

## **A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO DEVELOPING COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS: ENHANCING LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS AND IMPROVING STUDENT PERFORMANCE [616]**

Robert Cohen <sup>a</sup>  
Jill Fox <sup>b</sup>  
Harold Fitrer <sup>c</sup>  
Jennifer Smith-Slabough <sup>d</sup>  
Torey Edmonds <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Virginia Commonwealth University

<sup>b</sup> University of Texas at Arlington

<sup>c</sup> Richmond Public Schools

<sup>d</sup> Virginia One-To-One Mentoring Partnership

### **Session Plan**

#### **Workshop Summary**

In 2002, only 10 of 50 public schools in Richmond, Virginia, earned full accreditation based on their scores on the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) tests. In response to poor student performance on these tests as well as concern about the safety and positive development of public school students, the Richmond Public Schools, in collaboration with the City of Richmond and the business community, launched a comprehensive effort to improve student performance. This undertaking, known as the Superintendent’s Initiative for School Excellence, brought together leaders from business, volunteer, and other civic organizations as well as representatives from child-serving agencies, school administrators, and parent and teacher organizations for the purpose of developing and implementing a plan to boost student performance and improve conditions and services in the public schools of Richmond. A steering committee composed of key stakeholders was formed to guide this initiative.

One of the primary challenges identified by this group was to strengthen partnerships among schools and business and community organizations for the purpose of providing mentoring, health and human services, and other resources that directly contribute to student performance and positive development. In order to facilitate this process the city contracted with Virginia Commonwealth University to assist the steering committee. The objectives of the contract were (1) to develop an understanding of the various options for program models that engage the community and volunteers in school settings; (2) to identify evidence-based best practices among the array of program modes; (3) to assess models currently used in selected Richmond schools; and (4) to develop a template for community and volunteer engagement. Faculty from Virginia Commonwealth University conducted a literature review, held focus groups with personnel and other stakeholders from three identified “model” partnership schools, and administered two surveys to all school principals in order to document best practices in school-community-business partnerships and to assess the level of development of the individual schools as well as the school system as a whole.

Based on this assessment, a strategic plan was developed. The plan included establishing an infrastructure to support collaboration at both the individual school and system levels. Recommendations for infrastructure development included support and monitoring of partnership activities, recruitment of additional partners, and

training for individuals responsible for partnership implementation. The steering committee, which approved the strategic plan, has been engaged in implementation for the past 15 months. Although the partnership represents only one of many systematic efforts to improve student performance, making it difficult to determine the unique contribution of any specific activity, it is worth noting that in 2005, 45 of 50 schools in Richmond earned full accreditation on the SOL tests.

This workshop will focus on the process of engaging multiple stakeholders for the purpose of developing a systematic approach for improving student performance and enhancing the safety and positive development of children who attend urban public schools. Each presenter represents a unique prospective on this partnership. The discussion will cover approaches used to facilitate partnership development, outcomes to date, and lessons learned.

### **Workshop Goals**

1. To give workshop participants an opportunity to learn about how school-community-business collaboration may be established for the purpose of improving student performance and enhancing the safety and positive development of children in public school settings.
2. To teach participants about the principles and strategies employed to create a comprehensive partnership, to expose them to outcomes and lessons learned, and to encourage them to apply these concepts and approaches to their own situations.

### **Workshops Objectives**

1. To present and describe the rationale and process for establishing a comprehensive school-community-business partnership
2. To provide participants with perspectives from a diverse group of stakeholders engaged in the partnership development process, including school administrator, mentoring development specialist, community liaison, and university faculty
3. To enable participants to consider lessons learned from the Richmond experience and assess the advantages and disadvantages of the various strategies employed
4. To engage participants in a process that encourages them to apply the concepts and strategies from the Richmond experience to their own local situations

### **Workshop Activities**

- 10-15-minute introductions and overview presentation of the Richmond partnership development experience
- 30-35-minute presentation of stakeholders' perspectives by Dr. Fitrer, Dr. Fox, Ms. Smith-Slabough and Ms. Edmonds, and discussion addressing participants' questions and concerns
- 20-minute experiential component in which participants apply materials from the presentation to their home situations
- 10-minute question and answer period

### **Assessment**

The effectiveness of this workshop will be measured by observing participants' demonstration of their comprehension of the material, their engagement in the discussion, and their responses to a post-workshop evaluation survey (to be distributed at the workshop).

