

Chapter I. How Might We Enact a Transforming Commitment to Social Justice by Engaging in Projects That Benefit Both the Community and the University?

This book examines how our work in the writing classroom can enact social justice and shape social change through equity-based collaborative partnerships with local organizations. Community-engaged writing takes place on many college campuses in both formal and grassroots initiatives. This chapter addresses writing projects and programs seeking to employ community-building approaches to create more equitable partnerships.

The Terms of Community-Engaged Scholarship

Universities are increasingly placing a high value on translating academic resources into collaborative initiatives that benefit both the community and the university. Through collaborative partnerships, both faculty and students participate in community-engaged scholarship. This movement became popular in the 1990s when Ernest L. Boyer (1996), former Carnegie Foundation president, claimed that “the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems, and must reaffirm its historic commitment to . . . the scholarship of engagement” (p. 11). Put plainly, community-engaged scholarship today “reflects a growing interest in broadening and deepening the public aspects of academic scholarship” (Barker, 2004, p. 123). As engagement scholar Drew Pearl (2020) acknowledged, “In the world of community engagement, we understand that the word “scholarship” refers to much more than our research” (p. 1). Engaged scholarship, or community-engaged scholarship, is research that puts the university’s academic resources to work in contributing to the public good. It consists of (a) research, teaching, integration, and application scholarship that (b) incorporates reciprocal practices of civic engagement into the production of knowledge (Barker, 2004, p. 124). Barker (2004) asserted that “the language of engagement suggests an element of reciprocal and collaborative knowledge production that is unique to these forms of scholarship” (126). In community-engaged projects, not only can we deepen our understanding of what it means to be civically engaged, but we also learn more about what it means to collaborate “with communities in the production of knowledge” (Barker, 2004, p. 126).

In 2021, over 360 U.S. colleges and universities have received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, an elective designation that indicates an institutional commitment to community engagement by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The foundation defines community engagement as “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional, state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (Driscoll, 2008, p. 39). Additionally, Campus Compact (n.d.-c) is “a national coalition of colleges and universities . . . dedicated . . . to campus-based civic engagement . . . to develop students’ citizenship skills and forge effective community partnerships” (Campus Compact Overview).

Mutuality and Reciprocity

Community-university partnerships offer higher education institutions and the communities in which they are located enormous potential for mutual benefit. Generally, a community-university collaboration is lauded as a joint “win/win” by both parties. Universities have a stake in improving their communities’ local economy, health, and culture on a fundamental level. The university benefits from partnerships by advancing academic engagement—working toward original contributions to disciplinary questions while engaging with communities—and working directly with community members or with organizations that work on behalf of those communities, such as nonprofit organizations. Studies show that faculty members who engage in community engagement have more publications in peer-reviewed journals, more funded research projects, and higher student evaluations of their teaching than those who do not (Doberneck et al., 2010). Not only are partnerships generative for relevant scholarship, research, and creative activity, but also, they enrich teaching and learning in order to prepare educated engaged citizens, strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility, address critical societal issues, and contribute to the public good (Fitzgerald et al., 2005).

The community benefits from university partnerships as well, with the stated end goal generally being to work together toward creating new knowledge or building capacity. This could take the shape of something as concrete as a new resource or deliverable, or something more abstract such as an improved method or approach to operations. In most cases, the community partner gains from the collaboration new knowledge, resources, or capacity it ordinarily would not have. University programs can partner with local groups and organizations, schools, and nonprofits. Through this work, organizations grow in skills and capacity while fulfilling their missions, making them more effective at shaping lasting change.

The Carnegie Community Engagement classification is the leading framework for institutionalizing community engagement in U.S. higher education, currently taking place every two years and requiring evidence-based documentation of institutional practice to be used in the process of self-assessment and quality

improvement. Universities may seek classification for community engagement to support the university mission and encourage self-study on how the university connects with local, regional, and global communities. The classification process invites the university to identify current best practices, envision future opportunities for engagement, and earn public recognition for the university's commitment to contribute to the public good. (The Elective Classification for Community Engagement, 2022).

