

The Research 1 Community-Engaged Institution: Addressing Critical Community Needs

Henry R. Cunningham, Theodore R. Smith, and Baylee Pulliam

Abstract

Higher education institutions have heeded the call to be engaged with their communities, and many have responded by partnering with community entities to address the various social and economic challenges in their locale. Among these are public, Research 1 (R1) higher education anchor institutions that are inextricably linked to their communities, focused on bringing human and intellectual capital to help address local challenges. This article looks deeper into community engagement and explores how public R1 institutions can partner with the community to conduct cutting-edge research that positively impacts their shared home. A four-quadrant research and engagement model of modern higher education institutions is presented. The model focuses on the value and impact of this new breed of research-intensive, place-based institutions.

Keywords: Research 1, community-engaged, research model, community engagement model, place-based



Many universities are anchors in their communities, holding significant purchasing power, making major investments, and serving as major employers (Initiative for a Competitive Inner City & CEOs for Cities, 2003), although the degree and manner of engagement in that community varies from institution to institution, depending on research and geographic focus. In this article, we present a four-quadrant research and engagement model of modern higher education institutions, with special focus on the value and impact of a new breed of research-intensive, place-based institutions.

We argue that these institutions are inextricably linked to their home communities (Harkavy & Zuckerman, 1999), giving them a unique stake in these communities' outcomes—the health, success, and growth of their community benefits the institution, its employees, and students (Cunningham et al., 2015). What's more, these institutions have the capacity to engage in local revitalization (Haarman & Green, 2023; Harkavy

& Hartley, 2012; Harkavy & Hodges, 2012; Yamamura & Koth, 2018). These institutions have resources, including human and intellectual capital, both employing and producing a workforce that is skilled, educated, and able to partner for improvement, growth, and development (Harkavy & Zuckerman, 1999; Perry & Menendez, 2011). The skills and expertise this workforce brings can be used to engage in new discoveries and help to address many of the societal issues in direct partnership with community members and local organizations (Harkavy & Hodges, 2012; Whitmer et al., 2010). Many practitioners and scholars have argued for this kind of engagement, including Ernest Boyer (1996), who called for institutions of higher learning to become a more vigorous partner in finding the answers to the most pressing societal problems. The Kellogg Commission (1999) further emphasized the need for academia to be more involved in finding the answers to pressing community issues by challenging universities to return to their roots and go beyond service and outreach to engage with the community in

a meaningful way. The Commission defined “engagement” as the redefinition of teaching, research, and service to become more involved with the community in a productive manner with a commitment to “sharing and reciprocity” (p. 9).

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching defined community engagement as the “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities . . . for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (ACE, n.d., “What Is Community Engagement?”). The purpose of community engagement is to utilize the knowledge and resources of higher education institutions in collaboration with community partners, both private and public, to address critical community issues through teaching and research. Although the Carnegie Foundation recognized community as local, national, and international, institutions of focus in this article engage with their immediate surroundings—partnering with their neighbors to solve problems and make discoveries in their own backyard. This focus on local engagement reinforces universities’ role and the value of being an anchor and enhances the town–gown relationship.

Similarly, the nature of research has been evolving. In the United States, the largest funders of research largely represent the fields of life sciences, health care, basic science, and engineering. Specific funders include the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense. These agencies have made their research agendas a balancing act: on one side, basic research, which may have a very long timeline (if any) for practical application; on the other, translational or industry–supporting research. Less funding is available from the federal government in the humanities or professional schools to support research and scholarship. Public and private philanthropy have a more prominent role in these areas. Interestingly, philanthropic support is often provided by a mix of national foundations that support scholarship that builds and advances scholarly fields of study as well as local or regional activities. Regardless of the funder, increasing value has been placed on ensuring that research activities are not “extractive” but rather participatory (Emanuel & Bird, 2022; Gill, 2013; Vera et al., 2019). For research addressing societal challenges in

the medical, environmental, and social sciences, there has been increasing emphasis on cocreation of research activities that seek to build agency in community and likely improve the success of the project (Christopher et al., 2008; Wilson et al., 2014). The nature of research is changing so that in many cases, funding sources expect research with societal relevance to be performed in and with society (Odedina et al., 2024; Sanchez-Youngman et al., 2021).

