

ED 325 535

TM 016 068

AUTHOR Grobe, Terry; And Others
TITLE Synthesis of Existing Knowledge and Practice in the Field of Educational Partnerships.
INSTITUTION Brandeis Univ., Waltham, MA. Center for Human Resources.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC. Programs for the Improvement of Practice.
PUB DATE Dec 90
NOTE 50p.; One of four commissioned reports on educational partnerships; for the other reports see TM 016 066-069. Prepared for the Educational Partnerships Study Group.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Definitions; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *School Community Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

A brief history of business/education partnership development (BEPD), using the development of the Boston Compact in 1975 as an illustrative case study, highlights several points: partnerships embrace diverse territory and goals; a partnership is a process, not an event; a partnership is a relationship between institutions and people within those institutions; and the goals and form of a partnership change and evolve. Benefits of partnerships are considered in terms of gains for business, education, higher education, parents and students, and the community. Three typologies of BEPD are presented: (1) levels of involvement (incorporating three stages--support, cooperation, and collaboration); (2) partnership structure (simple, moderately complex, and complex); and (3) levels of impact (containing six categories--partners in special services, partners in the classroom, partners in teacher training and development, partners in management, partners in systemic educational improvement, and partners in policy). The first two typologies illustrate the relationship between partners and the structure of these relations, respectively. The third model focuses on goals and emphasizes the partnership's impact on the educational system, and is therefore considered the most useful of the three typologies. The six levels of impact categorized in the third typology serve as the framework for presenting numerous specific examples of partnerships corresponding to each level; this is followed by a section in which the following more generic elements of successful educational partnerships are outlined: top level leadership; grounding in community needs; effective public relations; clear roles and responsibilities; racial/ethnic involvement; strategic planning; effective management and staffing structure; shared decision-making/interagency ownership; shared credit/recognition; appropriate well-timed resources; technical assistance; formal agreements; action and frequent success; patience, vigilance, and increased involvement; and local ownership. A brief discussion of outcome measures and evaluations of the six types of partnerships conclude the paper. Endnotes and references are included, and a list of contacts for major partnerships discussed in this paper is appended. (RLC)

ED325535

Synthesis of Existing Knowledge and Practice in the Field of Educational Partnerships

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Prepared for
The Educational Partnerships Program
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Washington, D.C.

Prepared by
Terry Grobe
With Assistance from Susan P. Cuman
and Alan Melchior
The Center for Human Resources
Heller Graduate School
Brandeis University
December, 1990

4016068

Preface

The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) funded the first cycle of four year projects under its new Educational Partnerships Program in September 1990. The Educational Partnerships Program is authorized by the Educational Partnerships Act of 1988, Title VI, subtitle A, Chapter 5 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Pub. L.100-418) (20 U.S.C. 5031-5039). This legislation also requires the Secretary to conduct an annual evaluation of the grants made under the program and to disseminate information relating to the activities assisted.

In performing the evaluation and dissemination responsibility, OERI has attempted to design its activities to build on what already is known, and to expand knowledge about the characteristics of effective partnerships and how to establish, sustain, and evaluate them. In order to establish a baseline for future work, assess what already is known about educational partnerships, and review potential evaluation design options, OERI commissioned the following analyses and syntheses:

Danzberger, Jacqueline P., "EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM: ANALYSIS OF PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS," December, 1990.

Education Resources Group, "AN OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION RESEARCH ON SELECTED EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS," January, 1991.

Education Resources Group, Inc. "OPTIONS FOR EVALUATING THE EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM," January, 1991.

Grobe, Terry and Susan P. Curman and Alan Melchior, "SYNTHESIS OF EXISTING KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS," December, 1990.

This is one of the four commissioned reports. All four are available through ERIC.

Synthesis of Existing Knowledge and Practice in the Field of Educational Partnerships

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
History and Context of Educational Partnerships	1
The Boston Experience: A Case Study	4
Partnerships: Definitions and Typologies	6
Typology #1: Levels of Involvement	8
Typology #2: Partnership Structure	9
Typology #3: Levels of Impact	10
Partnership Examples	12
Partners in Special Services	12
Partners in the Classroom	14
Partners in Teacher Training and Development	17
Partners in Management	19
Partners in Systemic Educational Improvement	21
Partners in Policy	24
Generic Elements of Educational Partnerships	29
Evaluating Partnerships	37
Final Remarks	39

SYNTHESIS OF EXISTING KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

Introduction

Partnership has become the watchword of the nineties. In fact, where once this concept was mostly the province of the education and business communities, partnering is increasingly being used as a tool to stimulate and promote reforms within and between various service delivery systems. The term "partnership" is widespread, invoked to describe any number of relationships and activities. At the same time, an incredible array of public and private funders are supporting partnership activities in communities across the country. It will help to inform the work of both funders and practitioners if we can step back a bit from all the activity to look at the history and context of partnership building; examine successful prototypes or models of educational partnerships and consider where the business of partnership is headed in terms of development. These themes should suggest both a focus for current work in the field as well as a vision of how partnerships can be used as a tool for social change.

History and Context of Education Partnerships

Business/education partnerships perhaps have the most fully documented history; a plethora of articles, reports, books and project descriptions attest to considerable activity, especially in the last ten years. In addition, this country's rich history of volunteerism has greatly contributed to the success of school/community partnerships. Long term partnerships also exist between the public schools and the higher education community, relationships forged from the mutual concerns of teaching and learning. Indeed, a particularly successful partnership, rarely considered as such by researchers, is the internship component of teacher preparation programs. Colleges and universities have collaborated with public schools for many years to place student teachers in elementary, middle and high school classrooms under the guidance of experienced public school teachers.

In many urban areas, the social pressures of the late sixties and early seventies led to greater involvement of university communities in the concerns of the public schools. More formal pairings began to develop as colleges and universities lent their energies to the tasks of developing multi-cultural curricula, training teachers to better respond to diversity and in general working on quality education issues for an increasingly disadvantaged school population.

Business and education have been linked since the late 1800s, as rapid industrial changes necessitated the creation of education programs and institutions which could respond to the changing needs of the workforce. However, in the late 1970s, when the term "partnership" became a popular expression and notion, the first partnership efforts were motivated largely by public relations concerns and the desire for corporations located in or near urban communities to be good neighbors. Many of these initial endeavors focussed on the giving of financial donations or equipment to area schools or the purchase of rewards (sweatshirts, gift certificates) for students as incentives for improved school attendance or course grades. Businesses did not always initiate these relationships. Dr. Ruth Love pioneered the Adopt-A-School Program in 1981 when she headed the Oakland, California school system.¹ The premise of this program was to encourage businesses to "adopt" a school or schools to help provide additional resources. The program, after achieving success in a number of urban communities, gained nationwide prominence and won support of major businesses, such as the Sara Lee Corporation.

However, a crisis within public education was beginning to build increasing concern. In 1983, the U.S. Department of Education's National Commission on Excellence in Education issued A Nation At Risk, a report which strongly articulated the need for reform of public education and called for the establishment of higher standards for graduates and teachers entering the profession. A wave of publications under the aegis of various commissions and national foundations followed.

At the same time, businesses grew alarmed about the lack of preparation of its workforce as the change from a manufacturing base to a service driven economy escalated.

Employers were experiencing burgeoning training costs because entry level employees were unable to meet the demands of new and more complex job requirements, requirements which called for higher order thinking and problem solving skills. It became apparent that a growing gap was developing between our nation's educational achievement and that of other industrial countries. Added to these issues, the country's demographics were changing. Experts predicted that by 1995, the number of 16-24 year-olds would decline 20% from 1980 levels.² Of that pool, the numbers of minorities and of poor and disadvantaged would significantly increase. It was clear that in order to ensure the continuing economic health of the nation, business would need to recapture the sense of vested interest in improving the preparation of its future work force.

These twin concerns, of crisis in public education and the increased demands of a service driven economy, generated a flurry of activity. Between 1983-84 and 1987-88, the number of business education partnerships rose from 42,200 to 140,800. More than nine million students-24% of all public school students-were directly involved in education partnerships. Overall, 70% of schools were in partnerships with businesses during 1987-88.³ Activities varied enormously, from small scale projects which provided a school-to-work transition for selected high school students to city-wide partnerships that developed long term goals for school improvement in exchange for business' pledge of employment opportunities for graduates.⁴

As the scope of business/education partnership initiatives took on greater depth and breadth, the number of partners multiplied and the agenda for change became more ambitious. Multiple partnership projects began to include the human service sector, community-based agencies (often having their own rich history of partnership efforts within the community), labor unions, health organizations/hospitals and city/county government. Agendas began to reflect broad themes of interest to all parties, such as the social/economic health of the community; or the self-sufficiency of the citizenry. These efforts--community-wide change initiatives--have begun to develop over the last five years. It is perhaps too early to determine either their efficacy or their impact.