A recent national survey of 100 urban universities and colleges conducted through the University of Virginia's Institute for Advanced Studies focused on the current state of community-university partnerships. The resulting report indicated, "As the influence of the Carnegie Foundation's classification suggests, accrediting bodies have the unique ability to incentivize university leadership to prioritize community engagement as well as provide objective feedback and recommended next steps" (Yates & Accardi, 2019, p. 35). A growing number of colleges and universities are considering community engagement as a primary indicator in the granting of tenure and promotion, the conferring of grants and other awards, and the determination of merit raises, increasing both the value and visibility of community-engagement efforts at the institutional level.

While many of our institutions are riding the wave of community engagement (or, as the trend indicates, will soon be), the movement is not without its critiques. Despite the growing demand to pursue and promote community-university partnerships, they remain a challenging work in progress, in part because "many universities have a fraught history of failed, even parasitic, relationships with their local communities" (Yates & Accardi, 2019, p. 6). In addition to the problem of unethical partnerships, infrastructure and resources remain significant hurdles. Community-engaged initiatives and programs are frequently "sporadic, disconnected or redundant in nature, supported by individual faculty, specific funding or fleeting leadership, without incentives for broad-based support or long-term institutional commitment" (Yates & Accardi, 2019, p. 6).

With the growing demand for more community engagement at our universities (fueled in part by the sought-after Carnegie classification), the field of writing studies has informed meaningful, ethical conversations around reciprocal partnerships, infrastructure, and the public good—longtime discussions in the discipline. The field of community writing, working across borders and locales for decades, is uniquely positioned to help guide this growing movement in higher education.

A major strength of the field lies in its ability to extend, complicate, critique, and ultimately enrich notions of what it means to engage in the "mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Commission on Public Purpose in Higher Education, n.d., Defining Community Engagement section)—a subject to which nearly every university has directed its gaze. Writing studies scholars looking at the nature of community-university partnerships pose relevant questions that are timely to the community engagement movement:

- “Are we privileging ourselves over the community?” (Bortolin, 2011, p. 55).
- “Where is the *community* in the literature?” (Cruz & Giles, 2000, p. 28).
- “Do they continue their lives unchanged? If not, how do they articulate the benefits?” (Ball & Goodburn, 2000, p. 82).
- “How can universities and communities collaborate in ways that are genuinely mutually beneficial?” (Yates & Accardi, 2019, p. 44).
- “What are the ethical obligations and responsibilities of community partnerships?” (Taufen, 2018, p. 7).
- “Engagement for what, to what end?” (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2012, p. 9).

Guiding Principles

Three guiding principles emerge from scholarship on community writing partnerships. These principles represent signposts of thought emerging from the field of writing studies. They are presented here as an entryway to working with community partners. The principles are offered in the spirit of a conversation starter and as signals in a process rather than as an ending point or a perfect formula for community-engaged work. A centralized process for working with community partners would be the opposite of what this book is trying to achieve. Instead, inspired by the Allied Media Projects’ (n.d.) network principles and the Design Justice Network’s (n.d.) principles, the guiding principles offered here can be viewed as an inclusive set of values that guides various types of work in the fields of writing studies, community writing, computers and writing, and technical and professional communication. These principles can provide a starting framework for our goals and aims as we work with communities:

1. We prioritize the strengths and assets of our community partners. When working with community partners, we focus on the assets inherent in the community while building capacity for improvement.
2. We value the co-creation of new knowledge with our community partners. When working with community partners, we create reciprocal, generative spaces for the co-creation of knowledge.
3. We are committed to a process of transformative change. When working with community partners, the impact on the community is prioritized throughout the process.

Guiding Principle 1: We Prioritize the Strengths and Assets of Our Community Partners

How are we defining “community?” Is the project approached through a strengths-based view (rather than a deficit-based view)? The first guiding principle intentionally frames work with our partners as a relationship that focuses foremost on the partner—rather than the university. The nature of communi-

ty-engaged work dictates that we direct our energy at real-world issues that are defined by communities “as we locate ourselves within the democratic process of everyday teaching and learning in our neighborhoods” (Cushman, 1996, p. 12). Although it may sound obvious, even self-evident at this point, there is much riding on this statement for the field of community writing. Prioritizing community partners orients our work in a way that puts our partner’s gains first, rather than the gains of the university. Historically this has not always been the case. Nadinne I. Cruz and Dwight E. Giles (2000) identified several reasons for the lack of attention on communities in engagement scholarship. For one, they noted that since the 1990s, community-based learning has focused on validating the discipline itself, tending to academic concerns, faculty perceptions, and student learning outcomes. It is a relatively common occurrence in community-university partnerships that “university representatives frequently exercise more agency in partnerships, controlling money, setting schedules based on university timelines, privileging student over community outcomes, speaking with discourses and epistemologies tied to power, publishing about community members, and holding more institutional clout and resources” (Shumake & Shah, 2017, p. 12). Additionally, “funders, seeking to document and evaluate their investments, have made student outcome research a priority in their grant-making” instead of a research focus on community impact (Cruz & Giles, 2000, p. 28).