Here, we consider the intersection of these two important functions of a higher education institution and how the evolution of these functions may create a new breed of institution that excels in research because it excels at community–engaged scholarship. Here, we will consider in more detail the forces at play in each area and offer a framework to bring them together.

What Is a Community–Engaged Institution?

The engaged institution is one that is committed to working closely with community partners in a reciprocal relationship in a spirit of sharing and collaboration. For institutions to be truly engaged, they must see their relationship with community partners as a two–way street where there is mutual respect for each other and what they bring to the table (Cunningham, 2020). The nature of such collaboration includes defining problems together, identifying common goals and agendas to pursue, and determining what success will look like for both the university and community partner (Kellogg Commission, 1999). This concept is supported by others, including Overton (2017), who indicated that communities are more likely to find research helpful when they are involved, most likely because the research will be relevant to their needs. The Kellogg Commission (1999, p. 12; see also Inman, 2004) laid out seven guiding characteristics for the engaged institution:

- Responsiveness—listening and responding to community needs
- Respect for partners—respecting the knowledge and resources of partners
- Academic neutrality—maintaining neutrality when dealing with contentious issues
- Accessibility—enabling partners

to navigate and access university resources

- Integration—integrating scholarship with service and teaching missions of the university
- Coordination—ensuring all are well-informed about the partnership to enhance efficiency
- Resource partnership—identifying and allocating resources to fund the work

The Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) in its 2019 report advocated for similar initiatives in what it termed “public impact research” (p. 3). The report outlined six guiding principles for universities to truly engage in research that impacts the community, which has some overlap with the Kellogg Commission’s seven guiding characteristics. In addition, the report provided five action steps institutions must take to engage in this work.

Role and Function of a Public Community-Engaged Institution

Universities are well-positioned to engage with their local community to address the ever increasing need for academic research. Bringing as they do the intellectual capacity of skilled and knowledgeable faculty and students from diverse fields of study, no other entity is as equipped as universities to confront the complex issues in our communities (Whitmer et al., 2010); these institutions therefore have a responsibility to society to utilize their intellectual capital to address community issues (Overton, 2017). Boyer (1996) shared these thoughts when he stated that universities and colleges remain “one of the greatest hopes for intellectual and civic progress,” further stating that colleges and universities must partner to address “pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems” (p. 11).

The role of public community-engaged institutions is to participate in research for the public good, as stated by the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good (Overton, 2017). Research for the public good, or public impact research (APLU, 2019), is research that positively impacts the community. These researchers argued there is a need to engage in research focused on social issues and to find solutions to social problems. Community-engaged institutions should participate in engaged research to

address current issues and give back to the community (Overton, 2017).

APLU in an undated report stated that the core aspect of public universities’ mission is to serve their communities to enhance the lives of citizens through cutting-edge research in just about every field and discipline. According to the report, public universities annually conducted over \$61 billion of research, making up 66% of all university research. They further argued that public universities have a responsibility to ensure their community is vibrant and prosperous and that these universities should be engaged with community stakeholders in all aspects of community issues, including health care, K-12 education, and urban neighborhoods. This responsibility encompasses engaging multiple stakeholders, including communities and organizations (American Academy of Arts & Sciences, 2016; APLU, 2019; Gelmon et al., 2013; Overton, 2017). All initiatives should be aligned with the needs and strengths of the community. This concept was supported by Harkavy and Hartley (2012), who in their research discussed how Penn State University effectively served its community by focusing on teaching and research on addressing public issues, including work with area schools, in health care, and on economic development.

Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement Standards and Criteria

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching developed the Elective Classification for Community Engagement for institutions of higher education to demonstrate their level of engagement with the community (ACE, n.d.). Like the Carnegie designations for research institutions, the community engagement classification requires that institutions qualify by conducting a lengthy self-study, which is then reviewed by a panel of experts who determine whether the institution has demonstrated that it has the infrastructure in place and is engaged with the community in meaningful and reciprocal partnerships. The classification encourages institutions to ensure continuous improvement in community engagement. Institutions demonstrate infrastructure through adequate staffing, policies, practices, and systems to promote and support mutually beneficial partnerships through engaged teaching, research, and outreach initiatives. Engagement is demonstrated through indicators such as campus and community

context, foundational indicators, leadership support, outreach and partnership, faculty and staff scholarship, and inclusion in curricular development.

Carnegie Classification in Research Standards and Criteria

In addition to the Elective Classification for Community Engagement, Carnegie also provides criteria for its classifications surrounding degrees offered and research activity. This includes the Research 1, or R1, designation for U.S. colleges and universities that award doctoral degrees and meet the definition of “very high research spending and doctorate production.” Long considered the gold standard for research institutions, the R1 designation indicates that a school has met or exceeded the following criteria: conferred 70 or more research/scholarship doctoral degrees and had at least \$50 million in research spending within the measured fiscal year. As of the 2025 listing, 187 U.S. institutions meet these criteria, with other universities designated as the lower activity Research 2 or the new designation, Research Colleges and Universities (Palmer, 2025).

Role and Function of an R1 Institution

Knowledge Creation. R1 research universities have a focus on knowledge creation, constantly pushing the boundaries of human understanding in various disciplines. Through groundbreaking research projects, these institutions generate new knowledge, devise innovative solutions, and create intellectual property that can lead to economic growth. R1 institutions must also award research- and scholarship-focused doctoral degrees; they are also responsible for training the next generation to continue this pursuit.

Economic Engines. R1 research universities serve as critical economic drivers for the communities in which they are embedded. They attract funding from government grants, industry partnerships, and private philanthropy, resulting in significant investments in research and development. This influx of resources stimulates local economies by creating jobs, supporting businesses, and fostering entrepreneurship. The university-industry collaborations facilitated by R1 institutions often lead to the development of new technologies, startups, and industries, further enhancing economic growth and prosperity.

Educational Excellence. R1 research

universities provide exceptional educational opportunities for students. These institutions offer a vast array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, enabling students to engage with world-class faculty and cutting-edge research. The presence of R1 institutions in a community elevates the overall quality of education by fostering a culture of academic rigor, critical thinking, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Graduates from these universities contribute to the local workforce, bringing their expertise, skills, and fresh perspectives to address community needs and drive innovation.

Community-Engaged Services. R1 research universities actively engage with their surrounding communities, recognizing their responsibility to serve as catalysts for positive change. Through community outreach programs, partnerships with local organizations, and knowledge transfer initiatives, these institutions address societal challenges, promote social justice, and improve quality of life. R1 universities also facilitate public lectures, workshops, and cultural events, fostering a vibrant intellectual and cultural atmosphere that enriches the community and promotes lifelong learning.

Health Care and Public Service. Many R1 research universities have renowned medical schools and health care facilities, providing advanced medical care, research, and training. These institutions contribute to improving health care outcomes, developing innovative treatments, and addressing public health concerns. Additionally, R1 universities often have faculty members and experts who contribute their expertise to inform public policy decisions, providing evidence-based recommendations on issues affecting the community, thereby enhancing the well-being of the region.

Managing Conflicting Interests

Academic researchers are often under pressure to pursue funding to support their scholarship, especially in the health and biomedical realms. In an ideal world, the funding opportunities available to researchers would be perfectly aligned with community-identified interests; in practice, however, available funding requirements can create unaligned interests. For example, a competitive grant to study a specific chemical that may be present in a community could be awarded without the requirement that the community considers

this specific issue a priority. This context—a project that has been defined and has started absent community input—can disrespect community partners and the important role their lived experience can play in formative research design and erode trust. As a result, researchers may struggle to establish lines of communication with community members and university community engagement offices. A possible best practice for avoiding this type of conflict is development of institutional policies and mechanisms for screening for community endorsement in the preaward phase of grant development. In cases where the community is engaged later than they should be, it is important to acknowledge the oversight and consider restorative strategies such as community benefits agreements or other explicit acknowledgments that value the community.

