



The Anti-Violence Partnership

A University/Multi-Agency Collaboration

**Prepared By
Susan E. Roche, Ph.D., M.S.S.W.*
Associate Professor,
Department of Social Work
University of Vermont**

On Behalf of the Anti-Violence Partnership Steering Committee

***Dr. Roche may be reached at: 437 Waterman Bldg., 85 South
Prospect St., Burlington, VT 05405, 802-656-1200, sroche@zoo.uvm.edu**

Table of Contents

Core Philosophy and Mission: Adopted 1/01	1
Vision	1
Mission Statement.....	1
Partnership Philosophy	1
Understanding of Violence	1
Values and Ethics	1
A Multi-cultural Context for Scholars, Practitioners, Activists, and Students.....	2
Partnership Goals	3
Example Types of Partnership Activities.....	4
Discovering information.....	4
Sharing information	4
Providing technical assistance	4
Organizational Structure.....	5
Membership.....	5
Membership Responsibilities.....	5
Division of Labor.....	5
Steering Committee	6
Steering Committee Responsibilities	6
Steering Committee Size, Composition and Term of Office.....	8
Budget and Finance.....	10
Ad-hoc Committees	10
Formal Leadership of the Steering Committee and Partnership.....	11
The Co-Chairs of the Steering Committee	11
The Partnership Between the Co-Chairs and the Coordinator	12
Executive Committee.....	12
Partnership Staff	12
Primary Administrator(s).....	13
Position responsibilities and title.....	13
Position requirements and desirable qualifications.....	13
Project Teams.....	14

Appendix A: History of the Anti-Violence Partnership	15
Appendix B: Augmenting the 'Vision, Mission, Philosophy.....	24
Appendix C: Organizational Governance Principles	25
Appendix D: Original Literature Review	28
References.....	33

The Anti-Violence Partnership: Community Collaboration at The University of Vermont

Core Philosophy and Mission: Adopted 1/01

Vision

We Envision

The creation of a safe, just and civil society.

Mission Statement

The “Anti-Violence” Partnership supports and sustains unified approaches within the community and the world to understand and change the existence and acceptance of violence and works toward its prevention and elimination. The Partnership promotes, protects, and enhances the quality of life of those victimized by a culture of violence.

Partnership Philosophy

The Partnership subscribes to the belief that safety is a fundamental human right and that violence is a violation of this right. This philosophy is translated into action through current and potential links between the scholars and staff at UVM, local and state agencies, and the global human rights and anti-violence community.

Understanding of Violence

We understand violence as any individual or group-initiated action or inaction that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual, or psychological abuse. This includes, but is not limited to, threats of such acts, coercion, or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life.

The causes and consequences of violence are complex and multi-faceted. Violence itself is multi-dimensional; it is biological, sociological, psychological, emotional, economic, environmental, and political. The interacting contexts of oppression contribute to and perpetuate violence in our society.

Values and Ethics

The mission of the Partnership rests on the core values of *safety, agency, restoration, accountability, and justice*. The core values of the Partnership inform broad ethical principles. These principles guide its practices, relationships, and self-assessment, particularly in making decisions regarding ethical issues. These are set forth as follows:

- The Partnership's central ethical obligations are to protect and advance the right to safety and to promote the community's responsibility and capacity to ensure it.
- The Partnership places the interests of those who are endangered and victimized by violence above its own self-interests.
- The Partnership promotes meaningful victim/survivor participation in defining safe and just practices.
- The Partnership holds its own practices and relationships to the same standards of accountability that it promotes for others.
- The Partnership pursues social and individual change.

A Multi-cultural Context for Scholars, Practitioners, Activists, and Students

One of the reasons for locating this agency-university partnership at the University of Vermont is to take advantage of the compatibility between the university's research, teaching, and scholarly service purposes and the goals of the Partnership. The human resources of a teaching and research Partnership include the faculty and the next generation of professional practitioners. The university's mission enables the development of personnel and allies for anti-violence work. The university's curricula and technical capacities provide the means of exposing them to, and teaching them to develop and apply, up to date human rights and anti-violence research, theory, policies, and practices around the world.

A global human rights network of researchers, practitioners, and social movement activists has emerged in the past 50 years whose work is directed toward all forms of violence as a human rights violation. The university's resources also include the current and potential links between scholars and staff at UVM and this loosely connected global human rights and anti-violence network. The Partnership will seek sources of external support to bring individuals from around the world to work with the Partnership in a variety of capacities. They will be sought for example, as key note speakers, interdisciplinary seminar leaders, researchers, and lecturers. Also, it will seek to

develop international and intra-national human rights and anti-violence exchange opportunities for scholars, practitioners, and students.

In turn, the university and the agency partners in the Partnership can expect this Partnership feature to attract students from this country and state who wish to learn in a multi-cultural, global context with immediate, local application. Among these individuals, it will be likely that practitioners in anti-violence organizations may want to attend UVM to earn an advanced degree in a field that will deepen their expertise. Likewise, some agency partners may want to enter into agreements with the Partnership which will allow for personnel exchanges between Vermont and international or intra-national organizations. The Partnership also might offer opportunities for agency personnel to take sabbaticals at the Partnership or for university scholars to take sabbaticals in partner agencies.

These and additional possibilities will contribute to the reputations of agencies, the state, and the university as vibrant communities engaged in the development and promotion of cutting edge anti-violence practice, policy, and academia. The aspirations for the Partnership to act globally as well as locally will position the partners to make global and local contributions to the kinds of collaborative approaches necessary for addressing the complex social issues of violence and its consequences. Current world events add emphasis to this vision of the Partnership as set forth months before September 11, 2001.

Partnership Goals

- To support existing partnerships and develop new community collaboratives aimed at promoting sustainable conditions of safety and security.**
- To work to bring about social, political, and cultural change.**
- To advocate for public policies and community awareness.**
- To serve as an educational resource.**
- To conduct relevant research and evaluation on the etiology and effect of violence.**
- To develop and find effective methodologies to reduce or eliminate violence.**

Example Types of Partnership Activities

Discovering information .

- **Researching and evaluating violence and its prevention and intervention**
- **Facilitating dialogue between anti-violence researchers and practitioners**
- **Assessing gaps in anti-violence policies and services for identified populations**

Sharing information .

- **Producing educational materials on violence nationally and internationally**
- **Compiling and making available information on best anti-violence practices**
- **Acting as a clearinghouse for anti-violence information & activities**
- **Providing information on related resources, grants, and conferences**
- **Facilitating and providing related cross training with UVM departments and colleges, other universities, community colleges, and training Partnerships**

Providing technical assistance .

