One-Way Street

Emily Du
Duke University

I was working for the Center of Documentary Studies at that time in Community Programs, and we were invited to be a part of some of the very initial meetings, but it became very clear that a lot of work needed to be done before anyone was going to do any documentary work.
     'Why are you taking that picture? What are you going to do with that?'
     This and again that, 'We're tired of students coming into the neighborhood, taking what they need for their research, and leaving...
     'What happens to what they said they would do for us? How does that positively impact our community?'

These words were spoken in an interview with Barbara Lau, director of the Pauli Murray Project and "Face Up," a collaboration between Duke University's Center for Documentary Studies and the local Durham community aimed at celebrating the life of Durham-native and activist Pauli Murray while promoting solidarity between residents of different neighborhoods and also between residents and the university. Embedded within the concept and origins of this project was an essential conflict between the neighborhoods and the university. It was framed by Lau's questions that were presumably posed by frustrated Durham residents who believed that not only were local universities failing to respond to their needs but that those universities were also unjustly drawing resources from their community. As described by a recent university report, the civil involvement between Duke and Durham was "diffuse, unfocused and not very visible" prior to the establishment of the Duke-Durham Partnership Initiative in 1996 (Annual Report 2011, 4). Since then, Duke has striven to "improve the quality of life and youth educational achievement within the 12 neighborhoods closest to campus" through educational outreach to Durham's public schools, neighborhood partnership in residential neighborhood revitalization, community service, and providing loans for the development of affordable housing. Duke is not alone in its efforts, as many universities have made an increased effort to integrate themselves and their students into local communities for mutual benefit (Blouin and Perry 2009; McNall et al. 2009; Jackson and Cherry 2002). University administration and faculty have established and allocated resources for community engagement programs specifically designed to be carried out by students (Dewar and Isaac 1998). Service learning, for example, has become popularized as a means to produce variation in the learning environment while encouraging (or requiring) students to participate in community engagement (Strage 2004).

While these laudable accomplishments yield many positive outcomes for both the university and the community, differences between the two groups in level of education, affluence, or racial and age demographics could lead to disconnect when they attempt to work together. Conflicts between town and gown are "multiparty disputes or conflicts" with "dispute or conflict [occurring] at and between different system levels," such as between students and residents, or on an institutional level in terms of policy that favors one party over the other (Warfield 1995, 65). The term "town-gown" emphasizes this dichotomy between the academic community of a university and its host community of local residents or businesses. Many contributing factors to the town-gown relationship exist, simply because any interaction—

whether it be formal, informal, social, political, or academic—has the potential to shape the overall relationship and create lasting impact on the region. The Duke University Libraries indeed have an entire archive of publications, newspaper articles, and reports dedicated to the Duke-Durham relationship, titled "Town and Gown: Resources for studying the relations between Duke and Durham," covering a wide range of topics including labor unions, race relations, regional economics, and local housing. Specific factors that will be considered in this article through the lens of impact on the university-community relationship include community engagement, university impact on the regional economy, and payments in lieu of taxes (PILOTs). The relationship between these subtopics will be discussed further along in the article.

Each of the aforementioned areas of conflict carries its own respective weight in literature, which differs amongst them. Service learning, for instance, has been written about extensively whereas in comparison, university retail development has not. Discourse on the underlying issues within these conflicts, such as varying perspectives, conflicting goals, and institutional hegemony, is limited and comes chiefly from universities themselves. In addition, the effects of these conflicts on the overall university-community relationship are rarely studied even though these individual areas of conflict contribute to a much larger social construct that governs the residents and university affiliates. Yet promoting town and gown relationships is important because an entire region's economic growth and opportunities, demographics, amenities, and more can potentially be defined by the dynamics with its local university.

A close study of the contributing factors of community engagement, local economic impact, and PILOTs, reveals that hegemony creates conflict in all three of these areas, regardless of the fact that they are all very different, seemingly unrelated, and rarely discussed in conjunction with each other. Universities tend to provide infrastructural and financial assistance to combat these issues, such as program development and funding, which is appropriate because universities are often rich in these resources. However, this arrangement often leads to communities acquiescing to the university, an institution that is then perceived as a domineering, out to further its own agenda at the expense of the "less-educated common folk." It is imperative that the community-university partnership be reinvented with the overarching goal of empowering the community, versus disregarding its needs entirely or simply providing temporary solutions to single conflicts. A one-way street in services and resources ironically promotes the very hegemony that universities seek to ameliorate through their efforts. It is an unspoken agreement that may give universities plenty of opportunity to self-reflect on their own work and generate new ways to appease their host communities, but provides much less chance for communities to voice their own opinions and contribute in return to the universities.

