (2013) emphasizes the advantages of qualitative methods in evaluation as part of rigorous process evaluation practices, noting the importance of recognizing how participants understand program components set within specific contexts. The purpose of this evaluation is to generate insights into the experiences of participants in the second cohort of the program. Specifically, this evaluation examines the degree to which communication shared to participants by program administrators and within teams, fosters the intended culture of collaborative leadership.

Evaluation Questions

The questions below were used to guide inquiry into key program processes. The evaluation illustrates perspectives solicited from a university principal investigator (PI), a supporting faculty member and a community partner.

1) How effective is communication to and within project teams in fostering a collaborative team culture among participants?

    a. What works well?
    b. What needs improvement?

2) How does professional development (specifically the launch meeting, and expectations for strategy sessions) facilitate collaborative partnerships and approaches to community-engaged scholarship?

    a. What works well?
    b. What needs improvement?

III. Methods

Evaluation Design

A qualitative design was utilized to generate a deeper understanding of participant experiences within the second cohort. Methods leveraged included document review, and semi-structured interviews with one self-reported PI, one supporting faculty member and one community partner to capture experiences from multiple vantage points. The review of relevant documents was completed first and included artifacts from both cohorts one and two. The context gleaned through the review process informed the development of interview protocols for selected P2 participants. The evaluation framework provided in Appendix B, offers an overview of the connections between the evaluation questions, indicators and data sources leveraged.

Sampling Strategies

Due to the intimate scope of the inquiry, the evaluation utilized a purposive non-random sample (Alkin, 2011). This approach allows for inquiry specifically into the experiences of participants in the second cohort, who self-identified as fulfilling a specific role within the team. Roles included that of the university affiliated PI, a supporting faculty member and the community partner. The P2 grant program provides funding and resources for a three-year term, therefore making findings salient for current participants.

Cohort two is comprised of two teams. One team includes five representatives from two community partners, one university affiliated PI, three supporting faculty, two undergraduate students and one graduate student.

The second team team is a collaboration with two community partners. The team has one university affiliated PI, and four additional faculty engaged in grant activities as part of the P2 program.

Once the participant roles were identified, interview participants were selected using a convenience strategy.

Data Collection

The evaluation framework (see appendix B) highlights a qualitative design, which utilized document review and semi-structured interviews with select participants from the second cohort. What follows is a description of each data collection strategy.

Document Review

The purpose of the document review is to enhance the understanding of the way in which communication is facilitated between the program personnel and participants. The document review was performed as the first step of the data collection strategy and focused on three types of artifacts: (1) documents disseminated to participants by program staff related to professional development, (2) documents associated with the application and grant making process (3) survey responses from participants following specific professional development activities. Specific attention was paid to where and how often themes of collaborative leadership, pathways and reciprocity were incorporated. This information was used to guide the development of interview protocols and increase trustworthiness in the findings through triangulation. The table below outlines the documents reviewed.

Accepted P2 Applications (Y2)	Post strategy session survey
2019 Launch meeting presentation	Post-strategy session survey responses
2019 Launch meeting survey	Fall kick off meeting handouts
2019 Launch meeting survey responses	Post-Kick off meeting survey responses

Interviews

Semi-structured interview questions were crafted with a deepened understanding of program context through the document review process, in order to develop rich descriptions of participants' perceived feelings of how communication from the program staff and professional development activities foster a culture of collaborative leadership.

Participant contact information was provided via program roster by the ICEE Assistant Director, who also sent advanced email notice to all members of cohort two, making the introduction to the evaluator and alerting participants of the potential to be contacted for interviews. The evaluator followed up with email correspondence inviting selected participants to engage in a dialogue about their experiences. One out of office message was received by the evaluator stating that the selected participant would be unavailable, and in that instance an additional participant representing a similar role was selected. Each of the participants engaged in 30-45 minute recorded conversations with the evaluator. No incentives were offered for participation in the evaluation activities as the data collected is intended to inform the Director and Assistant Director, offering potential benefit to current P2 teams.

