
Developing Effective Social Work University–Community Research Collaborations

Audrey L. Begun, Lisa K. Berger, Laura L. Otto-Salaj, and Susan J. Rose

In many instances, departments of social work in universities and community-based social services agencies have common interests in improving professional practice and advancing knowledge in the profession. Effective university–community research collaborations can help partners achieve these goals jointly, but to be effective these collaborative partnerships require considerable effort and understanding by all partners involved. This article provides to novice investigators and social work agencies new to research partnerships an integrated discussion of important issues to develop the groundwork necessary for building and maintaining effective university–community social work collaborations. Through experience gained from a series of social work research partnerships, as well as an overview of relevant literature, the authors offer a set of strategies for building and sustaining research collaborations between university and community-based social work professionals. The general topics discussed are technology exchange, adopting a longitudinal perspective, knowing your partners, and practical contracting/budgetary issues. The article has relevance to beginning social work researchers, social work educators, and social work practitioners seeking to engage in collaborative partnerships that improve social work practice through research and advance the knowledge base of the profession.

KEY WORDS: *applied research; research collaboration; research-to-practice; technology transfer; university–community collaboration*

From the earliest medieval “town versus gown” disputes (Bender, 1988) to the recent “covenant” for university engagement with communities (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities [hereafter, Kellogg Commission], 2000), the nature of relationships between academic scholars and members of their institutions’ communities has been characterized along a broad continuum of ambiguity: from hostility to apathy to championing each others’ causes, and it has been viewed as anything from parasitic to symbiotic in nature. Currently, many campuses actively pursue the role of “the engaged university,” which, among other things, entails developing strong, mutually rewarding, mutually valued, enduring university–community research partnerships (Kellogg Commission, 2000; North Central Association of Colleges and Schools [NCA], 2003). These concepts of mutuality and two-way relationships are central to the development of effective university–community research collaborative partnerships (Austin, Briar-Lawson, King-Ingham, Spicer, & Davis, 2005; Pardasani, 2005) and are ideally suited to the development of social work research collaborations.

Social work literature concerning the practices of community organization, advocacy, and program evaluation provide important insights into the nature of collaborative partnerships. However, emerging trends related to social work research and pressures on community-based organizations suggest that revisiting strategies for developing university–community research partnerships is warranted. Pressures on community-based organizations, in a context of diminished resources, include the following: public and private funders who require engagement with university research partners for service grants, ideological and policy expectations for engaging in research-based practices, and a national movement to promote community-based participatory research (Straub et al., 2007). Community-based participatory research (CBPR) is an emerging methodology for bridging gaps between research knowledge production and community-based practices; however, there are few guidelines for such partnerships or established strategies for their effective development (Ahmed, Beck, Maurana, & Newton, 2004; Currie et al., 2005; Jason, Pokorny, Ji, & Kunz, 2005; O’Fallon & Dearry, 2002; Viswanathan et al., 2004).

The goal of this article is to provide both sides of the research partnerships (that is, universities and community-based social work professionals) with a clear understanding of factors that can support and impede the collaborative process, in keeping with this journal's aim to describe collaborative efforts among social work practitioners and academicians (Delva, 2006).

RELATED LITERATURE AND EXPERIENCE BASE

Recent literature concerning university–community partnerships emphasizes the effects of such partnerships on the community. For example, Currie et al. (2005) offered a complex and comprehensive model of community impacts derived from community–university research partnerships to address real-world practice issues. Their model presupposes a multidimensional, nonlinear, multidirectional, and developmental nature of the impact of research on the communities involved. However, “the model emphasizes outcomes or impacts; it does not address structural elements of partnerships and audiences, nor processes that could be utilized to enhance research impacts” (Currie et al., 2005, p. 402).

O’Fallon and Dearry (2002) outlined six principles of CBPR of translational research, comprised of outcomes and methodologies. These principles include a mixture of methodologies and impacts. For example, four outcomes are as follows: fostering co-learning, initiating community-driven projects, useful and practical dissemination, and use of culturally appropriate strategies. Two methodologies are (1) promoting participation throughout the process and (2) defining the community in terms of a single unit of identity. Although the authors argue that outcomes from CBPR projects demonstrate benefits to both academic researchers and community members, they do not offer a strategy framework in their examples. CBPR approaches offer strong possibilities for community change (Krieger et al., 2002); however, these are not the only ones identified in the literature.

