

2000

Community-University Partnerships: Policy and Legacy

Vivian Reznick

Hilary Hahn

Elizabeth Morris

Sandra Daley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.cwsl.edu/cwlr>

Recommended Citation

Reznick, Vivian; Hahn, Hilary; Morris, Elizabeth; and Daley, Sandra (2000) "Community-University Partnerships: Policy and Legacy," *California Western Law Review*: Vol. 36 : No. 2 , Article 9.
Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.cwsl.edu/cwlr/vol36/iss2/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by CWSL Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in California Western Law Review by an authorized editor of CWSL Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact alm@cwsl.edu.

COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS: POLICY AND LEGACY

VIVIAN REZNICK*

HILARY HAHN**

ELIZABETH MORRIS***

SANDRA DALEY****

INTRODUCTION

This article explores the thesis that flexible federal legislation allows the development of creative local solutions, encourages collaborations, and fosters comprehensive interdisciplinary approaches to complex urban problems. A unique local collaboration between the faculty of the University of California at San Diego, the community of City Heights, an urban neighborhood engaged in redevelopment, and the San Diego Housing Commission, a local government agency, took advantage of the increasingly flexible legislation to design and target university research and housing programming to address key challenges facing San Diego.

The nature of urban problems in this country is evolving: changing demographics of the population, crumbling infrastructure, and economic disparity challenge the governmental response. Traditional federal responses

* M.D., M.P.H. Dr. Reznick is a Professor and Vice Chair, Department of UCSD Pediatrics. She has been involved in creating community based programs in San Diego for medical students and resident training. She worked with city and county governmental agencies to create access to health care and enhanced educational opportunities for children and families. Dr. Reznick also has worked within the University to encourage community based research and collaboration.

** Hilary Hahn has a Master's in Educational Administration, Planning and Social Policy from Harvard University. She is currently the Project Manager for the Community Outreach Partnership Center, and is also a Violence Prevention Fellow of the California Wellness Foundation Violence Prevention Initiative.

*** Elizabeth Morris was appointed as Chief Executive Officer of the San Diego Housing Commission on August 2, 1994, by the Mayor and City Council. Through her service on numerous local civic boards and on state and national professional associations, Ms. Morris promotes collaborative working relationships that deliver comprehensive services in conjunction with quality housing opportunities.

**** M.D. Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Assistant Dean of Student Development and Community Programs, UCSD School of Medicine.

are highly structured, regulate eligible expenditures and determine program activities. Legislation regulating funding assumes similar conditions in every community and can inhibit the development of innovative community based solutions. With a growing sense of urgency, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) recognized the magnitude of the challenges facing our urban communities, and actively sought new strategies to address these problems.

As America enjoys the longest sustained period of economic growth in its history, Secretary of HUD Andrew Cuomo has stated:

[c]ities are the strongest they have been in a decade. Job growth, home ownership and consumer confidence is up. It is a tribute to the strength of our national economy, the innovation of elected officials and the work of concerned citizens that our cities are poised and ready to lead America into the 21st Century.¹

However, as cities grew and prospered, their urban cores steadily declined for both contemporary and historic reasons, including concentrated poverty, shrinking populations, and the economic pressures of global competition.² In California, there was a need to deal with this issue on the local level: "Present land use, economic and growth patterns reflect the separation of two Californias by race, income and class We cannot succeed in the long term with thriving successful suburbs and devastated or troubled inner cities and older neighborhoods."³

I. HOUSING

Congressional leaders recently adjusted national housing policy in response to evolving urban issues. The first federally funded housing programs were created during the Great Depression as a temporary solution and then modified over the next fifty years.⁴ During this period, federal financing of privately owned assisted housing, largely in developing suburbs, augmented public housing. In the last twenty-five years, federal housing programs used direct rental assistance as the primary vehicle for families receiving housing assistance. Rental subsidies, paid on behalf of individual low-income renters, allowed families (at least in theory) to choose the type of housing and the neighborhoods they preferred. As nationally supported housing programs expanded, reams of legislation, regulations and operational handbooks evolved. These legislative policies dictated in great detail all aspects of pro-

1. UNITED STATES DEPT. OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, STATE OF THE CITIES REPORT, Cover letter to President Clinton (June 1998).