In addition to specific questions around communication and professional development, the protocol included general questions about motivation and interest allowing the evaluator to glean generous contextual information and build rapport. A final question was also asked to help clarify how participants were able or unable to connect the program activities to an enhanced understanding of collective leadership. Member checking was leveraged to ensure accurate interpretation occurred.

Data Analysis

Directed by the evaluation questions and context from the program staff, a microanalysis of data was conducted. Data from the document review process were outlined in a table by source and coded for frequency of representation of collective leadership, reciprocity and pathways. Codes indicated *strong*, for documents where the themes were evidenced often, *moderate*, where they appeared more than once, and *light* where they only appeared once. Documents that did not reference these themes included the launch meeting survey and responses.

Document review findings, interview transcripts, and launch meeting survey responses from members of cohort two (n=6) were synthesized in relation to the stated evaluation questions, allowing for the triangulation of findings. Leveraging a combination of data collection methods allows for triangulation, to enhance the trustworthiness of the data and associated conclusions in reference to the program as it currently stands (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Maxwell, 2013).

Limitations

Meaningful limitations exist, as the evaluation is a snapshot into the experiences of P2 participants specifically from cohort two. The sample is narrow and therefore is not intended to represent the experiences of all participants in the P2 program, or those in the specific roles of PI, supporting faculty and community partner.

There are approximately 33 participants currently in the P2 program, and 18 in the second cohort. Specific to cohort two, two are categorized as university affiliated PIs, six are supporting faculty, and seven are identified as community partners. Three university affiliated students (two undergraduate and one doctoral) were referenced. The student experiences are not reflected in the findings for this evaluation but should be considered as part of future inquiry.

Launch meeting survey feedback from cohort two was limited to six respondents, with indication of three responses per team. There were seven team members present at the launch meeting for the Well Crafted team. Eight team members were present from the Conflict Resolution team. Each included the PI, supporting faculty and community partners. The data does not reflect which individual from each team responded to the survey but does offer broader context for the specific reflections of those interviewed.

IV. Findings

What follows are the findings specific to each of the evaluation questions posed. Findings relevant to sub-questions are broken out individually. Additional findings are included to surface insights that offer additional context and direction for future consideration. It's important to note, across all evaluation questions, a consistent theme underpinned all reflections. The pre-existing relationships established within teams and with P2 staff were reflected in the participants' views of their role in collective leadership, satisfaction with communication and with professional development activities.

1. How effective is communication to and within project teams in fostering a collaborative team culture among participants? What works well? What needs improvement?

Communication to project teams by program staff.

Through Content. A review of program documentation revealed that the program tenants of collective leadership, reciprocity and pathway creation are well represented in the primary communication to P2 participants, particularly at the beginning and the end of the program year. Across program documentation reviewed, strong references were cited in all four accepted P2 applications, indicating that at minimum the PIs from each program team had a conceptual understanding of these components before being accepted to the P2 program. Additionally, the strongest non-application representation appeared in the launch meeting presentation, indicating a substantial investment in time by the program staff outlining and discussing these topics in and across teams (and cohorts). Fall kick off activities also included strong representation of these tenants, however the second cohort has yet to participate.

From teams to program staff. In terms of communication with program staff, P2 teams indicated that email was the primary, and most appropriate mode of contact for engagement. Participants noted being satisfied with the communication method and frequency. Emails were cited as being "*comprehensive*" and "*really helpful*."

One participant shared *"I think the communication has been great. It's honestly been a communication as needed sort of thing. We're dealing with [community partners], so the less communication the better just cause there's so much going on."*

Another expressed similar sentiments and offered "*They are very comprehensive. I wear a lot of different hats, and so unfortunately have not been able to attend to all of the emails*." Participant feedback was consistent with view of roles within the group. In this case, the participant had not established a relationship with the P2 team prior to joining the program and viewed their engagement as limited because of other internal responsibilities.

Participants leverage multiple sources to stay informed about program updates. One person shared "*[UNCG faculty] have been a really great source of information for me. So, the combination of the emails and having them as a voice as well to carry forth information is definitely helpful.*"

Additional in person opportunities to connect were mentioned as well but were specific to individual relationships or overlap in other professional areas. There is a shared appreciation for the prompts and reminders, which allow participants to act within their respective teams.

