DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 748 UD 028 508

AUTHOR	Clark, Terry A.
TITLE	Collaboration To Build Competence. The Urban Superintendents' Perspective.
INSTITUTION	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC. Programs for the Improvement of Practice.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-036037-4; PIP-91-850
PUB DATE	Dec 91
NOTE	68p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Mail Stop: SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-9328.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Administrator Role; *Community Cooperation; *Competence; *Cooperative Planning; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Institutional Role; Participative Decision Making; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; *Superintendents; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

The Collaborative Efforts Action Group of the Urban Superintendents' Network moved from an examination of the roles of schools, businesses, and community agencies in improving the quality of education in America to promoting the creation of comprehensive collaboratives that can strengthen family and community life. This report shares what superintendents have learned about collaboration. Strategies for developing the united front necessary for viable comprehensive collaborations are described in the following sections: (1) Introduction: The Spirit of Collaboration; (2) Building on Partnerships; (3) Key Collaborative Players; (4) Characteristics of Successful Collaboratives; (5) Measuring Success; and (6) Shaping Collaboratives for the Future. The superintendents urge colleagues in the nation's cities to explore the possibilities, broaden their perspectives, and lower bureaucratic barriers that inhibit children from reaching their full competence. Included are a 53-item list of references and a 37-item list of selected school-community partnerships in 24 cities. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: UD

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. EA

ED341748

THE
COLLABORATION
URBAN
TO BUILD
SUPERINTENDENTS'
COMPETENCE
PERSPECTIVE

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
US Department of Education

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 document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE
COLLABORATION
URBAN
TO BUILD
SUPERINTENDENTS'
COMPETENCE
PERSPECTIVE

Terry A. Clark
Education Resources Group

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Mail Stop: SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-9328
ISBN 0-16-036037-4

U.S. Department of Education
Lamar Alexander
Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Diane Ravitch
Assistant Secretary

Programs for the Improvement of Practice
David Mack
Acting Director

December 1991

Collaborative Efforts Action Group

OERI Urban Superintendents' Network

Richard C. Wallace, Jr., Chair
Superintendent
Pittsburgh Public Schools

Manford Byrd, Jr.
Former General Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

George Garcia
Former Superintendent
Kansas City Public Schools

William M. Kendrick
Superintendent
Seattle School District #1

Lee Etta Powell
Former Superintendent
Cincinnati Public Schools

Matthew W.Prophet, Jr.
Superintendent
Portland Public Schools

Laval S. Wilson
Former Superintendent
Boston Public Schools

Other Contributing Members of the

OERI Urban Superintendents' Network

Charles Almo
Former Interim Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

William R. Anton
Superintendent
Los Angeles Unified School District

Lillian C. Barna
Superintendent
Tacoma Public Schools

Jack Bobroff
Superintendent
Albuquerque Public Schools

Leonard Britton
Former Superintendent
Los Angeles Unified School District

Lester W. Butts
Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools

Eugene C. Campbell
Executive Superintendent
Newark Public Schools

Constance E. Clayton
Superintendent
School District of Philadelphia

Alonzo Crim
Former Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools

Marvin Edwards
General Superintendent
Dallas Independent School District

Joseph Fernandez
Chancellor
New York City Board of Education

Robert J. Ferrera
Superintendent
Minneapolis Public Schools

J. Jerome Harris
Former Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools

Frank J. Huml
Superintendent
Cleveland Public Schools

Richard C. Hunter
Former Superintendent
Baltimore City Public Schools

Andrew Jenkins, III
Former Superintendent
District of Columbia Public Schools

Ted D. Kimbrough
General Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

Hernan LaFontaine
Former Superintendent
Hartford Public Schools

Floretta Dukes McKenzie
Former Superintendent
District of Columbia Public Schools

Thomas W. Payzant
Superintendent
San Diego City Schools

Robert S. Peterkin
Former Superintendent
Milwaukee Public Schools

John W. Porter
Former General Superintendent
Detroit Public Schools

Herb A. Sang
Former Superintendent
Duval County Public Schools

Albert Thompson
Superintendent
Buffalo Public Schools

Alfred D. Tutela
Former Superintendent
Cleveland Public Schools

Octavio Visiedo
Superintendent
Dade County Public Schools

Everett J. Williams
Superintendent
New Orleans Public Schools

Larry Zenke
Superintendent
Duval County Public Schools

Mary A. Campbell
Coordinator, OERI Urban
Superintendents' Network
U.S. Department of Education

Susan L. Gruskin
Former Coordinator, OERI Urban
Superintendents' Network
U.S. Department of Education

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Sandra Ham, James Knickman, Richard Lacey, Lillian Marti, and Edward J. Meade, Jr., for their critical reviews of the manuscript and their editorial and research assistance. Mary Ann Okin assisted in preparing the manuscript.

Preface

Urban superintendents understand very well that the challenge to effectively educate children of poverty requires sustained and comprehensive efforts on the part of entire communities. Schools cannot—and should not—be expected to do the job alone.

With this understanding, the Collaborative Efforts Action Group of the Urban Superintendents' Network met several times to examine the roles of schools, businesses, and community agencies in improving the quality of education in America. We began by reviewing the relationships that exist among such institutions across the country and found a wide array that serve children and youth. We believe the progress made in collaboration among these agencies to date to be significant. But much more needs to be done.

As we focused on the educational and societal conditions of disadvantaged children and youth, it became clear that we need to promote the creation of comprehensive collaboratives that can strengthen family and community life. Our goal, then, became that of proposing integrated delivery of services to children and their families to increase the likelihood that our young people will become healthy, educated, and participating adult citizens. We agree with the thesis of Lisbeth Schorr in her book, *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage* (1988), that this goal can be attained if we can get agencies to work together effectively and efficiently.

We examined a variety of cooperative relationships in virtually every major city in the nation and found many that have proven effective in promoting the types of educational outcomes we all seek. We looked at individual adopt-a-school programs, ambitious collaborative projects (e.g., the Boston Compact) and comprehensive community collaboratives (e.g., the Portland Investment).

We concluded that while all of these partnerships are valuable and will help improve education for youth at risk, we need to aggressively promote the establishment of comprehensive community collaboratives. It is our belief that integrated, comprehensive social and educational services will best serve the needs of disadvantaged children and youth in this nation's cities.

In this report, we share what we have learned about collaboration—what to do and what not to do. We offer some suggestions about how to get started and how to keep going. We endorse the need for more comprehensive evaluation of collaborative relationships. And, we underscore the imperative need for schools, businesses, and social service agencies to work together to improve the quality of life and the quality of education for all our young people. Not to do so could have serious consequences, for the well-being of our nation is tied inextricably to the well-being of our children.

Richard C. Wallace, Jr.
Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools
Chair, Collaborative Efforts Action Group
Urban Superintendents' Network

Contents

Page

OERI Urban Superintendents' Network iii
  Collaborative Efforts Action Group iii
  Other Contributing Members iii

Acknowledgments iv

Preface v

Part 1. Introduction 1

Part 2. Building on Partnerships 7

Part 3. Key Collaborative Players 15

Part 4. Characteristics of Successful Collaboratives 23

Part 5. Measuring Success 31

Part 6. Shaping Collaboratives for the Future 35

References 43

Appendix: Selected School-Community Partnerships 49

Part 1

Introduction: The Spirit of Collaboration

The Urban Superintendents' Network is in good company in advocating comprehensive, communitywide collaboration as a mechanism for serving at-risk children. Other constituent groups—the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Governors' Association, and the National Alliance of Business, among others—have also called for formal relationships among schools, service providers, and their communities to increase society's chances for nurturing competent adults.

A coalition of national groups has recommended that new partnerships among education, public welfare, employment training, health, and related programs be established to realize the goals of the Family Support Act of 1988 (P.L. 100–485), which seeks to strengthen families and foster self-sufficiency (W.T. Grant Foundation, 1988). In her groundbreaking book, *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage (1987),* Lisbeth Schorr argues that only through the delivery of integrated, comprehensive services—from a multitude of agencies—will children at risk be given the opportunity to become healthy, educated adults. Collaboration that successfully improves the quality of services to families and children and the ways they are delivered is unprecedented.

By endorsing a collaborative approach in preparing poor children to become self-sufficient and to join a competent workforce, the superintendents emphasize that comprehensive services must be delivered in a focused and coordinated way. If they are not, society will continue to produce both high school graduates and school dropouts who are unprepared to enter either the workforce or postsecondary education—i.e., incompetent citizens. On the other hand, the superintendents believe that pooling resources to serve the whole child will improve such outcomes as a more prepared work force and a lower school dropout rate.

School-community partnerships (one collaborative mechanism) have not necessarily focused on the most needy children. Accordingly, as seen in the following passage from *Dealing with Dropouts: The Urban Superintendent's Call to Action* (1988), the superintendents' network urges more community, social service, and parent involvement in public schools and recommends collaboration as one of six strategies for serving students at risk.

> A growing number of people, organizations, and institutions together are developing strategies to hold youngsters in school until they graduate. Many of their efforts greatly enhance the chance for at-risk students to stay in school. . . Parents, the juvenile justice system, religious organizations, youth employment and training programs, policymakers, businesses, and industry can each offer invaluable expertise and resources. . . Collaborative efforts have encouraged districts to evaluate which services to provide and which to leave to non-school agencies. Tight budgets have forced some schools to rely more on outside resources, even when this means sharing administrative authority (p. 47).

Such strategies require additional resources, and the superintendents realize that these will not become available unless the public is aware of the need and is willing to provide support to address it. The superintendents have concluded that unless they take a leadership role in collaborations, the all-encompassing needs of the majority of urban school children, especially potential dropouts, will not be addressed. Their rationale for collaboration is not to improve schools *per se* but to improve services to children. While they believe that school systems are pivotal organizations within collaboratives, all service providers—including school systems—must actually change the way they do business with one another.

> ***At the center of all our social agencies sits a client who must be housed, transported, educated, fed, and kept healthy. For every agency, it is the same person, the same client.***
>
> Harold L. Hodgkinson

The need for collaboration and strong leadership by school superintendents provides the framework for this publication. The justification for each can be found in the proliferation of reports, media clippings, and research studies on such issues as poverty, academic underachievement, school dropouts, poor health, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, and delinquency—conditions which often prevent children from becoming competent adults.

Because schools are charged with educating children, they are home to children for a good part of each day and for many days each year. They are the public agency most often called upon to nurture children and to provide leadership in addressing their needs. Most urban public schools, however, are increasingly unable to provide high quality education to those from impoverished and disconnected homes. As Charles Almo, formerly Interim Chicago Superintendent, stated: "We should be addressing the problem of children's vast needs which cannot be met by schools alone, or by *any* business or agency alone. The education community has been accused of not doing its job as well as it should, and we need to make clear, in a factual, non-defensive manner, that other organizations and agencies also have responsibilities to children."

Sharing responsibility does not obviate the role of the school system. Alonzo Crim, former superintendent in Atlanta, explained: "Superintendents need to aggregate power to get things done for children. We need to put things together, coordinate, collaborate, and provide a vision and a forum to talk about the issues. . . The major forces have to coalesce to get the job done; otherwise, we will be tilting at windmills."