2. See UNITED STATES DEPT. OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, ASPEN SYSTEMS CORP. & CISNEROS, HENRY, THE UNIVERSITY AND THE URBAN CHALLENGE (Feb. 1995).

3. PHILIP ANGELIDES, CAL. STATE TREASURER, DEBT AFFORDABILITY REPORT, SMART INVESTMENTS 12-13 (June 1999).

4. United States Housing Act of 1937, 42 U.S.C. § 1401 (1937).

gram operation, from broad policy matter to minute procedural guidelines with little local discretion. In some cases, attempts to “streamline” programs brought new sets of guidelines that conflicted, in whole or in part, with existing rules, and with the training and practice of staff in local agencies.

Disparities between the way local real estate businesses handle their affairs and the methodologies prescribed by the laws, regulations and handbooks governing assisted housing programs were significant and often led to operational inefficiencies. Dictums such as length of leases, and grievance procedures beyond those contained in state law accreted over the years. As in other government endeavors, policy makers in San Diego had not resolved the tension between two goals, the first to conduct government like a business and the second to retain control over the use of taxpayers’ funds.

II. HIGHER EDUCATION

At the same time that our cities and national housing policies changed, higher education in the U.S. experienced tremendous growth. Higher education in American society evolved from an elite institution attended by about 1% of the population just over 100 years ago, to one attended by fifty-seven percent of eighteen to twenty-four year olds in 1994.⁵ Between 1982 and 1992, the percentage of non-white students attending colleges and universities across the nation grew by 5.6%.⁶ Many of these older institutions were surrounded by deteriorating neighborhoods. Students and faculty were reminded daily of the decline of the urban core.

Ernest Boyer, in *Creating a New American College*, described the relationship that must evolve between universities and communities:

[c]olleges and universities must join the effort to rebuild their communities, not just for moral reasons but also out of enlightened self-interest. The long-term futures of both the city and the university in this country are so intertwined that one cannot—or perhaps will not—survive without the other. Universities cannot afford to become islands of affluence, self-importance, and horticultural beauty in seas of squalor, violence, and despair.⁷

Given the geography and the increasing diversity and enrollment of the students, college campuses were compelled to participate in the redevelopment of their communities.

5. See D.P. Baker & T.M. Smith, *The Impending Final Mass Transformation of American Higher Education; Implications for Future Demand and Supply* (Aug. 1997) (paper presented at the American Sociological Association meetings, Toronto, Canada).

6. THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUC. ALMANAC 15 (Sept. 1994).

7. Ernest L. Boyer, *Creating a New American College*, THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUC. A48 (Mar. 1994).

A. Policy

Congress, through HUD, created a series of demonstration programs to try new approaches that address the pervasive problems in traditional housing programs, engage new partners in solving problems and maximize efficiency of taxpayer expenditures. Two of these demonstration programs, Community Outreach Partnership Centers and Moving To Work, engage the university in the redesign of housing programs and in solving the problems in our cities.

III. COMMUNITY OUTREACH PARTNERSHIP CENTERS

In 1992, Congress passed legislation that created the Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) program in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This was a response to the needs of our cities and to the new philosophy being advocated in the academic community. The COPC program is a demonstration to "determine the feasibility of facilitating partnerships between institutions of higher education and communities to solve urban problems through research, outreach, and exchange of information."⁸ The program is designed to advance university-community partnerships through a wide range of resources, incentives and guidelines that assist universities in accomplishing their urban mission.

The COPC legislation created a mechanism to provide universities with a number of resources that facilitate collaboration. Congress defined the potential field of action as: "problems associated with housing, economic development, neighborhood revitalization, infrastructure, health care, job training, education, crime prevention, planning and community organizing and other areas deemed appropriate by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."⁹ The university and the community use this funding to leverage private and public dollars, promote institutional change, and build capacity in order to sustain activities and programs long after federal dollars are tapped out.

The COPC program provides support to universities to set priorities and tailor community-building strategies to local needs and resources. COPC encourages universities to utilize a multi-disciplinary approach to address community problems, ensures that the community plays a central role in identifying problems and developing meaningful solutions, and provides guidelines that emphasize research, evaluation, and student learning experiences in community settings.