Proposed Framework for R1 Community-Engaged Institutions

Although frameworks exist for each of these classifications individually, there does not currently appear to be any standardized framework describing the intersection of

these two factors—research activity and community engagement—across institutions. We propose a four-quadrant model mapping the alignments of various institutions along these measures, and the unique value of high research activity, high community engagement institutions. This framework yields four alignments that capture the majority of U.S. institutions.

1. Low research, low engagement: These institutions focus on graduation, with little connection to or involvement with the community. Trade and online-only schools may fall into this category.
2. Low research, high engagement: These institutions have a connection to the community through such activities as service, arts, and culture, but have little focus on original research. This quadrant may include community colleges and some private liberal arts schools.
3. High research, low engagement: These institutions have a strong focus on research, but have little connection to their community.

Figure 1. Framework for Local Community-Engaged Research



4. High research, high engagement: These institutions have a heavy focus on both research and community connection, often working collaboratively with community members to solve problems that affect their shared home. This quadrant may include large, public metropolitan research institutions.

Each of these institutional alignments creates value, though their focus may be on different measures. Low-research, low-engagement institutions, for example, can be major contributors to the local skilled talent pipeline; high-research, high-engagement institutions may pair their research expertise with community agencies to contribute to larger scale solutions for public health, transportation, and economic development. This framework assumes that local community engagement is bilateral. Both low-research and high-research institutions need to have high fidelity information about the situation on the ground in these places in order to act on community-derived data or discover new knowledge perhaps about root causes or offer interventions to address community-identified needs. A low-research, high-engagement institution might develop community-specific vocational programs that are evaluated using criteria established by the community. A high-research, high-engagement institution may be asked to find the cause of a cluster of cancer cases in a neighborhood or inform a debate about alcohol advertisements placed on city buses. It is a necessary precondition that such awareness of community needs and priorities can come only from long-term relationships that reinforce partnership by meeting community needs over time. As of Carnegie's finalized update of both lists in 2025, about 102 institutions hold both designations—roughly 2% of all institutions classified by Carnegie. These are the nation's foremost community-engaged research universities—those that not only conduct a very high level of research and train the next generation of terminally trained researchers, but focus their energies on ensuring that research is in partnership with and offers benefits to their community. They bring the backing of the institution with the full force of its infrastructure—faculty expertise, equipment, technology, and grant funding, as well as internal budgetary allocation. Engaging in community-engaged research is no different from what is happening in other types of scientific research on campuses

except that it is conducted in partnership with community stakeholders to address community-identified issues that directly benefit the community. The Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (2019) encouraged its member institutions to engage in this type of research, which it calls “public impact” research.

For reference, one need only look at the university of Louisville, an R1 community-engaged metropolitan institution in Louisville, Kentucky. The institution has put a heavy focus on community-engaged research, resulting in direct impacts to the city that researchers share with their community collaborators. For just a few examples, researchers at UofL have partnered with the community to

1. Lead the planting of thousands of trees and shrubs across South Louisville as part of a first-of-its-kind interventional study on how greenness affects health. As the first large-scale interventional clinical trial of this kind, this study will have significant value as cities around the world seek to mitigate the health risks from a changing climate through green infrastructure. The results could also reveal new public health approaches to improving heart, psychological, and other health outcomes.
2. Study the evolving “future of work” in different settings and industries, each with its own unique workforce needs. This research led to targeted industry-specific training and apprenticeships, developed in partnership with employers, that connect what students learn in class with their eventual careers. The apprenticeships also give students field experience with disruptive, cutting-edge technologies.
3. Understand the barriers first-generation immigrants face in navigating the complex health care system. The result was a health care “storefront,” staffed by community volunteers who can help immigrants to secure insurance, find a provider, and more.