And Lee Etta Powell, former superintendent of the Cincinnati public schools, has claimed that no coalition composed merely of schools with one other group is a genuine collaborative. "*All* related organizations must come together in a roundtable; we must get away from one-on-one. . . We must identify the problem, get people to come together, assemble the resources, formulate a strategy, and provide for evaluation."

The purpose of collaboration is not so much to ensure efficiency, but to make sure that as the services and efforts reach the children, they are indeed focused. . . and that they are indeed done, beginning with the interests and needs of the child as the hub.

Nelson Smith

The superintendents emphasize that the stakes have changed, and that all stakeholders in the future of American economic and social life must play a larger, more committed role in shaping children's development and education.

Comprehensive Collaboration Defined

The superintendents believe that the most effective collaborations, and the most necessary for the coming century, must be broad in the range and diversity of their membership and must facilitate the provision of comprehensive services to meet the needs of the whole child.

School systems, parents, government and social service agencies, community and church groups, cultural institutions, legal and civil rights groups, postsecondary institutions, businesses, and youth-serving agencies must all share responsibility for the successful development of America's young people. Communitywide collaboratives which engage entities with the influence and willingness to cooperate will reflect the unique social, economic, and political milieu of the community. Effective collaborations will be committed to the following mission and goals.

The *mission* of comprehensive collaboratives is to create a dynamic force to provide coordinated, quality programs and services to children and families, which enable students to function more successfully in school and society.

The *key goals* of comprehensive collaboratives are to reduce the number of school dropouts, increase the number of high school graduates competent to enter the work force or postsecondary education, and ensure the capacity of graduates to participate effectively in the social, cultural, political, and economic life of the community.

To achieve these goals, the superintendents envision comprehensive collaboratives with the capacity to mobilize intensive services, to respond flexibly to student and family needs, and to pull together varied and bureaucratically unrelated programs that will better serve and educate children. They may focus, for example, on community-supported early childhood programs, coordinated social service delivery systems, work experience and career exploration programs, recreational after-school programs, and federal and state policies and practices affecting education.

Collaboratives will use a wide range of mechanisms to accomplish their tasks. Organizations may coalesce around a stated set of goals and then plan, conduct needs assessments, delegate research and decision-making tasks to subcommittees or member agencies, develop program proposals, raise funds for implementation, set standards for and monitor related service-delivery programs, negotiate systems for integrated service delivery, propose needed policy or legislation, and so on.

11

In essence, collaboratives will be decision-making bodies designed to use the various resources and service-delivery systems of member organizations to more comprehensively and efficiently serve the needs of children.

Collaborations must be defined in the context of policy and economic strategy. We need to look at the root causes of unemployment, emasculated families, lack of access to nutrition, the lack of a value system. . . And superintendents must know what services children should be receiving. As educators, they have the preeminent responsibility for mobilizing resources for children and youth. . . It's a losing game unless you get the stakeholders around the table together.

Milton Bins

Collaboratives may respond to specific needs at different times. Their memberships may be fluid also, depending on the particular focus at a given time. As Warren Bennis predicted in his 1968 book, *The Temporary Society:*

> There will be adaptive, rapidly changing temporary systems. These will be task forces composed of groups of relative strangers with diverse professional backgrounds and skills organized around problems to be solved. The groups will be arranged on an organic rather than mechanical model, meaning that they will evolve in response to a problem rather than to preset, programmed expectations (p. 98).

Bennis suggested that building this collaborative climate will be difficult, yet essential. "Modern problems are too complex and diversified for one [person] or one discipline," he wrote. "They require a blending of skills and perspectives, and only effective problem-solving units will be able to master them."

Through collaboration, the superintendents are essentially proposing to focus the group's energies on serving the needs of children. As Matthew Prophet, superintendent in Portland, Oregon, has said: "We need something global, a positive, direct, unambiguous action—a united front which questions the present structure that does disservice to our children."

Designing Strategies for Collaboration

This publication shares strategies for developing viable comprehensive collaborations; that is, the "united front." In Part 2, the superintendents recognize functioning school-community and school-business partnerships and show how they fit into a continuum, progressing toward comprehensive collaboration.

Part 3 describes the roles of key collaborative players, including school systems, parents, and community—roles that are substantively different but equal, both in voice and responsibility.

12

Part 4 describes the characteristics of successful collaboration as they have been identified by various groups. Although most collaborative efforts have not been formally evaluated, enough is known from documentation and other studies to delineate indicators of success and the "do's" and "don'ts" for collaboration. Part 5 suggests approaches for measuring outcomes.

Part 6, the final section, describes issues that the superintendents believe must be addressed as collaboratives are formed and nurtured during the 1990s and beyond. The superintendents hope that readers—including colleagues in other cities and key leaders in government, business, and the community—will find this discussion thought-provoking and useful for designing strategies for improved programs and services for youth in danger of dropping out.

Building on Partnerships

Traditional education partnerships—particularly those between schools and businesses—are considered to be valuable to the extent that partners have helped reduce illiteracy, provided assistance in work experience and college scholarships for students, enlisted volunteers for individual schools, and donated equipment. These types of partnerships broaden the education that schools provide, for example, through tutoring and mentor programs, recognition and incentive awards, field trips, and dropout prevention activities.

A National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) survey found that, in 1987–88, 40 percent of the nation's public schools had some kind of formal partnership with an external institution. In urban areas, 54 percent of partnerships are with businesses; another 17 percent are between schools and civic or service organizations; and 9 percent are with postsecondary institutions.

Eighty percent of urban education partnerships are initiated by school system staff. They report wanting partnerships to foster school-community cooperation (35 percent), provide incentives for students (25 percent), supplement curriculum and staff (23 percent), and obtain equipment (11 percent).

Primary activities reported by urban schools with partnerships include receiving goods and services (69 percent), monetary contributions (10 percent), or both (20 percent). Specific types of support provided by partners include:

- guest speakers/ demonstrations/ use of partner's facilities (49 percent);
- awards/ scholarships/ incentives for students (42 percent);
- academic tutoring for students (19 percent);
- assistance for students with special needs (18 percent);
- awards for teachers or schools (18 percent);
- participation on education committees/ task forces (17 percent);
- donations of computers, other equipment, or books (15 percent).

A Partnership Continuum

One-on-One

Most activities identified through the NCES survey are one-on-one institutional partnerships and, as seen on the following continuum (Exhibit 1), they are the most basic types. The best known are adopt-a-school programs, in which a business provides services, equipment, or other resources to a school. The variety of services that might be offered to students, teachers, or schools are listed under the heading, "Institutional One-on-One."

Exhibit 1. A Continuum of School-Community Partnerships

Institutional One-on-One (Sponsor → Beneficiary)	**Cooperative Agreements (Sponsor ↔ Beneficiary)**	**Comprehensive Collaboratives (Sponsors ⇄ Beneficiaries)**
Focuses:	**Focuses:**	**Focuses:**
1. Tutoring	1. Needs assessment	1. Needs assessment
2. Mentoring	2. Planning	2. Broad-based, multi-agency planning
3. Field trips	3. Research and development	3. Research and development
4. Guest speakers	4. Training in new technology	4. Long-term institutional commitment
5. Summer jobs	5. Teacher/administrator professional development	5. Commonly defined vision
6. Paid work-study	6. Advocacy—policy/laws	6. Goals/objectives by consensus
7. Scholarships	7. School-based health clinics	7. Shared authority/decision making
8. Incentives/recognition awards	8. Magnet schools	8. New roles/relationships
9. Demonstrations	9. $ to support innovation	9. Advocacy—policy/laws
10. Use of business facilities	10. Advice on restructuring schools	10. Integration of multiple services
11. Loaned executives	11. "Focused" (e.g., on dropout or teen pregnancy prevention)	11. Cross-institutional programs
12. Volunteers		12. "Comprehensive" services, focusing on the whole child
13. Mini-grants for teachers		
14. Teaching assistance		
15. Equipment/supplies donations		
16. Public relations		
17. Adopt-a-school		
18. Legal/accounting/tax assistance		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These reported services provide evidence for the judgment expressed in *American Business and the Public School* (Levine and Trachtman, 1988), that business involvement continues to be "fairly traditional. . . Relatively few partnerships branch out into more ambitious efforts such as support of magnet schools, research on teacher professionalism, or pledges of support tied to higher academic standards" (as quoted by Olson, 1988).

Cooperative Agreements

Some partnerships do attempt to branch out. A fall 1989 Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) survey of the 31 members of the Urban Superintendents' Network elicited information about collaboratives in their districts and found that many do involve multi-agency, multi-service projects that are jointly planned and governed.

A few of these—the Atlanta Partnership of Business and Education, the Boston Compact, and Hartford's School-to-Work Transition Program—had participated in the Metrolink Project in 1984 and 1985.

> ***Today, partners in education are reforming curricula, assisting talented individuals to enter the teaching profession, establishing training institutes for principals and administrators, and pressing for curative legislation to bring about significant changes in the way children are taught.***
>
> Thomas Evans

Funded by the Danforth Foundation and designed and documented by the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL), Metrolink focused on communitywide collaboration around human-resource development through education, employment, and training. IEL's purpose was to study the processes of broad-based collaboration and long-range planning in eight cities which were starting or had established partnerships to address human-resource development. The findings, which are included in Part 4 of this report, lend insight into and understanding of the multi-agency, multi-service partnership.

These types of collaborations—many of which have been functioning for several years—are depicted as cooperative agreements on the partnership continuum displayed in Exhibit 1. They are characterized by formal agreements about each partner's responsibilities and expected outcomes, and they imply a reciprocal commitment between or among partners. Activities might include staff development, advocacy for education policy, targeted services for specific age groups, and magnet school support. Many are focused on a particular area, such as dropout prevention, teenage pregnancy, and employability training. See page 11 for examples from Network districts.

Comprehensive Collaboratives

A few districts have collaboratives which have reached beyond cooperative agreements. They exemplify the comprehensive collaboratives proposed by the superintendents and are represented on the continuum as the most sophisticated and fully developed partnerships. Broad-based and involving multiple organizations, they require long-term institutional commitment. They proceed with a commonly shared vision, goals and objectives developed through consensus, shared authority and decisionmaking, new roles and relationships for the various players, integrated delivery of multiple services, and cross-institutional activities. Most important, they address the comprehensive needs of children, from preschool through high school.

Two noteworthy examples of comprehensive collaboratives in Network school districts are the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative (CYC) and the Portland Investment (see pages 12 and 13).

A partnership is really a "hook-up" and a collaborative is a change in the way you do business.

William Kendrick

17

Cooperative Agreements

The BOSTON COMPACT is a set of formal agreements between the public school system and local businesses, universities, and labor which promise postsecondary opportunities to graduates in return for measurable improvements in systemwide performance in such areas as attendance, academic achievement, and the dropout rate. The reauthorization of the Compact in 1989 added a new goal—a movement to school-based management/shared decisionmaking in return for greater accountability at the school level. The unemployment rate for each graduating class 6 months after graduation has been lower (Dooley, 1990). Local businesses are hiring more minority graduates from the city's school system (Farrar, 1988).