It was appropriate for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to initiate the COPC legislation. President Lyndon Johnson planted the seeds of the university-community partnership concept in the founding days

8. Housing and Community Development Act, 42 U.S.C. § 851 (1992).

9. *Id.*

of HUD, when in 1965 he said:

[t]his new Department will provide a focal point for thought and innovation and imagination about the problems of our cities. It will cooperate with other Federal agencies, including those responsible for programs providing essential education, health, employment, and social services. And it will work to strengthen the constructive relationships between nation, state, and city—the creative federalism—which is essential to progress.¹⁰

In 1994, HUD established the Office of University Partnerships (OUP) to support and encourage the efforts of colleges and universities to participate in the strengthening of their communities. In the first of a series of essays on universities and the urban challenge, then Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros stated that, “American colleges and universities possess a wealth of intellectual and economic resources that they can bring to bear on the problems of our cities.”¹¹

The mission of the OUP is to:

- Foster dialog;
- Disseminate models of university-community action research;
- Facilitates access to resources;
- Develop future agents and leaders of community development; and
- Build capacity of individuals and institutions to engage in meaningful community-based work.

To accomplish this mission, the Office of University Partnerships funds the following three programs in addition to the COPC: (1) Joint Community Development Program facilitates a wide range of rehabilitation and economic development activities that fall under the Community Development Block Grant program; (2) Doctoral Dissertation Research Grants encourage individuals to engage in housing and urban development policy research that may influence local and national policymaking processes; and (3) Community Development Work Study introduces about 120 disadvantaged and minority undergraduate and graduate students to careers in community and economic development professions.

A. *Moving to Work*

In 1996, Congress authorized legislation that created the Moving to Work Program. In its earlier deliberations, Congress struggled to enact legislation that provided flexibility in housing programs. Members of Congress, who traditionally supported less government intervention, insisted, contrary to their usual stance, on greater oversight because they were concerned about subsidy programs for the poor and with the administrative capabilities of local governments. On the other side of the aisle, advocates for federally de-

10. President Lyndon B. Johnson, State of the Union Address (Jan. 4, 1965).

11. ASPEN SYSTEMS CORP. & CISNEROS, *supra* note 2, at 4.

rived social programs feared that, unless details designed to protect the poor were dictated in national legislation, those in charge of implementing the programs might twist them in a manner detrimental to the intended beneficiaries.

The Moving To Work Program was a reasonable outgrowth of the deadlock. This legislation provided an opportunity to cut through the policy debate, harness creativity in the field, and conduct a national evaluation of several model programs without permanently altering existing housing policy. Moving to Work assisted the housing industry in its quest for deregulation. It also gave local housing agencies the flexibility to set aside certain components of existing complex legislation and the ability to create local affordable housing programs that encourage low income families to move towards self-sufficiency. The legislation shows that while housing reform for its own sake is often unsuccessful, housing reform for low-income families, when framed as a component of welfare reform, is achievable.

Moving To Work is a five year demonstration program created by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.¹² The demonstration gives housing authorities the flexibility to: (1) design and test various approaches for providing and administering housing assistance programs outside of the restrictions of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937; (2) reduce cost and achieve greater cost-effectiveness in federal expenditures by determining how to use program funds, including combining them into a single pool; (3) provide incentives to families with children by assisting heads of households to obtain employment; and (4) increase housing choices for low income families.

The Moving to Work designation offers participating housing authorities no new funding or expansion of service; rather it grants remarkable flexibility to high performing local housing agencies. HUD selected approximately thirty agencies and allowed them to redesign their programs and to seek waivers from extant legislation and regulations. The key legislative provisions that remained intact include the statutory requirement to serve certain populations (primarily defined by income) and all fair housing provisions.

It is anticipated that analysis of these scattered demonstrations will yield valuable information about effective program designs, financing requirements and operational efficiencies. Definition and measurement of outcomes under various models will generate a rich body of knowledge. It is hoped that information gained from Moving to Work will form a rational basis for rewriting national housing policies.

