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ABSTRACT

Academic-community partnerships (ACPs) are a means by which community-based organizations can implement their missions and programs of higher education can facilitate student educational objectives through real world learning experiences. Many ACPs are framed in the educational methodology, service-learning. Theoretical definitions of ACPs (as a type of inter-organizational relationship) describe them as relationships that are on-going, reciprocal and characterized by mutual trust and respect.

During the past 15 years, ACPs and service-learning have experienced a rapid growth in nursing education. Literature pertaining to ACPs in nursing education is largely anecdotal and concerns undergraduate nursing programs. There are few reports of research pertaining to ACPs, particularly those involving graduate nursing programs or community partners’ perspectives of their experiences in ACPs.

The purpose of this study was to explore community partners’ perspectives of partnership with a graduate nursing program. The grounded theory approach to qualitative research was used to answer research questions concerning the process of, and factors influencing, the partnerships.

The setting for the study was 17 organizations that have partnered with a graduate program of nursing as part of a project called, Community Engagement Through Service-Learning. Thirteen key contact persons from each partnership were each interviewed once. Additional data collection methods included field notes, a group meeting and member checking. Thirteen participants representing 14 partnerships participated in the study. Data analysis began with the initial interview. Techniques included open coding, constant
comparison, the Six C’s family of codes and memoing. Phases of data analysis included: Level I (Level I, II and III coding), Phase II (delimiting the theory) and Phase III (writing the theory). Accepted strategies to promote rigor were also employed: two rounds of member checking, peer review and maintaining an audit trail.

Twelve participants reported positive outcomes and satisfaction with the relationship. Nine had engaged in partnerships with one faculty member for one semester. Four had partnered with one faculty member for two to four semesters. Products of data analysis included: a summary of each interview, 20 categories, six concepts, and two constructs along with their associated properties; the basic social process i.e., Connecting for Partnership and a substantive, descriptive theory.

The partnerships in this sample were seen as being of two levels. Level I, Teaming, refers to the process, a sequence of five stages, which occurs over the course of one semester. Factors relevant to each stage were identified and include: commitment by all involved; a close, working relationship; consideration of each other’s culture; thorough, effective communication, and careful planning. Primary and secondary outcomes were identified for both participants and students. Level II, Sustaining, refers to on-going partnerships characterized by continuing commitment, shared goals, building on evaluation findings and mutual trust and respect.

The findings of this study supported the literature and identified several factors specific to partnerships with a graduate nursing program. Advantages and challenges unique to working with MSN students were discussed. Implications for direct relevance and transferability for professional nursing and other disciplines were described. Limitations related primarily to the use of grounded theory methods and directions for future quantitative and qualitative research were identified.
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SERVICE-LEARNING WITH A GRADUATE NURSING PROGRAM:

VOICES OF THE COMMUNITY

Chapter I

Introduction

The purpose of this grounded theory study was to examine the perspectives of community organizations (COs) regarding the process of partnership with a graduate nursing education program. The theoretical underpinnings were derived from Cruz and Giles' (2000) approach to examination of community perspectives of service-learning and Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, and Kerrigan's (2001) model for assessment of service-learning.

Methodological underpinnings of the study were based on Glaser and Strauss' Discovery of Grounded Theory method of qualitative research (1967). Data collection methods included semi-structured interviews with partner COs, field observation, and review of literature as indicated.

The following discussion will address the problem statement, purpose, questions, terms, theoretical and methodological underpinnings, assumptions, and significance for nursing.

Background

The Need for Inter-agency Collaboration

In recent years, COs concerned with promoting the health of populations and communities have faced increasingly limited financial and human resources while at the same time calls by national leaders and funding agencies for inter-disciplinary and inter-agency collaboration (Department of Health and Human Services, 2000). One response by these
organizations has been utilization of collaboration with other organizations in order to accomplish their missions and goals (Pilot Study participants A, B, and C, personal communication, 2002).

The concept of inter-agency collaboration for community health has been frequently studied as to both outcomes and process. Several frameworks have been published which describe factors influencing inter-agency collaboration and research has examined the extent of collaboration among agencies. Examples include Prolivka, 1996; Scott and Thurston, 1997; and Lasker, Weiss, and Miller, 2001. Although the settings and influencing factors varied from study to study, factors common to all included: mutual respect and trust among partners; shared aims; and clear, continuous communication.

The models and research findings referred to above are discussed in detail in Chapter II and, using Glaser and Strauss’ approach to development of grounded theory, were reconsidered during the data analysis phase of this project.

**Academic-Community Partnerships**

Programs of health professions education, including graduate nursing education, have been called upon to provide increased student learning experiences geared toward population-focused, health promotion and disease prevention in community-based, inter-disciplinary settings and to promote student commitment to civic engagement (Pew Health Professions Commission, 1998; American Association of Colleges of Nursing, 1999; and Battistoni, 2001). Academic-community partnerships (ACPs) and service-learning are innovative strategies by which COs and programs of graduate nursing can respond to these challenges. ACPs allow COs to utilize community assets to build community capital, enhance the quality and quantity of their services, and improve the health of their clients and community (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993 and Hancock, 2001). For programs of graduate nursing
education, ACPs offer a means to implement service-learning, provide “real-life” experiences in inter-disciplinary, community based settings and promote student appreciation of the value of community service.

Service-learning, an educational methodology with roots in experiential education, appeared in the literature in the late 1970’s (Sigmon, 1979). Its integration in higher education dramatically increased during the mid-1980’s. Sigmon (1979) suggested three principles for service-learning and basic guidelines for their implementation. In the late 1980’s, a group of early leaders in service-learning met at Wingspread to develop a research agenda and the Principles for Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning (Wingspread Principles) (Honnet and Poulson, 1988). The ten principles emphasize reciprocity between the academic and community partners, programs designed to meet community needs, and mutual planning and evaluation (Honnet and Poulson, 1988).

The service-learning movement spread to health professions education during the 1990’s. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), a national organization founded in 1996 to foster collaboration among academic and community-based organizations, has been a strong leader. CCPH articulated nine principles “to help facilitate and strengthen partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions” (Seifer and Maurana, 2000, p. 7). Exemplary partnerships were described as reciprocal, collaborative relationships guided by “mutually agreed-upon mission, values, goals and measurable outcomes” (Seifer and Maurana, 2000, p. 7). The Sigmon (1979), Wingspread (Honnet and Pauson, 1988), and CCPH (2000) principles may be congruent with factors influencing inter-agency collaboration.

As integration of service-learning has expanded into the academic disciplines, leaders in the movement have continued to suggest directions for future research (Howard, Gelmon,
and Giles, 2000). One direction identified in 1991, 1997, and again in 2000 is the need to move beyond study of the impact of service-learning on students to addressing the perspectives of multiple stakeholders, including community partners and their clients. However, unlike research in the broader field of inter-agency collaboration, service-learning research has focused heavily on the academic process and outcomes (Cruz and Giles, 2000). The clear need for service-learning research geared to the community perspective is examined in this study in terms of graduate nursing education. In the next four sections, the reader will find an overview of the state of current research regarding the community perspective of service-learning examined, in increasingly narrow scope, from the general area of higher education to the specific area of this study, graduate nursing education.

Higher Education (Excluding Health Professions Education)

In Fall, 2000, The Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning published a special issue, Strategic Directions for Service-Learning Research. In their article, "Where's the Community in Service-Learning Research?", Cruz and Giles (2000) reported their meta-analysis of available literature on the topic. They noted the lack of existing models for, and rigorous research designed to examine, the community partner's perspective. In calling for scholarly work to address this gap, Cruz and Giles (2000) emphasized the importance of incorporating the key service-learning principle of reciprocity between partners and proposed a four-part model for assessing community partners' perspectives of service-learning.

In 2001, Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, and Kerrigan published their handbook Assessing Service-Learning and Civic Engagement. The assessment model was based on that developed to evaluate the Health Professions Schools in Service to the Nation (HPSISN) and several other large-scale service-learning projects. The importance of a multi-constituency
approach, including community partners, to assessment of service-learning was again emphasized.

*Health Professions Education (Excluding Nursing Education).*

In 1998, Gelmon et al. published the final evaluation report of the 1996-1998 national multi-site demonstration project, Health Professions Schools In Service To The Nation (HPSISN). The authors stressed the importance of a multi-constituency approach to assessment that included community partner agencies and reported their findings of feedback from community partners (Gelmon et al., 1998).

In 2001, Wolff and Maurana noted several studies had examined factors influencing ACPs from the academic perspective but there was a lack of knowledge about the community partner's perspective. They reported findings of their study of community partners' perspectives of ACPs involving academic health centers.

*Undergraduate Nursing Education*

Undergraduate nursing was early to embrace service-learning and many faculty have published reports of experiences. A comprehensive examination of available, published literature revealed 22 articles and one book on ACPs and service-learning in nursing (Note: the articles and book are indicated in the References with a "*"). Like the higher education literature, reports of experiences with service-learning and ACPs in undergraduate nursing education were largely anecdotal and described the authors' experiences in one or a few courses. Six of the publications reported research studies of varying rigor (Hales, 1997; Simoni and McKinney, 1998; Schneiderman, Jordan-Marsh, and Bates-Jensen, 1998; White, Festa, Allocca, and Abraham, 1999; Petersen and Schaeffer, 1999; and Schaeffer, Mather, and Gustafson, 2000). Although many articles had multiple authors, only two were co-
authored by both a faculty member and a community partner (Schaffer, et al., 2000 and Corbett, Setter, and Rappuchi, 2000). The remainder was authored only by faculty.

A number of articles acknowledged the principles of exemplary service-learning and ACPs. However, the nursing literature clearly focused on the academic process and student outcomes. Several reports made no mention of feedback from the community partner (Hales, 1997; Callister and Hobbins-Garbett, 2000; Simoni and McKinney, 1998). The remaining reports mentioned benefits to the community partner; however, just four discussed their methods (Schneiderman, et al., 1998; Petersen and Schaeffer, 1999; Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington, 1999; White, et al., 1999).

Graduate Nursing Education

Six publications were found that reported experiences of graduate nursing education with ACPs and service-learning (Logsdon and Ford, 1998; Horak, O'Leary, and Carlson, 1998; Scheideberg, 1999; Lutz, Herrick, and Lehman, 2001; Cohen and Milone-Nuzzo, 2001; and Narsavage, Lindell, Chen, Savrin, and Duffy, 2003). One of the six (Narsavage et. al, 2003) reported findings of a research study designed to examine a program-wide experience. Analysis of the graduate nursing literature paralleled that of undergraduate nursing as to: use of a service-learning framework and focus on the academic perspective. Just three of the graduate nursing articles reported feedback from the community partner/s and one indicated methods used.

Problem Statement

Hallmarks of successful, exemplary service-learning practice and academic-community partnerships include reciprocity; mutual trust and respect; shared aims; activities designed to meet community-identified needs; clear, continuous communication; and beneficial outcomes for both partners. There is a growing body of literature in higher
education, including graduate and undergraduate nursing as well as other health disciplines, that documents processes and positive outcomes for academic partners. A few models of community partnerships and assessment of service-learning have been described.

However, theory development and research concerning the perspective of community partners' is lacking at all levels of higher education and graduate nursing education in particular. Much of the limited information available is anecdotal in nature and one cannot assume it has relevance for service-learning and ACPs involving graduate nursing education.

Graduate students in nursing have specific learning needs and bring unique professional skills and life experiences to partnership with a CO that are very different from those of undergraduate nursing students or students of other disciplines. It cannot be assumed that the few available frameworks have relevance for ACPs and service-learning in graduate nursing education. As Glaser and Strauss noted in their book, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*,

Substantive theory faithful to the empirical situation cannot, we believe, be formulated merely by applying a few ideas from an established formal theory to the substantive area. To be sure one goes out and studies an area with a particular... perspective, and with a focus, a general question, or a problem in mind. But he can (and we believe should) also study an area without a preconceived theory that dictates, prior to the research, "relevancies" in concepts and hypotheses (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 33).

*Purpose*

Further research and theory development was needed concerning community partner's perspectives of participation in ACPs involving graduate nursing education. The purpose of the study was to contribute to meeting this need by examining community health
organizations' perspectives as to the process of participation in academic-community health partnerships involving graduate nursing education.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. How do community organizations describe the process of participation in an academic-community partnership with a graduate nursing program?

2. What factors do community organizations identify as influencing partnership with a graduate nursing program?

Definitions of Terms

1. Community organization (CO) – A community-based organization that has an interest in promotion of community health and prevention of disease. These efforts may be primary (contributing directly to the organization's mission) or secondary (creating conditions which facilitate achieving the organization's mission). Examples of COs include: voluntary health and human service organizations, governmental agencies (health and human service, police, fire/rescue, and jails), houses of faith, museums, and educational institutions such as pre-school and kindergarten -grade 12.

2. Partnership: “A close mutual cooperation between parties having common interests, responsibilities, privileges and power” (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2001).

3. Academic-community partnership (ACP) - A working relationship of one program or course in higher education and one CO conducted within the framework of service-learning and in which each partner benefits from the arrangement. Collaboration and partnership are considered to be synonymous (adapted from Rothman, 1998, p. 202).
4. Service-Learning – service-learning is "a structured learning experience that combines community service with explicit learning objectives, preparation and reflection. Students participating in service-learning activities are not only expected to provide direct community service but also to learn about the context in which the service is provided, and understand the connection between the service and their academic course work" (Connors and Seifer, 1997, p. 13).

Theoretical Underpinnings

The theoretical underpinnings for the study were derived from the perspectives of research in service-learning and interagency collaboration for community health. The design of the study was not shaped around a particular conceptual framework as: (a) no framework specific to academic-community health partnerships has been proposed and (b) the purpose of grounded theory research is not to verify an existing theory but to generate a substantive theory based on the study findings. Conceptual frameworks that may have relevance to this study are briefly presented below and discussed in more detail in Chapter II.

Interagency Collaboration for Community Health

Considerable theory development and research has been done in the area of interagency collaboration for community health. Three conceptual frameworks of interagency collaboration were assessed as to their relevance to the study: Prolivka’s (1996) Conceptual Framework for Interagency Collaboration, Scott and Thurston’s Framework for the Development of Community Health Agency Partnerships (1997); and Lasker, Weiss, and Miller’s (2001) Framework for Partnership Synergy. Each tested the model at least once. The partnerships examined varied widely among the studies as to purpose, structure, number of partners, and duration. Although there are some differences among the models as to factors found to influence interagency collaboration for community health, there are also several
similarities: a common goal, plan and structure agreed upon by all partners; a reciprocal relationship with mutual trust and respect; continuous, effective communication; and program evaluation. These factors are congruent with the principles of partnership referred to earlier. The models and their associated research as well as an additional research study are discussed in depth in Chapter II.

_Service-Learning_

Few conceptual frameworks for design, implementation and assessment of service-learning and ACPs have been described in the literature and none were found specific to service-learning and ACPs in graduate nursing education or undergraduate nursing education.

Cruz and Giles (2000) noted the lack of rigorous service-learning research on the community perspective of service-learning and suggested the reasons were "complex with political, intellectual and practical dimensions" (p. 28). Their proposed model addresses this issue by: (a) making the partnership the unit of analysis, (b) focusing on assets, (c) incorporating the principles of service-learning and (d) using methods of action research. Cruz and Giles cite two examples of efforts incorporating these elements: Gelmon et al.’s assessment model and the 3-I Model being revised and tested at Vanderbilt University by Melinda Clark.

The Cruz and Giles' (2000) model and the model and detailed procedures reported by Gelmon et al. (2001) are discussed in further detail in Chapter II and elements of both were integrated into the design and implementation (constant comparative analysis and theoretical sampling) of the study.

Jensen and Royeen (2001) described their experience with their adaptation of the “Integration Matrix of Konrad” for formative assessment and analysis of academic-community partnerships. The model has four dimensions (partnership, management, finance,
and project goals and outcomes) and was used in a federally funded, community-based clinical training program involving students in occupational and physical therapy. Jensen and Royeen found three assumptions emerged from use of the Integration Matrix Model: (a) community is central, (b) the dimensions of the model overlap, are interdependent and significantly co-effect one another, (c) the operation of dimensions is not linear, as posed by Konrad, but nonlinear and fluid as consistent with chaos theory (Jensen and Royeen, 2001).

**Theoretical Assumptions**

This research study was guided using the following assumptions: (a) Partnerships are an effective means for community health organizations to build on community assets, develop community capital and enhance their services; (b) Service-learning is an educational method by which graduate nursing faculty can enhance the quality and diversity of learning experiences and provide students with opportunities for engaged citizenship; (c) ACPs are a type of partnership which may involve community health organizations and schools of health professions education, specifically graduate programs in nursing; (d) ACPs should strive to exemplify best practices in service-learning and principles of successful partnerships.

**Methodological Underpinnings**

Qualitative research is appropriate when little known about a topic and the grounded theory method of qualitative research has utility when the researcher seeks to understand a particular process, in this case service-learning and academic-community health partnerships (Hutchinson, 1993).

The discovery of grounded theory approach to qualitative research was first described by Glaser and Strauss in 1967. Subsequent, separate publications by Glaser and Strauss and others have further developed and refined their initial work (Glaser, 1978; Glaser, 1992; Strauss and Corbin, 1997; Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Dey, 1999; and Charmaz, 2000).
Grounded theorists search for, and seek to understand and predict, social processes present in human interaction. There are two types of grounded theories: formal and substantive. Formal theories address a conceptual level of inquiry while substantive theories are generated for a specific, circumscribed, and empirical area of inquiry. Substantive theories can be used to build formal theories (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Grounded theory research is guided by the following assumptions:

1. “People do, in fact, order and make sense of their environment, although their world may appear disordered or nonsensical to observers.

2. Reality is a social construct.

3. Each group shares a specific social psychological problem that is not necessarily articulated.

4. When a previously unarticulated problem and its resultant basic social psychological process are uncovered and conceptualized, one can explain and predict behavioral variation in a group” (Hutchinson, 1993, pp. 186-187)

Significance For Nursing

Specific Relevance

The findings of the study have specific relevance for professional nurses employed by the COs involved in the study as well as the graduate nurse educators and graduate nursing students who partner with them. Factors influencing collaboration of COs with the program of graduate nursing education are discussed.

Transferability

In qualitative research the external validity of the findings cannot be specified. Therefore, decisions concerning utility of the findings beyond the study setting are made by persons interested in making the transfer. The likelihood of transferability of the findings was
enhanced through use of techniques such as the constant comparative method of data analysis and thick descriptions (Glaser and Strauss, 1967 and Lincoln and Guba, 1993).

The findings of this study have relevance for professional nurses practicing in COs and for graduate nurse educators in other institutions in four ways. First, professional nurses practicing in COs will be informed that ACPs are a strategy to enhance social capital, build on community assets, compensate for limited resources and respond to national calls for inter-agency collaboration. Additionally, ACPs allow nurses specializing in community/public health (C/PHN) to implement their roles and functions as described by the American Nurses Association (Council of Community Health Nurses, 1985; Quad Council on Public Health Nursing, 1999). For example: (a) one of the essential public health services is: "Mobilize community partnerships to identify and solve health problems" (Association of State and Territorial Directors of Nursing, 2000), (b) the second tenet of public health nursing states: "The health of the people is most effectively promoted and protected through collaboration with members of other professions and organizations" (Quad Council on Public Health Nursing, 1999, p. 4) and (c) Standard VIII of the Standards of Community Health Nursing Practice (1985, p. 14) states: "The nurse collaborates with other health care providers, professionals, and community representatives in assessing, planning, implementing, and evaluating programs for community health".

Second, the findings of this study alert faculty in graduate nursing education to ACPs as a strategy to: (a) implement service-learning; (b) answer calls for increased student learning in community-based, interdisciplinary settings; (c) provide student opportunities for engaged citizenship; and (d) expose students of all advanced practice nursing specialties to population-focused health promotion and disease prevention and other aspects of public health practice. ACPs may also allow graduate nursing faculty to promote the missions of
their institution pertaining to service and offer rich opportunities for faculty practice and scholarship.

Third, the findings of this study may be used to educate practitioners in COs and graduate nursing education as to the principles of service-learning and ACPs and emphasize the importance of assuring that: community-identified needs are being met, the relationship is reciprocal, and partnership activities mutually planned, implemented, and evaluated.

Finally, this study informs those involved in ACPs of factors described by community partners as influencing such partnerships and suggests strategies for assuring their success.

Summary

In their report of the 1989 Wingspread Conference on Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning (p.1), Honnet and Poulson (1988) noted: “Service, combined with learning, adds value to each and transforms both”. ACPs can be a powerful means to achieve the goals of graduate nursing educators and practitioners in COs. However, both partners have a responsibility to assure the principles and best practices of service-learning and ACPs are being met. There is dearth of published research concerning partnerships between programs of graduate nursing education and COs, particularly from the community perspective. This study used the grounded theory method of qualitative research to examine the experiences of community agencies with the process of partnership with a graduate nursing program.
Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Introduction

This research study examined the perspectives of community organizations (COs) about the process of partnership with a graduate nursing program. Conceptual underpinnings were derived from Cruz and Giles' (2000) model for examination of community perspectives of service-learning and Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, and Kerrigan's (2001) model for assessment of service-learning. Methodological underpinnings of the study were based on Glaser and Strauss' Grounded Theory (1967).

The purposes of this chapter are to: (a) discuss current knowledge concerning academic-community partnerships (ACPs) in graduate nursing education and related topics, (b) identify gaps in knowledge concerning CO's participation in partnerships with graduate nursing education, (c) discuss the secondary literature review, (d) describe the Grounded Theory method of qualitative research, and (d) describe the author's experience with ACPs.

Process for Review of Literature Pertaining to ACPs

According to Hutchinson (1993), the grounded theory researcher accesses the literature twice during the study: (a) prior to data collection to discover sensitizing concepts and gaps in knowledge (primary literature review) and (b) at the end of data analysis to discover literature that supports, illuminates, or extends the proposed theory (secondary literature review).

The primary literature review included all information believed to have some bearing on the topic. Because very little literature on collaboration between COs and graduate
programs of nursing was found, the review of literature began with examination of interorganizational relationships and proceeded through narrower topics more closely related to the topic of interest.

In keeping with the approaches to data collection used in Grounded Theory research methods (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), the professional literature was reviewed using a variety of sources: (a) Electronic data bases; (b) reference lists provided in books, articles, and conferences attended by the researcher; (c) two meta-analyses of service-learning research, one general and one specific to community agencies; (d) presentations at conferences attended by the researcher and (e) professional organizations including Community-Campus Partnerships for Health and Campus Compact. Electronic searches utilized MEDLINE, CINAHL and PSYCHinfo with the key words: community-campus partnerships, collaboration, partnerships, and service learning.

The secondary literature review was undertaken following completion of data analysis and examined theoretical and research literature identified by the researcher after the primary literature review. The process was essentially the same as that described above. However, the focus was narrowed to literature relevant to the descriptive theory which had emerged from the results.

Rationale for Collaboration for Community Health

The academic-community partnership (ACP) movement in health professions education began in the mid-1990's and continued to gain momentum through the time of this study. ACPs were the outgrowth of national trends and forces affecting both COs and programs of health professions education. Partnerships between programs of undergraduate nursing education and COs appeared early in the ACP movement and are quite common today, whereas partnerships involving graduate nursing education appeared later and remain
less common. Literature concerning ACPs with programs of graduate nursing education is sparse, largely anecdotal or descriptive and focused on the academic perspective. This examines the rationale for collaboration between COs and programs of graduate nursing education from both perspectives.

Community Organizations

For the purposes of this paper, a community organization (CO) is defined as an organization that has an interest in promotion of community health and prevention of disease. These efforts may be primary (contributing directly to the organization's mission) or secondary (creating conditions which facilitate achieving the organization's mission).

Examples of COs include: voluntary health and human service organizations, governmental agencies (health and human service, police, and fire/rescue), houses of faith, museums, and educational institutions such as pre-school and kindergarten (K) to grade 12.

COs have long been encouraged to collaborate with other organizations. Inter-agency collaboration may allow agencies to coordinate, integrate and/or enhance services, reduce duplication of effort; engage in community asset building, and achieve mutual goals each organization could not accomplish alone (Bloxham, 1996; Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993; and Lasker, Weiss, and Miller, 2001). Today, as COs attempt to ameliorate or cope with racial and ethnic disparities in health status and increasingly limited financial and human resources, inter-agency collaboration continues to be seen as a desirable endeavor (Koplan and Fleming, 2000). The United States (US) Department of Health and Human Services' (DHHS) Healthy People 2010 (2000) identifies community collaboration as a core strategy for achieving its' health promotion and disease prevention objectives, those funding COs seek evidence of collaborative efforts in project proposals, and some government-funded health and human service programs are mandated to collaborate (Bloxham, 1996).
Building Community - The Role of Community Organizations

Hancock (2001, p. 276) described four types of community capital, or forms of community wealth:

1. Human capital - healthy well educated, skilled, innovative and creative people who are engaged in their communities and participate in governance.

2. Natural capital - high environmental quality, healthy ecosystems, sustainable resources and the conservation of habitat, wildlife, and biodiversity.

3. Social capital - the "glue" that holds communities together. It includes both informal social networks and more formal social development programs.

4. Economic capital - the (financial) means by which we can attain many of our human and social goals.

Community building, also known as community development, refers to "community members working together to achieve long-term benefits for the community and an overall stronger sense of community" (Rothman, Anderson, and Schaffer, 1999). Community building, community health and community capital are closely linked. The goals of community development include building the four types of community capital and achieving optimal health for the community and its citizens. Yet, human, social and economic capital cannot be built and community development cannot occur without healthy citizens.

Inter-agency collaboration is also a key strategy in the asset or capacity-building approach to community development. In many instances during past years, community development was an activity undertaken by professionals from outside the community who identified the community's problems and needs and took action to remediate them. Community development was done "to" or "for" the community. Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) believe this approach can have numerous negative effects on the community,
principally "residents think of themselves and their neighbors as fundamentally deficient, victims incapable of taking charge of their lives and of their community's future" (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993, p. 4). They advocated a "community-as-partner" approach to community building that empowers communities and is "asset-based, internally focused, and relationship driven" (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993, p. 9).

Asset-building strategies include: (a) collaborative efforts among the community's groups and organizations; (b) Door-to-door canvassing to identify, in creative yet simple and inexpensive ways, what individual citizens and families can and will contribute to their community; (c) developing a community asset map by diagramming the community's assets and potential linkages and (d) board-type games to educate participants in the process (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993).

Public health is most often thought of as a specific profession. However, all disciplines that work to promote community health are, in some measure, practicing public health. Inter-disciplinary collaboration and community-as-partner are key strategies in the practice of public health. The central role of community collaboration in achieving the Healthy People 2010 objectives was noted previously. Public Health in America (Public Health Functions Steering Committee, 1995) states the vision of public health as "healthy people in healthy communities" and puts forth ten essential public health services including "Mobilize community partnerships to identify and solve health problems". These statements reinforce the concepts of human capital and inter-agency collaboration.

Many COs employ community/public health nurses or nurses such as school or parish nurses whose role includes population-focused health promotion and disease prevention. Both the Standards of Community Health Nursing Practice (1985) and the Scope and Standards of Public Health Nursing (PHN) Practice (1999) emphasize the
interdisciplinary, collaborative nature of PHN practice, the principle of community-as-
partner, and the priority given to health promotion and disease prevention. In 2000, the
Association of State and Territorial Directors of Nursing (ASTDN) wrote a "guide for the
role of the public health nurse as it relates to population health" (ASTDN, 2000, p. 1). Even
its title, *Public Health Nursing: A Partner for Healthy Populations*, reflects the collaborative
role of the PHN.

**Building Community-The Role of Graduate Nursing Education**

Programs of graduate nursing education are clearly important assets in their
communities and their participation in partnerships can contribute to community development
efforts. These activities also allow them to respond to trends in health professions education
and health care delivery, the goals of Healthy People 2010, and their institutions' missions
pertaining to community service.

In their Fourth Report, *Recreating Health Professional Practice for A New Century*
(1998), three of five Pew Health Professions Commission's recommendations for all
programs of health professions education can be met through ACPs: "(a) require
interdisciplinary competence in all health professionals, (b) continue to move education into
ambulatory practice and (c) encourage public service of all health professional students and
graduates" (Pew Health Professions Commission, 1998, pp. iii-vi). Of the Commission's 21
competences for the 21st century, at least ten can be addressed through ACPs and service-
learning. Examples include: "embrace a personal ethic of social responsibility and service,
rigorously practice preventive health care, integrate population-based care and services into
practice, partner with communities in health care decisions, provide culturally sensitive care
to a diverse society, work in interdisciplinary teams, and improve access to health care for
those with unmet health needs" (Pew Health Professions Commission, 1998, p. vii).
ACPs are also a strategy by which graduate nursing programs can meet at least two of the four Pew Health Professions Commission's recommendations specifically targeted to advanced practice nursing (APNs): "(a) Reorient APN education programs to prepare APNs for the changing situations and settings in which they are likely to practice, regardless of payer source and (b) Emphasize the practice styles that are a critical part of APN including the emphasis on preventive and health-promoting interventions and attention to psychosocial, environmental, and resource factors (Pew Health Professions Commission, 1998, p. viii).

The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (ACCN), in their report: *Nursing Education's Agenda for the 21st Century* (1996), stated curricula should include interdisciplinary team participation and sensitivity to socioeconomic, religious, lifestyle and cultural diversity (AACN, 1999, p. 6). Guidelines recommended by the AACN included: (a) faculty practice that promotes links between schools of nursing and their communities and (b) increased emphasis on student learning in community-based settings. These recommendations can be met, in part, through ACPs.

ACPs also allow graduate programs in nursing to implement service-learning, an educational methodology with roots in experiential learning. Numerous definitions of service-learning exist; the one used for this study is from the Health Professionals Schools in Service to the Nation (HPSISN) program:

A structured learning experience that combines community service with explicit learning objectives, preparation, and reflection. Students engaged in service-learning are expected to not only provide community service but also to learn about the context in which the service is provided, the connection between the service and their academic coursework, and their roles as citizens (Seifer, 1998, p. 274).
Service-learning is implemented through partnerships with community organizations. Implementation of service-learning with its associated ACPs allows programs of graduate nursing education to respond to the aforementioned challenges as well as to trends toward increased community-based care, diversity and aging of the US society, and the dramatic decrease in engaged citizenship (Putnam, 1999).

Graduate programs in nursing, as opposed to undergraduate nursing programs, can make unique contributions to partnerships with COs in that their students are licensed professional nurses, are skilled in the practice of nursing, bring a variety of life experiences and can engage in service activities requiring a high level of critical thinking, autonomy and self-organization.

Summary

For over 200 years, mankind has recognized "A nation's health is a nation's wealth" (Hancock, 2001, p. 275). Yet today, citizens of the United States, the wealthiest country of the world, continue to experience disparities of health status and access to health care services. As recently as 1997, Maya Angelou (1997, p. 108) observed: "If it is true that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, isn't it also true a society is only as healthy as its' most deprived?"

Eliminating these disparities and assuring the underserved of our communities have opportunities to achieve optimal health can only be accomplished through the concerted efforts of a community's citizens, groups and organizations. Partnerships between programs of graduate nursing education and COs can contribute to these efforts and allow them to: respond to trends and challenges in their own disciplines and US society, carry out their missions, meet goals they would be unable to achieve alone, and contribute to community capital by building on existing community assets.
Collaboration Between Community Organizations

Dimensions of Inter-agency Relationships

Relationships among organizations may vary widely in scope, constituency, context and degree of involvement of each organization. They may range from a loosely structured, short-term relationship between two organizations for the purpose of achieving a single, specific outcome to a highly organized, multi-agency partnership with external funding and a separate leadership structure that may include individual citizens and a number of community-based organizations. The literature reveals many terms used to describe these relationships: coordination, cooperation, collaboration, alliance, partnership, coalition and synergy. These terms may be used as nouns (type of relationship) or as verbs (process of relationship), and numerous definitions exist for these terms, some of which are synonyms.

The strength of the relationship may be viewed on a continuum from cooperation to coordination to collaboration to partnership to synergy. Cooperation is characterized by no formal rules and emphasis on the individual organization's goals and activities whereas coordination, collaboration, and partnership involve an increasing degree of formality as to rules and structure and mutuality of goals and activities (Rogers, Whetten and Associates, 1982). Synergy, the highest level of engagement, "enables a group of people and organizations to combine their complementary knowledge, skills and resources so they can accomplish more together than they can on their own" (Center for Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health, How Developed, 2002).

Prior to data collection and analysis, the term partnership was used to refer to the relationships examined in this study. Partnership is the term most commonly used to refer to the organizational relationships used to operationalize service-learning (CCPH, 2000). Moffatt, King, and Sowan (2002, p. 1) define partnership as: "two or more entities working
together with all parties sharing power, being actively involved, and having a vested interest in the success of the project". The researcher has added the additional element of "having mutual goals". Coordination, cooperation and collaboration are seen as less structured relationships in which goals may be parallel rather than shared and will be discussed in further detail in following paragraphs.

Three models of collaboration for community health will be discussed and analyzed according to their relevance to the current study and research findings will be discussed.

Prolivka's Framework for Inter-agency Collaboration

Prolivka's Conceptual Framework for Interagency Collaboration was initially described in 1996 and is based on the works of several authors in organizational behavior. The framework describes interagency collaboration as a function of environmental conditions, pre-existing organizational situation factors, and task characteristics. Once alliances are formed, transactional factors (intensity, formation, decision-making methods, size, and structure) influence the outcomes (organizational, inter-organizational, client, and community).

Prolivka, a public health nurse researcher, and colleagues have tested the framework and assessed the degree of collaboration for three groups of organizations: rural sex education programs (Prolivka, 1996), public health and community mental health agencies (Prolivka, Kennedy, and Chaudry, 1997) and rural early intervention collaboratives (Prolivka, Dresbach, Hemlich, and Elliott, 2001). The organizations studied were chosen because they should collaborate to provide optimal client services or are mandated to collaborate. The authors have not studied organizations that purposefully elected to partner to achieve a common goal. Data collection methods included semi-structured interviews and a survey instrument.
designed to assess the five domains of the model. The instrument was modified for each study based on available and relevant indicators for each component of the model.

In each situation, the level of collaboration was low. In both the 1997 and 2001 studies, path analysis indicated that knowledge of staff, goals and services of other agencies was linked with interagency processes and with interagency relationships (1997) or outcomes (2001) (Prolivka, et al., 1997 and Prolivka, et al., 2001). Therefore, communication among organizations as to roles, goals, and services is a key factor in initiation and outcomes of interagency collaboration.

**A Framework for the Development of Community Health Agency Partnerships**

In 1997, Scott and Thurston published their "Framework for the Development of Community Health Agency Partnerships". The authors are from Canada, where, due to the national health care system, inter-agency collaboration is strongly encouraged. Scott and Thurston were concerned with large scale partnerships characterized by establishment of a referent organization. Their article was chosen for inclusion in this proposal because it was the only study found during the literature review that used grounded theory methods. The purpose of the study was to "generate substantive theory regarding the development of effective partnerships among community agencies working with vulnerable populations" (Scott and Thurston, 1997, p. 416).

Scott and Thurston (1997) interviewed eight individuals who were currently involved in inter-organizational partnerships. The theoretical framework that emerged during data analysis includes six categories and their associated properties: (a) External factors - administrative and service provision, (b) domain - recognition and support, (c) partnership characteristics - groundwork, organizational structure, resources, representation, and reputation, (d) partner characteristics - organizational structure, resources, representation and
reputation, (d) communication - type and area, and (e) operations - type and area (Scott and Thurston, 1997, p. 418).

Scott and Thurston integrated the six categories into a process model for partnership development. Key components of an effective partnership process include: (a) shared vision with mutual commitment of all partners; (b) gaining commitment from potential partner agencies; (c) agreement on partnership characteristics, communication strategies, and operations; (d) implementation; and (e) evaluation (Scott and Thurston, 1997).

Framework for Partnership Synergy

In 2001, Lasker, et al. of the Center for Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health (CACSH) of the New York Academy of Medicine proposed a framework for effective partnership functioning and tested it in a National Study of Partnership Functioning that included 63 partnerships and 815 partnership participants. Eligible partnerships were pre-existing (at least two years), broad-based, and had at least ten partners (Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health, NSPF and How Developed, 2002). A central hypothesis of the study was that partnership synergy is key to the transition from partnership functioning to partnership effectiveness. The study indicated the majority of the 63 partnerships had been relatively successful in achieving partnership synergy. Four dimensions of partnership synergy were identified: (a) leadership effectiveness, (b) partnership efficiency, (c) administration and management effectiveness, and (d) the sufficiency of non-financial resources. Leadership effectiveness was the most powerful determinant (Weiss, Miller and Lasker, 2001). A key outcome of the study was development of an on-line, interactive Partnership Self-Assessment Tool. To use the tool, partnerships need to have been in existence for at least six months, have at least five active partners, and meet other process criteria (CACSH, Partnership Tool, 2002).
Bloxham's Case Study of Inter-agency Collaboration

Bloxham (1996) conducted in-depth interviews with 25 staff from four partner agencies working together in a series of adolescent sexual health initiatives. Study findings were congruent with her literature review and showed effective collaboration was influenced by "shared aims, mutual respect, and good working relationships" (Bloxham, 1996, p. 389). Bloxham (1996) also suggested that an informal, networking approach to development of a partnership may not facilitate long term success and that strategic planning by key leadership persons is also necessary.