Some authors have emphasized the unidirectional, top-down process of research teams carefully selecting specific community-based partners to support a research agenda. For example, Straub et al. (2007) noted the importance of coalition size to creating synergy among the partners and identifying partners that have a high capacity for acting as agents of social change. Other authors have addressed critical issues

related to building and managing human service collaborations in general, with only tangential relevance to *research* collaborative partnerships in particular (for example, Dluhy & Kravitz, 1990; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 1993; Takahashi & Smutny, 2001). Evaluation research has also been examined as one activity that can help build stronger university–community partnerships, as a partnership tool rather than an end goal (for example, Bowen & Martens, 2006).

Reid and Vianna (2001) identified several factors related to the negotiation of research collaborations and the nature of the relationships. These factors include the motivations and values of the community partners to engage in the collaboration, social interaction factors that may contribute to the breakdown of these relationships, and the importance of shared goals and respect for cultural (and class) differences. The authors offer several suggestions relevant to the strategies discussed below; however, these relate more to the effective maintenance rather than the overall development of university–community research collaborations. Fielden et al. (2007) have also offered a series of recommendations related to facilitating program management in the context of an ongoing research partnership. Despite the value of these recommendations, there continues to be a need for a set of strategies specifically related to the development of research collaborations that are characterized by bidirectional, mutual exchange.

The authors of this article are social work faculty and scientists in a research center, housed in a social work department. Each academic and community practice contributor recognizes the value of effective university–community social work research partnerships and is actively engaged in teams consisting of university-based faculty, academic staff scientists, student researchers, and practitioners from community-based social work agencies. Significant input was solicited and integrated from community partners representing an array of collaborative research partnerships, and our collective experiences have resulted in a set of transferable lessons about building and sustaining these partnerships. Exploring these developmental lessons among partners can facilitate the collaborative process; ignoring them can result in insurmountable barriers to collaboration.

STRATEGIES

Through our experiences, we have come to appreciate the observation that “for all its simplicity . . . collaboration also is immensely complex” (Kavanagh,

1995, p. 46) and the reality that research partnerships take time, strong social skills, and patience to develop and evolve (Bowen & Martens, 2006; Gass, 2005; McKay, 2006; Reid & Vianna, 2001). Time-, personnel-, and effort-intensive partnerships can contribute to the development of research that has "real-world" relevance to the social work profession, greater engagement and "buy in" by participating individuals, and improved reliability and validity of research results (Sobell, 1996). As noted by Pardasani (2005), "the successful outcome of any collaboration requires the identification and prompt resolution of any issues that may pose challenges" (p. 70). The following observations are offered as a practical resource to support partners in preparing for and enhancing the evolution of effective university–community collaborations.

Four general strategies have emerged from the experiences of building these university–community research partnerships. First, the adoption of a "technology exchange" perspective respects the unique contributions of each partner active in the collaboration. Second, all collaborators adopting a longitudinal perspective and recognizing the developmental/evolutionary nature of effective research partnerships is important. Third, the need to know your partners implies an understanding of motivation, informal and formal organizational systems, and agency culture (including policies and procedures) among research partners. Finally, achieving clarity concerning financial arrangements, budgets, and contracts is a key process in creating and maintaining long-standing, effective research partnerships.

Adopting a Technology Exchange Perspective

Technology transfer usually describes the diffusion of innovations and the process of ensuring that the results of research studies are actually used in practice (Backer, 1995; Rogers, 1995). This translational research concept is generally unidirectional in nature, encompassing the transmission of knowledge and information from the developer or university to the user or community agencies and practitioners (Tenkasi & Mohrman, 1995). At best, only modest impacts on practice can be expected when technology transfer is unidirectional (Kanouse, Kallich, & Kahan, 1995).