The Boston Experience: A Case Study

One of the oldest and best known partnerships is the Boston Compact and its development illustrates the above history very well. In 1973, court ordered desegregation provided the impetus for partnership development with colleges and universities. As part of his court orders, Judge W. Arthur Garrity, Jr. asked area colleges and universities to pair with the Boston schools to help end "the ravages of discrimination."⁵ In March 1975, 21 area institutions volunteered to lend their expertise to the desegregation effort, agreeing to work in partnership with the schools to develop quality education for all 76,000 children in the system.⁶ The early years of this precedent setting agreement were devoted to cooperative relationship building and the development of small projects--curriculum development, staff training or tutoring.

In the meantime, the Tri-Lateral Council for Quality Education, a business leaders' group, initiated an Adopt-a-School program with a number of major companies and Boston high schools. An outgrowth of this first activity was a Jobs Collaborative Program which placed job developers hired by the Private Industry Council in the high schools to place students in summer jobs. By 1982, business was ready and willing to take on a broader agenda, one which included school reform, workforce preparation and job opportunities. To this end, the first Compact agreement was drafted and endorsed, an agreement which pledged greater access to entry level jobs in return for school system improvements in the preparation of its graduates.

In addition, fifteen years of school/college collaboration set the stage for more systemic involvement by this sector. The post-secondary education community signed a parallel agreement in 1982 which provided increased access to higher education for Boston Public School graduates. Then, in 1984, the Higher Education Information Center was opened at the Boston Public Library to provide free post-secondary information and counseling services to counselors, students and parents of all income levels. In 1985, a "last dollar" scholarship program called ACCESS was established to help students for whom

college funding stood as a formidable barrier to higher education. And in the following year, a new corporate funded foundation--The Boston Plan for Excellence--created a permanent endowment for the public schools, addressing issues ranging from early childhood education to after school sports programs.⁷ Various business/ university/community-based agency initiatives continue to build and expand upon this long history of partnership success.

However, as Eleanor Farrar's excellent studies point out, the school improvement focus of the Compact has waxed and waned. The turnover in school and program staff leadership, along with the lack of incentives and central office support for building-based improvements have seriously hampered the ability of the school system to deliver on commitments, particularly the goal of lowering the dropout rate.⁸ Recently, a renegotiated set of Compact goals were approved calling for the decentralization of school governance and a more serious effort at reducing dropouts.

The above discussion and case study suggest several important points regarding partnership development. First, partnerships often embrace diverse territory and goals. In Boston, the vision expanded from Adopt-A-School approaches offering enriched opportunities for youth to embrace broader goals of system-wide reform. The second point is that partnership, like change, is a process, not an event. A partnership is a relationship between institutions (and people within those institutions). As in all human relationships, goals change over time, beginning with needs for affiliation, moving to the establishment of mutual responsibilities (and enjoyment of mutual benefits), to increased commitment, if each stage is successfully negotiated. Thus, both the definition of partnership and the expectations must be appropriate to the particular stage of development.

In the same vein, the form of a partnership will generally change and evolve. Partnerships often start modestly, with a partner or two providing specific services, and grow through the years to include increasing numbers of partners working on larger and larger concerns.

Finally, partnerships are creatures of their context and environment. Both their focus and range shift to reflect changing ideas about how to address urban ills and educational reform. Initially, partnerships in urban areas concentrated on assistance activities designed to benefit a small group of teachers or students; then expanded to provide resources to "needy" urban schools; evolved over time to focus on school-to-work transition programs; and most recently, have begun to work on developing "comprehensive service systems" and full-scale educational reform. With these shifts comes the need to involve different and more varied sets of players and develop new ways to shape and define the goals.

Partnerships: Definition and Typology

What distinguishes a partnership from other kinds of cooperative relationships? One definition suggests the following:

. . . successful partnerships are characterized by an exchange of ideas, knowledge and resources. Partners form a mutually rewarding relationship with the purpose of improving some aspect of education. The relationship must be based on the identification and acceptance of compatible goals and strategies. In addition, the partners should respect the differences in each other's culture and style, striving to apply the best of both worlds to achieve established goals.⁹

Roberta Trachtman at Fordham University differentiates partnerships from other types of institutional relationships by asking the question, "who benefits?" If the answer is not "all parties," the arrangement is not a true partnership.¹⁰ What are the benefits for various partners? Benefits vary according to the community, of course, but in general partners benefit in the following ways:

Business gains: improved public relations, better prepared entry-level employees, decreased training costs, increased productivity; heightened potential for local economic development;

Education gains: increased public confidence and support for education, access to new technology, enhanced opportunities for professional growth and development, increased resources (dollars and people), increased staff morale and student success (resulting in fewer problems, i.e. violence, truancy, suspensions, etc);

Higher Education gains: increased college admission and retention, better prepared students, decreased remediation costs;

Parents and students gain: increased voice in education affairs, empowerment, increased and more effective services, enhanced higher education and career opportunities;

Community gains: improved quality of life, a strong education system which can attract newcomers to the city.

This said, how are institutional relationships established and how do they grow through stages to become successful partnerships? How do small partnerships grow, as in the example of the school/college collaboration in Boston, from program specific activity to system-wide, or even community-wide change collaboratives?

Typologies provide useful conceptual frameworks by which to answer these questions. There are any number of existing partnership typologies and no single model is entirely adequate to explain the complexities of the process. For one thing, partnership activities are extremely varied and so resist simple categorization. For another, there are various ways of looking at partnerships. One could choose to look at the focus of the partnership: is it program specific? school wide? school system or community-wide? One could look at target population: does the activity benefit students, school staff, parents, disadvantaged youth and adults, the entire community? One might examine how the partnership was created: was it generated locally? initiated because of a state-or federally-sponsored initiative? because of

a grant from a private foundation? Or, one could consider the locus of leadership: is the partnership generated from the top down? the bottom up? Obviously, there are many paths to traverse which will help shape and define an understanding of these unique institutional relationships.

Three typologies seem particularly useful, however, and will be described below. The third typology introduced will serve as the basis for the heart of the discussion and the framework for the presentation of specific examples. The reason this particular typology was selected as the most useful is because it emphasizes the partnership's impact on the educational system, and this emphasis most easily lends itself to the issue of how to evaluate community partnerships.

Typology #1: Levels of Involvement

The first typology describes the stages of partnership development by focussing on levels of involvement. Three stages are delineated: **support, cooperation and collaboration.** Each stage is characterized by how it varies on seven dimensions:

- amount and type of resources
- type of activities
- participation in planning/decision making
- effectiveness of communication
- commitment of leadership from top management
- "equality" of partners
- participation of staff

In the support stage, typically a beginning phase, some member of the school community, a teacher, principal, or superintendent, engages a partner, often a local business, to provide resources--volunteers for classroom activities, such as a read-aloud program;

money for school libraries, computers or special student projects. These first relationships usually focus on the acquisition of new resources for very focussed activity. There is typically limited attention to the other dimensions which characterize more sophisticated relationships. However, these are first steps which begin to build interest and support and lay important groundwork for greater involvement.

The cooperation stage is recognized by a greater degree of communication, participation and leadership, although the relationship is unequal, with the school being on the receiving end in terms of accrual of benefits. Typical examples are the development of a mentorship project or school-to-work transition program. Usually at this stage of the game, some planning structure comes into being to support the greater levels of participation and shared decision-making; usually either a joint planning team or a project director co-funded by the partners.

In the collaboration stage, the partnership begins to assume "a life of its own." In this stage, the partnership looks like a full scale orchestra performance led by various conductors. The partnership team has the full attention and involvement of top level leadership and implementation support from a full-time staff. Partners have established long range goals which address essential school or community needs. Major resources from various partners are committed and many activities are happening at once. There is widespread involvement of staff within all partner institutions and all benefit within a relationship where parties enjoy a relationship among "equals."¹¹

Typology #2 Partnership Structure

A second typology concentrates on the organization or structure of the partnership. Three types are delineated: Simple, Moderately Complex and Complex. In a simple partnership, one partner manages the initiative and other partners provide supportive services or resources. The school system is the recipient of services or provides

access to students. Adopt-A-School programs are typical examples of this type of arrangement.

The moderately complex partnership involves any of three arrangements: shared management or decision making among two or more partners; multiple partners, each with substantive program responsibility; or more than one partner within each sector, e.g. two or more community colleges, each involved with providing college awareness workshops for urban students and parents. Another example of this type of structure is a summer jobs partnership in which school personnel identify students and teach courses, the employment and training office provides work readiness skills and job placement/supervision and a community-based agency offers case management or counseling services. It is important to add that in the moderately complex partnership, the school system is not a recipient of services, but an active partner in the enterprise.

