AUTHOR   Ascher, Carol
TITLE   Urban School-Community Alliances. Trends and Issues
              No. 10.
INSTITUTION   ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York,
              N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED),
              Washington, DC.
PUB DATE   Dec 88
CONTRACT   OERI-RI88062013
NOTE   30p.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers
              College, Box 40, Columbia University, New York, NY
              10027.
PUB TYPE   Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis
              Products (071) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Agency Cooperation; College School Cooperation;
              *Community Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning;
              Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation;
              Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education;
              Institutional Cooperation; Literature Reviews; Parent
              School Relationship; Program Descriptions; *School
              Business Relationship; *School Community
              Relationship
IDENTIFIERS   Academic Alliances; Boston Compact; *Collaboratives;
              High School Academies; National Alliance of Business;
              *Partnerships; Project EQuality

ABSTRACT

        Collaborations between urban schools and businesses,
community agencies, cultural institutions, and universities have
become a popular way to improve public education. Motives for
collaborating include the following: (1) schools with a largely
disadvantaged population need powerful, vocal support groups; (2)
businesses need a highly educated and skilled workforce; (3) health
and social service agencies need to connect with clients; (4) arts
and cultural institutions need to widen their audiences; and (5)
universities and colleges need students with appropriate skills and
knowledge demanded by post-secondary education. Collaboratives can be
comprised of entire educational systems or single-schools. Individual
organizations or coalitions can represent the community side of the
collaboration. Many are student-focused. The Boston Compact and the
Rochester Education Initiative are examples of multi-institutional
collaboration with an entire district. Umbrella organizations have
also developed to advocate, initiate, coordinate, direct, and
evaluate collaboratives. Principles of successful collaboratives
include the following: (1) commitment; (2) egalitarian
decision-making; (3) clarity about roles; (4) clarity and flexibility
about methods and goals; and (5) ability to bridge institutional
cultures. Problems encountered in collaboration include
accountability, funding, and equitable distribution of resources. A
number of serious policy questions require further research. A list
of 49 references is appended. (FMW)

4-27-89

URBAN SCHOOL-COMMUNITY ALLIANCES

Carol Ascher

ERIC ®

URBAN SCHOOL-COMMUNITY ALLIANCES

Carol Ascher

TABLE OF CONTENTS

URBAN SCHOOL-COMMUNITY ALLIANCES

The proliferation of literature on alliances between urban schools and businesses, community agencies, cultural institutions, and universities reflects the growth of these inter-institutional projects nationwide. Whether called partnerships, collaborations, adopt-a-schools, coalitions, or a variety of other terms, these alliances between schools and community institutions have been growing in both popularity and sophistication. A survey of school partnerships around the country in the 1987-88 school year found 140,800, of which 57 percent were with businesses or business organizations, 7 percent with colleges or universities, 16 percent with civic and service organizations, and 7 percent with government agencies (Cavazes, 1988). Moreover, these partnerships do not merely offer schools free hamburgers or name-brand hats to be used as student incentives and awards; instead, there has been an increasing tendency for business and other institutions to become involved in school improvement, even by helping to set school reform agendas (Levir & Trachtman, 1988).

The schools have not been the only ones to seek collaboration. Those institutions that have begun to collaborate with the public schools also have good reasons for doing so. In fact, it has become a commonplace observation in the area of collaborations that those that work best are based on mutual self-interest and a recognition of common problems (Trubowitz, 1984; Maeroff, 1983).

MOTIVES FOR COLLABORATING

A critical impetus to the growth of school partnerships has been an agreement among educators and the general public that the schools have not been successful in educating students for the complicated and changing needs of our society. Although many educators would argue that social changes, such as the loss of values and decreased family cohesion, have made the task of educating students much harder, high dropout rates and the low level of student literacy have been as worrisome to businesses and social leaders as to educators. As a New York State Education Department report (1987, p.111) points out, "while the responsibility for improvements rests most directly with educators, we all share responsibility for providing the environment and resources necessary to achieve this goal."

The Public Schools. Although educators were initially skeptical about opening their doors to what might easily be only criticism and interference, schools have had strong motives over the past years for reaching out for help. Most important has been the sense that, given the deep and many-faceted troubles from which schools suffer, "the American school system cannot accomplish the required educational reform on its own. Only by involving other constituents of our society—colleges, corporations, communities, and government agencies—will we be successful" (Gross, 1988, p. xi).

In fact, in urban areas where poverty, unemployment, torn families, homelessness, drug abuse, racial prejudice, and other forms of social disfunction further complicate education, public schools have assumed ever increasing burdens—from preventing in-school crime and disruption, to providing students with nutritional supplements, day care, clinics, and even housing. In this period of declining public monies, educators are often forced to reach out to other institutions for help, even to continue existing services, and collaboratives appear to be a new way to increase resources and try out new programs that might not otherwise be funded under school auspices. For example, in anticipation of their potentially controversial nature, most of the recently established school medical clinics were initially privately funded, even though housed on school premises (Dryfoos, 1988).

2

7

American schools have traditionally neglected education in the arts, and under present budgetary constraints arts education has tended to be the first to cut. As Chapman (1982) points out, it is often cheaper for schools to "hire" artists or arts institutions for specific services than to maintain a full arts program.