Within teams. Respondents reflected feeling satisfied with communication within their respective teams. Communication within teams reflected the impact of pre-existing relationships most emphatically. This was the resounding answer when asked what works well about communication.

One participant offered "*I think the communication in our group is great. We're not outsiders anymore. We already had a pre-existing relationship with our community groups. I guess in short, we can be trusted.*" Another shared that the partners they worked with were "*really engaging and non-threatening*", making it easy to build rapport and trust.

When reflecting on what could be improved, it was noted that working in groups comprised of university and community partners with various pulls on their time was a challenge. To combat this, in person communication among member types was most common.

Interestingly, the requirements of time and patience were referenced multiple times. One participant described the way partnerships develop organically. They shared an example of a key partner who had not previously demonstrated interest in engaging, although they were a major influencer within the community partner organization. "*We found out [he] worked out at the same gym, and they didn't know each other worked [at the community site]. It's funny to think that we can have lunch now, but before that we couldn't even get a meeting in his office.*"

Another indicated similar notions around patience and shared the scenario of a key community partner that took six months to engage. "*We were patient and now they want to work with us. I mean, in the end that in of it's self is community building, right?*".

Summary of Findings:

- Participants felt satisfied with the level and types of communication with the program staff and within their teams.
- Digital strategies were found to be easiest to manage logistics, and in person touch points were most leveraged for relationship building and maintenance.

2. How does professional development facilitate collaborative partnerships and approaches to community-engaged scholarship? What works well? What needs improvement?

Participants interviewed from cohort two shared a general enthusiasm for the professional development opportunities afforded by the program. Due to the brevity of time in the program, the launch meeting was the only formal professional development event that the P2 teams had engaged in thus far. However, respondents were able to indicate their expectations for the strategy meetings and both teams had them scheduled for April-May 2019.

Launch Meeting. Respondents' sentiments surrounding their experience with the launch meeting held in January were positive. Feedback included an appreciation for the opportunity to meet other teams. One participant reflected that it was a "*big meeting in a good way*", sharing that it "*was really good that there were people there who had already started their projects*".

This notion was expanded upon by a participant who noted gratitude for the opportunity to learn from other groups. They expressed "*I think the way things were broken out forced people from different groups to be together. There's a lot that different groups can learn from each other, and it was informal which was kind of nice."*

Participants not only viewed the cross over between teams as valuable but took notice of other parties represented in the event. One respondent noted *"I liked that people from the research office are there to listen, which felt like there was going to be an increased profile for our work and maybe those people would be thinking about how to support it."*

Challenges were surfaced around how to manage space, best leverage the time spent together, and general availability. One participant recalled challenges with the physical space, noting that "*the space was cramped*." Another referenced their inability to attend because of other constraints on their time but referenced feeling *"welcome"* to participate. Future inquiry should include soliciting feedback specifically from those in attendance. Consideration should be given to how information from professional development events are relayed to team members unable to attend.

Most notably, participants may view the launch meeting as the official starting point for P2 team communication. While all team members were working in projects that pre-dated the grant, participants referenced experiencing trade-offs between needing time to plan internally and valuing the engagement that conversation across teams provided. Meaningfully, one person shared:

> *"It's so important for the teams to have inner group conversation. I wish it could be an all-day thing and you could do both. I found the cross over incredibly valuable. But I sometimes feel like when you have a conversation, you just get to a point where you could learn something about what the other group is doing but there's not enough time to consider that in a way that it impacts the project or is translational, so it's like you can't do a deep dive on crossover between teams. I don't know how much you get out of doing a medium dive. So, I think some some kind of brief ice breaker level stuff, is super helpful so people can see the different ways communities collaborate and that might be the level that might be the sweet spot for the way the [P2] program's structured."*

Strategy Sessions. P2 teams in the second cohort had not yet engaged in the strategy sessions at this point but had made arrangements to connect. Collectively, respondents viewed these meetings as opportunities for internal conversation and planning. Both teams defined internal as "university affiliated partner" meetings, and arrangements made by both teams did not include community partners.
As an example, one participant lamented:

> "*Our [community] partners won't be there. Not to exclude them, but it was a realization that we're not ready in my opinion to bring them to the table if we don't have our act together. They have too many priorities for us to say you should be sitting at our table when you have all these issues at the [community partner site] that are important.*"

A community partner expressed that they were not part of the planning but viewed their connection to the university-affiliated team members as sufficient and trusted their ability to make determinations about the sessions and topics. Insights were also gleaned as to how useful strategy sessions may be for "entire group" engagement. One person cited "*Sometimes the meetings that go along with the P2 grant are obligatory for community partners to participate in. I think we need to think about ways to shift that and decentralize the university a bit.*"

Summary of Findings

- The launch meeting was valuable for participants from the second cohort. The opportunity to engage across teams was useful, but consideration should be given to the allocation to times across versus within teams.
- Participants view the first strategy session as an opportunity for internal processing that excludes community partners.
- In these instances, the collective leadership model is challenged in that distinctions were made between university-affiliated team members and community partners. UNCG team members demonstrated a need to protect the time and relationships with community partners. This practice is likely reflective of how the community partnership programs were managed prior to the onset of the P2 program. These implications should be considered in future inquiry around P2 program structure.

Additional Findings

Insights gained through interviews, the review of program artifacts and survey data begin to shape the picture of how participants in the second cohort are experiencing the program. Semi-structured conversations also allowed for additional understanding to surface relevant to the perceived value of the P2 program. Also articulated are insights on how the shift to a mindset of collective leadership is being achieved. These findings are included as they may be salient to the P2 program staff as areas for deeper inquiry.

University-affiliated participants from the second cohort view the structure of the P2 program positively and are compelled to apply for reasons that align with the program mission. The self- identified PI interviewed described the key P2 program benefit as a way to highlight the effort that community-engaged work requires. They went on to explain:

> *"The most beneficial thing is that it gives validity to the work because at early stages the work doesn't provide the productivity benefit that you need to be successful at the university. You're not getting publications or student credit hours, it's a lot of effort that doesn't show up. What the grant does is makes it show up because it recognizes the community engagement piece".*

Similarly, reflections shared included sentiments that further validate the structure of the program. In reference to how this differs from other grants for similar projects, a participant elaborated saying "*as soon as you get the grant email, you feel like you've got to start producing things. This [P2 grant] gives you time and space to think and let your ideas develop.*"

Additionally, university-affiliated participants reflected on how they understood collective leadership as a result of P2 program involvement. One participant explained that "*..it can be difficult to understand how you're a leader if you're not in charge. We are starting to see that leadership can be employed in ways that are kind of in the* *background."* This is further evidenced by reflections from another participant, who when considering how engagement with community partners differed in the P2 program, indicated that being part of a collective team has allowed them to reflect on how working collectively with individual areas of expertise and a shared goal can contribute to the establishment of sustainable pathways for partnership.

"It's always been, to oversimplify a one to one relationship [faculty and community partner]. Now it's more."

"It's very much enabling other people to have their own relationships."

When describing the shift to collective leadership, one participant likened it to a transfer of leadership depending on area of expertise. The participant noted challenging themselves to ask "*So, when am I not the person to do that? We're used to being "the people", and so it' about stepping back and understanding when not to be the person anymore*."

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

The Community-Engaged Pathways and Partnerships (P2) program, aligns scholarship and community-initiated priorities to meaningfully impact the quality of life in the Greensboro community. Well-developed relationships inside the university and extended to the community allow for pre-existing programs to benefit from the support of the P2 grant program. The conclusions and recommendations to follow highlight opportunities for future inquiry to further the mission of creating sustainable pathways for partnership through collective leadership.

- The current approach to communicating to P2 teams by the program staff is viewed as helpful and effective. In addition to being timely and comprehensive, P2 participants recognize that patience and persistence is needed in efforts to build lasting relationships.

Recommendation: The P2 staff should continue sharing critical program information to all P2 team members via email. Additional opportunities for in person engagement should be taken advantage of as a mechanism to further develop a sense of ownership in the work across team members, particularly to those representing community partner organizations.