A complex partnership has the characteristics of the above structure plus one or more of the following characteristics: two or more levels of partnerships in the project; a new organization formed for purposes of the project; or multiple partners from two or more sectors. An example of a complex partnership is a city which establishes a broad-based Youth Commission to address major issues, coordinate funding and existing programs, and address service gaps or programmatic improvements. An important point in considering the value of this typology is that the terms refer only to the structure of the partnership and do not correspond to the level of complexity of the project's goals or objectives.¹²

Typology #3: Levels of Impact

The preceding models focus either on the character of the relationship between or among partners or the structure of the partnership itself. A third type of typology, one particularly useful in thinking about outcomes and therefore, the ways of evaluating partnership activity focusses on levels of impact upon the educational system. Six levels are outlined:

- Level 6: Partners in Special Services
- Level 5: Partners in the Classroom
- Level 4: Partners in Teacher Training and Development
- Level 3: Partners in Management
- Level 2: Partners in Systemic Educational Improvement
- Level 1: Partners in Policy

Again, within this classification system, some partnerships start small, providing services to select student groups or individual classrooms and over time expand to address increasingly difficult issues and concerns. Some partnerships remain small but effective. Some are initiated at the outset to effect system-wide change. Multi-dimensional partnerships can be found at any level; however, in general, "the higher the level of involvement and investment in education, the greater the opportunity to bring about lasting improvements in education, and the greater the likelihood of significantly improving the workforce readiness of our nation's youth."¹³

Discussion

As has been stated, the first two typologies presented illustrate some critical elements regarding partnership development, elements which center on the relationship between partners and describe the structure of these relations. The third model, however, stands out for its focus on goals. One of the dilemmas of evaluating partnerships comes from the widely shared belief that relationship building is an end in itself. Certainly successful relationships provide critical groundwork for any collaborative effort. But, it is also clear that partnerships are established to achieve some end. The purpose of these partnerships needs to be both clearly stated and clear-sightedly measured.

Partnership Examples

The literature abounds with examples of various kinds of partnerships in urban and rural areas across the country. Selected descriptions will be used to illustrate each of the above levels delineated by the Impact Typology. Special attention will be given to levels 3

through 6. These levels most closely describe the "state of the art" of partnerships established in the last five years and provide the most potential for education reform, economic development and community revitalization.

Partners in Special Services

Special Services partnerships "provide short-term, project-or student-specific activities or resources to help with a specific problem or need."¹⁴ IBM, for example, takes 4,000 young people to Yankee Stadium each year as a reward for improved attendance. Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company helped a school rebuild its parent organization by matching each membership fee dollar for dollar.¹⁵

The value of this type of partnership is restricted by the time-limited nature of the service provision. It may be relatively easy to measure impact, however. Schools involved with IBM can easily see whether more students improve attendance each year and whether the particular incentive is effective. On the other hand, there is a tendency not to pay much attendance to the results of short term services. The major value of this type of partnership is that it is a good beginning for new partners. Because activities are generally simple and straight-forward, and success quick and easy to measure, special service partnerships promote affiliation, and build interest for partners in working together.

The Career Beginnings program is something of a hybrid model, although in a sense it illustrates a moderately complex, multi-dimensional, special services partnership and so will be discussed here. Career Beginnings was created in 1986 with an aim to increase the number of high school juniors from low income families who complete high school and enter college, technical training or full-time employment. Since its initiation, Career Beginnings has operated in over 30 colleges in more than 25 cities, with some 100 students being served per year.

The program, a partnership of local colleges, public schools and businesses, works with "tenacious" students-those with average grades who are underachieving but are not highly at risk of dropping out. The Program matches students with mentors from the local business community. Mentors are carefully trained and supported; they help students with career planning, applying to college and understanding the professional work environment. Students also benefit from a mix of related services, i.e. year round academic/career workshops designed to address needs developmentally, a summer job on a college campus and case management. Career Beginnings is typically managed by a full time Director located in a local college/university. Directors are supported through funds pooled for this purpose by school, college and business partners.¹⁶

Three particular elements make this program effective. The first is the focus on goals. Many mentorship programs work to establish caring, extended family relationships among young people and their mentors. This is the primary aim, and the outcomes of the relationship are enumerated as secondary benefits. Career Beginnings established the relationship for the purpose of fostering college entry for young people.

The second unique feature of the program is the synergy of its program components. All services are designed in concert to support students, encourage academic success and college entry and link education to the world of work. Career Beginnings Director Bill Bloomfield believes that mentoring programs for disadvantaged youth should not be developed as stand alone programs but should be part of a comprehensive set of services.¹⁷

The third unique feature of Career Beginnings is its three-part partnership of schools, colleges and business, each fulfilling a role to advance the mission of better preparing young people for careers and success in the workforce. This partnership provides specific services for young people over a fixed time period, usually nineteen months. It is a special example of a way in which involvement at this level can, in fact, generate significant impact.

The Ford Foundation sponsored a multi-year initiative--the Urban School-Community Dropout Prevention Collaborative--beginning in 1986. Twenty one cities received grants to develop dropout prevention partnerships. Each city established a coalition of leaders from schools, businesses, local government, social agencies and parent organizations. These groups examined the causes of why students left school and devised ways to address the specific issues. Examples of community activities included establishing dropout data bases, developing multi-agency service delivery systems, increasing staff development in schools with high dropout rates, developing services for out-of-school teen parents, and creating early intervention or school-to-work programs. Again, this initiative is difficult to categorize. In one respect, it can be regarded as a partnership which brings special services to a vulnerable school population. On the other hand, participant cities worked on a wide range of interventions, from providing focussed programmatic services, to developing teacher training programs, changing schools and re-working school policies.

Partners in the Classroom

Classroom partners are volunteers who "improve the learning environment by bringing their business or occupational expertise directly into the classroom for students and teachers, or bringing the classroom to the business."¹⁸

An example of a rural, classroom-based collaboration was a pilot project called Partners In Education, a three year effort established in Vermont in 1986, involving IBM and high schools in four counties. The purpose of the partnership was to strengthen the math and science programs offered by Vermont High Schools. Participating School Districts were selected by the Department of Education based on interest and ability to make several commitments, among them creating planning time for teachers and business partners to meet. IBM employees were chosen according to interest and technical expertise. Teachers requesting assistance were matched with an IBM employee on the basis of particular classroom needs. The business partner worked in the classroom for at least one semester. He or she assisted with classes in math, science, or computer usage for up to one day a

week, usually team teaching with the classroom instructor. The Vermont Department of Education selected the schools; IBM offered one day a week away from work with pay and travel expenses.

A major challenge for the partnership was putting in place a timely matching process, something which proved time consuming, cumbersome, and difficult. What helped make this process work was having a coordinator or broker of the process, a role which the Department of Education assumed. Much communication and follow-up were required to develop an effective process. The Department considers educational partnerships critical in resource scarce rural areas and states that both schools and businesses report benefits from sharing technical and human resources. The Department used this successful pilot to interest other businesses in partnership projects, while IBM went on to create a school/business elementary and middle school initiative.¹⁹

A second example of partners in the classroom is the High School Academies model, first begun in Philadelphia by the Urban Coalition in the late 1960s and later disseminated nationally through leadership from the Academy for Educational Development. The High School Academies are three year schools-within-schools that address needs of disadvantaged youth by relating education more closely to the world of work. Academies are structured around specific career areas, hence, the Academy of Environmental Science and Health or the Academy of Science. Partners in these ventures are schools, the business community and an intermediary, community-based agency. This model has been carefully evaluated; Public/Private Ventures has called it "the best single model in the country for business involvement in the schools."

The Academies are important first because they demonstrate many components of what is now considered the folk wisdom of serving "at risk" youth, i.e. clear criteria for selecting participants and student choice; high expectations for young people; the connection of learning with real life; consistent support, individual attention and motivational awards;

and close supervision of youth in job placements.²⁰ In addition, the partnerships inherent within the academies model are very interactive. Business participates in decision-making and fund raising, but more particularly in developing curricula, working in teams with educators and community members. Community-based agencies function as brokers, and in this capacity work to obtain support for the academy, facilitate the work of business/education partners, serve as advocates for student interests and coordinate the mentor and work components of the program.

A third example is the Indiana Partners in Education Program. This program provided grants to cities which agreed to form partnerships and address one of several state developed goals. Examples of these goals included increasing student achievement, employability and post-secondary entry. Participating cities were required to hire a local coordinator to manage emerging school/business partnerships. In addition, cities established management committees which included business and education representatives, including teachers. This group assessed community needs, formulated goals and objectives, designed the program and monitored progress. The state provided oversight and technical assistance.