- **Collaborating and building coalition through anti-violence networks**
- **Assisting organizations to conduct related social audits and policy reviews**
- **Providing assistance to anti-violence trainers and workshop facilitators**
- **Providing anti-violence policy development consultation**
- **Assisting with related grant writing and other funding strategies**

- Developing academic and agency training curricula which integrates awareness, ethics, understanding, and skills of anti-violence work
- Engaging students in related practica, internships, volunteer activities, and mentoring
- Assisting with related program development, implementation and evaluation.

Organizational Structure

Membership

The proposed Partnership membership is large, open, and inclusive of organizations and individuals who desire to participate. Moreover, it is the aspiration of the Partnership developers that the membership represent diverse stakeholders, most especially the survivors of various forms of violence. This diversity includes those members of stakeholder groups who experience violence and exploitation on the basis of race, class, gender, sexuality, age, and disability, to name a few.

Membership Responsibilities

The membership will establish the purposes, processes, and accomplishments of the Partnership using democratic processes. The membership determines the mission, philosophy, and goals of the Partnership, and therefore, only the membership can decide to amend them. An overarching Partnership policy document (e.g., bylaws or operating policies) will designate the nature of the work of the Partnership to be conducted in the larger, open group (e.g., collaboration/coalition building, review of accomplishments, approval of annual priorities, information sharing).

All work of the membership and employees is to be planned and evaluated for its congruence with the mission and philosophy. The membership will meet no more than quarterly, and no less than semi-annually, at least one meeting of which will be known as the Annual Meeting. At the annual meeting the membership will review the past year's accomplishments, consider new and emerging issues, practices, and research related to the Partnership mission, and approve the Partnership priorities for the next twelve months.

Division of Labor

The central governance committee of the Partnership is known as the Steering Committee. To mitigate the potential drawbacks of open membership

structures, a division of labor and designated work flow will be designated by the Steering Committee and ad hoc committees. The first priority of all committees will be to promote sustainable safety and security from violence for all people, as per the Partnership vision statement.

The policies set forth by the Steering Committee will be implemented by the Committee's members, a small Partnership staff, and project and administrative teams. A description of the proposed Steering Committee, subcommittees, staff, and teams follows.

Steering Committee

The proposed Steering Committee is a smaller, open, yet less inclusive entity formed by and accountable to the membership.¹ As such Steering Committee membership is intended to represent proportionately, the desired diversity of the Partnership membership.

The Steering Committee will function as a governance *and* advisory body. Within the parameters set for Partnerships at the University of Vermont, it will provide leadership, stewardship, and trusteeship for the Partnership's business and affairs. Therefore, it will function as the legislative and executive policy body and oversee the operations of the Partnership in conjunction with the operating and personnel policies of the University. In matters of University decisions which affect the business of the Partnership, the Steering Committee will serve advisory and liaison functions between key university personnel (e.g., Deans, Department Chairs/Directors, and faculties) and the partner organizations. Parity and mutual determination among the Partnership partners are the ideals against which these exchanges will be evaluated.

Steering Committee Responsibilities

The primary responsibility of the Steering Committee will be to ensure quality decision making and follow-through regarding all aspects of Partnership activities and their impact on victims and survivors of violence. Quality decision making is defined herein as decisional processes and consequences which are congruent with the Partnership mission, philosophy, and goals. The focus of the

¹ Research and theory suggest that open membership structures offer wide access, broad inclusiveness, and creative possibilities. By the same token, they tend to mitigate against setting and implementing clear agendas, because of the difficulty involved in resolving differences and coordinating the actions of members who participate idiosyncratically. More tightly defined membership structures may be more able to gain agreement and implement agendas, but they may exclude key stakeholders and restrict the freedom of working groups or even limit funding sources. The proposed membership structure takes these points into account.

Steering Committee's decisions will be to sustain, enhance, and improve the functioning and contributions of the Partnership. As the trustee of the Partnership's purpose, the membership will delegate to the Committee final decision making responsibilities on all matters involving Partnership policies, relations, and practices.

The basic responsibility areas of the Steering Committee stem from its overall responsibility for the policies and maintenance of the Partnership. They include the following ten types of responsibility:²

- 1. Fiduciary: Collective and individual responsibility for the conduct of the Partnership in accord with legal standards (i.e., exercising care and diligence regarding mismanagement, non-management, self-dealing, and conflicts of interest) and sound fiscal practices;**
- 2. Trust: Broad social responsibility, Committee composition, and decision making which represents the interests of civil society, with particular accountability to those groups who are socially vulnerable to, and as a result of, violence;**
- 3. Decision Making: Timely, relevant policy and shared policy/administrative decision making, implementation oversight, and accountability;**
- 4. Appropriate Conduct: Ends-means congruence with Partnership vision, mission, and philosophy in internal policy decisions, oversight, and administration, as well as external policy sharing, coordination, implementation, and advising;**
- 5. Training and Development: Orientation and training, meeting satisfaction, decision quality, policy review and refurbishment, collective and individual performance assessment, and renewal of Partnership members in general, and Steering Committee members in particular;**
- 6. Structure: An effective committee with a fair division of labor for developing policy recommendations and dealing with special issues facing the Steering Committee and the maintenance of the Partnership goals and resources;**

² ADAPTED FROM TROPMAN (PY UNKNOWN).
ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE.

7. **Productivity: Processes of partnership and accountability,³ which will facilitate the work of the Steering Committee in an effective, democratic, and timely manner (e.g., communicating, leading, analyzing, generating ideas, creating spaces for differences, addressing tensions and dilemmas, weaving shared meanings, making mutual decisions, following through).**
8. **Standards: Maintain and disseminate the standards for Partnership practices, including those pertaining to collaborative inter-organizational relations, and the conduct of safe, ethical research, training, technical assistance, and policy advocacy. Ensure the appropriate review of all applications for externally funded projects prior to their submission to the proposed source of such funding. Work in concert with the university's Committee on Human Research.**
9. **Community Relations: Promote the mission, values and work of the Partnership and steer the Partnership's external relations with various sectors (e.g. local, state, national, and international agencies and policy makers; socially responsible businesses and finance community; and interfaith networks).**
10. **Personnel: The Steering Committee will designate a member affiliated with the university to monitor compliance and report necessary changes for Partnership personnel practices in adherence with the university's policies and collective bargaining contracts. S/he will serve as liaison for staff regarding all needs, concerns and personnel issues.**

Steering Committee Size, Composition and Term of Office

The proposed size of the Steering Committee should be between 6 and 12 with members from agencies and anti-violence organizations, colleges and universities, survivor groups, and the community at large.