Schools in depressed urban areas with high dropout rates have also come to understand the connection between students' staying in school and the prospect of employment, and so a major thrust has been the targeting of jobs for those students who stay in school and achieve (Farrar, 1988; New York State Education Department, 1987).

Finally, as schools, particularly in urban areas, have lost their middle-class constituencies, many educators have bemoaned the fact that low-income parents are neither sufficiently interested nor powerful enough to help the schools politically, and so the schools must look for new, powerful and vocal support groups. (Of the partnerships in the 1987-88 survey, 51 percent were in urban school districts; and twice as many were in large schools, with over 1000 students, as in small schools, with less than 300 students [Cavazes, 1988]). Although educators remain ambivalent about relying on business—only 6 percent want business to serve on educational committees and task forces (Cavazos, 1988)—many have nevertheless reached out to develop new allies to support educational legislation, local bond issues and school taxes. In so doing, they have become accountable to business and other groups, as well as to the parents of their school children.

Business. Businesses report a number of direct and indirect reasons for wanting to involve themselves in public education. First, they have followed the viewpoint of the reform reports of the early 1980s, which argued that the American workforce is encountering increased international competition, and that our future prosperity will be linked to a highly educated and skilled workforce. More recently, there has also been the common perception that modern production and manufacturing techniques will increasingly require a "new kind of 'non-traditional' worker," who has higher level reading, writing, and problem-solving skills, as well as self-discipline and the ability to acquire and apply new knowledge (Committee for Economic Development, 1985; Martin, 1985; U.S. Department of Labor, 1988). It has also been argued that the needs of the business

3

8

community and the goals of public education are converging: "Each is interested in a liberally educated society, equipped with basic skills and higher-level cognitive abilities. They share the objective of educating people who can and will continue to learn for their own growth and development, as well as to be able to advance in their workplaces" (Levine & Trachtman, 1988, p. xxi).

At the local level, businesses have several important incentives to become involved with schools in their areas. According to the National Alliance of Business (1987, p. 7), "The second most often cited reason for a business selecting a particular location is the quality of the schools." Businesses are interested in public schooling in their area, "because they recognize the connection between good schools and the ability of the city to attract new businesses and maintain a healthy tax base, in addition to providing an employable labor pool and fostering student interest in community-based cultural activities..." (Pink & Borman, 1986, p. 116). Although the suggestion has been made that business-school alliances can even prevent corporations from moving, either domestically or to foreign shores (The Business Roundtable, 1988, April), corporate actions can sometimes be at apparent cross purposes. Corporations do pull out of communities at the same time as they give gifts to their local schools: for example, Atari gave computers to the San Jose school system, even as the company was leaving the community, depriving it of thousands of jobs (Leiter, 1985).

Whatever the general literacy level of the country, businesses also want the pool of youth on which they draw to be prepared for employment. For example, a New York State report estimated that, while 800,000 entry-level job openings for high school graduates would be created in the state between 1987 and 1990, at least 180,000 would remain unfilled—over half of those in areas of the state with severe dropout problems (New York State Department of Education, 1987). Currently, business itself spends $30 billion annually for training, much of this to supplement what employees have learned in school (Justiz & Kameen, 1987). The National Alliance of Business (1987) notes a number of benefits and savings derived from a better prepared workforce, including: reduced remediation and retraining costs; reduced workplace errors, decreased supervisory time; and increased productivity and product quality.

4

9

Health and Social Service Agencies. Clearly, schools cannot control the level of need with which their students arrive each morning. But they can link up to agencies that can help to solve those needs. Agencies such as clinics, which increasingly are called upon to service adolescents, view the schools as the single best place to find their clients, simply because the school is the only institution in society that can mandate attendance (Dryfoos, 1988; Fruchter, 1987). On the other side, as school clinics and other collaborative ventures have already made clear, community health and other social service efforts cannot be instituted without the cooperation of school, local government, hospital, and community (Ascher, July 1988).

Arts and Cultural Institutions. Institutions such as museums, theatres, and concert halls have also had their reasons for joining with the public schools: most often, the wish to widen their audiences. The revival of interest in the arts as among the education "basics" has generated foundation as well as government support for arts institutions to create collaborations of various sorts with the schools, which has helped these financially pinched institutions (Fowler, 1984). In addition, a tax change in the late 1960s has made it beneficial for museums to define their work as "educational" (Pitman-Gelles, 1985). As with clinics and other social service agencies, it has been pointed out that, "[b]ecause schools, and only schools reach all the youth," arts institutions must work through the schools to open the "new generations to the heritage of all the arts" (Fowler, 1984, p. 7).

Universities and Colleges. From the point of view of universities and colleges, collaborations meet several needs. Post-secondary institutions hope to avoid expenditures for remediation and developmental courses by focusing on the improvement of primary and secondary education. They would like to see public school teaching and curriculum improved to better provide students with the skills and knowledge demanded at the post-secondary level (Wilbur, Lambert, & Young, 1987). Further, in a period of declining enrollments, colleges and universities are in the market for students, and collaborations are one means of putting in their bid for the interested and prepared students in the schools with which they work.