The LOS ANGELES EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIP is a collaboration of corporations, universities, and community leaders. The partnership has raised more than $7 million for educational initiatives focusing on staff development, community involvement, technology, magnet schools, and dropout prevention programs. Its innovative Principals-for-a-Day program allows business leaders to experience—first hand—the challenge of school management, which fosters greater understanding and awareness of critical education issues.

The MINNEAPOLIS YOUTH TRUST, a collaborative of major employers, city and state agencies, social services, and the public schools has two key components. The Job Connection is an apprenticeship and summer employment initiative, and the Buddy System is a mentorship program provided by volunteers to high school youth. The collaborative was initiated in the community and key players are the Chamber of Commerce, the school system, and the United Way. The superintendent's *Urban Action Agenda for the 1990's* extends this collaborative spirit through school-community partnerships and coordinated services.

In SAN DIEGO, two major collaboratives are addressing the academic and support needs of students. The SAN DIEGO DROPOUT PREVENTION AND RECOVERY ROUND TABLE—one of 21 Urban Dropout Prevention Collaboratives supported by The Ford Foundation—is a coalition of diverse groups working toward a common goal. NEW BEGINNINGS—an interagency collaborative involving the city, county, K–12, and community college district—is restructuring and integrating health, social service, and economic support to students and their families.

In SEATTLE, city government, the school system, and the United Way jointly funded a program of FAMILY SUPPORT WORKERS in the schools. These professionals coordinate external services, work with families, school staff, and children and try to address children's various needs. In this case, the schools and school-site counselors identified problems and needs, and the superintendent approached the city and the United Way to get financing and support for the program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cincinnati Youth Collaborative

Nearly one-half of the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative's (CYC) 45-member steering committee represents local businesses. Five members are employees of Procter & Gamble, whose president was instrumental in organizing the collaborative in 1987.

The Cincinnati Public Schools are represented by the superintendent, a deputy superintendent, and three board of education members. The community is represented by the teachers union, the parent-teachers association, two universities, three citywide religious groups, nine community based organizations, and two county social service agencies.

The superintendent, Procter & Gamble's chief executive officer, and a city official co-chair the collaborative. An executive director, who reports to the co-chair, coordinates collaborative activities. The first executive director and the associate director, who was on loan from Procter & Gamble, oversaw the raising of $6.9 million in pledges of support for collaborative initiatives. Sixty percent of these dollars came from corporations.

CYC's initiatives are diverse and far reaching. A Last Dollars scholarship fund—which in 2 years awarded $300,000 in scholarships to high school graduates—is administered by the Cincinnati Scholarship Foundation, an affiliated organization. The Taft District Pilot Project—an articulation effort among one high school and its two feeder schools—is designed to increase the number of graduates. The Earn and Learn summer jobs program for seventh and eighth graders motivates students to remain in school and to achieve academically. The collaborative is also sponsoring a preschool pilot, in which 3-year-olds participate regularly in programs in two elementary schools.

In March, 1990, the 2-hour CYC Future-Thon—a collaborative effort hosted by all eight Cincinnati television companies—received over 16,000 phone calls from volunteers to help children at risk of dropping out of school. The collaborative is now training and placing 1,000 volunteers as mentors for the city's schoolchildren.

The CYC was one of five school/business partnerships honored by President Reagan in the Rose Garden in 1988. More recently, President Bush visited Cincinnati to honor the CYC as an example of "what's right" in American public education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Portland Investment

The Portland Leaders Roundtable is a collaboration among the Oregon city's education, business, and government leaders to address the problem of youth unemployment. In 1983, the Roundtable developed the Portland Investment, a plan which outlined a 10-year commitment to implement activities focused on dropout prevention, employability training, and work experience. The project targeted low-income, minority youth from birth through age 21.

The Executive Committee of the Leaders Roundtable directs the Portland Investment. Represented on this committee are the chief executive officer of the city's largest bank, the mayor, the chairman of the Private Industry Council (PIC), Portland's school superintendent, and the chairperson of the Portland Chamber of Commerce. Roundtable at-large members include representatives of organized labor, area colleges, the United Way, the Urban League, the school board, the governor's office, and area businesses.

A planning team coordinates implementation of the plan, monitors activities, and consults with the Roundtable regarding progress on the project. The team is made up of school district and PIC staff, although businesses and city government offices are also involved. A full-time staff person (whose salary is paid with joint city, school system, and PIC funds) manages day-to-day activities on the project.

The Portland Investment includes more than a dozen programs and serves over 2,300 youth. The operating budgets of these programs total $4.6 million; funds are provided locally by member agencies. Examples of key projects include the Teen Parent Program, which provides prenatal and child-care services; Screening Kids, Informing Parents (SKIP), a comprehensive health-screening program for 3- and 4-year-olds; Blueprint for Student Success, a neighborhood program for at-risk elementary students; Project Bridge, support services and basic-skills classes for eighth-grade middle school students; Partnership Project, a school-to-work transition program for 11th and 12th graders; and The Youth Employment Institute for out-of-school youth.

The Roundtable credits its ability to develop a superior level of trust among its membership as the cornerstone of its success.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Part 3

Key Collaborative Players

School System Leadership

Studies show that the superintendent's leadership is an indispensable motivating factor in successful school-community partnerships and school improvement involving the community. The Rand Corporation's review of promising innovations in six school districts, all of which are Network members, states:

> The school superintendent is usually the single most important actor in the improvement process, whether that person is the initial architect or an indispensable member of a coalition of improvement-oriented groups. No improvement effort that we studied caught fire without an active superintendent willing to interact with community forces and to attack the school system's inertia. The superintendent, in short, is the essential link between schools and the community (Hill, et al, 1989, p. 20).

Rand found that the superintendents' actions—which were instrumental in the success of the initiatives—included some or all of the following:

- creating a public mandate for the schools;
- promising action, but not dramatic, short-term improvements;
- ensuring continuity of like-minded, knowledgeable leadership;
- advocating for *all* racial/ethnic groups;
- increasing and maintaining the flow of information to the public; and
- encouraging staff professionalism (pp. 20–27).

A documentation of 21 Urban School-Community Dropout Prevention Collaboratives, initiated and supported by The Ford Foundation between 1986 and 1990, found that "visible, facilitating leadership from the superintendent" characterized the more successful collaborations (Clark, 1988). This leadership has been manifested in different ways. In a few cases, the superintendent is a member of a core decision group representing the schools, business, and local government. In other cases, the superintendent is not actively involved but gives full support to senior staff who are. In still another case, the superintendent exerts strong, behind-the-scenes leadership at all times and is present for key decisions and events. In cities in which the collaborative concept was never fully realized, the superintendent clearly lacked interest in the collaborative effort.

Initiating collaborative leadership can be as straightforward as identifying needs and making sure the public is aware of them. The urban superintendents believe their experiences in running school systems help them to identify needs and problems. They also believe they have a responsibility to give a message to leaders of various community sectors—that is, that all of them can contribute to a collaborative effort. As William Kendrick, superintendent in Seattle, explained, "What is needed in partnership is school-focused leadership. It takes the superintendent, city government, and business, looking to school-focused leadership, to identify needs. We must give the community a chance to respond to these needs."

The Role of Business

Businesses have been responding to these needs and their own priorities by contributing resources, equipment, and dollars to schools through school-business partnerships. In these arrangements, business has been the prominent partner and benefits to both partners go beyond immediate resources.

The historical and potential contributions of business partners should not go unheeded, although business motivation for involvement with the public schools is complicated and often subtle.

> ***If you trust business as a partner, policy changes and future direction of schools will be assisted.***
>
> Joseph Fernandez

"School/business partnerships have proliferated for a variety of reasons. . . ranging from a perceived crisis in public schooling to the need for better educated employees," say the authors of *American Business and the Public School* (Levine and Trachtman, 1988).

Public/Private Ventures (P/PV), a not-for-profit corporation which focuses on workforce preparedness, investigated nine of the strongest school/business partnerships operating in the mid-1980s, including the Boston Compact and the Atlanta Partnership of Business and Education. P/PV concluded that "school/business collaboratives have emerged as significant primarily because they act as a catalyst for wider support for public education and can provide at-risk youth with experiential evidence of the link between academic achievement and eventual employment" (1987).

Compact replication sites sponsored by the National Alliance of Business (NAB) since 1986 (including eight districts from the Urban Superintendents' Network) are attempting to learn from the successes and mistakes of the Boston Compact. A key finding after 2 years is that "business still does not adequately understand the magnitude and seriousness of the problems of our public schools. . . [and they] have only limited knowledge of education reform issues" (1989_a). Most business people feel their help is needed, yet realize the limitations of existing partnerships. The Council for Aid to Education reports that "only 22 percent of the business leaders *Fortune*/ Allstate. . . surveyed think their efforts have improved the quality of students' education. . . Many business leaders feel that while their partnership programs touch lives and provide opportunities for students fortunate enough to participate, they rarely effect changes that will benefit students passing through the system a year or so later" (*PIE Journal*, 1989, p.20).

On the other hand, "fears abound that business is treading in areas it knows little about, that it will skew subject matter to meet its needs for workers, that it will wrest control of school systems and curriculums away from the experts, and, perhaps worst of all, that it will expect immediate results and will pull out if instant gratification is not forthcoming. . . Thus, whether business should be more than a source of money and political support remains hotly contested" (Deutsch, 1989).

> ***We need to do something to turn [private sector] rhetoric into commitment and performance over the long haul. . . We need to learn from experiences in other cities which are attempting to achieve similar goals. . . We need to share these experiences with our own business communities to get them substantially involved with dollars and contributed personnel.***
>
> Richard Wallace

The Committee for Economic Development (CED) attempted through its 1985 policy statement on business and the public schools to establish useful guidelines for business involvement. In *Investing In Our Children*, CED urged businesses to 1) become advocates for adequate funding and policies aimed at school improvement, and 2) apply business strategies to education in the areas of cost/ benefit analysis, human-resources development, staff empowerment, research and evaluation, diversity and experimentation, and investments in services, staff, and programs.

Jane David, an education consultant studying school-restructuring efforts at the state and district levels for the National Governors' Association, has found that a very "different role for business is evolving, a genuine interest and commitment to educational improvement. . . and quite a bit of openness to trying new ways of working with states and districts, although there are huge variations in manifestations of this" (1990). She notes that one activity that seems to be increasing is the application of individual business skills—in management, marketing, and communications—to school systems. Business people are beginning to understand that their existing skills can enhance school and district performance.

The National Alliance of Business (NAB) has published *A Blueprint for Business on Restructuring Education* (1989b) which, as the title implies, takes these suggestions a step further. It calls for "new kinds of joint ventures between business and education. . . ventures unlike most of the business/ education partnerships that already exist." NAB asserts that the experience of restructuring business—which happened of necessity across the nation in the 1970s—is applicable to education reform.

NAB makes far-reaching recommendations about business involvement in major educational change. But the Alliance is cautious as well. It warns that business people must understand three axioms if they are to work productively with public schools.

- They must recognize that the crisis in American education is critical to them.
- They must learn about education if they expect to make viable, adaptable recommendations.
- They must view their connection to education as an ongoing, long-term effort.

The urban superintendents welcome this intensified business involvement, but realize that other major institutions must also participate fully if disadvantaged children are to be better served. As P/PV concluded, "While school/ business collaborations can act as a catalyst for educational improvement, they *alone* cannot revitalize urban schools. Such a change must be grounded in the educational system itself—in its teachers, administrators, and leaders and in political, community, and parental advocacy for education" (1987).