The governing representatives who serve on the Steering Committee will be drawn from the general membership of the Partnership, rather than simply from the affiliated organizations. It is desirable that each participate consistently in the Partnership membership for at least six months prior to being considered for membership on the Steering Committee. In order to meet the goal of having diverse and meaningful membership in the steering committee, the 6 month membership recommendation may be waived.

³LANGUAGE BORROWED FROM TAMASESE, WALDEGRAVE, TUHAKA, & CAMPBELL, 1998, P. 51.
February 2008 revision

Each representative to the Steering Committee will be selected by the current steering committee according to a clearly defined parity-based process. Membership should reflect small and large, private and public organizations, small and large units at the University of Vermont, other universities and multiple fields of practice and issue areas. One member will serve in the capacity of official liaison to the University of Vermont. As part of the total, there also will be at least one and can be up to five (5) at-large members. The at-large members will be selected by the Steering Committee according to the principles of diversity and first hand knowledge of victimization and the impact of 'victim' and 'offender' services.

The members of the Steering Committee will not be paid for their service as employees of the Partnership. Likewise, employees of the Partnership will not serve as members of the Steering Committee, although the Coordinator(s) of the Partnership will serve on the Committee in an ex officio capacity. Other Partnership members, staff, and outside community members may be present at the meetings of the Steering Committee. The Coordinator(s) and other employees will provide staffing functions as designated by their position descriptions and the University's annual evaluation and mutual agreement processes.

The term of office for Steering Committee members will be three consecutive years and each member is eligible to be reappointed for an additional three years consecutively. Current members of the Steering Committee will establish staggered terms to ensure continuity across predictable growth patterns and other changes of membership. Former members of the Steering Committee are eligible to rejoin after a hiatus of three years. Current members of the Steering Committee will be responsible for recruitment and training of new Steering Committee members.

Processes and Meetings

The Steering Committee will employ a democratic, legislative process, whereby members represent a broad, expansive group of people, and the Partnership at large, not only their employing agencies or home communities. It should function with enough structure that its cycles are predictable and its decision-making open, accessible, and supportive of all other parts of the Partnership. The language of oral and written communication by the Committee and its subcommittees should make the operating values and methodology transparent. The procedures should be flexible enough to be responsive to change and question, and stable enough to provide a continuous infrastructure to sustain the Partnership as defined by the mission, philosophy, and goals.

The Steering Committee will meet at least quarterly with monthly meetings being optimal for effective decision-making and keeping informed about projects.

Notice of time, place, date, and agenda will be disseminated to the members of the Steering Committee, as well as the membership-at-large, at least two weeks prior to the meeting. The minutes of the last meeting will be attached to the agenda, along with any background information necessary to participate knowledgeably in the upcoming meeting. Written notice may be given by e-mail, personal delivery, or postal service. Notice will be deemed to have been given two days after the date mailed.

Budget and Finance

The Steering Committee will deal with all policy matters of budget generation and financial oversight, including reviewing financial trajectories on a monthly basis. It will work with the administrator of the Partnership in preparing budgets and making proposals for budgetary revisions, such as adding new expenditures, subject to the approval of the Steering committee.

The Steering committee will oversee the pursuit and accounting of grants and contracts in accord with the policies and related personnel of the appropriate fiduciary agency.

Ad-hoc Committees

Because the functions of the Steering Committee are varied and complex, at times the Steering Committee may want to establish ad hoc committees.

Ad-hoc committees will include at least one member of the Steering Committee who will chair the committee and report back to the Steering committee. Other members may be recruited from the Steering committee, the membership and community at large who have the knowledge and expertise to deliberate on a particular issue or request. Membership on ad-hoc committees must be approved by the Steering committee.

Their membership is intended to represent the experiences of at least the following groups of stakeholders: agency and university personnel, and at-large members. Additional ad hoc members may be selected by a subcommittee to augment the expertise of the rest of the subcommittee, as long as the ad hoc member has the approval of the Steering Committee.

Delegation

The Steering Committee may delegate rights, duties, or responsibilities to an ad-hoc committee, as permitted by prevailing Institutional policies and Vermont statutes. Delegation will usually be in the form of issue study, policy recommendation, policy oversight, strategic planning, internal consultation, and evaluation. . The general membership of the Partnership will be notified immediately following substantive delegation of a Steering Committee responsibility.

The Steering Committee cannot delegate its accountability for any areas of its own responsibility which it may assign to a ad-hoc committee. The progress and impact of the delegated work will be evaluated by the Steering Committee.

Formal Leadership of the Steering Committee and Partnership

The formal leaders of the Partnership will consist of the Co-Chairpersons of the Steering Committee. The individuals in these positions will serve on as the Executive Committee. (See Executive Committee.) Other formal leadership positions may be established by the Steering Committee as the need becomes apparent. The term of office as a chairperson will be two years, preferably the last two years of an individual's term of membership on the Steering Committee. Ideally, the Co-chairpersons of the Steering Committee will have staggered terms of office in order to provide for continuity.

The formal leadership will be selected at the end of each fiscal year by the Steering Committee. The terms of office will begin in the first month of the subsequent fiscal year. These individuals will not hold more than one such position at a time. In order to ensure representation across the partnership organizations, one Co-chairperson will represent public or grassroots agencies, and the other will represent the University.

When a leadership position becomes vacant during a fiscal year, the Steering Committee will appoint someone to fill it. The individual who is appointed will serve out the term of that position until the next regularly scheduled selection. The Partnership membership will be notified by the Steering Committee of all regular and ad hoc leadership selections.

The Co-Chairs of the Steering Committee . The Co-chairs of the Steering Committee will lead and motivate the Steering Committee, and invest heavily in the planning and evaluation process of the Partnership. They will divide and work in partnership according to their skill and availability to divide and carry the following responsibilities: planning, convening, and facilitating the Steering Committee Meetings; Co-facilitating with the Coordinator or others, the meetings of the membership; representing the Steering Committee and the Partnership-at-large as spokespersons; acting in complementary partnership with the

Partnership Coordinator; and coordinating the interrelated work of the ad-hoc committees.

The Partnership Between the Co-Chairs and the Coordinator . The Co-chairs and the Coordinator will have clear, separate domains, and a shared domain. The Co-chairs will lead the Steering Committee. The Coordinator's role is defined in a job description and will be reviewed annually. Together they will lead the Partnership. The Co-chairs' domain (i.e., Steering Committee) will be that of setting policy and long-term strategies. The Coordinator's domain (i.e., daily operations) will be that of managing the work involved in implementing these policies and strategies with the staff and teams (planning, organizing, and evaluating). (Original reference citation for this conception of shared leadership is irretrievable.)