Perspectives in Community Engagement

Community-based learning (CBL) initiatives, such as volunteering or service-learning courses, are popular in university settings because they can enhance empirical learning while providing an opportunity to provide meaningful service to the community (Sax and Astin 1997). They also contribute to the university-community relationship as an essential "pedagogical tool in which the community becomes a partner in the process" (Edwards, Mooney, and Heald 2001, 445). Yet it is widely acknowledged in the field that the impact of these programs on the university and its students is well-studied, without detailing the impact on the community (Sandy and Holland 2006). Transparency and representation for both the university and the community are crucial because, "the failure to grapple with understanding the community perspective may have potentially dire consequences because there is considerable room for misunderstanding

between higher education and community partners, a divide that is evident in the language higher education practitioners use" (31). In a direct example, the thirteen-paged Year-End Report for the Duke service-learning program contains only three statistics on the response of community-based organizations (CBO) to their service-learning experience, all of which only reflect positively on the service-learning program (Connecting Civic Engagement to the Curriculum 2011). In community-based research, a similar predicament arises as well, in which the university affiliate, in this case the researcher, focuses on his or her own needs over the community affiliate's. Representational biases such as this one understandably exist though because the priority of these academic programs produced, funded, and organized by the university is reserved for the students and their educational benefit, and thus, assessment of the programs focuses on the students versus the community. Furthermore, there are academic pressures that students and faculty face demanding work in community-based research that "indeed treats communities as subjects," in order to obtain tenure or external funding in the form of grants (Ferman and Hill 2004, 245). To fill the knowledge gap, many writers have sought community opinions as well as developed strategies for creating more equitable partnership (Stoecker, Tryon, and Hilgendorf 2009; McNall et al. 2009; Edwards, Mooney, and Heald 2001; Baum 2000).

Researchers at Indiana University have explored the outcomes of service learning for CBOs (Blouin and Perry 2009). They found that even though CBOs benefit from the student volunteers, they also face a host of practical problems in their experience with the service learning program. Many CBOs in the subject pool of the study were pleased with the "skills, commitment, fresh perspectives, and energy of student service learners" (122). Service learning was also attributed to lessening negative stereotypes of college students through positive interactions with community members. On the other hand, many CBOs reported struggling with service learners who were unreliable or acted unprofessionally towards the organization or, in an even more egregious offense, towards the organization's clients. In cases like these, the CBO must suffer at the cost of the student's education, a predicament that reflects poorly on the program and on the university. Some CBOs have also expressed a strained or nonexistent relationship with faculty, who could potentially have "inaccurate assumptions or lack of information about an organization's culture, basic operation, or needs," despite incorporating the service-learning experience into their curriculum (130). Another study of CBO perspectives revealed that faculty had created assignments that were illegal or inappropriate for the CBO's environment (Sandy and Holland 2006, 37). This situation can have especially detrimental consequences if instructors do not facilitate the preparation of service learners to confront issues related to poverty, race, mental illness, substance abuse, or homelessness if students are expected to confront these issues in their work for the CBO. Students who are unprofessional or ignorant may be inadequately prepared to engage with the community, and thus contribute negatively to the CBO's work.

In addition to the challenges of successfully executing a service learning program, there are challenges in the development of programs. Dr. Denise Comer (2012) of Duke University's Thompson Writing Program recently taught a service learning course within the discipline of writing. In an interview, she described a conflict of interest between the goals of students, faculty, and the CBOs with which they worked. Students in her class were required to generate writing-intensive deliverables for their CBO that aligned with course objectives, which the CBO needed and appreciated immensely. However, because the students were not interacting directly with community members or able to experience first-hand the benefits of their work, they did not

feel like the service component of the course met their expectations in providing an opportunity for community engagement. The instructor was faced with the dilemma of reconciling multiple objectives: creating a service experience satisfactory to the students, furthering the writing goals of the particular course curriculum, and meeting the needs of the CBO. This situation illustrates differing goals in service learning between university participants and the CBO that can impede the success of these programs for any one of its stakeholders. Furthermore, service-learning itself is a precarious arrangement because it risks the CBO transforming entirely into a pedagogical tool rather than a mutually beneficial partnership if students do not genuinely value the organization's work. A study conducted by Barbara Ferman and T. L. Hill (2004) reveals a similar disparity in agendas within partnerships formed due to higher-education community-based research (CBR) (241-57). CBOs are likely to partner with universities if the partnership leads to "obtaining project-related resources, leveraging further resources, gaining access to networks, and increasing legitimacy" (245). As mentioned previously, university faculty engage in partnerships in order to fulfill intellectual interest, political or ideological commitment, or the academic demands of their profession. However, CBO representatives described incidents of partnerships going awry when the needs of one group, usually those of the community, are not met. This can occur if university affiliates fail to share secured grant money or when researchers maintain an air of superiority in knowledge over the expertise of their community partner. In describing the consequences of these sour partnerships, Ferman and Hill declare that "in many communities, it is almost impossible to overstate the amount of distrust community leaders feel towards academics—in large part because of the persistent experience of having their reality reinterpreted, devalued, ignored, or otherwise disrespected" (248).