### **References**

- Cohen, R., Linker, J.A. and Stutts, L. (2006), Working together: Lessons learned from school, family and community collaborations. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43, 419-428
- Cotton, K. (1990). School-community collaboration to improve the quality of life for urban youth and their families. Northwestern Regional Educational Laboratory School Improvement Research Series, Topical Synthesis 5. Retrieved June 15, 2004, from <http://www.nwre.org/scpd/sirs/6/topsyn5.html>
- Cushing, E., and Kohl, E. (1997). Allies for education—Community involvement in school change: A two year exploration. San Francisco: San Francisco School Volunteers and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.
- Epstein, J. (2001). School, family and community partnerships. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Epstein, J. L., and Salinas, K. C. (2004). Partnering with families and communities. *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 12-18.
- Fox, J.E., Cohen, R., Karlowicz, J. and Meyer, A. (2004). School-community partnerships: Standards for success. Unpublished report, Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Henderson, A. T., and Mapp, K. L. (2002). A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family and community connections on student achievement. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- National Network of Partnership Schools. (2002). Update data point to factors for high quality partnership programs. Type 2 National Network of Partnership Schools, 13. Retrieved June 13, 2004, from <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/type2/issue13/ttype2rb.htm>

## Appendix A

### INITIATIVE FOR SCHOOL EXCELLENCE Richmond Public Schools [616]

#### History

In the fall of 2004 Dr. Jill Fox and Dr. Robert Cohen evaluated the potential for school-community-business partnerships for the Richmond Public Schools Superintendent’s Initiative for School Excellence. Dr. Cohen proposed a plan to improve effective partnerships between schools and community organizations as a way of enhancing student learning and development. The Virginia Mentoring Partnership was asked to collaborate with Superintendent Dr. Deborah Jewell-Sherman’s Balanced Scorecard initiative (Goal 5 Strengthen Collaborations with Shareholders) to conduct a two-part survey of the Richmond public schools to determine how partnerships and volunteers were currently being utilized in the schools.

#### Phase I Summary: Snapshot of Partnership Components

From the first part of the survey, it was determined that although there were many partnerships and volunteers in the schools, the methods of dealing with partnerships and volunteers varied greatly. Results indicate that almost all schools reported wanting additional volunteers and partnerships but that relationships were difficult to build and sustain due to lack of time, knowledge, or organization.

- Schools surveyed: 41 schools (26 elementary, 7 middle, 6 high, 2 specialty)
- Partnerships identified in the schools: 336 (80 business, 77 faith, 111 community/higher education, and 68 paid professional)
- Partnerships included mentor, mentor/tutor, tutor, literacy, lunch buddy, healthcare/ social services, arts, classroom aide, after-school activities, and one-time projects
- Numbers of volunteers in schools = 2,119
- Total volunteer and paid professional hours = 59,213/year
- Total volunteer hours = 39,877 (value approximately \$678,000 based on a \$17/hour national rate)
- Number of student units provided partnership services = 21,851

#### Phase II Summary: Detailed Partnership Coordination

The second part of the survey was a follow-up telephone survey conducted by the Virginia Mentoring Partnership. The purpose of these conversations was to talk to the person at the school who was designated to work with volunteers and partnerships and to gain a deeper understanding of how each school’s system worked. The person working with the volunteers differed from school to school and variously included a designated volunteer coordinator, a teacher, a guidance counselor, the principals, and a committee of school staff and volunteers. The time spent on coordinating volunteer activities also varied greatly.

#### Summary of Telephone Interviews

- Telephone surveys were conducted with 53 schools (36 elementary, 7 middle, 7 high, and 3 specialty schools).
- Schools have a sense for volunteer hours worked, but not many schools keep accurate records of all volunteer and partnership hours.

- All schools record financial contributions. Accurate financial records of gifts in kind are not typically recorded.
- Most schools (96 percent) have more than one person interfacing with volunteers and partnerships.
- Very few schools (3) or 5.67 percent) reported a part-time volunteer coordinator on staff (example, retired school personnel).
- Few schools (8 or 15 percent) reported having a paid outside professional on staff. (Family Lifeline, Communities in Schools coordinate volunteers.)
- All other volunteer and partnership activities are managed by the principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, or full-time teacher.
- Staff time spent on working with partnerships and volunteers averaged 10 to 20 hours per week with a range of 5 hours to more than 30 hours a week.