Other high-research, high-engagement universities include the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNC Charlotte), Northeastern University, and Arizona State University. UNC Charlotte received a \$20 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education, one of the largest in the

university's history, and used it to develop a program whereby the university partnered with state and local education agencies, vocational rehabilitation agencies, and service providers to study and enhance efforts to improve employment options, education, and integration into the community for young people dealing with disabilities (UNC Charlotte, 2020).

Northeastern University, through its Climate Justice and Sustainability Hub, awards grants to its faculty aimed at reducing environmental impacts and promoting equitable research. This initiative resulted in several projects being carried out in the community to address environmental concerns (Northeastern University, 2025). Faculty at the University of Arizona formed a research team comprised of Indigenous and non-Indigenous scientists in a tribal-university partnership with the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Council. The research team looked at how climate change and upstream pressures threaten the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Council ecosystems, lands, and resources (Chew & Chief, 2023).

The Ohio State University, focusing on its status as a high-research, high-engagement institution to address issues relevant to communities, funded a study to learn about community leaders' perspective on university researchers conducting research in the community, particularly including participants in research. The study aimed to provide community members with a voice in the nature of university research conducted in their community. The study had four aims: (1) identify ways community members want Ohio State University to build and maintain relationships with them, (2) describe community members' experiences with the university research and engagement, (3) document the language community members use when discussing community-university research relationships, and (4) understand community members' perceptions of the institution and its role in the community (Clark et al., n.d.).

The benefits of partnering with the community on research are numerous, but include (1) better research questions and lines of inquiry, because they are formed in collaboration with people experiencing the problem or phenomenon being studied, and (2) assurance that the research being conducted can have a direct, positive impact on the world.

Best Practices for Connecting High-Research and Community-Engaged Research

Institutions of higher learning can adhere to a number of best practices when engaging in high-research, high-engagement practices. Community partners need to be involved in the research process throughout, from beginning to end, such that they have a voice in all matters pertaining to the research and they feel valued and empowered to contribute. Clear communications between institutions and community partners are essential to enabling research findings to be clearly communicated, including research methodology and ownership of data. It is also important that trust is developed with community partners. Development of trust occurs over time and therefore requires a long-term commitment to the partnership from institutions. Given that many projects are grant funded, it is important to maintain contact at the completion of the project or when funding ends to sustain a relationship with community partners. During this time, reports and publications that include community partners as coauthors may be drafted, with these partners authoring the sections about their community, their lived experiences, and other areas that can tap into their expertise. This is also a time to explore other projects for collaboration. The end of funding or the completion of a project should not mark the end of the partnership but rather a time to explore other opportunities on which stakeholders may embark.

For high-research high-engagement to take place, institutions must have strong partnerships with their communities. Scholars have established several models for successful university-community partnerships. Bryan and Henry (2012) developed a seven-stage model for building school-family-community partnerships. One of its stages is creating a shared vision and plan between the university and community, emphasizing the need for collaboration and ensuring community partners have a voice in the process. Another model that provided best practices for university-community partnerships comes from Hudson and Hardy (2002). They presented six principles for successful partnerships between universities and communities: (a) acknowledgment of the need for partnership; (b) clarity and realism of purpose; (c) commitment; (d) development and maintenance of trust; (e) establishment of clear and robust partnership arrangements; and (f) monitoring, review,

and organizational learning. Strong university–community partnerships are important for high–research, high–engagement institutions. For these institutions to be engaged with their communities in conducting research, these models serve as a blueprint to ensure successful collaborations.

Conclusions

R1 research universities are vital assets to the communities in which they exist. Their commitment to knowledge creation, economic growth, educational excellence, community engagement, and health care advancements make them indispensable partners for societal progress. As centers of intellectual and innovative excellence, R1 in-

stitutions bring together the brightest minds to collaborate, explore, and create, leading to positive transformations that extend far beyond the boundaries of the campus and into the lives of individuals and communities they serve. The presence of such institutions within a community fosters an environment of intellectual curiosity, attracting exceptional minds and contributing to the overall knowledge base of society. Our proposed framework can help to categorize that contribution and understand the unique role high–research, high–engagement institutions play in the growth and success of their communities.