Community and Parent Roles

If comprehensive collaboration is to succeed, both community organizations and the community of parents must be involved. The roles of the first group are more easily defined because each organization typically has an area of advocacy or service in which it specializes. The participation of parent representatives has been viewed as more amorphous; although the benefits of parental involvement are tangible, the what and how of their involvement are less clearly understood. In addition, the contributions of organized parent groups differ from those of parents who are elected or who volunteer directly out of the general community. Potential roles for community and parents are described below.

The Community

As exemplified in the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative and the Portland Investment, various community organizations have become actively involved in addressing the needs of disadvantaged children. Every urban area has a unique configuration of community organizations which play more and less dominant roles, depending on the cultural and economic environment of the city. Some are local groups serving particular ethnic/racial populations, such as the Urban Appalachian Council in Cincinnati and the National Puerto Rican Forum in Hartford. Well-known organizations (e.g., the United Way in Portland and the Junior League in Minneapolis) have become involved. Community colleges, which must teach local high school graduates who often have few skills, are active participants. Local churches that work with children out of school hours recognize the benefits of collaborative planning and of sharing information about children's needs. In some places, youth-serving agencies have developed strong after-school and extracurricular programs which can contribute to collaborative efforts. Health agencies and hospitals have played significant roles in other cities and are increasingly important to the provision of school-based health services to teenagers.

NAB suggests that a high level of interest from educators, business leaders, and government officials is necessary if lasting solutions to a community's problems are to be found (1989$_a$). Public figures, such as a city council member in Cincinnati and a state commissioner in Columbia, South Carolina, have played critical roles in the Ford Urban Dropout Prevention Collaboratives. Other service agencies in large cities (e.g., human resources, justice, mental health, and transportation) have key roles to play in collaborative initiatives.

It is absolutely essential that superintendents actively seek to join forces with parents, social service agencies, the corporate community, and civic/political leaders so that our collaborative energies and efforts will be directed toward a common goal—the preservation and continuation of our democratic society.

Leonard M. Britton

National organizations with local affiliates, such as the National Urban League (see page 20), have also started programs designed to increase collaboration among communities and school systems. Many of these focus on raising the educational achievement of minority students, thereby decreasing school dropout rates.

Comprehensive collaboratives may include many or all of these types of organizations. The essential criterion for participating is a recognition of the diverse and urgent needs of disadvantaged children and the desire to provide comprehensive services as a partner with other organizations in the community.

Parents

Parents are almost always the least represented constituency on partnerships, task forces, and commissions that focus on the needs of children. Although there are legitimate reasons for this—the irregular work schedules of poorer families, the sense of inefficacy felt by poor and minority parents, and the large number of single-parent families—few formally organized groups aggressively pursue parent participation in their efforts. In too many instances, the professionals representing school systems, community organizations, business, and civic groups are themselves parents who are well-educated and middle class, and whose children are enrolled in private schools. The voices of parents whose children are being served are often unheard and unheeded.

We have learned that one of the hardest parts of our collaborative effort is bringing parents in, but we also feel that until we do that, we are not going to reach the level of success we want. We are now looking at how we are going to do that... We may train parents to be effective members of the collaborative; by doing so, we are really training people to create a power base in the community, and that can have a positive impact on the schools... What we're really going for is what I would call the grass roots parents who are the types who don't normally go to established functions, but who somehow need to be involved.

Lee Etta Powell

The National Urban League's Education Initiative

The National Urban League launched its Education Initiative in 1986, by calling for its 113 local affiliates to develop community-based education activities aimed at improving academic achievement among African-American students.

Participating affiliates provide direct services and work collaboratively with other community agencies to meet student needs. Affiliates have mobilized their communities through "Speak Out" forums and conferences, advocating changes in practices and policies (e.g., tracking), providing academic assistance to students, and sponsoring parent support services (e.g., parenting skills).

As of 1988, 107 affiliates were involved in education-related activities, ranging from helping parents enhance their children's learning at home, to analyzing public school policies on pupil placement in special education. Eighty affiliates have signed formal collaborative agreements with their school districts.

The Education Initiative has shown signs of success. Urban League staff involved in the project have reported that (1) school systems are viewing them as a partner in the education process; (2) lines of communication are more open between Urban League staff, school counselors, and teachers; (3) they are collaborating with superintendents and co-developing programs which address minority education needs; and (4) parental involvement has become a priority for their school districts.

Six Education Initiative districts are participating in a joint Urban League/Educational Testing Service project to investigate how tracking and grouping affect student placement in middle-grades mathematics classes, and how this affects disadvantaged students' educational experiences and opportunities. Funded by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, a final report of the project—which used interviews and surveys to study tracking policies, math teachers and classes, classroom interactions, and students' and parents' perceptions—was released in early 1991.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Among the 21 Ford Foundation Urban Dropout Prevention Collaboratives, only Atlanta has a vocal parent representative who has been a major player in the collaborative's decisionmaking. However, other collaboratives have had important and successful parent-involvement *programs* designed to 1) increase parents' knowledge and understanding about educational policies and practices; 2) improve parenting skills and the ability to use available health and social services resources; and 3) provide training in computer literacy, tutoring, and other instructional strategies, so that they can assist their own children's education. This movement toward empowering parents is a logical objective in the pursuit of their clear and active participation in collaborative decisionmaking. For example:

- The Albuquerque Business/Education Compact has offered parents computer literacy classes to help them understand computer-assisted instructional techniques being used in their children's classrooms.
- Newsletters and community rallies in Cincinnati are designed to inform parents about collaborative activities.
- A parent leadership task force in Tucson helps the schools retrieve student dropouts.
- The Memphis collaborative assigned school social workers to assist families of at-risk students in securing health, financial, and social services.

> ***You might want a collaborative effort to make parent participation in school a priority consideration with measurable goals and outcomes, but I think that the consideration about how parents can become effective collaborators is a separate and somewhat more focused consideration.***
>
> Edward Dooley

Characteristics of Successful Collaboratives

Although few school/community partnerships have been formally evaluated—and this is a major shortcoming— enough is known from documentation of their implementation and products to indicate that both concept and practice are maturing. Clearly, one-on-one institutional partnerships are here to stay. Less is known about the ultimate effectiveness and longevity of more complicated cooperative agreements and comprehensive collaboratives.

The need for multi-agency, multi-service collaborations, however, has been well documented. Likewise, a variety of groups including academics, education-related nonprofits, and national associations, has attempted to document and identify characteristics of successful collaborations with school systems. Criteria for identifying successful collaboration generally include such factors as length of time in operation, range and diversity of membership, visibility of collaborative activities, evidence of benefits to students, and products.

The results of documentation of successful collaboratives are summarized later in this section (see pages 24–26). The summaries were compiled by researchers at major universities, research and evaluation firms, and corporations. Individually, they tend to reflect the perspectives of their organizations. Collectively, they offer a rich resource both for designing and evaluating school-community collaborations.

The primary elements of success found consistently across these lists are the following:

- A shared vision, written goals, and objectives.
- A commitment of top-level institutional support and visibility.
- A willingness to cross traditional institutional boundaries.
- A willingness to be flexible, to subordinate traditional roles, and to adopt new ones.

In addition, successful collaboration requires a formal organizational structure, long-term commitment, and diverse membership.

Districts interested in establishing comprehensive collaboratives might consider these elements to constitute a basic framework with which to begin. If observers of collaboration are correct, superintendents and partners can approach their tasks confident that they are on the right track.

Characteristics of Viable School-Community Collaboratives

1. Visible, facilitating leadership from the superintendent.
2. A collaborative chairperson who is a recognized community leader.
3. Representation of diverse community groups.
4. Over time, "new blood" in collaborative membership to offset volunteer burn-out.
5. A half-time to full-time coordinator whose key responsibilities relate to the collaborative.
6. "Can-do," non-bureaucratic attitude among staff, whether inside or outside of school district.
7. Mutually agreed-upon goals and objectives.
8. Periodic needs assessments for development and modification of collaborative objectives.
9. Realistic planning period and regular review of plans so that all needs are addressed.
10. A clear sense of gaps in services and what is needed to enhance the work of representative agencies.
11. Evenly distributed tasks/assignments among all member organizations.
12. Flexibility, receptivity, and willingness to change traditional roles.

—Terry Clark
Education Resources Group

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Ingredients of Partnerships

1. An ongoing structure with a small staff
2. Visible leadership commitment
3. A broad, shared vision of purpose
4. Agreed-upon plan of action
5. Written goals, objectives, timetables, and performance evaluation measures
6. Long-term organizational commitment

—National Alliance of Business,
A Blueprint for Business on Restructuring Education)

Lessons for Partnerships

1. Partnerships must be institutionalized with an organizational structure for the school system and participating partners, so that when people change, the organization does not.
2. Partnerships must have mechanisms—written agreements with evaluations—for accountability.
3. Partnerships must be capable of undergoing an evolutionary process that adapts to changing needs and opportunities.

—TRW Space and Defense Corporation,
Partnerships in Education Journal , 3 (12)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Standards for Collaboratives

1. Focus on the needs of families and children so that children have the best start in school.
2. Provide services to the child as an individual and family member. Involve parents.
3. Provide early and ongoing assessment.
4. Make a commitment to the goal of individual self-sufficiency.
5. Actively work to overcome racial bias and other forms of discrimination as barriers to opportunities to enhance self-sufficiency.
6. Work toward a comprehensive, coordinated system—both remedial (for youth with barriers to employment) and preventive (to keep barriers from forming in the first place).
7. Provide three key program components: basic skills, support services, and employment training.
8. Make improvements in programs and systems: eliminate needless duplication and reduce fragmentation among existing services.
9. Involve the business sector as a partner at all levels to orient programs toward the outcome of successful, long-term employment.
10. Have measurable short-term and long-term outcomes.

—Matthew Prophet, Superintendent
Portland Public Schools

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Do's and Don'ts

Based on their experiences, members of the Urban Superintendents' Network provided advice on the "do's and don'ts" of partnerships and collaboration. The following two recommendations were made consistently.

1. **Do keep lines of communication open by disseminating information honestly and regularly to all partnership members.**
2. **Do operate with the strong support and involvement of all partners from the outset.**

> ***There is a reality factor: the requirement of a significant amount of the superintendent's time and energy. There are also turf issues, but in many communities partnership members know how to interplay carefully, not in competition, so that the whole system fits together. It is structured in such a way that people don't get their feelings bruised.***
>
> Laval Wilson

Other frequent recommendations, which also exemplify the characteristics of successful collaboration:

- Secure top-level commitment/leadership from all partners.
- Seek diverse membership in the collaborative.
- Include a representative from the school board.
- Establish an independent governance/operating mechanism.
- Have a small staff manage the collaborative and implement its activities.
- Develop a broad, optimistic vision of change.
- Write measurable goals and objectives.
- Allow sufficient planning time.
- Practice shared decisionmaking.
- Celebrate small victories!

ERIC

The overriding "don't" for collaboration:

Don't be impatient! Change takes time!