Executive Committee . The Executive Committee will have three primary responsibilities: a) coordinating the main functions of the Steering Committee and the interrelated work of the ad-hoc committees, b) making decisions in behalf of the entire Steering Committee when the demands of a situation require attention before a scheduled meeting or a special session of the Committee can occur, and c) resolving conflicts among members of the Steering Committee. In matters of unresolved dispute, this subcommittee may seek outside expert consultation, mediation, or arbitration when deemed necessary for the benefit of the Partnership. The subcommittee will make decisions in behalf of the Steering Committee only as permitted by prevailing institutional policies and Vermont statutes.

The Executive Committee will consist of the two Co-Chairs of the Steering committee. The Coordinator of the Partnership will serve as an advisory member of the committee. He or she will have no decision making authority on the subcommittee.

All actions taken on behalf of the Steering Committee by the Executive Committee will be brought before the Steering Committee for review and ratification at the next scheduled Steering Committee meeting. All other actions of the subcommittee will be reviewed annually in the course of reviewing the functioning and accomplishments of the entire Steering Committee and each subcommittee.

Partnership Staff

It is the purpose of the Partnership to enhance and coordinate the anti-violence work of university and organizational personnel. It is highly improbable that the personnel who represent the partner organizations will be able to assume the labor intensive work involved in the day to day development and operations

of the Partnership. Therefore, it must be staffed adequately so as to achieve its potential and assist rather than burden the membership in pursuing the mission and goals.

Primary Administrator(s)

In order to maintain the enthusiasm and involvement of Partnership members and sustain their participation in the complex processes of inter-organizational relations and decision-making, a central staff person with excellent participatory facilitation and administrative skill will be needed.

Position responsibilities and title. As part of the process of building the Partnership into a recognizable, accessible resource to those engaged in anti-violence work, this position will share leadership functions with the Chairpersons of the Steering Committee. More specifically, this position will have the following primary areas of responsibility: facilitation of interpersonal & inter-organizational member collaboration; fiscal management; professional writing and speaking; organizational development and administration; personnel administration, including supervision of support services staff and graduate assistants.

This position will be the most central position in the daily work of the Partnership. Therefore, the position could be entitled 'Partnership Coordinator' or 'Partnership Facilitator' in order to convey a recognizable label for the responsibilities assigned to it. It will be a full-time equivalent position which can be filled by one full-time exempt employee, or by two half-time, non exempt employees. The potential benefit of the former is that the Partnership would have consistent, accessible staffing with flexible capacity to meet with various stakeholders when they are available. The potential benefit of the job sharing approach is that it could combine the experiences and reflect the equality intended by this university-agency partnership.

If the job sharing approach is selected, it should be undertaken as a one year trial and evaluated quarterly. Its continuation should be based solely on its impact on Partnership operations and not on allegiance to the individuals sharing the position. This should be made clear in the position description and announcement, and throughout the hiring, orientation, and supervision of those who accept the shared position. A creative approach to filling the position if it is to be shared should also be devised to ensure the two individuals complement and can work well together while adhering to fair employment practices and the university's hiring and personnel policies.

Position requirements and desirable qualifications. The requirements for this position will include the following: an advanced degree in social work or an allied field; demonstrable knowledge and experience in anti-violence work, at least some of which include participation in inter-organizational initiatives; a

minimum of three years' experience in nonprofit or university administration; ability to bridge academic and agency frames of reference; and strong writing and oral communication skills.

The desirable qualifications are as follows: at least three years of direct practice with victims, survivors, witnesses, and perpetrators of violence; specialized knowledge and skill in at least one area of Partnership activity (i.e., research, training, technical assistance, information dissemination); and familiarity with current research and scholarship on coordinating community responses to violence, restorative and community justice practices and critiques, inter-organizational practice; crime victim services and their critique; social movements; and child abuse, violence against women, and/or racial violence.

Project Teams

Much of the daily work of the Partnership will occur in project teams. These teams will be drawn from the membership and beyond. They may be employees of one or a combination of the partner organizations, or contracted directly by the Partnership for a segment or the duration of a project. Research projects for example, may have a principal investigator leading the project with a team of agency co-investigators, graduate student research assistants, and a support staff person. A training project may involve a faculty member, an agency's training coordinator, members of a victims and survivors organization, a faculty member, and student interns.

These teams will usually be ad hoc. That is to say, they will exist only as long as the life of the project, and then they will disband. The nature of any project (e.g., its purposes, approved activities, funding guidelines, time lines, and projected ends-means congruence) and its financial resources will determine its duration. Projects that are not completed within a projected period of time may be extended until they are finished, but extensions will not be automatically permitted.

Requests for extensions will be made according to a standard procedure which employs a series of questions formulated by the Steering Committee and is contingent upon any related criteria established by the university or project funding source.

**Appendix A:
History of the Anti-Violence Partnership
(Written by Susan Roche in March, 2003)**

In March 2000, the Department of Social Work at the University of Vermont invited individuals, agencies, and other UVM units to participate in a consultation meeting to consider collaborating on issues of violence. Those who were invited had expressed or demonstrated commitment to halting victimization (e.g., child abuse, violence against women, abuse in same sex couples, and abuse of elder and disabled adults).

The First Planning Meeting

The first planning meeting took place on March 17, 2000, in the John Dewey Lounge in the Old Mill Building on the UVM campus from 2:30-5:00 p.m. Twenty-seven individuals attended, representing nine state and local organizations and four UVM units.⁴

Representing the host Department, Professor Gale Burford, Chair/Director of the Department of Social Work, facilitated the meeting. Participants introduced themselves, their organizations, and their interest in the topic. The aim of the meeting and the three assumptions underlying it that had been identified in the invitation were re-identified.

The stated purpose was to discuss what kind of collaboration would be useful in working together to halt victimization, especially abuse in couples and families and other violence by intimates and strangers. In particular, the purpose was to consider what role the development of a Justice Center, or a similar structure at UVM might play in developing and sustaining the collaboration. (At that time, such a center was viewed by some at UVM to hold the potential to serve as an umbrella for a variety of activities in the university and between the university, the City of Burlington, and the State of Vermont.)

⁴The City of Burlington Attorney's Office; the Burlington Police Department; the Governor's Commission On the Status of Women; the Vermont Department of Corrections; the Vermont Department of Mental Health; the Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services; Women Helping Battered Women; the Women's Rape Crisis Center; the University of Vermont: Area Health Education Consortium; College of Education and Social Services, Dean's Office; Family Medicine Department; Department of Social Work. Apologies were received from the Vermont Network Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, and an office at the Department of Corrections.