## Survey Conclusions

- All schools reported the necessity of partnerships and volunteers. Partnerships and volunteers provide much needed support and service.
- Schools vary greatly on the way they organize and handle partnerships.<sup>1</sup>
- During the course of the conversation, most school contacts reported a dire need for a Volunteer Coordinator. It was suggested by survey respondents that this person could perform the following duties:
  - Recruit and manage volunteers
  - Recruit and sustain partnerships
  - Coordinate training with agencies, such as the Virginia Mentoring Partnership, and orient partners to school partnership activity policies
  - Keep accurate records
  - Place volunteers appropriately
  - Provide support for volunteers and partnerships
- Several survey respondents suggested the creation of a central office volunteer coordinator position to develop procedures, manuals, and guidelines for all the schools in the district. This person could help all volunteer coordinators in each school. A school districtwide policy and procedure process would streamline partnership relationships and volunteer activities.

---

<sup>1</sup> It needs to be noted that there was some confusion regarding terminology and responsibilities. Additionally, there have been recent staff/leadership changes and paid service provider staff transitions, which made collecting accurate information difficult. Many schools have developed a system that best suits their needs. This could look very different from another school that also has a system that works. The information in this report is highly subjective and provides just a snapshot of what was discussed in a single conversation.

## Appendix B

### Analysis of the Richmond Public Schools Principal Survey of School-Community Partnerships [616]

Robert Cohen and Jill Fox  
VCU Center for the Study & Prevention of Youth Violence

This Appendix is a summary of the responses given by school principals in Richmond Public Schools, 2004-2005.

Table 1. Survey response rate in Richmond public schools

	Richmond Public Schools	Survey Respondents
Number of elementary schools	31	26
Number of middle schools	9	7
Number of high schools	8	6
Number of specialty schools	2	2
Total	50	41 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Seventy-seven (77) percent of principals responded to the survey.

### Partnerships

1. Who are the partners of the Richmond Public Schools?
  - a. Types
    - i. Big Brothers/Big Sisters (3 percent)
    - ii. High school volunteers (41 percent)
    - iii. Religious organizations (61 percent)
    - iv. Business Organizations (61 percent)
    - v. University/college (64 percent)
  - b. Partnerships per school
    - i. Mean (5.3)
    - ii. Meridian (6)
    - iii. Mode (3)
2. What is the nature of the partnership activities?
  - a. Other (39 percent)
  - b. Family support (44 percent)
  - c. Academic assistance (61 percent)
  - d. After-school activities (67 percent)
  - e. Technical support (69 percent)
  - f. Volunteer tutoring (86 percent)
3. Have long-term goals been established for the partnership? (15 responses including the following 11)
  - a. Six related to students' academic performance
  - b. Three related to student discipline/citizenship
  - c. One related to the overall school environment

- d. One related to increasing the percentage of students attending college after graduation
4. Which objectives are most important within the partnerships?
  - a. Recreational opportunities (39 percent)
  - b. Health Services (41 percent)
  - c. Logistical support (47 percent)
  - d. Financial support (58 percent)
  - e. Decreasing problem behavior (69 percent)
  - f. Increasing prosocial behavior (70 percent)
  - g. Improving homework (75 percent)
  - h. Building self-esteem (80 percent)
  - i. Improving SOL scored (91 percent)

### **Family Involvement in Partnerships**

1. To what extent are family members involved in the partnership?
  - a. Somewhat (57.6 percent)
  - b. A little (18.2 percent)
  - c. Not at all (15.2 percent)
  - d. Very involved (9.1 percent)
2. What roles do family members play in the partnership?
  - a. Volunteer (36.1 percent)
  - b. Service recipient (38.9 percent)
  - c. School planning (44.4 percent)

### **Teacher involvement in partnerships**

1. To what extent are teachers involved in partnership activities?
  - a. A little involved (11 percent)
  - b. Moderately involved (33 percent)
  - c. Very involved (44 percent)

