

# *Equitable Partnerships*

Katie Valenzuela Garcia  
Principal, Valenzuela Garcia Consulting  
September 7, 2016

“Boundaries” are the problem.

Community knowledge is undervalued.

The role of “boundary organizations”  
should be finite.

## **Bad: No Relationship**

Research and planning work not connected to target communities.

Staff not accessible to community partners.

Funding not shared outside of the institution.

## **Better: Collaboration**

Research and planning somewhat connected to target communities.

Staff accessible to community partners if work aligns.

Some funding shared with partner organizations.

## **Best: Partnership**

Research and planning determined by target communities.

Staff embedded in community organization work.

Funding transparent and shared.

# *Case Study: SJV CHIP Project*

UCD Center for Regional Change entered in to a contract with partners that set clear expectations for their project.

## Key elements:

- project's purpose
- guiding principles
- roles and responsibilities
- decision-making process
- ownership of data and sharing results

## Guiding Principles:

- **Resources and Compensation:** any new funding and resources had to be disclosed to, approved by, and non-competing with Valley EJ groups and include them when possible. Research partners would be a bridge to resources and help EJ groups lead the funding with researchers as subcontractors when possible. Appropriately compensate community groups and individuals for advisory roles.
- **Leave Us Better Than When You “Found” Us:** research partners had to actively help build the capacity of the Valley EJ groups, and not replicate or replace their work.
- **Self-Determination:** communities speak for themselves. Establish a steering committee to guide work. Allow partners final product review. Academics may give advice, but do not have a decision-making role.

*Questions?*

Katie Valenzuela Garcia  
[katie@vgconsulting.org](mailto:katie@vgconsulting.org)