Summary and Conclusions

Research and theory development concerning inter-agency collaboration for community health is designed to examine the perspectives of all partners and has revealed a number of factors influencing such relationships. Three conceptual frameworks, and their associated research, and one research study were summarized. Although there are some differences among the factors found to influence success of inter-agency collaboration, there are also many similarities: a common goal, plan and structure agreed upon by all partners; a reciprocal relationship with trust and respect; continuous, effective communication; and program evaluation. These factors are congruent with the principles of partnerships. Notable exceptions among the findings include: Lasker et al. (2001) emphasis on leadership more strongly than the other authors, and Prolivka's (1996) separate set of factors concerning task characteristics.

Principles of Academic-Community Partnerships (ACPs)

A number of organizations have published principles or standards for service-learning and/or academic-community partnerships. Four will be discussed here as they reflect the evolution from an emphasis on learning to an emphasis on partnerships and each is
It has been referred to in publications reviewed on ACPs in higher education, health professions education and nursing education.

Earliest efforts to describe effective service-learning programs recognized the essential and integral role of the community and reciprocity between partners. Reciprocity is defined as "mutual dependence, action or influence" (Merriam-Webster, 1994). In 1979, Robert Sigmon suggested three principles of service-learning: (a) "Those being served control the service(s) provided, (b) those being served become better able to serve and be served by their own actions, and (c) those who serve also are learners and have significant control over what is expected to be learned" (Sigmon, 1979, p. 10).

In 1998, leaders in the service-learning movement met to articulate more detailed and explicit principles and develop a research agenda for service-learning. The Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning (Honnet and Poulsen, 1989) (see Appendix A) introduced the concept of reciprocity as well as active involvement of all stakeholders and those served define their own needs. The principles included just two references to "learning" and referred to the link between education and community as "programs". In their narrative explanation of the principles, the authors acknowledged the essential link between service-learning and academic-community partnerships. However, they went on to note that despite the emphasis on learning, the Principles were not limited to partnerships involving schools but relate to programs and policies based in any community organization (Honnet and Poulsen, 1989). Note the introduction of the term "partnership" to refer to the relationship between the educational institution and the community agency.

Community Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), a national, non-profit organization founded in 1996, has been a leader in the academic-community partnership movement. Their mission is to "foster partnerships between communities and health
professions schools" (Seifer, 1998, p. 276) and is reflected in nine principles of partnerships (Seifer and Maurana, 2000, p.7) (see Appendix B). Although CCPH supports service-learning (Seifer, 1998), the CCPH principles, unlike the Wingspread document, make no reference to learning, refer to the linkages between education and community as "partnerships"; make no direct reference to service; and place even stronger emphasis on the importance of reciprocity between partners; mutual goals, plans and outcomes; and sustained relationships. Except where the Sigmon (1979) and Wingspread principles are specifically referenced in articles reviewed for this paper, the CCPH principles will be the point of reference for best practices in ACPs. It is the more recent document and is directed toward partnerships between schools of health professions education and community health organizations.

Summary

As they have evolved, principles of service-learning and/or ACPs have become increasingly congruent with the tenets of community development and community capacity building as well as concepts of inter-agency organizations. Whether academic-community partnerships are guided by the Sigmon, Wingspread, or CCPH Principles, the critical roles of reciprocity, mutual trust and respect, and active involvement of all stakeholders are fundamental. The following review of the literature on ACPs and service-learning demonstrates that publications in this area focus largely on the academic perspective and tend to be anecdotal and descriptive. There is a need for rigorous, scholarly examination of the community perspective of participation in partnerships with institutions of higher education, and graduate nursing education in particular.
Community Perspective of Academic-Community Partnerships in Higher Education

Theoretical Literature

As the service-learning movement in higher education experienced rapid growth during the 1990's so did research in service-learning. In 1991, 1997, and 2000 leaders in the field assessed the current state of service-learning research and proposed an agenda for the coming years. The community perspective has been a consistent theme in calls for service-learning research. However, student outcomes have been the primary focus of study.

An early exception to the focus on student outcomes was the comprehensive evaluation model developed at Portland State University (PSU) and first reported in 1996. The PSU model uses a multi-constituency approach that includes community. It has been further developed and refined and was used in evaluation of the first national demonstration program of service-learning in a set of disciplines, The Health Professions Schools in Service to the Nation (HPSISN) program. HPSISN involved 17 schools of health profession education.

Two outcomes of the evolution of the PSU model have been the formation of the national organization, Community Campus Partnerships for Health, and an assessment handbook. Although the title indicates the handbook is for assessment of service-learning and civic engagement, the authors note it has utility for assessment of a "broad array of partnership activities including but also transcending service-learning" (Gelmon et al., 2001, p.10). The assessment approach uses a multi-constituency matrix framework derived from the project goals. The authors caution that in assessing the impact on the community, care must be taken to explore how the "participation of the partner organization in the academic activity affects the partner" and avoid what might be viewed as a performance review of the organization (Gelmon et al., 2001, p.87). Recommended focus areas for assessing community
partners include: (a) "capacity to fulfill organizational mission (economic and social
benefits), (b) nature of the community-university relationship (partnership), (c) nature of the
community-university interaction, (d) satisfaction with the partnership, and (e) sustainability
of the partnership" (Gelmon et al., 2001, pp. 87-88). Although the purpose of the framework
is to assess outcomes, feedback concerning process is sought as well. Methods for assessing
community partners include surveys, observation, focus groups, and interviews. Detailed
instructions and instruments are provided. Components of the handbook were incorporated
into the design of this study.

In 1999, Eyler, Giles and Gray published a meta-analysis of research on the impact of
service-learning on students, faculty, institutions, and communities from 1993-1999. Of the
68 total studies, just nine addressed the impact of service-learning on communities. Overall
findings included: (a) satisfaction with student participation, (b) service-learning provides
useful service in communities and (c) communities report enhanced university relations.
Samples in the nine studies ranged from four students to over 6000 participants (students,
institutions and communities combined). In most of the reports, the primary sample was
students with a brief reference to feedback from community partners. None of the reports
focused solely on the community (Eyler et al., 1999).

In the Fall, 2000 Special Issue of the *Michigan Journal of Community Service
reviewed current service-learning literature related to community. They found that most
service-learning literature concerning community is anecdotal and descriptive or program
evaluation in which community is one variable among others. Very few articles reported
rigorous research focused only on community. Cruz and Giles suggested reasons for the
dearth of service-learning research on community and current knowledge about the value of
service-learning to communities. The key findings and key claims of twelve reports on
service-learning and community were categorized into three broad topic areas: (a) contributes
to community development, (b) bridges town-gown gaps, and 3) offers benefits to community
partners (Cruz and Giles, 2000). Two of the topic areas were very similar to those noted in
the 1999 report by Eyler et al.

Cruz and Giles (2000) suggested a new model of service-learning research on
community which would: (a) Have the partnership itself as the unit of study, (b) be consistent
with good practices of service-learning, (c) use action research and (d) focus on assets. The
concepts of community asset building and partnership as well as the principles of service-
learning and partnership were discussed in detail earlier and were integrated into the design
of this study. Action research, with its' priorities on community voice and involvement,
clearly has relevance for service-learning research design. However, it is not appropriate to
the purpose of this study as the overall MSN program project had been fully implemented at
the time of this study. Cruz and Giles cited Gelmon et al.'s (2001) guide for assessment of
service-learning and civic engagement as an example of one of two existing models that
synthesize the four concepts in their "new approach" to service-learning research focused on
community.

Research Literature

The primary review of the literature elicited five reports of research involving
community partners only, or multiple stakeholders including community partners, from 1997-
2002 (Johnson, Young and Johnson, 1997; Geschwind, Ondaatje, and Gray, 1997; Gelmon,

The institutions of higher education included community colleges, four-year colleges
and research universities in urban and rural settings. Community partners also varied as to
location, size, mission and services provided. The number of community participants ranged from 30 (Ferrari and Worrall, 2000) to 443 (Geschwind et al., 1997). Data collection methods included surveys and/or interviews and rigor of the reports varied from limited (Johnson et al., 1997 and Geschwind et al., 1997) to detailed discussion of methods (Gelman et al., 1998; Vernon and Ward, 1999 and Ferrari and Worrall, 2000). Four reports focused on the partner and partnership (Johnson et al., 1997; Geschwind et al., 1997; Gelmon et al., 1998; and Vernon and Ward, 1999). Ferrari and Worrall (2000) focused only on the partners' evaluation of the students.

Overall, all studies reported overwhelmingly positive feedback from the community agencies. Partners reported benefits to students (Johnson, Young and Johnson, 1997 and Vernon and Ward, 1999), agencies (Johnson et al., 1997; Geschwind et al., 1997; Gelmon et al., 1998; and Vernon and Ward, 1999) and communities (Johnson et al., 1997). Agency benefits centered around improved ability to meet agency goals (Johnson et al., 1997; Geschwind et al., 1997; Vernon and Ward, 1999). Ferrari and Worrall (2000) found community partners benefited from students' work skills and service skills.

Four studies found improved community-campus relations and/or improved community partner perceptions of the university (Johnson et al., 1997; Geschwind et al., 1997; Gelmon et al., 1998; Vernon and Ward, 1999). Three studies reported little or no impact on supervisors (Johnson et al., 1997; Geschwind et al., 1997; Gelmon et al., 1998). Satisfaction with the partnerships was very high. Over 90% of participants in four studies indicated they would recommend academic-community partnership and/or involves students again (Johnson et al., 1997; Geschwind et al., 1997; Gelmon et al., 1998). Gelmon et al. (1998) also found partnerships promoted networking among community agencies.
The key recommendation across all four partner-focused studies was the need for improved collaboration between the educational institution and community partners. Areas of difficulty included: scheduling, attendance, logistics such as transportation, and student preparation/training. For example, Gelmon et al. (1998, p. 54) noted "partners ... found institutions operated in bureaucratic ways that did not foster interdisciplinary cooperation - seen as essential to addressing community needs." This recommendation pertained to both central offices for student service (when institutions had them) and individual course faculty. Several studies noted agencies believed educational institutions should take a more active role in coordination and communication with their community partners (Johnson et al., 1997; Geschwind et al., 1997; Gelmon et al., 1998; Vernon and Ward, 1999).

Vernon and Ward (1999) and Gelmon et al., (1998) reported community partners sought recognition for their role as teachers, opportunities to visit campus, a voice in the partnerships, and a sense of participation from planning to evaluation. All five studies noted the importance of including community organizations in formal evaluation (versus anecdotal comments) of the partnerships.

Despite widely publicized principles of service-learning and academic-community partnerships that emphasize reciprocity, research studies about community organizations' perspectives of partnership are few. Findings of the few reports on community perception's of ACPs indicate positive outcomes and a strong desire to continue, and expand, the relationship. Coordination and communication with the educational partners are key factors in success of the relationship.
Review of the literature revealed one conceptual framework for academic-community partnerships in health professions education. Jensen and Royeen (2000) led an academic-community partnership, funded by the US Health Resources and Services Administration. Students in physical and occupational therapy provided rehabilitation services to members of the Winnebago and Omaha Indian Nations in Nebraska. The Integration Matrix of Konrad, a conceptual framework developed for the project, was used to shape formative assessment and analysis of project operations. The Integration Matrix, originally described by Konrad in 1996, "addresses 12 dimensions of service development and delivery, representing core elements involved when ... organizations work together on a project" (Jensen and Royeen, 2000, p. 169). Konrad also suggested that the degree of sharing among organizations can vary and described five levels of integration: information sharing and communication, cooperation and coordination, collaboration, consolidation and integration (Jensen and Royeen, 2000). This parallels the continuum of strength of inter-organizational relationships (cooperation to coordination to collaboration to synergy) discussed earlier in this chapter.

Jensen and Royeen (2000) list the questions used to assess the 12 dimensions of the Integration Framework. However, they do not discuss their methods of data collection and analysis. Three assumptions emerged from the project that suggested a need for modification of the Integration Matrix: (a) "community is central, (b) interdependence and co-effect, and (c) multidimensional and non-linear" (Jensen and Royeen, 2000, p.174). The model was revised and depicted as a pyramid with community as foundation and communication (culturally-sensitive, formal and informal) as pervasive. Above the base, are four key elements of partnerships: partners, management activities, finance and project goals and
outcomes. The key importance of communication parallels the findings of the studies discussed in the previous section of this paper (community partners' perceptions of ACPs in higher education).

Research Literature

The primary review of the literature revealed one case study and one research study that reported community agencies' perceptions of partnership with a non-nursing program of health professions education. In the *CCPH Guide for Developing Community Responsive Models in Health Professions Education*, Baker (1997) described his agency's ten-year experience in partnership with the University of Connecticut School of Medicine. This was the only article found in which a community agency described their perspective of partnership with an institution of higher education. Baker described the partnership as positively impacting both partners: (a) Improved agency ability to meet client health needs, (b) cost-effective for the agency, (c) positive changes in the medical school curriculum, (d) student expansion to include nursing, and (e) a community service requirement for all medical students. Baker concludes with factors that are key to success of an ACHP: (a) a sense of ownership by all involved, (b) good communication, (c) opportunities for community partner involvement on campus, (d) a written agreement of roles and expectations, (e) shared vision, and (f) recognition (Baker, 1997). These factors reiterate findings reported in the principles of partnership and the previous section on academic-community partnerships.

In 2001, Wolff and Maurana reported findings of their qualitative study of eight community-academic partnerships at five academic health centers. Twenty-five participants from the eight community partners were interviewed. Wolff and Maurana (2001) provide a detailed description of research methods used in the study; however, a full page of corrections
appeared in a later issue of the journal. Nine major themes emerged as factors participants thought strongly influenced the effectiveness of ACPs: (a) creation and nurturing of trust; (b) respect for a community's knowledge; (c) community-defined and prioritized needs and goals; (d) mutual division of roles and responsibilities; (e) continuous flexibility, compromise, and feedback; (f) strengthening of community capacity; (g) joint and equitable allocation of resources; (h) sustainability and community ownership; and (i) insufficient funding periods.

Although these three reports take very different forms, they continue to reflect themes identified by previous authors: reciprocity, mutuality of goals and plans, clear and continuous communication among all stakeholders, and a sustained relationship. Boex and Henry (2001) summarize the concept of academic-community partnerships succinctly in their "Commentary" to Wolff and Maurana's report. They posed the question: "Why does anyone enter into a partnership?" and responded with: "to accomplish a goal that cannot be accomplished alone" and defined partnership as "an open collaboration of shared risk and reward" (Boex and Henry, 2001, p. 151).

Academic-Community Health Partnerships With Undergraduate Nursing Programs

Of the various disciplines in health professions education, undergraduate nursing education was early to embrace service-learning and many faculty have written of their experiences. Most of the literature is anecdotal and descriptive in nature with the focus clearly on the academic perspective. Of 25 articles and one book, none focused specifically on community partners and just six reported findings of research studies (Hales, 1997; Simoni and McKinney, 1998; Schneiderman, Jordan-Marsh, and Bates-Jensen, 1998; White, Festa, Allocca, and Abraham, 1999; Peterson and Schaeffer, 1999; and Schaffer, Mather, and Gustafson; 2000).
Research Literature

Of the articles reporting findings of research, the number of student participants varied from 7 to 48. All six articles reported using service-learning and three referred to either the Sigmon, Wingspread or HPSISN principles. Simoni and McKinney (1998) referred to Sigmon's principles of service-learning; Peterson and Schaeffer (1999) cited portions of the Wingspread Principles and Schaffer, et al. (2000) referred to HPSISN's key characteristics of service-learning experiences. Three studies (Schaffer, et al., 2000; Hales, 1997; and White et al., 1999) were framed with conceptual frameworks. Schaffer et al. (2000) framed the students' activities (health needs assessment) and White et al. (1999) used Boyer's model of scholarship. Hales (1996) cited six features of service-learning as described by the Kellogg Faculty Committee on Service-Learning of the University of Michigan as service-learning theory. However, these features are oriented to student learning and no mention of reciprocity or community involvement in the process is made.

The level of rigor and extent to which feedback from community agencies was sought varied. Simoni and McKinney (1998) and Hales (1997) focused totally on student outcomes with no mention of feedback from community agencies; Schaffer et al. (2000) quoted feedback from the agency director but did not state the methods by which the data was collected. White et al. (1999) and Schneiderman et al. (1998) indicated tools were developed to seek agency (White) or agency and client (Schneiderman) feedback and reported the findings. However, White et al. (1999) and Peterson and Schaeffer (1999) did not discuss how the instrument was developed and Schneiderman et al. (1998) mentioned only that the tool was assessed for content validity. Four articles referred to partnership in the literature review while White et al. (1999) and Schaeffer et al. (2000) referred to partnership in reporting and discussing findings of their studies.
Of the four research studies that sought feedback from the community agencies, findings were highly positive as to agency evaluation of student performance and contributions to agency goals and services. Additionally, Schneiderman et al. (1998) found 95% of clients saw student services as beneficial and felt students learned during the experiences. Agencies sought to continue the relationships and have more students. Peterson and Schaffer (1999, p. 213) reported several problems identified by agencies: "unclear communication, errors in data entry and lack of student follow-through with assigned schedules". Recommendations included: agencies request increased role in orientation and scheduling of students (White et al., 1999); students learn how to interact with diverse cultural groups (Schneiderman et al., 1999); more direct communication with faculty (Peterson and Schaffer, 1999).

Descriptive nursing literature

Nineteen articles and one book were found that described anecdotal reports of experiences with service-learning or academic-community health partnerships involving undergraduate nursing education. Types of academic courses and community settings varied widely as did the number of students and agencies. The academic perspective predominated. Four of the 21 reports were co-authored by both the academic and community organizations and gave a more balanced report of both perspectives. (Corbett, Setter and Rappuchi, 2000; Sebastian, Davis, and Chappell, 1998; Ellenbecker, Byrne, O'Brien and Rogosta; 2002 and Ellenbecker, O'Brien and Byrne, 2002). Ellenbecker et al. (2002) published two articles on their project, one from the academic perspective and one from the community perspective. The second article gave a detailed statistical report of services provided and client outcomes but did not discuss the partnership process, problems or recommendations for improvement.
Twelve articles indicated participation in partnerships (Corbett et al., 2000; Sebastian et al., 1998; Riner and Becklenberg, 2001; Sternas et al., 1999; White and Henry, 1999; Bailey et al., 1999; Sackett, Hendricks and Pope, 2000; Rodgers, 2001; Hammer, Wilder, Avery, and Byrd, 2002; Ciaccio and Walker, Ellenbecker et. al., 2002 and Ellenbecker et al., 2002). Thirteen of the articles indicated use of service-learning (Callister and Hobbins-Garbett, 2000; Miller and Swanson, 2002; Kulewicz, 2001; Riner and Becklenberg, 2001; Sternas et al., 1999; White and Henry, 1999; Rodgers, 2001; Drevdahl, Shannon, Grevstad, 2001; Mayne and Glascoff, 2002; Hammer et al., 2002; Ciaccio and Walker; Bittle et al., 2002 and Bailey et al., 1999). Three reports referred to the Sigmon, Wingspread, HPSISN (pre-CCPH) or CCPH principles of partnership (White and Henry; 1999; White, 1999; Sebastian et al., 1998; and Rodgers, 2001). Bittle et al. (2002) referred to four essential elements of service learning including reciprocity and meaningful service.

One article (Long, 2002) discussed advantages of home health agency collaboration with nursing education rather than reporting a specific experience. Eight of the 16 remaining articles/book reported feedback from community agencies (Corbett et al., 2000; Sebastian et al., 1998; Kulewicz, 2001; Sternas, O'Hare, Lehman and Milligan, 1999; White and Henry, 1999; Hammer, Wilder, Avery and Byrd; 2002; Bittle, Duggleby and Ellison, 2002; and Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington; 1999). In most cases that feedback was noted in one or two sentences and the methods of obtaining the feedback were not explained. All community feedback, whether from agency staff or clients, was reported as highly positive. No problems or recommendations were discussed.

Exceptions were the Bailey et al. (1999) book and the Corbett et al. (2000) article. Bailey and colleagues (1999) reported their experiences as part of the HPSISN project and proposed a guide for service-learning. One chapter was devoted to "Community Partnerships
in Service-Learning”. The chapter included "stories" written by community agencies of their experiences with the partnerships. The stories included outcomes as well as recommendations for improvement. The chapter also reported strategies for sustaining partnerships arising from focus groups held with the community agencies. They were to: (a) meet the needs of the agency; (b) prepare students for the experience; (c) ensure that students are reliable, dependable, and understand expectations of them; (d) strengthen partnerships with more feedback and better communication; (e) include community in reflection activities; and (f) continue the focus groups. Although Bailey et al. (1999) provided their qualitative and quantitative instruments for evaluation of student outcomes, they did not provide the interview guide used for the focus groups.

Corbett et al. (2000) reported their experiences with undergraduate nursing-home health agency partnerships. Benefits to agencies included: research, service and economic outcomes. Factors in successful partnerships included: "(a) administrative advocacy and support from both partners, (b) mutual respect, (c) team work, (d) recognition of the strengths and contributions of all partners, (e) both organizations should engage in education or service projects first to allow time to establish mutual trust and respect; (e) build on the strengths of both institutions, (f) continue to acknowledge contributions of each party, and (g) initiate collaborative research after the partnership has become established" (Corbett et al., 2000, p. 14).

Rodgers (2001) noted that, in order to establish a partnership between an academic unit and a community, the fit between the community’s needs and the university and academic unit’s mission and goals must be explored and role expectations of faculty must be clarified. She also noted that the academic unit must make a commitment to the community, particularly in respect to whether the experience will be one time, episodic, or continuous;
whether the same faculty member will always run the project; whether interruption of service during college breaks will diminish the service and whether the activity can run uninterrupted if necessary to meet the community’s needs.

**Summary of Undergraduate Nursing**

Findings of review of undergraduate nursing experiences in service-learning and linking with community agencies parallel those of higher education and health professions education. Although, nursing literature is replete with reports of undergraduate nursing experiences with service-learning and linkages with community agencies, most are anecdotal and, for those reported as research, the level of rigor varies widely. Moreover, despite the fact that at least 16 of the reports referred to engaging in partnerships and/or service-learning, the focus was clearly on the academic perspective. Efforts were made to meet community-identified needs. Minimal attention was given to describing how reciprocity was assured or discussing feedback from community agencies regarding their perceptions of the relationship. The exceptions, Bailey et al. (1999) and Corbett et al. (2000) in particular, were congruent with previously discussed factors in assuring successful partnerships: reciprocity, mutual trust and respect, clear and continuous communication, and building on the strengths of both partners.

**Academic-Community Partnerships With Graduate Nursing Programs**

A comprehensive review of the literature revealed six reports of ACPs with a graduate program in nursing (Logsdon and Ford, 1998; Horak, O’Leary and Carlson, 1998; Scheideberg, 1999; Lutz, Herrick and Lehman, 2001; Cohen and Milone-Nuzzo, 2001; Narsavage, Lindell and Batchelor, 2001); Narsavage, Lindell, Chen, Savrin, and Duffy, 2002). Five articles were anecdotal reports of short-term, one course experiences with service-learning. Narsavage et al., (2001 and 2002) reported research findings of an MSN
program's experience with service-learning. The Horak, O'Leary, and Carlson (1998) article did not include a nurse author although nurse practitioner students were included in the multi-health professions project.

Like the undergraduate nursing literature, the six graduate nursing reports clearly focused on the academic perspective. None included a conceptual framework for the partnership, none focused solely on the perceptions of the community partner, and none of the authors represented the partner agency. Although five of the reports indicated they were framed in service-learning (Logsdon and Ford, 1998; Scheideberg, 1999; Lutz, Herrick, and Lehman, 2001; Cohen and Milone-Nuzzo, 2001; Narsavage et al., 2002), only three (Horak, O'Leary, and Carlson, 1998; Lutz, J., Herrick, C. and Lehman, B., 2001; and Narsavage et al., 2002) referred to the relationship with community agency as a partnership. The others referred to the agencies as "sites" (Logsdon and Ford, 1998), "agencies" (Cohen and Milone-Nuzzo, 2001) or "community" (Scheideberg, D., 1999).

Three articles reported feedback from community agencies (Horak et. al., 1998; Cohen and Milone-Nuzzo, 2001; and Narsavage et. al., 2002). However, only Horak et. al. (1998) indicated how the information was obtained and that was through interviews. Feedback from community agencies was uniformly positive and included: (a) requests for additional students or to continue the relationship (Cohen and Milone-Nuzzo, 2001; Horak et. al, 1998), (b) valuable contributions to agency goals (Cohen and Milone-Nuzzo, 2001; Narsavage et al., 2002), (c) greater benefits to agency from graduate nursing students compared to students of other disciplines (Cohen and Milone-Nuzzo, 2001); (d) clients pleased with direct services (Narsavage et. al., 2002); (e) contributions to healthcare in the community (Narsavage, et. al., in press); (f) clients benefited from student projects (Horak et al, 1998); welcomed multi-disciplinary, student team approach (Horak et. al, 1998). Lutz et.
al, (2001) made no reference to agency feedback but noted a quote from one community client who found the student services to be helpful.

None of the six reports included recommendations from the community agencies as to how to improve the relationship. Horak et al. (1998) noted one agency had no suggestions for improvement and although the article concluded with guidelines for working with community agencies, the strategies pertained largely to the academic partner.

In summary, analysis of information provided in the six published reports of service-learning at the graduate level of nursing education working with community agencies indicates: (a) the focus was clearly on the academic perspective, (b) either there was no partnership or the level of partnership could not be determined, and (c) feedback from community agencies, if sought at all, was usually informal.

Summary and Conclusions: Pre-Study Review of the Literature and Gaps in Knowledge

This section of Chapter II has defined partnerships as: two or more entities working together with all parties sharing power, being actively involved, and having a vested interest in the success of the project. The potential benefits of collaboration among community health organizations and graduate programs in nursing for both partners and the greater community were established. Three sets of principles of partnership were examined and the CCPH principles were selected as the frame of reference for best practices in ACP as they related to the current study. The CCPH principles are highly articulate and difficult to summarize; however, reciprocity is the dominant theme throughout with mutual trust and respect among all stakeholders; a high level of commitment by all partners; and clear, open communication (CCPH, 2000).

Relationships among organizations have been the subject of considerable research and theory development. Three frameworks of collaboration among organizations for
community health were examined. Several research studies of inter-agency collaboration were discussed that described outcomes, and factors influencing the relationship, from the perspectives of all partners. Findings were congruent with the principles of partnerships and included shared aims, mutual trust and respect and open communication among all parties.

Partnerships between community health organizations and institutions of higher education, including programs of graduate nursing education, should strive to meet the principles articulated by CCPH. Over the past 14 years, the need for rigorous research in service-learning and ACPs in higher education has been proclaimed on several occasions. Proposed agenda indicate the perspectives of all stakeholders including the community should be considered and research should examine both outcomes as well as processes.

However, this review of publications in the area of service-learning and ACPs in higher education, health professions education, undergraduate nursing education and graduate nursing education indicate this has not been the case. While the strategies of service-learning and academic-community partnerships have gained widespread acceptance in the first three areas and is in the early stages of adoption for graduate nursing education, research has focused largely on student outcomes. With the few exceptions of reports from higher education cited earlier in this chapter, studies that do consider the community perspective vary in rigor and are often evaluative in purpose. Outside of the HPSISN project whose purpose was evaluation, no studies were found of research involving undergraduate or graduate nursing programs that gave equal attention to all stakeholders or focused solely on the community partner. Most reports did indicate efforts were made to address community-identified needs; one identified a strategy for assuring reciprocity; and a few referred to principles of service-learning and/or ACPs. However, in most cases, it was difficult to determine whether reciprocity was a goal of the project. Authors often stated they were
engaging in service-learning but the term partnership was not always used and the community organizations were referred to in traditional terms such as agencies or sites.

When reported, feedback from agencies was uniformly positive. In the few instances where comments or recommendations concerning the process of ACPs were sought, improved communication was a clear theme. This finding is congruent with the principles of partnerships and factors found to influence collaboration among CHOs.

Reciprocity is a fundamental principle of exemplary service-learning and ACPs (Cruz and Giles, 2000). Taking action to assure community-identified needs are being met is an important step but is not sufficient to assure reciprocity or to meet the CCPH principles of effective partnerships. There is a need for rigorous inquiry to understand and explain factors influencing successful service-learning and ACPs. This is especially the case for ACPs involving graduate nursing education where the knowledge base is small and influencing factors may be modified by the unique characteristics of graduate nursing students and the services they are able to provide.

This researcher sought to address the gap in knowledge of community partners' perspectives of partnership involving graduate nursing education. The study used grounded theory methods of qualitative research to examine the perspectives of community health organizations that have partnered with faculty and students in a graduate program of nursing education. The following section of this chapter provides an overview of Glaser and Strauss' (1967) initial Discovery of Grounded Theory approach to research and a brief summary of further developments and variations by Glaser, Strauss, and others.

Secondary Literature Review

In keeping with stages of the grounded theory approach to qualitative research, secondary review of the literature focused on publications related to the descriptive theory
which emerged out of the data analysis. Thirteen publications were identified: eleven theoretical publications (Seifer, 2002; Bailey, Carpenter and Harrington, 2002; Seifer and Vaughn, 2002; Elias and Bui, 2002; Bejarano, Balcazar and Brewer, 2002; Leiderman, Furco, Zapf and Goss, 2003; Jacoby, 2003a; Jacoby, 2003b; Jones, 2003; Enos and Morton; 2003); one descriptive article (Holloway, 2002) and one research report (Narsavage et al., 2002). Five publications pertained to nursing and were included in a special issue of the *Journal of Nursing Education* (2002). The one research report (Narsavage et al., 2002), was part of the special issue of the *Journal of Nursing Education* and was included in the primary review of the literature as “in press”. Four publications were chapters in a book entitled *Building Partnerships for SERVICE-LEARNING* (Jacoby, 2003).

Leiderman, Furco, Zapf and Goss (2003) published the findings of their September, 2002 national summit of 21 leaders of community organizations that were currently partnering with institutions of higher education as part of projects funded by the Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education. Discussions took place in a “variety of formats including focus groups and work sessions” (Leiderman et al., 2003, p. 2) and a summary of the summit was published in a pamphlet. Leiderman et al.’s publication may represent a summary of a research report. However, the researcher was unable to locate the “complete findings” (Leiderman et al., 2003, p. 3)

*Principles of Partnerships*

A number of the publications identified in the secondary review of the literature referred to the Principles of Partnerships (discussed earlier in this chapter) as important resources in describing successful community-academic partnerships (Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington, 2002; Jacoby, 2003a; Jacoby, 2003b; Jones, 2003; Seifer, 2002; and Seifer and Vaughn, 2002). Jacoby (2003a) identified an additional set of principles for ACPs and
Ramaley’s “Lessons Learned From Existing Partnerships”. Published by Campus Compact in 2000, “Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships” built upon the “Wingspread Principles” discussed earlier in this chapter. The Campus Compact principles are shaped around three stages of partnership (designing, building collaborative relationships, and sustaining partnerships over time) and refer to “genuine democratic partnerships”. Refer to Appendix C for the characteristics of each stage. Ramaley’s “Lessons Learned from Existing Partnerships” “focus on the comprehensive university” (Jacoby, 2003a). As they are congruent with the other principles and beyond the scope of partnerships examined in this project they will not be discussed further.

**Concepts and Frameworks of Community-Academic Partnerships**


Jacoby (2003a) differentiates partnerships from other types of inter-organizational relationships by observing that if all parties do not benefit, the relationship is not a true partnership and noting the key factors of reciprocity and shared goals. Jacoby (2003a, p. 7)
describes" truly reciprocal partnerships as also termed collaborations" and cites Mattessich and Monsey (1992, p. 7) in defining them as:

A mutually beneficial and well defined relationship [that] includes a commitment to:
- a definition of mutual goals; a jointly developed structure and share responsibility;
- mutual authority and accountability for success; and sharing not only of responsibilities but also of rewards. All individuals and institutions involved in partnerships, or collaborations, learn about themselves and others in the process and are affected, and likely changed, in the process.

Jacoby (2003a) noted that some authors use the term collaboration, others use partnership and some use them interchangeably. She preferred to use the term "partnership" and, for the purposes of her book, used the CCPH definition of partnership (see Chapter I).

Enos and Morton (2003, p. 23), contributors to Jacoby and Associates (2003) book, build on the aforementioned principles of community-academic partnerships by "Developing a Theory and Practice of Campus-Community Partnerships. They identified two types of partnerships and "adapted theories used to examine leadership to provide a way to examine (the development of) partnerships as they move from transactional to transformative" Enos and Morton (2003, p. 23).

...Most of our service-learning and community service efforts can be characterized as transactional... Our community service and service-learning projects may be well managed and, we can track and document service hours, and we can guarantee agencies that students will appear semester after semester for assignments ...this is not to say these transactional relationships are not important, be we can expect that little or nothing will be changed by them over time...(Yet) From our experience, we know that campus-community partnerships have the potential to be far
more...dynamic, joint creations in which all the people involved create power, mix personal and institutional interests and meaning.

Table 1 lists Enos and Morton's criteria for transactional and transformative partnerships.

Table 1

**Transactional and Transformative Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis of relationship</td>
<td>Exchange-based and utilitarian</td>
<td>Focus on ends beyond utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End goal</td>
<td>Satisfaction with exchange</td>
<td>Mutual increase in aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Satisfaction of immediate needs</td>
<td>Arouses needs to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles played by partners</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of existing institutional goals</td>
<td>Accepts institutional goals</td>
<td>Examines institutional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Works within systems to satisfy interests of partners</td>
<td>Transcends self-interests to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner identity</td>
<td>Maintains institutional identity</td>
<td>Changes group identity in larger definition of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of commitment</td>
<td>Limited time, resources, personnel to specific exchanges</td>
<td>Engages whole institutions in potentially unlimited exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Enos and Morton (2003, p. 27) suggested a Framework for Development of Campus-Community Relationships that depicts five types of relationships, overlapping, according to two dimensions: time (horizontal) and depth of complexity (vertical): (a) One-time events and projects, (b) short-term placements, (c) on-going placements or mutual dependence, (d)
core partnerships or interdependence, (e) transformation or joint creation of work and knowledge.

*Stages of Community-Academic Partnerships*

Bejarano, Balcazar and Brewer (2002) developed “The Model for the Partnership to Address Health Disparities in Tarrant County” based on their experiences with a multi-organization project in Tarrant County, TX. The model depicts a process for change with five stages: (a) getting together, (b) building trust, (c) developing a strategic plan, d) taking action stage and (e) going to scale.

As previously noted, the Campus Compact’s “Benchmarks for Campus-Community Partnerships” depict partnerships as having three stages: (a) designing, (b) building collaborative relationships, and (c) sustaining partnerships over time (refer to Appendix C for a summary of the Campus Compact benchmarks).

*Factors Influencing Community-Academic Partnerships*

Factors influencing CAPs may be inferred from the various Principles of Partnerships. In addition, several recent publications have identified factors influencing the success of CAPs. Factors include:

1. The loosely coupled nature of colleges and universities. The fact that many colleges and universities are “loosely coupled” with relatively autonomous units may be an advantage in that one unit may be quite successful at CAPs while another may not. It can be a disadvantage in that communication and coordination may be lacking and it may be difficult to transform or change the entire institution (Enos and Morton, 2002).

2. Risk and trust. Enos and Morton (2003, p. 34) observe that CAPs exist on a continuum of risk and benefit. The development of trust, “a mutual understanding of
the interests of the partners, together with some faith that the partners will stay in the relationship despite obstacles or difficulties that will surely arise” allows the partners to overcome the risks involved in the relationship. They add that “trust cannot be signed off in a contract...it emerges gradually as a working relationship develops”.

3. Fit. Jones (2003, p.159) states: “There must exist a close match between the university’s objectives and intended student-learning outcomes and the community organization’s mission, activities, and timelines. Without such a match, partnerships will always serve university and student interests first”.

4. Time. Jones (2003, p.158) notes that “Effective partnerships with community agencies are developed over time and take time to develop ...Faculty and staff seeking to initiate partnerships must take the time to truly get to know the organizations with which they would like to partner...this includes developing a working knowledge of mission, services, programs, staffing, and clientele, and is best accomplished by spending time on site at the community agency. ... Leiderman et al. (2003, p. 15) advised: “allot time for relationship building early on, and as an ongoing part of the community engagement work”.

5. Communication. Referring to communication, Jones (2003, p. 159) observes: “Often communication between university and community agency personnel focuses on “setting up” the service-learning site placements. After an initial investment of time, university faculty and staff tend to back away from the day-to-day facilitation of the partnership...Effective partnerships with community agencies are characterized by consistent communication and dialogue throughout all aspects of the partnership process...” Learn how to talk together about racial, ethnic, and economic inequalities and their causes with candor, and incorporate these discussions into
community/campus partnership-building work (Leiderman et al., 2003). Elias and Bui (2002) note that miscommunication among partners can influence the success of the relationship.

6. Attention to power dynamics. Jones (2003) suggests that, in order for partnerships to succeed over time, both partner organizations must have the infrastructure and capacity to support the partnerships.

7. Identify the underlying reasons for establishing or developing community/campus partnerships (Leiderman et al., 2003)

8. Understand the organizational contexts in which all partnership members work (Leiderman et al., 2003)

9. Colleges and universities can invite community partners onto campus so they can share their expertise with faculty and students (Leiderman et al., 2003)

10. Be meticulous about the details (Leiderman et al., 2003).

11. Adhere to the principles of partnership (Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington, 2002)

12. Establish a community advisory committee that contributes to development and evaluation of the program (Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington, 2002)

13. The university has a key responsibility to nurture the partnership and place students who interested in the community partner’s work (Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington, 2002).