Schools of education have also found that they can profitably contract to provide in-service education courses to collaborating local schools; collaboratives

5

10

with public schools answer the common criticism that schools of education are "out of touch," at the same time as they offer real opportunities to join research and practice (Gifford & Gabelko, 1987). On the other hand, a consensus has been growing that the responsibility for education should be expanded beyond the schools of education to the universities as a whole (Mocker, Martin, & Brown, 1988). College administrators, both in and outside of schools of education, often feel pressure from political leaders to show their community spirit by joining collaborations that are directed to solving urban school needs. Perhaps out of the same impulse, colleges often list increasing minority enrollment as a major reason for joining collaboratives (Mickelson, Kritek, Hedlund, & Kaufman, 1988). Finally, as Trubowitz (1984, p. 9) suggests, more funding is currently being directed to public schools than to institutions of higher education, and many grants available to the latter "prescribe that the college must work with a public school."

TYPES OF COLLABORATIVES

The literature indicates that public schools are collaborating with businesses, community agencies, cultural institutions, and universities in many kinds of activities and through a variety of structures. In fact, what is most characteristic of these collaborations, given the general rigidity of schools, is the high degree of flexibility with which the connections and projects are instituted. Both the activities and the structures are determined by the schools' particular needs and the collaborating institution's ability and willingness to contribute resources—staff, time, and funding. While some activities are directed at students, others, such as curriculum changes or teacher recruitment, training, and retraining, are aimed at school personnel or school processes, and so have an indirect student impact. For example, a guide for businesses suggests a list of possible activities, including increasing public awareness of the school districts' budget, sponsoring fund raising efforts, purchasing new equipment, donating time to help with new technology, opening training programs to educators, working to enrich the school curriculum, and contributing personnel to team-teach with school teachers (New York State Department-of-Education, 1987). An analysis of school university alliances (Ascher, December 1988) itemizes the range of activities according to whether they directly or indirectly affect students:

6

11

Direct Student Services	Indirect Student Services
college study in high school	teacher revitalization and improvement
counseling and advising	curriculum development
financial aid	district policy change
skills building	curriculum delivery
access to information	research

Organizationally, some collaborative programs, whether with business, colleges, or other community organizations, rely on the efforts of individual teachers or principals who on an ad hoc basis seek their cooperation; others are highly institutionalized, involving the Chief Executive Officers, as well as many other participants, in both organizations. Ascher (July 1988) suggests that while some collaboratives throw open wide nets to participation, others rely on the activism of a few groups or individuals who may well have been working on their own all along, and still others are largely ritualized collaborations.

Collaborations also involve different amounts of personal interaction among the members of the collaborating institutions. While, at a minimum, an adopt-a-school program may simply mean that a business provides athletic equipment or computers, some collaborations aimed at bringing about real school change can demand that a number of people spend a great deal of time together, often in each other's institutions. It has been suggested that, because school systems are regulation-driven, collaborations tend to be most effective when the other party to the collaborative is also active; school-dominated collaboratives often generate activities that are more symbolic than useful. Collectively operated collaboratives make changes slowly, but they bring in a range of participants and can allow for some restructuring of the school system (Ascher, July 1988). In these intense situations, "Each [institution] contributes to the process, and each is also likely to undergo internal change as a result of the process" (Mocker, et al., 1986, p. 16).

A study of nine school-business collaboratives classifies these alliances into three main types—equally applicable to school collaboratives with other institutions—depending on the goal and sphere of activities. Most widespread are the pairing of a business or group of businesses with a *single school*; this can take place through an "adopt-a-school" program, or through other types of connections in which specific forms of assistance (mentors, equipment, awards) are offered. Collaborative efforts also focus on *entire educational systems*, either at the local or

7

12

state levels. In these systemwide efforts (the least frequent type of programs), businesses usually offer new resources (grants, job opportunities, volunteers), increased community support for public education, and special programs for at-risk youth. The Boston Compact, now being imitated around the country, is one such systemwide effort. Finally, there are *student-focused* programs that serve a small group of carefully targeted youth with special classes, part-time jobs, health services, or other resources. Examples of this third type can be found in the Off-Campus Work/Study program in St. Louis, the Teen Opportunities Promote Success (TOPS) in Birmingham, or in the Philadelphia High School Academies (McMullan & Snyder, 1987).

MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATIVES

A number of collaboratives around the country involve the collaboration of more than one institution with a school or school district. Some link businesses, local colleges, health care institutions, museums and theatres to theme schools or to projects focused on science or the arts (Franse & Siegel, 1987; Pitman-Gelles, 1985). Others involve the commitment of members of business, labor, community organizations, and the universities in "compacts" that focus on improving the schools in a city or district (Farrar, 1988; Johnson, Dwyer, & Spade, 1987-88).

The Boston Compact. The most famous of the multi-institutional collaborations, and a model for others, has been the Boston Compact. Created in 1982 as a formal agreement between the city's public schools and the business community, the Compact was joined the following year by area colleges and universities, and by Boston trade unions the year after that. The Boston Compact has been an attempt to improve the educational and work prospects of Boston's young people by demanding such school change as improved attendance and achievement, and lowered dropout rates (in each case by 5 percent annually) in return for more college and employment opportunities (also to improve at a 5 percent annual rate). The Compact worked with the Boston Private Industry Council (PIC), a private, federally supported organization, to explore private sector initiatives in employment training. In addition, the Boston trade unions agreed to set aside 5 percent of their apprenticeship positions annually for qualified high school graduates, and 25 Boston area colleges pledged to assist the schools in

8

13

strengthening their college preparatory curriculum (Farrar, 1988; Steering Committee, 1988).