Assumptions Underlying First Planning Meeting

The assumptions underlying the composition of that first planning group and the agenda for the meeting were as follows:

- 1. As a result of their years of experience in working to halt child abuse and violence against women, many of those attending had clear ideas about what works and does not work.**
- 2. Violence is a very complex problem, the halting of which requires ongoing involvement of mandated authorities, community leaders, educators, and veterans of anti-violence movements, as well as people directly affected (the victims, survivors, witnesses, perpetrators, and their families and communities).**
- 3. Successful and sustainable collaborations are best built from a common philosophy, and therefore, the participants would each need to carefully articulate their own and listen to others' perspectives and assumptions about justice and victimization. Moreover, they would need to engage in discussions to enable them to work from a common set of assumptions.**

In order to develop an identifiable group aimed at promoting safety and justice, Professor Burford, then Chair/Director of the UVM Department of Social Work, proposed that the group work to develop an "anti-violence" organization that was conceived as one of several university-agency partnerships that would come under the umbrella of a justice center to be located at UVM. He pointed out that considerable momentum for collaboration around these issues existed at the time in Vermont, nationally, and internationally. He also asserted that experience suggests that the controversies surrounding the relationship between those issues are among the ones that require the most careful consideration for inter-organizational collaboration to be successful. Therefore, he suggested that early in the process participants discuss their different perspectives on violence against women and family violence.

By the end of that first meeting, consensus was attained to work together on an anti-violence project, and to dedicate the next meeting to beginning to understand each others' orientation to anti-violence work and interest in this project. Antje Ricken, then Agency Coordinator at Women Helping Battered Women in Burlington, proposed that to prepare for that discussion the group draft several common questions that each organization would address as a means of generating their diverse perspectives. Naomi Clemens, Area Health Education Consortium staff member, offered to collate the responses, and the Department of Social Work to disseminate them as preparatory materials for the next meeting's discussion. The group agreed and drafted the following:

Preliminary Organizing Questions

- 1. What is your vision for a partnership on the issue of violence?**
- 2. What philosophical assumptions should drive such a Partnership?
–What assumptions do you hold dear?**
- 3. What is/are your and your organization's interest in and need for such a partnership?**
- 4. What do you or your organization have to offer or contribute?**
- 5. Who else should be involved or consulted?**

Subsequent Meetings and Decisions

Initial Conception and Development of the Partnership

The answers to the five questions were instrumental in the organizational development completed during the next 18 months. The last question of who else should be involved or consulted was raised at the end of each meeting, and the Department of Social Work sent invitations and background materials to each individual and organization that was added to the list. This resulted in a large increase in the number of participating organizations. Today the mailing list has 74 members.

Likewise, the responses to the first four questions contributed substantively to the discussions in the next two meetings. They provided language, concepts, and assumptions which were debated and expanded upon. These discussions led to the development in subsequent meetings of a document developed and agreed upon by fifty-five participants which sets forth the vision, mission statement, core philosophy, goals, projected activities, and key definitions.

Agreement to participate in the Partnership as defined in that document underwent an approval process in some organizations. Approval to proceed in accord with the vision, mission, and philosophy was given by the faculty of the Department of Social Work, the Burlington City Council, the Burlington Police Department, the Steering

Committee of the Vermont Network Against Domestic Violence, and the Steering Committee of Women Helping Battered Women. Other organizational representatives received tacit approval from their organizations pending the completion of this formal proposal.

Name Changes.

The anti-violence project has undergone three name changes since its early years. During the initial year of its development, the organizers referred to it as the Anti-Violence Institute (AVI). This nomenclature was employed due to the original assumption that the AVI would become one of several other institutes that would reside at UVM in a "Justice Center" which was being developed simultaneously. When it became clear that the group might apply for formal designation as a UVM Institute, the working name was changed to Anti-Violence Initiative in order to retain a descriptive acronym while not using the designation any longer as a working designation unless it became the designation formally agreed upon with the university. Early documents may use either of these names.

Transition from Idea to Formal Entity

In the summer of 2002, a transition committee appointed by the members of the Partnership developed an approach for implementing the governance structure. This committee studied the options for formal affiliation with UVM, funding and staffing of the partnership, and defining Partnership projects. The committee was dissolved in February 2003 with the formation of the first Steering Committee.

Formal Affiliation with UVM

Center or Institute. The transition committee studied the two administrative units that seemed most likely to provide the type of affiliation with UVM that was conceived originally by the founding members, 'center,' and 'institute.' These units are defined in the university's *Officers' Handbook*. Representatives of the committee also met with Jill Tarule, then Dean of the College of Education and Social Services, to explore her thinking about locating the AVI as a new or part of an existing center and institute in the CESS. At that time, she could not offer specific assistance, but rather suggested that the AVI affiliate with a more generic research group in the College. The committee decided not to do this at that time in order to preserve the partnership's specialized anti-violence focus and the parity between agency and university partners.

Agency-University Partnership. Ultimately, the members of the committee concluded that as defined by the university, neither administrative designation of center or institute adequately addressed the type of relationship between community and university partners that was envisioned by the founders of the AVI. Therefore, the committee drafted an alternative administrative unit, called an Agency-University Partnership, to propose to UVM. The conception of this unit turned on the principle of partner parity; decisions that would be made between the partners regarding fiduciary, personnel, and other infrastructure features could be made on a case by case basis, according to specific purposes and

philosophy of the partnership and the contingencies entailed in translating these into accountable action. This document was disseminated to the membership via electronic list serve.

Redirection of Affiliation Recommendation. As part of its summer work report, the Transition Committee presented the agency-university partnership document at the fall 2002 general membership meeting. The agency-university partnership document and its implementation implications were discussed carefully. An alternative to formal affiliation was proposed for its efficiency; that was to carry out specific activities much as any other externally funded project at UVM or a partner organization, with one or the other institutional partner serving in the fiduciary role. The decision was made to postpone the pursuit of more formal affiliation with the university until the AVI had experience with several funded projects and the contingencies that would be involved. The participants in this meeting also decided to redirect the responsibility for raising this issue in the future to the Steering Committee, the policy governance body to be formed that year.

Name Change. Decision was made to discontinue calling the group the AVI because it no longer would pursue institute status. Proposing a new name was placed on the first year's agenda of the Steering Committee. Other business assigned to the Steering Committee at this meeting included defining the definition of what constitutes a partnership project, the coordination needs, the graduate students' responsibilities, membership definitions, the project team for Project Safe Neighborhoods grant, and the next year's goals and activities. The Transition Committee was asked and agreed to extend its work through the fall until the Steering Committee could be formed. Dr. Janine Allo agreed to facilitate a Steering Committee nomination and selection process and to work on updating the general membership list assisted by the MSW student who would be doing her second year field practicum in the AVI.

The Transition Committee met the next month to debrief from the general membership meeting and to follow-up on the Steering Committee business. Among the items that remained from the general membership meeting was the name change. The Transition Committee decided to recommend that the name be changed from Anti-Violence Initiative to Anti-Violence Partnership (AVP). The final recommendation about this would be left to the new Steering Committee.