12. Department of Housing and Urban Development Veterans Administration and Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 42 U.S.C. § 204 (1996).

IV. RESPONSE TO POLICY: THE SAN DIEGO HOUSING COMMISSION AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) School of Medicine is the only medical school in the country to receive a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) award from HUD. The UCSD COPC expands the ten year New Beginnings (NB) Partnership between UCSD, San Diego County Department of Social Services, Department of Public Health, Department of Probation, San Diego Community College District, San Diego Unified School District, the San Diego Housing Commission, Neighborhood House Head Start, Mid City For Youth and other community based organizations serving children and families in City Heights. This partnership began with a conversation in 1988 between Jake Jacobson, then Director of the County of San Diego Department of Social Services and Tom Payzant, San Diego City Superintendent of Schools. They were both frustrated with the current education and social service systems. They both realized that they were investing millions of dollars in services for children and families and questioned the net results of that investment. They called together the Chief Executive Officers of the NB partner agencies. They all shared similar frustrations and agreed that substantive change might occur if they worked together. A ten year relationship of trust and a multidisciplinary approach to urban problems has evolved. UCSD provides direct health services, disease prevention services and educational outreach to children and families and conducts applied research in City Heights, an Enterprise Community which is part of the physical, commercial and residential heart of Mid City.

The following Community Outreach Partnership Center activities focus on "Community Needs," "Assets, Resources and Opportunities" and "Education for the Future"¹³ in science and the arts for children and youth in neighborhood schools (1) "Employment Opportunity" through education, job counseling, improved access to community resources and case management for residents; (2) "Housing Re-engineering" which provides greater program efficiencies while reducing cost of federal expenditures, incentives to encourage heads of households to participate in employment opportunities to and become economically self sufficient and increased housing choices; and (3) "Access to Health" maintenance and disease prevention services for children and families in "Move to Work" public housing units, schools and in the community.

V. RESEARCH ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THESE INTERVENTIONS

In 1997, the University of California, San Diego and the San Diego Housing Commission obtained a Community Outreach Partnership Center Grant with the San Diego Moving to Work project as its core. The UCSD COPC meets the intent and blends the resources of these two federal legisla-

13. See CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CITY HEIGHTS ECONOMIC AND CRIME SUMMIT REPORT (1994).

tive initiatives. Its goal is to strengthen the ability of individuals in the community to obtain and retain employment in the work force. This goal is a response to the recommendations in the 1994 *City Heights Economic and Crime Summit Report*, the Mid City Neighborhoods Full Employment Initiative, the San Diego Housing Commission's resident focus groups, and the *New Beginnings: Feasibility Study of Integrated Services for Children and Families*.¹⁴ UCSD COPC activities are designed to meet these goals and includes research and evaluation of the rate of utilization and effectiveness of these services in assisting the moving to work program participants in achieving self-sufficiency goals, as compared to a cohort of public housing and community residents who are self-referred or referred by community agencies.

The economic future of San Diego depends on the ability of its work force to participate in an economy that emphasizes technology, commerce and tourism. Individuals who succeed in this economy must be literate and have skill and knowledge of mathematics and the sciences. Therefore, employment opportunity with an emphasis on education is the cornerstone of the UCSD COPC.

The San Diego Housing Commission is the housing agency responsible for expanding affordable housing opportunities in the City of San Diego. Governed by an appointed board of seven members, the Housing Commission is ultimately responsible to the Mayor and City Council in their capacity as the Housing Authority of the City of San Diego. HUD has consistently rated the Housing Commission a "high performer." Nationally, the Commission is considered to be an innovative organization offering a breadth of housing related services.

To the Housing Commission, Moving to Work offered welcome opportunities to change the way federally funded programs are structured. A potential outcome is that this demonstration could lead to new approaches for expending approximately \$70 million annually. These monies currently support Section 8 rental assistance,¹⁵ which pays private rental owners for housing 9000 families (including seniors and people with disabilities) throughout the city and for the management of more than 1400 federal public housing rental dwellings located in small, dispersed complexes in San Diego.