Other "don't" recommendations made by responding districts:

- Don't allow overrepresentation or control by any one partner, including the school system.
- Don't allow the collaborative to be a rubberstamp body or a forum for public relations, politics, or personal gain.
- Don't make decisions without involving all collaborative members.
- Don't lose sight of the collaborative's goals.
- Don't get locked into formal agreements which inhibit flexibility.
- Don't forget to evaluate progress frequently.

This last point—to evaluate progress—is key to understanding whether and how a collaboration is working. It is critical at the outset to plan mechanisms for measuring the process of collaboration and its effects on students. Several school systems have sophisticated research and evaluation departments whose staffs can assist in developing evaluation mechanisms, but some collaboratives may have to rely on their own resources. Basic guidelines for doing so are included in Part 5.

> ***Programs that have been successful for children-at-risk had to cross disciplinary, professional, and bureaucratic boundaries. There were no quick fixes, no single ingredient to make them work, no shortcuts.***
>
> Lisbeth Schorr

Phases of Collaborative Development

1. The need for collaboration is commonly agreed upon by community leaders in response to urgency of community problems.
2. Commitment and involvement by community leaders become visible and public awareness of collaborative effort develops.
3. Collaborative participants begin to address long-range, systemic problems and resolutions, and identify barriers to further collaboration.
4. Collaborative participants sacrifice turf, power, resources, personal priorities, and traditions to overcome barriers to collaboration.
5. Long-range commitment from leadership is assured, and an organized decisionmaking/planning structure is established.

—Institute for Educational Leadership,
Metrolink Report

Principles of Collaborative Bridging

1. Top-level institutional support and cooperation are essential.
2. Collaboration depends on a "community of believers," in which enthusiasm, flexibility, and a shared language help break down traditional institutional barriers.
3. Collaboration requires a hard-nosed assessment of resources, time to do a good job, and realistic expectations.
4. Each collaborating organization must know what the rewards are.
5. Collaboration depends on effective delivery and reception systems for services.

—Wynn De Bevoise, University of Louisville,
Educational Leadership, 43 (5)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Measuring Success

John W. Porter, former General Superintendent of Schools in Detroit, has cautioned that " we have no means by which we can assess whether or not such collaboratives and activities... really have any impact upon the goals. [We need] a reporting mechanism annually or biannually as to whether or not the strategies are making any difference" (1990).

Collaborative leaders *can* establish straightforward record-keeping and tracking systems to help measure progress and outcomes. Such systems might include records for each student participant in a dropout prevention program (e.g., hours of participation, entry and exit dates, school attendance, grades, test scores, and courses completed). Analysis of these data after a certain time period—a semester or a school year, for example—can range from simple tallies to sophisticated measures of change in attendance or achievement. The variables included in the tracking system would depend on the specific goals and objectives of the program which, of course, should be measurable. For each goal and objective, the question should be asked: How can we show that we did this? If the evidence can be observed or described, it is measurable.

For example, accomplishment of an objective to set up an information hotline for a targeted client group can be proved by the tangible product (e.g., phone or computer systems, information, paid or volunteer staff to operate it). Use of the hotline is another performance indicator; records can be kept on the numbers of requests, types of information desired, and responses. A more sophisticated performance indicator would be the results of a survey of hotline users which asks if they received the information they sought and if they were able to use it.

Another collaborative objective might be to conduct an inventory of available services around the community and identify gaps in needed services. One indicator might be the survey instrument that was distributed or used in a telephone interview. Another might be the results of the survey or the documentation of a meeting during which gaps in services are discussed.

Useful as these performance indicators are, however, none provides information about the quality or effectiveness of an activity; formal evaluation does that. Indicators *do* shed valuable light on progress, task completion, credibility, and accountability. They also provide the substance for reflective discussion among collaborative members about next steps, continuing needs, and future direction.

Record-keeping and tracking systems also are invaluable to an impact evaluation, should one be commissioned. They enable the evaluator to review data and document files about each of the collaborative's goals and objectives. Further, they provide a collaborative history, indicators of performance, and baseline information against which to compare future data.

Developing Performance Indicators

Collaborative leaders should keep in mind that even the broadest goals can be broken down into measurable components. An example is a dissection of the superintendents' collaborative mission statement: **The mission of a comprehensive collaborative is to create a dynamic force to provide coordinated, quality programs and services to children and families, which enable students to function more successfully in school and society.** In this statement, "coordinated, quality programs and services" are the interventions expected to influence outcomes. One desired outcome is that high school graduates be competent to enter the workforce or postsecondary education, with the capacity to participate effectively in the community. In order to evaluate the success of quality programs and services, one must define the expected outcomes. What is meant by "competence"? What is meant by "participate effectively?"

Competence might be defined in a variety of ways. For example, employers who use a job-application test may consider an increase in the percentage who pass to be an indicator that more graduates are competent to enter the workforce. Keeping records on pass rates would be easy if collaborative members made appropriate arrangements, and particularly easy if key local employers are members. Competence to enter college could be measured through traditional means (e.g., scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test or grades in higher level high school courses) or through measures which are becoming more popular (e.g., portfolio assessments, whereby students collect documents and work products indicating their performance and accomplishments).

Another desired outcome—to ensure the capacity of graduates to participate effectively in the community—also requires an operational definition. What are the standards by which society defines a well-functioning, participating individual? These standards may include the ability to keep a job, to pay bills on time, to understand current national events, to vote regularly, to own and maintain a car or a house, to be a member of a church or community organization, or other such appropriate indicators. The task is to decide which of them will be used to measure a particular goal and to maintain records and track performance on them.

Identifying Outcomes

Each collaborative will have its unique goal statements and program objectives which, in the end, must be measurable. Collaborative members must agree on what constitutes progress and reasonable evidence of success, whatever program they are implementing or sponsoring. They must recognize uncontrollable factors—independent of the collaborative—which may affect its outcome. They also need to distinguish between program processes and program outcomes.

Experts on school-business partnerships recently delineated the program processes and program outcomes measured by some two dozen partnership programs around the country, including the Portland Investment (see Otterbourg and Adams, 1989). Research has more typically been done on process (e.g., collaborative implementation, politics, and decisionmaking) than on outcomes. The number of program processes measured ranged from 4 to 10; common to most were number, kind, place, and frequency of activities. Keeping records on these is necessary if a collaborative wants to show that the program has actually been implemented.

Members may want to commission a formative evaluation or documentation of processes.

The number of program outcomes identified by Otterbourg and Adams ranged from 2 to 17. The following are random examples of selected outcomes—by program title, partner, and place—of programs that happen to be in Network districts.

- **Youth Education Program/The Travelers** (Hartford)
  Selected Outcomes: improved basic skills; improved job/occupational skills; improved school attendance; increased choice of more advanced courses; improved school morale; increased population in post-high school academic and vocational programs.
- **The Power Hour of Homework/Amoco** (Chicago)
  Selected Outcomes: improved attitudes toward school, education, and homework; improved behavior and amount and quality of time spent doing homework; increased level of awareness of the Power Hour Campaign.
- **Partners Recognition Program/Burger King** (Dade County)
  Selected Outcomes: improved school attendance, academic achievement, student behavior, and student motivation and attitudes toward school; improved school climate/environment.
- **Partnership Program/School System** (Los Angeles)
  Selected Outcomes: reduced tardiness, class cutting, vandalism, and use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs; increased participation in school and community; improved nutritional and safety habits; increased attendance at voluntary programs aimed at wellness, safety, and career awareness.

These examples provide an array of outcomes that collaboratives might want to identify and measure. The possibilities for developing others are limited only by the nature of the collaborative and its stated goals and objectives. Addressing the need for outcome measures—based on program goals and objectives—and identifying them from the beginning are two essential steps in preparing for program evaluation.

Full-scale program evaluation is typically more complex than the strategies recommended for collaboratives seeking to provide evidence of such things as implementation, progress, client participation, and service delivery. Yet the basic tasks of tracking and record keeping, setting performance indicators, and identifying measurable outcomes provide the framework for full-scale evaluation. Any experienced evaluator asked to conduct an impact study will request such data.

Lessons of Successful Programs for Disadvantaged Children

1. Successful programs see the child in the context of the family and the family in the context of its surroundings.
2. Successful programs typically offer a broad spectrum of services that are coherent and easy to use.
3. Successful programs recognize that they cannot respond to untidy basketfuls of needs without regularly crossing traditional professional and bureaucratic boundaries.
4. Successful programs are fundamentally flexible; they find ways to adapt or circumvent traditional professional and bureaucratic limitations, when necessary, to meet the needs of those they serve.

—Lisbeth Schorr
Within Our Reach

Lessons Learned From Collaboration

1. Collaboration works when all institutions proceed on the basis of enlightened self-interest.
2. Collaboration requires the direct and continued involvement of the chief executive officer of each institution.
3. Collaboration is most effective when all the institutions work toward a common set of clear and measurable goals.
4. Collaboration works best in a generative environment conducive to innovation.
5. Collaboration is most effective when the needed resources come from the total institution and not just one division.
6. Collaboration requires diverse community organizations, public and private, joining together and accepting ownership of the problem.

—Mocker, Martin, and Brown
Urban Education, 23 (1)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Part 6

Shaping Collaboratives for the Future

The superintendents have identified the focal points around which comprehensive collaboratives might be built. They believe that

- A collaborative should focus on the needs of children at risk, especially those living in poverty; and
- The collaborative commitment should be to enhance educational opportunities for these children.

These focal points suggest the bases for decisions about the role and function of a collaborative and the development of a program agenda. They can also be used to identify the organizations which might be seriously interested in joining the collaborative.

> ***It's a new game financially and politically in cities. . . We need commitment by the political infrastructure of cities to put pressure on city agencies to coordinate. The mayor has a budget control and should put leverage on human services and the welfare system.***
>
> Michael Usdan

Implementation Issues

Within the process of initiating collaboration, the superintendents foresee a series of implementation issues which must be addressed. These issues cluster around structure, participation, and coordination.

Structure

- Exploring alternative structures;
- Institutionalizing the collaboration;
- Funding the management function.

Participation

- Ensuring that participation includes the community's diverse ethnic and cultural elements;
- Soliciting top CEO support and leadership from each sector of the community, for both the short-term and the long-term;
- Involving the media in eliciting broad community support;
- Working out turf issues that may inhibit smooth functioning.

Coordination

- Ensuring that responsibilities are clearly delineated and supported by all partners;
- Sharing leadership among collaborative partners;
- Articulating both the school's and the community's objectives;
- Articulating clearly and responding to students' needs;
- Building trust, flexibility, and open communication among partners;
- Designing methods for measuring school performance and student outcomes.

Implementation Strategies

In *Building Coalitions for Support of Schools* (Hart, 1988), the Oregon School Study Council recommends the following set of strategies designed to result in a functioning community collaborative.

1. *A first step—and a common element in the formation process—is for one group to identify an issue and contact other groups with an interest in it.*

This is traditionally referred to as needs or problem identification. It starts with recognition of a need—in this case, for better education of at-risk children—and the joining of like-minded persons to begin discussing how to address the need. Once it is clear that a variety of groups must play a role in solving the problem, the need for collaboration becomes more apparent.

