



Partnership Illinois

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Evaluation Report for the 2002 Partnership Illinois Seed Grants

Cheryl D. Bullock
Head, Division of Measurement and Evaluation
University of Illinois
and
Lizanne DeStefano
Associate Dean for Research
Director, Bureau of Educational Research
College of Education

August 2003

Contents

Executive Summary	i
Background on Partnership Illinois	i
Evaluation Efforts	i
Summary of Evaluation Findings	ii
Conclusions and Recommendations	ii
Evaluation Report for the 2002 Partnership Illinois Seed Grants	1
Background on Partnership Illinois	1
Evaluation Efforts	2
Summary of Evaluative Information	2
Section I: Impact and Products	3
Table 1. Projects, Original Target Audience, Changes (if any).....	3
Table 2. Anticipated Impacts and Reported Accomplishments by Seed Grant	4
Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role	4
Section III: University Partner Benefits.....	5
Table 3. Impacts on Future Research, Teaching, and Public Engagement Presented by Project and General Benefits Afforded the University	6
Section IV: Collaborative Process	7
Section V: Long-Term Benefits.....	7
Table 4. Continuation and Funding Plans.....	8
Section VI: Suggestions.....	8
Conclusions and Recommendations	9
Table 5. Logic Model Developed from Evaluation Summary.....	12
References.....	14
Appendices.....	15
Appendix A: Development of a Logic Model	15
Appendix B: The Eight Projects Chosen for Interviews in the Evaluation Efforts	17
Appendix C: Individual Interview Summaries, 2003	
Academy for Municipal Excellence Interview Summary, 2003	
Turf Management Interview Summary, 2003	
Formation of a Champaign County Women’s Health Coalition Interview Summary, 2003	
Artworks Interview Summary, 2003	
River Web Interview Summary, 2003	
Fostering IDAs for Champaign County Interview Summary, 2003	
Volunteer Fire Service Statewide Summit Interview Summary, 2003	



Partnership Illinois

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Evaluation Report for the 2002 Partnership Illinois Seed Grants Executive Summary

August 2003

Cheryl D. Bullock and Lizanne DeStefano

Background on Partnership Illinois

In accordance with the strategic plan of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Partnership Illinois (PI) is designed to raise visibility and improve access to University resources through partnerships with schools, businesses, government agencies, and private organizations. One of its elements, aimed at fostering outreach and partnership, is the Partnership Illinois Grant program. Grants are given to University partners so they may work collaboratively on a strategic initiative with an external partner within the State of Illinois. The PI administration has identified five strategic initiatives to be served by the projects they fund.

Evaluation Efforts

The Partnership Illinois administration asked Cheryl Bullock (Head of the University's Division of Measurement and Evaluation) and Lizanne DeStefano (Director of the Bureau of Educational Research and Associate Dean for Research of the College of Education) to gather evaluative information on a sampling of the grants and to write a summary report.

The PI administration was interested in determining if the following quality indicators accepted by the University as constituting value added were present in the projects. These indicators are:

- ***Sustainability***: the public engagement project should produce a confidence for both partners that ultimately ends in a sustained relationship;
- ***Shared Decision Making***: the University partners should have the ability and willingness to listen to their external partner; from this respectful exchange should come a relationship with shared decision making;
- ***Dynamic***: a program should be able to evolve, be dynamic, and meet the changing needs of its target audience; and
- ***Reciprocity***: there should be reciprocal benefits for both its University and external partners.

These four indicators served as guiding issues in defining the context of the Partnership Illinois evaluation questions. The evaluators used modified versions of last year's interview protocol for each of the projects. These protocols contained six broad categories of questions, five that were linked to one or more of the four quality indicators of interest. These six categories are presented

on the following page and are linked (when appropriate) to the indicator associated with their specific questions.

- ✓ Impacts and Products (*Sustainability & Dynamic*)
- ✓ External Partner Benefits and Role (*Dynamic & Shared Decision Making*)
- ✓ University Partner Benefits (*Reciprocity*)
- ✓ Collaborative Process (*Shared Decision Making*)
- ✓ Long-Term Benefits (*Sustainability*)
- ✓ Suggestions for Partnership Illinois Administration

Summary of Evaluation Findings

As well as information on the four quality indicators, the PI administration was interested in the development of a logic model through the process of collecting and summarizing the evaluation data. With these two issues in mind, the summary section of the full report details both the strengths and limitations of the projects in each of the four quality indicator categories. This section concludes with a developed logic model that represents each of the eight projects involved in the evaluation. The following paragraphs present an abbreviated form of the evaluation findings and conclude with the evaluators' recommendations.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Sustained Relationships

A hallmark of sustained public engagement projects is a relationship built on trust and respect. Significant impacts and products will flow from just such a relationship.

Strengths: The projects interviewed reported a variety of significant impacts and products. These impacts included Illinois Mayor's graduating from UI training over a period of eight years, the development of a three-state network with over 100 stakeholders, and the formation of a community health care campus.

Another measure of sustainability is whether or not the projects are planning to continue and if they have secured, or at least have promising, sources of funding. Almost all the projects involved in this year's evaluation efforts have solid financial plans to continue.

Limitations: Ultimately, the goal of a sustained public engagement project is to produce long-term benefits. While, as with last year's findings, all the interviewees believe their projects have forged sustainable relationships, few could provide documentation of even short-term benefits that might lead to long-term change. This may be due more to non-articulated outcomes assessment goals rather than a lack of actual identifiable benefits. The benefits may well exist; the interviewees simply did not understand how, or have the technical assistance necessary, to collect data on these outcomes.

Shared Decision Making

The UI administration has identified shared decision making as specifically critical for quality public engagement activities.

Strengths: Several of the interviewees articulated how they encouraged shared decision making with their external partners. Additionally, the evaluators participated in two project's meetings with external partners. It was clear in both of these meetings that the University partner fostered collaborative decision making with the external partner.

Limitations: Some of the interviewees were frustrated with their attempts to form a collaboration with both partners as equals. They spoke of variance in external partners' willingness to jointly solve problems. For example, some external partners assumed a passive role, and their University partners were frustrated by their lack of desire to share in decision making.

Dynamic Nature

Yet another hallmark of a quality sustained public engagement activity is this: it will change over time to meet the needs of participants. One example of dynamic change is a program that can expand to meet a changing target audience.

Strengths: All the interviewees noted that they had expanded their projects to serve a greater target audience. These expansions included demographics, geographical location, and ages of target audiences. Some of the projects had expanded to the point of becoming institutionalized. For example, one had ongoing waiting lists of paying participants, and another had developed to include the formation of a community health campus.

Limitations: A few of the interviewees felt no reward system was in place to encourage their projects to expand. They spoke of lack of funding, as well as general non-support from their academic units.

Reciprocal Benefits

In order for a sustained, dynamic, and collaborative public engagement activity to be of high quality, it must also be reciprocal. This is one litmus test for reciprocity in public engagement: identifiable benefits are afforded to the University partner.

Strengths: Each of the interviewees reported University partner benefits, which can be found in Table 3 on page 6 of the full report. Highlights from that table include: increased publicity and improved public relations; student involvement and recruitment; and increased linkages with both public and private entities.

Limitations: Two of the interviewees with tenure track positions warned that too much attention to public engagement, at the expense of research and teaching activities, could be problematic for non-tenured faculty. This is consistent with findings from last year's evaluation efforts.

After reflection on all the evaluation efforts (interviews, observations, follow-up e-mails, and a focus group), the evaluators make the following recommendations to the Partnership Illinois administration.

❖ Consider Establishing a Faculty Advisory Board

Both this and last year, seasoned faculty noted that the process of conducting public engagement is more beneficial when directly linked to the University partner's research

agenda. They further noted that much value was afforded the University by their using examples from their projects when teaching and encouraging service learning through student involvement with their projects. However, interviewees from both last and this year did note that public engagement is often not valued within traditional faculty reward frameworks. The formation of a faculty advisory board, modeled after the Teaching Advisory Board, might provide support and validation for public engagement efforts among faculty. This board could encourage the linkage of public engagement activities to both research and teaching, as well as promote faculty rewards for public engagement.

❖ **More Training/Information on Outcomes Assessment**

As with last year's evaluation results, interviewees would like more information on the outcomes of interest to the Partnership Illinois administration, as well as technical assistance to collect data on those outcomes. More training may be needed to increase both the University and the external partners' ability to understand the process necessary to collect impact data. Of specific interest might be to give partners a framework that involves the four quality indicators: sustainability, shared decision making, dynamic nature, and reciprocal benefits. To encourage accountability, the PI administration could collect brief progress reports on outcomes assessment plans. Final reports could have clear expectation of documented outcomes assessment efforts. Additionally, technical assistance may be necessary throughout the process.

❖ **Continue to Refine the Logic Model Developed**

Just as a successful public engagement activity is dynamic and changes to meet the needs of its population, so must a logic model. As Partnership Illinois continues to provide funding for University partners to collaborate, so should the logic model (presented in Table 5 on page 12 of the full report) continue to develop. In order to remain accurate, a revisiting of this model should occur at least every three years in the funding cycle. Further, the dissemination of this logic model will help articulate the activities of Partnership Illinois more clearly to the University community.



**Evaluation Report for the 2002 Partnership Illinois Seed Grants
August 2003
Cheryl D. Bullock and Lizanne DeStefano**

Background on Partnership Illinois

In accordance with the strategic plan of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Partnership Illinois (PI) is designed to raise visibility and improve access to University resources through partnerships with schools, businesses, government agencies, and private organizations. One of its elements, aimed at fostering outreach and partnership, is the Partnership Illinois Grant program. These grants are given to a University partner so they may work collaboratively on a strategic initiative with an external partner within the State of Illinois. The Partnership Illinois administration has identified five strategic initiatives to be served by the projects they fund. These five initiatives are described below.

1. Build the Capacity of Education, Social Service, and Health Agencies and Organizations to Serve Children, Youth, and Families (Children, Youth, and Families)

This initiative's focus is on serving children, youth, and families in local, low-resource neighborhoods by fostering collaboration among community groups (e.g., schools, social and health services, service clubs, and neighborhood councils). Of specific interest are groups that develop models for enhancing skills, knowledge, resources, or opportunities for children, youth, and families.

2. Enhance the Capacity and Performance of State, Local, and Municipal Governments (Government)

This initiative's focus is on the state legislature, county government, municipal government, or the executive branch agencies involved with the Illinois state government. Of specific interest are initiatives that enhance performance, productivity, and government accountability; develop and enhance innovations and "best practices" designed to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of government; create or extend public-private partnerships and/or privatization; address the "new federalism" and decentralization; enhance citizenship and an improved democracy; and/or seek solutions to critical problems facing states and localities (e.g., welfare reform, flood control, the environment, revenue, and expenditure patterns).

3. Expand Ways by Which Illinois Communities Can Explore Cultural and Artistic Opportunities (Art)

This initiative's focus is on the creation, understanding, and enjoyment of art and cultural practices by children, youth, and families in order to nurture the whole person and build life-long capacities and knowledge. Of specific interest are partnerships that encourage local opportunities, reflect community life and cultural history, and provide access to communities underrepresented in the area of culture and the arts.