The concept of *technology exchange* is adopted by the authors and their collaborators as it defines bi- and multidirectional interactions between partners.

Technology exchange incorporates three concepts that Gass (2005) identified as relevant to community–campus partnerships: the iterative nature of the collaborative relationship, an emphasis on processes that promote co-learning between partners, and "synergy" as a mechanism through which more can be accomplished by a partnership than by the partners as individuals. This perspective presumes that the exchanges help satisfy goals and objectives of the partners and are mutually satisfying as a result. It also presumes that collaborators (academic researchers and community practitioners) share an appreciation of the democratic, "equivalent voice" processes of interaction and decision making that define true collaborations (Uehara et al., 1996).

Technology exchange opportunities are characterized as dialogues in which university researchers learn from "real-world" practitioners and programs at the same time that community-based practitioners are acquiring knowledge, skills, and insights developed through interaction with the researchers. These types of exchanges shape the types of questions and research methodologies, making the research results more relevant to community practitioners. Concurrently, the exchanges facilitate the development and implementation of better quality research by encouraging feasible and context-appropriate participant recruitment, instrumentation, and design procedures (Rosen & Proctor, 2003). In the long run, the social work profession can be moved forward through research that tests the *effectiveness* of interventions in diverse, real-world circumstances after their *efficacy* in controlled clinical settings has been established.

It is critical to university–community partnership that all participants recognize the value of the differing expertise that each brings to the relationship (Thomas, 2002). Our community partners relate past unfortunate experiences with university "partners" who had little interaction with them during project conceptualization or development. Others report their experiences with university "experts" who tell them what to do or how they should do things. In addition to feeling that their own hard-earned experiences have been "disrespected" and invalidated, they also note that the expertise is useless to them without having been tailored to their real-world, unique situations and constraints. Similarly, our university partners have sometimes encountered community partners who hold unrealistic research expectations that cannot reasonably be fulfilled

(for example, helping prove a cherished position or providing money for services).

Technology exchange can be operationalized through regular consultation between university and community partners. One model involves university scientists and community practitioners consulting together to create clinical protocols to be implemented and studied (Sobell, 1996). In our four-year Temporary Assistance for Needy Families substance abuse services evaluation project (Project MATE), social work researchers and practitioners collaborated side by side to design, implement, reassess, and continuously modify the project design, measures, data collection, procedures, and intervention approaches. Community partners were involved at the beginning, middle, and end of the project, including development of final reports, conference presentations, and publications. Working as teams to provide workshops and conference presentations encouraged practitioners to integrate research evidence with clinical practice toward the goal of achieving evidence-informed practice (Bilsker & Goldner, 2000; Fraser, 2003). In effect, these technology exchange processes became multidirectional, "hands-on" experiences for the university researchers and agency-based social work partners.

Adopting a Longitudinal Perspective on Collaborative Relationships

Effective university–community research partnerships evolve through a series of successes over time. For example, Safe At Home, a five-year federally funded intimate partner violence prevention project, was conducted in partnership with a community-based agency whose purpose is to address the needs of underserved women. This large-scale project was developed on the heels of three prior small-scale collaborative efforts. Subsequently, we partnered again on Heart to Heart, a five-year federally funded HIV risk-reduction project for women with alcohol or substance abuse problems. The project teams are staffed by both university and agency personnel who hold parallel positions in their respective settings. The investigators are university social work faculty members and the project coordinator is a clinician employed by the community agency. Project screeners, assessors, and therapists are employed either by the university or by the community agency, resulting in a hybrid entity and bidirectional learning. Community agency social workers have been trained in empirically supported, cutting-edge approaches that

The development of effective research collaborations requires long sequences of mutually rewarding and satisfactory interactions over significant time periods.

they can transfer to other segments of their agency programming; the agency benefits by having this sort of staff development and training funded by the project budget. Presence of agency staff on the project teams results in increased external validity of the research, as methods of project implementation are worked out among the whole integrated team. Commitment of the agency and practitioners is greater than it would be if research activities were simply conducted at their site by university staff with a university agenda. Longitudinally, the early successes of collaborating on smaller research projects allowed both the university and community partners to learn about each other, to develop effective mechanisms for working together, to experience the rewards and challenges of collaboration, and to develop trust in each other. The development of effective research collaborations requires long sequences of mutually rewarding and satisfactory interactions over significant time periods.

