Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship

Manuscript 1294

Conflicting Responsibilities: The Multi-Dimensional Ethics of University/Community Partnerships

Stephen Danley

Gayle Christiansen

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.northgeorgia.edu/jces

Conflicting Responsibilities: The Multi-Dimensional Ethics of University/Community Partnerships

Stephen Danley and Gayle Christiansen

Abstract

While there have been sharp critiques of university/community partnerships, most assume a dichotomous relationship in which universities privilege their own interests over those of community. There has been little theorizing or investigation of ethical responsibilities involved in such partnerships, and even less that acknowledges that communities are rarely unified and contain multiple different perspectives (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Using the principles of action research and reflective practice, we examine two cases of university/community partners as a means to investigate ethical responsibilities. Our cases demonstrate that there are multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities and that they have the potential to conflict with one another. That has dramatic implications for institutions hosting university/community partnerships. We argue that future research should examine the role of community boards as an oversight mechanism grounded in community that can address the often conflicting multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities within such partnerships from a community perspective.

Introduction

Universities have simultaneously pushed for civic engagement and partnerships with surrounding community (Ehrlich, 2000), while largely exempting such partnerships from formal ethics processes such as the Institutional Review Board (IRB). While such partnerships have largely been lauded, particularly in urban universities where many university/community relationships have a troubling history, there are an increasing number of scholars criticizing such partnerships as reifying local power structures and taking advantage of communities (Cruz & Giles, 2000; Bortolin, 2011). Embedded within these critiques is an acknowledgment of a complex ethical framework of such partnerships, but this complexity is rarely explicitly studied or theorized. In this paper, we use two case studies to show the multi-dimensionality of ethical responsibilities in such partnerships. We develop both theory for addressing this multi-dimensionality and apply that theory to the institutional level.

Our paper is grounded in a pair of partnerships. The first is between Rutgers University-Camden and the Latin American Economic Development Association (LAEDA), and the second between the university and North Camden Schools (New Jersey). These partnerships demonstrate the complex web of ethical responsibilities that we, as faculty and staff of an urban university, face when engaging in local partnerships. Faculty and staff, working on behalf of the university, face multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities across a networked community and university context. Those representing universities struggle to fulfill their ethical responsibilities to a myriad of local stakeholders, including university students, parents, municipalities, nonprofits, and others.

Ethical activity within community partnerships is not simply the result of IRB-mandated actions such as consent and minimizing risk. Ethical partnerships require attention to conflicting responsibilities on both the individual and university level. Here we focus on the wider ecosystem of ethical processes found in the university setting, a critical issue because the IRB process only covers the researcher-research subject relationship. We recommend that universities incorporate a community advisory board to ensure attention to these complex ethical challenges that often happen outside the purview of IRB. Such boards require further study but have potential to incorporate community voice in ways that help ensure community is treated ethically across the university. That is of critical importance in a networked system with multi-dimensional and conflicting ethical responsibilities.

Literature Review

The planning discipline challenges itself to engage community actors directly, and as a result has begun to address the myriad complexities of its ethical responsibilities. Qualitative researchers across sociology, anthropology, public policy, and other fields have adopted community-centric methodologies such as participatory action research

Published by Nighthawks Open Institutional Repository,

(Whyte, 1991) and questioned the ethics of the research world (Holman, 1987). Universities have been called to engage more directly with local community through partnerships and community service learning (Ehrlich, 2000), but such calls have largely avoided critical perspectives and explicit conversations about ethics. Some research celebrates the role of universities (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003) while a second layer of research is critical of such partnerships (Cruz & Giles, 2000; Bortolin, 2011). Here we bridge such critiques to widen disciplinary discussions about complex ethical responsibilities across disciplines and university/community partnerships, a process that informs our examination of our case studies.

Calls for universities to engage communities through service learning, civic engagement, and scholarship are nothing new. John Dewey (1897) famously called for such pedagogical advances more than a century ago. Ehrlich (2000, p. vi) defines civic engagement as "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." Service learning is one way to extend student experiences beyond the classroom (Kenworthy-U'Ren, Zlotkowski, & Van de Ven, 2005). There is also a call for increased scholarship of engagement, a returning of the university to solve the greatest issues in society and contribute to the common good (Boyer, 1996). Lynton (1994) argues against the linear flow of knowledge from the university to practitioners, describing its creation as an ecosystem that has many directions and feedback loops in which discovery, teaching, reflecting, and sharing all generate new knowledge that can become scholarship. The most important issues of the time cannot be solved with technical rationality from the Ivory Tower, but are found outside where methods are arguably less scientific and the potential learning is more relevant (Schon, 1995). As such, the civic engagement discussion in the university setting is largely divorced from the wider discussion about declining civic engagement in the United States (Putnam, 1995; Levin, 2017; Clark & Eisenstein, 2013). Instead, universities are increasing such activities in an attempt to meet demand for experiential learning.