As a result of the initiative, Hammond, Indiana formed a partnership between Inland Steel and the four Hammond High Schools. Inland Steel offered an afternoon work placement at Inland to a High School Chemistry teacher. In return, the teacher used Inland's Chemistry Lab on Saturdays to teach advanced chemistry to a group of students. This local partnership is worth noting because, although small and focussed, it was a true partnership--both parties benefitted from the arrangement. Business gained an employee and the school system accessed technical resources. In addition, the partnership gave gifted students an enriched learning experience.²¹

The benefits of this type of partnership lie in the ability to directly and positively impact a small group of young people. In fact, when goals are clearly developed, it is relatively easy to measure progress in terms of academic achievement, attendance, work

readiness, job placements, etc. This classroom-based partnership model is also a good way to foster improved understanding and better relationships among teachers and business or community members. When planned carefully and implemented well, this model can facilitate the implementation of new teaching technologies and instructional approaches. This can be powerful, for many partnerships do not directly involve teachers and therefore have limited impact on the quality or effectiveness of instruction.

The limitation of the approach is clear. Classroom-based programs benefit only a small number of students and teachers. In urban areas, these program-specific interventions often come under criticism for being inequitable, for delivering too little, too late and for too few. Most classroom-based interventions are billed as pilot programs, which if successful can be "replicated" or "institutionalized." Rarely, however, is either successfully accomplished. Funding constraints, lack of leadership, institutional resistance, lack of incentives are only a few of the reasons why many successful programs fail to impact the larger arena of the school or the system.

Partners in Teacher Training and Development

Partners in teacher training and development provide "opportunities to update, upgrade, or maintain skills (for example, to learn the latest development in science or mathematics,) or learn more about the labor market. . . workplace needs. . . career opportunities" or developments in allied fields.²²

An excellent teacher training partnership, one which involves the partnering of a private foundation and a school system is the Jefferson County Public Schools/Gheens Foundation Professional Development Academy. Planning for this project began in 1983 and extended through 1986. A second phase of development was completed this past summer. The vision upon which the Academy was developed was the premise that school improvement activities must be "linked implicitly to the professional development of those working in the school system." The Academy was established to provide on-going

professional development to education professionals and relate the training to "a continuing review of state of the art knowledge about teaching, learning and organizational effectiveness."

The Academy itself is a former elementary school rehabbed by the district into a modern and functional conference center. Renovations funds came from the school system as evidence of a long term commitment to the venture. Leadership in planning came from the school superintendent, the Executive Director of the foundation, leaders of the Teacher's Association, among others. The Academy offers a full range of professional development activities, such as clinical supervision training, teacher support groups, grants assistance sessions, leadership training for high school chairpersons, writing seminars, etc. Although the Academy is a fine example of a professional development partnership, much of the work of the Academy can be said to contain elements of a systemic educational improvement. In its work with the schools, the Academy draws upon several approaches--the Coalition of Essential Schools, the Middle Grades Assessment Program, Professional Development Schools--all of which have as a major thrust the goal of school re-structuring.²³

Academic internships for staff provide additional examples of this type of partnership. The Industry Initiatives for Science and Math Education is a partnership of San Francisco Bay Area Industries and the University of California Berkeley's Lawrence Hall of Science designed to improve the quality of math and science education in the public schools. Selected teachers are offered summer opportunities in industry for pay; with assistance from industry mentors, teachers work with teams on specific but short term work projects. Teachers receive guidance from the University to transfer lessons learned through the summer experience to their classrooms. Through 1989, the program expanded to 50 business sponsors offering 345 teacher fellowships.²⁴

Business benefits from this program because summer is a down-time and fellowships offer increased staff for specific projects. Teachers benefit because the program offers a chance to learn new skills, become familiar with new technologies, earn a summer salary in

a new environment, update classroom instruction, relate curriculum to the world of work and provide students with information on jobs and careers. One teacher who served as a summer fellow reported that the program had shown the need for higher order thinking skills in the workplace; as a result, she had re-structured her teaching approaches to focus more intensely on cooperative learning techniques, i.e. project oriented learning and working in teams to solve "real life" problems.²⁵

The benefit of this type of partnership lies in its ability to address the deficiencies of the classroom-based model. For teacher training partnerships are not only able to impact the way instruction is delivered, but engage large numbers of the teaching staff. The limitations of the approach lie in what Jane David calls the "jig-saw puzzle" nature of education.²⁶ Because of the interconnectedness of the system, a reform at any one level is often limited by problems that the change causes at a different level of the system. For example, teachers attempting to work as a team in a middle school often encounter problems with union rules, central office curriculum and testing requirements or principal resistance.

Partners in Management

"Management assistance partnerships provide school officials with management support and business expertise in a broad range of areas, such as increased principal or teacher autonomy, labor management relations, flexible personnel and incentive systems, purchasing efficiencies, plant and equipment issues, management information systems, strategic planning," etc.²⁷

In fact, businesses and private foundations are increasingly investing in partnerships with education to reorganize the management of public schools. Management training is an area in which many businesses excel; because of this expertise, it is an area in which the private sector can make a significant contribution to educational improvement. In addition, some large companies have participated in top-to-bottom reorganization (born out of fiscal

necessity) and thus are able to lend a hand with the task of re-structuring public school systems. Again, because of different focus and goals, some of these partnerships are modest; others are extremely ambitious in terms of scope and potential.

One particular example is typical and illustrates the above points well. In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, business leaders associated with the Greater Milwaukee Education Trust (The Trust), in cooperation with the public schools, initiated a management partners program with school principals. Principals interested in developing a school-based management in their schools (two-thirds of the school staff must have approved the plan) pair with a management partner from the business community. Partners work on various management and governance issues and problems. This partnership process applies the experiences of business executives to the management of public schools; business partners have been able to bring in additional company resources to address specific concerns, for example in areas of technology, curriculum and staff training.

An executive on loan to the Milwaukee Trust says that business partners experience more satisfaction and success when the principal requesting assistance evinces a strong desire to share power. In addition, he says that the change process is "evolutionary, not revolutionary." Although business can lend a hand in encouraging and fostering participatory processes and good strategic planning, unless major decisions, such as budgeting and personnel, devolve to the school level, not much will be different. And, if these decisions get handed to the schools, a more systematic training approach will need to be developed and implemented beforehand.²⁸

The partners in management approach enables a school system to avail itself of the business community's significant technical expertise and work in partnership to develop more efficient and competent management and finance systems. This can go a long way towards helping restore community confidence in public education. However, while educators can learn much about more efficient systems, they are not always able to implement them, due

to government or union restraints. And, even if new systems can be implemented, efficient systems aren't necessarily effective systems. If management reforms do not change what happens in school buildings, particularly in classrooms, the problems that plague educational systems will not diminish. Even the decentralization of school governance, while touted as a promising reform, will not necessarily create positive change unless principals and teachers feel ownership, have a significant role, receive technical assistance and training, have access to resources for professional development and address clearly stated goals which have the full support of the community.

Partners in Systemic Educational Improvement

Systemic partnerships are change initiatives in which "businesses, education officials, and other community leaders identify the need for reform or improvement in the educational system, and then work over the long term to make those changes happen."²⁹ Some of the most creative and potentially impactful partnerships emerging in recent years are multi-dimensional partnerships focussing on systemic educational improvement. Instead of emphasizing the classroom or a special population, these initiatives aim at a more substantial restructuring of the educational system. Restructuring in this context means "to preserve and build upon what has been successful in educating...children and...rethink and re-design... aspects that have failed. This ultimately requires taking a critical look at all aspects of schooling including mission and goals...organization and management...curriculum... instruction...roles and responsibilities of educational personnel...roles, responsibilities and involvement of parents and the community, school finance and educational regulation and control."³⁰

These new partnerships generally evolve as a result of several years of work on more program-specific partnership activities. It makes sense that when partners build a trusting, cooperative working relationship and then begin to provide remedial, enriched or special services to a youth population that eventually it becomes obvious that there are glitches in the system which make service provision difficult. These glitches may indeed be so serious

that they serve as barriers to success, particularly for disadvantaged youth. Given this recognition, the partners will often seek to address issues within the system itself.

A number of examples serve to illustrate the power of this type of partnership. The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation sponsors an urban initiative designed to "develop and provide an education of high expectations, high content, and high support to disadvantaged youth in the middle grades in urban school systems." Five school systems--Baltimore, Louisville, Milwaukee, Oakland and San Diego--are grant recipients. Each system has launched a comprehensive project in two or three pilot schools to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged youth. School/community teams in the pilot schools base activities upon four program objectives specified by the foundation.

The Foundation encourages school/business/ community-based agency partnerships in the grantee cities. In addition, the Foundation itself considers itself in partnership with communities to advance the agenda. To this end, it provides on-site technical assistance; grants to community-based organizations for local training and capacity building; and grants to national foundations to help with training, networking, disseminating and directing national attention to middle grades reform. After one year of implementation, the foundation reports that the initiative has led teachers to attempt different approaches in educating disadvantaged students and has encouraged business and parent involvement in the schools. This modest start again proves the point that educational change takes time; even with impressive resources, change is still an evolving process.