Farrar and Cipollone (1988) have documented the complex institutional history of turning the Boston Compact into a school improvement strategy. Among the many sources of problems over the years were a new Superintendent, who did not hold the Compact as his primary commitment; the Office of School Assistance, which was too busy helping the district's 124 schools implement new state mandates to provide assistance the Compact needed; lack of support "two layers down in the bureaucracy," beyond the Superintendent's reach; general hostility of the school headmasters to the idea of changing their schools for the Compact; and the Compact's lack of resources for offering training and technical assistance to teachers and others responsible for learning. According to Farrar, speaking to *The Boston* ⌐ , "Like most bureaucracies, the Boston public school system is adept at absorbing new programs and then ignoring the decisions, deflecting orders, domesticating new practices and, in the end, sabotaging programs that propose to interrupt the prevailing norms and practices of the organization" (Snyder, 1988).

The results of the Boston Compact since 1982 have been far better publicized than the institutional process: largely because Boston was experiencing an economic boon, the business community superceded its commitment in jobs. At the same time, the schools increased both attendance and achievement, but, rather than decrease by 5 percent annually, the dropout rate among public school students increased from 36 percent to 46 percent over the last six years (Farrar, 1988). In October 1988, five new goals were proposed for the Compact, including greater autonomy for individual schools, and greater parental involvement in both educational and job training programs and in the life of the school (Boston Private Industrial Council, 1988). However, recent reports suggest that the business community may want to pull out of the Compact, partly because of the schools' inability to solve its high dropout rate (Rothman, 1988).

The Rochester Education Initiative. In 1985, the Urban League of Rochester launched a community-wide initiative to improve education in the Rochester Public Schools. In contrast to the Boston Compact, from the outset the Rochester Education Initiation was to be community- and school-based. Town Meetings

9

14

were held to publicize the crisis in education in Rochester; religious, neighborhood, fraternal, business, human service, and governmental organizations were asked to co-sponsor the initiative; a conference sponsored by the Urban League and the University of Rochester attempted to involve community leaders in developing a plan of action; and "speakouts" were organized for students, parents, and educators. Not only were parents' and community members' views considered essential to any educational change, but all such change was viewed as useful only as it responded to the specific problems of each school. Thus school-based School Action Committees (SACs), which had a variety of participants, depending on the school, drew up their own plans for their school's improvement. Projects to reduce school suspensions, improve attendance, increase student and staff participation, and raise school spirit, were among the many varied foci.

As in Boston, business formed a strong unit; but in Rochester the Business Task Force did not demand anything specific from the schools in return for its aid. Instead, it limited itself to five tasks: providing job placement opportunities to students; creating partnerships with schools that provided opportunities for mutual interaction; marketing the importance of education to the Rochester community; assisting in staff development; and consulting with the school district on management problems (Johnson, Dwyer, & Spade, 1987-88).

After three years, results of the Rochester Education Initiative are decidedly mixed, with some schools experiencing minor successes and others showing no change or even failure. In line with the Initiative's focus on school-based planning, Rochester teachers received one of the highest-paying contracts in the country in return for their taking on more responsibilities, including the mentoring of middle-school students. However, budget cutbacks have necessitated retrenchments in the Rochester Education Initiative in many areas, and there has been trouble getting the SACs to function as active policy-making and review bodies. Although documents on the Initiative remain filled with excellent ideas for school restructuring, both fiscal support and community involvement are flagging. Despite setbacks, however, the Rochester Center for Citizen Involvement in Education has recently received foundation funding. In addition to training parents and the community for school-based planning, this Center will be available to groups to provide assistance in school monitoring (Brooks & Johnson, 1988).

10

15

COORDINATING ORGANIZATIONS FOR COLLABORATIVES

The proliferation of inter-institutional collaboratives has also spawned a number of umbrella organizations that attempt to coordinate, direct, and evaluate existing collaboratives, as well as advocate, or even initiate, new alliances. The coordinating organizations for school-business collaborations are generally for the business members of the collaborations; and, while obviously hoping to influence the schools, the literature they produce is less for educators than for a business and lay audience. In 1986, the National Alliance of Business, for example, initiated The Compact, a national demonstration project in twelve communities around the country. Based in large measure on the Boston Compact, businesses and schools entering The Compact are working together to develop long-term measurable goals for both student achievement and the hiring of youth for summer jobs and full-time entry level positions. The roles of the National Alliance of Business in the process are "facilitator, broker, and resource provider" (National Alliance of Business, p. 2).

The Committee for Economic Development (CED), while not actually coordinating any collaboratives, has recently offered a rather detailed proposal for school "restructuring" through school business partnerships. Arguing that "adopt-a-school programs have had a limited effect on the performance of high-risk students," and that these programs "can sometimes become an easy substitute for a more sustained and far-reaching corporate commitment to public education for disadvantaged children," CED suggests three "effective investment strategies": collaborative early intervention programs, business support of projects that "reach beyond education's traditional confines, and so help to restructure basic education, and partnership programs that work toward retention and reentry of disadvantaged students" (Committee for Economic Development, 1987, pp. 65-66).