4. Extend the Education and Knowledge Base Required to Produce and Consume Safe and Healthy Food and to Be Assured a Safe Water Supply and Clean Air (Food, Water, and Air)

This initiative's focus is on enhancing the ability of municipal and state agencies, as well as nonprofit and private organizations, to create programs and services aimed at key issues concerning the safety of Illinois' water and air and the food we eat.

5. Increase Community Vitality and Promote Economic Development (Economic Development)

This initiative's focus is on launching components of the "Community Exchange Center" concept, a joint proposal of the Urban League of Champaign County and the Consortium for Collaborative Community Research on campus. The initiative's main concerns involve two outcomes: 1) community empowerment and service to the neighborhoods of Champaign-Urbana, as an immediate goal, and 2) models for service delivery, skill training, or action research that could be replicated in other cities and localities.

Evaluation Efforts

The Partnership Illinois administration asked Cheryl Bullock (Head of the University's Division of Measurement and Evaluation) and Lizanne DeStefano (Director of the Bureau of Educational Research and Associate Dean for Research of the College of Education) to gather evaluative information on a sampling of the grants and to write a summary report. A full description of how these efforts were conducted and the consequent logic model developed is included in Appendix A of this report.

Summary of Evaluative Information

One of the advantages of having an evaluation of a multi-site project, such as Partnership Illinois, is that the evaluators categorize and coherently present information. This categorization frequently encourages use of the results by giving a thumbnail sketch of information presented in a myriad of ways. With this in mind, we constructed and presented several tables in this report. This evaluation information is summarized and presented within each of the six pre-determined categories on the following pages.

Section I: Impact and Products

The interview questions in this category focused on any changes that may have occurred with regard to the original target audience, the anticipated impacts, and the realized impacts of the project.

Table 1, which follows, categorizes (by grant title) the original target audiences involved with each of the projects and explains how they have changed. Note that in all cases, the original audiences expanded to include larger or broader audiences.

Table 1. Projects, Original Target Audience, Changes (if any)

Grant	Original Target Audience	How They Have Changed
The Academy for Municipal Excellence (Bob Rich)	Mayors, other elected officials, Illinois Municipal League	Expanded to include more and varied municipal leaders
Interactive Turf Management (Henry Wilkinson)	Professional lawn, sports, sod, and golf managers	Expanded to include more of these individuals
Formation of a Champaign County Health Coalition (Janet Reis)	Provena Covenant	Expanded to include Public Health, Carle Clinic, and other health provider associations
Artworks (Hewitt/Rasmus)	Younger and teen students	Expanded to include more children from surrounding areas
River Web (Burton/Cheney)	High school students	Expanded to include future teachers
Fostering IDAs for Champaign County (Cynthia Geerdes)	Families and individuals qualified for IDAs	Expanded to include more individuals
Building Research Council/Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Technical Assistance Training Program (Kate Brown)	Dept of Commerce and Community Affairs, Illinois Housing Authority, and Illinois Association of Housing and Redevelopment	Expanded to include working with other federal agencies, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Illinois Volunteer Fire Service Statewide Summit (Richard Jaehne)	Illinois government, industry, and first responders for Heartland Security	Expanded to include more emergency service and first responders from these categories

Interviewees were also asked to discuss both the anticipated and realized accomplishments of their projects. Anticipated impacts were often focused on increasing knowledge and skills of participants, but some outcomes included the establishment of a network or collaboration among the University and participants. Table 2 on the following page presents these results.

Table 2. Anticipated Impacts and Reported Accomplishments by Seed Grant

Project	Anticipated Impacts	Reported Accomplishments
The Academy for Municipal Excellence (Bob Rich)	Increase knowledge and skills to improve effectiveness of officials	Eight years-worth of graduates who frequently send others from their municipalities; current waiting list.
Interactive Turf Management (Henry Wilkinson)	Increase environmental awareness, encourage stakeholder access to UI	Over 100 stakeholders from Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana have formed a network.
Formation of a Champaign County Health Coalition (Janet Reis)	Bring together health care providers to approach complex issues of providing health care	This alliance has been formed, and productive dialogue has occurred. Discussion led to further planning of a community health care campus.
Artworks (Karen Hewitt/ Ann Rasmus)	Increase community awareness of the Krannert Art Museum	Increased attendance at Krannert by community children and families.
River Web (Vernon Burton/ Matt Cheney)	Provide interactive modules on East St. Louis in 1900's	River Web is in use in East St. Louis high schools and can be fitted with other geographically specific data.
Fostering IDA's for Champaign County (Cynthia Gerdes)	Increase financial literacy and encourage new efforts in the community	As of March 2003, thirteen community members have graduated, and ten are close to graduating.
Building Research Council/Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Technical Assistance Training Program (Kate Brown)	Provide training on affordable, accessible housing throughout state Encourage use of alternative building materials in design and development of affordable housing	Provided the training on: Flat roofs; heat gain and loss; lead-based paint awareness training; design/build studios; Habitat for Humanity house; and planning for accessible housing design. All done in collaboration with various state and local agencies.
Illinois Volunteer Fire Service Statewide Summit (Richard Jaehne)	The creation of a Volunteer Fire Summit that would facilitate communication among various professionals	Created collaborations between private, state, local, and regional organizations. Fostered communication, bonds, and trust for these professionals to share and learn.

Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role

This category involves the University partner's interpretation of their project's success and asks them to identify the ways in which they have measured outcomes. The majority of the projects this year, as with those last year, had collected little (if any) impact data; this substantiates our past recommendation for increased outcomes assessment among PI projects. However, even without empirical data, all project directors were able to talk about their success and impact in an anecdotal manner. The following excerpts are representative of the interviewees' perceptions.

Illinois Fire Volunteer Service (Jaehne): One example of this is how well the train derailment was handled last month in Tamaroa, Illinois. The process used to respond is the one highlighted in our workshops. Key personnel told me that the information they learned from the Homeland Security workshops helped them make the decisions and pull together, quickly, the necessary agencies.

Interactive Turf Management (Wilkinson): The Brookfield Zoo was very concerned that if they held more events on their malls, they would ruin the turf quality to the point of reducing the Zoo experience for their customers. We enrolled the Zoo staff in the InteractiveTurf.com program to monitor the health of the turf. Consequently, the event in question was held, raised \$500,000, and the Zoo's turf was preserved.

River Web (Cheney and Burton): This is one of the things about River Web of which I've become convinced: its success and impact lies in the manner in which it engages the learner. With River Web, students are given the opportunity to be historians and to engage themselves in the material.

The Academy for Municipal Excellence (Rich): I can think of three indicators off the top of my head. First, past participants frequently send others from their municipality to the LEAD program for training. Second, President Stukel, during his community visits, frequently hears past LEAD participants comment on the high quality of the LEAD program. Third, the LEAD certification ceremony is well attended by past participants.

Formation of a Champaign County Health Coalition (Reis): The benefit is basically a forum where the University can serve as a major player—one that can offset powerful voices that might dominate with their own agenda.

Fostering IDA's for Champaign County (Geerdes): We've graduated thirteen income-qualified participants who previously did not own assets, and we have ten about to finish.

BRC/DCCA Technical Assistance Training Program (Brown): One example would be that the Director of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program in Bloomington wants to come here and look at our Habitat House.

While these stories make it clear that the projects are having an impact, the collection of substantiating empirical data would be useful for Partnership Illinois administration.

Section III: University Partner Benefits

This category involves the impacts the University partner's grant-related role had on traditional responsibilities of the academy, such as research, teaching, and engagement with the community. This section also contains questions aimed at ascertaining the general benefits afforded to the University by each project.

Only three interviewees addressed issues involved with research, publications, or tenure prospects (the others do not currently have those responsibilities at the University). Of those three, two clearly felt that public engagement activities were not rewarded through traditional

paths, such as salary increases. The third felt that public engagement was expected and rewarded in her field. All, however, were able to comment on the general benefits afforded to the University with regard to their Partnership Illinois project and their personal commitment to and satisfaction with their project. Table 3 below presents this information.

Table 3. Impacts on Future Research, Teaching, and Public Engagement Presented by Project and General Benefits Afforded the University

Project	Impacts on Research, Teaching, and Public Service	University Benefits
The Academy for Municipal Excellence (Bob Rich)	Teaching and training examples, case studies, expansion of research agenda.	Linkages to state and municipal agencies. Increased public relations.
Interactive Turf Management (Henry Wilkinson)	Teaching examples, graduate and undergraduate student involvement.	Allows University to meet mission as a land grant institution. Linkages with professionals.
Formation of a Champaign County Health Coalition (Janet Reis)	Teaching examples, graduate and undergraduate student involvement, expanded research agenda.	Linkages to community public health providers; College of Medicine residencies. Increased public relations.
Artworks (Hewitt/Rasmus)	Increased awareness of the diverse community.	Linkages with community family and children.
River Web (Burton/Cheney)	Graduate and undergraduate student involvement. Publications and presentations.	Showcasing Urbana as educational technology savvy. Linkages with K-12 community.
Fostering IDA's for Champaign County (Cynthia Geerdes)	Graduate students work in Clinic as part of a course's service-learning component.	Sole Clinic of its type in country, impact on recruiting potential law students.
Building Research Council/DCCA (Kate Brown)	Increased statewide publications of affordable housing materials; provided teaching examples.	Linkages with state agencies; capstone course experience; undergraduate and graduate student involvement.
Illinois Volunteer Fire Service Statewide Summit (Richard Jaehne)	Increased connectivity to campus, and ability to conduct applied research in public policy safety.	Better public relations; linkages with public entities; undergraduate student involvement.

It is clear that Partnership Illinois activity provided faculty with experiences and examples that were useful in their teaching and research. Several mentioned that undergraduate and graduate students gained valuable working experience in service by participating in the PI projects.

There were also clear general benefits afforded to the University. These included improved capacity for student recruitment, increased opportunity for field placement and student involvement, and linkages with municipal and stage agencies.

Section IV: Collaborative Process

This fourth category is concerned with the types and benefits of collaboration between the University partner and the external partners. The following excerpts from the interviews are representative of interviewees' thoughts on their project's collaboration.

Illinois Fire Volunteer Service (Jaehne): My goal for collaboration is to get individuals together to communicate and better understand each other.

Fostering IDA's for Champaign County (Geerdes): Productive collaborations occurred on many levels and involved partner-partner, partner-participant, and participant-participant collaborations.

The Academy for Municipal Excellence (Rich): A natural collaboration grows from participants in the LEAD program connecting with others. We also involved IGPA faculty in collaborations.

Formation of a Champaign County Health Coalition (Reis): My role is to convene the meetings and to control the agenda. There is also a fair amount of behind the scenes discussions between myself, the Carle entity, and the other members of the group.

Artworks (Hewitt and Rasmus): We collaborate with a wide range of individuals, many from after-school programs. We work to tailor our program to their particular needs.

River Web (Cheney and Burton): Vernon has done quite a bit of collaboration with teachers from high schools in East St. Louis, as well as with Bill Sutton at University High School in Urbana. Additionally, museum historians and archivists in East St. Louis helped us locate and better understand documents used in River Web.