Two grantee cities portray specific partnership activity. Baltimore has focussed on providing disadvantaged youth with a more challenging education through a collaboration with Johns Hopkins University. School and university staff are working cooperatively to improve the quality and delivery of reading instruction and will continue work over the next three years in different subject areas.

In Louisville, project schools which have had little parent involvement have experienced as much as a 150 per cent increase in Parent Teacher Association membership. This is a result of an effective outreach strategy by school staff. Staff have been assisted in this venture by working in partnership with the University of Louisville's School of Education. A university staffperson with significant expertise in parent involvement works with the coordinator or principal of the pilot schools to provide training and on-site support.³¹

The Clark Foundation mentions a number of issues serving as barriers to change in the grantee cities, among them: lack of school system leadership; lack of stable project oversight; the continued emphasis on discrete projects, rather than system-wide change; and the related difficulty of replicating pilot school successes to other schools in the system.³²

Another example, one which features business interest in the issue of school restructuring, is The Coalition for Essential Schools Dissemination effort. The Exxon Education Foundation, Southwestern Bell, General Foods and Citibank support a group of 60 elementary and secondary schools across the country making fundamental changes in the way schools are structured and instruction delivered. These schools, under the leadership of TheodoreSizer, professor of education at Brown University, are working to establish group instruction with teachers as coaches; small class sizes; a simplified curriculum stressing critical thinking skills; and active involvement of the student in the learning process.³³

The National Alliance of Business is expanding and supporting a Partnership Network of cities and states working on education reform and school re-structuring. The purpose of the Network is to shorten the process of educational change by sharing what works and by actively disseminating knowledge of new developments in the field of education.³⁴

Obviously, the benefit of this approach is its impact on the system as a whole, its potential for significant change. The drawback is the time and labor connected with the task. Changing an entrenched, politicized system is slow going. However, it is important for

the more complex types of partnerships to communicate a "sense of urgency" for their change agenda. A community should reasonably expect to see progress on school restructuring in five, certainly in ten years. Our timelines need to be realistic, neither too short nor too long.³⁵

Partners in Policy

"Policy partnerships are collaborative efforts at the national, state, or local level, among businesses, schools, and public officials that shape the public and political debate, bring about substantive changes in state or federal legislation or local school governance, and affect the overall direction of the educational system."³⁶

Most cities (or states) have several levels of partnership in operation before undertaking a policy change agenda, though this is not always the case. Typically, however, communities have experienced some success with programmatic or classroom partnerships; these have led to concerns about changes in the larger education system, including the issue of connecting schools and community resources. This work generally leads to the recognition that there is a lack of connection between various service sectors and that there are significant organizational barriers to effective collaboration. At this point, collaborators may begin to develop policy partnerships and community-wide initiatives.

Two historical examples are worth mentioning in this context, particularly since the initiatives are recognized as the forerunners of policy partnerships. The Boston Compact, as has been mentioned, had a successful school-to-work partnership in place in several high schools before creating the historic agreement between the school system and business community. In a more recent policy development, a broadly representative Compact Steering Committee negotiated a second set of five year goals, endorsed by the community in 1989. As part of the negotiations, a groundbreaking agreement with the Boston Teacher's Union provided the opportunity to include as a goal the de-centralization of management to the school building level.

The Portland Investment grew out of a working partnership between the public schools, the city, the Chamber of Commerce, the Private Industry Council and various community organizations. In 1984, when the leaders of these organizations became convinced that a larger effort was needed to improve long-term job opportunities for disadvantaged youth, a Leader's Roundtable was convened. From this forum began some unique work designed to coordinate employment services and create school-to-work transitions for youth. In 1986, an interagency implementation team was created representing the school district, city and business communities. New goals were established calling for the creation of a comprehensive service system for youth with a continuum of educational, employment and support services pre-natal through age twenty-one.³⁷

Commonwealth Futures was a Massachusetts state level initiative established in 1986 and operated out of the Governor's Office of Educational Affairs. Futures featured collaboration at both state and local levels designed to better address the needs of "at risk" youth. The mission of this initiative was to reduce school dropout rates and increase the rates of program re-entry for youth who had already dropped out. At the state level, a steering committee of cabinet level secretaries and an interagency work group provided oversight and addressed barriers to local implementation. This involved designing more coordinated state funding processes, providing technical assistance and changing or adjusting funding regulations where feasible.

At the local level, Futures worked with 13 communities which had high concentrations of "at risk" youth. In each city, a partnership structure was formed. An Executive Board comprised of the Mayor, Superintendent, Private Industry Council Chair and lead Human Services Representative provided oversight, made sufficient resources available and addressed policy concerns. Broad-based planning teams, working in concert with city leaders and with staff, developed and implemented community-wide service plans to address dropout/re-entry/post-secondary placement issues. All city plans addressed three broad goal areas:

- building a continuous, linked service system for youth;
- creating school change (re-structuring schools to provide better instruction and support for at-risk youth and changing school policies i.e. attendance, suspension, promotion, graduation which served to "push out" marginal students); and
- developing community partnerships to provide avenues to post-secondary opportunities and enhance support.³⁸

During the life of Commonwealth Futures, dropout rate decreases were reported by the Department of Education in 7 of the 13 communities.

San Diego provides an interesting example of the initiation stages of a locally generated school/human service/city and county government partnership. After various news articles highlighted problems in one elementary school and its surrounding neighborhood, the leadership of the above sectors met to see how they could address the issues. From an initial commitment to work together, the leaders commissioned a study which explored the feasibility of developing an integrated services model for children and families in the area. Parents were surveyed, along with school and human service providers.

Several findings emerged: parents cited the elementary school as the place they would go for help with various concerns; major needs of children and families were identified; and service barriers were articulated. As a result, a one-stop coordinated family services center was proposed which would operate on or near the school site and serve as a laboratory for work on service integration strategies. Among the policy issues that will need to be addressed will be multiple eligibility criteria, client assessment, service delivery, confidentiality, service gaps, health insurance, etc. The city-wide leadership group has recently obtained support from several national foundations to support the family services center. It is slated to begin operation in March, 1991.³⁹

A Mayor's 1986 Education Summit provided the initial impetus for system-wide change in the Chicago Public Schools. Evolving out of the Summit was the Alliance for Better Chicago Schools, a coalition of 40 civic organizations. This coalition, led by a business leader, lobbied for statewide legislation that would make changes in the school system. This legislation effectively de-centralized management of the public schools, putting more power and authority into the hands of school-based governance boards composed of principals, teachers and parents and establishing accountability measures for school staff.

Several important elements of this re-organization include the strong three-part partnership forged between city government, business and powerful community-based agencies through this effort; the on-going training for school councils provided by foundations and the business community; and the creation of business-funded community organizers who have worked with CBOs to develop council involvement within various neighborhoods. The initiative has experienced the usual problems with de-centralized management efforts, mainly the tension between traditional top-down management and the newer de-centralized endeavors; problems created by the diverse skills and experiences of council members combined with their new and significant responsibilities; and a set-back precipitated by the Illinois Supreme Court--it recently challenged the constitutionality of the school councils' election process.⁴⁰

South Carolina provides an excellent example of a state-wide policy level partnership between the public schools and the business community. Collaboration between the business, education and political communities, largely fueled by the desire for economic development and the poor quality of the public schools, resulted in the passage of a comprehensive piece of legislation--The Education Improvement Act (EIA) of 1984. Lobbying efforts by the business community were widely viewed as essential to gaining the financial underpinnings for this legislation, obtained by adding a penny to the state sales tax. In return for their support, business pushed for, and gained a formal accountability system as part of the Education Act.

As a result of the legislation, school improvement councils were created and schools were mandated to plan improvements and create partnerships to strengthen the involvement of parents, business and other community members. The results thusfar include test score increases at all grade levels, continuation rate increases to post-secondary institutions, and increased remedial, support and enrichment programs. Elements which have contributed to the success of this initiative include leadership by both the public and private sectors, a wide spread acknowledgment of the problem, a state-wide political and educational campaign to gain support for reform, a data-based system of accountability and on-going mechanisms for sustaining the effort.⁴¹

Two additional initiatives are important to mention since both began with a policy level thrust. The first is the Annie E. Casey Foundation's "New Futures" project. This effort, involving 6 cities, focusses on a community-wide strategy to reduce school dropout, youth unemployment/inactivity and teen pregnancy.

The vision of "New Futures" is impressive, since it calls for institutional change not only in schools, but in all youth serving organizations and institutions. A major structural element of the initiative is the creation of city-wide Oversight Collaboratives. In each city, these leadership groups oversee planning and implementation and are responsible for making policy changes which make various service delivery systems more responsive to the needs of youth.

The Rockefeller Foundation's Persistent Poverty Program is also noteworthy. This six city initiative is designed to give cities maximum discretion in formulating strategies to combat the issue of persistent poverty in targeted neighborhoods. Unique features of the program include the use of community-specific data to drive and motivate partners and the concentration on community organizing and community awareness as major tools in the work.⁴²

The benefits of policy level partnerships lie in the ability to involve large numbers of stakeholders, address significant issues, create change within and between various systems and shape state and federal policy in ways which benefit young people.