The Business Roundtable, by contrast, advocates a more policy-directed effort. As a national organization, the Roundtable sees its role as influencing federal policy debates on such issues as curriculum standards; guiding its member companies on education programs and policies, including state and local initiatives

11

16

effecting education; and helping to strengthen school/business partnerships at the state and local level (The Business Roundtable, 1988).

Unlike those business coordinating organizations, coordinating organizations for school-university collaborations are not directed at either end of the alliances; instead, they see their audience as the collaboratives per se. Moreover, they tend to emphasize the ideal of equality among collaborative members. Four such coordinating organizations should be mentioned: The College Board's Educational EQuality Project Models Program for School-College Collaboration, the Council of Chief State School Officers' School/College Collaboration, the National Association of State University and Land-Grant College's (NASULGC's) University-Urban School Collaborative Program, and the American Association for Higher Education's Academic Alliances.

The College Board's Educational EQuality Project Models Program for School-College Collaboration includes eighteen partnerships in different parts of the country, some of which involve a single school district working with one college, while others include several school districts and a number of two- and four-year colleges and universities. Although these partnerships involve a variety of student, teacher, curriculum, parent, and community activities, the focus of the EQ Project is less on direct student services than on projects that change schooling—through improving teachers or the curriculum, for instance—and so, indirectly, improve both the quality and equality of education (The College Board, 1987).

The Council of Chief State School Officers School/College Collaboration is directed to state education projects to plan collaborative activities. Most of these projects have addressed both attracting exceptional persons into teaching and enhancing the current teaching force, particularly in areas where there are high-risk students (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1988).

The National Association of State University and Land-Grant College's University/Urban School Collaborative Program is a project of the Division of Urban Affairs of the National Association of State University and Land-Grant Colleges. The Program includes sixteen collaborations that focus on reducing the transition problems of urban youth as they move out of high school, either into

12

17

post-secondary education or into the workplace. Many of the projects guarantee job placement, college admissions, and scholarships, linked to school performance (Martin, et al., 1986).

Finally, the *Academic Alliances*, local groups of public school and college teachers in particular disciplines, are loosely coordinated by the American Association for Higher Education. Over 300 such groups now exist around the country, and the focus on disciplines allows for a "collective responsibility for the quality of each other's teaching and learning" (Gaudiani & Burnett, 1985/86, p. 6). The role of the American Association for Higher Education is merely to identify and encourage these groups, and to point them to possible resources.

PRINCIPLES OF SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATING

Two aspects of any collaborative are analytically distinguishable: process and impact. The former are those aspects of process that promote a collaborative's ability to function smoothly, to withstand periods of disturbance, and generally to sustain itself over time. The latter are the effects of collaborative projects on teachers' performance, students' health or achievement, or other areas targeted for improvement.

Until now, the literature on project results has been scant and uneven. (Interestingly, one of the few areas where collaboratives have produced results that have been recorded, perhaps because the programs are controversial and have had to establish ammunition for defense, are school-linked and school-based clinics.) Nor are there studies that compare the effectiveness of collaborative processes to that of other methods of delivery. This absence of studies applies equally to collaboratives designed to offer student services, improve teaching, redesign curriculum, or conduct research.

The collaboratives most commonly studied for process variables are those between schools and universities. This is understandable, given the fact that educational researchers are so often affiliated with universities. Although school-business collaboratives has generated a good deal of literature, these reports tend not to be research-based, and are often merely promotional pieces. Finally, the

13

18

process of school-arts and school-health or social service collaboratives has scarcely been studied. In some cases, this is because the relationships are highly charged and fragile; in others, it is because, after the political battles are waged, there are simply insufficient resources to conduct evaluations. Nevertheless, the literature suggests that the principles for successful collaborations are similar, whether the collaborations are between schools and universities, cultural institutions, health or social service agencies, or businesses. At bottom is the idea that good collaboratives are not initiated merely because an educator thought the idea of collaboration a good one, but because the educator had a good idea that required collaboration (Sosniak, 1988).

Once collaborations are started, among the most important aspects are commitment, egalitarian decision-making, a sense of ownership by participants at all levels, clarity about roles, clarity and flexibility about both methods and goals, an ability to bridge different institutional cultures, training, and patience concerning the collaborative process itself (Ascher, July 1988; Fruchter, 1987; Trubowitz, 1985; Pitman-Gelles, 1985).

Analyzing the components of successful school-college collaborations, Maeroff (1983) stresses:
- agreement by educators at both levels that they have common problems;
- the ability to overcome the traditional academic "pecking order";
- sharply focused projects;
- recognition for participants; and
- a focus on action—not machinery.

Noting that "bridgework" is the key to successful collaborations between schools and universities, De Bevoise (1986) argues that collaborators should: have realistic expectations, work toward consumer satisfaction, and avoid becoming involved in the internal politics of the other institution.

Pitman-Gelles (1985) suggests a number of personal guidelines for successful school-museum collaborations:

14

19

- learn about the other agency—its goals, resources, and schedules and develop a respect and appreciation for its work;

- have realistic expectations about the project, including schedules and products;

- define roles and responsibilities;

- be flexible about commitments, resources, etc;

- give praise honestly and frequently to contributors; and

- continue to communicate information, ideas, frustrations and successes.