Staffing

The staffing of this partnership has been provisional and multi-disciplinary. The Department of Social Work and the VT Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS), through their shared Title IV Training Project, contributed financial support for very part-time clerical and coordinating staff positions during the first two years. This support enabled the reproduction and

dissemination of announcements, agendas, minutes, and reports; and the development and maintenance of the membership list and electronic list serve. Social Work faculty members (Gale Burford and Susan Roche) ensured scheduling and organizational development work flow, facilitation of meetings, synthesis of the ideas produced in working sessions into the governance structure document, and field instruction for two advanced practice social work graduate students. The UVM Medical College provided staffing (Naomi Clemmons, then of the Area Health Education Consortium) to collate the answers to the pivotal five focus questions identified above.

In the summer of 2002, the Center for Crime Victim Services funded part-time coordination assistance provided by Janine Allo. At the end of the summer, the Vermont Network Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault took over the funding of Janine's staffing through a federal *Project Safe Neighborhoods* grant that the Network was awarded and Janine contracted to coordinate. The application for this grant was discussed with and approved by the Transition Team as the first attempt at applying for an Anti-Violence Partnership project.

Graduate Students: In the fall of 2002, two graduate students in social work at UVM were selected to be the first AVP field students (i.e., interns). Both initially were assigned to carry out about a third of their required 15 hours per week in the partnership a third in a partner organization (Wendy Yorgensen in the VNADVSA and Carol Kelley at Safeline in the fall and BWSS in the spring), and a third on field education meetings and writing. Susan Roche, Associate Professor in the Department of Social Work serves as the first AVP social work field instructor. The students also receive supervision from Rose Pulliam (VNADVSA), Janine Allo (AVP), and Elizabeth Roman (BWSS). Wendy assists Janine with membership tasks and staffs a committee of multiple organizational representatives regarding legislative policy on children affected by domestic violence. Carol and Wendy jointly developed and co-facilitated an AVI founders' reflecting group meeting in the fall. Carol's assignments have included providing direct services in local programs in Randolph (fall semester) and Barre (spring semester) to women who are experiencing domestic violence.

Additionally, Wendy is completing her comprehensive exam (i.e., the "Final Project") on teen dating violence. Likewise, Carol will begin her Final Project in Social Work and Violence in the summer 2003. Susan provides faculty mentorship for their Final Projects over and above the weekly field instruction she provides to both of them. (Final Projects are a graduation requirement of all students in the UVM MSW Program.)

Partnership Projects

The *Project Safe Neighborhoods* grant notwithstanding, the Transition

Team prioritized the need for a clear policy definition on what constitutes a partnership project. One of the issues surrounding this is that the AVP currently is not a fiduciary agent, although the organizations comprising it are. A series of practical questions has arisen which need to be addressed. How, for example, can individuals and organizations form and participate in AVP projects? What types of AVP membership exist and is AVP membership required for participation in an AVP project? While the AVP has no fiduciary status as an organizational entity, who has fiduciary rights and responsibilities for externally funded AVP projects? How can or should the AVP assume fiduciary rights and responsibilities (i.e., institutional status of the AVP)? How can the necessary personnel and material infrastructure expenses be supported in order to ensure adequate staffing and continuity? The Steering Committee has agreed to address this issue prior to the Annual Meeting scheduled for May 2003.

Beyond the practical questions about what constitutes an AVP project, the Steering Committee also will have to consider some of the philosophical and theoretical issues about the content and purposes of AVP projects. For example, with what type of projects regarding violence does the AVP want to be associated? The founding members of the AVP provided the Steering Committee guidance on making such policy decisions by establishing provisions to consider in the mission and philosophy statement and the governance structure documents. To illustrate, the Standards subcommittee might be formed early in the development of the Steering Committee's work in order to recommend to the Steering Committee standards as AVP project criteria and a process for approving and renewing such projects.

AVP Steering Committee

The first AVP Steering Committee was selected in January 2003. Members are Sherry Burnette (Department of Corrections), Stephanie Courcy (Department of Health), Shirley Markland (Rutland Community Mental Health) Rose Pulliam (VNADVSA), Mike Reilly (Snelling Center for Government), Susan Roche (UVM Department of Social Work), and Sharon Snow (UVM Women's Center). The Steering Committee has scheduled three meetings and identified several alternative dates for a spring AVP annual meeting.

At the first meeting the Steering Committee agreed on a new organizational name to propose to the membership: The Anti-Violence Partnership: Community Collaboration at the University of Vermont. The committee also set its spring agenda to include reviewing the work of the Transition Team, planning the annual meeting, defining what constitutes an AVP project, and implementing the AVP governance and membership structure (including the institutional status).

The Future

Organizational Development and Governance

The Steering Committee will be establishing the sub-committee structure through which to carry out an effective division of labor as designated in the Organizational Structure and Processes Plan. Likewise, it will create a five year strategic plan for the Partnership and a work plan, calendar, and budget for FY '04. The annual plan and budget will establish priorities for the Partnership's accomplishments in the coming year.

In the March 17, 2003 Steering Committee meeting, several sub-committees were prioritized for development and Steering Committee members who were present agreed to provide oversight to these subcommittees primary functions at least until the subcommittees can be more formally established. Sherry Burnette agreed to oversee the Standards functions (i.e., definition and criteria for Partnership Projects); Stephanie Courcy, Community Relations (i.e., the public and community representation of the AVP); Rose Pulliam, Membership, Training, and Renewal (i.e., membership definition criteria, and participation); Susan Roche, Personnel (i.e., responsibilities and support for staffing, e.g., currently by contract and internship). Individuals also were nominated to serve as Co-chairs of the Steering Committee and to oversee Finance and Development, pending confirmation of their willingness and availability.

Membership

Currently, Janine Allo and Wendy Yorgensen are conducting a phone and e-mail survey of the members of the Anti-violence electronic list serv to ascertain which individuals and organizations remain interested in participation in this partnership and to provide information about it to prospective members. As part of this membership process, each individual is being asked to identify other anti-violence collaborative projects and groups in which they participate. This information will be used to mobilize the membership and to inform the Steering Committee's action planning.

Funding

Janine Allo and members of the Steering Committee are seeking sources of funding to develop the organizational infrastructure of the partnership. So far, small amounts of funding have been attained to support the very limited staffing the partnership has received. This funding has come largely from line items in larger project budgets such as Project Safe Neighborhoods, where the personnel and supplies these cover serve purposes of both the project and the partnership.