About the Authors

Henry R. Cunningham is assistant vice president for engaged scholarship at the University of Louisville. His research focuses on the institutionalization of community engagement, campus–community partnerships, and the impact of community engagement. He received his PhD in educational leadership and organizational development from the University of Louisville.

Ted Smith is associate dean for research and professor of environmental medicine, and director of the Center for Healthy Air, Water, and Soil at the University of Louisville, where his research focuses on community–engaged environmental health science, wastewater–based epidemiology, and the translation of exposure data into public health and policy action. He received his PhD in experimental psychology from Miami University.

Baylee Pulliam is a doctoral student in educational leadership and organizational development at the University of Louisville. Her research interests primarily lie in how organizations innovate. She received her master’s degrees in business administration and organizational leadership from Western Kentucky University.

References

- American Academy of Arts & Sciences. (2016). *Public research universities: Serving the public good*. The Lincoln Project: Excellence and Access in Public Higher Education. <https://www.amacad.org/publication/public-research-universities-serving-public-good>
- American Council on Education. (n.d.). *The Elective Classification for Community Engagement*. Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. <https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/elective-classifications/community-engagement/>
- Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities. (n.d.). *How does public university research and community engagement benefit society at large?* <https://www.aplu.org/our-work/4-policy-and-advocacy/publicvalues/research-engagement/>
- Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities. (2019). *Public impact research: Engaged universities making the difference*. <https://www.aplu.org/library/public-impact-research-engaged-universities-making-the-difference/>
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11–20. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/666>
- Bryan, J., & Henry, L. (2012). A model for building school-family-community partnerships: Principles and process. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 90(4), 408–420. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2012.00052.x>
- Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (n.d.). *About the Carnegie classifications*. <https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/carnegie-classification/>
- Chew, S., & Chief, K. (2023). Community-engaged participatory climate research with the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe. *Ecology and Society*, 28(1), Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-13725-280116>
- Christopher, S., Watts, V., McCormick, A. K. H. G., & Young, S. (2008). Building and maintaining trust in a community-based participatory research partnership. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(8), 1398–1406. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2007.125757>
- Clark, J., Kaiser, M., Reece, J., & Schmiesing, R. (n.d.). *University research in the neighborhood: The perspective of community members*. The Ohio State University.
- Cunningham, H. R. (2020). Communities and community engagement. In V. Hines-Martin, F. Cox, & H. R. Cunningham (Eds.), *Library collaborations and community partnerships: Enhancing health and quality of life* (pp.29–39). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Cunningham, H. R., Hines-Martin, V., & Hall, D. (2015). The signature partnership initiative: A university-community collaboration. *The International Journal of Community Diversity*, 15(4), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-0004/cgp/v15i04/39978>
- Emanuel, R. E., & Bird, K. D. (2022). Stories we tell: Unpacking extractive research and its legacy of harm to Lumbee people. *Southern Cultures*, 28(3), 48–69. <https://doi.org/10.1353/scu.2022.0025>
- Gelmon, B. S., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. D. (2013). Community-engaged scholarship in the academy: An action agenda. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 45(4), 58–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2013.806202>
- Gill, R. (2013). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of the neoliberal university. In R. Ryan-Flood & R. Gill (Eds.), *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections* (pp. 228–244). Routledge.
- Haarman, S., & Green, P. M. (2023). Does place actually matter? Searching for place-based pedagogy amongst impact and intentionality. *Metropolitan Universities*, 34(2). <https://doi.org/10.18060/27203>
- Harkavy, I., & Hartley, M. (2012). Integrating a commitment to the public good into the institutional fabric: Further lessons from the field. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(4), 17–36. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/980>
- Harkavy, I., & Hodges, R. A. (2012). *Democratic devolution: How America's colleges and universities can strengthen their communities*. Progressive Policy Institute. https://www.progressivepolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/10.2012_Harkavy-Hodges_Democratic-Devolution.pdf