When putting community first, it is necessary to look at how we attend to and define “community.” Many studies use the term “community” when referring exclusively to nonprofit participation (Vernon & Ward, 1999). Who or what is the community when we in the fields of writing studies and community writing refer to it? The community could be located in service-learning partners, nonprofit leadership members, ad hoc community groups, student groups, agencies, agencies’ clients, a geographic location, or even a virtual network (to name a few). This first principle asks us to consider where we work, prioritizing the community in our research, which for some may start with defining what kind of community we are in partnership with. While it might (again) sound obvious, it is not always a cut-and-dried definition, and the waters can quickly get murky. For example, when considering a nonprofit organization as a community partner—is that organization “the community”? Can the nonprofit be accountable to speak on behalf of a community? What happens when the viewpoints of the broader community at large differ from the nonprofits that intend to serve them?

In a study of 85 qualitative interviews conducted in three low-income Philadelphia neighborhoods, researchers Rebecca J. Kissane and Jeff Gingerich (2004) compared how nonprofit directors ($n = 51$) and community residents ($n = 34$) perceived their neighborhoods’ problems. They found that nonprofit leaders and community residents drifted apart in their assessments of the neighborhoods, holding widely disparate perspectives. For example, they noted that nonprofit leaders indicated lack of jobs and job training as significant problems in the area, while lack of youth services, followed by lack of food programs, were indicat-

ed as problems by community residents. The researchers found that not only do nonprofit leaders hold varying viewpoints from community residents but also possibly from the nonprofit organization's funders and donors. To be sure, this is a complex issue, warranting ongoing attention. However, what is telling is the degree to which we (and, here, I mean teachers in writing studies) might presume that the nonprofit organizations represent and serve the community, that the nonprofit organization is valuable to its community, and that the nonprofit organization is accountable to its community. We (and, here, I mean I) have often conflated the two, working under the assumption that partnering directly with a nonprofit is one of the best ways to benefit the community as a whole.

When working with communities, writing scholars recommend a focus on assets, referring to asset-based community development (Cruz & Giles, 2000; Diehl et al., 2008; Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Shah et al., 2018), a movement embraced by the community engagement field, "standing as a touchstone for respectful and effective ways of framing communities" (Shah, 2020, p. 23). Asset-based community development arose as a way to rebuild communities by shifting the focus from a deficit-view of low-income communities in community development programs to a strengths-based view (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). One of the dangers of a deficit-based view is that it positions community members as "fundamentally deficient victims incapable of taking charge of their lives and of their community's future" (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993, p. 4). Community writing scholars have illustrated how a deficit-view can lead to communities being detrimentally perceived in terms of their struggles (Boyle-Baise & Efiom, 1999; Mitchell et al., 2012). As Cruz and Giles (2000) explained, taking a strengths-based view rather than a deficit-view is more beneficial: "Instead of asking what does a community need and focusing on its deficiencies, this approach asks what a community has that can be further developed and utilized by the community" (p. 31). Rather than focusing on the negative elements in communities, such as crime, violence, welfare dependency, and drugs, asset-based community development emphasizes recognizing the positive capacities of communities, such as creativity, local wisdom, and survival-motivated tactics.