14. Ensure fairness in exchange of resources among partnership members (Leiderman et al., 2003).

15. The importance of follow-through for building sustainable partnerships (Leiderman et al., 2003, p. 4)
16. How community partners weight the costs and benefits of partnering with an institution of higher education (Leiderman et al., 2003, p. 4).

17. Acknowledge expertise. Faculty and staff from the collegiate setting recognize the contributions community partners can make to student learning (Jones, 2003).

18. Evaluation and assessment. Effective partnerships must include on-going assessment and evaluation with input from all stakeholders (Jones, 2003).

19. Orienting new students each semester (Holloway, 2002)

20. Lack of (undergraduate) students during summer break (Holloway, 2002).

Characteristics of Successful Community-Academic Partnerships

Characteristics of successful ACPs described in the literature are based on authors’ descriptions of long-term partnerships that have often involved several organizations. For example, Jones (2003, p.162) describes characteristics of “stable, meaningful, mature relationships”. There is some cross-over between influencing factors and characteristics of successful ACPs. The reader is also referred to Enos and Morton’s (2003) criteria for transactional and transformative partnerships as well as the Principles of Partnerships.

Characteristics identified in the secondary literature review include:

1. On-going relationships (Jones, 2003).

2. Mutual needs are met (Jones, 2003).

3. Partners collaborate in advocacy and funding proposals (Jones, 2003).

4. Stakeholders from each partnership participate in each others organizations (Jones, 2003).

5. Responsive to community-identified needs (Elias and Bui, 2002; Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington, 2002).
6. Respectful. Students need to understand cultural differences, examine their own values, gain a sense of history of the community and partner organization (Elias and Bui, 2002).

7. Reflective. Students should explore their own biases and preconceptions and analyze and synthesize the experience (Elias and Bui, 2002).

8. Reciprocal or win-win relationships (Elias and Bui, 2002; Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington, 2002).

**Summary**

The secondary review of the literature elicited a number of recent publications concerning the topic of community-academic partnerships. All, except Leideman et al. (2003) are theoretical in nature and based on the authors’ experiences with service-learning and community-academic partnerships. Models, types, stages, influencing factors, and characteristics of successful partnerships were described. Readers are admonished to “always remember that service-learning is all about partnerships” (Jacoby, 2003, p. 315).

**Overview of The Discovery of Grounded Theory**

Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss first described their innovative approach to research, the discovery of grounded theory, in 1967. Although Glaser and Strauss were sociologists, their approach to research has had strong links to nursing from the start. The first study in which Glaser and Strauss applied the grounded theory approach concerned dying, in particular, nurses' perspectives of dying, and was funded with a Public Health Service Research grant from the Division of Nursing. Several of Glaser and Strauss' early and long-term colleagues have been professional nurses and include Juliet Corbin, Jeanne Benoliel, Sally Hutchinson, Phyllis Stern, Janice Swanson and others. (Benoliel, 1996).
Grounded theory is defined as "discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p.1). Glaser and Strauss contrasted generation of theory to verification or testing of theory and described their approach to research as a means to arrive at theory suited to its intended uses. Glaser and Strauss saw a need for more sociological theory and were concerned with researchers who attempted to "force" an existing theory to fit new data. If the purpose of a theory (in sociology) is to "predict and explain behavior", then it must "fit the situation being researched" and "work when put to use" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 3). Glaser and Strauss believed the best approach to generate a theory that "fits and works" is to, from the beginning, systematically discover the theory from the data under study.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) viewed generation of theory and verification of theory as being independent of the method of data collection and believed that either quantitative or qualitative data or both could be used for either generation or verification of theory.

*Generation of Theory*

The development of grounded theory is an inductive process. "To make theoretical sense of so much diversity in his/her data, the analyst is forced to develop ideas on a level of generalization higher in conceptual abstraction than the qualitative material being analyzed" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p.114). Grounded theory research may lead to two forms of theory and two types of middle-range theory.

The two forms include: (a) "a well codified set of propositions or (b) a running theoretical discussion using conceptual categories and their properties" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 31). Glaser and Strauss favored the second form as they viewed development of theory as an on-going process.
The two types of theory are substantive and formal. Substantive theory is "theory developed for a substantive or empirical area of study" and "formal theory is theory developed for a conceptual area of inquiry" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 32). For the current research, an example of formal theory would be "inter-organization relationships" and an example of substantive theory would be "academic-community health partnerships involving a graduate program of nursing". Grounded theory research may lead to either type of theory but is particularly useful for developing substantive theory. Glaser and Strauss caution that substantive grounded theories are suggested, not tested, and their applicability to other substantive areas may be limited. Applicability of substantive theory may, however, be facilitated through the minimizing or maximizing of differences among comparison groups (see p. 45) (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Elements of Grounded Theory

Grounded theory has two elements: (a) conceptual categories and their conceptual properties and (b) hypotheses (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Categories are the conceptual elements of the theory and properties are the conceptual aspects or elements of a category. Both categories and properties emerge from the data and are not the data themselves. Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggested that lower level categories emerge early in the data collection process whereas higher level, overriding concepts and their properties arise later during joint collection, coding and analysis of data. They described two characteristics of concepts: (a) analytic and (b) sensitizing. Analytic concepts are "sufficiently generalized to designate characteristics of concrete entities, not the entities themselves" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, pp. 38-39). Sensitizing concepts yield a meaningful picture to the reader.
Hypotheses are "generalized relations among categories and their properties" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 35). At first, hypotheses may seem unrelated, but with on-going theoretical sampling and comparative analysis, inter-relationships will appear followed by the core of the emerging theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Glaser and Strauss (1967) believed integration of grounded theory occurs at many levels of generalization and integration of theory is best when it emerges like the concepts.

Data Collection Through Theoretical Sampling

Grounded theory research is conducted through the joint collection, coding, and analysis of data. For purposes of clarity, data collection and analysis will be discussed as separate topics.

Initial decisions for data collection are based largely on the researchers' knowledge of the general subject or problem area. The researcher "may begin the research with a partial framework of "local" concepts, designating a few principal or gross features of the structure and process in the situation he will study" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 45). However, as the purpose of the research is generation of theory, plans for data collection are not based on an existing theoretical framework.

Once initial data collection has begun, subsequent decisions as to what data to collect and where to find them are not pre-planned but driven by the emerging theory (theoretical sampling). Researchers using theoretical sampling cannot state the number and types of groups from which data will be collected in advance, and must be flexible in their decisions as to which groups to include (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

In theoretical sampling, groups (aggregates or individuals) are selected according to two criteria: (a) theoretical relevance and (b) theoretical purpose. Groups chosen according to theoretical relevance will further development of the emerging categories, help generate as
many properties of the categories as possible, and help relate categories to each other and their properties (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Theoretical purpose refers to the generality of the theory and includes two aspects: population scope and conceptual level (substantive to formal). Comparison groups chosen to minimize differences (i.e. groups are sub-types of the same type) increase the probability of collecting similar data on a category thus helping to verify its existence and establish the conditions under which a category exists. Comparison groups chosen to maximize differences (i.e. different types of groups) increase the probability of collecting different and varied data bearing on a category as well as finding similarities among groups. If little is known about the subject area and the researcher's goal is a substantive theory, he/she will tend to select groups that are more similar. However, the researcher who seeks to develop a formal theory would maximize differences among groups. In general, the researcher tends to minimize differences among groups at the beginning of the study and maximize differences among groups as the theory emerges (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Multiple comparison groups promote credibility of the theory and assist the reader to identify its applicability and limitations.

By precisely detailing the many similarities and differences of the various comparison groups, the analyst knows, better than if he had studied only one or a few social systems, under what sets of structural conditions hypotheses are minimized or maximized, and hence to what kinds of social structures his theory is applicable (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 231).

The grounded theory researcher must also make decisions as to how many groups he/she should study and how much data should be collected from each group. These decisions are important as the grounded theory researcher, especially one conducting a large study, is
likely to find him/herself continuously dealing with multiple groups and multiple situations within each group.

Data are collected and simultaneously analyzed until theoretical saturation occurs or no new properties of the particular category are being identified. Guided by the theoretical purpose, the researcher attempts to saturate categories by maximizing differences among groups. This is accomplished by seeking groups that stretch the diversity of data being collected about a specific category. Glaser and Strauss caution the grounded theory researcher that he/she will never attain theoretical saturation by examining one incident in one group. The researcher will not have a theoretical sample and the associated theory is usually thin, not well integrated and will have too many obvious unexplained exceptions. The researcher should sample a category until he/she is confident of its saturation. The researcher should continue to saturate all categories until it is clear which are the core categories (those with the most explanatory power) and the core categories should be saturated as completely as possible. As the grounded theory researcher cannot state at the beginning of his/her study how many groups will be required and how much data will be collected from each, he/she cannot also not predict how long the study will take to complete. (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Theoretical sampling by the grounded theory researcher doing a field study involves simultaneous reading of documents, interviewing and observing. Interviewing will not be a highly systematic and structured process. Rather, the researcher will begin with open-ended questions that encourage the participants to tell their stories. Later, interviews and observation will be guided by the emerging theory. The researcher will ask more direct questions designed to elicit information about the emerging categories and their properties. Later interviews are usually shorter in time and greater in total number. When the purpose of
theoretical sampling is to follow a situation over time, sequential observations and/or interviews may be required (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Data Analysis Through Constant Comparison

In grounded theory research, the constant comparative method of data analysis is used. Through systematic coding and analysis of data, the constant comparative method generates a theory that is integrated, consistent, plausible, close to the data and in a form clear enough to be operationalized for testing in quantitative research (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The constant comparative method includes four steps that tend to predominate in the order listed; however, the earlier stages will remain in use throughout the research process.

Step 1: Compare incidents applicable in each category. The researcher codes each incident in the data into as many categories as possible. Coding of data may elicit new categories or may fit an existing category. Categories may be noted in the margins of the transcripts or field notes or on separate cards. While coding an incident for a category, the researcher should compare it with previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category (rule 1 of the constant comparative method). The researcher should keep a written record of the comparison group in which an incident occurs.

During the first phase, the researcher will soon begin to generate theoretical properties of the category. Properties should be viewed in terms of: the dimensions of the category, conditions under which the category is changed, major consequences of the category, and the relationship of the category to other categories.

When the researcher finds conflicts in the emphases of his/her thinking, he/she should stop coding, record a memo of his/her ideas and, possibly, discuss the theoretical notion with a colleague (rule 2 of the constant comparative method). Memos can be written
directly on the transcript or as field notes, along with the code, to provide an immediate illustration of an idea.

Step 2: Integrate categories and their properties. As coding continues, the researcher compares incidents with incidents and incidents with properties. Correct use of the constant comparative method will cause the accumulated knowledge concerning a property of a category to readily start to become integrated. They will be related in many ways and result in unified whole. "Thus the theory develops, as different categories and their properties, tend to become integrated through constant comparisons that force the analyst to make some related theoretical sense of each comparison" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p.109).

Step 3: Delimit the theory. The researcher delimits the emerging theory at two levels: categories and theory. As the original list of categories elicited from early collection and coding of data categories becomes theoretically saturated, it is modified to become more select and focused. If, in a large study, a new category emerges after much coding has been done, the researcher should not go back and code all previous data for the new category but start to code for the new category where it emerges (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

The emerging theory is delimited by becoming solidified (fewer and fewer major modifications) and reduced (a small set of higher level concepts). The resulting theory will then meet two major requirements of a theory: parsimony of variables and formulation and scope (applicability to a wide range of situations).

Step 4: Write the theory. At this point in the research process, the grounded theory researcher has: (a) coded data, (b) a series of memos that indicate the content behind the categories leading to the major themes of the theory and (c) the theory. The researcher should publish the theory when he/she is convinced the analytic framework: (a) forms a systematic substantive theory, (b) is a reasonably accurate statement of the matters studied and (c) is
couched in a form that others in the same field could understand. In writing the theory, the
coded data is revisited to: (a) validate a suggested point, (b) pinpoint data behind a hypothesis
or gaps in theory and/or (c) provide illustrations. "Pinpointing" is a "procedure that tends to
be used relatively late in one's inquiry and pertains mainly to integrating theory through the
checking of detailed points suggested by specific hypotheses" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 173).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) make a strong case for the role library or documentary
materials can, depending on the topic of interest, play in the comparative method of data
analysis. "These materials are as potentially valuable for generating theory as our
observations and interviews" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 163). Early on, documentary
materials can help the researcher understand the substantive area he/she will study and may
help in formulation of early hypotheses. Later, documentary materials may be used for
descriptive analysis and the emerging theory may be compared with existing theories.

When seeking out library materials, the researcher should follow the same procedures
as during selection of comparison groups for field observation and interviews. He/she should
not be constrained by the principal topic and its' synonyms but be open to any materials that
may have some bearing on the comparative process. As categories, their properties, and
hypotheses emerge, the researcher seeks out additional comparative materials that, according
to the theoretical purpose of the study, will minimize or maximize differences among groups
(Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) devote considerable attention to the role insight plays in
development of theory. They see the sensitive insight of the researcher as the root source of
all significant theorizing. Insights should be regarded as data and incorporated into the
comparative analysis process.
Credibility of Grounded Theory

Glaser and Strauss viewed judging the credibility of a grounded theory publication to be the joint responsibility of the researcher and the reader. Credibility of a study is assessed through: (a) the extent to which readers become so caught up in the description that they feel they are also in the field and (b) the reader's assessments of how the researcher came to his/her conclusions. The researcher facilitates reader critique of the theory development process and reader decisions as to applicability of the theory by using multiple comparison groups to increase the scope and delimit the generality of the theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Practical applicability of the substantive grounded theory is influenced by four properties: (a) the theory must fit the substantive areas to which it will be applied, (b) the theory must make sense and be understandable to professional and lay persons working in the substantive area, (c) the theory should be sufficiently general to be applicable to a multitude of diverse daily situations within the substantive area and (d) the theory should enable the user to have enough control in everyday situations to make its application worth trying (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Glaser and Strauss identified two challenges in the researcher's efforts to convey credibility of the grounded theory: (a) "getting readers to understand the theoretical framework and (b) how to describe the data of the social world studied so vividly the readers can almost literally see and hear its' people - but always in relation to the theory" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 228). To respond to the first challenge, the researcher should include an extensive abstract of the overall framework and principal associated theoretical statements at the beginning and/or the end of the publication and in segments throughout. To respond to the second challenge, the researcher should present characteristic illustrations and use codified
procedures, such as the constant comparative methods, for analyzing the data, which allow readers to understand how the theory emerged from the data.

Summary

Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss, sociologists from the University of California at San Francisco, first described The Discovery of Grounded Theory, their innovative approach to qualitative research, in 1967. The purpose of grounded theory research is to, through systematic collection and analysis, discover theory from data. The grounded theory approach may be used to develop substantive or formal theory concerning the social sciences but is particularly useful for the former. Strategies used to develop grounded theory are implemented jointly and include: (a) data collection through theoretical sampling of multiple comparison groups until theoretical saturation is reached; (b) coding of data to elicit conceptual categories, their conceptual properties and hypotheses; and (c) constant comparative analysis of data. When properly developed, the categories of a grounded theory should be: (a) understandable to researchers and laymen familiar with the substantive area, (b) readily applicable and indicated by the data under study (fit) and (c) meaningfully relevant to and be able to explain the behavior under study (work).

Post-1967 Developments in Methods in Grounded Theory Research

Subsequent Books by Glaser and Strauss on Methods in Grounded Theory Research

Following Glaser and Strauss' initial description of The Discovery of Grounded Theory, a number of authors have sought to interpret, refine and expand their original methods include Glaser (1978 and 1992), Strauss and Corbin (1990 and 1998), Stern (1980), Hutchinson (1993), and Dey (1999). Following the 1967 book Glaser and Strauss' careers took separate paths. They continued to conduct grounded theory research and teach the
grounded theory method, however, eleven years passed before Glaser published another book on grounded theory research and 13 years for Strauss.

Glaser's next book on grounded theory research, *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*, was published in 1978. Glaser sought to answer criticism that the original book was vague in sections and lacked sufficient detail as to how to conduct grounded theory research. In addition to explaining data collection, coding, and analysis in more detail, Glaser introduced the concept of a Basic Social Process that built on the idea of core theoretical categories (those with the most explanatory power) in the original book.

Strauss and his nurse researcher associate Juliet Corbin published their revisions to, and expansion of, grounded theory research in 1990 (*Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*) with a second edition in 1998. These books "expanded the coding process so it was even more programmatic and overformularic" and did not mention the basic social process (Melia, 1996, p. 370). Glaser responded to the first edition of Strauss and Corbin's book with a harsh attack (Glaser, 1992) in which he accused them of a number of departures from the original grounded theory method including writing a new method of qualitative research which he referred to as "full conceptual description" (Melia, 1996). Strauss and Corbin have also been described as departing from grounded theory methods as an approach to qualitative research with philosophical underpinnings and viewing it more narrowly as a method for analysis of qualitative data.

**Critique and Interpretation of Methods of Grounded Theory Research**

The split between Glaser and Strauss and the subsequent development of essentially two versions of grounded theory methods (according to which of the original authors or their...
associates one follows) has been viewed as contributing to the "erosion" of grounded theory (Wilson and Hutchinson, 1996, p. 123) and a factor in the frequent misunderstanding of, and methodological errors in, grounded theory research (Baker, Wuest, and Stern, 1992 and Wilson and Hutchinson, 1996). Wells identified three reasons for the frequent misunderstanding of grounded theory methods: (a) "the constant comparative method is time consuming and demanding... (b) grounded theory is a challenge for readers because it is dense and its boundaries are often difficult to establish and ... (c) the originators of grounded theory have been largely silent with regard to issues that have come to dominate discussions of qualitative research in the past 10 years..." (Wells, 1995, p. 35).

Wilson and Hutchinson (1996) described several types of methodological mistakes commonly seen in grounded theory research including muddling of qualitative methods and methodological transgression. According to Wilson and Hutchinson other mistakes include:

1. Generational erosion – an undermining of the original canons for grounded theory research.

2. Premature closure- the under-analysis of textual or narrative data.

3. Overly generic - an analysis that relies on names for so-called discovered conceptual processes that are not situation specific.

4. Importing concepts - the grounded theory researcher does not suspend preconceptions, disciplinary perspectives, and previous readings when examining the data and fails to provide an original and grounded interpretation (1996, pp 123-124).

The last statement is an example of the numerous interpretations to be found of grounded theory. It appears to conflict with the 1967 book by Glaser and Strauss in which they instruct the researcher not to shape the study around a theoretical framework but encourage the researcher to compare the emerging theory with other theoretical frameworks
relative to the topic of inquiry as part of the constant comparative process (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

In addition to the numerous publications in which Glaser and Strauss' methods have been critiqued or interpreted, there have been at least two new versions of grounded theory research (Kools, McCarthy, Durham and Robercht, 1996 and Charmaz, 2000) as well as discussion of the philosophical underpinnings of grounded theory research (the Symbolic Interactionism school of sociology) (Annells, 1996) and its placement in the paradigms of inquiry (Annells, 1996 and Charmaz, 2000). Interestingly, in the 1967 book, Glaser and Strauss make no mention of Symbolic Interactionism and refer to Blumer, the originator of Symbolic Interactionism, by discussing one of his works as an example of the difference between the development and verification of theory and proceed, in a footnote, to distance themselves from Blumer (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 14).

Summary and Conclusions

Some 35 years since Glaser and Strauss first described their approach to qualitative research, grounded theory continues to be frequently applied, particularly in nursing research (Benoliel, 1996). The original book was rather vague and confusing at times and lacked details as to how to actually implement grounded theory research. The authors recognized this when they noted "because this is only the beginning, we shall often state positions, counter-positions and examples, rather than offering clear-cut procedures and definitions, because at many points we believe our slight knowledge makes any formulation premature" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 1).

Unfortunately, Glaser and Strauss did not maintain a relationship in which they were able to refine and expand their original work. Two models of grounded theory research, as well as several other interpretations and versions, have evolved based on the subsequent
writings of the original authors. The lack of a definitive approach to grounded theory research as well as other factors such as the complexity of the process as it has evolved, has led to slurring of grounded theory with other methods and mistakes in its application.

This researcher followed the original methods put forth by Glaser and Strauss (1967) insofar as possible. In situations where additional guidance was needed for study design and implementation, the author referred to the Glaser's first independent work (1978) and Hutchinson's 1993 chapter in Munhall and Boyd on grounded theory.

*The Researcher's Perspective*

*Background*

In qualitative inquiry, the researcher is interested in learning about, and understanding, another's world. In order to do so, he/she must begin the process with a self-awareness of his/her personal preconceptions, values and beliefs concerning the area of study. Once the researcher has achieved that self-awareness he/she "brackets" or sets it aside so the area of study may be examined and understood in an objective manner. Bracketing is done at the beginning of the study and is continued throughout by keeping a daily journal or diary in which personal feelings and reflections are noted (Hutchinson, 1993).

In their original work, Glaser and Strauss (1967) did not refer to bracketing. This may be because qualitative research was in its early stages of evolution at that time and bracketing had not been described and/or because Glaser and Strauss (1967) charged the researcher with deliberately using his/her knowledge of the area of study in making the initial plans for data collection. No reference was made to the issue of the grounded theorist's values and beliefs concerning the area of study. However, insofar as Sally Hutchinson, a nurse researcher and early colleague of Glaser and Strauss included bracketing in her publication, *Grounded Theory: The Method* (1993) the strategy was incorporated into the current study.
The Researcher and Academic-Community Partnerships: Undergraduate Nursing Education

The researcher has, as course leader and lead clinical instructor of pre-licensure courses in community/public health nursing, engaged in academic-community partnerships and integrated concepts of service-learning for the past six years. She became aware of service-learning when seeking ways to respond to student feedback that they wanted to have less observation experiences and more direct involvement in community/public health nursing practice. The researcher was also keenly aware of the disparities of health status and access to health care in the university’s neighboring community. Service-learning and community campus partnerships were seen as strategies by which student-identified learning needs, course objectives and community health needs could be addressed.

Student and faculty course evaluations as well as evaluation data on services provided indicate that service-learning and community campus partnerships have become an important component of the researcher’s courses. Over time, the researcher has become a strong believer in the benefits of service-learning and academic-community partnership in nursing education for the students, faculty, nursing education program, the community health organization, and the community-at-large. The researcher has participated in a number of educational programs on service-learning and academic-community partnerships including two sponsored by Community Campus Partnerships for Health, received a grant to enhance a specific partnership, made presentations concerning her experiences with academic-community partnerships and participated in a faculty learning-circle to explore service-learning and academic-community partnerships in terms of her institution’s undergraduate program.

Over the past five years, the researcher’s Health To Go! Project has had six partner organizations with an average of three to four partners per semester. The researcher’s
experience with service-learning and academic-community partnerships has been excellent. Feedback from students and community partners has been highly positive and has favored continuation of the project.

Views of the community partners are sought during and after each semester. Most often, this is done by a one-to-one meeting or phone call between a representative of the agency and the author. During the 2001-02 year, however, a brief survey (Appendix C) was used and a formal research project, the pilot for this study, explored their perceptions of the partnership experience (see below).

*The Researcher and Academic-Community Partnerships: Graduate Nursing Education*

The researcher's experience with service-learning and academic-community partnerships in graduate nursing education has been as manager of a funded project to integrate service-learning in all specialties of her employer's graduate nursing (MSN) program (2000-2002). The MSN program is part of the School of Nursing of a Carnegie I, research-intensive university located in a city of close to 500,000 persons in the Midwest. The university is surrounded by neighborhoods comprised largely of minority and low-income individuals. Community health organizations in the university's area are challenged by the need to address client populations with disparities in health status and access to services while facing increasingly limited resources. Traditionally, the mission of the university has emphasized research and education; however, recent times and new senior leadership have brought increasing emphasis on service, local as well as regional, national and international.

The MSN program is well-established and offers more than twelve specialties in advanced practice nursing including clinical nurse specialist, nurse practitioner, nurse midwifery and nurse anesthesia. In past years, clinical experiences (except for the CNS in
Community Health Nursing specialty) often took place in institutions such as hospitals or clinics and focused on the individual client and family. Influenced by trends described earlier, the need for increased community-based experiences with a population focus and health promotion orientation was identified. Funding was secured for a two-year project to address this goal through integration of service-learning and academic-community partnerships. It was expected that each student would participate in at least one course with a community-based component and health needs of underserved populations in the university's community would be met.

Community health organizations with an interest in partnership with the MSN program were identified largely through networking and discussions were held to mutually describe organizational needs and potential contributions by MSN faculty and students. These discussions generally occurred during bi-monthly meetings of a Project Advisory Group. Individual course faculty and community agencies then met to further explore possible linkages.

A data-base of potential partner agencies has been developed. Faculty and agencies negotiate a partnership according to the needs of the agency, the educational focus of the course and the skills of the students. Students, working individually or in groups, work with agency staff to develop a specific project that is recorded on a student/agency/faculty agreement form. The timeframe for most partnerships is one semester. However, several courses and their faculty have partnered with the same agency and, in all but one instance, the same course has partnered with the same agency each time it has been taught. With Institutional Review Board approval, evaluation of the project occurs during each course and has included: student pre/post tests, student qualitative feedback, and brief surveys by faculty and community agencies.
The researcher's relationship with the partner agencies for the graduate students has been indirect in that she has coordinated mailings to partner agencies and has planned and participated in bi-monthly meeting of a project advisory group that includes several community partner agencies. It has been direct in that she was acquainted with four of the partner agencies as she has placed pre-licensure students with them. The researcher also attended a four day Engaged Department workshop as part of an invited team composed of one community partner, the Project Director and two MSN faculty persons. The researcher is aware of quantitative and qualitative evaluation findings from the project, including feedback from the partner agencies and members of the advisory groups. Appendix D contains a copy of the Community Feedback instrument. The funded portion of the project, and the researcher's official role as Project Manager, ended prior to the start of this research study. However, integration of service-learning and ACPs in MSN courses and meetings of the advisory group two to three times a year will continue and include the researcher as member.

Pilot Project

A pilot project for this study was conducted during Fall-Winter, 2001-2002. The purpose was to explore the perceptions of community agencies with which the researcher had partnered. The methodological framework for the study was the phenomenological method of qualitative research. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the key contact persons from three partner agencies. Results revealed highly positive feedback concerning benefits to both the agencies and students. Participants praised the level of communication between the agencies and the researcher partner. Recommendations were few and included: (a) the need for a formal agreement between one organization and the school of nursing to enable a higher level of student activities and (b) more services by the students.
The researcher also gained experience with the design and implementation of a qualitative research study. Key findings included: (a) the phenomenological approach to qualitative research was not fully congruent with the research purpose and questions, (b) it was difficult for the researcher to avoid becoming involved in the interaction and (c) there are challenges presented by interviewing individuals one has worked closely with over several years. These findings were addressed in the current study though: (a) use of the grounded theory approach to qualitative research, (b) careful attention to interviewing techniques and (c) use of techniques such as bracketing and journaling to promote objectivity of data analysis, results and findings.

Summary and Conclusions- Review of the Literature

This chapter opened with a discussion of the reasons for, and benefits of, participation in academic-community partnerships by community health organizations and programs of graduate nursing education. An overview of three sets of principles for service-learning and academic-community partnerships was presented. Current literature pertaining to community health partnerships and academic-community partnerships at the higher education, health professions education, undergraduate nursing and graduate nursing levels was discussed and critiqued within primary and secondary reviews of literature. The dearth in knowledge concerning community partners' views of participation in service-learning and academic-community partnerships and the clear need for scholarly inquiry in this area, particularly graduate nursing education, were established.

The methods of grounded theory research, as proposed by Glaser and Strauss in 1967, were described and followed by a summary of subsequent writing on grounded theory research by Glaser, Strauss and others. The final section of this chapter presented the
researcher's perspective of, and described the setting for, this research study: community agencies' perspectives of partnership with a graduate program of nursing.
Chapter III

Methods

Introduction

The grounded theory approach to qualitative research was used to answer the following questions:

1. How do community organizations describe the process of participation in an academic-community partnership with a program of graduate nursing education?

2. What factors do community organizations (COs) identify as influencing an academic-community partnership with a program of graduate nursing education?

Approach to Grounded Theory Research

The primary source of grounded theory methods for this study was Glaser and Strauss' original work (1967). It was supplemented with methods described in Glaser's 1978 book, designed to address gaps in the original work, and Hutchinson's (1993) interpretation which builds on the original work and integrates strategies from both Glaser and Strauss' later works. In the proposal for this study, the researcher indicated intention to closely follow Hutchinson's ten processes. However, as the research entered the data analysis phase, the researcher found Hutchinson's processes were actually a combination of techniques and steps in the ground theory research process. The researcher adapted Hutchinson's processes and separated them into: (a) techniques used in qualitative research and (b) steps in the research process. The processes, discussed in detail in this chapter, include: (a) Initial literature review; (b) Initial data collection; (c) Phase I analysis: Level I Coding, Level II coding, Level III coding; (d) Phase II analysis: De-limit the theory; and (e) Write the theory. It is important to note that
grounded theory research is not a linear process and that data collection and analysis occur concurrently.

Primary Literature Review

The purpose of the primary literature review (Chapter II) was the discovery of sensitizing concepts and gaps in knowledge (Hutchinson, 1993).

Initial Data Collection

Sources for data collection included: observation, interviews, documents, member checking and a meeting of the participants. The purpose was to acquire large amounts of narrative data (Hutchinson, 1993).

Setting

The setting was the 18 community organizations known to have partnered with at least one course in graduate nursing program (MSN program) of the Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University from September, 2000 to April, 2003. The university is located in a large, midwestern city. Each organization was assigned a number (1-18). Information on which organizations comprised the setting was obtained, with permission, from the Director of the MSN Program.

Population

The population included the primary contact person and/or other staff of each organization in the population.

Sampling Criteria

Inclusion criteria included: being a member of the population and the ability to speak, read, and write English. This study incorporated the grounded theory research techniques of theoretical saturation and theoretical sampling described in Chapter II. Thus, the researcher
did not set in advance a specific sample size or highly defined inclusion criteria. Rather, sampling proceeded as follows:

1. An early guideline or goal was set of interviewing at least one individual, preferably the primary contact person, from each organization in the setting (N=18).

2. This goal was not absolute but was subject to modification as data analysis was begun and early categories identified (theoretical sampling).

3. At the completion of analysis of six interviews, no new categories were emerging and the initial level of theoretical saturation had been achieved.

4. The goals of sampling then became to: (a) contribute to understanding of emerging concepts, their properties and relationships among them and (b) increase the probability of collecting similar data on a category thus helping to verify its existence and establish conditions under which the category exists (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). This was accomplished by continuing to seek interviews with the remaining organizations in the setting and by asking more direct questions designed to learn more about the categories and their properties.

Sample Recruitment

The key contact person for each agency was identified from records of the Community Engagement Through Service-Learning (CETSL) project. The researcher approached each contact person by phone. The study was explained, including informed consent, questions answered and participation sought. In two cases the primary contact person referred the researcher to another staff member/s who would be most appropriate to participate. Although grounded theory research methods recognize the value of multiple interviews with one participant, due to the timeframe for this study, each participant in this study was interviewed once.
One organization had closed and three key contact persons were no longer employed by their organizations. All key contact persons, or staff referred by the key contact person, reached by phone or email (N = 15) indicated a willingness to participate. However, the contact persons from agencies 13 and 14 did not respond to subsequent efforts to set a date for the interview and were not included in the study.

Once the interviews were underway, the researcher learned that:

1. The key contact person for organization 11, who had agreed to participate, was not able to come and arranged for another staff member to participate. The individual had worked closely with the student and was willing to be interviewed.

2. A second participant had worked with MSN students while at a previous organization (17) and integrated all her experiences into the interview.

3. A third participant stated the partnership had actually been a 3 part relationship involving another agency in the setting (16). The key contact person for the other agency was no longer employed by the agency and did not respond to an email. This participant spoke for the overall partnership from her perspective.

4. A fourth participant reported her partnership had also involved another organization in the setting which was now closed (15). Efforts to reach the contact person for the closed organization were unsuccessful. Therefore the third participant spoke for the overall partnership from her perspective.

**Description of Sample**

Of the 18 organizations that initially comprised the setting, 13 organizations were represented in the sample of 13 participants (two participants were employed by the same organization but had separate partnerships and one participant had worked for two organizations in the study). Each participant was assigned a letter (A –M). Table 2 provides a
summary of the organizations and participants. The use of theoretical sampling is described later in the chapter.

Table 2

**Description of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Time With Agency (years)</th>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Semesters</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Voluntary health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4 ½</td>
<td>Voluntary health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>K-12 education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Specialty health care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Human service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Human service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>Human service (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>K-12 education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Voluntary health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>K-12 education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>K-12 education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>41/2</td>
<td>Specialty health care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Voluntary health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.0 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 sem.</td>
<td>1.6 inst.</td>
<td>1.6 crs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 2 instructors co-taught; b 2 courses included the same students

In order to maintain confidentiality of the participants and their organizations, some information that might have added depth and richness to the descriptions here and in Chapter IV is reported in the aggregate or not included in this report at all. This is particularly the case where there was just one occurrence of a particular characteristic or descriptor.
Types of organizations reflected in the study included: voluntary health agencies (5), voluntary human service organization (3), K-12 education (3); specialty health care (2). All participants were women, 7 were nurses, and 11 of the 13 described themselves as having a leadership or managerial role in their organization. All participants stated they had prior experience in partnerships. The participants' number of years with their agency ranged from 1½ to 20 and, although they were not asked to state the number of years in their profession, it was clear from the participants' descriptions of their background that each had at least 15 years of experience in their profession.

Information concerning the extent of involvement by participants with service-learning courses from Fall, 2000 (pilot of one course) to Spring, 2003 was gathered from both the participants and, with permission of the MSN program, from project records. Several participants could not recall the details of which semesters, course type and faculty with whom they had worked. The number of semesters a participant had partnered with an MSN course varied from 1-6. The number of instructors a participant had worked with ranged from 1-4 and the number of courses a participant had worked with ranged from 1-4. Overall, the extent of involvement for one participant ranged from 1 course, 1 semester, 1 student to 4 courses, 4 semesters and numerous groups of students at 2 agencies.

Seven participants stated they were members of the Community Engagement Through Service-Learning Advisory Group and responded to questions about it.

Field Observation

Field observation involved visiting each participant's agency. The purpose of the visit was for the researcher to demonstrate an interest in the agency, become generally familiar with the agency's environment and acquire a context for the partnership. The researcher made field notes immediately after each interview. Eleven interviews were conducted in the
participant’s office. Two interviews were conducted at the participant’s homes and subsequently followed by visits to the agency. Field notes were made following completion of each interview and site visit.

The Interview Process

Each participant was asked to select a date, time and preferred location for the interview. The researcher forwarded, by mail, fax or email, a confirmation of the date/time/place, the informed consent information (Appendix E) and the purpose of the interview. In one case, a participant requested to see a verification of Institutional Review Board approval. A copy of the approval memo was forwarded to the participant by email.

The researcher conducted all interviews. At the time of the interview, the researcher reviewed the consent with the participant, answered any questions, elicited the participant’s signature, sound checked the tape recorder and requested descriptive information (see Participant Information Sheet, Appendix E). All participants agreed to be audio-taped and two tape recorders were used. The length of the recorded interview ranged from 40-60 minutes. Time at the location of the interview ranged from 1-1/2 hours and was spent in a tour of the agency and conversation prior to initiation of taping.

The semi-structured interviews utilized open-ended questions (Appendix D) designed to elicit the participant’s experience of partnership with the graduate school of nursing, factors influencing the partnership, and suggestions as to how to promote a successful academic-community partnership with a graduate program of nursing. The interview guide was developed from the interview questions and Gelmon et al’s (2001) interview guide for assessing community partners’ views of service-learning was used as a resource. After the initial six interviews, theoretical sampling in the form of modifications to the original interview questions, was used to add depth to emerging categories and their properties.
Group Meeting

Following completion of Level III coding, the participants were invited to attend a meeting of the participants. The purpose was to meet requirements of one funder of the research: present the preliminary findings of the study and seek participants’ feedback on those findings. The feedback would be used to: (a) plan a program on community-academic partnerships for organizations in the university’s community and (b) refine findings, implications and recommendations of the study.

The meeting was held at the university and lunch was provided. Six of the 13 participants indicated they planned to attend; five came to the event. Meeting staff included the researcher, the university staff person who funded the project, and a graduate assistant who took computer notes of the discussion.

After signing a new consent which is described in the section on Protection of Human Rights, participants introduced themselves and the researcher gave a verbal summary of study findings along with several practical suggestions for implementing study findings. Participants were provided with a written copy of the findings and tools for implementing findings. Those who attended the group meeting found the study findings to be highly reflective of their perspectives of partnership with a graduate nursing program. They expressed surprise at the researcher’s ability to synthesize the content of the interviews. Some participants pointed to areas of the findings they particularly supported; there were no additions or deletions. Participants believed the tools provided by the researcher would be helpful in working with MSN students.

The funder asked participants to talk about the roles they had played in evaluation and reflection. Participants indicated they believed evaluation and reflection were important and that community partners should play a role in both. However, they noted that in their
work with the MSN students they had not been involved in student reflection at all and the evaluation, which was informal, they had done was with faculty. The participants indicated they would be interested in hearing the students’ perspectives of the projects.

Documents

Data collection also included documents such as a brochure describing a particular agency’s history, mission, and services; a newsletter or an annual report; and materials returned following member checking.

Data Management

The researcher reviewed field notes and listened to the audiotapes of the interviews immediately following the interview. Verbatim transcripts were made as soon as possible using the word processing program Microsoft Word 2000. There were no cases in which participants had to be contacted following the interview to clarify any unclear statements.