Priorities for the Moving to Work program design were derived through focus groups facilitated by staff from the Housing Commission resident services department. Residents, potential participants and community based service providers expressed their priorities for program design. Current residents and potential participants desired an opportunity to be gainfully employed to support their families. In order to progress toward self-sufficiency,

14. See C. ROBERTS ET AL., COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, *NEW BEGINNINGS: A FEASIBILITY STUDY OF INTEGRATED SERVICE FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES* (1990).

15. United States Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1401, as added by § 8 Aug. 22, 1974, 42 U.S.C. § 1437f.

residents identified several high priority needs:

Childcare that is accessible and affordable. MTW addressed this need by locating subsidized day care for participants. The COPC also provides training for child care providers.

Career planning and skill development: Community colleges and the Workforce Partnership assess resident employment skill and interest, design individual career plans, conduct English as a Second Language programs, and provide job training especially in nontraditional careers (e.g., women in construction or aviation careers).

Transportation to services and employment: San Diego's limited public transportation system is a barrier to accessing some employment locations. A van was purchased, car pools facilitated, bus tokens provided and routes mapped out for MTW participants. The need to travel is minimized by having some services offered on site.

Comprehensive services, coordinated by a single case manager: The COPC provides staffing for the learning opportunity center at the MTW site. Case management services, English as a Second Language, and job training are available in the learning center.

San Diego's Moving to Work program waives many housing regulations including mandated forms, lease documents and grievance procedures, which go beyond state landlord-tenant statutes. The San Diego Housing Commission also obtained waivers regulating rent setting, duration of family residency and commingling of federal housing funds.

Rent Setting. By virtue of the Brooke Amendment to the U.S. Housing Act¹⁶ rents are normally set at thirty percent of each family's adjusted income. Furthermore, HUD requires annual (or more frequent if circumstances change between annual appointments) re-certifications and resetting of rents. The Moving to Work legislation includes a waiver from the Brooke Amendment.

Welfare programs are frequently criticized because they penalize families who increase their earned income and improve their family status. Not surprisingly, housing programs have similar disincentives in their programs. For example, as family income rises, so does rent as a percentage of that growing income. Moving to Work sets rents at amounts that are substantially less than market value and remains constant for the duration of family participation, regardless of changes in family income. It is also important to note that rents under Moving to Work will not decrease if family income declines. Many participants expressed nervousness about giving up this safety net available in standard HUD programs.

Duration: Under normal HUD guidelines, housing agencies may not set a time limit on residency. Renters may continue to participate until their rising income renders them ineligible. In some parts of the country, this led to

16. United States Housing Act 42 U.S.C. § 1401 (1937), *amended by* The Brooke Amendment 42 U.S.C. § 1437a (1982 and Supp. 1985).

third or fourth generation “public housing families.” San Diego’s Moving to Work returns federal housing programs to their roots as temporary assistance. Families may utilize the program for a maximum of five years. During that time, the Housing Commission and its collaborating service agencies will offer resources to assist families in becoming self sufficient, but at the end of the five year term families must move on, regardless of whether they have achieved that goal.

Commingling of Funds. HUD funds affordable housing through a series of separate grants. For example, the public housing program is supported by a number of fund sources including operating subsidy, grants for building repairs, drug diversion for resident youth etc. An unbreachable boundary divides all of these fund sources. Each fund source has its own application process, eligible uses and accounting procedures. San Diego’s Moving to Work eliminates the fund boundaries. All revenues for the fifty Section 8 and twenty-four Public Housing demonstration units in the San Diego Moving to Work Program are placed in a common pool. All related expenses, including previously ineligible social services, will be paid for from this single, commingled fund.

VI. COLLABORATION

University, government and community partners in the COPC and the Moving To Work Program are committed to the level of institutional change and collaboration that is required to demonstrate the viability of integrated services for families. Partner agencies have worked together in the New Beginnings Partnership since 1988. This long term interagency collaboration established and maintained relationships among executives, middle managers and line workers. It also created a foundation of trust which permitted partner agencies to design an intervention program that blended the resources of the COPC and Moving to Work Program.