The subcategories of conflict discussed within CBL and CBR indicate issues within the conceptualization and realization of university-community partnerships. Poor experiences in any form of engagement could exacerbate tension, reinforce stereotypes, or hinder the future of relationships within CBL and CBR or in the greater community, despite the initially good intentions of these efforts. To improve the outcomes of community engagement for communities, universities should focus on community empowerment and prioritize the town-gown relationship over individual project outcomes. Researchers have suggested a wide array of strategies to combat these challenges by creating transparency, building trust, increasing accountability, and maintaining a realistic perspective on capacity (Ferman and Hill 2004; Baum 2000; *Achieving* 2007). In projects, universities could direct their efforts toward helping to empower CBOs to build capacity for their own research and service projects (Seifer and Greene-Moton 2007). Some specific empowerment strategies include "expecting community partners to identify programs and activities, focusing on the academic outcomes, allowing community partners to receive recognition for success from the community, and serving in a mentoring role rather than an expert role" (Ellery and Ellery, 2012, 1). By encouraging the community to extend a hand in partnership and voice its own needs, university-community engagement fights the perception of the university as a resource-rich entity in a position of power that sits in the driver's seat of the relationship. CBOs and community leaders should play an active role in initiating, managing, and protecting partnership projects. Furthermore, to counter the issue of conflict in agenda between community and university affiliates, universities can strive to instill value in the democratization of community engagement and through the tenure process, reward faculty whose work promotes it. They can do this by recognizing the expertise of community partners and including them in peer-reviewing work and also in the promotion and tenure process (Seifer and Greene-Moton 2007; Freeman, Gust, and Aloshen 2009). Supporting faculty involved with

4

community capacity-building means that "trusting, respectful, principled relationships can move from being just individuals and, instead, internalized within the institution" (Freeman, Gust, and Aloshen 2009, 96). Most importantly, participants of partnership from both university and community must continuously strive to prioritize partnership itself, and the resulting university-community relationship thereby fostered by cooperation, over individual projects. The success of any partnered project, as well as that of future endeavors, is integrally dependent on the fundamental relationship between its constituents.

Community Discontent, Despite the Dollars

Many universities compile intricate reports characterizing the economic impact of the university, detailing how many jobs the university has produced, how much money has been spent on the community, and what services the university has provided for their local region. Duke University's 2006-2007 annual economic impact on the city and county of Durham claims that the university contributed $3.4 billion to Durham, through employment opportunities (49.6% of which are held by Durham residents); student and visitor spending; purchasing of local goods and services; donations, including uncompensated medical care; and services, taxes, and fees (Office of Public Affairs 2007). While there are researchers that claim inaccuracy in such reports and inflation in their cited values, universities undeniably attract visitors to a region, employ a substantial number of local residents, and provide many services or resources to the local community (Siegfried, Sanderson, and McHenry 2007; Brown and Heaney 1997).

The contributions detailed in Duke's Annual Report align with the modern university urban development model, which includes plans focused on the areas of public safety, residential housing, public safety, commercial activity, economic development, and public schools. This new model arose after the failures of post-World War II urban renewal, a movement that had begun with the aim to attract students by improving the desirability and local amenities of universities. Many projects, such as the University of Chicago's renewal of Hyde Park, were poorly planned, unrealistic in their outcomes, self-serving for the university, disproportionately detrimental for poorer and minority residents, and ultimately unrealistic in their outcomes (Hirsch 2005; Roth 2011). They elicited negative responses from the community members, who perceived these endeavors as "a top-down, hyper-planned effort at transformation that imposed enormous costs on nearby, mostly poor, residents in order to benefit wealthier universities and their affiliates" (Roth 2011, 11). Newer models have been exemplified by universities such as the University of Pennsylvania, which is a well-documented case and "best-practice" model for other large universities. In addition to its civil projects, Penn began partaking in retail development in the late 1990's with Sansom Common, a 300,000 square foot complex at the heart of its campus, featuring restaurants and high-end retailers that could be enjoyed by local residents, university affiliates, and tourists (Nunery 2003, 15). Even with a glamorous, large-scale operation like Sansom Common, problems did arise when the new operations diverted business away from pre-existing local providers, such as on-campus eateries, that were faced with downsizing and operating deficits (18).