The transcripts were typed double-spaced, with a large margin for researcher notes, numbered lines, page numbers and headings. In an effort to transfer the tenor of the interview to the transcript, changes in tone of voice were noted in parentheses (e.g. laughed or voice faded away); and pauses were noted with a period (.). Field notes, transcripts and other literature from the participating organizations were stored in ring binders organized according to the order in which the interviews were conducted. Participant Information Sheets were stored in a separate binder.

Audiotapes, computer files, and written records pertaining to the study were stored in the manner described in the Protection of Human Rights section of this chapter.

Data Analysis

In the grounded theory method of qualitative research, the purpose of data analysis is, through inductive reasoning, to move from the bits of data derived from individual
participants to a highly refined set of categories and their theoretical properties that are
generalized to the point they "designate characteristics of concrete entities, not the entities
themselves" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). As Glaser and Strauss acknowledged, their 1967
work lacked specificity as to specific steps of grounded theory data analysis. This researcher
relied on the procedure described by Hutchinson (1993). However, as noted previously, even
those components of the process were found to be somewhat awkward as they seemed to
alternate between steps toward increasingly refined categories and techniques for achieving
those categories.

The following discussion of methods used for data analysis in this study is divided
into two sections: (a) techniques used and (b) a stepwise set of three phases of refinement and
synthesis of the emerging categories and their properties: (a) coding, (b) delimiting the theory
at two levels: categories and theory and (c) writing the theory. As data analysis begins with
the earliest data collection, the stages of data analysis, as well as the stages of coding
discussed below, are not linear and are likely to overlap.

Techniques of Data Analysis

According to grounded theory procedures, the researcher did all coding and began to
code data as soon as it was available. Seven techniques described by Glaser and Strauss
(1967), Glaser (1978) and Hutchinson (1993) were used: (a) open coding, (b) constant
comparison, (c) memoing, (d) sorting, (e) theoretical sampling, (f) theoretical saturation and
(g) member checking. All processes were used throughout data analysis. However, each
tended to dominate in developing a specific level of codes. Open coding, constant
comparison, memoing, sorting, and member checking are discussed under Phase I: Coding.
Theoretical saturation is discussed under Phase II, Delimiting the Theory.
Phase I: Coding

Coding, not mentioned in Glaser and Strauss' initial work, but later seen as the fundamental technique of data analysis, refers to identification of emerging categories, their properties and inter-relationships. The ultimate goal is to identify a Basic Social Psychological Process (BSP) and its' related properties. The BSP and its’ properties are “grounded” in and derived from the data. BSPs are discussed in detail later in this chapter.

Coding, along with theoretical sampling and constant comparison, led to three levels of codes: Level I (in vivo or substantive), Level II (categories) and Level III (theoretical constructs) (Hutchinson, 1993).

Techniques Used for Coding

Open coding was used for initial data analysis and led to Level I codes. Data were "fractured" or examined line by line to identify as many categories and their properties as possible. During open coding, the researcher asked the following questions: "What is this data a study of?", "What category does this incident indicate?", "What (process) is actually happening in the data?" (Glaser, 1978, p. 57).

In constant comparison, one incident is compared with other incidents to ensure they are mutually exclusive and cover the behavioral variation. Constant comparison is a key technique in developing level II codes. The result is a number of categories.

Memos were a spontaneous means of recording insights as to the theoretical ideas about the codes and their properties. Memos were not final and were modified as needed. An example of a memo was:

Participants have had varying degrees of experience with academic-community partnerships. Those who have been involved for more than one semester use that experience to modify their activities with later groups of students. Those who have
worked with students for one semester indicate they would do things differently the next time based on their experiences during that semester.

As a fund of memos that described emerging categories, their properties and relationships was accumulated, the researcher began the sorting process. The memos were sorted into Level III codes (theoretical constructs) that reflected the researcher's theoretical sensitivity and built on her knowledge of and experience with the topic. "Theoretical constructs conceptualize the relationship among the three levels of codes" (Hutchinson, 1993, p. 197) and, as they are based on substantive or theoretical codes, assure the theory emerges from, and is grounded in, the data.

Member checking involved seeking feedback from participants as to findings of individual interviews as well as findings of the overall study. This provides support for the correctness of the findings and is a key strategy in promoting rigor of the study. Member checking was used during Phases I and III of the study and details of the procedure followed are discussed in those sections.

An example of the data analysis process may be found in Table 3.

*Level I Codes*

The primary processes used to develop Level I codes were open coding and member checking. The product of open coding was a summary of the interview. Member checking proceeded as follows: each participant received a copy of the summary and was asked to review the summary, decide whether it reflected their thoughts, write a note on the summary and return it in an enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope (see Appendix D for a copy of the letter). Ten of the 13 interview summaries were returned. Eight agreed the summary accurately reflected their thoughts and made no changes, additions or deletions. One participant who was working with a group of students at the time of the interview added a
### Table 3

**Example of Data Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote from Participant</th>
<th>Level I Code</th>
<th>Level II Codes</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>BSP and Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>379 I think it’s very important to</td>
<td>Service should meet needs of a agency’s clients</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>BSP: Connecting for Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 Address needs that arise from the getting to know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381 The person you are providing the service to</td>
<td>Students should come to the agency</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct 1: Teaming Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490 “I think in this particular case it is best for the students to come here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 Because I think you have to see and interact with the (clients)</td>
<td>Students should meet the clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 and see them in their … environment</td>
<td>Students should learn about the clients and their needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 to get a sense of how we</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497 approach (our services) here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498 and the nature of the (clients) and of the needs ..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 So while I would be happy to go talk about the school down there,</td>
<td>Participant is willing to come to the school of nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503 I think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 you don’t get that sense unless you spend some time here..”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

brief update and one corrected several inaccuracies in the description of her agency and clients.
Level II Codes

The purpose of Level II coding is to reassemble the Level I codes at a more abstract level. The product of Level II coding is a set of categories and responses to the research questions. The primary technique used during Level II coding was constant comparison.

The Level II coding process proceeded as follows. A copy of each interview summary was cut into individual statements. The statements of a similar nature or topic were put into piles on a table. Each statement was compared to previous statements to determine if it was similar or different. Statements that differed were put into a new pile. Statements that seemed to be related were then put into business envelopes. Each envelope was marked with a one–three word label that described the phrases in that envelope, i.e. Roles or Evaluation. The result was a total of 32 envelopes. The phrases contained in each envelope were then taped to pieces of paper which were assembled in a ring binder and sectioned according to the label – i.e. 21 sections or categories.

Level III Codes

The purpose of Level III coding is to refine the emerging categories into theoretical constructs along with their properties and relationships. The final product of Level III coding is the discovery of a core variable, or basic social psychological process (BSP). Primary techniques used during level III coding included sorting and memoing.

Glaser’s (1978, p. 74) coding family, “The Six C’s”, was used to develop Level III coding (as described in Table 4). To accomplish Level III coding, the researcher determined into which of five C categories (co-variances was not used) the nineteen Level I categories would fit. She then re-organized the sheets of paper with phrases attached to them into the six C categories.

The researcher found coding according to the 6 C’s to be an awkward process akin to
Table 4

*The Six C’s Coding Family*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>What is the cause of the BSP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>What is the setting where the BSP occurs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>Upon what is the BSP contingent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>What are the outcomes of the BSP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-variances</td>
<td>Includes connected variables without forcing the idea of cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>What factors are essential for actualization of the BSP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or qualifiers)</td>
<td>(Adapted from Glaser, 1978; Hutchinson, 1993).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"forcing a round peg into a square hole". Some categories fell easily into one of the codes, while others seemed to be a weak fit or were orphaned from a code. Coding according to the 6 C’s did assist the researcher in beginning to see the categories as a process and to identify properties associated with the categories.

As suggested by Glaser and Strauss, the Level III coding process led to identification of a Basic Social Psychological Process: Connecting for Partnership. "Connecting for Partnership" had several of the characteristics of a BSP described by Strauss (1978, p. 36): (a) it recurred frequently in the data; (b) it linked the various data together; (c) it explained much of the variation in the data; (d) it had implications for a more general or formal theory.

*Selective Coding Based on the Basic Social Psychological Process (BSP)*

Once the BSP, Connecting for Partnership, emerged, it became the focus of the data analysis. Theoretical sampling, coding, constant comparison, memoing and sorting focused on enhancing the researcher's understanding of collaboration. As described by Hutchinson (1993), the result of selective coding for collaboration was six theoretical constructs, their categories, and properties.
Phase II: Delimiting the Theory

Following coding, the second phase of grounded theory data analysis is de-limiting the theory. As the researcher noted that no additional data were being found that added properties to the categories elicited during coding, they were modified to become more focused. This process is referred to as “theoretical saturation” (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

During this phase, the researcher synthesizes the emerging theory at two levels: categories and theory. As described by Glaser and Strauss (1967), the product of Phase II of data analysis of was an emerging theory that was increasingly solidified (fewer major modifications) and reduced (a small set of higher level concepts).

The researcher’s decision as to when to end the study was guided by efforts to achieve theoretical completeness or theoretical coverage as well as practical limitations of time, energy, money and the research situation itself. The researcher believes that, given the setting (i.e. this study reflected only the perspective of the primary contact persons of the community partners and did not include other stakeholders) and other practical constraints, an optimal level of theoretical completeness was achieved.

Phase III: Writing the Theory

Phase III of data analysis began once the BSP was identified, theoretical saturation of categories, their properties and inter-relationships reached; and theoretical completeness achieved. During the third phase of the data analysis, the researcher endeavored to integrate the codes, categories and constructs into a substantive theory of community organizations’ partnership with a graduate program of nursing. In accordance with Hutchinson’s view of grounded theory data analysis, the researcher endeavored produce “a dense, parsimonious theory covering behavioral variation” with a description that included its associated properties, conditions, strategies, and consequences (Hutchinson, 1993, p. 206).
Both Hutchinson (1993) and Glaser and Straus’ (1967) saw the outcome of Phase III data analysis as a publishable piece of research. Glaser and Straus suggested the researcher is ready to publish the outcomes of grounded theory research when an analytical framework exists that: (a) forms a substantive theory, (b) is a reasonably accurate statement of the matters studied and (c) is couched in a form that others in the same field could understand. This researcher believes she was able to accomplish the outcomes Glaser and Strauss and Hutchinson described for Phase III of the data analysis. Discussion of the substantive theory along with its categories and their properties and interactions may be found in Chapter IV.

Techniques used during phase III included:

1. Revisiting the data and using them to: (a) validate categories, their properties and interactions, (b) pinpoint data behind a hypothesis or gap in the theory and 3) provide illustrations.

2. Member checking: a summary of the final results of the study was sent to all participants along with a letter of explanation and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Participants were asked to review the summary and return it signed with their reactions. Appendix D contains a copy of the letter sent to participants.

3. Secondary Literature Review. The researcher engaged in secondary literature review to identify literature that “supports, illuminates, or extends the proposed theory” (Hutchinson, 1993, p. 195). Integration of the secondary literature review is included in Chapter II.

Protection of Human Rights

Ethical Issues in Qualitative Research

Streubert and Carpenter (1999) identified several aspects of human rights protection that require special consideration in qualitative research. First, due to the evolving nature of
qualitative data collection, informed consent may be difficult, if not impossible to obtain. Second, in qualitative research, the nature of participant recruitment, data collection and reporting is such that it may be difficult to assure anonymity. However, there are actions the researcher can take to protect confidentiality as much as possible. Third, as the data collection tool, the researcher may develop a close relationship with the participant and fourth, sensitive issues may arise out of the interview. Fifth, the researcher has an obligation to maintain an objective stance throughout the study.

The researcher found she was able to maintain an objective stance during the interviews. However, she did find that, at times, her interest in the topic overtook her focus on the participant’s views and she began to engage in a discussion of the topic with the participant. In those situations, the researcher redoubled her efforts to focus the interaction on the participant’s views of the issue.

**Potential Ethical Issues in this Setting**

Insofar as the researcher is also a member of the faculty of the graduate program of nursing, has played a key role in the funded portion of the CETSL project, and may be interviewing both key leaders and mid-level staff at the same partner agencies, participants may have had concerns about the confidentiality of information they shared during the interview.

**Strategies to Protect Human Rights**

The following strategies were employed in the current study in order to protect human rights, in particular, the concerns noted above. First, approval of the Case Western Reserve University Institutional Review Board was obtained prior to initiation of the study (Appendix E).
Second, each participant was told of the informed consent process during recruitment and provided with a copy of the consent form prior to the interview (Appendix E). All questions were answered. The opportunity to alter consent was available throughout the interview. No participants chose to follow this course.

Third, to protect confidentiality, participants were assured that information revealed during the interviews was totally confidential and would not be shared with faculty, students, or other staff at their agency or any other agency. Audiotapes were made only with consent of the participant and were coded as to agency (number) and participant name (letter). A sheet with descriptive information for each participant was kept in a binder separate from the transcript and the descriptive information was used for aggregate statistics only. Every effort was made to assure that the written report, and any publication or presentation of the findings, would not contain participant's names or the names and locations of their agencies. Any quotes have been modified so that the participant and/or their agency could not be identified. The audiotapes, transcripts, and signed informed consent forms are kept in a locked file, accessible to only the researcher and thesis supervisor. Computer files are password protected. All materials associated with the study (i.e. audiotapes, computer files, field notes, participant information sheets, transcripts and consent forms) will be retained for three years following the last publication associated with the study and then destroyed. In the case of the group meeting, an addendum to the IRB approval was requested and obtained (Appendix E). Those who had been interviewed for the study were contacted, informed of the purpose of the group meeting and asked to participate. All individual interview summaries were mailed and responses received prior to the group meeting.

Fourth, to promote objectivity and findings true to the data, the researchers' perspective was discussed in Chapter II and the following strategies were employed during
the study: (a) personal pre-conceptions, values, and beliefs were bracketed during the proposal process as described in Chapter II, and in a diary, (b) a second researcher familiar with the topic reviewed the data and verify categories, and (c) summaries of the individual interviews as well as the overall study findings were sent to the participants so they might review the it accuracy and completeness (member checking). The researcher also kept journal in which personal feelings and reflections were noted.

Fifth, if issues of concern to the participant arose during the interview, such as suggestions as to ways to improve the partnership, the researcher was prepared to discuss with the participant, following the close of the interview, means by which they could be acted upon while protecting the confidentiality of the participant-researcher relationship. No such issues arose during the interviews.

**Rigor**

Rigorous research is characterized by truth value, applicability, consistency and neutrality (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). In quantitative research, criteria used to assess these characteristics are internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity, respectively. Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose four characteristics of qualitative research that exemplify trustworthiness (credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability) and suggest strategies researchers can implement to promote the trustworthiness of their research.

**Credibility**

Qualitative research that demonstrates "truth value" is characterized by credibility. The study integrated the following three strategies suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985). First, activities were employed to increase the likelihood of producing credible findings: (a) prolonged engagement to provide scope (sufficient time to learn the "culture", to test for misinformation introduced by distortions of the self or the respondents, and to build trust); (b)
persistent observation to provide depth; and (c) triangulation of methods and theories.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) also suggest triangulation of sources. However, due to limitations of time and scope, there was one source for each partnership in this study.

The second strategy used to promote credibility was peer debriefing. The researcher explored her thoughts about the data collection/coding/analysis processes by discussing them with the chair of her research committee who is a skilled qualitative researcher. The committee chair also reviewed the researcher's coding on two interviews. A written record of these activities became part of the audit trail.

The third, and most important, strategy to ensure credibility was member checks. Formal member checking was implemented by asking participants to react to a summary of their interview as well as a summary of the overall findings of the study.

Transferability

Transferability corresponds to applicability or external validity in quantitative research. The researcher facilitated this decision by providing "thick description" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 316). "Thick description" involves direct quotations taken from the participant interviews or field notes illustrative of the codes, categories, or constructs that emerge during the process of data analysis. The reader is also provided with a general description of the participants and their organizations.

Dependability

Dependability corresponds to consistency or reliability in quantitative research. A dependability audit can be integrated with a confirmability audit (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Confirmability

Confirmability corresponds to neutrality or, in quantitative research, objectivity. The fundamental strategy for assuring confirmability is the confirmability audit. If necessary, the
materials will, at the completion of the study, be made available to an independent auditor familiar with the topic of interest for audit of the study: 1) raw data including tapes, field notes, and other documents; 2) transcripts of interviews and write-ups of field notes with codes; 3) memos; 4) drafts and the final report; 5) process notes including methodological notes and audit trail notes; 6) materials relating to intentions and disposition including the inquiry proposal, personal notes and expectations; and 7) instrument development information including pilot forms and preliminary schedules (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Summary

This chapter delineated the methods of the grounded theory approach to qualitative research used in this study, measures taken to protect human rights, and strategies to assure rigor of the study. The researcher’s original intent was to follow Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) grounded theory methods as refined by Glaser (1978) and Hutchinson (1993). However, the researcher found these methods to be somewhat cumbersome modified them to the nature of this study while preserving Glaser and Strauss’ original intent to have the resulting theory be inductive, substantive, and, most importantly, “grounded in the data”.
Chapter IV

Results

Introduction

This qualitative study of community organizations' perspectives of partnership with a graduate nursing program included 13 participants. Data were obtained through interviews, field notes, agency brochures, and a group meeting. The results discussed in this chapter were derived from interviews, field notes, and agency brochures. Results will be reported as categories, concepts, and a descriptive theory. Responses to the two research questions set out in Chapter I will be addressed:

1. How do community organizations describe the process of participation in an academic-community partnership with a graduate nursing education program?

2. What factors do community organizations identify as influencing partnership with a graduate nursing education program?

Supporting quotes have been single spaced and edited for clarity. To promote confidentiality, any identifying information has been changed and replacement terms are in parentheses.

Results of Level I Coding

The results of Level I coding consist of the key points that emerged from each of the 13 interviews - e.g. a summary of each interview (Appendix F). To protect confidentiality, some information about the participants, which might have added richness and depth to the findings, is reported only in the aggregate (Chapter III) or has been omitted. Ten of the 13 participants (77%) responded to the summary which had been mailed to them. One
participant was laid off from her agency during the study. Eight of the 10 participants who responded found the summary to accurately reflect their interview and made no corrections, additions or deletions. One participant noted she had not yet received the students’ plan for their project. Two other participants (L and M) corrected inaccuracies in the descriptions of their organizations.

Results of Level II Coding

The Level II results (Table 5) include twenty categories. Each category is comprised of a group of phrases ranging from a few phrases to a large number of phrases taken from the interview summaries. The Level II codes were shaped largely by the interview questions. At this point the categories had not been sorted other than in alphabetical order. Two early observations about the level II codes, noted in memos, were: (a) some codes appear related and can be combined together and (b) participants’ experiences with a particular aspect of the relationship and suggestions as to how to improve that aspect might be in the same or separate codes/categories and could be integrated in a new category. Following identification of the Level II codes, the researcher answered the two research questions.

Research Question 1: How do community organizations describe the process of participation in an academic-community partnership with a graduate nursing education program?

Participants were clear as to their overall satisfaction with the partnership experience. Twelve of the 13 participants indicated they were highly satisfied with the overall experience. While four participants reported the process had gone very smoothly, the remaining nine participants noted that, while they were pleased with the outcomes, the process had its ups and downs. This is particularly the case for participants who had worked with multiple groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Advisory Group</td>
<td>Views of CETSL Advisory Group by those who attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication</td>
<td>Communication within partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation</td>
<td>Experiences with evaluation in partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prior partnerships</td>
<td>Previous experiences with partnerships &amp; service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Follow-up</td>
<td>Post-semester follow-up reported by participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Implementation</td>
<td>Descriptions of implementation phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Influencing factors</td>
<td>Conditions seen as influencing success of partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Initiation</td>
<td>How participants linked with MSN program &amp; S-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lessons learned</td>
<td>What participants would do differently if partner again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MSN students</td>
<td>Differences between MSN &amp; undergraduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Orientation of community partner</td>
<td>Orientation to service-learning, MSN program, student learning objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Orientation of students</td>
<td>Orientation of students to community organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Outcomes</td>
<td>Outcomes of the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Participants and their organizations</td>
<td>Descriptions of the organizations and participants' roles in the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Planning</td>
<td>The process of planning student activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Positives</td>
<td>What went well with the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Problems/Challenges</td>
<td>Difficulties encountered with the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Purpose</td>
<td>Why participants partnered with MSN program; expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Recommendations</td>
<td>Suggestions for how to improve partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Roles</td>
<td>The variety of roles participants played in the partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of students within a semester, with multiple courses and/or the same course for more than one semester.

The interviews revealed that participants' relationships with the MSN program followed a basic sequence through a semester. However, their responses to questions were not linear and included references to various aspects of the partnership. In order to provide clarity of the process for the reader yet acknowledge that data analysis was only at Level II coding when the research questions were answered, the participants' descriptions of the partnership process have been divided into very basic segments progressing through the typical timeframe for projects done by a group of students. Participants who had worked with students over more than one semester were invited to compare/contrast their experiences. There were a few instances in which projects were continued into a second semester by the same or a different group of students.

Nature of the Partners

Analysis revealed that many of the participants shared certain characteristics. All were highly experienced in their professions and all but one had been with the organization for more than four years. Seven of the 13 were nurses; the remainder was educators or held leadership positions in voluntary health and human service organizations. All had a broad understanding of their organization's mission, services and staff.

All participants reported some previous experience with collaborative activities and several indicated they were able to apply lessons learned to their work with the MSN students. Nine participants, including the seven associated with voluntary health or human service agencies, stated that collaborative activities were an integral part of their organization's work. They saw collaboration as a key strategy for implementing their missions and goals, particularly in the current climate of diminishing financial support.
Participant B shared: “We are simply here to meet the needs but not just in a band-aid fashion. We are also very much advocates and we work very closely with a number of organizations trying to seek some form of health care for everyone…”

Twelve of the 13 participants stated they had had some contact with nursing students in the past – providing clinical experiences or speaking to students about their organization. Three participants reported having been involved with service-learning and two reported having worked with graduate nursing students. Several participants specifically noted their interest in supporting learning experiences for students.

Initiation of the Partnership

Twelve of the 13 participants became involved through some contact initiated by faculty of the MSN program. In five cases, the agency was approached by the faculty member (four) or student (one). In six instances, the participants had prior relationships with the school of nursing (i.e. clinical site) or university (i.e. AmeriCORPS site). They were invited to be initial members of the MSN program’s service-learning advisory group (CETSL Advisory Group) or attended an MSN program-sponsored institute on service-learning and linked with faculty through those meetings. The twelfth participant became involved when asked to provide a client group for a project being done by an existing partnership between another organization and faculty member. In the thirteenth case, the participant contacted the school of nursing for assistance with a project she was planning, joined the CETSL Advisory Group and then linked with a faculty member.

Participant E was contacted by the faculty person: “Feels like I received a blank and brand new phone call from a person I had never heard of before in her life and her name was (name) and she was saying that she had this group of graduate nursing students who she wanted to be exposed to the community and that made fantastic sense to me ....”.
Orientation of Each Partner

Orientation of each partner to the other’s organization was informal and the extent varied with the participant and faculty. The discussions tended to be in person, although some were done by phone or email.

Participant F explained: “I don’t think at that time she knew completely what our organization was but she came to learn about our organization and then made that connection... (My orientation) was mostly sitting down with (faculty name) and talking over what it is and reading through some of the informational things ... It took a while for me to realize that it was bigger than just us doing it”.

Generally, the faculty persons took the lead in shaping the partnership. However, in the two cases in which the participant had worked with several courses, she took the lead in orienting the faculty person. Participant B observed that one faculty member was new to service-learning and had some reservations about the project.

“Because I’ve had some experience ... I think I was able to have a dialogue with her and alleviate her anxiety...kind of carry her a little bit and I..gave her some examples of some of the things we’ve done...and I felt really good about that. Unfortunately, I’ve not been able to meet her because we keep missing each other. I’d like to believe that as a result of that she feels...much more aware and positive.

Is There A Fit?

Once the participant and faculty person had met and oriented each other to their organization, they determined whether the partnership was a fit. Participant M noted that the faculty person initially contacted another person at the agency and was referred to her:

“The partnership with (another organization) already existed ...because I was (providing services there). So it was the logical connection and being an (FPB alum) myself...that connection was there... you know, I’ve always been interested in helping students learn so it was just a natural partnership to begin with...”

Purpose of the Partnership

Although most participants did not report specific discussions with their faculty partner as to the purpose of the partnership, they all had clear thoughts as to the purpose/s of the partnership or their expectations. Two primary purposes emerged: (a) providing
community-based learning opportunities for the students and (b) addressing needs of the participant’s organization. Several participants focused on one of the primary purposes, whereas participant C described how she saw the two purposes moving beyond a parallel relationship and combining into a single, shared goal:

“In the beginning before it was really implemented I saw it as an opportunity for (MSN) students to have a learning experience in a community setting. But as time has gone on...it actually is more of like a symbiotic relationship where there is some mutual benefit...In the beginning it...seemed one way. Now it seems more of a two way relationship and the degree to which it is two way depends upon planning, a commitment on the part of both parties and how the learning activity for the (nursing students) plays out”.

Several participants mentioned one or more secondary purposes for the partnership: (a) to promote personal challenge, fulfillment or growth for the participant, (b) to develop future health professionals, (c) to provide opportunities for students to learn about the agency and its services. Participant B noted:

“I am very passionate about nursing in general...and I’ll never forget where I came from when I was a student and how challenging it is to be a student ... and so I remember going through that adjustment of what you learn in school and what’s really out there...this provides me with an opportunity to personally and professionally to help those students see ... these are some of the kinds of things that you actually are gonna be dealing with and I think it’s a wonderful opportunity to be involved in that and to share what I have learned and the things that I have to do....”

Student Orientation

Orientation of students to the participants’ organizations varied as to location and extent. Some participants came to the school and did a presentation to the students about their organizations’ missions, services and project needs. In other cases, the students visited the agency to learn the same information noted above, have a tour and, in a few instances, observe agency provision of services.

In some cases, all students were involved in orientation. However, there were a few cases in which the participant’s only contact was with one or a few students and they did not
meet the other students until the culmination of the project. Several participants stated they felt that although they knew MSN students are very busy and have complex lives, the students' orientation to the organization was very limited (e.g. to the specific project they would do). In those situations, students did not gain an appreciation of the scope of the agency’s services, where their project fit in and/or the nature, including cultural perspective, of the organization’s clients. In some cases, this lack of orientation was seen as having a negative influence on the outcomes of the students’ projects. Participant H noted:

“In my specific case, it (orientation) did not go too well. Part of it had to do with the students didn’t seem to have the time...they sent out one of the three, they sent one person, and it was hard to explain to them what our structure is because it was foreign to their way of thinking. I think they had a real struggle to find out that they could not plan an eight week course and do it in one hour...I think it depended on which group of students they were...and it was my first time...They struggled a little bit because they were having trouble talking at the level of the students”.

Participant J commented on the importance of students understanding the nature of the organization’s services and clients and recommended a specific book on poverty:

“In talking with the students...some of the students (who are) from suburban, you know middle class homes, it’s rather difficult for them to really...understand what some of their issues are with a lot of our population of (clients) in Cleveland...this (resource) would really serve to help them to learn a little bit more about the primary population that they are serving in...health care”.

*Planning the Projects*

Planning for the partnerships took several forms which varied among the participants:

(a) preliminary discussions between the participants and the MSN faculty person, (b) discussions between the participant and one or more of the students and (c) discussions among the participant, faculty person, and students.

The first aspect of planning centered around determining: (a) whether students would work individually or in groups and (b) what projects students would do. Participants described graduate students as having the ability to do independent project-type activities
involving assessment and analysis of staff or client needs and implementation of an
intervention.

There was no clear pattern for how topics for projects were decided. In one or two
cases, the faculty and participant determined what the projects would be in advance of student
involvement. In a few others, the faculty and/or community partner identified suggested
projects and allowed students to select which they wanted to do or actively negotiated the
projects with the students because they felt the learning experience would be optimized if the
projects integrated both the organization’s needs and the students’ interests.

Participant B works in an agency with a wide variety of programs. She observed: “So
how can I look within my organization, my agency or my program to see what kinds
of things they may be able to do in something that they are particularly interested
in… because I believe, and this is just some personal thing, that if it’s something that
if the student is pretty passionate about or interested in then it will be more
interesting for them, we’ll end up with a better project”.

At least eight participants noted that students came to the partnership with preset
ideas of what projects they wanted to do and/or how to implement them. Students had not
considered the needs of the organization or characteristics of the clients. This necessitated
further student orientation to the target population and negotiation between the participant
and the students:

Participant C: “I have an endless list (of projects) but many students do come in with
a preconceived notion of what they envisioned doing and sometimes you have to help
them rethink that”.

Participant M: “It was very important to me that the students realized what kind of a
population they were working with because this group wasn’t really a textbook or
anything… and they sort of had this, ‘Well this is what we are going to go with this
group’ which all sounded very, very good but I said ‘You know I really think that
before you can make any solid plans you really need to come out and meet this group
of people’. This group of people is very unique… and I thought it might threaten the
success of the project there so the first thing I really sort of insisted upon was that
they come out on a field trip and spend a two hour session while I was there…”
Once the projects were set, additional planning concerned the outcomes, timeframe, responsibilities and other details of implementation. A number of participants commented that this aspect was too loose and should have been more highly structured.

Examples of difficulties relating to planning and implementation included:

1. The outcomes and timeframe for the project were not clearly defined.
2. Students changed projects midstream without consulting the participant and did not consider the impact this might have on the participant or others in the organization.
3. Students delayed work on the project and rushed at the end.
4. Students did not consider the target group or seek input from the participant as they were working on the project. Thus, the outcome was not the quality that it might have been – e.g. a class for fourth graders was taught at a second grade level.
5. Participants working with several groups of students found the culminating events (i.e. presentations) were not well coordinated and strained the schedules of the participant and other staff.
6. Communication between the participant and student was irregular and/or ineffective.

Participant K commented on several of these difficulties:

"I know we had a meeting with (instructor) and I believe some other nursing school personnel and we talked about it and then I did have a meeting with like a few students who represented the course and we kind of talked about it and they would do a (topic) emphasis... In retrospect I think the planning phase could have been stronger ...I think it’s very important to address the needs that arise from the getting to know the person you are providing the service to... I never really met with the group of students who were going to be doing something at the school"

Implementation of the Projects

Most student projects were designed in so that students would have an opportunity to do some type of presentation (to agency staff or clients) and leave behind a tangible product that could be used again in the future. In general, students implemented the presentations and they went smoothly or bumps were quickly smoothed.
Participant B noted: “They’ve been of such a high caliber, self motivated, they follow through, they know what they have to do. Yes, there is sometimes a challenge because this a piece of a much larger picture so they’ve taken the initial responsibility of looking at what kind of timing and I do depend on them to do that and like I said, almost without exception.”

However, there were instances when the presentations were less than totally successful. Reasons suggested by participants included: unrealistic goals, lack of thorough preparation, being rushed at the end of the semester, and difficulty in meshing schedules with the target group or projects changed at the last minute. Participant C noted:

“I really believe that if the projects didn’t go well probably where we failed was... that we did not sit down and view the details before implementation. So...it was a mutual screw up. I didn’t push them to present to me before they went in and they didn’t commit early enough and investigate what the (target group was like)”.

Communication

Every participant indicated that effective communication was a key aspect of the partnerships and some dimension of it (when, how or with whom) presented a challenge for every participant. Participant F’s organization does much of its work through committees composed of members of the professional community and interested citizens. Student groups working with Participant F collaborated with several of these committees and communication went well:

“The students self-selected the projects they wanted to work on and we let them know when the committees were meeting and they adapted their schedules to try to get to committee meetings ...At the committee meetings we try to share with the chair what happened ...why the committee was there, what its goal was, and then kind of as a committee work together on the project that they selected. So they were working with the volunteers who were on the committee and giving input to the committee so that was very nice.”

When they occurred, problems in communication concerned participant-student communication versus participant-faculty communication. Reasons proposed by participants included:
1. Complex, full schedules of participants and others in their organizations;
2. Complex, full schedules of the MSN students;
3. Lack of understanding or skills of students on optimal communication with the target populations;
4. The nature of a particular student group;
5. Lack of a set plan as to how and when to communicate during the period (often several weeks) when students were working on the projects off-site.

Participants described communication as a thread throughout the partnership. However, it was most important during the time between planning and completion of the projects, when the students were not on site at the participants' organizations. For some participants, communication continued beyond the individual semester: (a) seven participants have been members of the CETSL Advisory Group and (b) four participants reported they have established relationships with their faculty partner that extend beyond an individual semester. Two participants serve on the Advisory Group and reported an independent relationship with the faculty member.

Methods of communication, ranked in order of frequency of use, included: email, telephone, pager and in-person meetings. Most participants found email very useful in communicating with faculty and students. Two participants did not have access to email at work but found students and faculty expected them to use email routinely. As actual person to person telephone contact was rare, voice mail was found helpful and pagers less so.

Participant J noted:

"We did some email,...they would page me and I remember this one particular student worked in an ICU and she would page me and I could call back and leave a message on the voice mail and then I would be out of the office and she would page me again and I (chuckle) would call her ... but we eventually managed to connect with each other..."
Several participants who worked with multiple groups of students noted differences among them as to efficiency, dynamics, and effectiveness of communication. While addressing these differences complicated their role in the partnership, participants tended to view such variations as to be expected. Participant H noted:

"(Communication with) the students was a little hard. I think more than anything they had assigned one person to be the spokesperson but I think they had a few dynamics internally as in any group orientation and we couldn’t meet altogether. And although we tried to get everybody to meet at one time, that’s the problem with group work. And then when they came ..they came with a short time... I mean I’m talking about this particular group. I think it would vary or I know that others have had it easier”.

Participants also saw communication with the faculty as important and reported few problems in that regard.

Participant’s Roles

Participants played a number of roles within their partnerships. As with other aspects of the partnerships such as communication, these roles increased in number and complexity when participants worked with multiple groups of students and when the projects involved multiple layers within the organization.

In general order of frequency, participants reported the following roles: communicator, educator, advisor/coach, liaison, negotiator, coordinator, facilitator, “intermediator”, learner and evaluator. The role of communicator was addressed above.

All participants acted as educators during the orientation phase. Some maintained a strong role of educator and advisor throughout the project. However, several participants mentioned they did not have close contact as students developed their project and were not able to guide them in shaping the intervention to the unique characteristics of the target group.

For some projects, students worked directly with the participant. In others, sometimes with the same participant, students worked with other staff in the organization. In those cases,
the participant played a strong liaison role through activities such as linking students with 
other staff, explaining what the partnership was about, making sure they had the buy-in of 
key personnel and coordinating schedules. Participant G described herself as having several 
roles depending on the student group/project:

"Liaison between our agency and the students and faculty, coach to really get my 
staff on board and let them know that this is something that they've asked for... 
Coached the students to help them understand that you're not just wasting your time, 
this is something that we really need and that I know you have they skills when they 
are questioning: 'Do I really have the skills to pull this off'?.. And then, I think it 
almost becomes one that you are almost a teacher in some aspects of it, because you 
are working with individuals who may not have ever done this before...”

At least four partnerships involved students working directly with clients. Those 
participants noted the importance of gaining the trust of clients or input from the clients as to 
how best their needs could be met. Participant I has a close relationship with her clients:

"There are key people that have been here long enough and have watched our 
transition. They're members of the community, they still come and I kind of 
periodically invite them to a private lunch and we sit down and talk and say 'I'm 
thinking of starting having somebody who wants to come and do (activity), what do 
you think?'”.

Many of the participants noted they were learners with respect to the partnership 
process and their profession. Participant A noted: “I thought this was a good learning 
experience for both of us because I had never had to do this before either ...they gave me a 
logic model and then said ‘Now think about how to do this, give me some examples’”.

Outcomes

All but one of the participants found the partnership to be a positive experience. The 
participant who did not report a successful experience indicated she remained committed to 
service-learning and had already applied the lessons she learned in another partnership with 
great success.
Outcomes reported by the participants may be divided into primary and secondary. Primary outcomes were reported by 12 of the 13 participants and related to contributions made to the work of the agency as well as learning by the students. The extent to which the primary outcomes were achieved varied. At times, students both learned and made strong contributions to the organization.

Participant M noted:

"I think it was a good experience for the students. It was a good problem-solving thing, a good team working thing because they did divide up the group but ... they were all doing other things and they needed to cooperate within their own group. (The clients) would welcome them back again which is a very high endorsement from that group ... 'Could they come and see us again?' ... That's the highest praise you can get".

In other cases, student learning dominated with contributions playing a secondary role. Participant C noted that "It is okay to have it that way... I think that's a part of any cooperative relationship is that there is gonna be certain things that go better". She gave the example of a group of students who, earlier in the semester, cancelled a date to observe a group of school students they would be teaching:

"Although the students in that classroom probably didn’t get a whole heck of a lot out of the lesson, the (nursing) students learned mega because they realized this bombed basically, we blew it, in terms of knowing the development. How are we going to change this in twenty minutes when we go to the next class?... And hey, that’s what teaching is about, being able to be spontaneous when something isn’t working. So they learned a lot:"

Secondary outcomes included:

1. Participants experienced: (a) Personal, professional growth including learning from faculty and students, (b) Opportunities to fulfill responsibilities to own profession and alma mater, (c) Professional relationships with the faculty members.

2. MSN students learned about the agency and its services.

3. School students saw MSN students as role models.
4. The community organizations received funding for the project.

5. Projects completed by the students could be used again in the future.

6. Participants hoped the MSN student would work for the organization in the future.

**Scope of the Partnerships**

The scope of the partnerships may be viewed in terms of the number of courses, faculty, semesters, and students the participant had worked with as well as the number of projects done (many students worked in groups). Gathering this information was a challenge. A number of the participants were not certain of this information (especially number of students and projects), so the researcher attempted to retrieve it from CETSL project records.