While university/community partnerships are often lauded, academics have developed several sharp critiques of these partnerships. Hartman (2013) chastises universities for foregoing their role as institutions that promote democracy, seeing instead institutions too intent on remaining apolitical. Others (Cruz & Giles, 2000) argue that community voices and community priorities are too often missing from such partnerships. And Bortolin (2011) argues that universities are serving themselves by privileging universities over the communities with whom they work. Some explicitly call for a social justice orientation to address these challenges (Marullo & Edwards, 2000). Each of these critiques indicates that there is a complex moral and ethical world underpinning such partnerships, but unlike in other disciplines, this literature does little to explicitly lay out such ethical complexities or build wider theory on how to address them. These critiques are the starting point for our own examination, but also a launching point to examine the complexity of these ethical responsibilities.

The practice of civic engagement draws heavily on theories of participatory planning, communicative action, and advocacy. In working with communities, the planner plays the active role of critical listening and works alongside community members to design through inclusionary dialogue and the practice of making sense together (Forester, 1988). The conversation is a collaborative effort that builds new networks and can lead to citizen empowerment (Innes & Booher, 2004). Davidoff (1965) calls for planners to be advocates for the individuals they work with in order to uphold democratic values.

Similarly, qualitative researchers have long pointed to the need for a wider ethical frame. Holman (1987) writes about the critical link between social science research and action. He draws heavily on feminist literature (see Oakley, 1981, p. 40) that points out that viewing qualitative interviews as the extraction of knowledge is insufficient:

> Interviewers define the role of interviewees as subordinates; extracting information is more valuable than yielding it; the convention of interviewer/interviewee hierarchy is a rationalisation of inequity; what is good for interviewers is not necessarily good for interviewees.

Rather than this rational approach, ethical interviews need be seen as multi-directional,

with the questions coming from interviewees a critical part of the process. Indeed, to fail to answer such questions would be an ethical failing, a failure to treat interviewees like humans (Holman, 1987). The robust debate surrounding Alice Goffman's (2015a) ethnographic research in West Philadelphia points to a similar theme. African-American scholars point to the danger of cultural appropriation, and question whether this was Goffman's story to tell (Sharpe, 2014). Others challenge the ethical nature of her involvement in potentially violent activities, even going so far as to indicate that her actions constituted a felony for conspiracy to commit homicide (Lubet, 2014), or that she failed in her ethical obligation to give information to police officers regarding open crime investigations (Lubet, 2014). Goffman's vigorous response to such critiques (Goffman, 2015b) points to a complex ethical landscape with multiple ethical responsibilities.

Both planning and qualitative research have traditions and a broad theoretical base for understanding ethical responsibilities. Both point to the complicated nature of these ethical responsibilities. University/community partnerships require a similar examination to avoid the abuse of power. We use these concepts of a complex ethical framework with multiple actors to analyze our two case studies of university/community partnerships.

Methods

This paper draws on several research traditions. First and foremost is reflective practice (Schon, 1995). Reflective practice captures knowledge created by the process of doing, or in other words, action. Reflection-in-action "makes explicit the action strategies, assumptions, models of the world, or problem-settings that were implicit" (Schon, 1995, pp. 30–31). The scholar or practitioner can then reflect on the reflection-in-action, further pulling apart and analyzing the action and the "strategies, assumptions, or problem-settings implicit in a whole repertoire of situational responses" (Schon, 1995, p. 31). This type of knowledge cannot be created in a laboratory experiment and must rely on action research.

Similarly, participatory action research (Whyte, 1991) embeds the views of a practitioner in all stages of research. Our research and authorship team includes the director of an after-school program who has participated in defining, conducting, writing, and presenting this research. Many advantages have been found regarding practitioners in research processes, including a research output that is more useful to those in the field. We believe that to be the case in our paper.