The negative impact of university-developed retail sectors, similar to Sansom Commons, fuels the fears of small business-owners near Duke University. The small businesses near Duke's campus have an imperative role in the community both economically and culturally because not only do they provide jobs and generate revenue but also uniquely characterize Durham as a city (Christiansen, Stitely and Hoyt 2010). Duke has not had a history of retail development in Durham, but has in the past decade faced criticism and opposition from the community for its

campus retail initiatives. Durham's Ninth Street is an off-campus outlet that features one-of-a-kind, locally-owned stores such as The Regulator Bookshop and Francesca's Dessert Caffe. In 2004, Duke released plans to bring new student apartments, restaurants, and shops to Central Campus with intentions claiming to serve its students better. For residents of the Old West Durham neighborhood, which even includes Duke's East Campus and is located in close proximity to the Central Campus, the economic impact of the university's planning and developing the area is pivotal for maintaining the livelihood of their own community. However, local merchants suspected that "the university was pursuing a strategy to keep more student dollars on the campus while providing retail options that would also appeal to local residents," especially since the university expressed an interest in broadening the terms of the agreement to promote retail to a wider population (June 2004). For merchants along Ninth Street, renovations to Central posed a threat to their business and a means for the university to profit at the cost of the local economy. The skepticism and distrust of the local entrepreneurs towards the university's intentions reveals deeply engrained rifts in the university-community relationship. As reported in the same article, "the tension recalls the days when Duke's neighbors and others in the city saw the university as an isolated, arrogant, and sometimes clumsy behemoth that had little outward regard for local folk."

Opposition to the community perspective was present among students, an opinion expressed by Duke student Kristen Butler in *The Chronicle* (Butler 2006). The Durham Planning Commission had voted against the changing of the zoning designation from "residential," to the more flexible "university-college," which would have allowed the university to invite retailers to Central, due to strong opposition from local entrepreneurs. They feared that Duke would draw business away from local retailers. Butler insinuates that Durham is devoid of a student-oriented retail hub that even Duke's athletic rival, The University of North Carolina, possesses: "Indeed, we need only drive 10 minutes to behold a real student-centered business district. It's called Franklin Street." This revealing statement points to a divergence in perspectives about Durham of the students and the business. Retailers trying to protect their livelihood assert that Durham would be losing character in what they see to be a thriving area. However, many of the students do not perceive nor respect these areas the same way that residents do; while it is inaccurate to consider one perspective as representative of the entire student body's opinion, it makes sense that students' priorities would lie in the convenience and diversity of their on-campus options. Furthermore, the argument of the community's small business owners is loaded with the historically tainted town-gown relationship between Duke and Durham. For students completing their degree who have only been in the area for four years or less, the long-term university-community relationship is not necessarily a relevant issue in this discussion, and they perceive local community members to be unfounded in their fears of the outcomes of implementing a business sector on Central Campus.

As seen with the University of Pennsylvania case study, university retail has the potential to positively improve the community and its relationship to the university if executed conscientiously. Universities seeking to initiate retail sectors near their campuses should carefully consider town-gown impact throughout assessment and uphold the interests of the community through partnership. Compared to the assessment of service learning and CBR, the literature on the conflict in modern urban development by universities is much more limited. This may be because urban development does not align with the university's primary academic mission and thus appears to be on the periphery of the university's concerns. However, it is an issue that has considerable impact on town-gown relationships and therefore deserves to be

formally evaluated. In order to fully assess the effect of university-supported retail ventures, especially on community relations, in-depth case studies on an individual university basis must be conducted on the economic and social impact of these efforts. These studies should consider historical precedence related to the topic because of the potential for current issues to be rooted in past ones. Urban universities are secondary investors in the sense that they are a force with broad and long-term interests; their permanent role in a given geographical location as well as their primary goal of education shape their decisions in ways that differ from typical private developers (Roth 2011, 22-26). For a university to promote its retail development, it must do so with the support of the local community. A university could contract with local businesses to provide the university goods and products; at Penn, a "policy of economic inclusion kept neighborhood money in the neighborhood, and went a long way convincing skeptics that Penn was sincere in its desire to do right by West Philadelphia" (Crane 2004). David Roth (2011) also extols Penn's projects that "are often developed with an eye toward creating favorable externalities that will be captured by both the University itself and the surrounding neighborhood" (21). "Good" retail environments can improve the public's perception of the university, and universities should strive to take advantage of these positive situations for their benefit (Nunery 2003, vii). Before Duke will be able to fulfill its campus retail endeavors, it will need to convince Durham of the community's role in establishing, promoting, and supporting business that is not only "for" Duke but also "for" Durham.