- Communication within teams is heavily influenced by pre-existing relationships. This may pose a challenge for future cohorts interested in engaging in new initiatives.

Recommendation: Consider creating opportunities for new or prospective applicants to meet with participants from existing cohorts. The exchange of ideas and lessons learned may be valuable in determining who should be included in grant teams, and in developing relationships in preparation for the start of the grant cycle.

- While the programs represented partnerships that pre-date the grant, participants view the Launch Meeting as the impetus for P2 participant cohesion. Participants appreciate the opportunity to connect across teams and learn from each other but struggle to negotiate team priorities with those of the professional development activities.

Recommendation: To continue to support learning across teams, consider extending the time allotted for the meeting to allow for dedicated time for internal conversation and cross-team collaboration. Alternatively, consider sharing information in advance with P2 teams so that they may act on any needed conversations viewed as "internal" and dedicate time in the launch meeting to focusing on collaboration.

- It was noted that the space the Launch Meeting was held in was tight, and that it may feel too centralized for community partners to feel invested.

Recommendation: Consider securing alternate neutral space outside of the university for Launch Meetings that resonate to the community, such as HQ Greensboro or the Greensboro Chamber of Commerce that can accommodate larger groups.

- Strategy sessions are considered valuable touchpoints for university-facing members of the P2 teams and exclude community partners as a mechanism for protecting their time. This may limit the voice or perspective of the community partner in planning or structuring interventions, in turn diluting their investment in sustained partnership.

Recommendation: Consider preparing a set of guiding questions for teams intending to meet absent community partners, that allow them to reflect on how decisions made would impact the community partner and create a mechanism for sharing information back to those who were not in attendance.

- The scope of this evaluation was limited to participants representing three key roles in the P2 team structure. While insightful, this narrows the ability to fully understand how collective leadership is experienced by the P2 team. Each team is unique and experiences individual sets of advantages and challenges.

Recommendation: Consider continued evaluation support to conduct case studies of P2 teams that experienced success in creating pathways for sustained partnership through collaboration. Case studies may best highlight persistent themes around success, while representing the unique nuances of each program team. These stories may be used to attract "best fit" prospective applicants interested in aligning scholarship with community-initiated priorities to better the Greensboro community.

VII. References

Alkin, M. (2011). *Evaluation Essentials From A to Z*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press

Institute for Community and Economic Engagement and the Office of Research and Engagement. (2018). *Community-Engaged Pathways and Partnerships (P2): A Collective Scholarship Program* (Call for Proposal)

Janke, E. , Medlin, K. (Spring 2017) *Excellence in community engagement & community-engaged scholarship: Aligning community and university strengths and priorities*, Vol 3. Retrieved from https://communityengagement.uncg.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Vol-3-FINAL-060817.pdf

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Maxwell, J. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. 3rd Edition. United States: Sage Publications.

Mertens, D.M. & Wilson, A.T. (2012). *Program evaluation theory and practice: A comprehensive guide*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press

Newcomer, K. E., Hatry, H. P., & Wholey, J. S. (2015). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (Wiley Online Books). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119171386

Stake, R. (2004). *Standards-Based & Responsive Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA : SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412985932

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. S. (2014). *Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications*. Somerset, UNITED STATES: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. Retrieved from http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uncg/detail.action?docID=1801247

Weiss, C. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies*. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

VIII. Appendices

Appendix A

PROGRAM LOGIC MODEL: COMMUNITY-ENGAGED PATHWAYS AND PARTNERSHIPS (P2) GRANT
*Logic Model Represents a three-year process for grant teams.
Last updated 4/28/19

Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Short Term Outcomes (1-3 years)	Long Term Outcomes (4-6 years)
Personnel: ORE staff ICEE staff Review committee P2 Teams Strategy session collaborators *Resources:* Grant funding Funding for launch & fall kick-off events Space	Run proposal, application, and review process July. – Nov. each year: Create/revise proposal process Promote CFP Applicants submit proposal Review committee selects P2 Teams Hold launch meeting in Dec.: Organize/develop materials for launch meeting Hold launch meeting Follow-up on launch meeting Teams implement their projects Jan. – Dec. each year	Level of participant satisfaction Types of communication materials & strategies Types of relationships within teams Types of relationships with P2 staff Range of expertise within teams Level of collaboration amongst participants	Teams will develop sustainable, reciprocal, and collaborative partnerships and approaches to community-engaged scholarship Community-identified agendas are supported and facilitated across units by centrally coordinated leadership, systems, and structures Institutional structures support and reward sustainable collective engagement work	Cultural shift occurs making collaborative partnership approaches to community-engaged scholarship a best practice in the UNCG & Greensboro community.