In the ethnographic tradition, there is a wide-ranging debate surrounding the concept of "going native," a term originally believed to be coined by Malinowski (1922). Malinowski argues that such an immersion is necessary. While this has traditionally been considered a conflict with the "objective" position of the researcher (Gold, 1958), scholars increasingly question whether such objectivity is possible (Minh-Ha, 2009; Harding, 1987; Rosaldo, 1993). Others argue that connecting personally to qualitative research subjects can lead to increased access and better information (Fenno, 1978). A third view has recently championed the idea of "being native" rather than going native (Kanuha, 2000). Kanuha argues that being a member of the community to be studied can bring critical context and understanding to a research project.

This concept is of particular importance to any university/community partnership, as such a focus on civic engagement encourages faculty and staff to live in the community surrounding campus and to engage in research in this community. The ideology behind university civic engagement traces the same lines as Kanuha's arguments. Such concepts are doubly important in this case, as we are not just university employees but local residents and activists. Such context proved critical, not just in the carrying out of the community partnerships, but in our reflective process of researching them. At times, these partnerships bordered on controversial local conflicts and policies, and our knowledge as residents helped them navigate these troubled waters. But, as seen in the discussion of ethical responsibilities, the additional identity of resident, built on top of university representative, led to ethical challenges.

Finally, this research is based upon a pair of case studies. George and Bennett (2005, p. 5) argue that, "the case study approach—the detailed examination of an aspect of a historical episode to develop or test historical explanations that may be generalized to other events—has come in and out of favor over the past five decades." These methods are appropriate here because of the need not to generalize directly to the wider array of university/community partnerships, but to build basic theory on ethical responsibilities as exist in fields such as planning and in the broader study of qualitative

Published by Nighthawks Open Institutional Repository,

research. In-depth examination of case studies is ideal for building such theory (Eisenhardt, 1989).

In summary, our research occurs at the intersection of multiple qualitative traditions. From case studies to reflective practice, participatory action research to ethnography as a "native," this research focuses on in-depth examination of the ethical responsibilities of university/community partnerships. Such a strategy intentionally embeds perspectives of residents and practitioners into all stages of the research process, embracing the idea that such perspectives lead to a well-rounded and deeper analysis of the cases in practice (see Kanuha, 2000).

In this paper, we examine two cases of community partnerships in which we participated. The first is a loose affiliation of nonprofits, classes, an informal group of friends, and a planning authority organized by a faculty member. The second is a more formal partnership between Rutgers University-Camden and the North Camden Schools run by university staff. In each case, the collaborations were grounded in local community and local issues.

Faculty Partnership and Multi-Dimensional Ethics

The first partnership was between our Rutgers University-Camden class and the Latin American Economic Development Authority (LAEDA). Students in two classes worked with LAEDA to promote Dine Around Friday, as well as produce online restaurant reviews for a variety of local Camden restaurants. In both classes, students studied Camden and Camden's economic development strategy and history as an academic complement to the partnership. LAEDA's Dine Around was a direct response to these current and historical policy issues. The program linked downtown institutions to ethnic restaurants by providing a fixed-price lunch special on Fridays once a month. Rutgers University-Camden supported the effort by running a bus from campus to the lunch (paid for by the Office of Civic Engagement) and students organized an advertising campaign on campus.

As this collaboration was beginning, the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) reached out to me regarding its Camden Food Plan. An early draft of the food plan included a recommendation to raise grant money for a position inside Camden city government to promote and provide reviews for local restaurants, similar to a role played by the city of Camden's tourism office. However, community stakeholders pushed back, arguing that there were more critical things to use the (hypothetical) funds for in city government. During the course of that meeting, DVRPC proposed using students to conduct reviews as a viable alternative. Our class added the reviews to the syllabus, and to the existing partnership with LAEDA. As a result, Rutgers University-Camden students helped promote Dine Around, attended Dine Around, and wrote more than 70 restaurant reviews the following semester.

The shift in the focus of the partnership reflected the ways we were juggling a number of different ethical responsibilities.

A clear responsibility was to our students. Because Dine Around days were on Fridays during lunch and many of my students worked during that time, having students focus on restaurant reviews was a far more effective education strategy. They could do reviews on their own time, but the assignment helped them get out of downtown and experience firsthand the ways that development was reaching other neighborhoods in the city.

But the increased focus on restaurant reviews directly conflicted with the original ethical obligation to LAEDA—to support the Dine Around program as a way to support local businesses. As the partnership went on, LAEDA became concerned that the partnership was focusing more on the DVRPC's suggestion of conducting restaurant reviews than on the Dine Around program, which was seeing a drop in attendance and publicity in its second year.