- Harkavy, I., & Zuckerman, H. (1999). *Eds and meds: Cities' hidden assets*. Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, The Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/eds-and-meds-cities-hidden-assets/>
- Hudson, B., & Hardy, B. (2002). What is a “successful” partnership and how can it be measured? In C. Glendinning, M. Powell, & K. Rummery (Eds.), *Partnerships, new labour and the governance of welfare* (pp. 51–66). The Policy Press.
- Initiative for a Competitive Inner City & CEOs for Cities. (2003, Spring). Leveraging colleges and universities for urban economic revitalization: An action agenda. *Greater Philadelphia Regional Review*. <https://www.economyleague.org/sites/default/files/legacy/800422144961444642-leveraging-colleges-and-universities-for-urban-economic-revitalization.pdf>
- Inman, P. (2004). The engaged institution. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 10(2), 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.7227/JACE.10.2.4>
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Institutions. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Northeastern University. (2025). Climate Justice and Sustainability Hub grant program. <https://pref.northeastern.edu/cjsh-grant-program-recipients/>
- Odedina, F. T., Wieland, M. L., Barbel-Johnson, K., & Crook, J. M. (2024). Community engagement strategies for underrepresented racial and ethnic populations. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 99(1), 159–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2023.07.015>
- Overton, B. (2017). Engagement for the common good: Situating the National Forum’s work. In B. Overton, P. A. Pasque, & J. C. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Engaged research and practice: Higher education and the pursuit of the public good*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003444466-2/engagement-common-good-betty-overton?context=ubx&refId=1e6ab35c-347b-4f4e-8997-711aea1270ea>
- Palmer, K. (2025, February 13). Ending the Research 1 “arms race.” *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/institutions/research-universities/2025/02/13/ending-research-1-arms-race>
- Perry, D., & Menendez, C. (2011). *The impact of institutions of higher education on urban and metropolitan areas: Assessment of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities*. Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities. <http://staging.community-wealth.org/content/impact-institutions-higher-education-urban-and-metropolitan-areas-assessment-coalition-urban>
- Sanchez-Youngman, S., Boursaw, B., Oetzel, J., Kastellic, S., Devia, C., Scarpetta, M., Belone, L., & Wallerstein, N. (2021). Structural community governance: Importance for community-academic research partnerships. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 67(3–4), 271–283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12505>
- University of North Carolina at Charlotte. (2020, October 28). Largest grant in UNC Charlotte history expands national center for youth with disability. *Inside UNC Charlotte*. <https://inside.charlotte.edu/news-features/2020-10-28/largest-grant-unc-charlotte-history-expands-national-center-youth/>
- Vera, L. A., Walker, D., Murphy, M., Mansfield, B., Siad, L. M., & Ogden, J. (2019). When data justice and environmental justice meet: Formulating a response to extractive logic through environmental data justice. *Information, Communication & Society*, 22(7), 1012–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1596293>
- Whitmer, A., Ogden, L., Lawton, J., Sturner, P., Groffman, P. M., Schneider, L., Hart, D., Halpern, B., Schlesinger, W., Raciti, S., Bettez, N., Ortega, S., Rustad, L., Pickett, S. T. A., & Killilea, M. (2010). The engaged university: Providing a platform for research that transforms society. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 8(6), 314–321. <https://doi.org/10.1890/090241>
- Wilson, S., Campbell, D., Dalemarre, L., Fraser-Rahim, H., & Williams, E. (2014). A critical review of an authentic and transformative environmental justice and health community-university partnership. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(12), 12817–12834. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph111212817>

Yamamura, E. K., & Koth, K. (2018). *Place-based community engagement in higher education: A strategy to transform universities and communities*. Stylus Publishing.