### **Partnership Activities**

1. Evaluation of partnership activities
  - a. Most respondents say that they evaluate partnership activities through informal discussions.
  - b. Survey responses gave no evidence of systematic evaluations of partnership activities.
2. Long-range plans for partnership activities
  - a. 50 percent of respondents indicate that long-range plans for partnership activities have been made.
  - b. 25 percent indicate that no long-term plans have been made.
  - c. 17 percent don't know if plans have been made.
3. Consistency between long-range partnership goals and activities
  - a. 18 respondents indicated that long-term goals had been set for the partnership.
  - b. 11 respondents indicated that long-range plans had been made for partnership activities.
  - c. Survey responses from only one principal indicated congruity between long-range partnership goals and activities.
4. Factors identified as important in creating effective partnerships
  - a. Administrative support (69 percent)
  - b. Investment of resources (70 percent)
  - c. Parent involvement (75 percent)
  - d. Establishing objectives (83 percent)

- e. Building trust/values (83 percent)
- f. Strong leadership (86 percent)
- g. Teacher involvement (89 percent)
- h. Ongoing communication (89 percent)
- i. Partner commitment (94 percent)
- 5. Factors identified as impediments to partnership progress
  - a. 30 identified
  - b. Factors most commonly identified
    - i. Time (13 responses)
    - ii. Staffing (6 responses)
    - iii. Commitment (5 responses)
- 6. Lessons learned about partnership needs
  - a. 42 responses
  - b. Most frequent themes
    - i. Commitment of all partners (8 responses)
    - ii. Significant investments of time (7 responses)
    - iii. Designated human resources (6 resources)
    - iv. Financial resources (5 responses)
    - v. Ongoing communication (4 responses)
    - vi. Training to prepare partners for their work together (2 responses)
  - c. What survey responses indicate and do not indicate
    - i. Partnerships
      - (1) Indicate awareness of the need for committed partners and variety in community organizations partnering with schools
      - (2) Do not indicate awareness of the need for diverse representation from the community or of established processes for conducting the work of the partnerships
    - ii. Shared vision. Responses do not indicate that partners have collaborated to articulate a shared vision, goals, or objectives for their work
    - iii. Student learning and academic achievement
      - (1) Indicate that partnerships with stated goals are focusing on learning and achievement
      - (2) Do not indicate recognition that academic achievement, physical health and development are interrelated
    - iv. Family involvement. Responses indicate a lack of involvement by adult family members of students in the majority of Richmond’s public schools
    - v. Teacher involvement. Responses indicate limited teacher involvement in approximately 50 percent of the RPS partnerships
    - vi. Structure, resources, and roles. Responses indicate that successful partnerships need human resource allocations and ongoing communications among all partners

## Next Steps

- 1. Current commitment
  - a. To provide a literature review on school-business partnerships
  - b. To provide focus group findings of successful partnerships in the Richmond public schools
  - c. To provide survey results on partnership activities in the Richmond public schools
- 2. Final step: a final report summarizing these three activities
- 3. Recommendation for establishing a subcommittee
  - a. To review the three resources we have presented
  - b. To work with us to develop a template for school-business partnerships in the Richmond public schools
  - c. To present the template to this group for further action

**Appendix C**

A Framework for the Evaluation of SCHOOL-COMMUNITY-BUSINESS PARTNERSHIPS [616]  
 Developed by Jill E. Fox, Associate Professor, Virginia Commonwealth University (“VCU”) School of Education, September 2004