Similarly, we had an ethical responsibility toward the restaurants themselves. The DVRPC had been shocked when conducting their research regarding a Camden Food Plan that restaurants had prominent reviews on Yelp which cited not the food, but rather criticized the city, saying not to visit the restaurant because one might get shot. In sending students, most of whom had little experience in an urban environment beyond the confines of Rutgers University-Camden's campus, reviews had the potential to be damaging rather than constructive. Students needed to be trained both in how to write reviews—though they caught on quickly to the informal writing style of online review services like Yelp—and made aware that their lack of cultural experience or exposure to ethnic food could cause them to write unwarranted negative reviews. This was specifically addressed within the curriculum, as well as in class time

https://digitalcommons.northgeorgia.edu/jces

when students were asked to reflect and share their experiences.

Just as there were ethical responsibilities to students, LAEDA and the restaurants, we faced the ethical challenge of what was best for the wider community, a question that intersected with my own political beliefs as a resident of that community.

The underpinning theory behind working with LAEDA, DVRPC, and each individual restaurant was that doing so had the potential, in a small way, to help the city. Supporting local restaurants through Dine Around and reviews could help local businesses to tap into dollars that typically fled Camden in cars at the end of the workday. While this strategy seems relatively innocuous, it was a critique of local politicians and their development strategy. The CEO of LAEDA started Dine Around in part as a contrast to what residents saw as downtown-centric development strategies that rarely reached neighborhoods. The historical decision to invest much of the $175 million granted by the state in 2002 (Katz, 2009) in downtown institutions was particularly frustrating for residents who saw few jobs from Rutgers University-Camden, Cooper Hospital, a downtown baseball stadium, aquarium, and concert venue. A similar initiative providing tax breaks to major companies recently passed through the state legislature. The Economic Opportunity Act allowed multiple companies to move into the city, including Subaru, Holtec, and the Philadelphia 76ers, a basketball team that built their practice facility in the city. Activists argued that Camden residents themselves would see few jobs (Lamboy, 2015), and that the record of urban trickle-down economics was poor in the city (Katz, 2009). LAEDA was engaging in Dine Around and its broader food strategy as a strategic way of showing alternatives, that politicians instead of handing out close to a billion dollars in tax breaks to companies could support local businesses. But it was a deeply political act, one that carried an implicit critique of existing officials. That critique became explicit when the LAEDA CEO ran for mayor in the next electoral cycle.

Students reported back to me that these political considerations impacted them moving forward. Two separate students reported being questioned about their relationship with a "radical professor" when interviewing for jobs within the city—which they thought was a reference to us and the class. We have had frank discussions with others, particularly those with political ambitions, about the political implications of their work within the class.

These conflicts may seem small. On the surface, they point toward the critiques laid out within the literature, that university partnerships are inclined to focus more on university needs than community needs. But this partnership also points to something more complex: the many multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities within each university/community partnership, and that at times, these responsibilities may conflict with one another. As faculty, we have responsibilities to our students that may conflict with our responsibilities to our partners or even our own communities.

Staff Partnership and Multi-Dimensional Ethics

Just as with the LAEDA partnership, our partnership with Camden public schools, called Ignite, faced a variety of multi-dimensional and conflicting ethical responsibilities. This partnership began in 2010, when the Rutgers University-Camden's fledgling Office of Civic Engagement met with Camden public schools to see what it could do to support education in the city. The superintendent, noting the loss of after-school programming due to state budget cuts, committed funds to provide programming to the three Camden public schools in the North Camden neighborhood, the closest neighborhood to the Rutgers University-Camden campus. This initiative, started with work-study students serving a handful of students at each school, ballooned into a program to serve more than 300 students a day, multiple partners to provide programming, and a much larger paid student work force after Rutgers University-Camden won a five-year, $500,000 a year, 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant from the New Jersey Department of Education in the summer of 2012. (Retrieved from https://www.camden.rutgers.edu/civic-engagement/camden-ignite.) Additional funds came with greater accountability for a wider array of programming. The stakes were now much higher.

One of us was the director of Ignite and had a direct ethical obligation to university students. Students run and manage the Ignite program. They participate as assistant teachers, known as education ambassadors, managers of site operations, known as site coordinators, and club facilitators, or students who teach different enrichment clubs. Outside grant requirements and goals, the university has the additional goal for Rutgers University-Camden students to enhance their education through participating

Published by Nighthawks Open Institutional Repository,

in this off-campus experience. In Ignite, Rutgers University-Camden students engage directly in firsthand issues of urban education, poverty, and sociology. In building trust with families and youth they learn responsibility and leadership that will transcend to their future careers. Former Ignite ambassadors and site coordinators have leveraged their experiences in the program to land ideal careers after graduation, several as full-time staff working in these same schools.