Lieberman (1986), writing about school-university collaborations, repeats some of Pitman-Gelles' personal guidelines and adds the importance of "a capacity to deal with conflict." In addition, Lieberman offers structural guidelines for collaborative work:

- some type of organizational structure;

- a small core of people actually working on the collaboration,

- time allotted for the collaborative work per se; and

- an initial stress on activities, rather than goals (large goals become clearer after people have worked together).

Analyzing collaboratives with service agencies, Fruchter (1987, p. 4) points out the tendency for schools to act cautiously and to rely on more conventional agencies that may not be as effective in delivering what they need. "Since the choice of which service agencies to involve is often complex and highly political, administrators may be tempted to play safe by working with traditional agencies whose capacity to meet student need may be less effective than more activist, flexible, grass-roots organizations." On the other hand, while it may be useful for a school to work with a local black church or neighborhood housing advocacy agency, for example, these institutions clearly cannot provide the funding and other resources that might be available from more conventional alliances. Perhaps the best solution, then, would be to join a community institution with a larger or more economically solvent business institution.

15

20

As the literature makes clear, an important motive for schools to collaborate
with other institutions, particularly businesses, has been to acquire a vocal and
active constituency on the school system's behalf. On the other side, analyses of
the growing sophistication of corporate assistance to school identifies the shift from
adopt-a-schools, many of which were largely public relations campaigns, to
collaborations that aim for systemwide change, often through lobbying and other
budgetary or legislative support (Levine & Trachtman, 1988). Thus, one of the
inevitable, and perhaps unintentional, consequences of such alliances as the Boston
Compact has been to increase the group or groups to whom the public schools see
themselves as accountable—from parents to representatives of business, labor
unions, and colleges. To counteract this tendency, the Urban League's Rochester
Education Initiative has made valiant and creative efforts to keep its reform efforts
school- and community-based. In fact, though most collaborations have a rhetoric
about parent and teacher involvement, many reform efforts involve the creation of
new bureaucracies, regulations, and agendas that inadvertently ignore, or even
further restrict, the role of teachers and parents (Cummins, 1986; Timar & Kirp,
1987).

Thus an important question is whether the school reform goals that are part of
most collaborations can be accomplished if they leave teachers and parents largely
powerless. Cummins (1986, p. 18) argues that "a major reason previous attempts
at educational reform have been unsuccessful is that the relationship between
teachers and students and between schools and communities have remained
essentially unchanged." According to Cummins, not until teaching becomes a
"reciprocal" or "collaborative" venture between teachers and students, until teachers
have more control over curriculum, and until the power relations between schools
and parents are altered, giving parents a more active role, will the reforms really
take place. From this perspective, collaborations that only reinforce the
powerlessness of parents, or even those that build alternative groups to whom the
schools are accountable, must in some way be self-defeating.

16

In the case of the Boston Compact, the new accountability has, in fact, also limited the power of headmasters, teachers and other school staff. According to Farrar (1988), the Compact was signed by the Superintendent, without first gaining support from teachers and others who would have to do something differently in order for the schools to change; moreover, even a Summer Planning Institute took place with only administrators, no teachers. Thus, once the agreement was in place, it often was difficult to generate "ownership" at the school level. While some schools did make the Compact its own plan, others regarded it as "a compliance exercise."

FUNDING

Collaborations have been a means for schools to acquire additional funding, and many collaboratives (even those with health or arts institutions) are initially supported by foundation or corporate funds. One problem with this, as with any short-term funding, is that the programs are jeopardized when the money runs out. Another problem is that the funding agency is in a position to determine priorities, and thus schools may be diverted from their own course (Ascher, July 1988).

EQUITY AND COLLABORATION

Whenever a school gains a new resource, whether through public or private monies or in-kind donations, it is increasing what it has available to its students. In urban areas, where schools are generally poor compared to schools in other districts, these alliances can help to equalize resources. However, even within an urban school district, schools may acquire greatly varied resources, depending either on the entrepreneurial skills of the principal or on the resourcefulness of parents (Schmidt, 1988).

As Caldwell (1985) points out, the elimination of disparities in school finance have been the object of intense litigation. New contributions to schooling through partnerships or from private foundations may be likened to a kind of financing, and so one day be subject to judicial review by the courts. The question, as Caldwell phrases it, is: "how do we find the constitutional mechanisms for the fair and equitable distribution of corporate resources in aid of education?" (p. 24).

17

22

Although Caldwell argues against a concept of "unjust enrichment" (because a group of students occupies a particular socioeconomic class or happens to live in a particular school district), the problems in inequities in the distribution of resources have always serious—and will not be helped by the fiat of alliances.

Until now, there has been no analysis of the degree to which corporate or other assistance has changed the resources of a school or district, or whether more corporate resources have been directed at rich or poor school districts. In many cases, these resources may not be subject to a strict monetary valuation. However, there is a common view that corporate involvement, thus far, has not substantially changed the financial standing of any school or school district. For example, Trachtman (1988), in her analysis of 85 small urban and rural school districts, found that the actual amount of money coming into the schools from corporations was minimal, and that the business community had not filled the gaps left by cuts in federal spending.

A RESEARCH AGENDA ON SCHOOL ALLIANCES

A number of serious policy questions are raised by existing school alliances that should be investigated. Levine (1985) lists those questions, as they were raised by participants at a conference on private sector involvement in public education:

- How can contradictions of purpose be dealt with?