Although well-intentioned, framing partnerships in a way that emphasizes responding to a problem or issue in the community can be stigmatizing and can cause harm or can even unwittingly promote a savior mentality. Community writing scholars Shane Bernardo and Terese G. Monberg (2019) noted that "savior narratives and community deficit narratives have been critiqued but are also ongoing, and what is often missing is a larger story of how these disparities came to be and continue" (p. 87). An asset-based approach is also a tool to mindfully challenge and confront our own scholarly bias as academics. We are traditionally trained to see disciplinary problems and to frame research as a response to a problem (whether that be something concrete, such as a pressing social problem like incarceration, or something abstract, such as a problem of representation in the field). Rather than situating our projects and programs as revolving around

community needs or problems (a deficit, problem-based point of view), we can emphasize the “importance of utilizing local assets as key resources in tackling inequalities” (Harrison et al., 2019, Background section, para. 3). We can work on building relationships of mutual respect that promote interdependence between university and community—where “people can count on their neighbors and neighborhood resources for support and strength” (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993, p. 27). Kretzmann and McKnight advise that a focus on a community’s assets and resources “offers the most promising route toward successful community development” (p. 27).

Guiding Principle 2: We Value the Co-Creation of Knowledge With Our Community Partners

Is the project reciprocal? Is the project designed to co-create knowledge? Does the project bring the university and community together to share authority for knowledge creation? The second guiding principle foregrounds the co-creation of knowledge. Community-engaged partnerships involve both the university and the community partner’s participation in generating new knowledge. This could look quite different from a “service” or “outreach” approach, which may involve the “delivery” of expertise, training, or service that travels in one direction from the university to the community. Barbara A. Holland (2005) observed, “Too often, faculty assume that in a campus-community partnership, the faculty role is to teach, the students’ role is to learn, and the community partner’s role is to provide a laboratory or set of needs to address or to explore” (p. 11). A focus on co-creation ensures that community participants are positioned as “coproducers of knowledge and practice rather than objects of study” (Costanza-Chock, 2014, p. 207). Inherent in the engaged scholarship model is the pursuit of knowledge “through the combining of academic knowledge and community-based knowledge, eliminating a hierarchy of knowledge and a one-way flow of knowledge outward from the college or university” (Campus Compact, n.d.-b, Defining Engaged Scholarship section).

As scholars in community engagement critique, our research has often been shaped by colonial ideas of ownership, control, and the pursuit of status, focusing more on gains for the university than on gains for the community (Hartman 2015; Mathieu 2005; Patel 2015; Saltmarsh & Hartley 2012; Shah 2020). As Shah (2020) has noted, colonial patterns reinforce “paternalistic views of communities that legitimize university control of funds, agents, and decisions in collaborations,” and she has warned that these “patterns stretch back to the early days of community engagement and the community writing fields, and they will continue in the future if they are not interrupted” (p. 173).

Part of the work to decolonize partnerships rests in the politics of knowledge construction. As we work as a field to deepen community engagement, we must examine how narrowly we may have come to determine and evaluate our ways of

knowing—for example, favoring expert or specialist knowledge over community knowledge. Privileging university-based knowledge and undervaluing community-based knowledge has deep consequences. It invalidates “the knowledges of community members, and thus makes deep partnership and the practice of collaborative knowledge production difficult” (Shah, 2020, p. 5). Part of our work moving forward includes how to orient our partnerships so that both community-based knowledge and university-based knowledge are truly valued in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

Community writing scholars have long noted the importance of building reciprocal relations with community partners (d’Arlach et al., 2009; Flower 2008; Lohr & Lindenman, 2018; Sandy & Holland 2006). Through this scholarship, we can better understand what defines the movement today and how to support it in our work. Lina D. Dostilio and her colleagues (2012) conducted a useful concept review of reciprocity in community engagement literature in which they examined three orientations to reciprocity in the field of university-community partnerships. The first orientation looked at reciprocity through the lens of *exchange*—when both parties participate in the interchange of benefits, resources, or actions. The second orientation examined reciprocity through the lens of *influence*—when both parties in the collaboration are iteratively changed due to being influenced by the participants and their contributed ways of knowing and doing. The last orientation saw reciprocity through the lens of *generativity*—a function of the collaborative relationship in which participants (who have or develop identities as co-creators) become and/or produce something new together that would not otherwise exist. This orientation may involve transformation of “individual ways of knowing and being or of the systems of which the relationship is a part” (Dostilio et al., 2012, p. 20).

A generative view of reciprocity aligns with notions of “thick” reciprocity—reciprocity that “emphasizes shared voice and power and insists upon collaborative knowledge construction and joint ownership of work processes and products” (Jameson et al., 2011, p. 264). “Thinner” reciprocity is demonstrated by the transactional, exchange-oriented relationship and grows “thicker” the more both parties engage in the “collaborative generation of knowledge, shared power, and joint ownership of the full scope of work processes and outcomes” (Janke, 2018, p. 12). A thicker, richer reciprocal approach means that partners are working to “share and shape ideas together in a generative and collaborative spirit” (Janke, 2018, p. 13).