Conflicts in University Property Tax Exemption

A recurring and widespread source of conflict for many universities and their host communities is the local property tax exemption of land and buildings of private colleges universities used for educational purposes (Rokoff 1973). The property tax-exempt status of nonprofit organizations reflects support for these organizations' areas of endeavor, which often include programs at the forefront of social or cultural improvement (Ginsberg 1980). Because municipalities depend on property tax revenue to fund infrastructure, education, and public services, local officials have urged affluent tax-exempt organizations to provide financial compensation in order to sustain the community, especially during rough economic times. Universities are targeted for these demands because of their large endowments and often extensive ownership of real estate. Some universities therefore contribute payments in-lieu of taxes (PILOT) and services in-lieu of taxes (SILOT) to replace lost revenue (Bruning, McGrew, and Cooper 2006). PILOT payments usually do not fully compensate for the amount of revenue that would otherwise be generated through real estate taxes. Furthermore, despite PILOT programs, "existing property tax exemption imposes fiscal burdens on municipalities hosting educational institutions" (Rokoff 1973, 182). Rokoff argues this is the case because the burden of the university's lack of taxes falls unfairly upon the local tax base, even though the benefits of the university, such as museums, community health programs, professional libraries, and post-secondary educational programs are enjoyed by people living outside of the tax-base. The tax-exempt status of universities has thus introduced conflict with their host communities and posed challenges for them as well. Even though property taxes that would have been contributed by universities can be a significant percentage of the municipality's tax revenue, "the net impact of local taxes both paid and avoided, services provided in lieu of taxes, and changes in property values in the local area are complex […] and are seldom considered in impact studies" (Siegfried, Sanderson, and McHenry 2007, 554). Negative publicity on the issue does, however,

frequently incite the media at universities such as Brown, Princeton, and Tufts, thereby indicating that there is an impact on town-gown relationships (Russ 2012; McCuaig 2009).

A prime example of this situation is at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, where the city's battle against the university over tax compensation played out in the public arena of national media in early 2012. Rhode Island itself is on the verge of bankruptcy, as "the state's economy is currently trailing the national recovery, and its capital city has closed schools, renegotiated union contracts, and raised property taxes to try and bridge a $110 million budget gap" (Erickson 2012). More than half of the land in Providence is owned by tax-exempt organizations, which according to the mayor, Angel Taveras, costs the city more than $36 million annually in public services; the nonprofits collectively own $3 billion in tax-exempt property (Levitz 2012b). Taveras has urged these tax-exempt organizations, particularly Brown, to increase payments to the city. Brown University president, Ruth Simmons, initially rejected these calls for increased payments in a statement addressed to the Brown community, asserting that the university "could not simply provide unrestricted funds to address a structural deficit that had accrued for many years, and […]was the result of reductions in state aid, high employee and retiree costs and a reliance on one-time budget fixes" (Simmons 2012). She cites numerous ways in which the university already contributes extensively to Providence's economy and insists that the university will instead "seek to identify ways to enhance [its] current contributions to the city in ways that align with [its] mission, and specifically to support the schools and economic development." Ultimately, she claims that an increase in payments to the city would be crippling to the university and serve merely as a superficial, temporary solution to the city's dilemmas. However, Simmons eventually deferred to the city's demands to maintain the university's relationship with Providence, agreeing to contribute an additional $31.5 million over the next eleven years (Levitz 2012a).

President Simmons's decision came after much deliberation and negotiation between the city and the university, and was accompanied by the statement that Brown is "deeply concerned about Providence's financial situation" (Levitz 2012a). While Brown expressed concern for the economic condition of Providence, the value of a PILOT is not always just in its financial contribution, but its ability to serve as a bargaining chip or a form of leverage in negotiations. As a "solution" to property-tax exemption, PILOTs have been criticized because "the level of PILOT amounts usually depends more on the aggressiveness of municipal officials than on property values or the level of public services consumed by nonprofits" (Kenyon and Langley 2010). According to Kenyon, nonprofit organizations may feel pressured that government-related decisions including zoning changes or building permits, are contingent on PILOTs. An example of this was in early 2011, when Princeton University requested zoning for a $300 million arts complex that included plans to relocate a train station but met resistance from the Borough of Princeton, to which the university pays a PILOT. Following the initial meetings, the university vice president and secretary, Robert K. Durkee, was quoted in an email suggesting that the borough's lack of cooperation would result in a lowered PILOT: "It would be difficult to justify continuing contributions at existing levels to local officials who not only refuse to help the university achieve a key educational objective, but in some cases have sought to prevent the project from going forward" (Cooper 2011). This statement was corroborated by statements made by university president Shirley Tilghman. Despite the initial rejection, the zoning was eventually approved in late 2011. However, the situation was complicated further when in early 2012, Princeton Borough and Princeton Township residents filed a lawsuit against the University, the Borough, and the Township for "illegal spot zoning that was given to the