The Rutgers University-Camden students bring to Ignite a passion for working with youth. At some school sites where teachers are overworked and burned out, they are a burst of energy at the end of the day. The students are not, however, seasoned teaching veterans. The Rutgers University-Camden students often struggle with managing student behavior and planning engaging lessons given their inexperience. When regular staff observe unaccompanied students in the hallway or a Rutgers University-Camden student unable to quiet a loud classroom, they question Ignite's ability to provide academic enrichment for their youth. This model of Rutgers University-Camden students managing and leading Ignite presents an ethical dilemma because even though it reaches university goals of students enhancing their academic learning through real-world experience, using student staff in this way conflicts with the goals promised to school administrators and perhaps students and families to keep students safe and learning. It is also unfair to the Rutgers University-Camden students, who are thrown into a position for which they are not prepared.

To help resolve this dilemma, we had to change the model. One change was the creation of the Master Teacher role. This individual is a school-day teacher who co-manages the site with the student site coordinator. The Master Teacher knows the students well from working during the school day and has the experience to step in and assist with managing classrooms if issues arise. And the Rutgers University-Camden students still receive leadership and management experience. Another shift we made was toward additional school-day teachers to teach clubs after school, and to provide Rutgers University-Camden students with set plans and activities. This took the Rutgers University-Camden students out of the role of writing lessons, for which they lacked expertise. We also added professional development for students at weekly meetings in order for them to gain additional skills held by school-based professionals, and we focused on Rutgers University-Camden student retention because veteran student staff could more easily engage and manage large groups of students.

We also had an ethical responsibility to program partners that, in some cases, receive grant funds to teach different enrichment clubs such as choir, visual arts, aquatic science, and athletics like cycling, tennis, and soccer. The relationship with each partner is different as each has its own needs, their reasons for partnership with Ignite differ, and their goals do not always align with those of the university or the grant-maker; at times the needs of partners conflicted with one another and program goals. For instance, we found tennis coaches taking a good amount of program time having students learn about healthy eating at the expense of practicing on the court. Through discussions with the tennis partner staff, we learned one of their funding sources required them to spend a certain amount of time teaching nutrition. From a program standpoint, we already had the Rutgers University-Camden School of Nursing providing youth nutrition lessons as it provided nursing students real-world health education experience. By having our tennis partners focus on similar topics, the students were doubling up on nutrition at the expense of learning a new sport. To resolve this issue, the tennis partners were able to have conversations with their other funders regarding how Ignite can show that the students receive the nutrition education. In many ways the tennis partner could show their funders increased outcomes because with a different partner assisting in nutrition education, they can spend more time on tennis skills. What looked like a conflict between partners emerged as a synergy upon closer inspection.

We also had an ethical responsibility to the schools with whom we partner. These partnerships have become increasingly challenging as the educational landscape of the North Camden neighborhood changes. When Ignite began in 2012, the neighborhood had three district schools all managed by the Camden Board of Education and one parochial school managed by the Catholic Partnership Schools. In 2013, the state took control of the school district, appointing a superintendent and making the school board advisory. Camden Public Schools became the Camden City School District. This created changes to the North Camden Schools. One school has been closed and a second transformed into a Renaissance School (a New

Jersey construct in which the school is open to those in the neighborhood, public money supports the school, and the school is operated by a charter management organization), a traditional charter also opened, leaving only one original district school remaining.

As all those at the Camden Public Schools who first came to the table with Rutgers University-Camden to voice the need for after-school programming are no longer with the school district, there is a continual need to pitch the Ignite program and prove the ability to meet school leader needs. However, as with some partners, we found some school leader visions do not align with Rutgers University-Camden goals or grant expectations. For instance, at one school site the school leader thought Ignite should focus on math and literacy test prep in order to increase standardized test scores. In her opinion, there was no room for enrichment. Then, at a different school a push for educational enrichment proved challenging for the reason that school leadership believed the school day challenged students enough and that after-school time was best utilized for relaxing. These beliefs clashed with grant requirements to show positive outcomes in enrichment activities. It took multiple conversations from different stakeholders to show test scores could increase through the inquiry based, hands-on approaches pursued in the enrichment clubs. Trying to meet the needs of what seems to be constantly changing school models and leaders is exhausting. The only relief seems to be North Camden youth and families who have not changed over this time period and who have become some of Ignite's strongest advocates.