- What is the federal role in facilitating corporate involvement in public schools?

- Are certain results possible only through collaboration?

- Is programmatic institutionalization possible?

- Are collaborative programs cost-effective?

- What changes in the perceptions of corporate leadership can be identified with private sector involvement in education?

- Because the private sector measures results differently from public education, can ways of measuring success be developed that are meaningful to both groups?

18

23

In addition, more speculative questions remain. These include: Can collaboratives raise school achievement by decreasing local unemployment and promising jobs to students? Does business know enough about the curriculum changes that will be demanded by the technology and arrangement of work in the future to take a leadership role in altering curriculum? How can a balance be maintained among the agendas of parents, professionals, taxpayers, and business in developing school policy?

CONCLUSION

From the public school's side, collaborations with other local institutions have sprung up as a solution to the problems of increasing need in a period of scarce resources. But the other members of the collaboratives also have had their reasons for joining up with the schools. Just as business has wanted to improve schooling to help produce a better prepared worker, so have the colleges and universities felt that an investment in the public schools might help create a better prepared college student. Social service agencies, and cultural and arts institutions, have all seen in the schools a captive audience they needed to reach.

Collaborations have been used to add services and courses, generate new facilities and equipment, improve teaching, develop new curriculum, increase parent involvement, and even to generate research. While some collaboratives are largely symbolic, offering gifts or prizes with little contact between individuals of the two institutions, others involve goals for real school change and rely on intense interactions among the members of the allied institutions.

Despite their proliferation, these collaborations remain more of an enthusiasm than a tested way of improving public school education. While there are a few studies of the effects of school-based clinics on the health and sexual behavior of students, there is little research on whether, or how, collaboratives with business, universities, or other institutions change schools or improve achievement. Research on the Boston Compact, an exception to this generalization, showed a complicated mix of school reactions, with both improvements and losses by students during the period of, if not resulting from, the Compact.

19

24

Nor is there research that analyzes inadvertent shifts in school priorities that may occur as a result of collaborative processes. Does satisfying the goals set by business, or the university, necessarily mean better schools? As Gifford (1986, p. 78) notes concerning school-college collaborations, "Time is always scarce, and collaborations require greater expenditures of time. Other outcome costs associated with collaborations include reductions in efficiency and possible creativity, truncation of some individual expectations, and the possibility of disappointment resulting from some collectively inflated expectations." Here again, the Boston Compact is instructive. At the time the Compact was signed, there was no pedagogical agreement about how improvement would take place. As Goodlad has written of school-university collaborations, the schools have often sought out the universities "to help them do better what they are already doing" (in Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988, p.22)   There is also the suggestion that private sector involvement in public education may actually be "diversionary, drawing attention away from the scope and seriousness of problems in American public education." Those who take this view claim that "corporate voluntarism can neither fill the gap created by cutbacks in education budgets nor correct structural problems associated with school deficiencies" (Levine, 1985, p. 4).

The proliferation of the great variety of school-community collaborations is still on an upswing, yet the fate of these alliances is not at all clear.   As Public/Private Ventures' study of school-business partnerships notes, "Educational problems are being identified as potential economic catastrophes. Such an environment is fertile for continuing school/business partnerships" (McMullan & Snyder, 1987, p. 13). On the other hand, if there is an economic decline, which decreases the need for competent entry-level workers, the pressure on businesses to ensure that schools produce such workers will diminish. Or if, given population growth, colleges find that they can easily fill their freshmen classes with well-prepared students, the pressures on them to ensure that all students meet college entrance requirements may be reduced.

It is also clear that, at least insofar as business and civic groups are concerned, public education will need to show school improvement in order to sustain support. In Rochester, for example, a recent report suggests that the business community's

20

interest in funding school improvement projects was waning (Brooks & Johnson, 1988). Yet school improvement is a slow process, and may stem from factors entirely outside the collaborative process—factors that may, indeed, be slowed down or even hindered by the flurry of collaborative activity.

21

REFERENCES

Ascher, C. (1988, July). *Urban school/community collaborations: Making them work well.* ERIC Digest No. 45. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Ascher, C. (1988, December). *School College Collaborations: A strategy for helping low-income minorities.* Urban Diversity Series No. 98. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Boston Private Industrial Council, Steering Committee. (1988, October). *A summary of the Steering Committee's proposed new goals for the Boston Compact presented at the Boston Private Industry Council Annual Meeting.* Boston: Author.

Brooks, E.E., & Johnson, W. (1988). *A Proposal for the Rochester Center for Citizen Involvement in Education.* Rochester: Statewide Youth Advocacy, Inc. and the Urban League of Rochester.

The Business Roundtable, Ad Hoc Committee on Education. (1988, April). *The role of business in education reform: Blueprint for action.* New York & Washington, DC: Author.

Caldwell, R.A. (1985). Equity issues in corporate support for schools. In M. Levine (Ed.). *The private sector in the public school: Can it improve education?* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Cavazes, L.S. (1988, November). *Report to the President: America's schools, everybody's business.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Chapman, L.H. (1982). *Instant art, instant culture: The unspoken policy for american schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

The College Board, Office of Academic Affairs. (1987). *EQ Models Program for school-college collaboration.* New York: Author.