As indicated in Table 7, the scope of participant's relationships with MSN service-learning activities during the two and one-half years since the project began varied widely. However, some trends can be derived. Nine partners had worked with one faculty person for one (seven) or two (two) semesters. All expressed a willingness to continue involvement in service-learning but several had not worked with the course when it was taught again following the service-learning semester. In two cases, a second opportunity for service-learning had not yet occurred (i.e. partnered in a fall semester, interviewed in the following spring semester).

In three cases, participants had worked with one course and one faculty person for two or more semesters. All expressed satisfaction with the partnership. Two indicated they planned to continue the partnership again and one indicated a possible interest in continuing. The two remaining participants had, for various reasons, worked with multiple courses and faculty, each for one semester. They both indicated a strong commitment to service-learning, but expressed a desire to work with one faculty member in a continuing relationship.
As the focus of this study was process rather than outcomes, the researcher did not attempt to mine information concerning the total number of students and projects. However, participants reported the number of students they had worked with during one semester ranged from 1 student to 1 small group of students to up to 6 students or groups of students. Some participants oversaw up to six projects in one semester. It was noted that participants who either required or recommended a structured relationship (e.g. written plan with specified outcomes, responsibilities and timeline and/or a designated spokesperson for each student group) were those who had worked with several groups of students during one semester.

Differences Between Graduate and Undergraduate Students

The issue of differences between graduate and undergraduate students first arose in the interview with Participant C. She had noted the influence of MSN students’ busy schedules on the quality of a particular project:

“Many of the students in the program have complicated work schedules and work commitments and family commitments and you’re never gonna please everybody... We had one project that there were two themes. The one theme was teaching nutrition but the other, what I thought was more important was that it was a teaching project that was going to be implemented in two very culturally different buildings. As a result of them...procrastinating the one building got knocked out and we could not do it so it sort of defeated the purpose of the project...”

In light of this remark, the participant was asked about the differences between MSN and undergraduate students.

“I think there is a huge difference...I think MSN students are more comfortable with...their nursing practice and...their comfort level is different in that they have confidence in their nursing skills and just their practice in general whereas I think BSN students are still formulating their comfort level. Also, I think MSN students have life experiences and professional experiences to draw upon...I think they related better to the parents... Its like a those dolls that fit into one another, just another layer to use”.
Following this observation made by Participant C, the researcher added a question to the interview guide that asked if participants had worked with undergraduate students in the past and, if so, to compare/contrast their experiences in working with MSN students versus undergraduate students (of any discipline). Six of the eight participants interviewed after Participant E shared their thoughts on the differences and similarities in MSN and undergraduate students. When noted, types of undergraduate students that participants had worked with included: nursing, education, liberal arts and AmeriCORPS. One participant had extensive experience with associate degree nursing students. Some participants had worked with other types of graduate students (e.g. social work) and responded to the question as “graduate students” rather than MSN students.

Participants described clear differences between undergraduate and the MSN students. Listed below are points raised by more than one participant with the most frequent points listed first. The points are followed by discussion of two discrepancies in participant feedback and relevant quotes. An important note is that several participants observed variations among individual students and student groups as to these characteristics.

1. MSN students have busier, more complex lives with demands related to school, work and family. Students’ were not able to be flexible time-wise. Their availability for a thorough orientation to the community organization and to maintain close, regular communication with the community contact person was limited. In some cases, this led to less than optimal outcomes as students’ projects were not geared to the characteristics (e.g. time availability, socio-cultural or developmental traits) of the target population.

2. MSN students bring a higher level of knowledge. Several participants noted that they gained new information from the MSN students.
3. MSN have more extensive professional and life experiences on which to draw.

4. MSN students are more comfortable in their practice.

5. MSN students are free and open in discussion, more apt to raise questions.

6. MSN students interact at a higher level and are more analytical.

7. In some cases, when the participants first met the MSN students, the students were not fully committed to the idea of a service-learning project. Participants suggested this might be due to time limitations or not seeing the learning value of the activity.

Participants gave conflicting responses regarding two characteristics of MSN students: the need for supervision and interest in learning. In terms of their overall attention to the projects, several participants noted that students were less self-directed and needed more supervision or direction than the community partner had expected. This was attributed to their busy, complex lives. One participant who worked with both MSN and ADN students in a direct client care situation found the MSN students, as licensed registered nurses, required less direct supervision.

In describing students' openness to learning, at least two participants used the term "sponge". However, the term was used for both undergraduate and MSN students. Several participants described MSN students as being more focused on their education and interested in learning than undergraduate students. However, they noted that this interest was rather narrow and geared to their specialty area of nursing. One participant found the University's AmeriCORPS students (volunteers for community service) to be more open to learning and flexible in scheduling to meet agency/client needs.

Several quotes illustrate the differences that participants observed between MSN and undergraduate students and the differences between individual participants' experiences. Although factors influencing partnerships are discussed in the next section, recommendations
that participants made concerning working with MSN students have been included here.

Participant D noted:

“I find ...they are much more analytical and they will come back with many more questions as to ‘Why do you do this?’ or ‘I don’t know that I could do this’. I mean they’re much freer with their comments. I think they feel much more confident with themselves, which is good...the grad students...are like a sponge...they want to absorb everything they possibly can...

Participant G noted: “I find once they hit grad school they...have a mind of their own and they have their priorities and they’ve been in the work world for a while. So there are things they are not going to do. So you have to help them to become sponges and want it. So you always have to be creative in the way you present it. Whereas with undergrads (referring to AmeriCORPS students), they are comin’ in awe like wow and they’re like sponges...they are flexible and they are willing to take on more. They’re not saying ‘How is it gonna fit in my life?’...They are like ‘Oh, how can I fit my life around this right now’.

Participant E noted: “I think most people are not accustom(ed) to having graduate students out in the field so...it could be a new experience for some people. But for agencies that I know about it’s always been a good experience. I think if you are a person who works with students, then you know what to expect. I mean you know that you can come and only do so much, and within these ramifications and you know your bachelor’s level people can do this and your graduate level people can do a wee bit more”.

Participant H observed: “…graduate students tend to be working full time and going to school so their time is a lot more limited. I also think that since they’re working they have a tendency of focusing more on their specialty where they’re working. So to work in the community...they’re not really sure about it, where does it fit in their plans and I think undergraduate students just take it as part of their curriculum. They haven’t gotten so...focused on where they are going. Personally, I think it’s important they get a broader view, and how if you are in the community what the needs are and how that would fit in with their work...

CETSL Advisory Group

The MSN Program’s service-learning project included the Community Engagement Through Service-Learning (CETSL) Advisory Group composed of representatives of community organizations, faculty, CWRU staff from the Office of Student Community Service, and students. A core group of members attended from the start of the project.
However, each semester, faculty and community partners involved with service-learning courses were invited to join the group.

As the first participant in the study commented on the key role the CETSL Advisory Group had played in her work with the MSN program, a question was added to the interview guide. Six of the 13 study participants attended CETSL Advisory Group meetings as often as possible. Four were founding members of the group and five attended a service-learning institute sponsored by the MSN program. One other participant noted she would have liked to be a member of the group, but given constraints on her time, felt it was more important to work with the students. She did send a representative to a CETSL recognition event and it was at that time that she became aware of the wider scope of the service-learning project beyond the specific faculty member with whom she had partnered.

All six members of the Advisory Group found it to be an important activity and recommended it for other community partners. One participant felt regular attendance should be required for all active partners. Advantages of attending the Advisory Group included:

1. Participants gained knowledge about the profession of nursing and its current directions, service-learning, the MSN program, and activities of other member partners.

2. Participants had opportunities to network. Several participants made linkages with other community agencies that they subsequently used in their practice.

3. Participants enhanced their partnership. They had opportunities to meet with their faculty partner and gained ideas for future student projects.

Pluses included: (a) the timing of the meetings; (b) benefits such as stamping for parking and providing lunch; (c) email reminders, (d) copies of minutes at the meetings and via email, and (e) efficient conducting of the meetings by the chair.
Several members of the CETSL Advisory Group pointed to a partnership involving another participant member of the group as an example of the type of partnership they would like to achieve. They noted this individual had an advantage as she had worked with the same faculty member and the same course for three years (one semester per year) and they had developed a close working relationship.

Research Question 2: What factors do community organizations identify as influencing partnership with a graduate nursing education program?

Participants described seven key factors as influencing the success of partnerships with the MSN program and offered recommendations as to how to address them. Although factors were identified throughout the Level II codes, they were elicited largely from five codes: factors influencing partnerships, lessons learned, positives, problems/challenges and recommendations. The factors identified as influencing the partnerships are listed in Table 6 and discussed below along with their related recommendations. Relevant quotes are included to add clarity to the factors. Some address more than one factor.

Commitment

Commitment by all involved in the partnership was seen as a key factor in the success of the relationship. There was consensus that initial commitment should be between the community contact person (CCP) and the faculty person. However, students were also seen as integral members of the partnership and should be oriented to, and accepting of, the service-learning activity before meeting with the community partner.

Participants indicated that although the initial link occurs between two individuals, success of the partnership is facilitated by support from the community organization itself and that, over time, commitment should lead to a close working relationship between the faculty member and the CCP characterized by flexibility, respect and trust.
Table 6

Factors Influencing the Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>There is regular, effective communication among all partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>All involved support and commit to service-learning and the partnership. There is a close working relationship between the partners characterized by flexibility, respect and trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Each partner is familiar with the others' organization, needs, resources and culture (of target population and MSN students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared goal</td>
<td>Partners discuss their expectations and objectives; develop shared goal based on community service needs and student learning needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>A realistic plan is mutually developed and written with specific outcomes, timeline and responsibilities. The plan is adhered to and changes made only with agreement of all partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>All partners should experience positive outcomes. The community partner is viewed as a resource and teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Partners should determine effectiveness of partnership &amp; to improve the partnership (input form all stakeholders, planned in advance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants recommended strategies to achieve reciprocity: (a) ongoing relationship with one instructor, (b) good communication between the CCP and faculty member and (3) support by both institutions as well as the individual faculty and CCP.

Participant B stated: “I think the thing is that you have to be committed to it... You have to... If I was not... so passionate about it and that I didn’t believe in what it was... it might be different. But I’ve made it a priority because I think it is worthwhile... not only for the student but what the outcomes will be and so I think that everybody’s been very flexible”.

Participant G noted: “I think working with one person does give you a chance to facilitate the process and work out any quirks and use it the next time in the proper
way... Because the needs of the classes and needs of the agency are constantly changing that the closer tied into the needs of both... the better it would be... I know that when I listen to (another community partner) and what they have accomplished out there and that's been the whole time of being part of it, it keeps growing because they are constantly evaluating, constantly changing, constantly communicating that every student who goes out there gets a different experience and it's a positive experience.

Communication

Participants viewed communication as the most important factor in the partnerships and as a thread throughout all stages of the partnership process. Activities such as preliminary discussions, orientation, written plans and evaluation were all aspects of communication. Communication should be regular and effective and the methods of communication agreed upon in advance by all partners.

Possible methods of communication included: email, telephone, pager, mail, and in person meetings. It was suggested that students send a weekly email update to the CCP and faculty person regardless of whether action had occurred. Participants strongly recommended that students allow time to review their projects with the CCP and do a dry-run of any presentations before the scheduled date of implementation.

Participant E saw communication as the most important factor in the partnership: “Get the phone numbers where people can be reached, get email addresses and talk to them. I mean I never felt out of contact to anything... I knew your name, I had your phone number... As long as I can contact the people I’m working with, I’m okay...”

Participant D noted: “...Listening and really hearing it and being able to keep the communication lines open... To me that’s key... If you can do that... almost anything can happen...”

Orientation

Participants were in clear agreement that orientation of all partners is an important factor in promoting the success of the relationship and the student’s projects in particular.
Orientation occurs in three phases. First, the faculty member and community contact person familiarize each other with their organizations, resources, and needs. If the individuals decide there is a service-learning fit, then more in-depth orientation occurs as to the structure of the organizations. A key component is an understanding of each other's culture. The faculty member should understand the culture of the organization and the likely target group (i.e. staff and/or clients). The community partner should understand the culture of the educational institution and of MSN students (i.e. how they differ from undergraduate students in terms of their strengths and constraints). The partners begin to explore student projects.

The third phase of orientation involves the students. Student orientation should be a team effort by the CCP and faculty member. The CCP may visit the school to inform students about the organization and discuss possible projects. However, all students should take time to visit the community site and observe services/clients. The orientation to the community partner should be sufficiently thorough that students understand where their projects will fit into the broader work of the organization and the culture of the organization and its clients. Students may need to do special learning about the target population – i.e. from the socio-cultural or developmental perspectives. Visibility of the students may also facilitate credibility with and acceptance by the target group.

Participant F commented on the challenge of the students' busy schedules versus her belief that orientation to the organization is helpful: "...It might have been nice to have been able to have them come to some of our other committee meetings or ...to get ... a little more insight into our structure but I’m not sure, if that’s feasible really...because they were pretty much focused on their project, if they did get the full flavor of the whole organization ...if time would have allotted...I would have gotten them into some other...experiences with the organization...but I think that was pretty limited and they had outside work that they had to do on the projects..."

Participant M noted: "I really think that the key is to know your population, know their strengths, their weaknesses and what they need. And then I think you have to...aim your program at what's specific for that group whether its teenagers, ..., baby boomers, seniors...and then you need to know a little bit about their demographics...you need to know if there's money to be spent on it...and what
experts you can call upon... and then you have to fit that all in to whatever., the school... or students are looking for this experience...the first thing is you have to know your population”

**Shared Goal**

The faculty person and the CCP should discuss their expectations of and objectives for the partnership. Objectives should include both meeting community identified needs and student learning objectives. At the coordination level, each partner may have an independent goal that can be met through the relationship. As the relationship moves toward collaboration and partnership, the goal becomes a shared one through which community identified needs and student learning objectives will be met and goals are set for the partnership itself.

Participant J noted she learned from previous experiences with partnerships that “...everyone should be on the same page about what was to be expected and what was to be done...keeping in mind that each...entity has its own goals and objectives but ultimately you know its important that those be shared...and that there be a common ground and if there were problems or challenges that they be discussed and you know try to remedy...”

**Planning**

The first part of planning involves final decisions as to the students’ activities. The overall goal must be to meet community-identified needs. Participants found that the unique knowledge and skills of MSN students were optimized when their activities left some tangible project that could be used again in the future. Participants noted that students’ satisfaction was highest when they were able to complete a distinct project and had the opportunity to present it to or share it with the target group. At times, community needs were such that it was difficult for projects to be complete in the course of one semester. Participants suggested that the faculty and CCP strategize ways to meet student needs for closure and community needs for complex projects.

The CCP and faculty may predetermine the projects and assign them to the students. However, students are more likely to buy into the projects if they have some say in what they
will do. CCPs may wish to consider the students’ personal interests and unique skills (such as language) in determining what projects will be done. The CCP may also need to negotiate the projects if students come with pre-set ideas.

Once the projects are set, the faculty person, CCP and student work together to develop a plan of implementation. Participants agreed that the plan be written with specific outcomes, responsibilities, and timeline. One participant developed a form for this purpose. The plan should be prepared and implemented as early in the semester as possible. Changes should be made only if absolutely necessary and should be agreed upon by all partners. The most successful projects were those where students were well organized, started work on their projects promptly, and adhered to the plan.

Recommendations related to planning (in order of frequency of mention) included:
(a) seek funding to support the partnership, (b) consider spring semester for activities involving school nurses as they are very busy in the fall semester, (c) have a back-up staff member in case the CCP is unable to follow-through, (d) have an overall theme for the semester, especially if there are several groups of students, (e) provide community partners with a one-page overview of service-learning and a list of previous projects done. These can then be shown to other agency staff when the CCP is seeking their support and input or the partnership.

Participant H stated: “One of the big things is good communication about what your plans are, what your goals and objectives are and your time line. Try to see if there is some way at least one time that all parties can meet together near the beginning... that would be so helpful even if it’s only for thirty minutes all at one time...”

Participant C found a written plan to be a necessary to success of the partnership: “I think the proposal sheet, if you can get them to commit and they can’t really change their mind after the proposal sheet is submitted that would help... if they changed their mind and I had already set up an implementation date then that had to be changed not only with the administrator but with the teacher and so it is... very, very complicated...”
Reciprocity

Participants described the optimal partnership as being dynamic but seeking reciprocity, that is, relative equality in contribution of resources, effort and outcomes. This process requires a long-term commitment to the relationship – beyond one semester. Lessons learned and evaluation findings are used not just to improve student activities but to shape the partnership itself. As noted previously, participants who were members of the CETSL Advisory Group were those who had worked with MSN students for more than one semester and saw it as a valuable aspect of the partnership.

Participant K articulated what it takes to have a reciprocal relationship: “clarity of what your purposes (are)…what is the benefit to each of the partnering organizations, what’ll each of us hope to get out of this, what are each of us contributing to it, we were very very explicit about that…time to plan…you really need to have conversations in order to come to those …that clarity….ongoing dialogue with a great deal of flexibility because things will never go exactly as you thought and if you use that to conclude okay well this isn’t going to work lets forget it…that would be a loss…But if it’s a true service learning, the learning is as important as the service so the organizations are also learning what it takes to be collaborative organizations”.

Participant C described how she and her (faculty) partner were making plans to improve the partnership itself: “… We’re gonna try to do each year…in the future…a theme for the year and then direct the students that way…(my partner) and I get back and kind of recap… and we basically know two areas that we need to work on are the orientation piece…and we did talk about communication. The other last thing …is for some of the project we will ask for (staff) feedback…developing some just brief checklist…”

Evaluation

A few participants felt very strongly that evaluation should be a key component of the partnership. They indicated that evaluation is the only means by which partners can: (a) determine whether the goals and outcomes had been achieved and (b) identify strategies to improve the partnership in the future. It was recommended that evaluation involve input from all stakeholders and be planned in advance.
When participants who did not mention evaluation as a key aspect of the partnership were asked about it, all agreed that it should be incorporated into the timeline for the semester. Several noted that the final aspects of students' projects were often rushed at the end of the semester and there was no time to undertake a formal evaluation. Some participants did state they followed-up with the faculty at a later time.

Participant K noted: “Evaluation is extremely important...you know any time you are utilizing time and resources you need to make sure that maybe...what you're getting out of it is different than what you thought you thought you were going to get of it or what you intended but you do need to make sure that those time and resources have been well spent... I just think every stakeholder has to really step back and look at what were the outcomes what was the process and do that evaluation. Now that can be very qualitative. I don't think it has to be a collecting numbers type of thing... on the other hand, you could do that as well”.

Results of Level III Coding

Techniques used during Level III coding included sorting the categories into the six C coding families and as well as continued constant comparison and memoing. The purpose of Level III coding was to refine the emerging categories and their properties into a more tightly organized and synthesized set of codes. Table 7 lists the Level III codes. Level III coding allowed the researcher to conceptualize the categories as a process which was further refined and described as the BSP during Phase II of data analysis. Key factors seen as influencing the relationship were integrated into the stages of the BSP.

Phase II: De-limiting the Theory

Phase II of the data analysis centered around further refinement and synthesis of the categories along with the labeling/description of the BSP (basic social process). Phase II involved three activities: 1) identification of the BSP and six related concepts along with their key categories, properties, and interactions; 2) member checking of the results and 3) further synthesis of the results to identify core constructs of the emerging, descriptive theory.
Table 7

*Level III Codes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Characteristics/nature of the: Participants, organization, faculty, graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>Reasons for engaging in the partnership, Goal of partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Contingencies | Pre-meeting by faculty & participant, Understand each others’ organizations:  
  mission, goals, resources, needs, etc, Agree to work together  
  Preliminary planning  
  Possible projects – based on agency needs & student learning objectives  
  Ideal: funding support |
| Co-variances | Not used in this study (per Hutchinson, 1993)                         |
| Conditions  | Orientation of students, Mutual trust, respect, Clearly, defined plan – proposed  
  outcomes, agreed upon by all, written, Specific timeline -stick to timeline  
  Communication – among all stakeholders, regular, Plan evaluation, celebration |
| Consequences | Outcomes for community organization, Participant, Students             |
|             | Cooperation versus collaboration versus partnership                 |

*Member Checking*

It was during the period of Phase II analysis that participants were invited to the group meeting. As discussed in Chapter III, five of the 13 participants attended. Participants received a copy of the results at that point and heard a brief oral presentation of the results by the researcher. Those present affirmed the findings and offered no additions or deletions. The participants did note the importance of orientation of students to the community organization and of effective communication throughout the semester. At the request of the funder, participants were asked to comment on the extent to which they were involved in, and their thoughts on, evaluation and reflection. As noted in the study, participants stated they believed
evaluation of the partnership was very important but that their actual involvement in it had been minimal. As for reflection, several were not aware of its key role in service-learning and none had been involved in it with the MSN students. All agreed they would have liked to play a role in evaluation and reflection as well as celebration.

Following the group meeting and further refinement of the results, the second round of written member checking was conducted. A summary of the results (Appendix G) was mailed to the 12 remaining participants along with a self addressed, stamped envelope and a request to a comment on the summary and return it. Note: the thirteenth participant had notified the researcher she was no longer with her agency and had not offered a new address. Seven of the 12 participants returned the final summary. An eighth participant returned their individual summary with comments and included the stamped return envelope for the final summary. She did not include or comment on the final summary.

All seven participants who returned the final summary noted agreement; there were no additions or corrections. Comments written by the participants are as follows:

“Agree”; “Good summary”; “Agree entirely”; “I agree with this summary”;

“Excellent, very beautiful”; “Very good (next to CONNECT), Good luck!”; and

“I certainly agree with your study of the need to “Teaming Up! It has opened many new venues for nursing students to learn and for community agencies to partner with future nurses. It has also provided professionals to assist in teaching/shaping the upcoming nurses. Orientation to the agencies is a must and offering students and effective working relationship with each must be stressed. Students must feel a part of the organization and not just do a “rote” job. The future will open many doors. I hope that (agency) can continue to be a partner”.
BSP: Connecting for Partnership

Glaser and Strauss (1967) described the overall goal of grounded theory research as leading to identification of a "Basic Social Psychological Process" or BSP. Strauss (1978) described the BSP as having four characteristics: 1) recurs frequently in the data, 2) links the various data together, 3) explains much of the variation of the data and 4) has implications for a more general or formal theory.

As the purpose of this study was to examine the process involved in the partnerships between the participants and the MSN program, the researcher was not surprised to find that early data analysis led to categories which reflected a sequence of steps in the process. Subsequent analysis identified the nature of, and influencing factors, for each step.

Further analysis and examination of the data revealed two levels of partnership among the participants: a short term, one semester level and a longer term level. After much consideration of a number of relevant terms such as link and unite, the term "teaming" was identified as the most appropriate descriptor of the initial level of partnership.

The second level of the partnership is "sustaining", in which the CPP and faculty person commit to a continued working relationship. The two levels are discussed in depth in the sections on "Delimiting the Theory" and "Writing the Theory".

Concepts:

Once the BSP has been identified, the focus of grounded theory data analysis becomes identification of the related concepts. Thus, the twenty Level II categories and five Level III categories were analyzed further and synthesized into six concepts along with their properties. In this study, the concepts, discussed below, are also the stages of the process.
Ready to commit?

During “Ready to commit”, the stage is set for initiation of the partnership. Two key characteristics of the faculty and community contact persons (CCP) are key to future success of the “connection”: (a) certain characteristics of the faculty and CCP will facilitate development of a working relationship and (b) commitment by all parties is essential to long-term success of the partnership. Commitment of students to their activities is also necessary for short-term success during a specific semester.

The CCP should be secure in his/her position and have a broad understanding of the organization, its mission, structure, clients and staff. The CCP builds on previous experiences in partnerships and working with students. The community organization should be relatively stable and support partnerships and education. Faculty should value service-learning and partnerships as a way to achieve learning objectives and have taught the course in the past before integrating service-learning and CCPs for the first time.

Getting to know you

The “Getting to know you” stage is the period when the community contact and faculty persons actually “connect” and begin to lay the groundwork for the partnership. Collaborative pre-planning by the faculty person and the CCP should precede “connection” with the students and should include: (a) sufficient familiarity with each other to determine if there is a service-learning match, (b) in-depth orientation of each other as described earlier focusing on the needs and culture of the CCP's target population and the learning needs and the MSN students, (c) defining a mutual service-learning goal, and (d) early planning of student activities and evaluation.
Student orientation to community organization

Once the faculty person and CCP have begun to develop a working relationship and preliminary planning for the partnership, the “connection” extends to include the students. Early contact with students should involve a two-phase orientation: (a) “academic” orientation to the course and the service-learning project and (b) orientation to the community organization. Orientation of students to the community organization should be a team effort by the faculty and CCP. Students should understand the agency’s mission, services, structure, resources and needs as well as the culture of the population served. The CCP may visit the school but students should visit the agency site and observe/participate in service provision. Thorough student orientation, especially to the community organization, is a key factor in promoting success of service-learning and the students’ projects in the short run and, in the long run, the partnership itself.

We’re underway

During the “We’re underway” stage, the specific plan/s for that semester’s “connection” is/are developed. At the end of orientation or early in the implementation phase, the faculty, CCP and students should make final decisions as to the projects to be done. Integrating student interests and skills will facilitate their buy-in but ultimately, meeting agency needs is the priority. A specific, written plan is developed with realistic objectives, defined responsibilities and clear timeline. All parties should sign off on the plan.

Three factors are key to successful implementation of the plan: (a) being flexible while adhering to the plan and making changes only with agreement of all partners, (b) effective, regular communication and (c) the CCP’s roles such as: liaison, educator, negotiator, coordinator, direct supervisor and learner are geared to the specific situation.
We did it!

The process of “connection” should continue past the completion of the students’ projects. Follow-up is important to closure of the semester for the students and helps promote continuation of the relationship between the faculty and CCPs. Follow-up activities should: be given priority; set in advance as part of the initial plan; involve all stakeholders; and include evaluation, celebration and reflection.

Looking ahead

Community-academic partnerships have their “bumps in the road” and take time to develop and evolve. A one-semester relationship may have positive, outcomes for a specific student project or projects. However, a long term relationship between one CCP and one faculty member sets the stage for a “connection” that can evolve into a true partnership with outcomes at a higher level. When the faculty person and the CCP are committed to the “connection: and continue it into future semesters, they can use lessons learned and evaluation results to improve the relationship and move toward a higher-level partnership. The partners identify mutual goals for enhancing the partnership itself as well as for specific student projects.

Participation in the CETSL Advisory Group is another dimension of commitment and has several potential benefits for the CCP including: (a) becoming part of the broader MSN service-learning project, (b) involvement in planning and decision-making for the MSN project, (c) maintaining a working relationship with the faculty person outside of the regular semester, (d) opportunities to network and learn what other partnerships are doing and (e) promoting personal and professional growth.
Core Constructs

The third phase of Phase II of the data analysis involved identification of two core constructs of the emerging, substantive theory: Teaming and Sustaining. These constructs reflect the realization that participants fell into two broad groups according to the extent to which they had engaged in partnership with the MSN program. Both groups reported positive outcomes; however, the nature of the relationship differed being more complex at the second, or sustained, level. Table 8 depicts the flow of data analysis from Level II categories, to Level III concepts and constructs. Three categories, communication, planning and evaluation, are listed more than once as they have utility for more than one concept.

Teaming

Seven of the 13 participants had worked with a MSN faculty person and students for one semester. Six reported positive outcomes and satisfaction with the relationship and three hoped to work with MSN students again. Two other participants had teamed with MSN students for more than one semester and were committed to a service-learning relationship but had been stymied by having worked with different faculty each semester. One other participant worked with one faculty (but two courses) for two semesters but had not continued the relationship further. These ten participants referred to their relationships as “partnerships”. However, they were actually best described “teaming”; goals and outcomes were limited to discrete student projects. Reasons for a one-semester relationship between a particular CCP and faculty member were not sought out in this study. Two participants had just partnered for the first time during the semester in which the interviews occurred; however, the others had partnered 6-18 months before the interviews and had not partnered with that faculty member again.
Table 8
*Connecting for Partnership: Core Constructs, Concepts and Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Construct</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaming</td>
<td>Ready to commit?</td>
<td>1. Participants &amp; their organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Prior partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting to know you</td>
<td>4. Orientation of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Nature of MSN students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Purposes –expectations-goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student orientation to community organization</td>
<td>8. Orientation of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We’re underway</td>
<td>7. Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We did it!</td>
<td>12. Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Positives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Problems/Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>Looking ahead</td>
<td>19. Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20. Advisory group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sustaining*

Two of the 13 faculty-CCP relationships had achieved the level of collaboration-partnership and had demonstrated a commitment to sustaining the partnerships. One other appeared to be moving in that direction. These situations were ones in which the faculty and CCP had worked together for at least two semesters. They verbalized a commitment to
continued partnership and were setting goals for the partnership itself and/or had professional relationships outside of the service-learning semester itself (e.g. working on other projects or membership on the CETSL Advisory Group).

**Phase III: Writing the Theory**

In the grounded theory approach to qualitative research, the third phase of data analysis is writing of a substantive theory. During this phase, the researcher begins to transition from the results of data analysis to the findings of interpretation. In keeping with the grounded theory tradition, the researcher will briefly describe the proposed theory as part of this chapter in order to demonstrate the “grounding” of the theory in the data. The proposed theory will be further explored in terms of conclusions as compared to related literature, implications, and limitations in Chapter V.

*Connecting for Partnership: A Descriptive Theory of Community Organizations’ Relationships With A Graduate Nursing Program*

Partnerships between community organizations and a graduate nursing program can be an effective means by which MSN students receive community-based service-learning experiences community-identified needs are met. The partnerships begin with level one, Teaming Up, and may or may not transition to level two, Sustaining. Each level of partnership is influenced by certain key factors; some factors are common to both levels (i.e. planning, communication and evaluation).

**Teaming**

The process of Teaming involves a relationship in which an MSN faculty and community contact person (CCP) commit to working together for at least one semester. To be successful the partnership process proceeds through a series of sequential steps (Table VII) during which the partners: (a) decide to commit to the relationship, (b) develop a working
relationship, (c) identify mutual goals, (d) orient the students to the community organization and its culture, and (e) plan, implement and evaluate the partnership.

The “teaming” level of partnership may lead to primary and secondary outcomes. Primary outcomes relate to the immediate contributions made to the work of the community organization by completion of the specific projects as well as learning experienced by the MSN students. Secondary outcomes include other benefits to the participants, their organizations, MSN students, and agency clients.

Key factors influencing success of this phase include: (a) regular, effective communication among all partners that is carried through to evaluation and celebration; (b) the extent to which faculty, students and CPP are active and equal partners in a relationship of mutual trust and respect; (c) the degree of commitment by each partner; (d) each partner’s understanding of the other’s organization and culture, specifically the CPP’s target population and the nature of MSN students; (e) realistic goals which can be met through the partnership during the semester; and (f) a written, clear plan with defined outcomes, responsibilities and timeline.

During a one-semester relationship, it is possible for all partners to achieve both primary and secondary outcomes albeit short-term and limited in scope. At this time, the relationship between the two founding partners (generally the faculty and CPP) may end or it may transition to the second level, Sustaining. One case was observed in which the partnership was between a student and CPP. Factors influencing which path the partnership follows are not clear from this study.

**Sustaining**

Faculty and CPP who have engaged at the “Teaming” level may continue their commitment beyond the initial semester and work together again during future semesters.
The working relationship involves continued collaboration within the framework described above. This may occur in sequential semesters or on an annual basis (i.e. one semester a year).

A key factor influencing “Sustaining” is availability of both partners to continue the relationship, specifically, the faculty member. When, as in the case of two participants in this study, a CCP must establish a working relationship with a new faculty person each time the course is taught, it becomes challenging to optimize outcomes for each semester and impossible to move the partnership to the “Sustaining” level. Given a continued opportunity for the two partners to work together, other factors influencing “Sustaining” include: (a) maintaining a close working relationship with continued trust and respect; (b) shared goals at both the semester and overall partnership levels; (c) continued commitment to the partnership; (d) on-going communication and planning during and in-between semesters when students are involved; (e) participation by both partners in the CETSL Advisory Group and (f) other professional activities shared by the partners.

Summary

This chapter reported the results of three phases of grounded theory analysis of 13 community partners’ perceptions of their service-learning relationships with a graduate nursing program. The first two phases involved data analysis, coding, a group meeting of participants and two rounds of member checking. Twenty categories, the basic social psychological process (Connecting for Partnership), six concepts and two core constructs along with their related properties were identified. Supporting quotations were provided and the research questions were answered.

In the third phase of data analysis, a descriptive theory, Connecting for Partnership, was proposed. The theory describes two levels or phases of partnership with a graduate
program of nursing: Teaming and Sustaining. The levels were described and factors influencing each level identified as well as overall outcomes. Three factors are relevant to each level: planning, communication and evaluation.
Chapter V

Discussion

Introduction

The grounded theory approach to qualitative research was used to examine the experiences of community organizations concerning partnership with a graduate nursing program. Results of inductive data analysis (categories, concepts and constructs) were used to answer the research questions, identify the Basic Social Process (Connecting for Partnership) and develop a substantive, descriptive theory (Connecting For Partnership). The theory describes two levels of partnership, Teaming and Sustaining, along with their associated processes, factors, outcomes. This chapter will include: Interpretation, Conclusions, Implications for Nursing, Limitations, and Recommendations.

Interpretation

Basic Social Psychological Process

As data analysis proceeded through Levels II and III of Coding, the researcher made several observations concerning the relationships being explored in the study: (a) the basic social psychological process (BSP) described by the participants was their “partnership” with an MSN program, (b) the term “partnership” was being used by both the researcher and the participants in a generic sense, not unlike use of the term “Kleenex:” for facial tissue and (c) although all but one participant expressed satisfaction with the relationships, few of the academic-community partnerships (ACPs) explored in the study met the “Principles of Partnership” described by organizations such as CCPH. Thus, organizing or categorizing them, as well as comparing them to ACPs described in the literature, was difficult.
In seeking a label for the BSP, the researcher endeavored to link the relationships described by the participants with the term participants used to describe their relationships. Thus, “Connecting for Partnership”, was chosen. Connect denotes a joining together, a relationship, or a rapport with the intention of partnership.

Review of the literature revealed several frameworks concerning CAPs. One framework (Enos and Morton, 2003) acknowledged the occurrence of more than one level or type of CAP. Enos and Morton (2003) chose, however, to identify two types of partnerships, discussed below, rather than a single label for the overall process.

*Levels of Partnership*

As noted above, results of this study revealed that ten of the 13 partnerships were informal, one-semester, one faculty-one community contact person relationships. Yet, 12 of 13 participants reported satisfaction with the process and positive outcomes and the thirteenth had applied lessons learned to a subsequent successful partnership. One partnership in this study, also a one CCP-one faculty person relationship, had been active for three semesters, had become solidified with commitment to a long-term relationship and had shared goals for improvement of the partnership itself. Two other partnerships appeared to be transitioning to a higher level of commitment.

Thus, two levels of partnership were identified: “Teaming” and “Sustaining”. The largely descriptive literature pertaining to service-learning and ACPs in undergraduate and graduate nursing education was congruent with these findings at the connecting level of partnership. Additionally, the findings supported Enos and Morton’s (2003) framework for two types of partnerships, “Transactional and Transformational Relationships”. However, several criteria for transformational relationships were more expansive than the “Sustaining” level identified in this study.

service-learning programs such as “one time events and placements” and “short-term placements” places significant stress on the resources of both campus and community partners. They suggest that while most one semester placements are sufficiently cost effective to be seen as worthwhile by community partners, they are not likely to “generate new resources or knowledge” (Enos and Morton, 2003, p. 28). No studies were found that examined the effectiveness, in terms of both resource utilization and outcomes, of “transactional”-type partnerships.

**Stages of Partnership**

Results of the study indicated that the level, Teaming, had five stages: (a) Ready to commit?, (b) getting to know you, (c) Student orientation to the community organization, (d) We’re underway, and (e) We did it!. It is notable that three of the five stages occur before planning and implementation of the actual student projects begins. A sixth stage, Looking Ahead, is a transition to continuing the relationship and the second level of partnership, Sustaining.

Two publications (Jacoby, 2003a; Bejarano, Balcazar, and Brewer, 2002) also suggested stages of ACPs, though from very different perspectives. The Campus Compact Benchmarks (Jacoby, 2003a) describe principles for multi-sector partnerships at the institutional level while the Bejarano, Balcazar, and Brewer (2002) article suggests a model, the Five Stage Process for Change”, that evolved from a partnership with multiple members and a federally-funded, catalyst fellow. Additionally, Enos and Morton (2003) suggested two types of partnerships. Despite, their different perspectives, the stages discussed in each article parallel those identified in this study as described in Table 9.

**Teaming**

*Ready to commit.*

The terms, Ready and Commit, refer to the key activities of the first phase of “teaming”. The initial link occurs between the community contact person (CCP) and the faculty member and, in this study, was generally initiated by the MSN program. Specific characteristics
Table 9

Comparison of Stages of Academic-Community Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Transactional Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to Commit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Getting To Know You</td>
<td>1. Designing the Partnership</td>
<td>1. Getting Together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We’re Underway</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Developing A Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We Did It!</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Taking Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>3. Sustaining Partnerships Over Time</td>
<td>5. Going To Scale</td>
<td>2. Transformational Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Looking Ahead!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the faculty person and CCP were identified which appeared to facilitate establishment of the relationship. The CCPs: were in professions of nursing, education or social services had extensive experience in their profession; had been employed by their organization for 4 or more years; and held a position of formal or informal leadership through which they were familiar with the mission, structure, services, needs, resources, staff and clients of the organization. The participants indicated that faculty should be familiar with service-learning and experienced in teaching the course.