university in exchange for monetary payments, other items, and increased voluntary payments in lieu of taxes" (Knapp 2012). A commentator suggests that tax-exempt bodies, like Princeton University, "would find themselves facing the choice of upping their payments to local government to get their projects underway, or opting to have their projects delayed or killed as they challenge recalcitrant local government administrators in court" (Cohen 2012). The university is portrayed as the victim here, but the opposite situation could have easily occurred because the university had initially publically suggested decreasing its PILOT. While a compilation of news stories could exclude key details involved in conflict, thus offering an incomplete depiction, the issue at hand still illustrates the ability for PILOTs to financially dictate and corrupt the relationship between a university and its municipality. The system by which their amounts are "calculated" is flawed and the results can complicate the effects of property tax exemption.

Defining the term "educational" for the purpose of designating what properties qualify as tax-exempt poses an issue as well. The properties that universities hold are used for a variety of purposes, not all of them primarily educational. Furthermore, education encompasses an array of methods and activities—it is not just limited to buildings with classrooms and lecturing professors (Ginsberg 1980). In the 2006-2007 fiscal year, Duke University contributed $7.3 million in primarily sales tax and water and sewer fees with property taxes comprising 8% of that total (Office of Public Affairs 2007). The $611,000 in property taxes came from the Washington Duke Inn, a hotel located on the university's premises. On the contrary, Cornell University does not pay taxes on its campus hotel (Burness 1998). In an analogous situation, Duke does not pay taxes on a golf course located on campus while Yale University does. These specific discrepancies in defining tax-exemption status have not recently caused issues, but could incite conflicts in the future at Duke or other universities.

The conflicts described are not about property tax exemption itself, but rather the use of PILOTs to buoy both finances as well as the town-gown relationship. These situations all exemplify the affluent university brushing shoulders with its financially struggling surroundings. While theoretically, the university could be acting as part of the community in generating economic livelihood for the entire city, there is instead an institutional chasm between the two entities, which are at times pitted against each other in a financial battle. In Providence's case, the city seems to be dependent on Brown, looking to the university as a wealthy neighbor that has the duty to provide financial respite for the city, rather than an as economic partner and asset that generates revenue through its activities both for itself and for the community. The situation presents a power imbalance between the city and the university, deeply rooted in the socio-economic differences of the town and gown, as well as policies such as tax-exemption and PILOTs that cement them in those positions.

Beyond bargaining the dollar amounts cited by oppositional sides, the conflict caused by PILOTs and university property tax-exemption can cripple the town and gown relationship through distrust and hostility that will take more than money to fix. If the purpose of PILOTs is to substitute exempt property tax and nothing else, a fairer system for calculating PILOTs must be established, such as an equivalency factor for equating services and monetary payment rather than depending on particular traditions or need-basis. Currently, most universities negotiate their own PILOTs with their respective local community, but a more reliable system would prevent bribery and other illicit exchanges from occurring. Furthermore, properties that deserve tax-exempt status should be defined more strictly. Lastly, municipalities should not depend on the payments of non-profit organizations as a source of revenue during times of financial turmoil.

Universities and communities could instead seek to establish sustainable economic partnerships or other initiatives that do not involve monetary payments.

Widening the Road for University-Community Partnership

The issues that have been described surrounding service-learning and community-based learning, university impact on the regional economy, and PILOTs are prevalent across various universities and communities. Even though these areas are seemingly very different, a study of each of these areas allows us to reflect on their impact on the university-community relationship, as well as draw some conclusions about them.