Interactive Turf Management (Wilkinson): Extensive collaboration has occurred and involved: face-to-face planning sessions held twelve times per year, e-mail and instant messenger communications, phone planning and troubleshooting, onsite visits, inspections, consultations, and planning meetings.

In summary, all of those interviewed felt the collaboration that occurred between the external and University partners was positive, and they were able to articulate a process of collaboration; none reported significant difficulties.

Section V: Long-Term Benefits

The questions associated with this category involved both the extent to which Partnership Illinois funds had played a part in leveraging funds and the plans that had been made for continuing the projects. Table 4, which follows, presents this information.

In all but one case, firm plans had been made to continue the collaboration beyond the funding period. Potential or actual funding sources had been identified for all projects. Potential funders represented a broad range of public, private, local, state, and federal sources.

Table 4. Continuation and Funding Plans

Project	Continuation Plans	Potential Funding Sources
The Academy for Municipal Excellence (Robert Rich)	Continue training and expand to include other types of municipality leaders.	Illinois Municipal League, DCCA, some corporations.
Interactive Turf Management (Henry Wilkinson)	Continue providing service to professionals and other stakeholders.	University support, Green industry, turf organizations, and golf courses.
Formation of County Health Coalition (Janet Reis)	Continue facilitating alliance meetings.	Carle Clinic, University.
Artworks (Hewitt/Rasmus)	Continue providing presentations.	Illinois Art Council, Institute for Library and Museum Service.
River Web (Burton/Cheney)	Continue and expand to include college students.	National Science Foundation, Department of Education
Fostering IDA's (Cynthea Geerdes)	Continue service-learning clinic.	Independence Act Grant, local banks.
BRC/DCCA (Kate Brown)	Continue training state and federal agencies on key housing issues.	Cost recovery basis.
Fire Service (Richard Jaehne)	It has not been determined if future Summits will be held.	Recurring state, county, and federal funding.

Section VI: Suggestions

This last category asked interviewees if they had any suggestions for improving Partnership Illinois and increasing its impact.

Three themes emerged from the interviews. These were: 1) the need for increased information and technical assistance for collecting outcomes assessment data; 2) an established infrastructure to institutionalize public engagement as an important role for University personnel; and 3) dissemination of more information about Partnership Illinois activities across campus. The following confidential excerpts represent these suggestions.

We need some type of campus level advisory structure of faculty who understand the importance of public engagement. This mechanism needs to be given high visibility on campus and focus on encouraging the University's public engagement. This could very well be analogous to the Teaching Advisory Board.

I would suggest having the Chancellor's office formally contact the unit heads about the importance of public service for their faculty as well as for the University as a whole. There are many ways to approach research, and faculty interested in applied community-based work should be encouraged to do so and have their work valued. Some rethinking of the traditional

notion of scholarship is necessary because, as it stands now, it is actually making it more difficult for some faculty to be relevant and engaged with community.

I think more information about Partnership Illinois and its mission would be beneficial. When I first started with this project, I was clueless about Partnership Illinois' purpose. I thought they just gave money to projects they liked. I didn't realize there was a public engagement angle.

[The program needs] a better support system, more interaction with the projects, more marketing and extolling of people and projects that have made a difference, more incentives for those that get involved and make a difference to continue.

It would be helpful to more fully understand the expectations associated with Partnership Illinois funding. We know our goals, and we have certainly met and exceeded those, but more articulation from PI administration would be helpful.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluators summarized both the strengths and weaknesses of these projects with regard to the four quality indicators defined by the University administration for public engagement activities. These conclusions are presented below. Evaluator's recommendations conclude this report.

Sustained Relationships

A hallmark of sustained public engagement projects is a relationship built on trust and respect. Significant impacts and products will flow from just such a relationship.

Strengths: The projects interviewed reported a variety of significant impacts and products. These impacts included Illinois Mayor's graduating from UI training over a period of eight years, the development of a three state network with over 100 stakeholders, and the formation of a community health care campus.

Another measure of sustainability is whether or not the projects are planning to continue and if they have secured, or at least have promising, sources of funding. Almost all of the projects involved in this year's evaluation efforts have solid financial plans to continue.

Limitations: Ultimately, the goal of a sustained public engagement project is to produce long-term benefits. While, as with last year's evaluation findings, all of the interviewees believe that their projects have forged sustainable relationships, few could provide documentation of even short-term benefits that might lead to long-term change. This may be due more to non-articulated outcomes assessment goals rather than a lack of actual identifiable benefits. The benefits may well exist; the interviewees simply did not understand how, or have the technical assistance necessary, to collect data on these outcomes.

Shared Decision Making

Shared decision making has been identified by the UI administration as specifically critical for quality public engagement activities.

Strengths: Several of the interviewees articulated how they encouraged shared decision making with their external partners. Additionally, the evaluators participated in two project's meetings with external partners. It was clear in both of these meetings that the University partner fostered collaborative decision making with the external partner.

Limitations: Some of the interviewees were frustrated with their attempts to form collaboration with both partners as equals. They spoke of variance in external partners' willingness to jointly solve problems. For example, some external partners resisted efforts by their University partners to engage in decision making about the project.

Dynamic Nature

Yet another hallmark of a quality sustained public engagement activity is that it will change over time to meet the needs of participants. One example of dynamic change is a program that can expand to meet a changing target audience.

Strengths: All the interviewees noted that they had expanded their projects to serve a greater target audience. These expansions included demographics, geographical location, and ages of target audiences. Some of the projects had expanded to the point of becoming institutionalized. For example, one had ongoing waiting lists of paying participants, and another had developed to include the formation of a community health campus.

Limitations: A few interviewees felt that no reward system was in place to encourage their projects to expand. They spoke of lack of funding, as well as general non-support from their academic units.

Reciprocal Benefits

In order for a sustained, dynamic, and collaborative public engagement activity to be of high quality, it must also be reciprocal. One litmus test for reciprocity in public engagement is that of identifiable benefits afforded to the University partner.

Strengths: The University partner benefits reported by each of the interviewees can be found in Table 3 on page 6 of this report. Highlights from that table include: increased publicity and improved public relations; student involvement and recruitment; and increased linkages with both public and private entities.

Limitations: Two of the interviewees with tenure track positions warned that too much attention to public engagement at the expense of research and teaching activities could be problematic for non-tenured faculty. This is consistent with findings from last year's evaluation efforts.

After reflection on all the evaluation efforts (interviews, follow-up e-mails, and focus group), the evaluators make the following recommendations to the Partnership Illinois administration.

❖ Consider Establishing a Faculty Advisory Board

Both this and last year, seasoned faculty noted that the process of conducting public engagement is more beneficial when directly linked to the University partner's research agenda. They further noted that much value was afforded the University by their using

examples from their project when teaching and encouraging service learning through student involvement with their projects. However, interviewees from both last and this year did note that public engagement is often not valued within traditional faculty reward frameworks. The formation of a faculty advisory board, modeled after the Teaching Advisory Board, might provide support and validation for public engagement efforts among faculty. This board could encourage the linkage of public engagement activities to both research and teaching, as well as promote faculty rewards for public engagement.

❖ **More Training/Information on Outcomes Assessment**

As with last year's evaluation results, interviewees would like more information on the outcomes of interest to the Partnership Illinois administration, as well as technical assistance to collect data. More training may be needed to increase the ability of both the University and the external partners to understand the process necessary to collect impact data. Of specific interest might be to give partners a framework that involves the four quality indicators of sustainability; shared decision making; dynamic nature; and reciprocal benefits. To encourage accountability, brief progress reports on outcomes assessment plans could be collected by the PI administration. Final reports could have the clear expectation of documented outcomes assessment efforts. Additionally, technical assistance may be necessary throughout the process.

❖ **Continue to Refine the Logic Model Developed**

Just as a successful public engagement activity is dynamic and changes to meet the needs of its population, so must a logic model. As Partnership Illinois continues to provide funding for University partners to collaborate, so should the logic model (presented in Table 5 on page 12 of the full report) continue to develop. In order to remain accurate, a revisiting of this model should occur at least every three years in the funding cycle. Further, the dissemination of this logic model will help articulate the activities of Partnership Illinois more clearly throughout the University community.

Table 5. Logic Model Developed from Evaluation Summary

Project Description	Inputs	Outputs		Outcomes		
		Activities	Participation	Measured	Anticipated	
				Short-Term	Medium-Term	Long-Term
BRC/DCCA Technical Assistance Training Program. State grantees lack training facilities for sustainable, high efficiency, and cost-effective housing practices.	University faculty, students, staff, materials, and facilities. Agency staff and facilities.	Provided several workshops throughout state. Habitat for Humanity house built, helped organize and present INAHRO annual conference.	Urbana faculty, students, and staff. Members of state housing agencies.	Provided training (in collaboration with state agencies) on: Flat roofs; heat gain and loss; lead-based paint awareness; design/build studios; Habitat for Humanity; and accessible housing design.	Provide training on affordable, accessible housing issues throughout the state. Encourage the use of alternative building materials in the design and development of affordable housing.	Increased establishment of Urbana learning laboratory; increased connectivity with state agencies; impact on Illinois' sustainable and environmentally sound housing.
Illinois Volunteer Fire Service Statewide Summit. State emergency personnel lack infrastructure to substantively communicate.	University staff and students. Fire Service staff and facilities. Local leaders and facilities.	Provided several workshops and summits throughout the State of Illinois.	Urbana staff, Illinois government, industry, educational and fire service involved with Heartland Security.	Created collaborations between private, state, local, and regional organizations. Fostered communities of practice for these professionals.	The creation of a self-sustaining Volunteer Fire Summit that would facilitate communication among various professionals	Greater sense of connectivity with Urbana and local/state municipalities. More coordinated services for increased Heartland security.
Academy for Municipal Excellence. Leaders of municipalities lack quality-training opportunities.	University faculty and staff. University facilities.	Provided leadership training to over 100 municipal leaders, ongoing dialogues.	Urbana faculty and staff. Municipal leaders throughout Illinois.	Provided leadership training for past six years to mayors and others in positions of leadership.	More and varied types of leadership training provided.	Better prepared leaders of municipalities. Established infrastructure for leaders to collaborate on policy/practice.
Artworks. Children and families unfamiliar with local art museum.	University staff, students, and materials. After-school staff and facilities.	Provided children's workshops on art, promoted access to Krannert Museum.	Urbana staff and students, local children, after-school program employees.	Children receive art experiences, increased attendance at Krannert by children.	Increased art awareness and familiarity with Museum among local families.	Increased appreciation of art and art museums for previously underserved children and families.