With the university focused on university student experiences, partners paying attention to the needs of their funders, boards, missions, and school leadership still trying to make sense of a changing school landscape, we wondered: who was concerned about the needs of our youth? We believed the most important program constituency are North Camden students and their families. The Ignite mission is to spark student discovery through exposing students to new opportunities and to create lifelong learners. This is not an explicit goal of the grant, the university, partners, or the schools, but in getting to know the students, their stories, and their families, coupled with my experience as a former teacher, social justice advocate, and Camden resident, it proved challenging to encourage student staff to focus on their needs as student learners, the requirements of program partners, school leaders, or the university goals in themselves. We found ourselves alone at times in this pursuit for quality programming for our North Camden students and families as some students were wrapped up with gaining their experience in the field, the university seemed focused on promoting the program as part of its growing reputation as a civically engaged institution, and the schools at times focused on keeping the youth busy. We found ourselves asking, who ensures we are being responsible for the needs of the youth given the other competing priorities? And what would happen if we weren't motivated by the need for social justice? How would such a program with potential to provide greater opportunity be expected to do so?

Reconceptualizing Ethical Responsibilities as Multi-Dimensional and Conflicting

Wessels (2015) asks what are the ethical obligations and responsibilities of community partnerships. That question reorients our understanding of the ethics of university/community partnerships. Many critiques of these partnerships focus on a dichotomy of university and community. Doing so makes a mistake often found in education settings, assuming there is one unified community rather than a diverse array of interests (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Our cases show something similar. In our cases, there were a multitude of ethical relationships and responsibilities within each partnership. Our cases and experiences point to the need to reconceptualize the ethical responsibilities of university/community partnerships as multi-dimensional and potentially conflicting. This type of a shift has already happened in other disciplines. For example, our understanding of government and governance have shifted to consider the impact of networks (see Kooiman, 1993; Sørenson & Torfing, 2005). Our cases indicate the same needs happen within the study of university/community partnerships. They need to be reconceptualized as networks rather than a dichotomy between university and community.

From that starting point, a model of networked university/community relationships emerges from our case studies. The model starts with two tenets drawn from the extensive literature, then adds two tenets from our case studies:

1. University/community partnerships are embedded within a wider power struggle between universities and communities (Cruz & Giles, 2000).

2. Universities have ethical responsibilities within that political context (Hartman, 2013).
3. There exists a network of actors within these partnerships, each with their own ethical responsibilities. We highlight faculty, staff, students, partners, and community as stakeholders in our cases, but it is possible to imagine university administration, others within the nonprofit sector, and more as part of this network.
4. The existence of a multi-dimensional ethical landscape means that there may be conflicts across these multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities.

Implications for the University

We contribute to the literature on university/community partnerships by building a theoretical model that considers how such partnerships are nested in networks, and those networks are the sites for multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities with the potential to conflict with one another. While others have provided wide-ranged critiques of such partnerships (Cruz & Giles, 2000; Stoeker & Tryon, 2009; Bortolin, 2011), none have systematically looked at the multi-dimensionality of these ethical responsibilities along with strategies for addressing it. This contribution has implications for our understanding of these partnerships, but also implications for both individuals and institutions.

As individuals, we used a variety of strategies to address the challenges of conflicting multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities. We made it clear to community when we were required to wear our university hat and when we were free to speak as residents. We avoided controversy when we felt it would damage the partnership. We overcommunicated, making sure partners knew the challenges and conflicts as they arose and how we chose to handle them. And we strove for continuity in our projects to ensure community partnerships were built upon strong relationships. We lay out these principles in more depth in Danley and Christiansen (2017) where we examine the implications of working in such contexts—particularly for white educators—reaching the guiding principle that "we focus on relationship-building and investing locally in both business and people" (p. 15).

Here we build upon that individual framework, highlighting the institutional implications of these multi-dimensional and conflicting ethical responsibilities. How should a university address these challenges? As Wessels (2015) notes, there is little university infrastructure for addressing the ethical implications of university/community partnerships. What little infrastructure exists, such as the IRB process, is not particularly adept at working in such a multi-dimensional space. Little civic engagement activity is captured by IRB. Faculty classes must only use IRB protocols if they are conducting research, and staff activities do not fall under the IRB umbrella at all. Furthermore, IRB review is designed to specifically protect members in the study, focusing on issues such as consent. It is unclear that such a formal process can adapt a set of hard and fast rules for such cases, and a process similar to IRB also runs the risk of having a chilling effect for faculty and staff by creating a cumbersome process.