Education, Training, and Technical Assistance: A sample

Susan Roche will continue to develop social work education opportunities in the Partnership. One of these is the expansion of field practicum into a unit that will provide graduate and undergraduate field students supervised experiential (or "service") learning in the Anti-Violence Partnership and in member organizations at a minimum of 15 hours week for the entire academic year. Her leadership of such a unit has been formalized through the faculty mutual agreement process in the Department of Social Work. This process makes the field unit a regular teaching assignment equivalent to a course. This idea derives from recent conversations she has had with JB Barna, the Coordinator of Field Education in the department, and two MSW students who asked Susan about the options open to them for completing their advanced practice field education in the Partnership.

In the second UVM summer session of 2003, Susan is teaching an advanced MSW practice elective entitled Social Work and Social Movement Approaches to Violence and Human Rights. This course is open to students in MSW programs who have completed their foundation coursework and to practitioners who already have earned an MSW or an advanced degree in an allied profession. The students in the course were invited to attend the advanced advocacy program of the Partnership's annual meeting at which Loretta Ross, Executive Director of the National Center for Human Rights Education was the keynote speaker. They also were invited to attend Summer meetings planned for July 29-August 4 that will bring together state domestic and sexual violence coalition directors, national grassroots policy advocates, and women working in similar respects in other countries. As part of their participation in the meetings, the students will be asked to take notes in the small group sessions and provide periodic reflection of how they are impacted by the discussions.

Research and Scholarship

Several research projects that are funded and underway already may want to affiliate with the Anti-violence Partnership as soon as the Steering Committee defines what constitutes a Partnership project. Other projects will be initiated by various members of the Partnership. Similarly, the required research of graduate and undergraduate students (e.g., dissertations, theses, final projects, and course assignments) may be developed under the auspices of the Steering Committee.

All Partnership research projects will have to meet the criteria and follow the AVP sponsorship procedures established by the Standards Subcommittee. This process is in addition to institutional requirements incurred by individual researchers, such as the UVM policies and procedures about the protection of participants in social science research.

Appendix B

Working Definitions Augmenting the 'Vision, Mission, Philosophy...' Document

Safety

(Victim/Survivor-centered): No violation of one's person, no intrusion into one's home, and reduction of fear (Hart, cited in Danis & Harris, 2000⁵).

Agency

(Victim-Survivor-centered): The ability to make and implement decisions free from interference from the perpetrator (Hart).

Restoration

(Victim/Survivor-centered): Returning health, relationships with children and family, and emotional well-being as well as compensation and replacement of all destroyed possessions and payment for all incurred medical, counseling, and other damage costs created by the perpetrator (adapted from Hart).

Accountability

(Perpetrator and Community-centered): Perpetrators stopping their violence, giving up the belief that they have direct ownership of the victim, and being accountable to both the victim and the community. Communities holding perpetrators accountable as victims/survivors define this, while simultaneously not holding victims/survivors responsible for perpetrators' actions (adapted from Hart).

Justice

(Victim/Survivor and Community-centered): The legal, judicial, social, economic, and other aspects which constitute the basis of a society upholding the dignity of its members, and ensuring security and integrity of persons. ...the pursuit of justice also has wider implications...satisfaction of basic human needs and the equitable sharing of [social and] material resources (United Nations, 1992, p. 16⁶).

⁵ ⁸ (Danis, & Harris, 2000).

⁶ UNITED NATIONS (1992). TEACHING AND LEARNING ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS: A MANUAL FOR SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK AND THE SOCIAL WORK PROFESSION. NEW YORK: AUTHOR.
February 2008 revision

Appendix C
Organizational Governance Principles
(Adaptation of Ideas Generated in the July 24, 2001 Working Group)

Collaborative Power Relations

- **Hope is important when it comes to power and change. Sustain hope and change with collaboration.**
- **A collaborative is more than a collection of separate organizational and individual identities. It is an intentionally interconnected identity. Base Partnership structures and processes on interconnected identity.**
- **A collaborative also is a linguistic power relationship. Create accessible, shared language by consciously defining terms together and maintaining open dialogue.**
- **Information is power. Be mindful of and acknowledge the diverse ways members and prospective members process, exchange, and depend upon information; make Partnership information widely accessible according to this diversity.**
- **Collaborative power relations are learned. Offset the rarity of opportunities to learn how to participate in them by introducing and consistently reintroducing members to how they can participate fully in the Partnership.**
- **Collaborative culture is observable through relations with other organizations and individuals. Decide how the Partnership will live its mission and philosophy in relating to non-member organizations, authorities, and individuals.**

Shared Responsibility and Ownership

- **Individuals and organizations remain active members of inter-organizational partnership as long as they recognize how they fit into the whole, and what they have to contribute and gain from membership. Ensure that the processes of the Partnership facilitate and sustain belonging and shared responsibility and ownership based on broad recognition of how each person and organization fits into the whole.**
- **Each member organization and individual has multiple affiliations beyond the Partnership. Recognize the sub-powers of these other**

networks and connections, and encourage self-examination and clarity about managing their influence on Partnership interests.

- In the context of members' multiple affiliations outside the Partnership, employ processes that enhance the bases for mutual trust and respect of each other.

Difference, Domination, and Control

- Size, wealth, and affiliation often dictate control and entitlement. Consider carefully the potential inequity among organizational partners due to their significant differences in size, legal authority, social power, resources, autonomy, legitimacy, financing, etc. Moreover, consider carefully the differences in safety and entitlement between members who represent organizations and those who do not.
- No one owns the issue of violence, nor the sole right to resist it, but some of us have more everyday lived experience with both. Nurture cross-border dialogue about difference, domination, and our perceptions of each other, our sensitivities and receptiveness, and what it takes to keep dialogue open across jurisdictions and disciplines.
- Add to communities rather than depleting them. This will require stepping aside, standing behind, or working together with member and non-member organizations, rather than competing with them for funding.
- Trade the fear of losing power for the hope that thrives in genuinely discovering and honoring different ways of doing things and what they suggest for what the Partnership can accomplish because of these differences.
- Keep the overarching vision, mission, and philosophy central to our discussions as a common ground for buffering the inevitable fears and challenges of coming together to learn new ways of understanding and doing collaborative human rights and anti-violence work.
- When dilemmas arise, the dominant culture of coercion and violence works against collaboration in subtle as well as dramatic ways; therefore, institutionalize processes which continually remind us of the possibilities embedded in our larger purposes and our progress

so far, community building rituals for example, and stories of transformation in the face of struggle with coercion and violence.

Appendix D Original Literature Review

Over the past several decades the initiative taken by universities to be active contributors to their surrounding communities has resulted in the formation of an increasing number of university-agency partnerships. These inter-organizational relationships have been formalized to join university, state, community, and corporate resources in developing approaches to preventing and solving social problems and reducing the fragmentation of services (Walsh et al, 2000; Russell & Flynn, 2000; Riger, 1997; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Bailey & McNalley, 1996; Austin et al, 1999).