Table 5. Logic Model Developed from Evaluation Summary (continued)

Situation	Inputs	Outputs		Outcomes		
		<i>Activities</i>	<i>Participation</i>	<i>Measured</i>	<i>Anticipated</i>	
				<i>Short-Term</i>	<i>Medium-Term</i>	<i>Long-Term</i>
Fostering IDA's for Champaign County Those in poverty have no assets and therefore can't break cycle.	University staff, students, materials, and facilities. Financial agency staff and facilities.	Provided IDA training (16 hours) to income-qualified participants.	Community members, University staff and students.	Thirteen program graduates and ten near graduates.	Increase financial literacy and bring new assets into the community.	Changed behaviors in the areas of budgeting and making wise credit decisions.
Formation of a Champaign County Health Coalition Lack of productive dialogue on complex issues of providing health care.	University faculty and students. Local health care providers and facilities.	Shared decision making of University and local agencies.	University faculty and students, health care providers.	This alliance has been formed and productive dialogue is ongoing.	Residency opportunities, institutionalization of community health care campus.	Increased access to quality health care for low-income members of the community.
Interactive Turf Management Lack of resources and information for turf professionals.	University faculty, staff, and students. Turf professionals and facilities.	Development of, and training on, interactive turf management tool.	University faculty, staff, students, members of turf organizations.	Over 100 stakeholders from Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana have formed network.	Increased service to professionals and other stakeholders.	Increase environmental awareness, infrastructure of collaboration between University and turf professionals.
River Web Inner-city students lack access to engaging, accurate historical learning modules.	University faculty and students, high school teachers, school facilities.	Development of, and training on, interactive historical learning modules.	University faculty and students, high school students and teachers.	River Web is in use in East St. Louis high schools and can be fitted with other geographically specific data.	River Web customization for increased geographic areas, future teachers familiarization.	More effective and engaging use of learning technology in high schools, increased ownership of historical education by high school students.

References

- Bickman, L. (1987). The functions of program theory. In L. Bickman (Ed.), *New directions for program evaluation: Vol. 33. Using program theory in evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coffman, J. (1999). *Learning from logic models: An example of a family/school partnership program*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.
- Krueger, R. (2001). *Guide for measuring outcomes*. Workshop Materials. Minneapolis: MN: University of Minnesota, University of Minnesota Extension Service.
- McLaughlin, J., & Jordan, G. (1999). Logic Models: A tool for telling your program performance story. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 22, 65–72. Elsevier Science.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.
- Taylor-Powell, E. (2002). *The Logic Model: A program performance framework* (workshop materials). Madison: WI: University of Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin Extension Service.
- United Way of America. (1996). *Measuring program outcomes: A practical approach*. Arlington, VA: author.
- Weiss, C. (1997). Theory-based evaluation: Past, present, and future. In D. Rog & D. Founiers (Eds.), *New directions for program evaluation: Vol.76. Progress and future directions in evaluation: Perspectives on theory, practice, and methods*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX A

Development of a Logic Model

A logic model is a schematic for what a program is and what it intends to accomplish. As with previous evaluation efforts, one clear goal of the evaluation team was to collect information to develop a logic model that would describe current, and give direction to future, Partnership Illinois projects. According to Krueger (2001) the process to develop logic models is best handled externally. Those close to programs often make assumptions and overlook critical parts that would help formulate the model. McLaughlin and Jordan (1998) further define the following five-step process:

- Collecting the relevant information;
- Clearly defining the problem and its context;
- Defining the elements of the logic model;
- Drawing the logic model; and
- Verifying the logic model with stakeholders.

Our evaluation plan used the McLaughlin and Jordan process in developing the Partnership Illinois logic model.

Collecting the Relevant Information

Nine projects were chosen for participation in the evaluation. Project involvement was based on either the need for follow-up information after last year's evaluation or that the project had not been involved with the evaluation to date. Eight projects were actually included in this year's efforts, as one University partner was on sabbatical and unavailable for interview. Appendix B presents project titles, University and external partners, and initiative served for each of these eight projects. University partners involved with seven of the eight projects were interviewed, with each interview lasting about one hour; one project did not include an interview but involved observations during formal University and external partner collaborations. Interview protocols included questions common to all projects as well as those specific to each project. Interviewees were sent questions two weeks in advance, and all interviews were audio taped and transcribed. Interview summaries were sent to each interviewee for member checking in order to insure the validity of the data. A focus group of past participants from one project's program was also conducted.

Clearly Defining the Problem and its Context

The PI administration was interested in determining if the following quality indicators accepted by the University as constituting value added were present in the projects.

- ***Sustainability***: the public engagement project should produce for both partners a confidence that ultimately ends in a sustained relationship;
- ***Shared Decision Making***: the University partners should have the ability and willingness to listen to their external partner; from this respectful exchange should come a relationship with shared decision making;

- **Dynamic:** a program should be able to evolve, be dynamic, and meet the changing needs of its target audience; and
- **Reciprocity:** there should be reciprocal benefits for both its University and external partners.

These four indicators served as guiding issues in defining the context of the Partnership Illinois evaluation questions. As mentioned above, the evaluators used modified versions of last year's interview protocol for each of the projects. These protocols contained six broad categories of questions, five that were linked to one or more of the four quality indicators of interest. These six categories are presented below and linked (when appropriate) to the indicator associated with their questions.

Interview Protocol Categories and Associated Quality Indicators

- Impacts and Products (*Sustainability & Dynamic*)
- External Partner Benefits and Role (*Dynamic & Shared Decision Making*)
- University Partner Benefits (*Reciprocity*)
- Collaborative Process (*Shared Decision Making*)
- Long-Term Benefits (*Sustainability*)
- Suggestions for Partnership Illinois

Defining the Elements of and Drawing the Logic Model

While the flow of a logic model can be defined esoterically, there are typically four elements that need to be included. These are: 1) the situations of each project; 2) the inputs required; 3) the outputs that result; and 4) the impacts of the project (Krueger, 2001). The interviews conducted collected information that allowed the evaluation team to include these elements for each of the projects involved in this evaluation. The report includes the logic model that the evaluation team was able to draw after analysis of the information collected.

Verifying the Logic Model with Stakeholders

In order to verify the elements and ultimate creation of the logic model for this evaluation, two iterations of member checking were conducted. First, each interviewee was sent the summary of their interview. Second, after all changes and/or edits applicable were made from the first round of member checking, the various elements of the logic model were developed. These were presented in the tables included in this report. Each University partner was sent his or her particular section of all tables for a second round of member checking. Again, all appropriate changes and edits were incorporated.

APPENDIX B
The Eight Projects Chosen for Interviews in the Evaluation Efforts

PI Grant Selected For Evaluation Efforts	University Partner(s) External Partner(s)	Strategic Initiative Served
The Academy for Municipal Excellence (Bob Rich)	Institute for Government and Public Affairs Illinois Municipal League	Government
Interactive Turf Management (Henry Wilkinson)	Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences Professional Lawn, Sports, Sod, and Golf Managers	Food, Air, and Water
Formation of a Champaign County Health Coalition (Janet Reis)	Department of Community Health Provena, Carle Clinic, and Public Health	Children, Youth, and Families
Artworks (Karen Hewitt/Ann Rasmus)	Krannert Art Museum After-School Providers	Art
River Web (Vernon Burton/Matt Cheney)	Department of History High Schools in East St. Louis	Children, Youth, and Families
Fostering IDA's for Champaign County (Cynthia Geerdes)	College of Law Legal Aid, Bank Illinois, and Busey Bank	Community & Economic Development
Building Research Council/Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Technical Assistance Training Program (Kate Brown)	Fine and Applied Arts Department of Commerce and Community Affairs	Government
Illinois Volunteer Fire Service Statewide Summit (Richard Jaehne)	Fire Service Institute The State Fire Marshal; Illinois Fire Chiefs Association	Government



**Robert Rich
Academy for Municipal Excellence
Interview Summary, 2003**

Section I: Impact and Products

❖ **Could you talk about the history of this project, how it came to be initially, and how it came to be as it is today?**

Right now, our project is in its sixth year of operation, which means that the actual history goes back about eight or ten years. I began the program when I was still the Director of the Institute for Government and Public Affairs (IGPA). My goal was to conduct discussions with the Illinois Municipal League (IML) about developing an educational executive leadership program for mayors and other elected officials. The IML is a powerful state association that represents all the municipalities of Illinois. These municipalities range from those of five or ten thousand all the way to the city of Chicago. However, the very large cities tend to be less active in the League because it is primarily an advocacy (lobbying) association.

I began having those conversations with the League with the help of Jim Kean, a legislator at the time who was interested in developing capacity within local governments. Jim and I decided to conduct a focus group here on campus with successful mayors, village trustees, and members of both the Municipal League and IGPA. Participants were asked to think back to the first five years in their leadership position and to identify what knowledge and skills they wish they had possessed which would have made them more successful leaders. We took the results from that focus group and began fashioning a curriculum for leadership training. Eventually, this curriculum was refined into the six (two-day) sessions that now constitute the Leadership Enhancement and Development Program (LEAD). To date, this program has enrolled over 160 mayors, village trustees, and various other municipal officials (village administrators, city managers, and fire chiefs).

The program is a big commitment for the participants, who take it very seriously. For example, at the end of their six sessions, they receive a certificate of completion. What's really interesting is the number of participants that have returned the following year to make up days they missed because they want to receive that certificate. The Municipal League dedicates a portion of the largest plenary session of its annual meeting to a ceremony, during which those who have most recently completed the LEAD program receive their certificate of completion. Either the Chancellor or Steve Schomberg talks about Partnership Illinois briefly and then formally presents the certificates, which are placed in University of Illinois folders. Also interesting is the fact that about sixty-five to seventy percent of former LEAD participants come to the ceremony each year.

❖ **Please talk about any extensions that have occurred with this project.**

We've begun a program for municipal clerks that builds on the experience of clerks in the LEAD program. Additionally, programs modeled after LEAD have been implemented in nine other states and at least one other country (China).

❖ **Who was the original target audience, and has this audience changed?**

The original target audience was elected mayors and village trustees from throughout Illinois. This has expanded to include other elected officials such as municipal clerks.

Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role

❖ **What have you learned about the success and impact of this project?**

It has exceeded my expectations, and if you spoke with Ken Alderson (Executive Director of the Illinois Municipal League), I believe he would say it has also exceeded his. For instance, LEAD has become much more institutionalized. When we first started the program, it was sometimes hard work just to enroll twenty-five people. We now have a regular waiting list of people, even though we've expanded the class enrollment to include twenty-eight. (We tried thirty-two participants, but that was too many and didn't work well.) The more visible mayors are enrolling—another indicator of success; for example, the mayors of Palatine and Oakbrook are participating.

▶ **What kind of evaluation have you done?**

We ask participants to complete a brief evaluation form after each session. We then request that they complete a more extensive evaluation form at the conclusion of each training cycle, asking them to comment on speakers, course content, cases provided, and the details of food and lodging. We also use the certification ceremony held at the annual meeting of the Municipal League to talk with past participants.

About a year and a half ago, I used Partnership Illinois funds to hire a post-doc to send out an extensive follow-survey and collect and summarize those data. The primary function was to ask past participants what they had gotten from their participation and what they thought was lacking. I was disappointed in the return rate (roughly 33%), and I think it was because they felt they had already provided a great deal of information to us while participating. In addition, mayors are almost always part-time employees, and they have other full-time jobs; they are busy people.