**Standard 1: Partnerships**

Participants in the school-business partnership are strong, stable entities in themselves. Each partner has a vested interest in the community and sincere motivation to collaborate with others toward community enhancement. Partners seek to include other government, business, and nonprofit organizations in the partnership, recognizing that school improvement is a community-wide concern. Because of the diversity that characterizes urban communities, partners consider diverse representation an essential ingredient in the partnership if community needs are to be truly identified and met. Partners agree to conduct their work according to principles of the democratic process, knowing that mediation, negotiation, and resolution will be ongoing activities if goals are to be achieved. Each partner is committed to continuous participation in the partnership, and the partnership establishes a clear vision of its goals and a well-articulated plan of its activities to ensure a smooth transition if changes in representation do occur.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
Each partner is a strong stable entity.	Each partner is a contributing, stable component in the local community, and each displays a similar commitment to the partnership	Each partner is a contributing, stable component in the local community	Partners are developing interests and activities in the local community	Productivity or existence of partners in the community is uncertain.
Each partner has a vested interest in the community.	Each partner actively pursues opportunities to invest resources in the community; future outcomes are tied to community development.	Each partner has invested its resources and future outcomes in the local community.	Partners have made some or limited investments in the local community.	Partners have little commitment to or interest in the future of the local community.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
Partners represent government, business, and nonprofit organizations.	Government, business, and nonprofit organizations participate equally in the partnership.	Partners represent several segments of community-based organizations and are seeking to include other partners from different perspectives.	Partners represent limited segments of community-based organizations but are seeking to include other partners from different perspectives.	Partners represent a limited or single segment of community-based organizations.
Partners represent the social, cultural, economic, religious diversity found in the community.	Diversity in partnership members is actively sought. Social, cultural, economic, and religious diversity is present in the partnership.	Diversity in partnership members is actively sought by the partnership.	Some social, cultural, economic and religious diversity is present in the partnership.	Diversity in partnership members is limited and is not actively sought by existing partners.
The partnership conducts its work according to democratic principles.	Mediation, negotiation and resolution are a regular part of the partnership’s decision making; all partners participate in the process.	Mediation, negotiation, and resolution are used only when an impasse in the partnership’s work has been reached.	Policies and procedures for conducting work according to democratic principles have been established but are not followed by the partnership.	Decisions are made by individuals in the partnership without group input and participation.
Representation and participation of each partner in the partnership is stable and consistent.	Leaders from each partnership consistently contribute to the activities of the partnership; tasks are completed and reports are submitted back to the partnership.		Leaders from some partnerships send delegates to carry out partnership activities; timelines for completion of activities are not followed.	Partner participation is sporadic; partnership leaders do not complete tasks undertaken.
Goals and plans are clearly articulated to assure a smooth transition should changes in representation or participation occur.	Written goals and plans, including a timeline for completion, have been agreed to by all partners and are used to guide the activities and interactions of the partnership.		Goals and plans are evident but not adhered to in the partnership’s activities and interactions.	Goals and plans have not been fully developed and/or agreed to by all partners.

**Standard 2: Shared Vision**

Building on each partner’s commitment to community enhancement, the partnership develops and clearly articulates a shared vision of its work. This vision includes the end goals of the partnership, as well as individual objectives that must be addressed if the goals are to be achieved. A plan of action, clearly articulating each partner’s commitment of time and human and material resources is established, along with a timeline for the work of the partnership. The shared vision and the plan of action are agreed to by all partners and are the guiding principles by which the partnership carries out its work.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
The partnership has a clearly articulated shared vision of its work in the community.	All partners have contributed to the development of long-term goals for the community; these goals are the theme of all partnership activities.	The partnership is in the process of developing long-term goals on which all partners can agree.	The partnership does not have a shared vision to which all partners have contributed; there is no common goal to unite the work of the partners.
Individual objectives working toward the shared vision have been identified.	Achievable steps toward the long-term goals have been identified; the partnership is actively working toward completing these steps.	The partnership is in the process of identifying objectives which will take its work toward the established shared vision.	The partnership has not identified individual objectives which, when met, will lead the partnership to its shared vision.
Each partner’s commitment of human and material resources is clearly stated.	Each partner has committed itself in writing to providing specific resources for the work of the partnership.	The partners have made tentative or oral commitments of resources that might be used to achieve the partnership’s goals.	Partners have not made commitments of resources for the work of the partnership.
A timeline for the work of the partnership has been developed and is followed.	The partnership has established and is following a specific timeline for its activities.	A timeline for the work of the partnership may have been developed, but the partnership does not adhere to it.	A timeline for the work of the partnership has not been developed.
All partners have contributed and agree to the shared vision, objectives, commitment of resources and timeline.	The partnership has used a democratic process to achieve consensus among all partners about the vision, objectives, and commitment of resources and timeline that guide its work.	Some but not all members of the partnership have agreed to work toward a specific vision, objectives, and commitment of resources and timelines.	The vision, objectives, and commitment of resources and timelines are the work of a specific member of the partnership and have been adopted without full support from each partner.