> ***It is becoming increasingly clear to many education administrators that coalitions will develop even if school districts do not encourage their formation. If coalitions are to make significant contributions to the cause of education, the districts must lead the way.***
>
> Oregon School Study Council

In Portland, for example, a successful collaborative pilot project for employment and education of low-income youth led the partners (the school system and the Business Youth Exchange) to invite the mayor and a county commissioner to meet with them "to determine whether or not they could articulate common goals." This group formed The Leaders Roundtable and invited other key players in the community to join.

2. *A second step is to identify and recruit the people or community sectors who can participate in the collaborative.*

This step can occur in a variety of ways. Lists can be developed of categories of potential members (e.g., businesses and civic groups); an inventory can be made of services and service providers; and key interest groups (e.g., parents, large property owners, utility companies, financial institutions) can be identified.

Since participants will be motivated by self-interest and potential rewards, a strategy for attracting key people must be devised and marketed. Even such groups as social service agencies, whose role in a collaborative of this type seems obvious, need incentives and promises of outcomes to get involved. The Rand study of successful education innovations (1989), shows that several of the superintendents initiated processes of "public consultation" through speeches and by organizing interest groups, setting up meetings of key business people, and sampling public opinion. In doing so, they created a public mandate for education and attracted interested community leaders to the table.

3. *A third step is to adopt a formal structure and put together a governing board that will be able to establish operating procedures and generate funds.*

Experience indicates that in the formative phase, the structure of a new coalition tends to be determined more by its reasons for existing than by what it hopes to accomplish. "Most partnerships are formed initially to address a specific need, such as providing job experiences for high school students. Through diligent planning, the partnerships can develop into a broad, flexible collaborative structure for pooling resources to meet a variety of needs" (Zacchei and Mirman, 1986, p. 5). The formal structure is important to ensure the continuation of the collaborative even when key personalities depart.

For example, the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative's executive director serves at the discretion of the collaborative's co-chairs. When one of the chairpersons left, his replacement represented the same office. Likewise, the first executive director stepped down in 1990, but her position was filled before she left. In other words, the personality left, but the structure provided for a continuing role.

4. *A fourth step is to form committees to oversee the collaborative's planned activities once the organization and governing board are established.*

Committees could have a variety of tasks, such as establishing by-laws, conducting needs assessments, developing goals and objectives, exploring options for raising funds, or planning public information activities.

The Portland Leaders Roundtable, for example, formed several work groups—focusing on different age cohorts—which developed information on best practices, identified gaps in services, and formulated a model pilot project for each work group.

The Cincinnati Youth Collaborative's governing board established a development committee which solicited over $6.9 million in pledges from businesses and foundations during its first 3 years. These funds support ongoing collaborative activities.

The Urban School-Community Dropout Prevention Collaboratives (Ford Foundation) during their planning year, typically had subcommittees focusing on such tasks as assessing needs, clarifying and analyzing dropout data, developing a plan for implementation, and exploring strategies for raising the public conscience about the problems of at-risk youth. The committees changed when the collaboratives began the implementation phase, but the committee structure remained. Therefore, although tasks may be fluid, the committees provide a framework for continuity.

A Collaborative Model

Shirley Hord developed a model of collaboration based on her synthesis of literature on organizational collaboration (1986). The model provides a useful process for building a collaborative (see Exhibit 2, page 37). It clarifies issues of startup, communications, resources, characteristics, and leadership/control and provides a tool for analyzing them.

The following five rewards that Hord suggests accrue to participating organizations could easily serve as a rationale for comprehensive collaboratives.

1) Member organizations are able to share in a product/ service that would not have happened otherwise, because no one member could have carried responsibility alone.
2) The product/ service developed through this shared effort may lead to a permanent relationship, opening the way for further sharing and mutual benefits.
3) The public may gain greater benefit from the shared effort than from the efforts of separate organizations.
4) Each organization can experience an expansion of possibilities without having to "spread thin."
5) Duplication of services may be eliminated while the quality of service is improved.

One senses that the 1990s will show an increased amount of collaboration among schools, school districts, businesses, states, and agencies that serve children at each of these levels. One reason for this increase will be better information on the people who are actually served by social programs and how, in a time of limited funding, services can be teamed up to provide better delivery at the lowest cost.

Harold L. Hodgkinson

42

Exhibit 2. A Model of Collaboration

Beginning Process:

- Organizations agree on an exchange of tasks, each offering the others a product or services.
- Organizations join forces to plan and execute the design of a shared project.
- Organizations agree on projected results, outcomes, products, and services.
- Shared goals are arrived at and an action plan outlined.

Communication:

- Communication roles are established and channels created for interaction across organizations about the shared project.
- Many levels of communication are established, as communication is the keystone of success in the effort.

Resources/ Ownership:

- Organizations contribute staff time, resources, and capabilities.
- Mutual funding is obtained.
- A sense of ownership develops.

Requirements:

- Organizations expend time and energy.
- Members take action and risks.
- Compromise is a necessity; various trade-offs are arranged.
- Expertise of different kinds is contributed by each group.

Leadership:

- Dispersed leadership is characteristic.
- Responsibility is delegated; individuals must be willing to use independent judgment about assuming responsibility.
- Shared, mutual control is ideal; shared goals provide congruity to the effort.

—Shirley Hord, University of Texas
Educational Leadership, 43 (5)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Joining Forces

Forecasting education trends in the 1990s, Portland (Oregon) Superintendent Matthew Prophet told *Education Week*:

> I see the continuation of an oscillating phenomenon as various groups reassert themselves to gain control of education. . . What I don't see is any true synthesis that brings together all the actors—the state bodies and local boards, business people, and communities—to be involved at the same time. . . We need to stop this nonsense of political posturing and work together to collectively develop objectives (January 10, 1990).

This is beginning to happen.

- The Joining Forces project, housed at the Council of the Chief State School Officers and governed jointly by the Council and the American Public Welfare Association, encourages schools to form linkages with social welfare agencies at the local and state levels, on behalf of children and families at risk (Levy, 1989).
- The National Governors' Association in its report, *Bringing Down the Barriers* (1987), recommends coordination of schools, parents, the business sector, and a network of public and private agencies in seeking solutions to the dropout and teen pregnancy problems.
- The state of Connecticut passed legislation in 1988 to fund "Schools for the 21st Century," in which schools are used for teaching *and* "as centers for day care and other social services designed to bolster family life" (Fiske, 1990).
- The National Alliance of Business includes "linking education and social services" through a case management approach in its list of school restructuring components (1989b).
- The National Association of State Boards of Education calls for schools to work cooperatively with social-welfare, health, and youth-serving agencies to meet the needs of at-risk children (1989).
- The Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–297) calls for programs of "intensive, comprehensive, integrated, and continuous supportive services for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers from low-income families to enhance their intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development and provide support to their parents and other family members" (*Federal Register*, 1988).
- The Family Support Act of 1988 "offers new opportunities for education and human services. . . to plan and work together so that the full range of an individual's needs can be met without any single institution having to take a broader role than is appropriate or feasible" (W.T. Grant Foundation, 1988, p.13).

The Urban Superintendents' Network shares a vision that integrated services provided through interagency collaboration will be a critical force in the coming century. The superintendents urge colleagues in the nation's cities to explore the possibilities, to broaden their perspectives, and to lower the bureaucratic barriers which inhibit children from realizing their full competency.

References

"A Look Ahead: Education and the New Decade." (1990, January 10). *Education Week*, pp. 29–32.

Almo, Charles. (1988). Former Interim Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools. Comments at Urban Superintendents' Network Collaborative Efforts Action Group meeting.*

Bennis, Warren. (1968). *The Temporary Society*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Bins, Milton. (1988). Council of the Great City Schools. Comments at Action Group meeting.*

"Bridging the Gap: Business and Education Working Together." (1989, November). *Partnerships in Education Journal, (Special Issue)*. 3(12).

Britton, Leonard. (1990). Former Superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District. Written communication to Collaborative Efforts Action Group.

Clark, Terry A. (1988). Education Resources Group. Comments based on Carnegie Corporation-funded documentation of the Urban School-Community Dropout Prevention Collaboratives Program, made at Action Group meeting.*

Cohen, Deborah L. (1989, March 16). "Joining Forces, An Alliance of Sectors Envisioned to Aid the Most Troubled Young" (and related articles). *Education Week*, pp. 7–16.

Committee for Economic Development. (1985). *Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Crim, Alonzo. (1987). Former Superintendent, Atlanta Public Schools. Comments made at an Urban Superintendents' Network Meeting.

David, Jane, consultant. (1990, January 15). Telephone conversation.

DeBevoise, Wynn. (1986, February). Article among several on collaboration published in *Educational Leadership. 43(5).*

Deutsch, Cynthia. (1989, August 6). "Corporate Takeovers." *The New York Times, (Section 4A).*

Dooley, Edward. (1990). Executive Director, Boston Compact. Comments at Action Group meeting.*

Dooley, Edward. (1990, June 13). Letter to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Education Resources Group. (1990). Analysis of parent involvement in Urban Dropout Prevention Collaboratives Program by Sandra Ham, research associate.

Evans, Thomas. (1989, November). "Partnerships - Vehicles for Reform." *Partnerships in Education Journal (Special Issue)*. 3(12), p. 4.

Farrar, Eleanor. (1988). *The Boston Compact: A Teaching Case*. New Jersey: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University.

---

*The Urban Superintendents' Network Collaborative Efforts Action Group met in July 1988, October 1989, and February 1990 in Washington, D.C.

Federal Register. (1988, December 29). "Request for Applications for the Comprehensive Child Development Program."

Fernandez, Joseph. (1989). Chancellor, New York City Public Schools. Quoted in National Alliance of Business, 1989b.

Fiske, Edward B. (1990, January 17). "Starting With a Center for Child Care, A School Welcomes Social Services for Families." *The New York Times*, p. 38.

Hart, Thomas E. (1988, September). *Building Coalitions for Support of Schools*. Oregon School Study Council, 32(1).

Harris, Jerome. (1989). Former Superintendent, Atlanta Public Schools. Comments at Action Group meeting.*

Hill, Paul, Wise, A. and Shapiro, L. (1989). *Educational Progress: Cities Mobilize to Improve Their Schools*. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. (1989). *The Same Client: The Demographics of Education and Service Delivery Systems*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hord, Shirley M. (1986). "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration." *Educational Leadership*, 43(5), 22-26.

Institute for Educational Leadership. (1986). *METROLINK Developing Human Resources through Metropolitan Collaboration*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Kendrick, William. (1988). Superintendent, Seattle Public Schools. Comments at Action Group meeting.*

Levine, Marsha and Trachtman, Roberta (Eds.). (1988). *American Business and the Public School: Case Studies of Corporate Involvement in Public Education*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Levy, Janet E. (1989). *Joining Forces: A Report from the First Year*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Mocker, D., Martin, D., and Brown, N. (1988, April). "Lessons Learned from Collaboration." *Urban Education, 23(1)*, 42–50.

National Alliance of Business. (1989a). *The Compact Project: School-Business Partnerships for Improving Education*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Alliance of Business (1989b). *A Blueprint for Business on Restructuring Education*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1989). "Today's Children, Tomorrow's Survival: A Call to Restructure Schools." Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1989). *Education Partnerships in Elementary and Secondary Schools*. (Survey Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Governors' Association. (1987). *Bringing Down the Barriers*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Urban League. (1989, August 5). "Report to the Delegate Assembly." Washington, D.C.: Author.