Mutual Benefits of University-Agency Partnerships

Where successful, these collaborative efforts have enhanced the relationships between communities and universities to reflect a more actively cooperative form of communication. They also have provided the unique opportunity for “joining science with practice, inquiry with action” (Walsh et al, 2000, p.7).

To date, the research on this trend indicates the mutual benefits of successful university-agency partnerships and the ingredients for their success. Among such benefits, is the fulfillment of the institution’s mission for it’s community; maximization of research potential; improved service delivery through putting knowledge into action and practice; and effective responsiveness to social problems; (Russell & Flynn, 2000; Bailey & McNalley, 1996; Riger, 1997). Funding sources increasingly require collaborative efforts, the knowledge and

practice of working together successfully and effectively in a partnership for change (Riger, 1997).

Complex societal problems, such as violence, cannot be solved by one agency or university alone, but can be more effectively and creatively approached by the unified power of a collaboration or coalition of organizations (Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Walsh et al, 2000; National Network for Collaborative Framework; Austin et al, 1999; Bailey & McNalley, 1996). According to Mizrahi & Rosenthal (2001) the “actual power of coalitions still resides with collective power derived from the member organizations” (p. 66-7) and the power of the coalition exists because organizations endow it with their commitment to unity and it’s vision (also in Walsh et al, 2000; National Network for Collaborative Framework; Bailey & McNalley, 1996). Related studies indicate how to meet community needs and include community input in research, policy, and theories of program development (Walsh et al, 2000; Austin et al, 1999).

Key Ingredients of Successful Collaboratives

In a review of the literature on inter-organizational collaboratives several key ingredients were attributed to their success, effectiveness, and longevity. Mizrahi & Rosenthal (2001) found that social and political climate were important ingredients to the success of coalition building. These factors influence the shifting contexts of possibility and challenge for genuine, sustainable collaboration.

Shared Mission

An interorganizational partnership's statement of its core foundation is a key ingredient. Such a description includes a clear and concise goal, purpose and shared vision for the collaborative that is mutually beneficial to the university and community organizations individually, as well as their informal partnership. The shared vision of collaboration appears essential in steering the capacity of the collaboration for action and promoting social change (National Network for Collaborative Framework; Austin et al, 1999; Huxham & VanGen, 2000; Riger, 1997; Russell & Flynn, 2000; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001). It guides the process and increases the commitment of its partners toward seeing these societal changes through to completion.

Commitment and Determination

Commitment and determination from universities and organizations enhance the longevity of their collaboration, as well as increase the success with which the shared vision is fulfilled (Walsh et al, 2000; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001; Riger, 1997; Huxham & VanGen, 2000). They require that personnel pay close attention to ways the partnership can maintain and increase committed membership and full participation. Key to this capacity are active shared input into the process, mutual respect, nurturing of leaders, and a sustained atmosphere of shared responsibility (Bailey & McNalley, 1996; Gentry, 1987; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001; Russell & Flynn, 2000; Huxham & VanGen, 2000; Austin et al, 1999).

Mizrahi and Rosenthal (2001) found that the more resources members gave to the process and received from the collaboration the more their long-term dedication to the vision increased. Additionally, the “theme of mutuality,” visibly honoring diversity, equality in the partnership, shared responsibility, and accountability to the vision of the collaboration foster broad commitment to the goal (Austin et al, 1999, p. 93).

Diversity

The value placed on maximizing the diversity of the inter-organizational membership of the coalition provides the creativity, alternative resources, and input into the process of action and change (Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001; Riger, 1997; Austin et al, 1999; National Network for Collaborative Framework). Honoring diversity, mutual respect among members, and recognition of each individual’s skills are essential in building relationships, developing effective leadership, enhancing communication, and developing successful structures (Bailey & McNalley, 1996; National Network for Collaborative Framework; Austin et al, 1999).

Leadership

Effective leadership provides the context for the collaborative structure and guidance to the membership. It sets direction through goals and clarifies the decision making process. It also coordinates resources, empowers participants in the process, and provides the atmosphere of mutual respect and the honoring of diversity. All of these functions are critical to enhancing the commitment, trust, and cooperation that are vital to the process of a university-community

collaboration (Gentry, 1987; Beatrice, 1990; Bailey & McNalley Russell & Flynn, 2000; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001).

References

Austin, M. J., Martin, M., Carnochan, S., Goldberg, S., Berrick, J. D., Weiss, B., & Kelley, J. (1999). Building a comprehensive agency-university partnership: A case study of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium. *Journal of Community Practice*, 6, 89-106.

Bailey, D., & McNalley Koney, K. (1996). Inter-organizational community based collaborating: A strategic response to shape the social work agenda. *Social Work*, 41, 602-611.

Beatrice, D. (1990). Interagency coordination: A practitioners guide to a strategy for effective social policy. *Administration in Social Work*, 14(4), 45-59.

Danis & Harris. (2000).

Gentry, M. (1987). Coalition formulation and purposes. *Social Work with Groups*, 10(3), 39-54.

Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000) Leadership in the shaping and implementing of collaboration agendas: How things happen in a (not quite) joined-up world. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 1159-1175.

Mizrahi, T., & Rosenthal, B. (2001). Complexities of coalition building: Leaders' successes, strategies, and solutions. *Social Work*, 46, 63-78.

National Network for Collaboration. (1995). Collaboration framework-Addressing community capacity. (<http://nnco/collab/framwork.html>).

Riger, S. (1997, March 28) *Challenges in collaborative research: Trust, time, and talent*. Paper presented at the Conference on Collaboration between Researchers and Activists on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, University of Illinois at Chicago. (<http://www.mincava.umn.edu/papers/riger.htm>).

Roberts-DeGennaro, M. (1987). Patterns of exchange relationships in building a coalition. *Administration in Social Work*, 11, 59-67.

Russell, J., & Flynn, R. (2000). Commonalities across effective collaboratives. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75, 196-204.

Schopler, J. (1987). Inter-organizational groups: Origins, structure and outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 702-713.

Shepard, M., & Pence, E. (1999). Coordinating community responses to domestic violence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sink, D., & Stowens, G. (1989). Coalitions and their effect on the Urban Policy Agenda. *Administration in Social Work, 13*, 83-98.

United Nations. (199). *Teaching About...*

Walsh, M., Brabeck, M., Howard, K., Sherman F., Montes, C., & Garvin, T. (2000). The Boston College – Allston/Brighton Partnership: Description and challenges. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75*, 6-32.