All too often scientists encounter distrust and suspicion of research from agencies and social workers in practice. Our agency partners have reported several unfortunate experiences with university researchers who conducted "hit and run," "smash and grab," or "parachute" studies. The negative result on the university–agency relationship is that these experiences leave agency partners feeling violated, used, and robbed. These sentiments most likely arise when the community partner's primary role in research is unidirectional; for example, if community-based partners are only giving access to study participants or providing data to a university researcher, they believe that the university researcher leaves the agency and staff no wiser or better as a result of everyone's efforts (Thomas, 2002). A significant opportunity for experiencing the potential mutual benefits of the research endeavor and its outcomes is lost in these instances. A longitudinal perspective involves engaging and investing in professional development and education activities that contribute to agency staff expanding their own research competency, confidence, commitment, and capacities, which

can be generalized to aspects of agency programming beyond the collaborative partnership (Austin et al., 2005).

By adopting a longitudinal perspective toward university–community partnerships, we have seen our partners become advocates for the research center (for example, speaking on behalf of the center at a university Regents’ meeting, writing letters of support for grant proposals) and center staff members reciprocate by attending agency fundraising functions, addressing their boards, and participating in their media publicity events. Clearly, it is critical that the series of exchanges be mutually beneficial and respectful, allowing both sides to work in ways that are of mutual interest and provide benefits to the researcher and practitioner partners alike.

Knowing Your Partners

Several valuable principles are related to “knowing your partners.” It is important for both university and community-based collaborators to understand the roles played by motivation, organizational systems, and agency culture in successful research partnerships.

Motivation. One of the many ways that university–community research collaborations can get derailed arises from a failure to recognize why each is engaged in the relationship in the first place. According to Pardasani (2005), there is some debate in the literature concerning what motivates collaborative research efforts, including funding enticements, civic philosophy and commitment, and anticipation of institutional benefit. Reid and Vianna (2001) suggested that community partners are often motivated to collaborate when researchers can bring services, expertise that is needed, and prestige to the partnership, but fiscal considerations may become predominant. Similarly, Straub et al. (2007) discussed the importance of providing “deliverables” to motivate community partners to engage in the research relationship. In our experience, several community partners identified the need for an alcohol- and drug-related community resource guide that our university team was able to collaboratively develop and deliver. Not only was the practitioners’ need attended to through the outcome, but the experience of working together to develop the resource was an important relationship-building process that positively affected the initiation of several subsequent collaborations.

Our team of university researchers engage in research collaborations because research is what they do—for both tangible university-related rewards (for example, enhanced reputation, promotion, funding support) and intangible rewards (for example, developing expertise, intellectual challenge, a creative outlet). Community agencies generally participate for very different reasons. Their involvement in research is often related to the survival or viability of the agency. They may participate as a requirement of continued funding; because they believe that the results will help bring in more dollars and support; to help recruit more clients; to support their delivery of better, new, or expanded services; or to seek concrete answers to specific social work questions or problems. Knowing *why* each partner is involved in the collaboration is important in predicting *how* each will participate in developing a collaborative working relationship.

One common motivation is the desire to bring improved social work services to a particular population. It is not necessary that everyone have the same motivations, but it is important that disparate motivations be recognized, understood, and respected. Without such acknowledgment, it becomes difficult to design strategies to satisfy as many of the distinct needs or desires as possible. The importance of this lesson became clear in work on a multisite project that funded intervention services in exchange for collection of outcome data. The staff members were highly committed to providing the services and followed the treatment protocol (which they had helped to develop) with great fidelity. However, they were not uniformly committed to data collection (although they had helped design the instruments and procedures) because they did not see an immediate benefit for their clients. As a result, they were unreliable in collecting quality data. An education solution was adopted, which involved having the agency staff serve as educators to the research team through a series of focus group sessions designed to identify agency-specific questions that the research might help to answer. When convergence around possible research questions was achieved, subsequent focus group sessions helped to identify procedures and mechanisms that would facilitate the collection and timely transmission of valid data without impeding the primary service-delivery mission. Unique solutions had to be created for each program in the multisite study, seeking “goodness of fit” with staff personalities, incentives for quality data, resources

for organizing paperwork, and existing agency procedures.