Olson, Lynn. (1988, March 16). "Business Group Assesses Effects of School Partnerships." *Education Week*, p. 8.

Oregon School Study Council (1988, September). *Building Coalitions for Support of Schools*. Portland, Oregon: Author.

Otterbourg, Susan and Adams, Don. (1989). *Partnerships in Education: Measuring Their Success*. Largo, Florida: InfoMedia, Inc.

Porter, J.W. (1990, June 18). Letter to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Powell, Lee Etta. (1990). Former Superintendent, Cincinnati Public Schools. Comments at Action Group meeting.*

Prophet, Matthew and McNamera, Frank. (1989, August 29). "Essentials of Collaborative Efforts Schematic Presentation." Portland, Oregon: Portland Leaders Roundtable/Portland Investment.

Public/Private Ventures. (1987). *Allies in Education: Schools and Businesses Working Together for At-Risk Youth*. (Summary and Conclusions). Philadelphia: Author.

Schorr, Lisbeth B. (1988). *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage*. New York: Doubleday Press.

Smith, Nelson. (1990). Former Director, Programs for the Improvement of Practice, U.S. Department of Education. Comments at Action Group meeting.*

TRW Space and Defense Corporation. (1989). "TRW Formulates Proactive Approach to Partnerships." *Partnerships in Education Journal (Special Issue)*, 3(12), p.11.

Usdan, Michael. (1988). President, The Institute for Educational Leadership. Comments at Action Group meeting.*

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1987). *Dealing with Dropouts: The Urban Superintendent's Call to Action*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wallace, Richard. (1989). Comments at Action Group meeting.*

Wilson, Laval. (1988). Former Superintendent, Boston Public Schools. Comments at Action Group meeting.*

W.T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship (1988). *New Partnerships: Education's Stake in the Family Support Act of 1988*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Zacchei and Mirman. (1986). *Business/Education Partnerships: Strategies for School Improvement*. Andover, MA: Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Appendix

Selected School-Community Partnerships

Albuquerque

Program: **Albuquerque Business/Education Compact** (1986)

Description: Collaborative of business leaders, the city, and educational institutions, focusing on improving educational success of at-risk students, primarily through mentoring.

Management Committee chaired by local businessman. Staff housed at PIC; loaned executive from school system.

Partners: Albuquerque Public Schools
City of Albuquerque Private Industry Council
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque Technical Vocational Institute
Local businesses

Focus: All public school students

Contact: Albuquerque Business/Education Compact
1701 Fourth Street, SW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 768–6050

Atlanta

Program: **Partnership of Business and Education, Inc.** (1981)

Description: Nonprofit organization facilitates communication and coordination among Atlanta's public schools, businesses, and government agencies. Primary focus on adopt-a-school programs. Partnership committee chaired by the president of local business. Executive committee includes school superintendent, president of Chamber of Commerce, president of Georgia State University, and the Partnership's executive director. Housed at the Chamber; executive director's salary paid by school system. Business/foundations supplement dollars and support staff.

Partners: Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta City Council
Atlanta Chamber of Commerce
Georgia State University

Focus: All public school students

Contact: Partnership of Business and Education, Inc.
235 International Boulevard, P.O. Box 1740
Atlanta, GA 30301
(404) 586–8519

Atlanta (continued)

Program: **Dropout Prevention Collaborative** (1986)

Description: Community representatives and the Atlanta Public Schools address Atlanta's dropout problem. Collaborative activities include truant 'pick-up' program, public awareness campaign on dropouts, policy development on student employment, and placement of at-risk specialists in 14 middle schools.

Executive committee is chaired by an employee of the Georgia State Department of Education and vice-chaired by a local business person. Director of school system's Office of Dropout Prevention and Recovery administers dropout prevention plan.

Partners: Atlanta Public Schools
Government offices
Service/advocacy groups
Community service agencies
Area businesses/universities
Educational organizations

Focus: Students in all secondary and eight elementary schools

Contact: Atlanta Public Schools
Office of Dropout Prevention and Recovery
210 Pryor Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30335
(404) 827–8096

Baltimore

Program: **The Baltimore Commonwealth** (1985)

Description: Program offers an academic curriculum integrated with employment training and a college-bound component. School system designs curriculum, Greater Baltimore Committee offers job opportunities, BUILD organizes parent meetings.

Partners: Baltimore Public Schools
Baltimoreans United in Leadership (BUILD)
Greater Baltimore Committee

Focus: Middle and high school students

Contact: The Baltimore Commonwealth
101 West 24th Street—Suite 300
Baltimore, MD 21218
(410) 396–5627

Boston

Program: **The Boston Compact** (1983)

Description: Boston's schools, businesses, and universities pledge partnership support. Formal agreements spell out school and systemwide performance measures in return for increased student opportunities in careers, higher education, and apprenticeships.

Steering committee composed of mayor, superintendent, PIC chairman, chair for Higher Education Partnership and secretary for the Greater Boston Labor Council.

Partners:
Boston Public Schools
Higher Education Partnerships
Private Industry Council
Greater Boston Labor Council

Focus: High school students, graduates for 4 years

Contact:
Boston Public Schools—Office of the Superintendent
26 Court Street
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 726–6200, ext. 5313

Buffalo

Program: **The Governor's School and Business Alliance** (1987)

Description: SABA (School and Business Alliance) involves the state, public schools, and the private sector. Goals are to improve high school graduation rates and student employability, through adopt-a-school, mentoring, job development, critical thinking skills, and a Business and Guidance Counselor Partnership Program.

The Alliance Development Council and SABA Central (state office) make policy decisions, guide Buffalo SABA director, and initiate partnership activities. Businesses provide facilities, mentors, partial funding, internship programs, and serve as adopt-a-school sponsors for students.

Partners:
Area businesses
Buffalo Public Schools
Community agencies
Millard Fillmore Hospital
Higher education institutions

Focus: Elementary and high school students

Contact:
Buffalo Public Schools—Curriculum and Development Office
229 Floss Avenue
Buffalo, NY 14215
(716) 897–8136

Chicago

Program: **Adopt-A-School** (1981)

Description: Adopt-A-School pairs schools with businesses or other organizations in programs that enhance basic academic skills applied to business. Partnerships emphasize personal interaction.

Managed out of superintendent's office, where program director coordinates, recruits, and matches sponsors with schools. Sponsors partner schools for at least 1 year and provide staff to work directly with students.

Partners: 188 sponsors

Focus: All public school students

Contact:
Adopt-A-School
1819 West Pershing Road
5 Center North
Chicago, IL 60609
(312) 535–8346

Cincinnati

Program: **Cincinnati Youth Collaborative** (1987)

Description: Cincinnati Youth Collaborative (CYC) is led by business, education, and government. The 33-member steering committee and its subcommittees identify causes and solutions to dropout-related problems in schools, conduct pilot studies, secure funds, and mentor and tutor students.

Cincinnati School Superintendent, Proctor and Gamble's chief executive officer, and a city councilman co-chair the collaborative. An executive director, who reports to the co-chairs, coordinates collaborative activities.

Partners:
Cincinnati Public Schools
Social service organizations
Proctor and Gamble
Local businesses
The City of Cincinnati

Focus: All public school students

Contact:
Cincinnati Youth Collaborative
1700 Chiquita Center, 250 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 621–0033

Cleveland

Program: **Cleveland Scholarship in Escrow** (1987)

Description: Program provides student incentives (monetary rewards) to encourage youngsters to stay in school and achieve academically. The project is managed by the Greater Cleveland Roundtable.

Partners: Cleveland Public Schools
Greater Cleveland Roundtable

Focus: Students in grades 7–12

Contact: Cleveland Public Schools
1380 East Sixth Street, Suite 312
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 781–7430

Dade County

Program: **Partners in Education** (1986)

Description: Program targets dropout prevention and student achievement. Public schools and teacher's union provide management, technical assistance, and funding to support project activities. Wolfsen Foundation contributes matching funds for student scholarships, and Urban League provides ongoing community support. A school district staff member coordinates activities.

Partners: Dade County Public Schools
Urban League
United Teachers of Dade
Wolfsen Foundation
Miami-Dade Community College

Focus: Preschool through 12th-grade students

Contact: The United Teachers of Dade
2929 Southwest Third Avenue
Miami, FL 33129
(305) 854-0220

Program: **Satellite Learning Centers** (1987)

Description: Kindergarten classes are located at work-site of area employers for children of employees and operated by Dade County Public Schools. Participating businesses and colleges provide space, maintenance, and utilities.

Partners: Dade County Public Schools
American Bankers Insurance Group
Miami International Airport
United Teachers of Dade

Dade County (Continued)

Focus: Kindergarten students

Contact: Dade County Public Schools
Division of Professionalization
1450 Northeast Second Avenue—Room 450
Miami, FL 33132
(305) 995–1497

Detroit

Program: **The Detroit Compact** (1989)

Description: Compact assists students in acquiring academic, social, and leadership skills. Students who meet standards are guaranteed jobs and/or scholarships.

Chamber of Commerce oversees implementation of Compact activities and provides administrator. The state of Michigan, Chamber of Commerce, and public schools have pledged funds to support the program.

Partners: Detroit Public Schools
City of Detroit
Detroit Chamber of Commerce
Higher education institutions
State of Michigan

Focus: Students in four middle schools and two high schools

Contact: Detroit Public Schools—Superintendent's Office
278 Schools Center Building
5057 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, MI 48202
(313) 494–1075

* * * * *

Program: **School-Based Adolescent Health Center Collaborative** (1987)

Description: School-based health clinics offer personal and health care counseling, primary and specialized medical care, day-care classes, and pediatric care.

Partner CEOs sit on the executive committee. Department of Health is the medical provider and employer of clinic staff. The Wayne County Mental Health Board provides social workers for counseling services.

Partners: Detroit Public Schools
New Detroit Incorporated (private, nonprofit community coalition)
United Community Services (United Way Affiliate)
Detroit Association of Black Organizations
Detroit Department of Health
Wayne County Mental Health Board

Detroit (continued)

Focus: High school students in two schools

Contact: Northern High School
9026 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, MI 48202
(313) 875–1275

* * * * *

Program: **Interagency Program for Youth** (1988)

Description: Provides referral services from community agencies for students who have been expelled. Parents and students sign commitment to their prescribed services plan.

School system manages and staffs. Collaborating agencies participate in meetings, provide a contact person, report on student progress, and provide evaluation data.

Partners: Detroit Public Schools
Various Detroit neighborhood community centers

Focus: Students grades 7–12

Contact: Detroit Public Schools
2750 Selden Street
Detroit, MI 48208
(313) 494–1583

District of Columbia

Program: **Woodson School of Business and Finance Public/Private Partnership Program** (1982)

Description: College preparatory program offers an accelerated finance and business management curriculum to students interested in business careers. Business Advisory Council is the decision-making body. A program coordinator is based at the project site.