**Standard 3: Student Learning and Achievement**

The focus of the school-community partnership is on student learning and achievement. Although this focus may be articulated in varied ways, partnership goals and activities are directed toward enhancing student outcomes. The partnership recognizes that standardized test scores are only one measure of student learning, and it seeks to improve the quality and nature of students’ socio-emotional development, physical well-being, and academic learning. The partnership acknowledges students’ family and community contexts as key factors in student outcomes. The success of the partnership is determined by relevant, specific data on student outcomes.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
Partnership goals and activities focus on enhancing student outcomes.	All partnership activities contribute to the long-term goal of enhancing student outcomes.	Partnership goals and activities are directed toward enhancing student outcomes only in part.	Partnership activities serve the needs of individual partners.
Multiple measures are used to identify student outcomes.	Student outcomes are measured by multiple measures, including but not limited to standardized test scores, academic grades, disciplinary and counseling referrals, number of absences, student self-assessment, and teacher and parent reports.	Student outcomes are measured by standardized test scores and academic grades.	Student outcomes are measured solely in terms of standardized test performance.
Student outcomes include socio-emotional development, physical well-being, and academic achievement; family and community contexts are key to factors in student success.	Partnership work focuses on student outcomes in all developmental domains and acknowledges the family and community context as key factors in student outcomes.	Partnership work focuses on multiple domains of development, but does not consider family and community contexts.	Partnership work focuses on one developmental domain and does not address student issues outside of the school environment.
Success of the partnership is determined by relevant, specific data.	Partnership work is evaluated by specific concrete data collected from multiple sources.	Partnership work is evaluated at a surface level through opinions and anecdotal stories.	Partnership work is not evaluated by participants

**Standard 4: Involving Families**

Partnerships understand the importance of involving families in their work. Adult family members are considered to be expert sources of information on student and community needs as well as on the culture and resources in the community. Adult family members are important, contributing members in all aspects of the partnership’s work. Partnerships see students not just as individuals, but as members of their families and understand the importance of the family context for the students’ growth and development.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
Adult family members of students are active members of the partnership.	Adult family members of students fully participate in developing the mission and implementing the work of the partnership.	Adult family members of students participate in implementing the work of the partnership but do not contribute to planning or decision making.	Adult family members of students do not participate in the partnership.
Adult family members of students are consulted as experts on student and community needs and on culture and resources in the community.	Adult family members of students regularly contribute their knowledge of students and the community to partnership goal-setting and planning.	Adult family members of students participate in implementing partnership activities, but are not consulted in the planning or goal-setting.	Adult family members of students are not consulted in planning or implementing partnership activities.
Partnership goals and activities recognize the importance of students’ families in their growth and development.	Partnership goals and activities include and provide support for families of students.	Partnership goals recognize the importance of students’ families but activities are not designed to include families.	Partnership goals and activities focus on student outcomes only in the school environment.

**Standard 5: Involving Teachers**

Participation by classroom teachers is an essential ingredient of the partnership. Teachers are invited, rather than required by administration, to become contributing members of the partnership. Teachers are valued because of their relationships with students and because of their expertise on the teaching and learning process. Resources and principal support are available to facilitate teacher participation in the partnership without sacrificing either student learning or the teachers’ personal time.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
Teachers are invited participants in the partnership.	Teachers are invited to fully participate in goal-setting, planning, and implementation of partnership activities; teacher participation is ongoing in the life of the partnership.	Teachers are included when partnership activities involve classroom-based interactions with students or involve changes in the curriculum.	Teachers are not included in partnership activities, or teachers are directed to participate by building principals or central office administrators.
Teachers are considered experts on students and on the teaching and learning process.	Teachers are valued because of and consulted regularly on their knowledge of students and their knowledge of the teaching and learning process.	Teachers may be recognized as experts on students and on the teaching and learning process, but their expertise is not utilized by the partnership.	Teachers are asked to implement partnership activities but are not consulted in the planning and development of those activities.
Resources and principal support facilitate teacher participation in the partnership.	Principals access resources to provide release time and/or compensation for teachers’ participation in partnership activities.	Principals access resources to provide release time and/or compensation for some of teachers’ participation in partnership activities.	Teacher participation in partnership activities requires teacher time outside of the contract day; no compensation is provided.