► **Are there areas where you feel your evaluation could be strengthened?**

I would like more formalized data on how the participants have implemented in their own municipalities what they learned from the LEAD program.

► **What have you learned about the specific impacts on target audience?**

I can think of three indicators off the top of my head. First, past participants frequently send others from their municipality to the LEAD program for training. Second, as President Stukel travels around the state, he often hears about the high quality of the LEAD program from mayors and other elected officials. Third, at the annual meeting of the IML, we hold an “alumni” session in the afternoon after the certificate ceremony; this session is heavily attended by former LEAD participants (i.e., usually about 60–70 people).

❖ **Do they better understand the benefits of, access to, and the resources available from the University as a result of their Partnership Illinois involvement?**

I have a clear sense that our external partners now view the University as a real partner interested in concrete problem solving—not just an ivory tower where people sit around and theorize. This is substantiated for me by the frequency with which President Stukel, when visiting Illinois municipalities, hears that they have a LEAD graduate.

► **Can you think of a critical incident that demonstrates impact on their understanding?**

I have many examples of expanded understanding of the resources the University can offer. For instance, Paul Craig and I were asked to go to a past participant’s city (North Chicago) and plan a retreat to assist the city leaders to work through significant problems they were having. Another mayor from Mammoth asked us to help organize a search conference. This is an alternative form of strategic planning with more grass-roots kinds of efforts. We worked with him to organize this, which involved bringing together major stakeholders from the community. We have many other examples.

Section III: University Partner Benefits

❖ **What impact has the project had on your research, teaching, and engagement with the community? Teaching examples?**

Part of my responsibilities here at the University involves classroom teaching, and I also conduct a variety of executive leadership programs with state- as well as international-level participants. I would say that the examples I draw from LEAD are used in both of these venues. For example, I used some of the cases developed for LEAD in an executive training I provided for Chinese officials recently. I teach courses on health law and policy and on legislative projects for the UI Law School. Once every two years, I teach an undergraduate honors course called the American Health Care System. I use examples from LEAD in all of these courses.

My own research interest is in part on knowledge utilization and the uses of social science and public policy regime on collaboration. This is a natural blend for my work with the LEAD program.

► **Annual Salary?**

There is no doubt in my mind that if I had taken the time I devoted to public engagement (a good fifteen to twenty hours a week) and devoted it instead to writing articles or a book, that my salary would look a lot better than it does now. In terms of the University's faculty reward system, I would say that I've paid a price.

I think the Chancellor and Steve Schomberg need to think more about how they're going to build public engagement into the salary structure. I know the Provost now is appointing a committee to once again look at the promotion and tenure guidelines with respect to public engagement. Currently faculty understand the University's reward structure and know they will not be rewarded salary-wise for work in public engagement.

❖ **Have there been specific benefits to IGPA?**

The answer to this question is somewhat complicated; Let me explain. Two components are involved: 1) my involvement with both Partnership Illinois and IGPA, and 2) the fact that I coordinate within IGPA an office called the Office of Public Management (OPM) that provides executive leadership and executive developments. The office consists of me and two academic professionals, one in Springfield and one in Chicago. I believe it's a complicated answer because I think there's a faculty perception within IGPA, then there's a separate, external world perception. There is no doubt in my mind that the work done by OPM has enhanced the external world image of IGPA. However, among IGPA faculty (the internal perception), some question still exists as to whether or not this work is a good fit. I think that, from the faculty perspective, since we are not a degree-earning unit, a less direct connection exists. The complication comes because they accept that IGPA does this mostly because it's the former director of IGPA doing it. They tend to think, "He seems to enjoy it, and it receives quite a bit of visibility on campus," but they aren't really sure of its value.

If I were to vanish from the earth tomorrow and a vote were conducted, the IGPA faculty might vote to discontinue OPM. I think the Chancellor and Steve, quite frankly, would also tell you that the only reason they support the IGPA partnership is because of the connection it has with me.

But, I do want to point out that IGPA faculty have been afforded research opportunities through this Partnership. For example, the department of Central Management Services requested an evaluation on campaign finance laws. They came to me about whom to contact because I had been involved in a similar project with the Department of Community Affairs. I put them in contact with the right faculty at IGPA.

Section IV: Collaborative Process

❖ Describe the type of collaboration that takes place in your project?

The natural collaboration grows from participants in the LEAD program connecting with others. Collaboration with the University typically occurs when someone familiar with the program contacts us, asking that we help with some specific issue or problem. By the way, we also sometimes bring IGPA faculty into those collaborations as well.

Section V: Long-Term Benefits

❖ What efforts have been made to replicate and disseminate to a wider audience?

The program is disseminated by participants returning to their municipalities and carrying back what they've learned. Additionally, nine other states have developed LEAD program models, and some Chinese officials are using this model of leadership development.

❖ To what extent have Partnership Illinois funds been able to leverage external grants or other resources?

We have used the funds in several ways; one was initially for the development of the curriculum. But we've also used PI funds to pay some of the outside speakers and about a third of Paul Craig's salary. We've hired an occasional research assistant to develop case materials and scenarios to use in the training. As far as leverage, I have no doubt that LEAD has been a catalyst for the new funding we just received to develop training for Municipal Clerks.

❖ What plans are in place to continue the activities of the Partnership? How will that be funded?

The Illinois Municipal League has contributed twenty thousand dollars annually for the past five years. DECCA has also contributed money; sometimes it is bundled in with the League money, and sometimes it is separate. The Illinois Municipal League has put aside a fund of \$100,000 (that will hopefully grow to \$200,000) as an ongoing fund for the Academy for Municipal Excellence.

Section VI: Suggestions

❖ Do you have any suggestions for how Partnership Illinois can be improved?

We need some type of campus-level advisory structure of faculty who understand the importance of public engagement. This mechanism needs to be given high visibility on campus and focus on encouraging the University's public engagement. This could very well be analogous to the Teaching Advisory Board. Steve needs one or two staff members that address these issues. The primary job of these individuals should be the institutionalization of new efforts and initiatives. Steve simply cannot do this alone.

This is the other aspect that's important: the Partnership Illinois grant recipients don't get together very often; we're not brought together as a group where energy and momentum could be created. Although we tried group meetings before, they didn't work well. Maybe that's because we never found the right topic, the right mode, or the best way to facilitate the interactions. We need to develop a community of practice, and those past activities didn't accomplish that goal.



**Henry Wilkinson
Interactive Turf Management
Interview Summary, 2003**

Section I: Impact and Products

❖ **Who was the original target audience, and has this audience changed?**

The original target audience was professionals in lawn-care and sod, sports facility, and golf course management industries in the State of Illinois and contiguous states. While the target audience has primarily stayed the same, it has expanded. Specifically, our project has caught the attention of the billion-dollar horticultural industry, which has grown both in awareness and support of this project; this has consequently meant its growth in awareness and support of the University within the context of its relationship with this project.

❖ **What impacts were you anticipating with this project?**

The anticipated impact was to reduce pesticide use, increase environmental awareness, reduce potential ground water pollution, and increase stakeholder awareness of the enormous intellectual resources of the University of Illinois. Additionally, an anticipated impact was to promote substantive and reciprocal benefits and interactions between Illinois stakeholders and University staff.

❖ **What were the major accomplishments of the project?**

While the project is not complete, we anticipate that it will continue for 15–20 years if established correctly. However, to date, we have created a network of over 100 stakeholders who, in turn, represent hundreds of thousands of other Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana stakeholders. We have reduced pesticide use on two major industry venues: golf courses and the Brookfield Zoo. In addition, we have created the foundation of the first integrated turf grass pest management program in the country, attracted more partners to the program and gained in support, hired an executive director of the program, and published our accomplishments.

Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role

❖ **What have you learned about the success and impact of this project?**

The Chicago District Golf Association (CDGA) is one of our partners. CDGA members have seen the benefits of the program and consequently have increased their support by donating facilities and other financial support. The Brookfield Zoo, another partner, was able to improve its facilities several-fold and increase its ability to generate new revenue while still

protecting its grounds. In response, the Zoo has assigned staff to work with the program and has pledged support for 2003 and beyond.

► **Specific impacts on target audience?**

We have been effective in improving the ability and confidence of the golf course audience/stakeholders in managing their turf problems with less dependence on pesticides. I base this impact on the comments they have made to me. In the future, we'll collect more data of a statistical nature to support these impacts of reduction in use of pesticides. Additionally, we know the program, which used the InteractiveTurf.com website, has been successful for the stakeholders because the number of golf course managers wanting to join the program has increased.

► **May we schedule a time and place to capture impact via digital camera?**

I can make a call and have some pictures from the Brookfield Zoo project sent to me. I can digitize them and send them to you (Cheryl Bullock) via e-mail.

❖ **How have your external partners benefited from the Partnership Illinois Collaboration?**

Let me give you an example. The Brookfield Zoo staff were concerned that holding more events on their malls would ruin the turf quality to the point of reducing the zoo experience for their customers. We enrolled the zoo staff in the InteractiveTurf.com program to monitor the health of the turf. We developed a high-intensity use program based on the expertise of University turf experts as well as those from other Partnership Illinois partners (CDGA, Illinois Turf Grass Foundation, and Morton Arboretum). The zoo held the event in question and raised \$500,000 while still preserving the turf. Zoo staff were so impressed that they photographed and wrote an article on the entire event.

❖ **Do they better understand the benefits of, access to, and resources available from the University as a result of their Partnership Illinois involvement?**

Specifically, the following comments by participants demonstrate their increased understanding of the University's benefits and resources. Participants indicated that:

- the University (Wilkinson's program) had the expertise they needed;
- the University (Wilkinson's program) was so well connected to other organizations in the state that they could call on them for real-time assistance and consultation;
- the University of Illinois (Wilkinson's program) cared enough to help them, even though they did not have any support;
- they found it significant that a University of Illinois professor would take the time to personally work with them and extend all the resources at his disposal to help them; and
- they hoped that in the future the program would consist of much more than a meeting or brief consultation and that it would extend more than one year.

Section III: University Partner Benefits

❖ What impact has the project had on your research, teaching, and engagement with the community? Promotion and tenure documents?

If promotion, tenure, or salary increases were the criteria used to evaluate the project's success, then it is a waste of time. I have seen no indication that our project has impacted my promotion and tenure, or that of any of our volunteers (nine in total). Nevertheless, being able to apply what we have learned at the University to help others is the true reward. If I only did what the University rewarded, I would never have done this project.

▶ Teaching examples?

I try to make use of all my activities for teaching purposes, a common process for all good teachers.

▶ Annual salary review?

None.

❖ How has the project benefited the University?

This is the type of project that directly meets the mission of a Land Grant Institution. We are learning, teaching, and extending our knowledge and resources to the stakeholders in Illinois. However, those stakeholders' perception of the University of Illinois needs continual reinforcement. This project has shown Illinois stakeholders that the University is and will continue to be a great and powerful resource.

▶ Graduate student involvement? Undergraduate research? Dissertations?

Students have been involved, but really only in a cursory manner. Because of insufficient funds, we were unable to include them any further, although this project has provided them excellent opportunities. This was one of the main problems we faced: the project was not supported fully in its second year, a decision that disappointed all the partners involved.