Organizational Systems. Knowledge of formal and informal organizational systems is invaluable to collaboration because partners may mistakenly attribute observed behaviors to characteristics of individuals rather than organizational or system influences on behavior. Knowledge of organizational systems also helps in identifying the individuals who are best positioned for effectiveness in different functions essential to the collaboration. When partners understand each others' organizational level of influence, they can develop better attributions about each other and make better decisions about structuring the collaboration. For example, a project to help address comorbid HIV risk and substance use for people with serious mental illness, the ARRIVE Project, was well rewarded for expending effort in identifying and collaborating with key gatekeepers in the agency. The individuals who could control the project's actual day-to-day implementation, such as an on-site supervisor and a clinic receptionist, were far more instrumental allies in promoting action and minimizing complications than were more remote formal leaders such as the agency director or board members. In this functional relationship, the agency gatekeepers took into consideration the needs of the university researchers and elected to participate in collaborative creative problem-solving strategies, which resulted in the lowest costs and highest benefits to the collaboration.

Although it is important to understand a partner's organizational systems, it is also important to develop an awareness and understanding of their contextual constraints. University-based collaborators who work with nonprofit agencies need to be aware of the agencies' dependence on public opinion and reputation and that these partners may be in competition with others among the university's collaborators for donations and access to limited local funding. University-based social work researchers may find it necessary to participate in community-based social work coalitions as a means of strengthening the partnerships, while at the same time preserving scientific integrity of the projects. For example, in Project MATE, the state legislature and regulatory agencies attempted to use the project outcome data to determine which participant programs would and would not be reimbursable. One strategy of the partnership was to maintain their integrity as a coalition by only releasing outcome data from the

group as a whole (versus on an agency-by-agency basis). In addition, the university-community collaboration team was active in meeting with state regulators and interpreting data from the group of agencies, practicing and learning new approaches to effecting policy-practice change based on empirical social work data. As another example, the Safe At Home Project, was made possible because the four major domestic violence agencies and the university social workers acted together as a single, combined, coordinated coalition in soliciting funding and implementing the project. The partners worked together toward the common goal of bringing new service dollars to the community and shared equally in the reputation "boost" of being associated with the scientific process and products of the collaboration.

Agency Culture. It is important to understand the role that agency cultures play in university-community collaborative partnerships. For example, timelines are a significant cultural dimension along which community- and university-based social workers differ dramatically. Our agency-based social work partners often operate on a more exacting timeline than university researchers; what seems like rapid turnaround to university personnel seems plodding to community partners. This leads to large differences in opinion concerning what is feasible (for example, submitting a competitive grant proposal in only 10 days versus three months) and in expectations around the timing of feedback and rewards (for example, waiting four months for manuscript review with a journal is either relatively quick or ridiculously slow, depending on your cultural perspective).

Another cultural difference that affects university-community collaborations relates to communication styles and tools. University personnel may be far more technologically literate and resourced than their community partners. Successful collaborations need to rely on the "lowest common denominator" of technology for effective communications to occur. Many of our collaborating partners lack access to technologies that are compatible with ours and necessary to support our shared work. For example, both the Safe at Home and the Project MATE collaborations were hindered by a lack of computers and Internet access in many of the participating community agencies. This dictated data collection with paper-and-pencil measures, rather than procedures preferred by the university researchers. With other projects (for example, Heart to Heart

and the Center for Addiction and Behavioral Health Research's hospital-based clinical trials unit), the computers operated by our community partners run on very different and incompatible communication, security, and database operating systems. Many of our collaborating partners do not know how to use our computing systems, nor do we know how to use theirs. It has been necessary for us to offer equipment, technology support, and staff development sessions around computer applications related to specific collaborative efforts.