A fundamental problem in the university and community relationship is not that efforts do not exist to bridge the gaps in these three fields, but assessment of these efforts is scant and incomprehensive. In many instances, even though the ideals of partnership between university and community do not align with reality, assessment excludes some of these more disagreeable aspects. For example, evaluation of service learning targets students but not community members—universities often analyze their relationship with the community through a pedagogical lens, conflating meeting educational goals with successful partnership. PILOTs create conflicts that have yet to be thoroughly explored. Guidelines for soliciting PILOTs and developing PILOT programs have not been established either. Sometimes, the impact of these conflicts on the town-gown relationship is not fully examined, as is the case with any of these three fields. This relationship should be brought to the forefront of discussion within these subcategories because every decision, gain, and loss for one entity directly affects the other. The town-gown relationship is convoluted—not every university has a tax-exempt scuffle or a service-learning program at all—but a university can better understand and improve its relationship with its local region by understanding the major contributing factors to its own individual relationship. In Duke's case for example no number of community projects could convince many of the local businesses that Duke was not speaking against their interests by promoting a shopping complex on Central Campus. Determining a successful course of action for addressing conflicts in university-community interaction requires more extensive literature in the field and expanded understanding that integrates the individual facets that contribute to the relationship.

While there are many possibilities for courses of action that universities can take to improve the relationship with their host communities, focusing on the construction of a true partnership should target some of the power imbalances that often define these relationships. Instead of universities constantly trying to meet the needs of the community, communities could ask themselves what they have to offer to the university, even if it is not in the form of financial assistance. Furthermore, universities should direct their efforts to empowering their local community, rather than contributing to the hegemony that divides the entities. Bi-directionality in all aspects is crucial for a partnership in order to avoid a paternalistic approach to addressing power difference. This concept and approach can be applied to all three of the discussed areas of contention, as well as with other basic, organic interactions between universities and the community. For example, instead of the university solely sending students out into the community, community members could produce ways to welcome students into the community, such as with student-targeted events. These events would increase student traffic into the local community and introduce students who are unfamiliar with the area to its amenities. Community-members could be actively invited to the campus to partake in the cultural, artistic, athletic, and intellectual outlets available because individuals who take the time to appreciate the university

first-hand may be "more likely to regard the university positively on the relational dimensions of trust, openness, investment, and commitment" (Bruning, McGrew, and Cooper 2006, 127). Direct interaction with the university can help to eliminate stereotypes of the university as a sequestered, elitist entity within a larger, regional community—a widening of the road to mutually beneficial partnership.

References

Achieving the Promise of Authentic Community-Higher Education Partnerships: Community Partners Speak Out! 2007. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.

Annual Report. 2011. Durham, NC: Duke University.

Baum, Howell S. 2000. "Fantasies and Realities in University-Community Partnerships." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20 (2): 234-46.

Blouin, David D. and Evelyn M. Perry. 2009. "Whom Does Service Learning Really Serve? Community-Based Organizations' Perspectives on Service Learning." *Teaching Sociology* 37 (2): 120-35.

Brown, Kenneth H., and Michael T. Heaney. 1997. "A Note on Measuring the Economic Impact of Institutions of Higher Education." *Research in Higher Education* 38 (2): 229-40.

Bruning, Stephen D., Shea McGrew, and Mark Cooper. 2006. "Town-Gown Relationships: Exploring University-Community Engagement from the Perspective of Community Members." *Public Relations Review* 32 (2): 125-30.

Burness, John. 1998. "Dismiss Durham's Idea to Tax Duke's Dime." *The Chronicle*, April 15. http://www.dukechronicle.com/article/dismiss-durhams-idea-tax-dukes-dime.

Butler, Kristen. 2006. "Where's Our Franklin Street?" *The Chronicle*, October 13. http://www.dukechronicle.com/article/wheres-our-franklin-street.

Christiansen, Gayle, Amy Stitely, and Lorlene Hoyt. 2010. *Strengthening Local Economies and Civil Life: The Untapped Power of Small Businesses*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Community Innovators Lab.

Cohen, Rick. 2012. "Residents Allege that Princeton University Bought a Zoning Approval with a PILOT." *Nonprofit Quarterly*, January 5. http://www.nonprofitquarterly.org/policysocial-context/18861-residents-allege-that-princeton-university-bought-a-zoning-approval-with-a-pilot.html

Connecting Civic Engagement to the Curriculum. 2011. Durham, NC: Duke University.

Cooper, Michael. 2011. "Squeezed Cities Ask Nonprofits for More Money." *The New York Times*, May 12. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/12/us/12nonprofits.html.

Crane, Elizabeth. 2004. "Revitalizing the Campus Through Retail." *University Business*, November 1. http://www.universitybusiness.com/article/revitalizing-campus-through-retail

Dewar, Margaret E., and Claudia B. Isaac. 1998. "Learning from Difference: The Potentially Transforming Experience of Community-University Collaboration." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17 (4): 334-47.

Office of Public Affairs. 2007. *Durham and Duke: An Analysis of Duke University's Estimated Total Economic Impact on the City and County of Durham.* Durham, NC: Duke University.