To construct genuinely collaborative partnerships, “we need to consider the relationship-building process, which involves multiple parties, all of whom need to contribute to the construction of the relationship for it to be reciprocal” (Powell & Takayoshi, 2003, p. 417). Reciprocal relationship building calls for “an open and conscious negotiation of the power structures reproduced during the give-and-take interactions of the people involved in both sides of the relationship” (Cushman, 1996, p.16). This orientation shifts the position of communities from

knowledge consumers to capable knowledge producers and acknowledges the inherent expertise that lies within communities. A generative reciprocal relationship may mean that both parties are not only learning *with* but *from* one another in a non-hierarchical process. A reciprocal relationship may also mean that power and authority are shared “in all aspects of the relationship, from defining problems, choosing approaches, addressing issues, developing the final products, and participating in assessment” (Saltmarsh et al., 2009, p.10). In an equity-based collaboration, we position ourselves as “stewards not of specific pieces of knowledge but rather of the productive and generative spaces that allow for finding knowledge” (Patel, 2015, p.79). By designing spaces for the discovery and co-creation of knowledge, we build capacity within our communities and gain insights that can inform our discipline as we strive to do better. These conversations are signposts for consideration regarding the co-creation of knowledge within writing partnerships.

Guiding Principle 3: We Are Committed to a Process of Transformative Change

Are the community’s gains put first? Does the research project apply new knowledge to address issues in the community? Is the research impact collaboratively evaluated? Is the impact transformative? The third guiding principle entails collaboratively assessing impact and social change at the level of the partnership. It focuses on shifting from a relationship based on transaction to one based on transformation. Designing spaces for mutual knowledge creation and mutual benefit requires intentional framing of the research. A community-based approach asks both parties to define the topic at hand and frame the inquiry regarding the issue. How we first frame the research question (or the design question) not only establishes a research project but also plays a crucial role in limiting what can and cannot happen within our partnerships (discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4). Community-engaged scholarship involves an approach to research that “moves away from emphasizing products (e.g., publications) to emphasizing impact” (Fitzgerald et al., 2012, p. 7). That is not to say that products and publications are not necessary but rather that we should prioritize a commitment to community impact throughout the process. This prioritization has not always been the case, as research on the effects of engagement on community partners is conspicuously lacking (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Cooks & Scharrer, 2006; Sandy & Holland 2006; Shah 2020). If we are to remain accountable to our partners, we “have to adjust our lines of inquiry and our discourse to be sure we are engaging with communities with every effort to partner mutually with, and to the equal benefit of, our communities” (Bortolin, 2011, p. 56). The CCCC Statement on Community-Engaged Projects in Rhetoric and Composition now urges scholars to focus on communities by providing “evidence of discernible, specific contributions such projects make to the public good” (Conference on College

Composition and Communication, 2016). By putting the community's gains first (over the university's gains and commitments, such as in our publications, grants, and even student learning outcomes), we can frame our research as "a process which builds community," and our "research can be viewed as community-building" (Checkoway, 2015, p. 139). We can learn what is possible in this enterprise by asking more focused questions that help us achieve the goals of both university and community partners.

Framing our research from a community-based perspective means that we can also evaluate our research from a community-based perspective. We can remain accountable to our partners by asking, "Did we engage in a process that builds community? Evaluation of our work can be grounded in a framework of alignment that values the building of trusting, mutually enriching relations with community partners. When the project cycle is near completion, we can ask, "Has there been an increase in net community assets?" (Cruz & Giles, 2000, p. 31). These questions can be set into motion from the beginning of the partnership as we align our resources around our shared goals. Just as knowledge can be co-constructed in research partnerships, we can collaboratively evaluate their outcomes. When both parties prioritize a commitment to community impact, they can

design and implement the actions to be taken on the basis of their shared understanding of the problem. Together, the parties can develop plans of action to improve the situation together, and they evaluate the adequacy of what was done. (Greenwood, 2008, p. 327).