Section IV: Collaborative Process

❖ Describe the types of collaboration that take place in your project?

Our project fosters collaboration through:

- face-to-face planning sessions held twelve times per year;
- e-mail, instant messenger, and phone planning and troubleshooting;
- on-site visits, inspections, consultations, and planning meetings; and
- campus visits (seminars, planning sessions, and computer-assisted teaching).

❖ **Have there been any benefits of the collaboration beyond the scope of the project?**

Following are some of the benefits participants have received:

- friendships;
- interest from the Green Industry corporations;
- publications written by partners;
- new partners; and
- new volunteers for the project

Section V: Long-Term Benefits

❖ **What efforts have been made to replicate and disseminate to a wider audience? Journals? Media Publications? Networks? Replicated projects?**

The project made the following dissemination efforts: Website (www.InteractiveTurf.com); Brookfield Zoo publication; CDGA publication; and invited presentations at North Carolina, Indiana, and New Jersey.

▶ **May I have any materials available?**

When the materials are available, I will send them to you (Cheryl Bullock).

❖ **To what extent have Partnership Illinois funds been able to leverage external grants or other resources?**

We have not been able to leverage external grants or other resources to a great degree; the funds are too small to effectively allow for leveraging. This is a great weakness of the Partnership Illinois program. We are trying to win external funds through granting opportunities, but the University support is not sufficient to attract much attention. In fact, the low level of support sends a negative signal that the University must not think too much of this project.

❖ **What plans are in place to continue the activities of the Partnership? How will that be funded?**

We are attempting to raise funds from the various partners and stakeholders. This was the original goal, but the reduction in University support at the end of the first year was a detriment to the project. The responsibility to raise funds has now fallen on me, and I cannot devote enough time to it without negatively impacting the other aspects of my program.

It would be meaningful if the University helped one more year at a significant level (\$20,000). Such support could allow the project to reach two important objectives:

- Demonstrate that the administration (i.e., the campus) is behind this type of project, not just a single professor, his staff, and industry associates; and
- It could allow us to effectively leverage enough support to build a permanent funding base for the project.

▶ **What are the potential funding sources?**

Some of the potential funding sources include the Green industry, various stakeholders, private donations (golf courses), and USDA integrated pest management funding programs. Additionally, golf, sports, and turf organizations are potential funding sources.

Section VI: Suggestions

❖ **Do you have any suggestions for how Partnership Illinois can be improved?**

I offer the following suggestions:

- a better support system;
- more interaction with the projects;
- more marketing and extolling of people and projects that have made a difference; and
- offer more incentives to continue to those who get involved and make a difference.



Janet Reis
Formation of a Champaign County Women's Health Coalition
Interview Summary, 2003

Section I: Impact and Products

❖ **Who was the original target audience, and has this audience changed?**

Originally the Partnership was formed when Provena administrators approached me about using Partnership Illinois to expand women's health services in the Urbana-Champaign area. At the same time, a local partnership already existed between Public Health, Carle, and a cross section of other agencies formed to broadly talk about Medicaid funding problems and health care. The focus of the partnership discussions was planning efforts for local resources to respond to the crisis that would be created by the discontinuation of these services.

❖ **What impacts were you anticipating with this project?**

The conversations of the partnership group were primarily about broad principles of equity and access to health care. My initial goal was to use Partnership Illinois as a tool to bring together a group of health care providers to approach the complex issues associated with providing community health. I suggested this to the Carle administrator involved with the original group, and she was in agreement. With Schomberg's approval, we extended invitations to representatives from the various local institutions that provide direct health care services.

❖ **What were the major accomplishments of the project?**

This alliance has been formed, and productive dialogue has occurred. Discussion led to the formation of a community health care campus. The role I play as an impartial University entity is critical. As a University representative, I set the agenda, control the meetings, and make sure all parties (not just Carle) have equal say.

Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role

❖ **What have you learned about the success and impact of this project?**

Both tangible and less tangible impacts have resulted from this Partnership. A more tangible impact is the meetings, which actually resulted in productive discussions about how best to serve the health needs of disenfranchised members of the community. These discussions have included planning for both the logistics and personnel staffing issues associated with a community health care campus. A less tangible impact is the role I have been able to play as an outside mediator, with the credibility of the University backing me. At these meetings, the

University presence, through me, ensured that all voices were heard. As a representative of the University, I am able to help the various parties and facilitate decision making that keeps the best interests of community health care in mind.

❖ **How have your external partners benefited from the Partnership Illinois Collaboration?**

The benefit for the other partners, as I described above, is basically a forum where the University can serve as a major player to offset powerful voices that might dominate with their own agenda.

❖ **Do they better understand the benefits of, access to, and resources available from the University as a result of their Partnership Illinois involvement?**

I think Public Health definitely has a more positive, expanded understanding of the University and its resources. They've come to think of me as a personal contact at the University, a person to whom they can turn for help or advice when they are at critical junctures in their decision making. I think this is also true for Frances Nelson representatives.

▶ **Can you think of a critical incident that demonstrates impact on their understanding?**

Carle participants came to one of the meetings and said that they, along with Frances Nelson representatives, had identified the former Ants in Your Pants on Springfield as the new location for the Community Health Center. The location is not particularly convenient, and an estimated \$500,000 was needed for renovation. At the next meeting, Carle representatives reported that the facility would be around 200,000 in the red starting with the first year of operation. I responded that they had to understand that the University wanted to share the planning for the provision of quality community health care; however, presenting a plan that would start out losing money and that did not demonstrate a way to remedy this situation could not gain commitment from the University decision makers.

Section III: University Partner Benefits

❖ **What impact has the project had on your research, teaching, and engagement with the community? Teaching examples?**

It has given me, as well as the graduate student involved in the project, a very realistic understanding of the complexities and political realities of health care reform. As an academic, one doesn't get a clear perspective and understanding without actually getting out of the University setting and hearing the conversations that occur around the table. For example, I would not have the understanding I currently do if I hadn't actually heard an administrator's voice saying (on a recurring basis) that their institution would no longer see new Medicaid patients unless it was an emergency mandated by law.

I believe public engagement and research are not two completely separate faculty member functions: faculty can develop research projects from public engagement projects. For

example, I talked to a couple of junior faculty in landscape design, and one message I brought to them was the rich opportunities for applied work. For me specifically, this has translated into a research interest in integrative alternative models of community health care provision.

As far as impacting my public engagement, I believe that universities have a moral and ethical obligation to provide expertise to help communities resolve essential problems. If the Champaign-Urbana community doesn't get a better handle on access to primary health care, not only patients but also the community organizations providing health care and the broader business community will experience a negative impact. As a member of the University community, I believe I have a responsibility to provide my expertise to help with these issues. This project has allowed me to meet that responsibility.

❖ **How has the project benefited the University?**

The College of Medicine is considering medical residency placements through the Community Health Center, if a new facility becomes available. That's a concrete benefit for the University in terms of providing experiences for medical students. But another benefit is that this is the kind of project that illustrates for the community how the University can play an appropriate role in helping solve problems.

Section IV: Collaborative Process

❖ **Describe the type of collaboration that takes place in your project?**

My role is to convene the meetings and to control the agenda. The Carle entity, the other members of the group, and I conduct a fair number of behind-the-scenes discussions (sometimes with Steve's help because the politics are quite complicated).

❖ **How has that changed over time?**

The various constituencies have become much more relaxed over time. Repeatedly bringing people together in person to meet outside their regular work element has real value.

Section V: Long-Term Benefits

❖ **What efforts have been made to replicate and disseminate to a wider audience?**

A new campus, I think, would offer boundless possibilities to expand and serve a wider audience. I'm also hoping we can get to a point where we have a multidisciplinary subgroup of faculty that could help plan this new campus. They could bring their own disciplinary expertise to the effort (Landscaping, Art, Architecture, etc.), and it could become a model for the proper way to develop a community partnership with a university.

❖ **What plans are in place to continue the activities of the Partnership?**

The graduate student hasn't actually turned out to be that important. The more critical component has been meeting regularly, building a group with the University presence to balance the Carle presence. Those activities will continue because I will continue to be involved in the project.

▶ **What are the potential funding sources?**

On "good days," the potential for future funding from Carle exists. On "bad days," funds are not available. Another whole new dimension of this is a proposed Urbana school-based clinic, affiliated with one of its middle schools. Carle also has expressed interest in providing funding for this specifically.

Section VI: Suggestions

❖ **Do you have any suggestions for how Partnership Illinois can be improved?**

I would suggest having the Chancellor's office formally contact the unit heads about the importance of public service for their faculty as well as for the University as a whole. One can approach research in many ways, and faculty interested in applied community-based work should be encouraged to do so and their work valued. As it now stands, the traditional notion of scholarship which actually makes it more difficult for faculty to be relevant and engaged with the community needs to be rethought.



**Karen Hewitt and Ann Rasmus
Artworks
Interview Summary, 2003**

Section I: Impact and Products

❖ Who was the original target audience, and has this audience changed?

The original target audience was teens and younger students served by those teens through their participation in the project. Originally, we had established a mentoring program of sorts where these teens would work with younger kids.

Currently, the mentoring component has changed, but the target audience of both younger children and teens remains and includes children from pre-kindergarten to high school. The geographic location of the target audience has probably expanded. Initially, it was almost exclusively serving only Champaign-Urbana children. But now, with our modified version of the project, we are not only going out to groups of children from the Champaign-Urbana area, but also those in outlying areas such as Monticello, White Heath, and St. Joseph.

By way of background, except for its initial connection with Stratton, the program has never been school based prior to either of our (Hewitt and Rasmus) involvement with the project. Rather, it has been more of a community-based program, involving groups like Don Moyer's Boys and Girls Club and the Lakeside Terrace Club through Public Housing. We've expanded that to include other community and after-school programs.

❖ What impacts were you anticipating with this project?

The impacts we anticipated were increased community awareness of the resources the Krannert Art Museum has to offer children in Champaign. We were particularly interested in the underserved population—children who aren't likely to have the opportunity to visit a museum such as Krannert. They, or their parents, might not even be aware that such a museum exists in their own community, specifically one that is both accessible and free of charge. We also anticipated the impact of actually increasing the art skills and knowledge base of some of these children.

❖ What were the major accomplishments of the project?

Probably the best way to answer this question is to talk about a typical session conducted as part of the Partnership Illinois grant. Andrea, the .25 undergraduate Art History student assigned to deliver the program, goes out to a variety of places with after-school programs (these have included the Douglass Center, the Boys and Girls Club, Public Housing, various after-school programs, churches, and scout troops) to work with the children on site.