Committee for Economic Development. (1985). *Investing in our children: Business and the public schools.* New York: Author.

Committee for Economic Development. (1987). *Children in need: Investment strategies for the educationally disadvantaged.* New York: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1988). *School/college collaboration: Fact sheet.* Washington, DC: Author.

Cummins, J. (1986, February). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, (56)* 1, 18-36.

DeBevoise, W. (1986, February). Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework. *Educational Leadership, (43)* 5, 9-12.

22

Dryfoos, J.G. (1988, July/August). School-based health clinics: Three years of experience. *Family Planning Perspectives, (20)* 4, 193-200.

Farrar, E. (1988, July). *The Boston Compact: A teaching case.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, State University of New Jersey. Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics.

Farrar, E., & Cipollone, A. (1988, March). *Business community and school reform: The Boston Compact at five years.* Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo.

Fowler, C.B. (1984, November, December). Who owns arts education? *Design, (86)* 2, 4-7.

Franse, S., & Siegel, A. (1987). A case for collaboratives: Turning around the Bronx public schools. *The Urban Review, (19)* 2, 129-135.

Fruchter, N. (1987, Spring). *School-community collaborations: Dilemmas and opportunities.* New York: Academy for Educational Development.

Gaudiani, C.L., & Burnett, D.G. (1985/86). *Academic alliances: A new approach to school/college collaboration.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Gifford, B.R., & Gabelko, N.H. (1987, August). Research into research: SUPER project case studies. *Education and Urban Society, (19)* 4, 389-420.

Gross, T.L. (1988). *Partners in education: How colleges can work with schools to improve teaching and learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, W.A., Dwyer, B., & Spade, J.Z. (1987-88). A community initiative: Making a difference in the quality of black education. *The Urban League Review, (11)* 1 & 2, 217-226.

Justiz, M.J., & Kameen, M.C. (1987, January). Business offers a hand to education. *Phi Delta Kappan, (68)* 5, 379-83.

Leiter, M. (1985). Going public: A labor education perspective. In M. Levine (Ed.). *The private sector in the public school: Can it improve education?* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Levine, M. (1985). Approaches to private sector involvement in public education. In M. Levine. (Ed.). *The private sector in the public school: Can it improve education?* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Levine, M., & Trachtman, R. (Eds.). (1988). *American business and the public schools: Case studies of corporate involvement in public education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (1986, February). Collaborative work. *Educational Leadership, (43)* 5, 4-8.

23

Maeroff, G.I. (1983). *School and college: Partnerships in education.* Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Martin, D.C., Mocker, D.W., & Brown, N.C. (1986). *Joining forces for urban youth: The NASULGC Urban University/Urban School Collaborative Program.* Final report. Washington, DC: NASULGC.

Martin, R.L. (1985). *Business and education: Partners for the future.* Washington, DC: U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

McMullan, B.J., & Snyder, P. (1987, Fall). *Allies in education: Schools and businesses working together for at-risk youth.* Summary and Conclusions. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Mickelson, D.J., Kritek, W.J., Hedlund, R.D., & Kaufmann, A.M. (1988, February). *Urban school-university collaboration.* Final report to the Ford Foundation. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Graduate School of Education.

Mocker, D.W., Martin, D.C., & Brown, N.C. (1988, April). Lessons Learned from Collaboration. *Urban Education, (23)* 1, 42-50.

National Alliance of Business. (1987). *The fourth R, workforce readiness: A guide to business-education partnerships.* Washington, DC: Author.

New York State Education Department. (1987, October). *Partnerships for the future: Business-education partnerships in New York State.* Albany, NY: Author. ED 289 946.

Pink, W.T., & Borman, K.M. (1986). Building community-school programs in two cities. *The Urban Review, (18)* 2, 105-116.

Pitman-Gelles, B. (1985). Museums and schools: A meaningful partnership. In M.D. Fantini, & R. L. Sinclair. *Education in school and nonschool settings.* Eighty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rothman, R. (1988, November 9). Businesses refuse to sign "Boston Compact II." *Education Week, (2)*, p. 5.

Schmidt, W.I. (1988, December 27). Private gifts to public schools bring questions of fairness. *The New York Times*, A1, B5.

Sirotnik, K.A., & Goodlad, J.I. (1988). *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Snyder, S. (1988, October 25). Business to schools: We want results. *Boston Globe.* Business Section, 33 ff.

Sosniak, L.A. (1988). *Partnerships with a purpose: A report on two programs for curriculum development and delivery, within the Educational EQuality Project's Models Program for School-College Collaboration.* Draft. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

24

29

Timar, T.B., & Kirp, D.L. (1987, August). Educational reform and institutional competence. *Harvard Educational Review, (57)* 3, 308-330.

Trachtman, R. (1988). School/business partnerships: Their impact on teachers in small urban and rural school districts. In. M. Levine & R. Trachtman (Eds.). *American business and the public school: Case studies of corporate involvement in public education.* New York: Teachers College.

Trubowitz, S. (1984). *When a college works with a public school: A case study of school-college collaboration.* Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Department of Education, & U.S. Department of Commerce. (1988, July). *Building a quality workforce.* Washington, DC: Author.

Wilbur, F.P., Lambert, L.M., & Young, M.J. (1987). *School college partnerships.* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

30