The model has its disadvantages. Often community-wide initiatives have such diffuse, abstract or unrealistic missions that it becomes almost impossible to measure progress or recognize success. Often the structure of such initiatives is unwieldy, making process more important than product, planning more important than implementation. Often these initiatives lose sight of the clients; systems change is sought for its own sake rather than for the benefit of young people.

Discussion

At the conclusion of this brief "typological" review, two points are worth re-stating. First, many of the partnerships described actually embrace several categories. The Portland Investment, for example, contains classroom and special service partnerships. But at the same time, it is clear that this initiative has impact which extends beyond more circumscribed approaches. Finally, partnerships which attempt "higher level" strategies face a more challenging task, but they offer a more substantial and lasting impact on the community.

Generic Elements of Educational Partnerships

Given the almost inexhaustible store of partnership examples and the range of possible impacts on a system or across systems, one could reasonably ask if there is an overall "set" of elements which make educational partnerships effective. Although numerous characteristics were highlighted in the discussion of partnership examples and cited as reasons for their success, a listing of the major, generic elements should serve as a helpful roadmap. The following guide, like the typologies, may not include every possible component, but is intended to be as complete as possible.

Successful Partnerships Need:

Top Level Leadership: Most partnerships, particularly those which are stable and have impact, receive sustained attention from leaders. Who the top leaders are depends on the type and location of the partnership. Program specific collaboratives or whole school approaches need the buy-in and cooperation of the principal, though central office staff will also need to be informed and/or involved. A system-wide dropout prevention effort will need the blessing of the Superintendent and the involvement of other community leaders. A Workforce Preparation initiative will need business, school, higher education, community-based agency leadership, among others.

Partnerships generally begin because a school or community leader with an idea or a vision starts the process. This individual, sometimes called a "broker," convenes a series of meetings with various players which result in commitments to "do something" about the issue.⁴³ Over time, this individual generally allows authority and ownership to shift, either to a broad-based group, or project staff or both. This initial broker, a neutral convener knowledgeable about several organizational worlds and able to help partners bridge differences and set common goals, is an important player; yet few partnerships survive and grow if leadership does not expand beyond a single individual.

School leadership is critical for those partnerships which have educational change as their mission. Leadership means talking up the initiative, getting others interested and involved, providing necessary resources (in-kind, financial and staff resources), and holding staff accountable for results. Many partnerships have floundered because the Superintendent either blocked the process or remained too passive and disinterested to defuse resistance within the system.

Finally, if there are major political battles occurring in the city, it is not feasible to undertake a significant community partnership. It is important to pay attention to the saying that "it is easier to stay out than to get out." Many partnerships begun in haste, flounder because of the buffeting of political winds and make subsequent efforts more difficult to sell to the community.

Grounding in Community Needs: Good ideas have a power all their own, but in order to build ownership among partners, the initiative must address widely shared needs. Needs assessment is an effective vehicle for building consensus and shared ownership, though this important and time consuming process is often circumvented in the rush to get partners on board (particularly the business community) or to initiate action.

Data is a powerful tool for generating community concern. Numbers documenting high dropout rates or rates of grade retention generally get attention and provide proof that partners are addressing a real problem. On the other hand, a city which begins a Compact type project in the midst of a recession when adult workers are losing jobs is likely to fail.

Effective Public Relations: Partnerships need to build and maintain support for their efforts, often from a wide array of community "stakeholders." At the same time, partners need to be kept abreast of the activities and accomplishments of the partnership. In addition, ambitious agendas, such as school re-structuring need sustained public attention. For all of these reasons, successful and long lasting partnerships pay attention to the politics of public relations.

Clear Roles and Responsibilities: Once partners have decided to work together on a particular issue of concern to the community, they need to

clearly articulate and agree upon the role and responsibilities of each collaborator. This is a essential first step as it is integral to the concept. Partnerships are, after all, the development of reciprocal roles and sharing of resources in order to accomplish a goal which cannot be addressed successfully by any one party.

Racial/Ethnic Involvement: An obvious point is that, in most urban areas, large numbers of disadvantaged or vulnerable young people are poor and racially or culturally diverse. However, many partnerships are neither led nor staffed by diverse members. These partnerships often do not involve parents, students or other community actors in significant ways. Doing this may be very challenging, but it is worth keeping the issue ever present on the agenda. A partnership which does not truly involve the community will have limited long lasting impact.

Strategic Planning: Partnerships should follow strategic planning principles. Specifically, it is important to agree upon and put in writing a formal mission, set goals and measurable outcomes, develop an implementation plan which includes activities to meet goals, persons responsible, timelines and a monitoring and evaluation process. Cities do not need to re-invent the wheel with regard to planning strategies; care should be taken to base activities and interventions on research and best practice. This takes time: planning should not be too abbreviated a process, and it should be on-going. Some group, typically a leaders group, should assume responsibility for monitoring progress and for helping remove implementation barriers.

Effective Management and Staffing Structure: Partnerships usually start, as mentioned above, with a leaders group, planning team or "grass roots" coalition. However, most partnerships do not run smoothly without at least a full-time manager. Leader's groups or planning teams are good as idea

generators, oversight providers, policy developers or strategic planners, but these groups are made up of people who have full-time jobs in addition to their partnership responsibilities. Implementation does not happen by magic and someone needs to be there to "run the store." Managers and staff need to be optimistic, energetic "doers," with specific skills in the areas of negotiation, organization, communication and problem solving. In addition, managers need to be familiar with several systems so that they can communicate effectively across several organizations and institutions and help overcome turf and territory barriers.

As a partnership becomes more complex, the oversight, planning and implementation structures need to adjust so that the increased needs for communication and multi-level, multi-partner involvement are met. Often a community-wide initiative will have staff which work with practitioners such as case managers, job developers or dropout coordinators. These staff will be supervised by a Director who works closely with an interagency planning team. A Chairperson of the planning team, along with the Director plans meetings with a leader's group when questions of policy cannot be resolved by the planning team or when new plans must be endorsed.

Shared Decision-Making/Interagency Ownership: A partnership cannot survive if it is not owned by a critical number of partners. Ownership will not develop if the partnership does not meet the needs of collaborators, if it does not benefit all parties, if partners do not trust one another and if they are not allowed to share in the decision making. Sometimes a governance structure is created to give the illusion of democratic decision-making, but in reality decisions are made by a few individuals behind closed doors. In this case meetings become mere information sharing sessions. Or, in another scenario, meeting decisions are unmade afterwards, usually by one highly placed leader, such as a school superintendent or Private Industry Council Chair. When

either of these situations persists for long, people become angry and alienated, and organizations begin to pull out of the process.

Shared Credit/ Recognition: Partnerships do not work well when one partner tries to take the credit for work which was done through the sponsorship and hard work of various institutions. This point is often ignored, with disastrous results. Partners slighted in this way feel manipulated and used. Consequently, they are likely to withdraw support, sabotage the effort or pull away and start a competing program of their own. All partners need incentives for participation and should receive frequent public recognition or awards.

Appropriate, well-timed resources: Money is not a magic bullet which will solve human resource issues, much as we yearn to believe that this is the case. Additional resources-human, financial, in-kind-are important to partnership development, but it is more important to have a solid sense of direction and a good plan. "If you know where you are going, the money will come," is a good maxim for the partnership business.

Technical Assistance: Cities and school districts that are attempting to develop effective working partnerships will generally need technical assistance. In general, the more complex the partnership, the greater the need for technical assistance. Partnership plans should include specific assistance needs and the budget should include funds for this purpose. Most major foundation-supported partnerships now recognize the importance of this service and provide focussed assistance; in addition, there are numerous multi-site, at-risk youth initiatives in the country; all support replication of successful programs with very intensive technical assistance.²⁷

Cities need to determine local needs for assistance through cooperative processes and locate appropriate resources. Consistent with the principles of

good training programs, technical assistance should be on-going and not "one-shot;" it should be practical in nature, not theoretical. Partners should be able to work more effectively as a result. Technical assistance needs vary by project and by site, but in general, assistance needs fall into these categories: facilitation/ negotiation/problem solving; project management; strategic planning; evaluation; technical professional development, i.e. new instructional approaches, case management, etc.

Formal Agreements: Connections between agencies are complicated and often take much planning and negotiation. In the case of a city attempting to develop a case management system, service access issues may be daunting. Agreements must be carefully crafted; they should then be put in writing, signed, monitored and adjusted over time by a leader's group.