Although she is flexible when appropriate, she uses a basic, three-part program. However, before beginning her basic program, she completes an introduction, asking who in the audience has been to the museum and what they thought while they were there. She uses those responses, or lack of responses, to build a rapport with the audience. She then talks about museums in general and also specifics about how these children might end up visiting Krannert (with their family, or on a field trip). She often gives specific information such as the bus lines that provide service to Krannert. After this introduction, she begins the program. The first part, which includes a teaching unit that varies depending on the age and interest of the audience, includes slides and is very interactive. For example, several presentations she made this month included the use of images from the African gallery and a discussion about mask making and why someone might wear a mask. The second part of the program usually involves a hands-on component, some type of an art project that relates to the particular educational topic covered earlier. Finally, she extends a very specific invitation to the children in the audience and to their families to visit the Krannert Art Museum. Along with the invitation, she provides written information about upcoming events, such as program titles and dates, and often includes a flyer or a poster. The thought is that other family members will also read this literature. Additionally, before she leaves, Andrea talks with the organizer of the outreach (e.g., an activity director) about the concrete possibility of bringing the group into the museum for a tour.

Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role

❖ What have you learned about the success and impact of this project?

One of the project's impacts is an increase in visits from after-school programs; many event organizers have taken advantage of Andrea's invitation to schedule a field trip to the museum. Since we began our version of the Partnership Illinois project, the frequency of this type of scheduled visit has definitely risen from a few to a pretty good stream. Currently, we average about one tour of this type every two weeks, with around twenty children in each tour. In terms of our program's impact based on the number served through Andrea's outreach efforts, our program reaches around twenty children on an average of twice a week.

▶ How have you learned it?

Andrea takes an evaluation form with her; after each presentation, the organizer of the event either completes it on site or mails it back to us. The questions involve whether the program was age appropriate, if it held the children's interest, and whether it met the organizer's expectations. We read them and share them with Andrea. In a couple of instances, we have used the results to make changes. Additionally, I (Ann Rasmus) have done observations of the programs themselves.

▶ May we schedule a time and place to capture impact via digital camera?

We will take digital pictures of Andrea at one of her upcoming presentations and send those to Kristine Campbell. We will also send Cheryl Bullock information about the number of children served through the program.

❖ **How have your external partners benefited from the Partnership Illinois Collaboration?**

The financial partners have changed since the beginning of this project. They still receive the services, but no longer contribute to the budget. When I talk about the partners in response to this question, I am referring to the various organizers for the groups that receive the program's services. The benefits external partners receive are fairly obvious: the children our program serves receive both educational and skill-based art experiences they would not have received otherwise.

Another benefit is that the children, as well as their families, have increased familiarity with Krannert. We have seen familiar faces among the visitors at the museum—children we recognize from an after-school tour or from one of Andrea's programs.

▶ **Can you think of a critical incident that demonstrates these benefits?**

We particularly noticed some familiar faces at this year's Krannert Art Museum Family Festivals, which are held in conjunction with the School of Art and Design's *Art Education Saturday* program.

Section III: University Partner Benefits

❖ **What impact has the project had on your research, teaching, and engagement with the community?**

The project has helped us to be more aware of the community in which we're engaging, and has helped us build relationships. For example, I now get calls from individuals with whom I didn't used to be in contact before this project. Just recently, I took a call from the Director of the Douglass Library looking for information about another community resource person she thought I might know.

During the day, most of the museum's interaction is with University faculty and students. We know that visits by younger K-12 students who come into the museum after regular school hours are almost always because they learned about it through one of Andrea's presentations. We are also taking the museum outside the gallery confines and into the community, making information available to numerous different community groups with differing demographics, geographic locations, age groups, and education levels. Working toward that type of diversity is a high priority for the museum director.

Section IV: Collaborative Process

❖ **Describe the types of collaboration that takes place in your project?**

Event organizers first call the museum and speak with either Andrea or me (Rasmus). Interested parties include a wide range of individuals, many from some form of after-school program. They often have many questions about the program and how we could tailor it for

their particular needs. For example, if the program studies a particular topic, we work with them to capitalize on that through the program we'll provide.

Section V: Long-Term Benefits

❖ What efforts have been made to replicate and disseminate to a wider audience?

We recently conducted an interview with Black Thought (a local newspaper that has a periodic circulation). Once we have time, and if any money becomes available, we will work toward making more regional and national presentations on the project.

❖ What plans are in place to continue the activities of the Partnership? How will that be funded?

We get general operating support grants from the Illinois Art Council and the Institute for Library and Museum Services. Because this project is such an important aspect of what we feel a museum ought to be doing, we use these funds to pay for project personnel. We also hope to get supplementary funds from organizations like the Boys and Girls Club and C-U Housing Authority. We have certainly tried those avenues, but have discovered the following problem: service groups have erratic funding, at best. We have made presentations at their boards, written letters, had phone calls, and been promised money; however, it has not come through because they've changed their mind. They say, "Yes," but then the money never materializes.

Section VI: Suggestions

❖ Do you have any suggestions for how Partnership Illinois can be improved?

The process has been very clear, straightforward, and encouraging. It's just hard to know what specific outcomes Partnership Illinois is requesting or requiring. More fully understanding the expectations associated with Partnership Illinois funding would be helpful. We know our goals, and we have certainly met and exceeded those, but more articulation from PI administration would be helpful.



**Matt Cheney and Vernon Burton
River Web
Interview Summary, 2003**

Section I: Impact and Products

❖ **Who was the original target audience, and has this audience changed?**

The original target audience is and has for a long time been high school students, particularly those in East St. Louis. Generally speaking, these are students who have often been denied opportunities to learn about their local history, heroes, and defining events. We are also working to bring this information to the collegiate level. We would like to make River Web more accessible to freshmen, sophomores, and survey classes, for example. These would primarily be students in the discipline of Education with goals of becoming educators. By exposing these students to River Web, we encourage them to use online technologies, in general (and this technology, specifically) with the students they will eventually teach. In this way, the project will grow to have two target audiences: the original underserved high school students and college students studying to become future teachers.

❖ **What impacts were you anticipating with this project?**

Our primary goal was to open up avenues of local historical knowledge, in an interesting and engaging manner, to underserved high school students from the East St. Louis area. We gained another anticipated impact of eventually encouraging future teachers to more actively use learning technologies in their future classrooms.

❖ **What were the major accomplishments of the project?**

We've established a system of learning modules on various instructional topics. For example, we have a module on Steamboat Technology Evolution. When the student logs into the site, the teacher can pre-select which module the student will use that particular day.

A major accomplishment of River Web is that it provides students active and engaging information about East St. Louis in the 19th century (from around 1800 up to around 1917). We've worked hard, of course, to preserve integrity of the data, but also to make the site both engaging and meaningful for the students. For example, River Web provides information about a large race riot that is important to understand in terms of the transitions East St. Louis has experienced. The area used to be very affluent, with a lot of rich white people living there. Through a series of progressions, it became much poorer, and the racial demography changed. Race riots were a show—sort of cultivation—of this change. Providing information such as this in a manner in which students will actually learn is a major accomplishment.

Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role

❖ What have you learned about the success and impact of this project?

What I've learned is by way of comparison—contrasting how we do it with how it has been done incorrectly in the past. I have personally taken about fifteen courses online, starting as far back as 1998. I've often struggled through these courses, not because the material was hard but because they have not been taught particularly effectively. This is one of the things about River Web of which I've become convinced: its success and impact lies in the manner in which it engages the learner. For optimal learning benefit, students need to do more than just look at the computer screen and absorb the information; they also need to interact with the material. When you give students the opportunity to look at letters, diagrams, and pictures, then you are allowing them to create their own content, and this is more meaningful. With River Web, students are given the opportunity to be historians and to engage themselves in the material. It is a natural jump of logic to believe that their learning will increase dramatically because of this engagement.

▶ How have you learned it?

We're working with the PT3 program in the College of Education to conduct an evaluation of River Web's impact. We plan to conduct a survey of students using River Web to ask about the difference its active environment makes and also have them compare River Web with more traditional methods. Another evaluation study we're planning is to examine whether or not students take more ownership in the information because of the way River Web presents the material.

▶ May we schedule a time and place to capture impact via digital camera?

I know Kris Campbell, and if I have some pictures of actual students using River Web, I'll send them to her. I could also send her some screen captures from the teacher interface of River Web itself.

❖ How would you describe the extent of use? For example, could you talk about the numbers and the locations of those using River Web?

Regarding the location of River Web users, we have no easy way to tell if River Web is being accessed from Moscow or from Champaign; we just know that it is being accessed. River Web gets somewhere in the neighborhood of several hundred hits a day. While numerous students are using it as a result of school projects, I also think people who are just interested in East St. Louis history are accessing River Web.

❖ **How have your external partners benefited from the Partnership Illinois Collaboration?**

One of the benefits the external partners receive from River Web is the demonstration that the U of I cares about students and community members, not just in Champaign-Urbana, but also in other parts of Illinois. Our willingness to put our time and energy into a project that is not going to get anyone tenure or promotion and is often discouraged among professional historians is significant. I think it gives a better impression of the U of I, that it is not an enclosed ivory tower but that its representatives are willing to engage with the communities of Illinois. The second thing is equally important: we showcase ourselves in terms of technology. The University has a strong reputation, in general, of being one of the leaders in information technology. Our program shows that at Illinois, we are using technology in ways that go beyond the traditional. For example, we show that we're not just writing computer programs to conduct data analysis and create spreadsheets; we're using them with the humanities.

Section III: University Partner Benefits

❖ **How has the project benefited the University? Graduate student involvement? Undergraduate research? Dissertations?**

Certainly, one of the reasons I applied for graduate school at the UIUC in Library and Information Science is because of my interest in making digital records easily available to a wider range of people. I am going to be working on River Web through next year, striving to expand its mission and outreach and to modify and refine the techniques we use to aid the effort of portraying and presenting information. This experience will absolutely shape my graduate school education.

Two other undergraduate students are also heavily involved with the River Web project. One helps with grant writing as well as budgeting issues and actually setting up the system. The other student works primarily with the database and programming. While we have been paid for our work on River Web, we have also used it as an independent study credit (without pay). I'm proud of the work we've done, and it has been an incredible experience for us as students to be part of something this important.

Section IV: Collaborative Process

❖ **Describe the types of collaboration that take place in your project.**

Vernon has done quite a bit of collaboration with teachers from high schools in East St. Louis as well as with Bill Sutton at University High School in Urbana. I accompanied Vernon on some of those trips to East St. Louis and also met with teachers who collaborated by providing their educational input. In terms of the archival and historical collaborations, we met with museum historians and archivists in East St. Louis, as well as people at the Illinois Historical Survey. They helped us locate documents and also gave us a good idea of what the documents said, how they were related, and how they could be used in River Web.

Section V: Long-Term Benefits

❖ What efforts have been made to replicate and disseminate to a wider audience?

Vernon has made a number of presentations about River Web. For example, just last week he presented to the Department of Business and Administration at one of their lunches. He talked about River Web in the context of both humanities and social science computing. Also, an article has been published on a CD entitled Wayfair (this is a compilation of how computing sciences link with social science and humanities). Vernon and I also attended a meeting at the National Academy of Science in January. We discussed River Web quite a bit at the various round tables held during that meeting.