A. *Universities Connected to Communities*

The environment of the University of California system and the UCSD campus emphasizes Community Involvement as part of the mission of the University. The April 1997 Draft Report of the University of California Outreach Task Force prepared for the Board of Regents of the University of California proposed a comprehensive plan for the overall outreach effort in the University of California system. This Report was strongly endorsed by the UCSD Academic Senate/Representative Assembly in May 1997. The proposed plan aims to prepare students not just for University eligibility, but for academic competition at the most exacting levels. It is a multi-dimensional plan with a long-term component addressing the root causes of under-achievement and linking all major educational sectors in California in a common purpose.

The COPC legislation provided a structure for the university to engage in this work, to value this work and to reward faculty and students for their contributions. The COPC provides a mechanism for developing the institution's ability to mobilize interdisciplinary teams to address community needs, and raise the profile of outreach and research in the community. It also affords the opportunity to demonstrate the validity of community-based research and its potential for policy applications. COPC activities engender respect for community service when a faculty member is reviewed for academic advancement and develop a sustainable base of community resources to support community oriented research, teaching and policy activities.

The legacy of the Community Outreach Partnership Centers consists not only of a series of worthwhile academic enrichment and community development programs but also of experiential learning opportunities for students, faculty and members in the community. Experiential learning consists of educational, health and community service activities that:

- integrate ideas and actions into the community;
- motivate students to learn in the traditional classroom and in community settings;
- allow the community to gain knowledge of systems and access to resources available in institutions of higher education;
- provide an opportunity for the community to influence the design of programs, research and new technology; and
- teach citizenship through practice.

In a speech urging students at Stanford University to become involved in community service, John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and author of *Self-Renewal*, asked the simplest but most significant question "why bother?" and answered his own question in two ways: "To give your life meaning and to discharge your obligation to society."¹⁷

Experiential learning is an integral component of student course work in several UCSD required and elective courses on the undergraduate and medical school campus. The COPC activities increase the number of available field experiences and provide student volunteer and part time work study opportunities in City Heights. Because these activities are part of UCSD course work, they will continue to exist even in the absence of the COPC. The following courses serve as examples:

The elective in Community Advocacy in the School of Medicine is an excellent example of experiential learning that motivates students to apply knowledge gained in the classroom to respond to community problems. Students learn principles of health promotion as they design and implement health education and screening programs for under-served populations. Students identify community organizations (e.g. churches and youth groups)

17. William J. Cirone, *Community Service and Civic Literacy*, in *COMBINING SERVICE AND LEARNING: A RESOURCE BOOK FOR COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE* 237-39 (Jane C. Kendall et al. eds., 1990).

that can partner in the design and implementation of appropriate prevention programs. After several years of participation in the Community Advocacy course, students approached the UCSD School of Medicine faculty with a proposal to open a free clinic for the homeless. The resulting course, named the Free Clinic, is an intervention program that responds to community needs. In the first Free Clinic course, students provided clinical services to the homeless in one San Diego community. This course was so oversubscribed and so many students wanted to participate in the activity that students, with the help of the faculty, created two more free clinics that serve homeless and low-income families in the downtown area and at an elementary school. In these settings, students learn about health administration and health education. They also acquire the leadership skills they need to work effectively in a multidisciplinary collaborative model of health and social service delivery.

Graduate students in educational technology can complete their internships working with the Moving to Work program. Interns are responsible for identifying the resident's technology needs. They design, implement and test service delivery plans based on the results of repeated need assessments. They also create user-friendly systems for adults to access technology resources. Graduate students have established a close relationship with residents. This relationship allows residents to regularly inform the university and the housing commission about the strengths and weaknesses of the program enabling program officers to make mid course corrections.

Undergraduate students in the Theater and Dance Department enroll in a series of courses that take students off the campus to assist in teaching dance classes in elementary, middle and high school. These teaching experiences in community sites are designed to accomplish four objectives: (1) Provide advanced dance students with an opportunity to learn and apply principles and theories of teaching dance techniques to students of all ages; (2) Expand the student's knowledge of theater and dance through participation in the creative work of resident artists in major regional professional theater or dance companies; (3) Support local dancers and choreographers; and (4) Introduce students and community members to teaching skills needed to compete for and retain teaching positions in education and the performing arts.