Learning styles also may differ markedly between university and community-based social workers, resulting in significant disparities in communicating and understanding. For example, our university researchers communicate more comfortably with quantitative data than our partners, and prefer information to be presented numerically rather than visually. Our community partners generally prefer visual, graphic presentation of information (for example, pie charts, simple bar graphs). Some of our partnerships have experienced notable benefit from personalized discussions about learning and problem-solving styles and their potential impact on partnerships based on mutual respect and understanding. Knowing how to respond and relate to individuals with different styles is valuable, especially if research partners are to evolve beyond negative attributions when situations of "misfit" arise.

Because effective longitudinal university–community collaborations are built on mutual trust and respect (Gass, 2005), it is important for university and community personnel to know how to portray the relationship to outsiders. As social workers, we are used to thinking about client confidentiality; however, we may forget that our research partners also deserve the same respect. All partners need to exercise discretion in what is said about observations and experiences in interactions with each other; imprudent remarks have a way of causing great harm, polluting the collaborative relationship. Partners need to feel safe in the relationship and need to know that respect from team members is real and authentic, as communities are "small worlds"—the local geographical region, the research community, and the community of service provider agencies and professionals. It is critical that respect and confidentiality issues be addressed in "safe" venues with members from both sides of the partnership.

An additional concern is ensuring the physical safety of project personnel and equipment in the

community. Coulton and Korbin (2006) briefly discussed this issue in the context of an ethnographic household study. As university staff members become increasingly familiar with the community areas in which their partners are located, they become "better versed in the actual versus supposed dangers" (p. 413). Community agency personnel can be particularly strong mentors around personal and property safety for university partners, as they routinely live with and adapt to these circumstances. In recruiting and retaining university staff for research and training at community sites, it is important to be sure that their safety concerns are openly addressed and that agency members are engaged in university staff development sessions to teach safe practices.

Effective university–community collaborations require of the parties some knowledge of each others' relevant institutional policies and procedures. In several of our collaborative projects, university researchers and community-based team members have needed to learn about the administrative procedures, personnel or human resources policies, and procedures for interdepartmental coordination of each partner. Examples of issues that may provide a context for difficulties between agency and university social workers or project staff, and which should be addressed openly, are policies regarding holidays and awarding of vacation time; raises and merit pay; performance reviews; reviews of project protocols by multiple institutional review boards (IRBs); purchasing, travel, billing, and contracting policies; hours of operation and backup coverage; and coordination of research services at the community partner location.

Contracts and Budgets

Collaborative partnerships can be well served by the establishment of clear and unambiguous contracts or formal agreements, including well-developed budgets, in the context of developing clear lines of organization and management (Reid & Vianna, 2001). These types of preemptive agreements may range in complexity from a simple consulting arrangement based on a letter of understanding between an individual and an agency to a full-fledged contract (or subaward contract) between institutions. Regardless of agreement type, it is critical to establish who has the legitimate authority to enter into the agreement at both the university and the community partner sites, because those individuals actually conducting the work may not be so empowered. Regardless of

the agreement format, university and community partners need to establish a clear statement of the scope of work to be conducted and who is responsible for which aspects, as well as expected products and timelines for each research activity.

Issues of intellectual property rights require exploration and formal agreements as well. These are important in university systems and may include patents or copyrights. It should be specified up front exactly who can publish from the project and how due credit (including authorship and acknowledgments) will be ensured. Professional development opportunities should address the ethical aspects of using copyrighted materials in executing or marketing programs and projects and the conditions under which project materials can be used by partnership members. Other contracting topics to consider include conditions for termination of the partnership, conflict of interest, liability language, licensure, and agency-specific compliance certification or assurances (for example, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Environmental Protection Agency, drug-free workplace, and so forth). An authorized spokesperson for the partnership should be identified to address the media or to represent the partnership in reporting to any sponsors or funding agencies.