Action and Frequent Success: The problem with partnerships, particularly large-scale or city-wide initiatives is that they become unwieldy. Often people begin to pay more attention to the structure than to the goals. Or, teams or coalitions may plan and plan and never figure out how to get to action. Both of these situations lead to the eventual failure of the partnership. Every partnership project, and this is especially critical for large or more abstract ventures, needs to plan and implement a short-term activities and long term goals. The short-term successes, particularly if they truly assist young people, are a great motivator for future action.

Patience/Vigilance/Increased Involvement: Leaders, planners, managers come and go, and each staff change presents challenges to the partnership. Care must be taken to fully inform and involve new people and enlist their support, concern and leadership. This is a very time and labor intensive process and

it is tempting to try to "short sheet" the process. However, if a critical mass of leadership does not remain committed to the partnership, the effort will die.

Another critical point is that change takes time. If partnerships want to impact change in public education, it will take a number of years. It is not easy to make this long term commitment, especially when funding cycles take a short term approach to complex social issues. However, time is critical. In New Haven, Connecticut, schools using James Comer's approach to school change have been working on the initiative successfully since 1968.

Expanding involvement and activity is essential. Partnerships which are not growing are very likely dying. Since many collaborative efforts start small, with a limited number of partners, doing more means involving more groups and organizations. Reaching out to community groups, notably parents and students and racial-ethnic populations is critical. Working collaboratively with these groups demands new ways of thinking about outreach, involvement, information gathering/dissemination and decision-making.

Local Ownership: If partnerships develop in cities as a result of outside grants--from state or federal agencies, or from private foundations--the partnership will not survive the funding unless the initiative becomes locally owned. Often the first sign of this occurring is that the city renames the initiative (not using the state's terminology, for example) or the city incorporates the initiative within a larger venture which is locally developed. Another indication that the partnership is important to the city is commitment of local matching dollars, dollars that exceed the amount of the grant.

Evaluating Partnerships:

We are just beginning to grapple with the issue of how to evaluate these exciting relationships which are being set in motion in states and in communities across the country. The idea has been more compelling than the outcome, at least until recently. In the last two years, articles and publications have begun to question the results, particularly of business education partnerships. A frequent criticism is that business has been generous with dollars, but is not truly involved with the work of educational reform. Partnership activity often looks good, but lacks substance. Clearly, it is important to be clear about the purposes of educational partnerships and set measurable goals which measure client impact, or partnerships will begin to lose their efficacy and widespread support.

Some attempts have been made to formally evaluate partnerships. Many include community surveys or formal interviews with partners. Many are "process oriented," and seek to measure the relationship, the planning process or the ability of the partnership to include various constituencies. Few set measurable outcomes in terms of client or system impact and seek to evaluate the partnership against those outcomes. Few design evaluations up front before activity begins.

Several initiatives are taking evaluation seriously. A data-based system was developed for the Los Angeles Unified School District funded by the ARCO Foundation. It is the first system in the country to track the impact of partnership activities on a school improvement process. The Annie E. Casey grantee cities are developing city-wide management information systems designed to generate data on school performance measures, employment and health information. This information will guide future planning and measure progress towards the three goal areas. In addition, the foundation has developed "progress indicators" which help cities monitor their progress towards institutional change.

What should cities measure? If, as a guide, we consider the impact typology discussed earlier, measures begin to suggest themselves within each of the six levels. For example:

Special Services: Outcome measures focus on clients. Outcomes should not address servicing clients, but the outcomes of the particular service, for example, increased job placement rates as a result of the development of a summer school program; college placement rates for students in a Career Beginnings Program, low repeat pregnancy rates for girls being served in a school clinic-sponsored support group.

Classroom: Outcome measures focus on students' academic performance, classroom attendance, grade promotion, etc. In addition, some "softer" variables may be evaluated, i.e. self esteem, feelings about school, students/teachers respect for diversity, etc.

Teacher Training: Evaluations focus on whether "new" teaching strategies are implemented successfully in classrooms and whether new techniques improve performance, particularly the performance of disadvantaged youth. Implementation requires a peer coaching approach; evaluation requires the addition of these new requirements into the regular supervision process.

Management: Evaluations focus on whether new management techniques are successfully adopted by administrators and whether these methods improve staff morale and performance. Often new agreements with administrators and teachers give staff more control of the budget, hiring/firing and curriculum, in return for greater accountability for student performance.

Systemic Educational Improvement: Outcome measures may focus on a number of areas, often related to the problems experienced by the particular

school system (and confirmed by data). Examples of relevant outcomes are: increased academic performance and improved school attendance; increases in parent involvement (particularly at elementary and middle school levels); decreases in suspension, truancy, non-promotion; or increases in the graduation rate. (As an example of the arbitrary nature of these levels, it is worth mentioning that decreases in suspension or non-promotion will usually require a change in school policy.)

Policy: Outcome measures in this category should cross institutional boundaries and address common goals for the client and the system. Examples of common outcomes might be increases in job or higher education placement rates for graduates; or increases in education levels, job placements or job retention for young parents on AFDC. Monitoring formal agreements is an important part of a policy level evaluation. However, it is important not to lose sight of the reasons these system changes are sought: not for the sake of change alone, but to make the system work better for the clients of that system.

Final Remarks

The above discussion has attempted to provide a history and context for educational partnerships. What this history shows is that we have been engaged in the business of developing partnerships for a relatively brief span of time. In the ten years or so of major activity, partnerships have grown and evolved, both in terms of scope and complexity. On the other hand, we have enough history and experience to make concerns and caveats about the partnership process particularly relevant and critical. Certainly, we now know enough to recognize that the danger of these efforts is that they will, to adapt a phrase, be all style and showmanship, signifying nothing. On the other hand, community leaders have before them a relatively new field and a continuing opportunity to make a difference, in the lives of young people and in the overall quality of their communities.

Endnotes

¹Smallwood, David. "Business Adopts A New Approach to City's Schools," *Dollars and Sense*, Chicago, IL (February-March, 1987), p. 12.

²*The Practitioner's View: New Challenges in Serving High Risk Youth*, Public/Private Ventures, (Spring 1990), p. 8.

³*Business Means Business About Education: A Synopsis of the Business Roundtable Companies' Education Partnerships*, (June, 1989), p. 3.

⁴*America's Leaders Speak Out on Business Education Partnerships: Proceedings and Recommendations from the Compact Institute/Business Leadership Forum*, National Alliance of Business, (1989).

⁵Holzman, Terry. *A Decade of Commitment: School/College Collaboration in Boston: 1975-1985*, p. 3.

⁶Ibid., p. 3.

⁷Ibid., p. 14.

⁸Farrar, Eleanor and Anthony Cipollone. *The Business Community and School Reform: The Boston Compact at Five Years*, (March 1988), pp. 30-35.

⁹*Business Education Partnerships: Strategies for School Improvement*, The Regional Educational Laboratory, (1986), p. 5.

¹⁰Interview with Roberta Trachtman, Professor of Administration, Policy and Urban Education, Fordham University. (October 3, 1990).

¹¹*Business Education Partnerships: Strategies for School Improvement*, The Regional Educational Laboratory, (1986), pp. 12-13.

¹²Interview with Jacqueline Danzberger, Director, Governance Programs, Institute for Educational Leadership, (November 30, 1990).

¹³*The Fourth R: Workforce Readiness*, National Alliance of Business, (1987), p. 13.

¹⁴Ibid. p. 16.

¹⁵Salodof, Jane. "Public Schools and the Community: An Uneasy Marriage", *Management Review*, (January 1989), pg. 33.

¹⁶Bloomfield, William. *Career Beginnings: Helping Disadvantaged Youth Achieve Their Potential*, Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, (1989).

¹⁷Interview with William Bloomfield, Director, Career Beginnings. (December 5, 1990).

¹⁸*The Fourth R: Workforce Readiness*, National Alliance of Business, (1987), p. 15.

¹⁹Interview with Alan Kousen, Science Consultant, Vermont Department of Education. (December 4, 1990).

²⁰*Partnerships for Learning: School Completion and Employment Preparation in the High School Academies*, Academy for Educational Development, NY, (1989), p. 1.

²¹Dwyer, Margaret. *The Indiana Partners In Education Program Handbook*, Indiana Economic Development Council, Inc., (1986), pp. 7-8.

²²*The Fourth R: Workforce Readiness*, National Alliance of Business, (1987), p. 15.

²³*Innovation in Education: A Progress Report on the JCPS/Gheens Professional Development Academy*, Louisville, Kentucky, pp. 2-11.

²⁴Karp, Stanley. *Industry's Commitment to Math and Science Education: A Paper Presented to the American Educational Research Association Symposium*, (March 31, 1989).

²⁵Vaughn, Georgina. *A Practitioner's View of the Effects of IISME and MCMS on Teaching and Teacher Education*, Oakland, CA (March 31, 1989).

²⁶Raywid, Mary Anne. "The Evolving Effort to Improve Schools: Pseudo-reform, Incremental Reform, and Restructuring", *Phi Delta Kappan*, (October 1990).