Participants indicated that both the CCP and the faculty person should be enthusiastic about the partnership and committed to devoting the time and effort necessary for engaging in partnership with the other organization. Additionally, participants also noted that it is helpful for the community organization to be committed to collaboration and support of education as well.
However, that becomes a more important factor in sustaining the partnership and will be discussed further in that section. Participants believed students should also at least accept the service-learning activity and the partnership, at least during the time they are involved.

Little was found in the literature concerning characteristics of faculty and CCPs that will facilitate the CAP or the process by which partnerships are initiated. In their Stage II, Campus Compact Benchmarks referred to the need for “energetic leadership and inspiration” (Jacoby, 2003, p. 11). Bailey (2002) indicated that students should want to play a role in the work of the particular agency but did not refer to faculty and CCP. Other sources (Jones, 2003, Leiderman, et al., 2003 and Enos and Morton, 2003) referred to the importance of interest in and commitment of time to developing the partnership.

Jones (2003) observed that ACPs are generally initiated in order to implement a service-learning activity. Jones (2003) suggests that this approach may be effective in the short term but does not necessarily facilitate a long term relationship and proposes that ACPs be developed first and then lead to activities such as service-learning. The findings of this study indicated that for ten of the participants the relationship was initiated by the MSN program (faculty, student, or through the CETSL Advisory Group) in order to carry out the course-based service activity. Two participants linked with faculty at an MSN program-sponsored institute on service-learning. One participant approached the school of nursing seeking assistance on a project.

*Getting to know you.*

“Getting To Know You”, is the period during which the first opportunity to initiate four factors, identified in this study, arises: 1) orientation, 2) commitment, 3) reciprocity and 4) shared goals. Leiderman, et al., (2003) and Jones (2003) noted that time spent by the CCP and the faculty person in initial planning is key to success of the partnership. The potential partners should meet or talk by phone and become sufficiently acquainted as to each organization’s structure, resources and needs to determine if they appear to be compatible. Jones (2003) identified fit, as to both the nature of the work to be done and the time needed to complete it, as
one of six key factors in operationalizing principles of partnership. Like the participants in this study, she noted the challenge of meshing the schedules of academic institutions with those of community organizations that operate year round or on different schedules (such as K-12).

If the faculty and CCP identify a fit, they should meet in person to orient the other to their organization’s mission, structure, needs, resources, culture, goals and expectations. Several participants noted the value of funding to the partnership.

The importance of holding frank discussions concerning racial, ethnic, and economic inequalities and their causes was described by the participants in this study as well as Leiderman, et al. (2003) and Elias and Bui (2002). However, the literature did not reflect the need identified in this study for the partners (faculty and CCP) to have an equally in depth understanding of the nature of the graduate students -i.e. as to the MSN program itself, the course, their strengths and resources (such as desire to learn, willingness to ask questions, knowledge and expertise, life experiences, types of projects they could do and providing their own transportation) and their constraints (such as limitations on time and definite opinions on specific topics). These traits were seen as having positive and negative influences on the success of the partnerships.

Principles of Partnership (Honnet and Poulson, 1988; CCPH, 2000; and Jacoby, 2003a) as well as authors, beginning with Sigmon’s early writings on service-learning in 1979 and continuing to Leiderman et al.’s (2003) findings on parity in ACPs, have identified the importance shared goals, reciprocity and mutual trust and respect to successful ACPs. Findings of this study were congruent with the literature. Results of this study indicated that the extent of formal planning during the “Getting To Know You” phase varied among the participants but that formal planning between the faculty and CCP was preferred. Participants agreed with authors such as Bailey, Carpenter and Harrington (2002, p. 435) who noted the ACP must be a “win-win relationship with the needs of the students and community group receiving equal importance”. Participants placed clearly emphasized addressing community-identified needs while also
acknowledging that students were more satisfied with their projects when there was a close link
between them and the course objectives.

Orientation of students

The third stage in “Teaming” is orientation of students to the community agency. Although
the CCPs in this study noted students should understand and accept service-learning and its role
in their course before beginning the project, orientation of students to the community organization
received much more emphasis. Participants believed orientation should include an on-site
component and sufficient depth that students would appreciate the mission and scope of the
organization, resources, needs, where their project fit in, meet other stakeholders (clients and/or
staff), and understand the culture of the organization and the target population (whether staff or
clients). Participants stressed that student need this understanding so that their activities can be
geared to the target population – i.e. developmental level, language, reading level, socio-cultural
characteristics, values, expectations, etc. It is preferable if the target group has input into planning
of the projects.

The importance of student orientation was noted by Elias and Bui (2002) and Seifer and
Vaughn (2002) particularly in relation to the culture of the target group. Two of Elias and Bui’s
(2002) factors in successful relationships, responsive and respectful, relate to this issue. However,
it seemed to be an especially challenging aspect of the partnerships in this study due to constraints
on the time of the MSN students and the participants saw orientation as essential to success of the
projects.

We’re underway

The fourth stage in “Teaming” is “We’re Underway”. Participants saw this stage as
involving several key aspects: (a) final decisions on student projects that are realistic, meet
community-identified and student learning needs and tap into MSN students’ knowledge and
skills, (b) develop a specific, written plan with defined roles; responsibilities, and outcomes; a
timeline; and is agreed upon by all; (c) on-going communication is regular, effective, and uses
routes feasible for all partners – i.e. a weekly email report; (d) everyone follows the plan; (e) there is flexibility but no changes are made without agreement by all.

Some CCPs discussed general ideas for projects with the faculty person and negotiated the specific projects with the students so as to integrate their interests and skills. Interestingly, the two of the three partners who specifically mentioned they negotiated projects with the students were in Level II, Sustaining the Partnership, and the third was highly committed to working with MSN students but had not worked with one faculty person for more than one semester. CCPs in this study each took several roles such as liaison, coordinator, and learner during planning and implementation of the student projects. Several noted they learned from the faculty, students and projects. They also felt they could be educators to the students, particularly in tailoring presentation skills to the needs of the group, but were not used as that type of resource. This may have been due to time constraints or the CCP not being seen in that role. CCPs recommended students practice any presentations with them before the official day.

Participants in this study were in clear agreement with authors such as Leiderman et al. (2003), Jones (2003) and Elias and Bui (2002) as well as the CCPH Principles of Partnership as to the critical role that effective, on-going communication plays in successful partnerships. The study findings also supported Leiderman et al. (2003) and Jones (2003) in their calls for faculty to relinquish control and integrate the expertise of community partners in facilitating student learning experiences – both at the community agency as well as in the classroom. However, none of the literature reviewed for this study described the specifics of factors influencing partnerships (such as a written plan with timeline) identified in this study.

*We made it!*

The final stage in “Teaming” is “We Made It”. Participants indicated the relationships were often rushed and ended rather abruptly at the end of the semester. Evaluation, if done at all, was an informal discussion between the CCP and faculty member. However, several (including the one in Level II, Sustaining the Partnership) saw evaluation involving all stakeholders as
important. Those who attended the group meeting uniformly agreed that reflection and
celebration are also important. They had not been fully aware that reflection was a defining
characteristic of service-learning and stated they would like to be involved in it in the future.

Evaluation and celebration are recurrent themes in principles and frameworks of CAPs
(Jones, 2003; Seifer, 2002; Gelmon, et al., 2001; Jacoby, 2003a); Jones (2003) lists evaluation
and assessment as one of six conditions necessary to put “principles of partnerships to work”.
Gelmon, et al., (2001) noted that efforts to assess the impact of service-learning partnerships had
centered around educational outcomes. As discussed in Chapter II, they recognized the need to
assess the partnership itself and its impacts on all stakeholders, and they developed and
implemented a community-level, multi-source assessment matrix for improvement of partnership
performance (Gelmon et al., 2001).

Participants described a number of outcomes of partnership at the “teaming” level.
Primary outcomes included contributions made to the community organization (mission and
goals) through completion of the MSN students’ projects as well as learning by the students
specific to the project. In some cases, particularly where the participant had worked with multiple
groups of students (in one or more semesters), the balance of contributions versus learning varied
from nearly equal to more on the student learning end of the scale. A number of secondary
outcomes were described by one or more participants. In order of frequency they included:
participant outcomes such as personal/professional growth including learning from the students,
fulfill responsibilities to alma mater and/or profession, developed professional relationship with
faculty member; MSN students learning about the agency and its services; benefits of funding
support beyond the projects themselves; longevity of the student projects; and participant hopes
MSN student will work for the agency in the future.

Research and theoretical literature pertaining to ACPs and service-learning have
described outcomes similar to those indicated above. Enos and Morton (2003, pp. 23-24)
indicated that positive outcomes may occur with “transactional”-type partnerships. They do not
describe the specifics of those outcomes but indicate they relate to “satisfaction of immediate needs”, are “instrumental” and designed to complete a task “with no greater plan or promise”. The participants in this study described similar outcomes in relation to the students’ projects. However, they described a number of secondary outcomes for themselves, personally and professionally, as well. As discussed in Chapter II, numerous other authors have described, in anecdotal and research literature, benefits to students from service-learning and ACPs. Few research studies, and none in undergraduate and graduate nursing education, have described the specifics of outcomes for the community partners identified in this study that may accrue from short-term partnerships.

Sustaining The Partnership

In this study, the one or two relationships that could be considered to be at the sustaining level had been maintained for three or more semesters. In these relationships, the CCP and faculty person and the organization were committed to continuing the partnership, and were characterized by mutual trust and respect, reciprocity, and activities designed to improve the partnership itself and/or disseminate the story of the relationship.

Morton and Enos (2003) were the only authors found in the literature who addressed, in a theoretical way, the reality of two types of partnerships revealed in this study and in descriptive literature. Other authors (Leiderman et al., 2003, Jacoby, 2003a, and Jacoby, 2003b) described successful ACPs as having the characteristics of Enos and Morton’s (2003) “transformational” level. However, they did not acknowledge that many partnerships do not necessarily evolve to that level yet report positive outcomes.

Participants in Leiderman et al.’s (2003, p. 9) summit identified five factors as strongly influencing their decisions to enter a partnership or remain with it: (a) “established infrastructure such as presence of a coordinating entity and sufficient staffing to handle the scope and scale of the community engagement work, (b) administrative buy-in and support, (c) history of town/gown relationship, (d) trust and accountability and (e) clear goals and expectations”.


Several of these were reflected by the current study, i.e. 1, 2, 4 and 5. In the case of the study, one and two could be interpreted as the MSN Program administrative support for the project, funding for the overall project as well as several of the partnerships, the CETSL Advisory Group, and faculty buy-in.

Participants who were members of the CETSL Advisory Group strongly recommended it and, again, the two closest to the “Sustaining” level were active members of the group and several others who hoped to achieve a long-term partnership, were as well. As noted earlier in this section, Bailey, Carpenter, and Harrington (2002) emphasized the key role an advisory group can play in planning, implementation and evaluation of the service-learning program within the educational institution.

Developing a working relationship characterized by reciprocity, mutual trust and respect, and shared goals was identified by participants in this study as a key factors in successful partnerships and was discussed earlier under “Getting to Know Your”. Commitment to taking the time to maintain and enhance the relationship is also key to sustaining partnerships as well. Leiderman et al. (2003, p. 14) used the term “parity” and identified messages campus partners may send that lead to community partners “feeling used and (to) strained relationships”: (a) campus partners do not fully understand the community organization or its clients, (b) in a crunch, educational needs take precedence over community needs, (c) the community partners are not respected by the campus and (d) the engagement effort is for show (i.e. requirements or public relations) and not a genuine effort at engagement.

Lastly, theoretical literature (Seifer, 2000; Jacoby, 2003a; Jacoby, 2003b; Leiderman et al., 2003; and Enos and Morton, 2003) views sustained partnerships as having an institutional level of commitment by both partners. In the case of this study, several participants identified the need for strong support of their efforts by their organization’s leadership and those who participated in the Advisory Group noted they had increased awareness of support of the partnerships by the educational institution.
Conclusions

This study accomplished its purpose, i.e. to contribute to the need for research and theory development concerning community partners’ perspectives of participation in ACPs involving graduate nursing education and answered the research questions concerning the process and factors influencing such partnerships. The results of this study suggest that, for the 13 partnerships represented by the participants, the process was best described as “Connecting for Partnership”. There were two levels of partnerships, Teaming Up and Sustaining. Teaming Up is the most common level of partnership. It is characterized by a short term timeframe and five stages which progress from Are You Ready? through “We Made It”. Each stage is influenced by certain factors including communication, consideration of the other partners’ culture, careful planning and a close working relationship. Sustaining implies commitment at both the individual faculty/CCP and organizational levels to a long-term relationship with efforts directed toward continued reciprocity and enhancing the partnership itself.

The findings of this study provide evidence to support recent theoretical literature regarding service-learning in higher education as to: (a) two levels of community-academic partnerships, (b) the stages of partnerships, and (c) factors influencing their success. It is interesting to note that factors identified by participants in this study as influencing their largely informal, short term relationships were very similar to those seen as influencing long-term, highly structured, multi-sector partnerships. These included: communication, commitment, orientation, shared goals, planning, reciprocity and evaluation. Communication, in its many shapes and forms, appears to be the single, overall factor in success of both short and long term ACPs.

Participants in this study raised topics not addressed in other literature: (a) characteristics of the CCP and faculty person that facilitate the relationship; (b) the key role pre-planning by the faculty and CCP plays in success of ACPs, (c) the need to understand and consider the unique assets and constraints of the MSN student, (d) the key role of student orientation to the
community organization, (e) that community partners value ACPs and are willing to devote the time to making them succeed but desire clearly delineated, specific guidelines for the process such as a one-page overview of service-learning, a plan for communication, and a form for a written plan with timeline.

Implications for Nursing

While the findings of the study suggest a descriptive theory and a number of specific strategies for optimizing short and longer-term community-academic partnerships with a graduate nursing program, they reflect only the community perspective and it cannot be said their implementation will lead to successful partnerships.

Transferability of Findings

Professional Nurses Beyond the Study Setting

The study findings may have relevance for professional nurses such as: (a) faculty involved with service-learning and ACPs in MSN, BSN, Associated Degree, Diploma programs and (b) professional nurses practicing in community based settings. Seven of the 13 participants in this study were professional nurses in community-based practice. A key sub-population of the second group is generalists and specialists in Community/Public Health Nursing whose roles and functions specifically include engaging in partnerships, community building, and trans-disciplinary collaboration.

Aspects of the findings most likely to be transferable to nurse educators and nurses who practice in community based settings include:

1. The potential benefits of community-academic partnerships with an MSN program for facilitating student learning as well as enhancing services provided by community organizations.

2. Two levels of partnerships were identified: Teaming and Sustaining. “Teaming” (short-term, informal partnership) was the most frequent level.
3. "Teaming", is composed of five sequential stages and influencing factors (communication, commitment, shared goals, orientation, planning and reciprocity).

4. Characteristics of faculty and community-based organizations that facilitate ACPs.

5. Preliminary planning by the CCP and faculty person is essential to optimizing success of the relationship and communication appeared to the overriding factor throughout all stages.

6. The key importance of each partner (including students) being thoroughly informed of and respecting each other’s organization, mission, resources, needs, and culture. This is particularly true in terms of the unique strengths and constraints MSN students bring to ACPs.

7. The utility of qualitative research in providing evidence for the value of ACPs and service-learning in implementing course objectives and organizational missions, the advantages and challenges to these processes and practical strategies for implementing them.

*Non-nursing Disciplines*

The findings of this study may have at least as much relevance and transferability to non-nursing disciplines as they do for nursing. Six of the 13 participants in this study were from disciplines outside of nursing. Potential users of the findings include faculty, administrators and community service staff in higher education; leaders in community organizations; those active in facilitating community service (i.e. AmeriCORPS) and funders of both types of organizations.

Information they may learn and utilize includes that discussed for nursing. Additionally, those in non-nursing disciplines may be informed of the key role short and long-term ACPs with an MSN program can play in promoting their organizations’ missions. These potential contributions would seem to be especially important as several participants noted that collaboration was integral to implementation of their organization’s missions and funders value community-based organizations that engage in collaboration.
**Limitations**

*Methodological Limitations*

There are several reasons for methodological limitations in generalization of the study. First, the purpose of the study was to examine community partners’ perspectives of participation in ACPs involving graduate nursing education. Grounded theory methods were appropriate to the purpose and the purpose was met. However, it was done within the setting of one graduate nursing program. Thus, inherent to grounded theory research, the findings have direct relevance only for the sample in the study. Second, certain strategies used in qualitative research such as purposeful sampling may limit generalization of findings.

Third, the setting for this study was the ACPs within one graduate nursing program and the researcher was not able to interview all organizations involved in the project. Fourth, for this study, only the perspectives of the key contact persons at the community organizations were sought. However, partnerships are dynamic relationships that, in addition to the CCP, faculty, and students may include others such as agency staff and clients. Their perspectives on the process of partnership might have differed from those of the community contact persons.

The fifth methodological restriction centers the limited size of the sample and volume of interview data. Each participant was interviewed once and one representative of each partnership was interviewed. A deeper level of theoretical saturation might have been obtained had the researcher been able to conduct a follow up interview and had a larger, more diverse sample. This could have been accomplished in one or both of two ways: (a) follow-up interviews of participants, especially those early in the study and (b) a larger number of participants. Follow-up interviews might have allowed the researcher to more effectively implement Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) technique of theoretical sampling based on the emerging categories: “How would you describe a successful partnership with a graduate program of nursing?” or “How would you know if a relationship with a graduate program of nursing was not a partnership?” or, for partnerships lasting one semester, “Why has the partnership not been continued?” and “What would need to
happen for you to work with the school of nursing on a long-term basis?”. It was anticipated the group meeting might serve this purpose. However, those who attended heartily agreed with the findings and seemed to have little to add.

**Theoretical Limitations**

Reasons for theoretical limitations to generalization of findings of this study are linked to the use of the grounded theory approach to qualitative research. As conceived by Glaser and Strauss (1967) grounded theorists search for, and seek to understand and predict, social processes present in human interaction. In the case of this study, the human interaction was community organizations’ partnership with a graduate nursing program and the basic social process was “Connecting for Partnership”. Grounded theory research may elicit two types of theories: formal and substantive. Substantive theories are generated for a specific, circumscribed, and empirical area of inquiry and may be used to generate formal theories. Thus, substantive theories, such as the one that emerged from the current study, will have specific relevance only for the sample.

However, certain procedures were undertaken during data collection and analysis to promote rigor of the findings and facilitate possible generalization to other settings.

The second theoretical limitation is related to the two levels of partnership in the proposed theory, “Connecting for Partnership”. The findings of this study, descriptive reports of service-learning in nursing (see Chapter II) and the Enos and Morton (2003) framework indicate two types of partnerships for service-learning of which the more informal, short-term type predominates. However, in none of these reports, are the reasons for short timeframe or apparent lack of continuity of the relationship discussed.

In the case of this study, one possible reason for the apparent lack of continuation of a partnership is dissatisfaction of either or both partner with the process and/or outcomes or outcomes were not cost-effective in terms of time, resources and effort required. According to the results of this study, that did not seem to be an issue, as least from the community perspective.

Other possible reasons, several of which may not be under the direct control of the community
contact person, include: (a) lack of a sufficiently strong level of commitment to pursue the relationship despite challenges to it (i.e. "It worked out ok but...")}, (b) the course is taught once a year and had not been taught again after the first semester of partnership, (c) turnover in faculty and agency staff, (d) change in community organizations’ priorities and/or support of the partnership, (e) lack of resources – i.e. funding for partnership is depleted, (f) the closeness of “fit” is not maintained, and (g) lack of required legal agreements between educational and community organizations.

**Directions for Future Research**

Grounded theory research is typically used when little is known about a particular topic and the researcher anticipates the findings will set the stage for additional research. This study of community organizations’ perspectives of partnership with a graduate program of nursing addressed a topic about which no literature had been published and suggests additional research in several arenas.

The present study examined only the perspectives of the community partners. However, CAPs are dynamic relationships composed of at least one other partner (the faculty person) and possibly more (students, other agency staff, clients and the larger institution). It would be beneficial to explore perspectives of other stakeholders in the partnerships and compare with the findings of this study. Additionally, replication of this study in other settings of graduate nursing programs engaged in service-learning and CAPS as well as nursing education, health professional education and the broader arena of higher education and comparison with the findings of this study would provide evidence for similarities and differences of findings of this study.

Although there has been increased attention to the community perspective of community-academic partnerships, the literature is largely theoretical. There is a need for research studies designed to examine the various theories, conceptual frameworks, processes and factors described by authors such as Cruz and Giles (2000), Jensen and Royeen (2000), Gelmon et al. (2001), Elias and Bui (2002), Enos and Morton (2003) and discussed in Chapters I and II of this report.
Review of available literature revealed numerous reports of service-learning implemented through relationships with community organizations. All reports (largely anecdotal and focused on the educational perspective) indicated positive outcomes for students and community agencies. Some authors referred to the principles of partnerships (Appendices A, B and C) as a guiding force yet many of the relationships are referred to as “placements” or “community sites” rather than being viewed as partnerships and those that are labeled partnerships are of the “Connecting for Partnership” or Transactional type. Most published literature on service-learning in nursing education referred to pre-licensure education; six reports of service-learning in graduate nursing education were found.

Much time, effort and money (both indirect and direct) is being devoted to implementation of service-learning and ACPs in nursing. There is a clear need for empirical evidence relating to a number of research questions:

1. What is the current state of knowledge relating to process and outcomes in this arena? An initial exploration might begin with a meta-analysis of existing empirical, theoretical and descriptive literature.

2. What is the impact, in terms of investment and outcomes, of service-learning and ACPs in nursing education? Are there differences between different types of partnerships? (i.e. connecting or transactional and sustaining or transformational?). This should be answered with rigorous evidence that incorporates all stakeholders and looks at both resource utilization as well as outcomes. Gelmon et al.’s (2000) assessment matrix would be a good starting point although it does not incorporate resource utilization.

3. There is a need for theoretical frameworks for service-learning and ACPs in nursing education supported with empirical evidence. It is not likely that one model will “fit all” and that separate models are needed for various types of nursing education programs and levels of partnerships. This process should start with studies designed to
examine principles of partnership such as those put forth by CCPH. These principles appear relevant. However, no studies for, or empirical studies of, these principles were found. Are they realistic and if so, for what levels of partnerships? What processes and factors are necessary to achieve the principles.

4. Longitudinal intervention studies are needed to demonstrate the outcomes and effectiveness of community academic partnerships for all stakeholders including clients and funders. Community organizations, including those in this study, report increasingly limited resources and reliance on collaborations with diverse partner organizations to accomplish their missions and goals. Can schools of nursing, especially graduate programs, be a key player in these relationships while meeting their primary goals related to nursing education? If so, what are most effective approaches in terms of processes, outcomes and costs? Only well-designed research studies can provide the answers to these questions.

5. Those who have engaged in service-learning and ACPs enjoy “telling their stories”. However, these stories need to be both supported with empirical evidence and reported in venues accessible to those interested in the findings. Peer-reviewed, mainstream journals are the ideal format and reach the widest audience. Information that is anecdotal and/or disseminated in formats such as pamphlets and presentations at regional or national professional meetings may be important and/or practical but it is difficult to access them and assess their credibility. Additionally, community partners represent many disciplines and, if they publish in their professional venues, others who might be interested in the findings may not encounter them. CCPH has addressed this issue by publishing monographs of presentations at their annual meetings and encouraging co-authoring of reports by all partners. However, their reports are generally of large scale projects and also lack empirical evidence.
Summary

This study found that, for the sample, the process of partnership by community organizations with a graduate nursing program was described as “Connecting for Partnership”. Two levels of “Connecting for Partnership” were identified: Teaming and Sustaining. The first level, which pertained to most participants, was a process with five stages: Ready to Commit?, Getting to Know You, Student Orientation, We’re underway, and We did it! Participants identified several factors as key to success of “Connecting for Partnership”: effective, on-going communication; commitment; orientation, shared goals; planning; reciprocity; and evaluation. Participants stressed the importance of all stakeholders being involved throughout the partnership. Less was discovered about “Sustaining” as only one or two participants fell into this category. Participants at this level indicated they were engaged in activities designed to enhance the partnership itself as well as each semester’s student activities. Commitment, communication, reciprocity, planning and evaluation appeared to continue to be key factors in longer-term partnerships.

Study findings were interpreted in terms of relevant, available literature. The interpretation focused on several articles and a book published since the study was initiated and closely related to the topic of the study. The literature was theoretical in nature and the findings of the study supported the literature. Because the literature dealt with the broad area of higher education, this study found some factors related to the unique culture of graduate nursing education and its students. Interpretation of the findings was followed by conclusions.

The findings of this study have specific relevance for the study sample and may be transferred to the study setting as well as to other broader settings. The study has implications for professional nurses in nursing education and community-based practice as well as professionals in various disciplines such as social service and Kindergarten-12 education who partner with nursing education programs.
Reasons for limitations as to generalization of the study findings center around constraints inherent in the grounded theory approach to qualitative research and were largely anticipated during planning of the study. The grounded theory researcher anticipates from early in the planning phase that the study will set the stage for future research. Based on the findings of this study, as well as the current literature pertaining to academic-community partnerships, several directions for further research were discussed – particularly in regard to partnerships involving programs of graduate nursing education.


References marked with one asterisk indicate literature included in the review of undergraduate nursing education; two asterisks indicate graduate nursing education.


Kretzman, J. & McKnight, J. (1993). Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community’s assets. Chicago: ACTA Publications.


Appendix A

Wingspread Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning

- An effective program engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.

- An effective program provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.

- An effective program allows for those with needs to define those needs.

- An effective program clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.

- An effective program matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances.

- An effective program expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.

- An effective program includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.

- An effective program insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interests of all involved.

- An effective program is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations.

Appendix B

The CCPH Principles of Partnerships

- Partners have agreed upon mission, values, goals and measurable outcomes for the partnership.
- The relationship between partners is characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness and commitment.
- The partnership builds upon identified strengths and assets, but also addresses areas that need improvement.
- The partnership balances the power among partners and enables resources among partners to be shared.
- There is clear, open and accessible communication between partners, making it an ongoing priority to listen to each need, develop a common language, and validate/clarify the meaning of terms.
- Roles, norms and processes for the partnership are established with the input and agreement of all partners.
- There is feedback to, among and from all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goal of continuously improving the partnership and its’ outcomes.
- Partners share the credit for the partnership’s accomplishments.
- Partnerships take time to develop and evolve over time.

Source: Connors, K. and Seifer, S., 2000, pp. 7-8.
Appendix C

Benchmarks for Campus-Community Partnerships

(Characteristics of genuine democratic partnerships)

STAGE I: DESIGNING THE PARTNERSHIP

• Founded on a shared vision and clearly articulated values
• Beneficial to partnering institutions

STAGE II: BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

• Composed of interpersonal relationships based on trust and mutual respect
• Multidimensional: they involve the participation of multiple sectors that act in service of a complex problem.
• Clearly organized and led with dynamism.

STAGE III: SUSTAINING PARTNERSHIPS OVER TIME

• Integrated into the mission and support systems of the partnering institutions.
• Sustained by a "partnering process" for communication, decision-making, and the initiation of change.
• Evaluated regularly with a focus on both methods and outcomes.

Adapted from: Jacoby, 2003a, pp. 10-11.
Appendix D

Date: ________________________
Agency/Organization: ____________________________________________________________
Address: _________________________________________________________________________
Faculty Advisor: __________________________________________________________________
Faculty Institution/School: __________________________________________________________
Course Name: ____________________________________________________________________

1. Have you had students who were engaged in experiential learning/service-learning work at your agency before?
   1__ Yes  0__ No

2. How difficult was it to coordinate this experience with the student(s) and/or teacher?
   1__ Very difficult  2__ Somewhat difficult  3__ Not difficult

3. Orientation to the community experience is an important component of service-learning. How well oriented to your agency and client population were the students?
   1__ Poorly  2__ Adequately  3__ Excellent

4. Compared to your typical volunteer or worker, how effective were the students in the work they did at your agency?
   1__ Less effective
   2__ Neither more nor less effective
   3__ More Effective

5. Compared to your usual management of volunteers/workers, how much time and effort did you have to devote to this experience?
   1__ Not as much time and effort
   2__ About the same amount of time and effort
   3__ More time and effort

6. Do you think students benefit from service-learning experiences?
   1__ Yes  0__ No

7. Would you choose to do a similar experience again?
   1__ Yes  0__ No

Comments
Appendix E - CWRU IRB Application
Attachment A

Question 1
The sample will include community organizations (as of 12/1/02, N = about 15) that have partnered since September, 2000, or are currently partnering, with the faculty and students of the Community Engagement Through Service-Learning (CETSL) Project of the MSN Program, Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University. There is one primary contact person for each agency. The goal of the study is to conduct at least one interview with a participant from each organization. The researcher will call or email, in alpha order by name of agency, the primary contact person for each agency (see Attachment B). Contact persons will be recruited in the order in which they respond to the phone calls: the purpose of the study will be explained and the individual asked to participate. The date, time, and location for the visit to the agency and for the interview will be set based on the preferences of the participant. The agency visit and the interview may be done on separate occasions. A confirmation letter or email (Attachment B) will be sent to the participant along with a copy of the Consent Form (Attachment C).

Recruitment will stop when all partner organizations have been invited to participate. If the primary contact person of a partner organization is unable, or chooses not to participate, the snowball method of recruitment will be used. The primary contact person will be asked to suggest another member of the organization’s staff who has had a direct working relationship with faculty and students of the MSN program. Those persons will then be contacted and recruited in the above manner.

Due to the nature of sampling and recruitment for qualitative research, it is not possible to determine in advance the number of males and females there will be in the study. Based on the researcher’s pilot study and experience with the CETSL project, it is anticipated that most of the participants will be female.

Question 4
Audiotapes will be made only with consent of the participant and will be coded as to agency (alpha letter) and participant name (fictitious name). Participants will not be referred to by name during the interview and will be asked to not refer to the name of their agency during the interview and such information will not appear in the interview transcript. Each agency will be assigned a code letter and each participant a fictitious name. The audiotapes will be kept in a locked file drawer in the locked office of the co-investigator. The office and file drawer are accessible only to the co-investigator. The co-investigator will destroy the audiotapes three years after the last dissemination related to the research. See Question 5 for additional information concerning confidentiality.

Question 5
To protect confidentiality, participants will be assured that information revealed during the interviews is totally confidential and will not be shared with faculty, students, or other staff at their agency or any other agency. Audiotapes will be made only with consent of the participant and will be coded as to agency (alpha letter) and participant name (fictitious name). Participants will be asked to refrain from references to their name or the name of their agency during the interview and such information will not appear in the interview transcript. Each agency will be
assigned a code letter and each participant a fictitious name. A sheet with descriptive information for each participant (Attachment D) will be kept in a locked file separate from the interview transcript and the descriptive information will be used for aggregate statistics only. No-one except the investigator and the responsible faculty will read the transcripts. In the written report, and any publication or presentation of the findings, any descriptive information that might identify an agency, participant, location or setting will be altered to protect confidentiality. Any quotes will be modified so that the participant and/or their agency cannot be identified. As this is a qualitative study, analysis will include identification and coding of emerging concepts. The audiotapes, transcripts, signed informed consent forms, field notes, and participant information sheets will be kept in a locked file drawer in the locked office of the co-investigator. The office and file drawer are accessible only to the co-investigator. Computer files will be password protected. The researcher will maintain all materials related to the study (i.e. audiotapes, computer files, field notes, transcripts, consents, participant information sheets) for three years following final dissemination related to the study. At that time they will be destroyed.

Question 6

The risks and inconveniences of participation include: 1) the time required to participate in the interview and review a summary of the findings at a later date and 2) possible emotional discomfort with discussion of negative aspects of the partnership. These risks and inconveniences are reasonable as the information gained may be used to improve the effectiveness of community-academic partnerships by this and other schools of nursing.

Question 7

The benefits of participation are that the information may be used to help improve: 1) the participant organization’s partnership with the MSN Program of the Bolton School of Nursing, 2) other community-based activities of the Bolton School and 3) community-academic partnerships by other schools of nursing.
Community Health Organizations' Perspectives of Partnership
With A Graduate Program of Nursing

CWRU IRB Application
Attachment B
Recruitment Script (Phone Call or Email)

Hello, my name is Debbie Lindell. I am a student in the Nursing Doctorate Program of the Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University. Your organization has been identified as being a past or current partner in the Bolton School MSN Program's Community Engagement Through Service-Learning project and you have been identified as the key contact person for the partnership. I am interested in learning about your views of your experience of partnership with our MSN faculty and students. To do so, I would like to visit your agency and I would like to meet with you for an interview that will take about one hour. The visit and the interview can be done separately or together at a date, time, and place (for the interview) convenient for you. All information you share will be confidential. With your permission, I would like to tape record the interview and take notes. At a later date, I'd appreciate your review of a summary of your interview and a summary of the group findings.

Confirmation Letter to Participant

Date
Name
Agency
Address

Dear ----------

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the study “Community Health Organizations' Perspectives of Partnership With A Graduate Program of Nursing”. I look forward to visiting your agency on (Day, Date) at (Time) and to meeting with you on (Day, Date) at (Time) at (agreed upon location). As we discussed, the interview will take about 1 hour. With your permission, I will tape record the interview and take notes. At a later date, I'd appreciate your review of a summary of your interview and a summary of the group findings.

Please review the enclosed Consent Form prior to our appointment. I will be glad to answer any questions you have before the interview begins. One copy of the Consent Form is for your files.

I highly value your responses to the interview questions and hope the information you share will help promote successful partnerships at the Bolton School, your agency and other schools of nursing and community organizations.

Sincerely yours,

Deborah Lindell MSN APRN, BC
Student, Nursing Doctorate Program
CWRU IRB Application
Attachment C

CONSENT FORM
Community Health Organizations’ Perspectives of Partnership
With A Graduate Program of Nursing

You are being asked to be in a research study of your experiences as a community agency partner with the Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University. You were selected as a possible participant because you have partnered, or are currently partnering, with the faculty and students of the MSN Program, Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University. Please read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Researchers at Case Western Reserve University are conducting this study.

Background Information:
The purpose of this study is to learn about your organization’s experiences and views as a partner with the faculty and students of MSN Program, Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University.

Procedures:
If you agree to be in the study, we would ask you to do the following things:

1) Participate in an interview in which you will be asked to describe the nature of your partnership; your views of the partnership (both positive and negative); the effects of the partnership on you, your agency, and your clients; and your suggestions about the partnership.
2) The interview will take about 1 hour.
3) You will be asked for your permission to tape record the interview.
4) The researcher may request a follow-up interview.
5) At a later date, you will be asked to review a summary of the findings.

Risks and Benefits From Being in the Study:
The study has the following risks:

1) You will be asked to take about 1 hour of your time to participate in the interview.
2) You will receive a summary of the interview and will be asked if you wish to make any changes or additions.
3) At a later date, you will be asked to review a summary of the group findings.
4) You will be asked to discuss both positive and negative aspects of the partnership.

The benefits of participation are: the information will be used to evaluate the partnership and may be used to improve the effectiveness of your partnership with the Bolton School, other Bolton School community-campus partnerships, and community partnership activities by other schools of nursing.

You will receive no reimbursement for your time.

Confidentiality:
The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you or your agency. Access to the records will be limited to the researchers; however, please note that sponsors, funding agencies,
regulatory agencies, and the Institutional Review Board may review the research records. You will be asked for permission to audio tape record the interview. These tapes will also be kept in a locked file and will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:**
Your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your current or future relations with the University. There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not participating or for discontinuing your participation.

Provided to you will be any significant new findings that develop during the course of the research that may make you decide that you want to stop participating.

**Contacts and Questions:**
The researchers conducting this study are Theresa Standing PhD, RN and Deborah Lindell MSN APRN,BC. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have any questions later, you may contact Dr. Standing at 216-368-5990 or Mrs. Lindell at 216-368-3740.

If you would like to talk with someone other than the researchers about: 1) concerns regarding the study, 2) research participant rights, 3) research-related injuries, or 4) other human rights issues, please contact Case Western Reserve University’s Office of Research Administration at 216-368-4510 or write:

Case Western Reserve University
Office of Research Administration
4 Adelbert Hall
10900 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44106-7015.

You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

**Statement of Consent:**
I have read the above information. I have received answers to the questions I have asked. I consent to participate in the research. I am at least 18 years of age.

Print Name of Participant: ____________________________

Signature of Participant: ____________________________ Date: __________

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: ____________________________ Date: __________
Community Health Organizations’ Perspectives of Partnership
With A Graduate Program of Nursing

CWRU IRB Application
Attachment D
Participant Information Sheet

Participant’s Name:
__________________________________________________________

Role at
Agency:_____________________________________________________

Organization Name: __________________________________________

Address: ___________________________________________________

Work Phone: __________________ Work Fax:_____________________

Preferred
Email:_____________________________________________________

Bolton School Course/s Participant Partnered With:
1. __________________________ Semester/year____________________
2. __________________________ Semester/year____________________
3. __________________________ Semester/year____________________
4. __________________________ Semester/year____________________

Date of interview _____________ Length of interview _____________

Agency code _________________

Participant code ______________

9/02., rev. 12/02 DFL
Introduction: Academic-community health partnerships (ACHP) are an effective means for community health organizations (CHO) to enhance quality and quantity of services through community capacity building and for schools of nursing to provide opportunities for community-based education through service-learning. Successful partnerships should strive to meet established principles that include: founded on a shared vision; clearly articulated values; and strong, reciprocal, collaborative relationships.