University strategies need infrastructure to directly address these multi-dimensional, conflicting ethical responsibilities and to ensure that ethical action toward a networked community. Within partnerships, strategies like reflection (Jacoby, 2009) are effective. There is potential in peer-coaching circles like Iowa Campus Compact's "Teach to Teach Initiative," though that initiative will require further study and evaluation. But we argue that there is a wider systemic need for community to be represented in the governing of these partnerships. If IRB is designed for the research process, and faculty is obligated to prioritize students, then who in the system represents community?

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln has taken a direct approach to address this gap in infrastructure for university/community collaboration by commissioning joint advisory boards (Shah, 2018) for it. These boards incorporate community members and provide a critical oversight function from the perspective of the community. Enacting community-centric boards as oversight also avoids the potentially damaging process of requiring IRB for university/community partnerships, something that could simultaneously dampen enthusiasm for partnerships by creating extra barriers to such work, and put such partnerships within an IRB process that is not designed to handle these types of ethical challenges and might misunderstand the dynamics at play.

On the surface, some form of community advisory boards—perhaps housed within a civic engagement office or an office of service learning—is an elegant solution. It incorporates community

voice into the process, in turn acknowledging that relationships are multi-dimensional and there is a need for partner and community input.

A community board also holds the potential to bring a more holistic approach to community relationships, one that does not silo community concerns within a civic engagement shop that deals specifically (and only) with such partnerships. Too often, acting ethically toward community requires actions beyond the scope of a narrow partnership. In particular, we find that elements of community within our partners are often impacted by a focus on student safety by the university outside of the partnership. For example, at Rutgers University-Camden, a busing system that keeps students from walking local streets undermines community businesses or nonprofits eager to connect to university students. Spatial exclusion works the other way, as community members have restricted access to facilities such as libraries and the university gym, making it harder for grassroots partners to access university resources during the partnership. When these complaints are brought up within the context of university/community partnerships they are exceptionally hard to deal with—the faculty or staff in such partnerships rarely work directly with facilities or students in these ways. A community board provides a natural landing place for these issues, and widens the scope of possible ethical behavior by the university. It also provides a potential space where community members could take a more active hand in training for and curating discussions about university/community partnerships, and, in doing so, ensure ethical responsibilities to community are directly addressed. Including community voice in these processes is critical to a social justice orientation.

The study of such boards is still in its infancy (see Shah, 2018). Community boards would need to be carefully constructed to avoid token participation (Arnstein, 1969) in which community members have little power over actual proceedings. Similarly, community boards would need to avoid the political trappings of selecting a narrow band of community partners to serve on them. Ideally such boards would capture the voice not only of partners working with the university, but also grassroots partners who may have a harder time meeting university requirements for partnership, and community members who may not feel represented by the nonprofit organizations in their community. Lastly, community boards would need to be careful to be constructive spaces that provide value to community, not simply another "ask" of universities to community members.

Despite these challenges, the early returns from community boards are promising (Shah, 2018). They hold potential to provide institutional space for universities to acknowledge and act upon the complex ethical nature of multi-dimensional and conflicting ethical responsibilities.

From both a practical and theoretical perspective, the multi-dimensionality of university/community partnerships is of critical importance. Our model of ethical responsibilities in these collaborations contributes to the literature by developing a theory of multi-dimensionality grounded in two case studies at Rutgers University-Camden. These case studies show a multitude of ethical responsibilities to different actors in a networked context, and demonstrate how such multi-dimensionality comes into conflict. That is the foundation for our model, which builds upon existing understandings of university/community partnerships as (1) embedded in the power struggle between universities and communities (Cruz & Giles, 2000) and (2) that universities and individuals have ethical responsibilities within that context (Hartman, 2013) to argue that (3) these responsibilities happen in the context of a network of actors and thus are multi-dimensional and (4) that the multi-dimensional nature of ethical responsibilities within such partnerships means that there may be conflict across these differing responsibilities. We hope that this study provides a foundation for both further study of the implications of such complex ethical responsibilities, and the basis for addressing these issues on campus in multi-dimensional ways.

References

Arnstein, S.R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of planners, 35*(4), 216–224.

Bortolin, K. (2011). Serving ourselves: How the discourse on community engagement privileges the university over the community. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 18*(1), 49–58.