B. Housing Policy and Program Design

Ultimately, the legacy of the Moving To Work program rests on two factors: the ability of agencies to continue to collaborate effectively and the success of Moving To Work participants in achieving their self-sufficiency goals. An oversight committee with representatives from the Housing Commission, UCSD, the New Beginnings Partnership and community based organizations and participants meets semi-annually to ensure ongoing dialogue and open lines of communication. The progress of participants vis-a-vis self-sufficiency goals is being monitored closely over the course of the five year

demonstration project and will be measured by: changes in the percent of residents engaged in educational programs, obtaining high school diplomas, and increasing earned income. The percent of residents with a declining share of income from welfare/increasing share of income from work is also being measured.

It is anticipated that the Moving to Work program will change the systems that govern the local interpretation and implementation of federal housing legislation in the following areas:

Housing Policy. To the extent that quality, affordable housing is provided with less regulation and reduced cost, Moving to Work successes will form the basis for future federal housing policy. The program may demonstrate that flexible, locally derived solutions are more effective than national dictates.

Program Design and Implementation. Moving to Work will produce a wealth of information about programmatic issues. Affordable housing is necessary but not sufficient for improving family outcomes. It remains to be seen if five years is the appropriate time frame for moving a family to self sufficiency, if participants who volunteer for these programs achieve self sufficiency faster than less motivated housing residents and if the availability of on-site social and educational services improves outcomes. Coordination among service providers such as public health nurses, English as a Second Language teachers from the Community College, and counselors from Neighborhood House Headstart may enable case managers to better identify needs and resources for children and families. Duplications and gaps in services may be eliminated when service providers work in a coordinated manner. Services that prove to be critical for success may be enhanced by tracking family outcomes (e.g., monitoring changes in family income, education, and job placement).

By granting waivers and working with local housing agencies, HUD is creating the flexibility that enables housing professionals to design and implement programs that are better suited to local conditions. These programs will meet the original program objectives of providing cost-effective services, expanding housing opportunities, and ultimately contributing to the self-sufficiency of greater numbers of families. In programs like Moving to Work, HUD is measuring performance or outcomes rather than procedures or processes. Federal and local governments are working together in a partnership relationship, pooling resources and participating in collaborative problem solving. This fosters a climate in which housing agencies can experiment and grow in their ability to meaningfully meet the needs of their residents

CONCLUSION

Broad enabling legislation that stimulates collaboration and permits government and community agencies to pool their resources may lead to

comprehensive interdisciplinary solutions to complex urban problems. The University of California, San Diego and the San Diego Housing Commission are conducting research and evaluation to determine if this intervention strategy produces improved outcomes for the participating families, agencies, institutions and communities. By participating in community redevelopment, universities may benefit in several ways. First, students participate in experiential learning, applying lessons learned in the classroom to real situations. Secondly, university research becomes more relevant by working on real challenges with direct input from the community. Finally, the university maintains its reputation as a premier research institution by producing scholarship in the area of applied research. These benefits need to be highlighted by collaboratives within and outside the University and the faculty who participate need to be adequately recognized and rewarded for their work.

In the current system, faculty members who are engaged in teaching courses dependent on experiential activities, university service and applied research in urban or rural settings have difficulty getting promoted and convincing colleagues that their work is scholarly. These faculty are frequently acknowledged as experts in non-academic institutions and agencies such as Chamber of Commerces, State and Local Public Health Departments and government agencies such as the US Department of Health and Human Services. Ernest Boyer challenged American universities to face this problem in 1990 when he called upon American colleges and universities to rethink the priorities of the professorate and reorient faculty reward structures.

Boyer suggested institutions of higher learning broaden the definition of scholarship to emphasize not only the scholarship of discovery but also the scholarship of integration, application, teaching and service.¹⁸ The scholarship of discovery is defined as research in pursuit of new knowledge and technological inventions. The scholarship of integration draws on diverse findings and creates new paradigms. The scholarship of application takes new knowledge and utilizes it to address existing problems. The scholarship of service allows the university to broaden its role and responsibilities to address the issues in the surrounding community.

18. See ERNEST L. BOYER, SCHOLARSHIP RECONSIDERED: PRIORITIES OF THE PROFESSORATE (1990).