Problem: Although the reciprocal, collaborative nature of successful community-academic partnerships has been established, research has focused largely on the academic perspective and the degree of rigor varies widely. Little is known about the perspectives of community agencies concerning such relationships, particularly partnerships involving graduate programs of nursing.

Purpose: The purpose of the proposed research project is to bridge the gap in service-learning research related to graduate nursing education and perceptions of community partners by exploring community health organizations' views of partnership with graduate programs of nursing education. The proposed research seeks to answer the following questions: 1) How do CHOs describe the process of participation in an ACHP with a program of graduate nursing education? and 2) What factors do CHOs identify as influencing partnership with a program of graduate nursing education?

Design: The design will use the grounded theory method of qualitative research. The purpose of grounded theory research is to: search for, and seek to understand and predict, social processes present in human interaction. The setting will be CHOs that have partnered with a graduate program of nursing from September 2000 to present, N= about 15. The population will be key contact persons and other staff members of each agency who have worked directly with the faculty and students of the Community Engagement Through Service-Learning Project (CETSL) of the MSN Program, Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University. The sample will be purposeful. Participants will be recruited until all partner organizations have had an opportunity to participate and theoretical saturation is achieved (See Attachments A and B for more details on recruitment).

Data collection: The researcher will recruit the participants, visit each agency and conduct the interviews. Participants will be asked to set a convenient day, date, time and location for the researcher to visit the agency and to conduct the interview. Prior to the interview date, the informant will receive a letter of confirmation (Attachment B) with a copy of the Consent Form (Attachment C). Before the interview begins, the interviewer will answer any questions, the informant will be asked to sign the consent form and complete the Participant Information Form (see Attachment D). The participant will be interviewed in a semi-structured, open-ended manner (see Attachment F). The interview will last about 1 hour. In accordance with grounded theory methods of qualitative research, the interview questions may be modified during the data collection process. With the participant's permission, the interviewer will tape record the interview and take field notes during the interaction. At a later point following the interview, the participant will be asked to review a summary of the interview and a summary of the group findings.
Data Management: 1) The tape recordings will be transcribed verbatim as soon as possible following the interview, 2) The transcriptions and the interviewer's notes will be compared for accuracy and clarity, 3) The tapes, interview notes, information sheets and transcripts will be stored in a locked filing cabinet with access only to the co-investigator, D. Lindell, 4) All tapes will be destroyed when the project is completed. Human Rights will be protected per the procedures detailed in this document.

Data Analysis: The researcher will analyze the transcripts using grounded theory methods as described by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and their associates. The steps, implemented simultaneously, will include: coding via a coding paradigm and constant comparison; memoing; sorting; selective coding based on the Basic Social Process; saturation of codes, categories, and constructs; secondary literature review; and writing the theory (Hutchinson, 1993).

Rigor: The rigor and trustworthiness of qualitative research are ensured when the design and the report meet four criteria. 1) A qualitative study is credible when it presents such faithful descriptions or interpretations of a human experience that the people having that experience would recognize it from those descriptions or interpretations as their own. 2) A study meets the criterion of fittingness when its findings can “fit” into contexts outside the study situation and when its audience views its findings as meaningful and applicable in terms of their own experiences. 3) A qualitative study is auditable when another researcher can clearly follow the “decision trail” used by the investigator in the study and could arrive at the same or comparable but not contradictory conclusions given the researcher’s data, perspective, and situation. 4) Confirmability is achieved when credibility, fittingness, and auditability are established (Sandelowski, 1986).

The design and report of the proposed study will incorporate several strategies to ensure it meets the above noted criteria for rigor: 1) “bracketing” of the researchers previous experience and presuppositions about the phenomenon so as to not allow them to influence the data analysis (via the researcher's journal); 2) assuring auditability by “leaving a clear decision trial concerning the study from beginning to end”, review of the data analysis process by a peer and 3) assuring credibility and fittingness by “checking for the representativeness of the data; triangulation of data sources and collection methods; checking that descriptions, explanations, or theories about the data contain the typical and atypical elements of the data; deliberately trying to discount or disprove a conclusion drawn about the data; and obtaining validation from the participants” (See Attachments G & H) (Sandelowski, 1986, pp. 34-35).

References


Introduction: I am interested in your views of your service-learning partnership(s) with the faculty and students of the MSN program of the Bolton School of Nursing. Please make your responses to the questions as open and honest as possible. As I'd like the information to focus on your thoughts, I will hold any discussion until the interview has been completed. To help ensure confidentiality, please try not to mention the name of your agency. If you've partnered with more than one course, we can discuss them separately or combined, which ever you prefer.

1. Please tell me about yourself and your role in this organization.
   a. Type of discipline
   b. How long employed at the agency

2. Please tell me briefly about your organization – Purpose or Mission, Services, Clients.

3. Please tell me about your experience with partnerships?
   a. If with other schools, what disciplines?
   b. What types of activities were done?

4. Please tell me, from your own perspective, about the partnership project(s) with the Bolton School of Nursing MSN Program in which your organization participated. If you have partnered with more than one course, do you prefer to discuss them separately or together?
   a. What was the purpose of the partnership?
   b. What was your role in the partnership?
   c. What was your orientation like? To the MSN program? The course? Service-learning?
   d. What type of projects did the students do?
   e. Describe your communication with the faculty and students.

5. Tell me about the outcomes of the project(s) on your organization:
   a. What were your expectations or goals?
   b. To what extent were they met and how?
   c. What went particularly well and why?
   d. What obstacles/barriers did you encounter and how did you deal with them?

6. Tell me about the factors you see as important to success of partnerships such as yours with the Bolton School of Nursing.
   a. What does it take to have a successful partnership?
   b. By the faculty, students, and community agency?

7. Knowing what you know now, what could be done to improve the partnership?
   a. By you and/or your agency?
   b. By the Bolton School's MSN Program?

8. Is there anything else you would like to add?
Thank you for your time and responses to these questions.
9/02 rev. 12/02
Dear [Name],

Thank you again for taking the time to speak with me about your perspectives of partnership with the graduate nursing program of the Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing.

It is important that I verify my findings with the individuals who take part in the study. Therefore, I am enclosing a summary of your interview. I would appreciate it very much if you would read the summary and decide if it reflects our discussion and whether you would like to make any changes.

Please write a note on the summary and mail it back to me in the enclosed, stamped envelope. When the study is finished, I will send you a summary of the group findings and will ask for your comments on those as well. Be assured that strict confidentiality will continue to be maintained in the study and any dissemination of the findings.

I look forward to receiving your reply soon. Please call me at 216-368-3740 (work) or 440-349-1275 (home) or email me at dxl41@po.cwru.edu with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely yours,

Deborah Lindell MSN APRN,BC
Student, Nursing Doctorate Program
Date
Name of participant
Agency
Address

Dear ____________,

Some time ago, you were kind enough to let me talk with you about my study of community health agencies’ partnerships with the graduate nursing program of the Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing. I want to thank you again for allowing me to learn about your partnership experience. I am completing the write up of my study and, as we discussed at the time of the interview, I have an additional request to make of you.

It is important that I verify my findings with the individuals who took part in the study. Therefore, I am enclosing a summary of how those who took part in the study described their partnership experience with the Bolton School of Nursing. I would appreciate it very much if you would read the summary and decide if you agree or disagree with it.

Please write a note on the reply sheet as to your thoughts about the summary and mail it back to me in the enclosed, stamped envelope. When the study is finished, I will send you a brief report of the findings. I want to thank you again for taking part in the study. Be assured that strict confidentiality will continue to be maintained in the study and any dissemination of the findings.

I look forward to receiving your reply soon. Please call me at 216-368-3740 (work) or 440-349-1275 (home) or email me at dxl41@po.cwru.edu with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely yours,

Deborah Lindell MSN APRN,BC
Student, Nursing Doctorate Program
DATE: June 3, 2003
TO: CWRU Institutional Review Board
FROM: Deborah Lindell, Co-investigator (dxl41)
    Theresa Standing, Responsible Investigator (tss2)
RE: IRB Protocol #20030116 – Request for Addendum
CC: Glenn Odenbrett, Director, CWRU Office of Student Community Service

Data collection on the above referenced qualitative research study is nearing completion (N = 13). At most, there will be 2 more interviews. As per the original protocol and consent form, participants have been asked to review and comment upon a summary of their interview and will be asked to review and comment up a written summary of the overall findings of the study.

We are requesting an addendum to the protocol as follows:

1) The participants will be invited to attend a focus-group type meeting.
2) The meeting will be led by D. Lindell and G. Odenbrett (Director, CWRU Office of Student Community Service).
3) D. Lindell will present, in an appropriate format, the study findings.
4) Full confidentiality of findings will be maintained.
5) Those who attend the group meeting will be asked to sign an updated Consent Form (attached). The sections pertaining to the group meeting are in bold.
6) Participants will be asked to react to and comment upon the study findings.
7) Participants will be asked to give suggestions/strategies as to how the CWRU Office of Student Community Service can best plan and implement a future, larger program on service-learning and community-academic partnerships geared to a broader, more diverse range of community organizations.
8) The participants will be asked to permit the session to be tape recorded and notes recorded on flip charts.
9) Lunch and parking validation will be provided through the funding noted below. No other compensation will be provided.

Rationale:

1) The co-investigator has received partial support for this study from the CWRU Office of Student Community Service (OSCS) (Director, Glenn Odenbrett). Mr. Odenbrett is also a member of the co-investigator’s Nursing Doctorate thesis committee and is familiar with the study.
2) The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) is the original source of the OSCS funds.
3) Another aspect of the larger CNCS grant is the broader program referred to above (tentative date: Fall, 2003). The CNCS is interested in receiving input from the target organizations as to how best to plan the larger program.
4) Programs targeted toward a particular population are more likely to be successful when the population participates in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program.

Thank you for considering this request for an addendum to protocol 20030116.
CONSENT FORM
Community Health Organizations’ Perspectives of Partnership
With A Graduate Program of Nursing

You are being asked to be in a research study of your experiences as a community agency partner with the Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University. You were selected as a possible participant because you have partnered, or are currently partnering, with the faculty and students of the MSN Program, Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University. Please read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Researchers at Case Western Reserve University are conducting this study.

Background Information:
The purpose of this study is to learn about your organization’s experiences and views as a partner with the faculty and students of MSN Program, Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University.

Procedures:
If you agree to be in the study, we would ask you to do the following things:

6) Participate in an interview in which you will be asked to describe the nature of your partnership; your views of the partnership (both positive and negative); the effects of the partnership on you, your agency, and your clients; and your suggestions about the partnership.
7) The interview will take about 1 hour.
8) You will be asked for your permission to tape record the interview.
9) The researcher may request a follow-up interview.
10) At a later date, you will be asked to review a summary of the findings.
11) You will also be asked to participate in a group meeting of the participants.
12) At the group meeting, you will hear a summary of the study findings and you will be asked to discuss/comment on them. You will also be asked to make suggestions on planning of a program on community-academic partnerships and service-learning for a variety of community organizations to be held at a future time.
13) You will be asked for permission to tape record and make flip-chart notes of the group meeting.

Risks and Benefits From Being in the Study:
The study has the following risks:

5) You will be asked to take about 1 hour of your time to participate in the interview.
6) You will receive a summary of the interview and will be asked if you wish to make any changes or additions.
7) At a later date, you will be asked to review a summary of the group findings.
8) You will be asked to discuss both positive and negative aspects of the partnership.

The benefits of participation are: the information will be used to evaluate the partnership and may be used to improve the effectiveness of your partnership with the Bolton School, other Bolton School community-campus partnerships, community partnership activities by other schools of nursing, academic disciplines and community organizations.

You will receive no reimbursement for your time in the interview.
At the group meeting, you will receive lunch and parking will be validated.

Confidentiality:
The records of this study will be kept private. In the group meeting and any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you or your agency. Access to the records will be limited to the researchers; however, please note that sponsors, funding agencies, regulatory agencies, and the Institutional Review Board may review the research records. You will be asked for permission to audio tape record the interview. These tapes will also be kept in a locked file and will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
Your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your current or future relations with the University. There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not participating or for discontinuing your participation.

Provided to you will be any significant new findings that develop during the course of the research that may make you decide that you want to stop participating.

Contacts and Questions:
The researchers conducting this study are Theresa Standing PhD, RN and Deborah Lindell MSN APRN,BC. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have any questions later, you may contact Dr. Standing at 216-368-5990 or Mrs. Lindell at 216-368-3740.

If you would like to talk with someone other than the researchers about: 1) concerns regarding the study, 2) research participant rights, 3) research-related injuries, or 4) other human rights issues, please contact Case Western Reserve University’s Office of Research Administration at 216-368-4510 or write:

Case Western Reserve University
Office of Research Administration
4 Adelbert Hall
10900 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44106-7015.

You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

Statement of Consent:
I have read the above information. I have received answers to the questions I have asked. I consent to participate in the research. I am at least 18 years of age.

Print Name of Participant: ______________________________________________________

Signature of Participant: __________________________________ Date: __________

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: __________________________ Date: __________
Responsible Investigator: Theresa S. Standing
Department: Nursing
IRB Protocol #20030116
Title: Community Health Organizations' Perceptions of Partnership with a Graduate Program of Nursing
[Co-Investigator: Deborah Lindell]
Approval Date: Thursday, January 23, 2003
Continuing Review Deadline: Thursday, January 08, 2004
Expiration Date: Thursday, January 22, 2004

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) has APPROVED the above new protocol through the expedited review process.

It has been determined that this study involves minimal risk, and that no vulnerable populations will be involved.

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities include the following:

1. Report all adverse events and unanticipated problems involving human subjects to the Office of Research Administration (ORA) within three (3) days of your knowledge of the occurrence.
2. Provide the ORA with a complete Continuing Review form (available at the CWRU IRB Web Pages, or from the ORA) by the continuing review deadline noted above, and when the study is terminated.
3. Discontinue all work pertaining to this protocol if a continuing review approval is not finalized by the expiration date noted above.
4. Submit all proposed changes to the protocol to the ORA, and receive approval from the IRB, before implementation of the change.
5. Keep all research data and consent documents in your possession for at least three (3) years after the completion of the research activity.

******************************************************************************

CWRU Institutional Review Board
10900 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44106-7015
phone: 216.368.4513 fax: 216.368.4679
Case Western Reserve University
Institutional Review Board

NOTICE OF ADDENDUM APPROVAL

Responsible Investigator: Theresa S. Standing
Department: Nursing - General
IRB Protocol #20030116
Title: Community Health Organizations' Perceptions of Partnership with a Graduate Program of Nursing
[Co-Investigator: Deborah Lindell]
Addendum Approval Date: 6/5/2003

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) has APPROVED the submitted addendum for the above protocol.

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities include the following:

1. Report all adverse events involving human subjects to the Office of Research Administration (ORA) within three (3) days of the occurrence.
2. Provide the ORA with a complete Continuing Review form before Thursday, January 08, 2004, and when the study is terminated (Continuing Review forms are available at the CWRU IRB web pages, or at the ORA).
3. Submit any further changes to an approved protocol or consent form to the ORA, and receive approval from the IRB, before implementation of the change.
4. Keep all research data and consent documents in your possession for at least three (3) years after the completion of the research activity.

Comments:
******************************************************************************
***
CWRU Institutional Review Board
10900 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44106-7015
phone: 216.368.4513 fax: 216.368.4679

Please feel free to reply to this email address, or to contact: Compliance Assistant
Maureen Dore-Arshenovitz mxd4@po.cwru.edu or 216.368.6925
IRB Administrative Office (IAO) Head
Narinder Dhaliwal nkd3@po.cwru.edu or 216.368.6993
Appendix G

Summary – Interview Participant A (PA)

1. PA holds a leadership position in her voluntary agency. PA has been with the agency for 13 years.
2. PA has a numerous responsibilities within the organization as well as professional roles at the local, state and national levels.
3. PA is strongly committed to the mission of her agency and to providing holistic services her clients.
4. PA’s organization is currently facing decreased funding and she is seeking means by which she can maintain the work of the agency. This has involved new approaches to services.
5. PA values collaboration with other organizations.
6. PA sought the assistance of the School of Nursing (SON) in planning a major professional education program.
7. After speaking with several persons at the SON, PA was referred to G. Narsavage with whom she met to discuss her needs.
8. A faculty member oriented PA to service-learning and linked PA with a partner faculty member.
9. PA spoke with the faculty member by phone several times and they planned a project for the Spring, 2001 semester whereby students would assist in the planning of the professional seminar.
10. PA met with the students at the SON twice and had on-going email communication.
11. PA’s role in the project was to orient the students to the seminar and the health problem and be available during the project process to answer questions.
12. It was not felt that there would be added benefit for the students to come to PA’s office.
13. PA was highly satisfied with the partnership and found it to be a good experience.
14. The project had positive outcomes for PA:
   a. Students contributed (and PA learned) skills & knowledge needed to implement the continuing education credit component of the seminar.
   b. PA learned about a logic model relevant to the project.
15. The students also benefited from the partnership:
   a. Students learned about the specific health problem addressed at the seminar and PA hopes they will “spread the word” about it and be alert for the problem in their future practice.
   b. Students learned about the importance of assessing program outcomes & how to develop an evaluation for a professional education program.
16. PA would like to partner with the SON again but is unsure of how to integrate the knowledge/skills of the students with the work of her organization.
17. Partnerships need to be collaborative – to match organizational needs with the skills and knowledge of the nursing students.
18. PA has also been a member of the SON’s CETSL Advisory Group
   a. PA’s role has been somewhat passive - as a listener.
   b. PA is trying to identify ideas for further collaboration.
   c. As a non-nurse, PA sometimes feels like an outsider at the meetings – most members are nurses and have their own language.
   d. At times it seems like a nurses’ club.
   e. There are few other non-nurse community agency members.
   f. Feeling like an outsider does not keep PA from participating.
19. There are many voluntary organizations in this area that might benefit from partnership with the SON.
20. We need to brainstorm ideas for projects - think out of the box to identify ways to collaborate.

Summary of Interview With Participant B (PB)

1) PB is a manager with a large, national non-profit organization.
2) PB has been with the organization for 41/2 years and is well-informed as to the operations and services of the agency.
3) PB has a number of roles and responsibilities within the organization.
4) PB’s work involves collaboration with other agencies.
5) PB has been a member of the CETSL Advisory Group since its first meeting and has worked with several courses on a number of service-learning projects. P2 learned about service-learning from participation on the advisory group.
6) PB’s career focus has moved towards community health, community health education, minority health, and social services.
7) PB has a strong commitment to nursing and to supporting nursing education.
8) PB believes in the service-learning process and makes it a priority.
9) PB saw the partnership as having several purposes:
   a) Provides opportunities to fulfill the mission of the organization. The service-learning projects give PB additional resources and allow PB to move the work of the agency forward.
   b) Allows PB to implement her personal and professional role to share what she has learned and to help students link principles and theory learned in the classroom with the work environment.
10) PB has played several roles in her partnerships with FPB faculty and students.
   a) Looks throughout the agency to identify possible projects.
   b) Supervises the projects directly (majority of projects)
   c) Suggests student work directly with another staff member more closely involved with the project (liaison).
11) PB described how she links students and projects.
   a) PB identifies possible projects within the agency.
   b) PB communicates with the faculty member to understand the focus of the course and the service-learning objectives.
   c) PB visits the school of nursing to meet the students. P2 asks the students to refresh her as to the course name/number/focus.
   d) The students come to the agency for orientation:
      i) An overview of the agency
      ii) Project ideas
   e) PB meets with individual students in an effort to match student interests/characteristics with project needs. This makes the project more interesting for the student and results in a better project.
   f) PB reviews the plans with the instructor. Are they consistent with the course objectives?
   g) PB gave several examples of how the matching process has worked.
12) PB believes communication is an important factor in the service-learning projects.
   a) PB works closely with the course instructor.
   b) PB is up-front about communication
      i) All involved (PB, faculty and students) have busy schedules.
      ii) PB uses several methods of communication: email, phone, pager.
   c) A timeline helps everyone to know the plan and quickly see if they are on track.
13) PB has found the students to be high caliber, self-motivated and follow through on projects without close supervision.
14) PB described several factors in success of service-learning partnerships:
   a) The agency must be committed to the service-learning process.
   b) Be realistic –
      i) Find out how much time is allotted
      ii) Select projects that fit in that timeframe. PB has enough experience to know how long a particular project will take.
   c) Be flexible
   d) The agency and faculty member must have a close working relationship.
   e) The agency must understand the focus of the class and the service-learning objectives.
15) PB recently worked with a faculty member who was new to service-learning and had some reservations.
   a) PB took the lead, talked with the faculty member, gave examples of previous student projects, tried to help relieve some of the faculty member’s concern.
   b) PB has not actually met the faculty member; they keep missing each other.
16) PB described the partnership as having positive outcomes for students, agency and the participant.
a) Students learn about the agency and see their projects as part of a much larger picture.
b) Students contribute to the work of the agency. PB gave several examples.
c) PB has learned how nursing has progressed and has learned new concepts.
d) The project can be used to assess the need for, and barriers to, a larger project. Students doing an assessment project sought input from the target population.
e) Allows instructors in the agency’s training program to look beyond everyday classroom instruction and identify ways to enhance the program. PB keeps the ideas in mind for service-learning projects.
f) PB described a number of projects students have done and how they enhanced the work of the organization.

17) PB has participated in the CETSL Advisory Group
a) PB has networked with other members of the group. In one case, this has led to a whole new partnership. Another group member now speaks to the training program and has the opportunity to see potential employees.
b) PB works near the SON so can get there easily.
c) PB hosted a meeting of the CETSL group at the agency.
d) PB felt the leader is sensitive to the variety of demands of group members. Meetings are scheduled convenient times – over lunch hour.
e) The group meetings help to remind PB of SON schedules, class numbers and names.

Interview Summary - Participant C (PC)

The Participant, Agency and Prior Experience With Partnerships
The participant is a registered nurse who works in a K-12 educational setting.
The participant’s responsibilities are to provide comprehensive health services. P3’s roles include: administration, policy development, classroom education, and implementation (direct care).
This is PC’s 4th year in this school district.
PC has precepted students from other schools of nursing - these experiences were largely observational, clinical experiences. They did not involve a service piece.

Overview of PC’s Partnership With the Bolton School MSN Program
1. PC has worked with one faculty member and course over three years (2000, 2001, 2002). The course is taught in the fall semester. The first service-learning activity with CWRU students was as a pilot site; there were three projects. During the last two years, there have been 6 projects each time.
2. PC described the various projects students have done and gave examples of how they went smoothly or had kinks. Several examples are noted in this summary.
3. Initially, PC saw the relationship as an opportunity for CWRU students to have a learning experience in a community setting.
4. Over time, the relationship has evolved into more symbiotic, two-way relationship where there is some mutual benefit.
5. The degree to which the relationship is two ways may vary. The degree of mutual benefit depends on the extent of planning, degree of commitment by both parties, types of student project, and it could be just the day.
6. PC noted that the school district is very open to having students of all disciplines and having schools with diverse cultures makes the setting a good learning environment.
7. PC does not really have to “sell” these projects to the principals and teachers. They view the projects as an opportunity.
   a. Teachers are most receptive to the nursing students when their projects correlate with the curriculum and when the project can be reused in place of a prepared classroom lesson.
8. PC has noted that community partners see their roles differently. Some community partners are more concerned with how the agency will benefit from the project.
9. PC, as a teacher and nurse, saw the relationship as “How can I enhance the students’ learning experiences?”
10. PC has found that orientation and ongoing communication among agency, faculty and students are two important factors in the partnership.
11. PC uses the term "we" because she feels a "cool" thing of the partnership is that the projects belong not just to the students but are hers as well.
12. PC has learned that some projects such as multi-session programs were more involved than she originally thought.

PC's Role in the Partnership
1. Choreographer or liaison, to cut through red tape within the agency so the students can implement their service activities.
2. Facilitate learning by the CWRU students.
3. Help students that come in with preconceived ideas of what they envision doing rethink their ideas in terms of the needs of the agency and developmental characteristics of the children.

Orientation
1. PC's initial understanding of the learning objectives of the course and time line for the projects was lacking and PC was not certain how well the students understood the service-learning as well.
2. In 2001, PC went to the nursing students' classroom, described her agency and her role. PC felt that year students had a better understanding of the service-learning.
3. In 2002, PC did not visit the students' class and feels their grasp of the activity was not as strong as in 2001.
4. In 2002, PC's partner did orient the students as to the importance of gearing their projects to the needs of the agency versus their interests.
5. PC believes students that in order for students to have a successful service-learning experience, they need to have a good, conceptualized view of the dynamics of the agency and the planning involved in the student's project activities.
6. PC felt it would be beneficial for her to have an understanding of what is expected of the students and what their timelines are.
7. PC and her faculty partner are talking about ways to improve the orientation component of the partnership.
8. PC plans to develop a power point presentation to use in orienting the nursing students to her agency. Orientation of the students to how the agency works, logistics and dynamics within the agency may help students select an appropriate topic.

Communication.
1. PC felt that communication between her and her faculty partner has improved as they have gotten to know each other and the partner got to know the agency better. Now the level of communication with her partner faculty member is excellent.
2. Communication with students can be a challenge especially when PC has 5-6 groups of students with several students in each group (2001 & 2002). Things can get harried when students change their plans mid-stream. Student plans and timelines need to be clearly defined. Thus, the purpose of the Proposal Sheet.
3. Email is a very effective means of communication. Paging seems to be less effective. PC may be busy when she is paged.
4. The proposal sheet is another form of communication.
5. The advisory group is another route of communication between PC & her partner.

Planning and Implementation
1. PC has learned to negotiate the nature of the project with the students and define clearly what the students plan to do.
2. PC developed a Proposal Sheet as a tool for students document these plans and communicate with her and the faculty member.
3. Areas to consider when arranging nursing student projects include:
   a. Parent permission - informed consent
   b. arranging multi-session projects to coordinate absence of students from classrooms
4. PC looked for projects that will touch students, parents, and staff by having longevity of usage.
5. Try to use different focal points – i.e. for 2002 – nutrition. All six projects related to nutrition but at different age groups.
6. PC feels the partnership is optimized when students work in groups of 2-3 versus 4-5. More classes can be touched.
7. PC tries to link the students' interests with the instructional level and curricular goals. Students interested in a particular level or topic may have to shift their plans.
8. PC noted that student projects vary as to the amount of interaction with the participants. Students seem to like the interaction and feedback - i.e. seeing the expression on a child's face. However, projects where students do not have a direct two-way communication can still be very helpful (i.e. poster moved around to various schools).
9. Students need to commit to their topic and timeframe early on. When students delay firming plans or change the topic or dates midstream, PC has to go back to the administrator and teacher and make necessary changes. The process can become very complicated.
10. PC compared the process to peeling an onion - you keep peeling away layers until you get to where you need to go.

Other Thoughts
1. Another challenge involves coordinating students' implementation dates. One year they came within two-week time and this was difficult for PC to handle along with her regular activities.
2. The course PC partners with is taught in the fall - PC's busiest time - state reports and mandated activities.
3. PC views the service-learning process as fun and enjoys the relationship because both the nursing students and classroom students are touched as well as parents.
4. One of the best benefits of the relationship is that it has affected PC personally as to her professional growth. It forces her to look at her own practice and role. It is a way to fulfill her professional responsibility to give back to her alma mater.
5. PC feels that her agency is a perfect fit with the course taught by her partner.
6. PC understands that the MSN students have complicated lives too and that you are never going to please everyone.
7. The plans for one project called for students to teach on the same topic in two culturally different buildings. PC felt this was an excellent opportunity for the students to learn to modify their teaching to the target group. Unfortunately, the students were slow to develop their plans and one target group had to be removed. This took away from the potential learning value of the project for the students. PC was disappointed.
8. PC feels a check and balance system would help to optimize the learning experience for students and service to the agency - i.e. make students allow enough time in planning the project to present it to her before the actual classroom or for her to review materials to make sure they are appropriate.
9. The best group in Fall 2002 was one that got an early start & was well planned and organized.
10. PC meets with her faculty partner at the end of the semester to review their activities.
11. PC and her partner are thinking of developing a brief checklist for feedback and perceptions from teachers when there isn't an opportunity for teacher reflection. PC believes this is important.
12. PC can see a difference between working with BSN and MSN students. MSN students are more comfortable with their nursing practice, more confident in their nursing skills, and draw on their life experiences. PC likened it to a set of nesting dolls - another layer for students to use.
13. PC's advice to an agency new to service-learning: jump right in, give it a chance - you will be surprised at how the agency benefits, what the students learn and how they maybe develop their own teaching philosophy and use it as a tool.

PC and the CETSL Advisory Group
1. PC has found participating in the advisory group to be a positive experience.
2. A way to give back to her alma mater.
3. A means of networking - another member of the group has been a resource to her several times.
4. PC learns trends in nursing education
5. PC feels connected to the school of nursing.
6. The meetings are held at a convenient time (lunch) and are short and to the point.
7. PC likes to hear how other agencies are utilizing service-learning. It stimulates PC to think of new ways to work with students.
Summary of Interview With Participant D
The Participant, Agency and Prior Experience with Partnerships
1. Participant D (PD) holds a leadership position in a specialty health care organization.
2. PD has been in her current position for 5 years, has done this type of work for 10 years and has worked in this area of health care since 1980.
3. PD has considerable prior experience with partnerships.
4. PD learned it was important to seek input from the target group, especially other disciplines, as to their needs, to be involved in the whole process, and that it is helpful to have feedback as to the effectiveness of the program.

Partnership With the Bolton School’s MSN Program -courses 1 and 2
1. Initially, PD’s supervisor coordinated the service-learning with the MSN students as she wanted to see how it would go and wanted to make sure the agency did their best in working with the students. Then PD gradually became involved.
2. In the first course, students assisted the agency in preparing staff to care for a new type of patient. Students worked on developing a staff continuing education program.
3. PD believes that this community service should be mutual and reciprocal -a two way street.
   a. What can we give them?
   b. What can they give us?
4. However, PD did not have an opportunity to follow-up with the students as to reflecting on their learning about hospice and how they could apply it. This would be especially helpful in the case of PD’s specialty as the students come from a very different clinical perspective. Yet PD believes both the agency and students can learn from each other.
5. This may have been partly because PD’s supervisor worked more directly on the project.
6. PD was not involved in the 2nd project that related to developing strategies for care of a particular type of client. Her supervisor noted that as with course 1, the students did not seem to be able to find literature that focused specifically on the topic.
7. PD is not sure if this is because the literature isn’t there.

Course 3
1. PD is working with their 3rd course at the present. They will work together for 2 semesters. There is a new instructor. After talking with her supervisor about their previous experiences, she is doing things differently this time.
2. The process will be much more collaborative – an element that seemed to be lacking in the previous 2 courses.
3. She asked to meet with the instructor and students to discus what the agency would like to do and what direction the students might go. Everyone had to rearrange their schedules but it was worth it. The students and instructor came to the agency for a meeting and tour. Members of the agency’s education team attended the meeting too.
4. The instructor was good at helping the students see that although the agency’s dream is a big project, the students can play a role in moving it along.
5. The students were going to go back and propose a plan. PD and the education team will review the plan once they receive it.
6. The agency welcomes the students input.
7. PD is excited about working with the students.
8. PD hopes the students will create an educational piece for the staff and the students will learn the agency’s clinical specialty’s perspective of the topic and how it can influence their practice.
9. PD feels the approach this semester is much better organized.
10. They will continue to meet at the middle & end of the semester so the agency knows what the students are doing and the students know what the end goal is.
11. One challenge is students’ limited time to devote to the project so it is good there will two semesters.
12. PD plans to follow-up at the end of the project -what have the students learned and how can they apply it?
13. PD has invited the students to spend some time at the agency.
Factors Influencing Partnerships With MSN Students

1. MSN students are different from BSN students
   a. can interact at a higher level of critical thinking - more analytical
   b. free and open in discussions
   c. more confident and mature
   d. looking for information - know what they want to learn
   e. want to be in school
   f. ask questions

2. Create a trust relationship

3. Instructor has ideas but lets students be involved in developing the plan

4. Know what the expectations are
   a. for the student from the agency
   b. agency from the student

5. Understand that both are teaching and learning - agency learns from student and student learns from agency

6. Listen and really hear each other

7. If you keep lines of communication open, anything can happen.

PO's Thoughts on the CETSL Advisory Group

1. Opportunity to meet nurses from other specialties and agencies and understand the richness of the nursing profession.

2. To say you are a nurse is to say you are the point of a needle and have the whole quilt ahead of you.

3. The focus of PD’s specialty can be narrow.

4. PD may learn about referral resources for her clients

5. Hear about others’ service-learning projects.

6. Gain an understanding of the School of Nursing.

7. Educational for the participant.

8. Receiving the minutes is a means of knowing what the group is doing even if PD can’t attend.

9. Day of week is important – avoid Monday & Friday; lunch time is good

10. Little details are important
    a. Copies of minutes & agenda available at meeting
    b. That lunch is provided - PD thinks members would help pay.
    c. Validate parking
    d. Leader sticks to agenda

Summary of Interview With Participant E

The Participant, the Agency, and Current Partnerships

1. The participant (PE) has a leadership position in a large human service organization

2. PE is responsible for program development and implementation and supervises programs.

3. PE participates in a number of partnerships and, given limited resources, sees them as a key strategy to promote the agency’s mission.

4. PE believes advance planning is a key factor in the agency’s partnerships related to service provision.

5. PE’s agency welcomes students and has worked with BSN students, students of other disciplines, and research teams.

6. PE believes these activities help the agency gain new knowledge and promote the agency’s mission.

7. PE noted that while they do support research by universities, the agency also considers what benefit they will get beyond providing sources for data collection.

8. Overall, PE’s experiences with the University have been good.

The Partnership With The Bolton School’s MSN Program

1. The partnership was initiated by a phone call from a faculty member who sought opportunities for MSN students to work with clients in the community.
2. PE was very comfortable with discussing the request as PE sees the importance of students comparing/contrasting textbook theory and hospital situations with “real-world” situations in the community.

3. Purpose: provide students with a good learning experience in a setting not typically seen by students. PE hopes agency will role model dealing with individuals on a one-to-one basis.

4. P5 began planning by talking to the faculty member about what would happen at the sites, how the students would be paired with sites, and each site is different, and student accessibility to the sites.

5. PE noted that it was very fortunate that the faculty member, with support of the agency, obtained a grant for the project in 2001. See notes in outcomes.

6. The grant was very important to PE. Funding isn’t always available but is really nice and makes her more willing to have another project that is not funded.

7. The grant helped the centers do some creative activities that would remain with the center after the project was ended.

8. PE met with the students at the very beginning and oriented them to the agency’s mission, services, funding and organization.

9. Student projects varied from site to site and were developed to meet center-identified needs.

10. Students talked with directors and got to know the clients. PE believes it is helpful for students to share a meal with the clients and see the dynamics.

11. PE, who is detailed oriented, had to adjust to working with the faculty member who is more “laid back”. Their shared goal made the effort to understand style differences worthwhile.

12. PE’s orientation to service-learning came through the course instructor who sent her some written information about the topic.

13. PE noted that when projects are geared to the needs of the target population (i.e. stretching food money while eating nutritious meals) the rationale may not be clear to the students but the project definitely meets agency needs & priorities.

Communication

1. PE noted communication went very well.

2. Communication with PE and the instructor was very important.

3. PE facilitated communication with the centers.

4. One miscommunication was worked out.

5. PE had ongoing communication during the projects – talking with the center directors and the faculty member – PE acted as the “middle person – held it together from the middle”.

6. PE and her agency are accountable to funding sources and must document students’ projects just like staff.

Outcomes of the Partnership with FPB

1. PE was a “little nervous at first” as to how the projects would play out. But as time went by it became more clear and “people were happy”.

2. The experience was “wonderful”; a “really good experience”.

3. The projects were creative.

4. PE described several of the projects.

5. PE noted an example of client outcomes.

6. The staff and clients enjoyed the projects.

7. The students had a good time and a wonderful learning experience different from other experiences.

8. The students developed a web site. This was particularly well received by P5’s supervisor as he is very high tech.

9. Students shared that their views of elders changed. They learned that not all elders are “sick and decrepit” – a whole different population.

10. The faculty member brought back one other group of students in Summer, 2002.

11. The faculty member worked hard to make the projects successful. By having a grant, the centers and their clients received some incentives based on the needs of the centers and the projects. They were more than a thank you – they met a need.

Suggestions for Success

1. It is important to be able to contact people. Get email addresses and phone numbers.
2. Email is very helpful.
3. Some agencies are not used to having graduate students in the field.
4. PE has this experience and knows what to expect — that the students can only do so much, have certain time frames, and that BSN and MSN students have different capabilities.

Summary of Interview With Participant F

The Organization and P (participant) F’s Role
1. P F is the Communications Manager for a large collaborative
2. The organization is supported with federal, state, county and private funds.
3. P F has been with the agency for 4 years —
4. P F has worked on publications, liaison with the county, links staff with the collaborative committees.

P F has extensive experience with partnership activities as her agency is built on the concept of collaboration.

How P F became involved with the MSN students:
1. The faculty member approached her agency & was interested in learning about the agency. The faculty member has a special interest in the type of work done by the agency
2. The faculty member felt the agency was a good fit with her course and suggested the partnership.
3. At the time, the collaborative had some ideas for projects they wanted to do.