Budgeting and payment details should be agreed on in writing if money is involved in the research partnership. Dollar amounts to be transferred and payment schedules should be clearly delineated. It should also be made clear what happens to any equipment and supplies purchased for the partnership when the collaboration activities end. One budgeting factor that can become a cause of friction between university and community partners relates to the "cost return," "indirects," or "F&A" (facilities and administration) costs that are attached to budgets. One perspective expressed by some of our community partners is that these institutional monies come at the expense of their ability to provide more services to clients. From our university's perspective, these funds cover the institution's expenses related to the collaboration (that is, support for the IRB, administration of the agreements and contracts, use of university library and computing resources, and employment administration for university staff involved in the collaboration). Our experiences with these agreements lead us strongly to recommend routine (at least quarterly) conjoint review of the budget accounts as the collaboration progresses.

Not only does this regular monitoring process help develop timely awareness of problems, it also helps the partnership weather differences in billing and budget cycles across institutions.

CONCLUSION

Although building and sustaining effective university–community partnerships takes time and effort, investment in these collaborations holds many distinct advantages for social work researchers, practitioners, and the profession. Approaching collaborative research relationships from a longitudinal perspective allows partnerships to become more competitive for funding opportunities, especially where resources are restricted and competition is intense. Partners engaged in long-standing, effective exchange collaborations may be more able to respond quickly to a broader range of funding opportunities that arise, especially those with short windows of opportunity.

Understanding partner motivation; organizational systems and structures; and organizational culture and perspectives on research, service, and the "nuts and bolts" of conducting business can strengthen contributions and achievements of the partnership and ultimately lead to better research and its implementation. **SW**