	Hold two strategy sessions Jan. – Sept. Organize/develop materials for strategy session Hold strategy session Follow-up on strategy session Hold fall kick-off meeting- Aug. Organize/develop materials for kick-off meeting Hold kick-off meeting Follow-up on kick-off meeting Teams submit a letter of intent to pursue continued funding (Y1 & 2 only) Teams submit Collaboratory activity ICEE assistant director proxies activities Teams complete activities (Y1) Review and update activities (Y2 & Y3) Submit final reports/artifacts: Complete ORE funding report & budget summary Submit a public product	Types of resources provided Range & depth of topics discussed Range of participant expectations of roles Range of strengths identified Range of improvements identified	Participants will be better able to lead new groups to operate in a collaborative partnership model.	

Appendix B

Evaluation Framework

The evaluation framework defines the evaluation questions being considered, outlines the indicators as units of measure and the sources and data collection strategies employed to answer the evaluation questions.

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
Q1: How effective is communication to and within project teams in fostering a collaborative team culture among participants? • What works well? • What needs improvement?	Types of communication materials & strategies Types of relationships with P2 staff Types of relationships within teams Range of strengths identified Range of improvements identified Level of participant satisfaction	Program staff Participants Program documentation	Document review Participant Interviews (3) Program staff reflections
Q2: How does professional development facilitate collaborative partnerships and approaches to community-engaged scholarship? • What works well? • What needs improvement?	Types of communication & materials provided Range of expertise within teams Level of collaboration amongst participants Types of resources provided Range & depth of topics discussed Range of participant expectations of roles Range of strengths identified Range of improvements identified	Program Staff Participants Program documentation	Document review Participant Interviews (3) Program staff reflections

Appendix C

P2 Interview Protocol
P2 Evaluation Spring 2019

Introduction

Thank you for taking the time out to participate in this interview. My name is Catherine Goetz. The purpose of this interview is to aid us in understanding how the P2 grant program is working, and in what ways it can improve. This interview should take about 30 minutes of your time. Your responses are anonymous and will be reported to P2 Personnel in aggregate form. Do you mind if we record this conversation?

Background: Program Purpose and Team Dynamics

Q1: Could you please describe your experience in the P2 program so far. What has been the most beneficial?
The least? (provide examples)

Q2: What motivated you to participate in the P2 grant program?

Q3: How would you describe the (P2 team name) in terms of how you work together, and the various roles people play?

Q4: Can you share an example of how the group functions?
What has worked well?
What has been the most challenging?

Communication

Q1: How would you describe the communication processes within the group?
What works well? (example)
What has been particularly challenging (example)

Q2: How do you typically communicate with the P2 Grant Staff? What is the typical nature of this communication
(or for what purposes)?
What works well?
What needs improvement?

Q3: How would you change the communication between your team and the P2 staff, if at all?

Professional Development

Let’s switch gears and talk a bit about the professional development areas of the program. The launch meeting, strategy sessions and fall kick off meeting are designed to support program participants in connecting with each other, information and resources to promote collaborative leadership.

Q1: Describe your experience with the launch meeting held in January.
What has been helpful?
What might you recommend changing?

Q2: Describe your experience in planning the strategy sessions for your team this year.

General Program Feedback

Q1: In your opinion, how have the team roles changed if at all since starting the grant program?

Q2: How has your understanding of collective leadership changed since working through the P2 program?

Q3: Is there anything you’d like to share that we haven’t covered in our conversation today?

Thank you so much for your time! We greatly value your feedback and if you think of anything else that you would like to share with us, please do not hesitate to reach out by email.