P F’s role in the partnership
1. Liaison with the committees that the students worked with
2. P F’s colleague (public awareness) also worked the committees and the students
3. Work with the professor on developing ideas for projects.
4. Share the ideas with the committees to see if they support the project
5. Link students with the committees
6. Oversee the progress & see the end product

P F’s orientation to the course and service-learning
1. The faculty member met with P 6 and explained the purpose of the projects & gave her some informational materials on service-learning
2. Due to time constraints, P 6 was not able to attend the advisory group meetings
3. P F felt her time could be best used in working directly with the faculty & students.
4. P F did not realize, at first, that the course was part of a more extensive service-learning project.
5. P F sought clarification from the instructor that the projects involving work with the committees was appropriate learning experiences for the students & that direct contact with families was not necessary as students also had a clinical component to the course.

Orientation of students to the agency
1. P F and (later) her colleague, GR, went to the class and did a 1 ¼ hour powerpoint presentation on the organization & gave folders with handouts
2. They described the projects, listened to student feedback and answered questions.
3. Course instructor also did follow-up discussion about the projects

Implementation of the Projects
1. Student groups self-selected a project to work on
2. PF informed students as to when committees were meeting
3. Students worked hard to arrange their schedules so to attend their committee’s meetings
4. At the committee meetings: shared purpose of the committee, discussed project
5. Students worked with volunteer members of the committees
6. Projects
   a. Year 1 Group 1 - redesigned pamphlet
      i. Students took the project and ran with it - prepared drafts, reviewed with agency, developed into final product
      ii. Agency & committee were very pleased
      iii. Felt like students were part of the committee
   b. Year 1 Group 2 - went to center and did screenings using a specific tool
      i. PF may have seen this as a way for students to get hands-on experience
      ii. Students didn’t get to do many screenings
      iii. Also, put together ideas for a client workshop but it was difficult to find a group for that.
      iv. Project not as well defined – not as successful as project 1
   c. Year 2 Group 1 - Students worked with a committee to develop a handbook
      i. The start was slow as the committee was just beginning the project
      ii. Students were not able to complete the project but it is coming along well – agency is adding to the handbook, getting input from many people
   d. Year 2 Group 2 - Students worked with another committee
      i. developed a resource clients
      ii. More focused project
      iii. Students shared drafts at committee meeting – clients gave good feedback
      iv. Agency is editing the student materials down

Communication
1. PF found the most effective means of communication with faculty and students was email – also phone, and in person at the various committee meetings
2. Agency sent thank you letters to the students
3. First group: went to lunch at the end
4. Communication was multi-directional: PF, faculty, students, committees
5. PF filled out an evaluation for the instructor

What went well
1. PF was impressed with the students’ commitment & the work they did
2. The agency made progress on projects they wanted to do
3. Students’ made valuable contributions from their nursing practice- especially with families.
4. Students learned about the topic they worked on (i.e. cultural competence & various cultural groups in the agency’s service area)
5. Students learned about the process of planning and developing a project – working with a committee, various agencies and individuals from the community.
6. PF enjoyed working with the professor two times -> a relationship
   a. P 6 has spoken with the professor on another issue
   b. The relationship has the potential to expand into other things
   c. The professor was responsive, appreciative and reassured P 6 as to the learning value of the projects
7. Committees formed partnerships with the students & appreciated their efforts.
8. Working with one professor two times

Challenges
1. PF felt the students only had the opportunity to interact with one segment of the organization and weren’t able to get a perspective of the full organization.
2. She would have liked them to attend meetings of other committees and get to more about the agency’s structure
3. P F understands the students had commitments beyond their work with her organization and that the projects required time outside of what they spent on-site.

4. The students were disappointed they weren’t able to finish their projects & have ownership of them due to the semester schedule.

5. One projects had a slow start – had to determine roles & responsibilities

Suggestions:
1. P F would like the students to see the projects when they are finished.
2. P F would work with the faculty member again in Fall, 2003 but will need to see what the organization’s priorities are at the time.
3. Do preliminary definition of projects before starting (allows students to start their part more quickly)
4. Feedback from students about the projects & the organization would be helpful
5. Would be nice to have a wrap-up session

Interview Summary – Participant G (P G)

P G has worked with MSN students over 2 years (Spring, 2001, Fall, 2001, Spring, 2002 and Fall, 2002 semesters). During that time, she has been employed by two organizations (one geared toward health education and the one discussed below). She left the first organization during the Fall, 2001 semester.

Role in Current Organization
1. P G has a leadership position in a large human service agency.
2. A challenge is keeping staff informed of best practices for the populations they serve. This includes identification of training needs as well as strategies for improving services.
3. P G has been with this agency for 1½ years. She has much experience in social services.

Experience With Partnerships
1. P G has extensive experience with partnerships.
2. P G has developed partnerships with schools when the agency had a need and students were expected to develop a skill related to that need. These partnerships were a win-win for both organizations.
3. P G believes in partnerships because they allow you to develop your work force and educate them as to what organizations are doing in the community.
4. P G has had partnerships where an advisory board assisted her to advocate for the clients.
5. P G is a strong supporter of wanting new knowledge.
6. P G has worked with CWRU’s AmeriCorps students (undergraduate) – Agency 1.

Initial Involvement With The Bolton School’s MSN Program
1. P G was involved with the MSN Program’s service-learning project from the beginning.
2. Prior to attending the early meetings of the Advisory Group, she had attended a program on service-learning at another university.

P G’s Experiences With MSN Students
1. Spring, 2001 semester – 4 projects. More student centered than agency centered, but it meet agency needs and gave the agency something they could grow with.
2. Fall, 2001 semester - Students worked in 2 groups – as they were very busy. Each student group had a representative who met with P G and reported back to the group. Focus was on agency needs. But also faculty driven according to what they saw as priorities in the curriculum
3. Spring, 2002 semester - Students developed educational presentations for staff. CEUs were obtained and a power point program was left with the agency (now stored in the library for use by new staff)
4. Fall, 2002 semester - Students did staff education. Unfortunately, the times students were available to do the presentations were not convenient for the staff. Instructor is to give the materials to the agency & they will use them – they will do the presentation.
Orientation
1. P G orients the students to the agency by speaking at their class.
2. She gives out materials about the mission, services, etc of the agency.
3. At agency 1, she took the students on a tour of the agency and in semester 1, she interviewed the students to identify their interests and attempted to link them with the agency’s needs.
4. She encourages students to come to the agency to see how services are provided, learn about staff roles, etc. However, students have busy schedules so they have not taken advantage of opportunities to experience the agency on site.
5. P G was oriented to the MSN program and service-learning through participation on the advisory committee, being on their mailing list and attending educational programs.
6. P G’s orientation to the courses she worked with varied according to the faculty member’s level of experience with teaching at the school and teaching the course. In some cases, faculty were new to the community, the school and/or the course and P G found that she took the more active role in orientation – i.e. she oriented the faculty member to service-learning, partnerships, etc.

P G’s Role in the Partnership
1. P G does not see the partnership as a burden.
2. She sees it as a challenge – opportunity to do things differently
3. P G has been actively involved – at times, a one-person partnership (see challenges)
4. P G has been a liaison between the agency and the students & faculty.
5. P G has been a coach
   a. To facilitate staff acceptance of the partnership as a way to meet agency needs
   b. To help students understand this is a valuable use of their time – that the agency really needs their contributions
6. P G has been a teacher – i.e. working with students who have not done this particular activity before – encouraging them that they are able to do these projects & presentations
7. P G has been a learner – i.e. when carefully planed projects don’t work out
8. P G’s role has varied from more to less hands on according to the agency & semester.

Communication
1. Some semesters P G has played a direct role in the partnership and communicated frequently with faculty and students.
2. Other semesters, she has linked students with staff & then been less hands on.
3. Email works well – also phone
4. Needs to be liaison to faculty and students – not just liaison to faculty

Expectations
1. To have a successful project
2. To make sure all parties feel that have gained from it – win-win for students & agency
3. To have something at the agency that can be used later to meet needs in the strategic plan.

Outcomes
1. Overall, P G’s expectations have been met.
2. The 1st & 3rd semesters went best because the projects went to completion.
3. Students are more fulfilled when they are able to complete the project.
4. The experience has been very good for P G. It has been flexible and she can always see the difference as to where the agency is before the work is done and where the agency is after the work is done.
5. P G or other staff might not have had the time to do the projects done by the students.
6. See challenges re semesters 2 and 4.

What Went Well
1. P G had a back up person in semester 3. So when she was out ill for several weeks, the person stepped in and kept the projects moving along.
2. The quality of the projects is best when there is close communication among the agency, faculty & students.

Challenges

1. Students who did presentations were nervous – suggestion: if students do presentations in the future: discuss in advance how to project their voices
2. When P G left agency 1, even though she left another staff member in charge of the partnership, the individual changed the focus of the projects to meet immediate needs of the agency rather than what had been agreed to. This was difficult for the students.
3. Similarly, when agency 2 underwent a major reorganization during a service-learning semester and P G’s role changed, it became more difficult for the agency to carry out their responsibilities than P G had anticipated. That is why P G did not do service-learning in spring, 2003 semester.
4. It presents a challenge when the partnership is one-person focused (within the agency) – it is more advantageous when the institution incorporates partnerships as part of their over all plan and several people are involved.

Working With Graduate Students

1. P G’s experience with CWRU undergraduate students was with the AmeriCorps program: those students are like sponges, flexible and looking for opportunities to serve
2. Graduate students have a mind of their own and have many commitments outside of school which limit their enthusiasm and the time they can devote to service-learning.
3. P G has found she has to stimulate the graduate students to become sponges and want to participate in the partnership.
4. It is challenging when students have already done a service-learning project – especially with the same agency.

Evaluation

1. P G believes on-going evaluation is important to help improve the partnership’s outcomes.
2. The extent and type of evaluation P G has varied with the semester.
3. It has included sitting down with the students and/or faculty to process the activities and written staff feedback on student presentations (when CEU’s were provided).

Hints for Success - Agency

1. The staff person working on the partnership should be energetic
2. Have more than one staff person be responsible for the project
3. Take time to listen to the students’ interests & see if they can be integrated into agency needs
4. Remember, students’ time is limited. The agency can not always achieve the depth on the project that they would like.
5. Be clear and concise
6. Carry your end of the partnership - Be willing to pass along information, etc that will help the students move forward
7. Time management is very important

Hints for Success- Faculty & Students

1. Faculty & students should quickly accept that service-learning is part of the curriculum and move forward with it rather than complain.
2. Once they learn about the agency, F & S should share their ideas – it may be possible to integrate them into the agency’s needs.
3. Take time to visit the agency – it will lead to a better appreciation of the partnership than just having a classroom orientation and phone discussions.
4. Think of the project as if it were for their agency- What do they need to know about that agency to be successful?
5. Faculty must buy in to the service-learning. If no, students will sense that and be less committed to the project which will result in a less than optimal quality product.

Hints for Success – Partnership
1. Service-learning activities need to be closely linked to the course objectives and to agency needs.
2. Implementation of service-learning and partnerships goes more smoothly when the faculty and the agency have some experience with it and both are on the same page.
3. It is helpful for the agency person & faculty to work together for more than one semester.
4. Those (agencies, faculty & students) new to service-learning and community-campus partnerships should participate in mandatory training before getting involved.
   a. Training for agencies should include:
      i. have a back-up person
      ii. attend advisory meetings
      iii. Make sure projects going well are moved along and, if problems occur, quick changes made so the outcome remains positive.

Advisory Group
1. P G has been a strong supporter of the Advisory Group.
2. P G sees an important role of the group as giving good feedback and helping to strengthen the program. This requires members with consistent participation.
3. It changes the flavor of the group when some participants have been involved from the start and others are new agencies joining the group throughout the year and not always attending regularly.
4. P G believes that it is difficult for an agency to implement a partnership unless they have been attending the meetings consistently and understand the concepts of service-learning.
5. To promote more a more effective Advisory Group and service-learning program P G recommends:
   a. Open the Advisory Group to new members only in Fall
   b. New members should commit to attending meetings regularly
   c. See #4 above in Hints for Success
6. Optimal time of meetings: no good time for everyone. Some advisory groups rotate times & days.
7. Parking is a problem at CWRU but when the group has held meetings off-site with free parking & easy access, few faculty attend.
8. More feedback from students would be helpful. The group could use it to enhance the service-learning experience.

Summary of Interview – Participant H (PH)
1. P H is employed by a K-12 school district.
2. P H has extensive experience in her role - 18 years
3. P H has worked with other organizations but not in the same way as with the MSN program.
4. P H has hosted undergraduate nursing students in observation experiences.
5. P H enjoys working with nursing students.
6. Purpose of Partnership With the MSN Program:
   1. The school district will benefit from the knowledge and expertise of the graduate nursing students.
   2. The graduate students, who may have extensive experience in acute/critical care, will see that people are in the community before & after the hospital - -will see the big picture.

Role in the Partnership With the MSN Program
1. P H first became involved with the service-learning when encouraged to do so by a fellow school nurse.
2. P H and her colleague attended a workshop on service-learning sponsored by the MSN program.
3. P H thought she would work with the faculty member she teamed with at the workshop but wound up working with another.
4. P H was glad to work with that faculty member as her course dealt with health promotion, a topic very compatible with the concerns of school nurses.
5. P H’s colleague started working with the faculty member at the start of the semester and P H became involved later on.
6. P H had to use negotiation strategies to:
7. PH didn’t realize she would need to be as closely involved as she was – in terms of providing direction and structure.

Participant’s Orientation
1. PH found the workshop to be a very good orientation to service-learning.
   a. Stimulating to hear what others were doing
   b. Learned how service-learning differed from usual clinical experiences.
2. The course instructor provided a very good orientation to the course & MSN program.
3. PH has attended meetings of the advisory group & found them informative (see that section)

Orientation of Students
1. The orientation of the students did not go as well as her orientation to service-learning.
2. Students had little time for orientation – sent one to represent the three.
3. It was difficult to explain the structure & bureaucracy of the school district.
4. Eventually the students came to the school and began to understand the situation.

Process of the Partnership
1. During the presentation a logistical problem occurred but one of the teachers was very flexible and a solution was worked out.
2. Communication with the faculty member was very good – gave helpful feedback
3. Communication with students was not as effective – assigned a spokesman
4. There may have been difficulties in dynamics among the students. One student seemed to take the lead but didn’t follow through on commitments.
5. At one point students met with community aide but PH unable to be there. Led to some confusion which PH & the aide worked out because they have good relationship.
6. The students developed a nice program but it was 8 hours long & they only had a 40 minute period to present it. Eventually they came to the school and began to understand the structure. Then, they had to make major revisions in their program.
7. PH met with the faculty member to evaluate the partnership, she did not meet with the students.

Challenges
1. Logistics – couldn’t get students together
2. PH thought the students would be more self-directed
3. Students had difficulty communicating in simple language – it is ok to use big terms (expands school students’ vocabulary) but the words need to be explained.
4. Nursing school & school district have different start and end dates. Rushed at end.
5. Graduate students had limited time & are more focused on their specialties. Not as open to seeing where a community based experience can fit into their career & educational goals.
6. Undergraduate students are more open to new experiences & accept their assignments more readily.
7. Surveys were sent out to parents but PH never got them back.

Outcomes
1. PH’s expectations were met –
2. Turned out well in the end, students did a nice presentation
3. The process wasn’t as smooth as she had expected.
4. Good for the school students to see African-American nursing students as role models.
5. A learning experience for both PH & the nursing students.
6. Nursing students gained insight into the topic they address - need to start with young girls.

Factors Influencing a Successful Partnership
1. The partner’s role will vary with the particular students.
2. Good communication and clear understanding of structure.
3. Plans, goals; objectives and time line.
4. Takes time and experience to learn how to deal with glitches and have more successes than
   glitches

Suggestions:
1. Would like to do it again – it’s a learning process for both parties.
2. Good experience for graduate students of all specialties – gain community perspective
3. Meet with all students early on – be open, make expectations clear.
4. When students are working with a school, they should meet the principal.
5. All involved in the projects should meet together.
6. More focus and structure by PH - deadlines and a realistic timeline
7. If surveys are sent out – plan in advance how to get them back
8. Find a way to start earlier
9. Hold a formal evaluation with the students
10. Become more comfortable in giving feedback.
11. Seek feedback from students
12. PH recommends that other school nurses get involved in service-learning – provides a resource &
   expands your horizon

Advisory Group
1. The advisory group meetings were very informative
2. PH learned: what other partnerships are doing, about the school of nursing, and goals and objectives of service-learning.
3. PH got to know faculty
4. The meetings are run well – efficient.

Summary: Interview with Participant I

- Participant I (P I) is the coordinator of a voluntary, health organization
- P I is not a health care professional.
- The organization views healing as a holistic process; the goal is for clients to lead healthier lives.
- The organization provides health screenings, health education and counseling, referrals, and, when indicated, direct linkage with other organizations (i.e. transportation).
- Advocacy and empowerment are key components of the organization’s services.
- Many clients are minority, single, unemployed adults. The organization serves clients from the immediate area as well as from outlying communities.
- P I has been involved with her work for 10 years.
- Partnerships with a number of other health agencies are integral.
- P I has an on-going partnership with the school of nursing of a community college. Faculty & students come to the organization for clinical experiences on a regular basis.
- P I has been pleased with the partnerships she has had. Some do not work out but that seems to be evident for P I’s organization begins to rely on them.
- In some cases, P I’s partners’ abilities to provide services change over time and P I must adapt to those changes by finding other partnerships.
- P I has learned to be very persistent in looking for resources for clients.
- P I linked with a member of the Bolton School’s MSN program faculty through an area voluntary organization.
- The initial goal was to have a 3 way partnership between the two schools of nursing & P I’s organization. That did not work out due to policy constraints.
- The partnership with the Bolton School involved two aspects:
  - The project with the local voluntary organization in which MSN students did surveys of clients at P I’s organization to learn how the voluntary organization could improve their educational/health counseling services to urban, low income, minority clients.
  - Students have also done physicals
• At present, no MSN students are involved with the organization due to scheduling conflicts.

• The participant orients students at the agency.
  o It is important for students to see the location of the organization.
  o For students from the community college, the orientation is in-depth
  o For MSN students working with the voluntary organization, P I did not do a formal orientation but dialogued informally with the students.
  o MSN students doing physicals visited the agency for a brief overview of its mission, services, and clients.

• P I did not have an orientation from the Bolton School because she had been involved with the community college.

• P I's role in the partnerships with the schools of nursing has involved:
  o Setting up client appointments.
  o Making sure parent/guardians bring immunization records.
  o Providing space
  o Acting as an intermediary between clients and nursing faculty/students.
  o Coordinating documentation.

• P I communicated more with faculty than students.

• Expectations/Outcomes of the partnership with the MSN program.
  o P I's expectations of the work with the voluntary organization & MSN students were minimal as the project was initiated by the voluntary organization.
  o P I's expectations of the MSN students’ physicals were that students would do education with parents/guardians.
  o The expectations were met.
  o Students came at the agreed upon time.

• Barriers/challenges with the MSN program
  o There were no major barriers in the partnership.
  o One student who was inappropriate but the faculty & P I agreed on the situation.
  o P I knows these circumstances will occur.
  o P I did not get to know the students as well as the ones from the community college. She also didn’t get to answer their questions about the clients/organization.

• Reliability by service providers is an important issue for P I. Some agree to come then don’t show up.

• P I compared the ADN students to the graduate students.
  o ADN students were easier to work with - less preset ideas about the clients served by the organization.
  o Graduate students had some biases – from past experiences.
  o P I could see their apprehension in their body language.
  o P I didn’t have the opportunity to help students process through those biases prior to their experiences at the agency.
  o Graduate students are licensed – do not require close supervision by instructor.

• P I’s role is not to change students’ opinions but to ask that they respect the clients.

• P I identified factors key to the success of the partnerships
  o Mutual respect for each other’s skills, resources and roles
  o Shared leadership
  o Collaboration
  o Recognize when to step back if there is a disagreement, sit down privately and discuss it
  o P I has always been able to work out miscommunications

• P I had suggestions for other community organizations – for successful partnerships
  o Know your organization, its’ basic principles, and its’ limits
  o Understand your boundaries
  o Don’t presume you can anticipate a partner’s response to a situation ..let them respond
  o Seek input from the community (population you serve) as to its’ needs and how best to meet them – ie times for programs to be open
  o Share community input with your partners.
o Ask partners to respect them if they make a suggestion that the organization doesn’t feel is a good idea – explain why it isn’t a good idea based on input from the community.
o Work outside the box & hop over barriers – aim for circles instead
o Open communication – allow time to make sure communication is clear
o Listen to each other’s expectations
o Deliberate, careful planning
o Learn from your experiences
o Make changes as needed based on experiences
o Always growing and changing
o Focus on client’s needs versus those of the school of nursing or agency

• P I had suggestions for faculty
  o Be enthusiastic about the partnership and want to get involved.
  o Understand the organization - come to orientations with students.
  o Lay the groundwork for the partnership in their classroom before students come to the agency.
  o Students should come to the agency for orientation but the process should be collaborative – faculty be there and talk about the nursing role
  o Faculty need to develop trust relationship with the partner and the community
  o Students will be trusted because the partner and faculty are trusted by the community
  o The two MSN faculty have been accepted by the community

• P I has learned that organizations have to be responsive to community needs
• P I talked about how she relates to the community
  o Health care needs to be in the community and involve members of the community.
  o How you approach the community is key
  o Treat the community as adults
  o Let them tell you what they need; what their problems are
  o Started with informal discussions during meals held at the site
  o P I sat down with the community members
  o P I asked what went well and what didn’t
  o P I identified some key persons from the community and now invites them to a private lunch to ask their opinions about her ideas.
  o P I now has an advisory board of community members
  o Members of the advisory board talk with others to get their input
  o P I doesn’t use paper surveys – people will put down what you want them to because they have done too many surveys where they give ideas and nothing happens as a result
  o P I is clear with her community as to how she will follow through
  o If P I is unable to follow through, P I explains why
  o Sometimes you can help most by just being there, listening, cutting through red tape.

• Those managing welfare reform are not hearing needs of the people.

Interview Summary: Participant J (P J)

• P J is a school nurse in a large, urban school district.
• P J has over 35 years experience in nursing and over 20 years experience as a school nurse.
• MSN students were at a middle school and an elementary school.
• P J described the partnership process as a situation in which each organization has its own goals and objectives, but they also collaborate, or work together, to achieve shared goals as well.
• P J has learned that very clear communication is key to a successful partnership.
  o Partners need to have a common ground – shared goals and objectives.
  o Partners need to be able to discuss problems and challenges and find a solution.
• P J described the purpose of partnership with the MSN program as: to guide MSN students in completing a mutually desired project that meets school needs.
• P J’s role was as an intermediary and facilitator between the needs of the school and a project that the students are excited about and committed to-- “a meeting of the minds”.

P J first became involved with the MSN program in Spring, 2002 when she participated in a
workshop they sponsored on service-learning. Her manager had suggested she attend.
The workshop provided an overview of service-learning, projects others had done and some of the
challenges they experienced.
P J received handouts and a disc with information on service-learning.
Using the disc as a resource is difficult as P J does not have regular access to a computer.
It was difficult at first to explain to principals and teachers what service-learning is all about and
what MSN students could contribute to the school.
P J noted that it is challenging to get a block of time with the principal to discuss something like
service-learning.
P J recommends a one-page fact sheet that summarizes service-learning.
P J noted that she doesn’t really have a good understanding of the MSN program, especially the
sequence of the courses.
P J acknowledged that as partly her responsibility. She may have received some information but
didn’t have to take time to read it.
The beginning of the school year is a very busy time for P J.
P J gained helpful information by attending advisory group meetings and talking with students and
course faculty.
P J was very involved in the orientation of the MSN students to the school district and thought the
process went well.
P J got to know the students as a group and individually.
The students came to both of P J’s schools to observe the daily activities.
One student group that was going to do a certain project asked to visit the related site at the school
P J had about 5-6 groups of students during the Fall, 2003 semester. 3-4 groups at the middle
school and at least one at the elementary school.
P J noted that some groups had trouble finding a time that they could all meet with P J.
P J communicated with the faculty person and students most often by phone. They also used pager
and email.
P J managed to make contact with the faculty and students when it was really necessary.
P J noted a couple of problems she encountered with email:
  o She doesn’t get on line very often.
  o She didn’t always recognize the email addresses and would delete the messages. Then
    she wondered if the message was from a student.
Students & partner should develop a plan for using email so they know each other’s email
addresses (i.e. a password) and maybe pick a certain day for email exchanges.
P J noted that she will work on finding ways to improve communication.
P J believes a list of projects done by MSN students in K-12 educational settings would help her
explain the opportunities to principals, teachers, and staff.
P J and her faculty partner started planning for the service-learning projects in the Spring of 2002.
P J spoke to the principals of her schools about the partnership.
Over the summer, there were changes in the principals’ assignments so P J had to start over with
two of the schools in the Fall. The principal at the elementary school was new to the school and to
the administrative role.
P J described the process of determining the topics for the projects:
  o P J, the principals and the teachers all had ideas as to needs and possible projects
  o The students also had suggestions.
  o P J acted as facilitator to negotiate topic for the projects.
  o The faculty member also helped in the process.
  o P J felt projects should ones that could be replicated or reproduced each year.
Helping the principals and staff understand service-learning will be a on-going challenge for P J.
One principal suggested a health fair but P J saw that as a one time thing. P J will talk with the
principal again about service-learning.
A list of projects done by other students would help stimulate discussion with the principals and
teachers.
• P J saw the goal of the partnership as: the school district would gain information useful to
students and staff. Projects geared to staff might help them lead a healthier, happier life; feel better
about themselves, or increase staff’s knowledge about topics useful in communicating with
students.
• P J’s goals were met to some extent.
• Projects were most successful when MSN students actually worked with students in P J’s schools.
• In a several projects, MSN students prepared high quality information targeted to specific groups
but it was a challenge to find a forum in which the information could be shared with that group..
• P J did not realize the need to develop a plan in advance for sharing information the MSN students
had prepared with the target group. For example, with the project geared toward grandparents
raising grandchildren, the parent liaison participated in the students’ presentation, but P J was
unable to arrange for the grandparents themselves to be present.
• P J will be able to use the materials during the Fall, 2003 open houses. She will put them on the
display tables.
• Overall, P J felt the partnership went well.
• Most of the student groups worked well, were enthusiastic about the projects, and very creative in
how they approached the topics.
• P J hopes the projects were a good learning experience for the students.
• The biggest challenge was finding time to get together.
• P J recommends that the community partner and students develop a plan at the beginning of the
project that has a time line with set dates for completing phases of the project and giving them
to P J to review.
• That way P J can make sure the students are on the right track and make sure she coordinates the
dates for presentations at the end of the semester.
• P J has worked with both BSN and MSN students.
• P J could tell a difference between the two levels of students.
• P J tended to expect more of the MSN students.
• P J allowed them more freedom to come up with ideas on how to deal with problems and
challenges.
• P J found some students were nervous when doing their presentations – not used to public
speaking.
• In a couple of cases, P J felt the students may not have had the big picture about a particular aspect
of the project. P J made some suggestions as to other possibilities or factors in the situation.
• P J suggested students read the book Framework for Understanding Poverty by Ruby Payne. It
would help students from the suburbs understand the issues faced by children and families in the
urban school district.
• P J was able to relate situations described in the book to her own practice.
• Health care providers, especially those involved in health education, often do not understand the
culture of poverty. This is a factor in frequent re-admissions & rising health care costs.
• After the semester, P J and the faculty person met for a follow-up conversation.
• They also expect to meet to plan for the next year. It would be best to meet in the spring or early
summer as fall is a very busy time for school nurses.
• Spring semester would be the best time for service-learning projects in K-12 schools. Nurses are
not as busy with other responsibilities.
• P J’s primary tip for successful service-learning partnerships is to establish a means of
communication between the community partner and the student groups at the beginning of the
semester.
• P J suggests students share their projects at a staff meeting of all the school nurses. Posters could
be displayed.
• P J’s middle school is for gifted and talented students. They are highly motivated to succeed.
Other school nurses work in schools where students are not so motivated and the need for these
projects is even greater.
• Those nurses should be aware of the resources (i.e. MSN students) available to them.
• PJ attended meetings of the advisory group.
• P J found them to be excellent. Ideas and projects are shared.
• Lunch time is good.

Summary of Interview: Participant K (P K)

• P K holds a leadership position in an urban, elementary school
• The school engages in a wide variety of partnerships designed to engage their students in learning activities with people of all ages.
• P K knew the faculty person of the course from previous contacts.
• P K’s role in the partnership was as a coordinator of when students would come and what they would do.
• P K’s initial planning was with the faculty person.
• P K did not have a lot of direct contact with the students.
• The partnership was not very effective from the school’s perspective and P K is not sure how much the students learned from it.
• The project would have benefited from stronger orientation and planning.
• P K’s orientation to the course and service-learning was adequate.
• P K had a prior knowledge of and experience with service-learning
• P K learned about the course from the faculty person.
• Orientation of the students to the school was lacking
• The nursing students should have spent some time at the school before selecting the topic and planning the activity.
  o See and interact with the children
  o See the children in their learning environment
  o See how the school approaches teaching and learning
  o Get to know the nature of the children and their needs.
• Being on site would have allowed the students to make observations, identify a concern based on those observations, and develop a comprehensive plan geared to the characteristics of the school, its students and families.
• P K met with a few students who represented the class.
• P K never met all the students who were involved in the project.
• After the initial meeting, P K had little communication with the faculty person.
• P K was not clear on what was being done by the students.
• It would have been better to have regular updates from the students.
• The MSN students’ presentation was at too high a level.
• The nursing students did not engage the children and they didn’t learn much.
• Partners should share their expertise. In this case, the nursing students are the health experts and P K’s school is the education expert.
• If nursing students are going to do classroom teaching, they may need guidance in effective methods of education.
• P K’s expectation was that the project would help improve the health education provided to the children.
• The activity had little impact and was not as positive as it might have been.
• However, P K learned a lot from the experience.
• P K used her knowledge to facilitate a new service-learning partnership.
• The partnership has been a more active, comprehensive approach to collaboration.
• The faculty member came to the school regularly before the students arrived.
• The partnership has involved herself, the teachers, faculty and students.
• The students spend much more time on site.
• The partnership is evolving.
• P K’s dream is an onsite nursing clinic.
• The students are taking a broader perspective of the children – i.e meeting the children’s families.
A comprehensive approach to collaboration is very different from the traditional approach of nursing students coming to do one-shot lessons.

In the BSN partnership, the nursing students may do lessons but they are based on the students’ observations of the children and the students can do follow-up.

The nursing students are important role models for the children.

The children love being with the nursing students.

The nursing students are caring.

One barrier encountered with the undergrad students that did not occur with the MSN students is transportation.

P K believes that if the university is going to promote partnerships with community organizations that involve students it should provide transportation for the students.

P K’s suggestions for successful partnerships --

- Commitment to the concept of inter-generational education
- Clarity as to purpose and goals
- Deliberate, careful planning by both partners – takes multiple meetings
- Identify how the partnership will meet needs of and benefit each partner
- Important to address needs identified by the community or organization.
- Comprehensive approach vs one shot, in and out sessions
- Orientation is an essential component of the partnership.
- Financial support
- Define the contributions each partner will make
- Anticipate and plan for logistics
- Ongoing dialogue
- Flexibility
- Expect ups and downs, don’t let them stop you
- Recognize that learning is as important as service
- Organizations are learning what it takes to be collaborative organizations
- Takes time for the partnership to evolve
- Evaluation is very important
  - Have to be sure time and resources are well spent
  - Constant
  - Involve all stakeholders
  - Outcome
  - Process
  - Qualitative and/or quantitative methods according to need

P K believes more community organizations should create partnerships with academic institutions.

Summary of Interview: Participant L (P L)

- P L is the Director of Nursing of a specialty health care organization.
- P L has 14 years experience as a professional and 4+ years experience with the center.
- P M partnered with one MSN midwifery student who did a service-learning project at the center. The student has also been employed by the center for several years.
- The clients have unique cultural perspective They are free and open among themselves but closed with those from outside the community until you gain their trust.
- To have a successful relationship with the population, you need respect their values and gain their trust and confidence.
- It is important to understand the culture.
- Ways to do this include reading about the population and talking with the staff.
- If you try to tell the population what to do you may be viewed as a threat and will not gain their trust.
- It is necessary to negotiate (discuss) with the population according to the preferences.
- The center carefully screens those who request to do projects there.
- Sometimes when the center is asked to participate in a project, the organization or individual has already chosen the topic. The center might have had other ideas as to more important projects.
The MSN student has worked at the center for several years and identified some unique health issues.

She has learned how to approach the population and they were willing to work with her on the project.

She presented her findings to the center’s medical advisory group and developed a pamphlet for the clients of the center. She is also developing a protocol for the health care providers.

Summary of Interview: Participant M (P M)

P M holds a leadership position in a small, voluntary health organization.

P M’s organization has a long history of partnering with other agencies

They depend on partnerships to help accomplish activities they can’t do alone

The partnership with the MSN program started when the faculty member asked P M’s supervisor for a letter of support on a grant.

The request came to P M because she was already involved with the agency the faculty member planned to work with.

The partnership with agency 3 and P M’s agency was already active. The MSN students would add a 3rd organization to the partnership

P M is is always interested in helping students.

It was a natural partnership from the start.

P M’s roles in the partnership included:

- Liaison between agency 3 and the MSN students.
- Provided guidance and introductions to agency 3

Agency 3 is a very unique group of clients who tend to be set in their ways

P M had a close relationship with the clients.

It was important to P M that the students understand the population. That they are not a textbook group.

How students were introduced to the group could affect the success of the project.

- The students came with ideas of what they wanted to do.
- P M recommended they come to the site and meet the clients.
- The students could be a threat to the group

P M insisted the students come to meet the clients and talk with them. The students came with P M. Some students were reluctant; P M drew them in.

P M provided credibility for the students with the clients.

The introduction to the clients worked out well

The students rethought their initial ideas in terms of what they had learned about the clients and the setting.

Email was an effective means of communication between P M and the faculty and PM and the students. They cc’d the instructor

Students would send PM specific things they wanted her to read

Communication was not a problem with email

P M felt she had an adequate orientation to the course

P M wanted the experience to be positive

The students planned and implemented a program geared to the clients’ short attention span, limited resources, health concerns, etc.

The students used creative teaching strategies

They had some funding to use for AV - handouts, etc, giveaways, raffles etc.

P M brought the extras to her office and used them for clients who came there

P M’s expectation was that every client would gain one piece of helpful information

The students may have had more expansive goals

P M went table to table during the presentation & noted the clients were making positive comments about the students and indications they were picking up relevant information.

The students had scripts but realized they needed to be flexible
PM and the students worked together during the presentation – PM answered some questions.
The project gave the students practice in problem-solving and teamwork.
PM was a little concerned when the students thought they could do the project without coming to
the site. If they had not agreed to come, the project could have failed.
The students had a time table which helped them stay on track with the project.
PM understood the students had other commitments on their time.
PM had an unexpected outcome of the project – due to there being extra funds from the grant, PM
received some equipment she can use to benefit the clients.
This is a legacy that will last longer than the handouts from the program.
PM had some suggestions for successful partnerships:
  o Know your population - their demographics, strengths, weaknesses
  o Gear the program to the population
  o Know what funds are available - today, many projects have to be done for free
  o Know what experts you can call in as resources
  o Fit all of the above in with the type of learning experience needed by the students
  o Use email and voice mail to facilitate communication
PM noted that a written evaluation by the clients would not have been appropriate.
But, she received verbal feedback from them at the next BP clinic that indicated the clients
enjoyed the session, and would welcome the students back again. This is the highest endorsement.
PM doesn’t believe she was asked to do a written evaluation.
PM would do this type of project again.
Appendix H
Summary of Overall Findings

CONNECT for Partnership!

C  Commit to partnership
O  Orient all involved
N  Negotiate service-learning goal
N  Nail the plan
E  Engage to serve and learn
C  Communication is the key
T  Tie it all up

- Ready to commit?
  - Primary Contact Person – committed to collaboration with a graduate nursing program
  - Community Based Organization – relatively stable, support partnerships & education
  - Faculty – value service-learning & collaboration with community organization

- Getting to Know You - Course Faculty and Primary Community Contact Person
  - Preliminary discussions – “getting inside each other’s shoes”
  - Is this a match?
  - Define a mutual service-learning goal:
    - Address needs identified by the community organization
    - Provide learning experiences for students that meet course objectives
  - In depth collaborative planning – agency contact person & faculty person
    - Develop effective working relationship with mutual trust and respect
    - Understand graduate nursing students
    - Identify potential student activities/projects – longevity for the agency, linked to course objectives & realistic. Ideal if students can see project to completion; not always possible.
    - Involve all stakeholders
    - How will students do reflection? Role of community partner?
    - External funding is a plus

- Student orientation to community organization
  - Understand the agency’s mission, services, structure, resources & needs
  - Understand culture of agency’s clients/populations served
  - Students should come to agency - see how their project will fit in
  - Finalize projects - individual or groups? Consider student interests but meet agency needs

- We’re Underway
  - Plan, plan, plan! – specific realistic objectives, written plan, clear timeline – agreed upon by all
  - Contact person’s roles – liaison, educator, negotiator, coordinator, direct supervisor, learner
  - Communicate on a regular basis - join the CETSL Advisory Group
  - Be flexible but stick to plan - no changes unless all agree

- We Did It!
  - Reflect
  - Evaluate
  - Celebrate
• **Looking Ahead**
  - Maintain or enhance the level of connection – the goal is partnership
  - An evolving, dynamic process
  - Give it time – don’t expect perfection
  - Build on experiences and lessons learned
  - Get the word out about your accomplishments

© 7/2003  Deborah Lindell