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. M., Beck, B., Maurana, C. A., & Newton, G. (2004). Overcoming barriers to effective community-based participatory research in US medical schools. *Education for Health, 17*(2), 141–151.
- Austin, S. A., Briar-Lawson, K., King-Ingham, A., Spicer, J., & Davis, D. (2005). Role changes, learning enhancements and professional development through a university–school collaborative. *Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 8*(2/3), 84–97.
- Backer, T. E. (1995). Assessing and enhancing readiness for change: Implications for technology transfer. In T. E. Backer, S. L. David, & G. Soucy, (Eds.), *Reviewing the behavioral science knowledge base on technology transfer* (pp. 21–41). Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Bender, T. (Ed.). (1988). *The university and the city: From medieval origins to the present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bilsker, D., & Goldner, E. M. (2000). Teaching evidence-based practice in mental health. *Research on Social Work Practice, 10*, 664–669.
- Bowen, S., & Martens, P. J. (2006). A model for collaborative evaluation of university–community partnerships. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 60*, 902–907. doi: 10.1136/jech.2005.040881
- Coulton, C., & Korbin, J. (2006). Commentary. In L. B. Alexander & P. Solomon, (Eds.), *The research process in the human services: Behind the scenes* (pp. 408–415). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Currie, M., King, G., Rosenbaum, P., Law, M., Kertoy, M., & Specht, J. (2005). A model of impacts of research partnerships in health and social services. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 28*, 400-412.
- Delva, J. (2006). Greetings social work colleagues and friends of the profession [Editorial]. *Social Work, 51*, 5-7.
- Dluhy, M. J., & Kravitz, S. L. (1990). *Building coalitions in the human services*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fielden, S. J., Rusch, M. L., Masinda, M. T., Sands, J., Frankish, J., & Evoy, B. (2007). Key considerations for logic model development in research partnerships: A Canadian case study. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 30*(2), 115-124.
- Fraser, M. W. (2003). Intervention research in social work: A basis for evidence-based practice and practice guidelines. In A. Rosen & E. K. Proctor (Eds.), *Developing practice guidelines for social work intervention: Issues, methods, and research agenda* (pp. 17-35). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gass, E. (2005). The path to partnership: A new model for understanding university-community partnerships. *Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 8*(2/3), 12-23.
- Jason, L. A., Pokorny, S. B., Ji, P., & Kunz, C. (2005). Developing community-school-university partnerships to control youth access to tobacco. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 16*, 201-222.
- Kanouse, D. E., Kallich, J. D., & Kahan, J. P. (1995). Dissemination of effectiveness and outcomes research. *Health Policy, 34*(3), 167-192.
- Kavanagh, K. H. (1995). Collaboration and diversity in technology transfer. In T. E. Backer, S. L. David, & G. Soucy, (Eds.), *Reviewing the behavioral science knowledge base on technology transfer* (pp. 42-64). Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (2000). *Sixth report. Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world*. Retrieved from http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Kellogg/Kellogg2000_covenant.pdf
- Krieger, J., Allen, C., Cheadle, A., Ciske, S., Schier, J. K., Senturia, K., & Sullivan, M. (2002). Using community-based participatory research to address social determinants of health: Lessons learned from Seattle Partners for Healthy Communities. *Health Education & Behavior, 29*(3), 361-382.
- McKay, M. M. (2006). Commentary. In L. B. Alexander & P. Solomon, (Eds.), *The research process in the human services: Behind the scenes* (pp. 12-19). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Mizrahi, T., & Rosenthal, B. B. (1993). Managing dynamic tensions in social change coalitions. In T. Mizrahi & J. D. Morrison (Eds.), *Community organization and social administration: Advances, trends, and emerging principles* (pp. 11-30). New York: Haworth Press.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). (2003). *Handbook of accreditation* (3rd ed.). Chicago: The Higher Learning Commission.
- O'Fallon, L. R., & Dearth, A. (2002). Community-based participatory research as a tool to advance environmental health sciences. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 110*(Suppl. 2), 155-159.
- Pardasani, M. (2005). University-community collaborations: A case study of an effective partnership. *Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 8*(2/3), 64-72.
- Reid, P. T., & Vianna, E. (2001). Negotiating partnerships in research on poverty with community-based agencies. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 337-354.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). Diffusion of drug abuse prevention programs: Spontaneous diffusion, agenda setting, and reinvention. In T. E. Backer, S. L. David, & G. Soucy (Eds.), *Reviewing the behavioral science knowledge base on technology transfer* (pp. 90-105). Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Rosen, A., & Proctor, E. K. (2003). Practice guidelines and the challenge of effective practice. In A. Rosen & E. K. Proctor, (Eds.), *Developing practice guidelines for social work interventions: Issues, methods, and research agenda* (pp. 1-16). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sobell, L. C. (1996). Bridging the gap between scientists and practitioners: The challenge before us. *Behavior Therapy, 27*, 297-320.
- Straub, D. M., Deeds, B. G., Willard, N., Castor, J., Peralta, L., Francisco, V. T., Ellen, J., & the Adolescent Trials Network for HIV/AIDS Intervention. (2007). Partnership selection and formation: A case study of developing adolescent health community-researcher partnerships in fifteen U.S. communities. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 40*, 489-498.
- Takahashi, L. M., & Smutny, G. (2001). Collaboration among small, community-based organizations: Strategies and challenges in turbulent environments. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 21*, 141-153.
- Tenkasi, R. V., & Mohrman, S. A. (1995). Technology transfer as collaborative learning. In T. E. Backer, S. L. David, & G. Soucy (Eds.), *Reviewing the behavioral science knowledge base on technology transfer* (pp. 147-168). Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Thomas, V. (2002). Conducting research with community agencies: Meeting recruitment and collaboration challenges. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 28*(1), 9-14.
- Uehara, E. S., Sohng, S. S. L., Bending, R. L., Seyfried, S., Richey, C. A., Morelli, P., et al. (1996). Toward a values-based approach to multicultural social work research. *Social Work, 41*, 613-621.
- Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Gartlehner, G., Lohr, K. N., Griffith, D., et al. (2004). *Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence* (Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 99 AHRQ Publication 04-E022-2). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Audrey L. Begun, PhD, MSW is associate professor, College of Social Work, Ohio State University, 1947 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210; e-mail: begun.5@osu.edu. **Lisa K. Berger, PhD, MSW** is assistant professor, **Laura L. Otto-Salaj, PhD**, is assistant professor, and **Susan J. Rose, PhD, MSW** is associate professor, Department of Social Work, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Original manuscript received December 20, 2006
Final revision received January 16, 2008
Accepted August 28, 2008

Copyright of Social Work is the property of National Association of Social Workers and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.