Edwards, Bob, Linda Mooney, and Carl Heald. 2001. "Who is Being Served? The Impact of Student Volunteering on Local Community Organizations." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30 (3): 444-61.

Ellery, Jane, and P.J. Ellery. 2012. "Building Better Communities: Shared Leadership and Authentic Change." *International Public Health Journal* 5 (1).

Erickson, Amanda. 2012. "Town-Gown Tiff of the Day: Brown Versus Providence." *The Atlantic Cities*, February 21. http://www.theatlanticcities.com/jobs-and-economy/2012/02/town-gown-tiff-day-brown-versus-providence/1292.

Ferman, Barbara, and T. L. Hill. 2004. "The Challenges of Agenda Conflict in Higher-Education-Community Research Partnerships: Views from the Community Side." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 26 (2): 241-257.

Freeman, Elmer, Susan Gust, and Deborah Aloshen. 2009. "Why Faculty Promotion and Tenure Matters to Community Partners." *Metropolitan Universities Journal* 20 (2): 87.

Ginsberg, W.R. 1980. "Real Property Tax Exemption of Nonprofit Organizations: A Perspective, The." *Temp. LQ* 53: 291.

Hirsch, Arnold R. 2005. "Urban Renewal." In *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. Chicago Historical Society. http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1295.html.

Jackson, Michael L. and Cynthia Cherrey. 2002. "Collaboration with the Local Community." *New Directions for Student Services* (99): 37-46.

June, Audrey W. 2004. "Durham and Goliath." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 18, A26.

Kenyon, Daphne and Adam Langley. 2010. *Payments in Lieu of Taxes: Balancing Municipal and Nonprofit Interests*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Knapp, Krystal. 2012. "Residents, Lewis Trust File Suit Alleging Princeton University Arts and Transit Zoning Illegal." *Planet Princeton*, January 5.

Levitz, Jennifer. 2012a. "Ivy League School to Pay City Millions." *The Wall Street Journal*, May 2, A3.

———. 2012b. "Providence to College: Pay Up." *The Wall Street Journal*, February 14. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204062704577221653128623004.html.

McCuaig, Christy. 2009. "Targeting Tufts, Somerville Rep. Provost Calls for End to Tax Exemptions for Universities." *The Tufts Daily*, September 13. http://www.tuftsdaily.com/targeting-tufts-somerville-rep-provost-calls-for-end-to-tax-exemptions-for-universities-1.1876794.

McNall, Miles, Celeste Reed, Robert Brown, and Angela Allen. 2009. "Brokering Community–University Engagement." *Innovative Higher Education* 33 (5): 317-31.

Nunery, Leroy. "Reconceptualizing the College Town: Urban Universities and Local Retail Development" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2003).

Rokoff, G. 1973. "Alternatives to the University Property Tax Exemption." *Yale Law Journal* 83 (1): 181-96.

Roth, David. 2011. "Urban Development Through Planned Retail: Yale's Commercial Real Estate Program." *Student Prize Papers.* (Paper 75.).

Russ, Hilary. 2012. "Analysis: U.S. Cities Wrestle with Universities for Cash." *Reuters*, May 18. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/05/18/us-municipals-cities-nonprofits-idUSBRE84H0HE20120518.

Sandy, Marie, and Barbara A. Holland. 2006. "Different Worlds and Common Ground: Community Partner Perspectives on Campus-Community Partnerships." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 13 (1): 30-43.

Sax, Linda and Alexander Astin. 1997. "The Benefits of Service: Evidence from Undergraduates." *Educational Record* 78 (3-4): 25-32.

Seifer, Sarena D. and Ella Greene-Moton. 2007. "Realizing the Promise of Community-Based Participatory Research: Community Partners Get Organized." *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education and Action* 1 (4): 291-94.

Siegfried, John J., Allen R. Sanderson, and Peter McHenry. 2007. "The Economic Impact of Colleges and Universities." *Economics of Education Review* 26 (5): 546-58.

Simmons, Ruth. 2012. President Simmons' Message. Providence, RI. http://news.brown.edu/pressreleases/2012/05/agreement

Stoecker, Randy, and Elizabeth A. Tryon with Amy Hilgendorf. 2009. *The Unheard Voices: Community Organizations and Service Learning.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Strage, Amy. 2004. "Long-Term Academic Benefits of Service-Learning: When and Where Do They Manifest Themselves?" *College Student Journal* 38 (2): 257-62.

Warfield, Wallace. 1995. "Town and Gown: Forums for Conflict and Consensus between Universities and Communities." *New Directions for Higher Education* (92): 63-69.