Further research into methods for evaluation are warranted since "a major voice that's missing . . . is whether the community partners feel like they're getting benefit out of a mutually-beneficial partnership" (Yates & Accardi, 2019, p.41). Community engagement scholar Kathleen Bortolin (2011) asked practitioners "to undertake more research focused on community voice, community perspective, and community outcomes" (p. 56). In answering that call, scholars are exploring evaluative approaches that have roots in reciprocal principles. Community partner evaluations of the projects and other forms of feedback from "community members might be immediately useful for community engagement coordinators, instructors, and administrators looking to understand community impact and improve programs to deepen reciprocity" (Shumake & Shah, 2017, p. 14). To better measure partnership outcomes, Shah (2020) recommended a participatory evaluation process, a form of "program evaluation that involves stakeholders in analyzing the effectiveness and impact of an initiative" (p. 144). Shumake & Shah (2017) further suggested that "inviting community members to contribute to student grading might . . . have the potential to be both a valid form of assessment and a method for better incorporating . . . reciprocity (p. 14). Stephen Danley and Gayle Christiansen (2019) proposed implementing community boards "as an oversight mechanism grounded in community that can address the often

conflicting multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities within such partnerships from a community perspective” (p.8). There is a growing focus on how reciprocal evaluation methods such as partner evaluations, community grading, and community boards, help ensure that the requirements and expectations of both parties are met. These methods may also help ensure that our work is more inclusive and just.

We know that projects in community writing entail an enduring commitment to working with and within local communities. It takes time to build reciprocal relationships and to understand the nature and the possibilities of such work. Writing with communities is a form of slow media. Slow-media is the antithesis to a fast-paced, design-sprint ethos. Sasha Costanza-Chock (2020) has argued that

start-up ideology, such as “move fast, break things” and “fail hard, fail fast,” can become a justification for working styles that replicate broader structural inequality, when privileged student designers get to have a learning experience that involves making mistakes in the real world at the expense of community partners. (Preface section)

Like the slow food movement, the slow media movement is about making conscious decisions to consume and produce sustainable work that will help us grow, both in our classrooms and in our communities. Circulating disciplinary views suggest that engaged research should ground long-term faculty commitments in communities to build these relationships (Cushman 1996; Powell & Takayoshi 2003; Prell 2003; Taggart 2007). Powell & Takayoshi suggested that “thinking about the ethics of our research relationships will expand the ways we can envision the shape these relationships might take” (p. 398). To build stronger relationships with communities, partnerships “need to be viewed less as discrete, short-term efforts that function alongside the core work of the academy and more as mechanisms for making engagement an essential vehicle to accomplish higher education’s most important goals” (Fitzgerald et al., 2012, p. 23). To work toward our higher-order objectives requires that we shift our view from project deliverables at the end of the semester toward more sustainable and long-term commitments. This means that our community partnerships might not necessarily be conducted, completed, or evaluated in one semester—what many, including myself, have often accepted as the default setting for a course project. Christina L. Prell (2003) argued that “long-term commitments allow scholars to understand better the needs of community clients and come up with well-planned, sustainable solutions to those needs” (p. 194). This might entail setting the expectations up front that students contribute to a larger conversation with the community partner and that their work is not necessarily to complete a project deliverable in a given semester; rather, their work is part of a more considerable, ongoing investment.

By intentionally framing our research as a long-term process that builds community, we can begin to do just that—reimagine our programs, our partnerships, even our discipline. As community writing scholar Jeff Grabill (2010) acknowledged, it is possible to frame engaged scholarship in a way that can “drive change within a department, program, or college in terms of how that activity is understood and valued” (p.20). Through this work, we can learn to build not only mutually beneficial partnerships but also mutually transformative ones. Building transformative relationships “requires the fostering of substantive shifts in institutional culture and academic practices” (Yates & Accardi, 2019, p. 34). Deep and lasting change is not a single end point but rather emerges over time “from an accountable, accessible, and collaborative process” (Costanza-Chock, 2020, Preface section). For deep and transformative change to occur, we must examine power and privilege in an intentional and reciprocal process. Dostilio and co-authors (2012) claimed that “the potential of reciprocity within these new spaces is generativity-oriented in that it opens the possibility for new and different ways of being, processes, and outcomes to emerge” (p. 25). These principles provide a starting framework for our goals and aims as we work with communities.