One of the main features of River Web is to fulfill our internal mission to democratize the process of education by opening up local histories to underserved populations. We've created River Web with the capability of being fairly easily expanded to other locations besides East St. Louis. We're using advanced technologies to link letters to diaries, pictures, and other historical documents. If someone wanted to do the history of Des Moines, for example, all I would have to do is get the relevant historical information and link it into the River Web interface. I'd write narratives and redesign the educational modules, but the technical aspect is already in place. I can create an online education learning module by doing local research on any city I choose. We plan on doing this and disseminating River Web in this manner to a much larger audience.

❖ What plans are in place to continue the activities of the Partnership?

We know that the three students working on the project will continue next year. We have received some funding through the College of Education, and I've spent the past six or seven months writing grants for continued funding. These have included grants to NSF, NEH, and the Department of Education. We've been asked to resubmit some of the grants that originally were rejected. We feel confident that they will have a much better chance of being accepted once they have been rewritten.

Section VI: Suggestions

❖ Do you have any suggestions for how Partnership Illinois can be improved?

I think more information about Partnership Illinois and its mission would be beneficial. When I first started with this project, I was clueless about its purpose. I thought program staff just gave money to projects they liked; I didn't realize Partnership Illinois had a public engagement angle.



**Cynthea Geerdes
Fostering IDAs for Champaign County
Interview Summary, 2003**

Section I: Impact and Products

❖ Who was the original target audience, and has this audience changed?

The original target audience included families or individuals whose household income was less than or equal to 200 percent of the federal poverty level. This target audience will remain the same because it is mandated by federal rules governing the Individual Development Accounts Program. Since our project's inception, our efforts have changed: not only are we providing services to more of this target population, we've become savvier about the best prospects for successful participation from the target audience.

For example, after working with clients in crisis, we learned that these clients are not asset ready. The reality is that the poorest of the poor are not good candidates for our program until they are further stabilized through emergency services. Candidates who have some job stability are much more likely to succeed in our program. Although the target audience is still the same because the funders require it, we are becoming more selective in our interview and application process within that audience.

❖ What impacts were you anticipating with this project?

We anticipated increasing the financial literacy of community members and encouraging the development of new efforts in the community. The long-term impacts involve changed behaviors in the areas of budgeting and making wise credit decisions.

❖ What were the major accomplishments of the project?

First, let me give you some background on the program itself. The participants attend classes in financial education. In these classes, they receive ten hours of general education and six hours of information specific to their asset goal. Participants open a bank account (called an Individual Development Account [IDA])—another component of the program—and are required to save periodically, we hope monthly. When they finish the class, our program matches their savings, two dollars for every dollar they have saved (up to \$1,000 saved). This money never goes into their pocket—it must be used to purchase an asset. Research has shown that the poor often have no assets, and that asset accumulation is a critical element to climbing out of poverty. Sometimes this money is used to partially buy or repair a home or a car, or to start a small business. It can also be used to return to school because education is considered an asset.

In terms of accomplishments, as of early March 2003, thirteen people have graduated from the program and ten are close to graduating.

Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role

❖ What have you learned about the success and impact of this project?

We've learned that asset-ready participants are more likely to succeed than those still in emergency situations. We've also learned a great deal that has helped us improve our curriculum.

▶ How have you learned it?

Michael Sherraden, the creator of IDAs, runs the Center for Social Development at Washington University. The Center has a tremendous amount of expertise with regard to asset accumulation and IDAs. We were lucky in that Steve Anderson, an Assistant Professor in UIUC's School of Social Work with strong ties to the Center, was hired by one of our project's major funders to evaluate all three pilot programs, and we were able to be part of that process. Consequently, we have benefited from the results of a very professional evaluation, and we have used those results to provide better delivery of financial literacy education. We also have results from a pre- and post-test that show about a 15% increase in participants' knowledge about financial matters.

❖ Do the external partners better understand the benefits of, access to, and resources available from the University as a result of their Partnership Illinois involvement?

We've been amazed, for one thing, with the number of tellers at our partner's banks who are now applying to participate in the program. Also, one of the Housing Authority employees has made an application. Here's another example: partners have asked for our help in other ways beyond those offered in the program. I personally get quite a few phone calls from people who have heard me speak. They say they didn't know about the clinic before hearing me and now would like to use our services.

Section III: University Partner Benefits

❖ How has the project benefited the University?

Prospective law students are aware of their need for experience in clinical legal education, and no other clinics like mine exist in the country.

▶ Graduate student involvement?

I personally take eight new students per semester, then usually two more who are returning for advanced credit. Those working in the clinic receive four credit hours for their participation. They are required to work 180 hours per semester, which includes about 15 hours per week beyond their time in the classroom.

Section IV: Collaborative Process

❖ Describe the types of collaboration that take place in your project.

The project fosters collaboration on many levels, including partner-project, participant-project, participant-partner, and partner-partner collaborations. In terms of the very basic level of participation, the project has three board directors, and we meet at least monthly to collaborate. The meetings are held off campus at the external partners' locations. For example, we have held these meetings at the Legal Aid office, Bank Illinois, and Busey Bank.

❖ Have there been any benefits of the collaboration beyond the scope of the project?

We are continually discovering new benefits, mostly associated with identifying new things we can do together that we hadn't previously considered. For example, we're working on an alternative payday loan store.

Here's another type of example: a church sponsored my attendance at a workshop that was beneficial for the clinic and the program. While attending, I learned that we should be helping with clients' asset readiness and requiring them to attend ten hours of sessions before even opening a bank account.

Section V: Long-Term Benefits

❖ What efforts have been made to replicate and disseminate to a wider audience? Journals? Media Publications?

Much has been written about the project and the clinic. Most recently, we were mentioned in the Federal Reserve Bank newsletter. The local newspaper and several of our funders have also written about our program. Professionally, I have been providing consultations and presenting at various conferences. For example, this May, I'm speaking at a conference of Clinical Legal Educators, a subsection of the American Associates for the Law School, our largest professional organization.

❖ To what extent have Partnership Illinois funds been able to leverage external grants or other resources?

I received \$60,000 from Partnership Illinois and was then able to leverage \$10,000 more from the Champaign County Board of Realtors and about \$20,000 from local banks and churches. Additionally, we just received a federal Assets for Independence Act grant in the amount of \$100,000. Other services, such as web development, server support, and space for meetings, have also been leveraged.

❖ **What plans are in place to continue the activities of the Partnership? How will that be funded?**

We have to match the federal grant money with non-federal funds in order to continue in the short term. We've been able to cover about \$80,000 and still need to find \$20,000 more.

▶ **What are the potential funding sources?**

The banks are required through the Community Reinvestment Act to demonstrate that they are actively serving citizens in their community. We fit in nicely with their requirement of service to underserved clients, and they can fulfill this obligation by giving us money. We're working on connecting with the banks in this capacity. Also, legislative efforts continue at both the state and federal levels to promote, streamline, and mechanize IDAs into a defined financial product similar to the genesis and evolution of IRAs.

Section VI: Suggestions

❖ **Do you have any suggestions for how Partnership Illinois can be improved?**

The individual approach isn't the most effective in my opinion, and it would be better to fund a center for community partnership. This could be somewhat like a Beckman Institute or modeled after the Center for Community Partnerships at Penn. While it's a huge commitment from the campus administration, those of us committed to public service would love to see a community collaboration center created.



Richard Jaehne
Illinois Volunteer Fire Service Statewide Summit
Interview Summary, 2003

Section I: Impact and Products

❖ **What are some of the major accomplishments of this past year?**

The target audience and outcomes have expanded in that we've included more emphasis on the Terrorism Task Force's objectives (Objective 6: Reach Local Officials and Objective 3: Unified Incident Command) in our Homeland Security Workshops. We've expanded the number of workshops we present and have reached close to 6,000 emergency service personnel in our various workshops spanning the state. For example, we've just held one that was sponsored by the Illinois Municipal League and conducted in conjunction with the LEAD Academy. Along with adding more workshops, we've added components (key questions and protocols) to our workshops.

Another clear accomplishment is that the Homeland Security Summit report, along with a three-year report from the Terrorism Task Force, is being distributed to the Governor and his new administration, as well as to every state legislator in Illinois. The last four pages provide specific recommendations each member of the Task Force has reviewed. About half of them have checkmarks because one or more of the committees have taken action as a result of those specific recommendations. Another impact is that I conduct dozens of briefings throughout the state disseminating what we've learned from the workshops, reaching thousands of state officials in this manner.

Section II: External Partner Benefits and Role

❖ **What have you learned about the success and impact of this project over the past year?**

We've learned that because of these workshops, the process of pulling together interagency and interdisciplinary emergency teams is being influenced throughout the state. One example of this is how well the train derailment in Tamaroa, Illinois, was handled last month. Emergency workers responded to the situation using the process highlighted in our workshops. In addition, those involved with the containment had been participants in our workshops. Our workshops present the process, the decision making necessary to deal (in an interagency and interdisciplinary manner) with seven deadly threats. At least two of those deadly threats (explosive and chemical) were present in the Tamaroa train derailment, which caused a release of at least three deadly chemicals. The team reacted quickly and efficiently, and a major disaster was averted. Key personnel told me that the information they learned from the Homeland Security workshops helped them make the decisions and quickly pull together the necessary agencies.

Section III: University Partner Benefits

❖ How has the project benefited the University?

One clear benefit is the connectivity that has occurred between those doing research and the real-life functions and services associated with crisis management. For example, members of the University's Sandbox Team (Engineering) attended a recent workshop and listened to the stories of those performing emergency services. Dr. Liu and his team of five researchers came to a Homeland Security workshop and dialogued with 25 elected officials, including the workshop host, the Village President of Oakbrook. This type of exchange allows the University to define the real issues of performance necessary to both manage and respond to crises.

Section IV: Collaborative Process

❖ Have there been any additional benefits of the collaboration this year?

The paradigm I use is this: it is 1946 all over again. In 1946, the National Security Act was passed, and this redesigned the Department of Defense. International institutions were created, and the country focused externally on how to create national and international security institutions to manage nuclear, national, and international security threats throughout the world. Post 9/11, we have the passage of the Homeland Security Act, which focuses on terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and internal security issues that must be contained on American soil. We now have to ask 1946 questions from the perspective of homeland security issues at home, not overseas. New questions have arisen, and in order to help answer these questions, the University will need to do some rethinking concerning its role as a center of learning policy development. A side benefit of the collaboration that occurs at Homeland Security workshops is a jump-start on this role; University partners are collaborating with emergency service providers, and the dialogues have begun.

Section V: Long-Term Benefits

❖ To what extent have Partnership Illinois funds been able to leverage external grants or other resources?

We typically have little problem finding those interested in sponsoring us in at least some fashion. For example, we are working with Motorola to receive funding and develop a partnership to create an interdisciplinary Homeland Security Research Laboratory at UIUC.

Other agencies that have provided either real dollars or in-kind donations include the Emergency Management Agency, Public Health, the State Police, and EPA. Another type of leverage is local support for the workshops. Every workshop has a local sponsor and coordinator. These coordinators have included mayors, city managers, and first responders from around the state.

The Terrorism Task Force paid for a thousand copies of our report to be printed in color and distributed to each Illinois state legislator, along with a letter on Task Force letterhead signed by both the Task Force chairman and me.