**Standard 6: District Support**

Administrators and administrative policies within the school district provide support for the partnership. They organize flexible policies and procedures through which the partnership may work and consistently recognize that work and its value to students. Administrators assist the partnership in the implementation of its action plan and the evaluation of its work.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
Administrative policies and procedures facilitate the work of the partnership.	Administrative policies and procedures are designed to encourage the joint decision-making and shared power inherent in successful partnerships.	Administrative policies and procedures neither hamper nor encourage the work of the partnership.	Administrative policies must be “gotten around” if the partnership is to achieve its goals; procedures impede the work of the partnership.
Administrators recognize the work of the partnership and its value to students.	Administrators make opportunities to publicly recognize the work of the partnership and its importance in student learning and development.	Administrators acknowledge the work of the partnership and its influence on student learning and developing.	Administrators do not acknowledge the work of the partnership or comment on its value to the school or the students.
Administrators actively participate in goal-setting, planning and implementing the work of the partnership.	Administrators fully participate in developing the mission and implementing the work of the partnership.	Administrators participate in implementing the work of the partnership but do not contribute to planning or decision making.	Administrators do not participate in the activities of the partnership.
Administrators participate in data collection and analysis for evaluation of the partnership’s work.	Administrators are full participants in the evaluation of partnership activities, including the data collection and analysis.	Administrators are evaluators of the partnership but do not participate in data collection or analysis.	Administrators do not participate in the process of evaluating the partnership’s work.

**Standard 7: Schools Serving Communities**

Support and service flow reciprocally between all partnership participants. Students and their schools provide meaningful service to their communities along with receiving support from the partnership. Each partner has knowledge of the systems and operating cultures of all other partners and is aware of the resources and opportunities available in each setting.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
Students and their schools actively engage in activities of service to their community.	Students, faculty and staff regularly develop and participate in activities that provide meaningful service to the community.	Students, faculty and staff occasionally engage in activities that provide meaningful service to the community.	Students, faculty, and staff receive support from the partnership but do not offer to engage in service activities themselves.
Partners know of the systems and operating cultures each member brings to the partnership.	Each partner understands the structure and flow of decision making in other members of the partnership.	Each partner has limited knowledge of the structure and flow of decision making in other members of the partnership.	Partners have little or no knowledge of the structure and flow of decision making in other members of the partnership.
Partners are aware of resources and opportunities for service in the schools and community.	Each partner knows of resources contributed by other members of the partnership and opportunities for service in the school and community.	Each partner has limited knowledge of resources contributed by other members of the partnership and opportunities for service in the school and community.	Partners have little or no knowledge of resources contributed by other members of the partnership or opportunities for service in the school and community.

**Standard 8: Structures, Resources, and Roles**

The partnership establishes organizational structures and commits resources to support its shared vision. Partners ensure that resource commitments and allocations are honored. They create new roles and modify existing roles for students, teachers, and partnership personnel to achieve the partnership vision. The partnership effectively uses communication for coordination and linkage with the school district and the community and to inform the public, policy makers, and professional audiences of its work.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Emerging</b>
The governing structures and communication avenues of the partnership support student learning and development.	Organizational structures and chains of communication support student learning and development.	Organizational structures and chains of communication allow the partnership to function but do not actively contribute to partnership goals	Organizational structures and chains of communication are ineffective
Resource commitments and allocations made by individual partners are honored to support the partnership’s shared vision.	Partners follow through on their commitments of human and material resources to the work of the partnership; resources are allocated to further the work of the partnership as per the plan of action developed by the partnership.	Resource commitments are at least partially honored and resources are used in planned and unplanned partnership activities.	Partners do not honor resource commitments; resources are allocated randomly, according to the decision of individual partners.
New and existing roles in the partnership support the partnership’s shared vision.	Professional roles in one or more of the partnering entities have been established to support the work of the partnership.	Professional roles in one or more of the partnering entities have been expanded or re-designed to support the work of the partnership.	Work in the partnership is an added responsibility to existing roles in the partnering entities.
The partnership effectively communicates its vision and activities to the broader community.	Partners use various means of communication effectively to work toward their shared goals.	Partners have limited communication and attempt to work in relative isolation.	Partners have little or no communication with each other.

This page is blank.