Boyer, E.L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 49*(7), 18–33.

Clark, A.K., & Eisenstein, M.A. (2013). Interpersonal trust: An age–period–cohort analysis revisited. *Social Science Research, 42*(2), 361–375.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cruz, N.I., & Giles, D.E. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7*(1), 28–34.

Danley, S., & Christiansen, G. (2017). New to the Neighborhood: Race, Civic Engagement, and Challenges for Educators. *The Journal of School and Society, 4*(1), 47–62.

Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 31*(4), 331–338.

Dewey, J., & Small, A.W. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *The School Journal 54*(3), 77–80.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. University of Michigan: Onyx Press.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(4), 532–550.

Fenno, Jr., R.F. (1978). *Home style: House members in their districts.* New York, NY: Pearson Higher Education.

Forester, J. (1988). *Planning in the face of power.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

George, A.L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Goffman, A. (2015a). *On the run: Fugitive life in an American city.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Goffman, A. (2015b). A reply to Professor Lubet's critique. Retrieved from http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/soc/faculty/docs/goffman/A%20Reply%20to%20Professor%20Lubet.pdf.

Gold, R.L. (1958). Roles in sociological field observations. *Social Forces, 36*(3)217–223.

Harding, S.G. (1987). *Feminism and methodology: Social science issues.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hartman, E. (2013). No values, no democracy: The essential partisanship of a civic engagement movement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 19*(2), 58–71.

Holman, B. (1987). Research from the underside. *British Journal of Social Work, 17*(6), 669–683.

Innes, J.E., & Booher, D.E. (2004). Reframing public participation: Strategies for the 21st century. *Planning Theory & Practice, 5*(4), 419–436.

Jacoby, B. (2009). *Civic engagement in higher education. Concepts and practice*s. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kanuha, V.K. (2000). "Being" native versus "going native": Conducting social work research as an insider. *Social Work, 45*(5), 439–447.

Katz, M. (2009). Camden waterfront and its woes. *Philadelphia Inquirer,* November 9, 2009. Retrieved from http://www.philly.com/philly/news/20091109_Camden_s_waterfront_-_and_its_woes.html.

Kenworthy-U'Ren, A., Zlotkowski, E., & Van de Ven, Andrew H. (2005). Toward a scholarship of engagement: A dialogue between Andy Van de Ven and Edward Zlotkowski. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4*(3), 355–362.

Kooiman, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Modern governance: New government-society interactions*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publishing.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7–24.

Lamboy, R. (9/20/15). A better path needed to bring jobs to Camden. *Courier-Post*. Retrieved from https://www.philly.com/philly/opinion/currents/20150920_A_better_path_to_bring_needed_jobs_to_Camden.html.

Levin, Y. (2017). *The fractured republic: Renewing America's social contract in the age of individualism*. New York, NY: Hatchette Books.

Lubet, S. (2014). Ethics on the run. Retrieved from http://newramblerreview.com/book-reviews/law/ethics-on-the-run.

Lynton, E.A. (1994). Knowledge and scholarship. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 5*(1), 9–17.

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Marullo, S., & Edwards, B. (2000). From charity to justice: The potential of university-community collaboration for social change. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43*(5), 895–912.

Minh-Ha, T.T. (2009). *Woman, native, other*: *Writing, postcoloniality and feminism.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing Feminist Research,* pp. 30–61. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.

Putnam, R.D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6*(1), 65–78.

Rosaldo, R. (1993). *Culture & truth: The remaking of social analysis: With a new introduction*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Schon, D.A., & Rein, M. (1995). *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Shah, R. (July 2018). Partnerships and reciprocity: Centering community knowledge and accountability through joint advisory boards. Paper presented at the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Sharpe, C. (2014). Black life, annotated. Retrieved from http://thenewinquiry.com/essays/black-life-annotated/.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2005). The democratic anchorage of governance networks. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 28*(3), 195–218.

Wessels, A. (April 2015) Dear Prudence: Power, campus-community collaborations, and the elusive space between constructive disruption and neoliberal subcontract. *Paper presented at the Urban Affairs Association Conference*, Miami, FL.

Whyte, W.F.E., (1991). Participatory action research. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publishing.

About the Authors

Stephen Danley is an assistant professor in the Department of Public Policy and Administration at Rutgers-Camden University. Gayle Christiansen is program coordinator of Ignite, in the Office of Civic Engagement at Rutgers-Camden University.

Published by Nighthawks Open Institutional Repository,