²⁷*The Fourth R: Workforce Readiness*, National Alliance of Business, (1987), p. 14.

²⁸Interview with Bill Bennet, Greater Milwaukee Education Trust, (December 5, 1990).

²⁹*The Fourth R: Workforce Readiness*, National Alliance of Business, (1987), p. 14.

³⁰*A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring*. The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, (1988), pp. 1-2.

³¹*Disadvantaged Youth Program Update*, The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, (June, 1990), pp. 4-5.

³²Ibid. pp. 6-8.

³³Strickland, Carol. "A Risk Worth Taking," *Foundation News*, Vol. 31, No. 5, (September/October 1990), p. 21.

³⁴*Corporate Action Agenda: The Business of Improving Public Education*, National Alliance of Business, (1989), p. 10.

³⁵Interview with Hayes Mizell, Director, Program for Disadvantaged Youth, Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, (December 4, 1990).

³⁶*The Fourth R: Workforce Readiness*, National Alliance of Business, (1987), p. 15.

³⁷*The Portland Investment: A Regional Plan To Combat Youth Unemployment*, The Leaders' Roundtable, (November, 1987).

³⁸*Commonwealth Futures: A Community Youth Investment Strategy*, McMahonill, Albert and Terry Grobe, Boston, MA, (1986).

³⁹Interview with Claudia Hildreth, Hamilton Elementary School, (December 3, 1990).

⁴⁰Interview with Laurie Glenn, Alliance for Better Chicago Schools, (December 6, 1990).

⁴¹*The Education Improvement Act in South Carolina*, Glennan, Tom and Lin Liu. (October 25, 1990).

⁴²Interview with Andrew Hahn, Associate Dean and Professor of Human Services Research, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, (November, 30 1990).

⁴³*A Guide to Working Partnerships*, The Center for Human Resources, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, (1988), p. 5.

REFERENCES

After the Signing: The Boston Compact: 1982-1984. Farrar, Eleanor and Anthony Cipollone. Boston Private Industry Council, (February 8, 1985).

A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring. The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, (1988).

Bennet, Bill. The Greater Milwaukee Education Trust. Interview with author. (December 5, 1990).

Bloomfield, William. Interview with author. (December 5, 1990).

A Blueprint for Business on Restructuring Education. National Alliance of Business, (1989).

The Business Community and School Reform: The Boston Compact at Five Years. Farrar, Eleanor and Anthony Cipollone. (March, 1988).

Business-Education Partnerships: Strategies for School Improvement. The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, (1986).

Business Means Business about Education: A Synopsis of the Business Roundtable Companies' Education Partnerships. The Business Roundtable, (June, 1989).

Business Strategies That Work: A Planning Guide for Education Restructuring. National Alliance of Business, (1990).

Career Beginnings: Helping Disadvantaged Youth Achieve Their Potential. William Bloomfield, Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, (1989).

Comer, James P. "Educating Poor Minority Children," *Scientific American*. (November 1988).

Commonwealth Futures: A Community Youth Investment Strategy. McMahill, Albert and Terry Grobe. (1987).

Corporate Action Agenda: The Business of Improving Public Education. National Alliance of Business.

A Decade of Commitment: School-College Collaboration in Boston: 1975-1985. Holzman, Terry.

Disadvantaged Youth Program Update. Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, (June 1990).

The Education Improvement Act in South Carolina. Glennan, Tom and Lin Liu. (October 25, 1990).

The Fourth R: Workforce Readiness. National Alliance of Business, (November, 1987).

Glenn, Laurie. Alliance for Better Chicago Schools. Interview with author. (December 5, 1990).

Gordon, Jack. "Can Business Save the Schools?" *Training*. (August 1990).

A Guide to Working Partnerships. The Center for Human Resources, (1989).

Hahn, Andrew. Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University. Interview with author. (November 30, 1990).
Hardin, Howard. Van Hoose Education Center, Louisville, KY. Interview with author. (December 5, 1990).

Hildreth, Claudia. Hamilton Elementary School. Interview with author. (December 3, 1990).

Industry's Commitment to Math and Science Education: A Paper Presented to the American Educational Research Association Symposium. Karp, Stanley L., Raytheon Company. (March 31, 1989).

Innovations in Education: A Progress Report on the JCPS/Gheens Professional Development Academy. The Gheens Foundation, (1988).

Kousen, Alan. Vermont Department of Education. Interview with author. (December 4, 1990).

The Lessons of Multi-Site Initiatives Serving High-Risk Youths. Children's Defense Fund, (January 1989).

Mizell, Hayes. Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Interview with author. (December 4, 1990).

Partnerships and Schools. Otterbourg, Susan and Michael Timpane. Reprinted from *Public-Private Partnerships: Improving Urban Life.* New York: The Academy of Political Science, (1986).

Partners in Growth: Elder Mentors and At-Risk Youth. Public/Private Ventures, (Fall 1988).

Partnerships and Schools. Public/Private Ventures, (1986).

Partnerships for Learning: School Completion and Employment Preparation in the High School Academies. Academy for Educational Development, (1989).

Persistent Poverty Program: An Evaluation. The Rockefeller Foundation, (July 20, 1990).

A Practitioner's View of the Effects of IISME and MCMS on Teaching and Teacher Education. Vaughn, Georgina. Oakland, CA. (March 31, 1989).

The Practitioner's View: New Challenges in Serving High-Risk Youth. Public/Private Ventures, (Spring 1990).

The Portland Investment: A Regional Plan to Combat Youth Unemployment. The Leaders Roundtable, Portland, Oregon, (November 1987).

Raywid, Mary Anne. "The Evolving Effort to Improve Schools: Pseudo-Reform, Incremental Reform, and Restructuring," *Phi Delta Kappan*, (October, 1990).

Salodof, Jane. "Public Schools and the Business Community: An Uneasy Marriage," *Management Review*, (January, 1989).

Strickland, Carol. "A Risk Worth Taking," *Foundation News*, (September/October 1990).

**Contacts for Major Partnerships
Discussed in This Paper**

Career Beginnings, The Center for Corporate and Education Initiatives-William Bloomfield, Director (617) 736-4990

Ford Foundation Urban School Community Dropout Prevention Collaborative-Terry Clark (212) 529-4663

Vermont Partners in Education - Alan Kousen, Science Consultant (802) 828-3111

The High School Academies: The Business and Finance Academy, Westinghouse High School, Pittsburgh, PA.- Eunice Anderson (412) 665-3940

Industry Initiatives for Science and Math Education, - Kathryn D. Sloane, Director (415) 643-6594

Indiana Partners in Education - Margaret Dwyer, Consultant (704) 846-3585

Jefferson County Public Schools / Gheens Foundation Professional Development Academy - Terry Brooks, Director (502) 473-3494

Greater Milwaukee Education Trust - Susan Phillips, Executive Director (414) 224-0300

Middle Grades Initiative, Edna McConnell Clark Foundation-

Baltimore: Ms. Phyllis Moore, Baltimore Public Schools (301)396-8984

**Louisville: Mr. Howard Hardin, Director of Educational Assessment/
Instructional Choices, Van Hoose Education Center (502)473-3551**

**Milwaukee: Dr. Deborah McGriff, Deputy Superintendent
(414) 475-8006**

**Oakland: Dr. Barbara Daniels, Assistant Superintendent
(415) 836-8402**

**San Diego: Dr. Bertha Pendleton, Deputy Superintendent
(619)293-8034**

Coalition for Essential Schools- Theodore Sizer, Brown University (401)863-3384

National Alliance of Business, Partnership Network- Esther Schaeffer, Director, Center for Excellence in Education (NAB) (202) 289-2888

**The Boston Compact - Ted Dooley, Boston Public Schools
(617) 726-6200**

The Portland Investment - Marcia Douglas, Coordinator (503)243-7912

Commonwealth Futures - Terry Grobe, Center for Human Resources, Heller School, Brandeis University (800) 343-4705

San Diego Integrated Services Model - Carry Peery, Principal, Hamilton Elementary School (619) 2483

Alliance for Better Chicago Schools - Laurie Glenn, Communications Consultant (312) 951-6577

Annie E. Casey's "New Futures" Initiative -

**Dayton: Kathy Emery, Executive Director (513) 461-5151
James Van Vleck, Chairman of Oversight Collaborative
(513) 222-6323 x3792**

**Savannah: Otis Johnson, Executive Director (912)235-3505
William Sprague, Chairman of Oversight Collaborative
(912) 234-1261**

Little Rock: Donald Crary, Executive Director (501) 374-1011

Pittsburgh: Barbara J. Bazron, Executive Director (412) 338-2604

**South Carolina's Education Reform Project - Terry Peterson, Executive Director
(803) 734-0487**

**Rockefeller Foundation: Persistent Poverty Program - Andrew Hahn, Associate Dean,
Heller School, Brandeis University (617) 736-3774**