Partners: District of Columbia Public Schools
AT&T Information Systems
American Security Banks
Control Data Association
Greater Washington financial institutions

Focus: High school students in one school

Contact: H.D. Woodson Senior High School
Business and Finance Program
55th and Eads Streets, NE
Washington, DC 20019
(202) 724–4512

Kansas City, Missouri

Program: **School/Community Partnership Program** (1982)

Description: Program matches schools with community partners that provide cash, in-kind, and volunteer assistance to promote educational opportunities.

A partnership manager hired by the school district works with a volunteer advisory committee to oversee recruitment/evaluation, training, fundraising, and media/community relations.

Partners: School District of Kansas City
Nearly 200 area businesses, federal agencies, and civic organizations

Focus: All public school students

Contact: School District of Kansas City, Missouri
School/Community Partnership Office
1211 McGee Street
Kansas City, MO 64106
(816) 871–7623

Los Angeles

Program: **Los Angeles Educational Partnership** (1984)

Description: Partnership manages a public education fund which supports school/community program development and implementation. Raised over $7 million for educational initiatives in staff development, at-risk students, community involvement, technology instruction, and magnet schools.

Managed by 24 full-time staff external to the school system, a board of directors, and eight program advisory committees.

Partners: Los Angeles Unified School District
Foundations (ARCO, Rockefeller, Stuart)
Corporations (Neutrogena, TRW, Lockheed)
Local universities
Scientific organizations (National Science Foundation,
California Museum of Science and Industry)

Focus: All students

Contact: Los Angeles Educational Partnership
315 West Ninth Street, Suite 1110
Los Angeles, CA 90015
(213) 622–5237

Los Angeles (continued)

* * * * *

Program: **Workforce L.A.** (1988)

Description: Mission to build integrated resources and services for life-long employment training. Executive council is composed of executives from school system, community colleges, universities, organized labor, and government.

Focus: All students, through college

Contact: Workforce L.A.
2445 Daly Street, Room B002
Los Angeles, CA 90031
(213) 224–0567

Milwaukee

Program: **Youth Initiative** (1989)

Description: Collaborative oversees community centers offering family services in parenting classes, day care, probation services, child abuse prevention, teen pregnancy prevention, tutorial services, and job counseling.

Advisory committee is co-chaired by the director of the Department of Health and Human Services and the deputy superintendent of Milwaukee Public Schools.

Partners: Milwaukee County Department of Health and Human Services
Milwaukee Public Schools
Milwaukee Private Industry Council
Local churches

Focus: K–12 students in designated public schools

Contact: Youth Initiative Coordinating Council
2321 North Fourth Street, Room 1220
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 289–6833

* * * * *

Program: **Greater Milwaukee Education Trust** (1989)

Description: Partnership acts as a catalyst for systemic school improvement by brokering human and financial resources from all segments of the community. Board of directors composed of business, education, and community leaders. Decisionmaking is at executive committee level, which includes the school superintendent, corporate CEOs and the Trust's executive director.

Milwaukee (continued)

Focus:	All public school students
Contact:	Greater Milwaukee Education Trust 756 North Milwaukee Street Milwaukee, WI 53202 (414) 287–4145

Minneapolis

Program:	**The Minneapolis Youth Trust** (1987)
Description:	Businesses, schools, and government agencies collaborate to provide students with incentives to complete high school and prepare them to become productive workers and successful adults. Project focuses on personal and employability skill development through the Job Connection (employment arm) and Buddy System (monitoring arm) projects. A board of directors coordinates.
Partners:	Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce City of Minneapolis Minneapolis Public Schools, United Way Hennepin County Community Services
Focus:	K–12 students in Minneapolis public schools
Contact:	Minneapolis Public Schools Minneapolis Youth Trust Business Partnership Office 81 South Ninth Street, Suite 200 Minneapolis, MN 55413 (612) 627–2027

New Orleans

Program:	**New Orleans Effective Schools Project** (1989–91)
Description:	Project helps schools achieve educational excellence through adopting an Effective Schools Model of shared decisionmaking and instructional management. Initiative was started by the United Teachers of New Orleans, which provides in-kind services and funding for consultants. Participating groups provide technical assistance through staff development and in-service. The school system provides funding to support director and other expenses.
Partners:	New Orleans Public Schools United Teachers of New Orleans Urban League Universities NAACP

New Orleans (continued)

Focus: Twelve elementary and middle schools (1990-91)

Contact: New Orleans Public Schools
Division of Educational Programs
5931 Milne Boulevard
New Orleans, LA 70124
(504) 482–6425

Program: **Partnerships in Education** (1972)

Description: Community and schools improve academic performance and school environments, through student incentives, equipment donations, services, and financial support.

Metropolitan Area Committee recruits and matches program partners. The school system has a part-time coordinator.

Partners: New Orleans Public Schools
Area businesses, universities, civic groups
Metropolitan Area Committee (Citizens Action Group)

Focus: All students

Contact: Partnerships in Education
4100 Touro Street
New Orleans, LA 70122
(504) 286–2644

* * * * *

Program: **New Orleans Mathematics Collaborative** (1986)

Description: Network of mathematics educators, mathematics users in business, and community agencies enhance preparation of public school students through teacher internships, mini-grants, and workshops.

A steering committee of mathematics teachers and representatives from local businesses and universities directs the collaborative. Daily operations are handled by the Metropolitan Area Committee.

Partners: New Orleans Public Schools
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Universities (Loyola, New Orleans, and Xavier)
Consolidated National Gas
Middle South Utilities
Chevron and Shell Oil Companies

Focus: Middle and high school teachers

Contact: New Orleans Public Schools
Mathematics Instructional Specialist
5931 Milne Boulevard
New Orleans, LA 70124
(504) 483–64

ERIC

Newark

Program:	**Newark Education Council** (1987)
Description:	Broad-based collaborative examines problem areas in the school system and recommends reforms to the Board of Education. Steering committee and task forces provide financial support and in-kind services. A full-time director coordinates.
Partners:	Area businesses Education organizations Foundations Higher education institutions Mayor's office Board of Education Teachers Union
Focus:	All students in system
Contact:	Newark Education Council 494 Broad Street, Fourth Floor Newark, NJ 07102 (201) 624–7995

New York

Program:	**Join-A-School** (1983)
Description:	Corporations, government agencies, and other institutions serve as partners. The New York City Schools and New York City Partnership provide management, technical assistance, and community support.
Partners:	Sixty-two corporate partners
Focus:	Sixty-one high schools; 3 middle schools
Contact:	New York City Public Schools Director, External Programs 110 Livingston Street Brooklyn, NY 11201 (718) 935–5311

* * * * *

Program:	**Academy of Finance** (1982)
Description:	The Academy is a 2-year interdisciplinary program offering courses in accounting, banking, financial planning, international finance, and security operations, supplemented with paid summer internships, visits to financial institutions, and college-level coursework. The National Academy Foundation, a nonprofit organization, serves as fiscal agent for the program.

New York (continued)

Partners: New York City Public Schools
Baruch College
Securities Industry Association
NYC Financial Institutions (Shearson Lehman, Hutton, Primerica Corp., Oppenheimer & Co., and American Express)

Focus: 550 high school juniors and seniors

Contact: New York City Public Schools
Academy Director
131 Livingston Street, Room 509
Brooklyn, NY 11201
(718) 935–3776

Philadelphia

Program: **Committee to Support Philadelphia Public Schools** (1984)

Description: Private sector resources are leveraged for PATHS (Philadelphia Alliance for Teaching Humanities in the Schools) and PRISM (Philadelphia Renaissance in Science and Mathematics).

Programs are carried out by task groups, each led by a committee member. Funded primarily through the Greater Philadelphia First Corporation.

Partners: Philadelphia Public Schools
Community service organizations
Area corporations
Area universities

Focus: All students

Contact: Public/Private Ventures
399 Market Street, Suite 570
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(215) 440–3263

* * * * *

Program: **High School Academies Program** (1969)

Description: Academies teach at-risk students academic skills linked to vocational and career training. A board of directors representing schools, businesses, industry, and community organizations plans, monitors, and provides resources.

Partners: Philadelphia Public Schools
Businesses and community organizations
Philadelphia Urban Coalition

Focus: Students in 11 high schools

Philadelphia (continued)

Contact: Center of Vocational Education
JFK Building, Room 614
734 Schulkyl Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19146
(215) 875–3800

Pittsburgh

Program: **Partnerships in Education** (1979)

Description: Partnerships in Education establishes linkages between the school district and business, nonprofit, civic, and higher education sectors. Partners develop working relationships with specific schools.

The Allegheny Conference staffs a director. The Chamber of Commerce donates office space to house administrative staff.

Partners: Allegheny Conference on Community Development
Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce
Pittsburgh Public Schools

Focus: Elementary, middle, and high schools

Contact: Partnerships in Education
3 Gateway Center, 14th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
(412) 392–4545

* * * * *

Program: **Mathematics Collaborative** (1986)

Description: Math teachers are linked with other math professionals to enhance their classroom instructional practices. Collaborative seeks to improve student math achievement and encourages students to take higher-level math courses.

The University of Pittsburgh staffs a project director to coordinate activities. Pittsburgh Public Schools provides in-service time and computer equipment.

Partners: Pittsburgh Public Schools
University of Pittsburgh
Area business professionals working in math-related areas

Focus: Math and science teachers in all high schools

Contact: Mathematics Collaborative
3 Gateway Center, 14th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
(412) 392–4545

Pittsburgh (continued)

* * * * *

Program: **New Futures Initiative** (1988);
Greater Pittsburgh Youth Roundtable (1991)

Description: Collaborative seeks to help at-risk students stay in school, enhance academic achievement, prevent teen pregnancy, and improve employability skills. The Greater Pittsburgh Youth Roundtable is an outgrowth of New Futures which provides an ongoing forum to deal with youth issues.

Partners
Pittsburgh Public Schools
City Government, Allegheny County Departments of Health, Children and Youth
City of Pittsburgh Private Industry Council
Allegheny County Private Industry Council
WQED Public Television
United Way
Carnegie Library
Local foundations
Partnership in Education
Health Education Center
Allegheny Conference on Community Development

Focus: K–12 students in eight Pittsburgh public schools and their families residing in three "high risk" public housing communities

Contact:
Pittsburgh Public Schools
341 South Bellefield Avenue, Room 462
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 622–3981

Portland

Program: **The Portland Investment** (1983)

Description: Portland business, government, and school leaders address rising youth unemployment—particularly among disadvantaged youth and racial minorities. Their mission is to reduce school dropouts, provide increased employability skills and access to jobs, and promote changes and cooperation among community institutions.

Six-member executive committee represents top level business, education, and city government officials.

Partners:
Portland School District
Private Industry Council
City of Portland
Multnomah County
Local businesses

ERIC

Portland (continued)

Focus: Disadvantaged public school students

Contact: Portland Public Schools
Career and Technical Education Division
2508 N.E. Everett Street
Portland, OR 97232
(503) 280–5858

* * * * *

San Diego

Program: **San Diego Dropout Prevention and Recovery Round Table** (1986)

Description: Community/school district collaborative advocates, oversees, and develops community support for policies and programs to meet dropout prevention and recovery goals. Nine-person executive committee made up of community representatives makes decisions.

Partners: San Diego Unified School District
Civic organizations
Businesses
City government agencies

Focus: All students in need of additional support and attention

Contact: San Diego Public Schools
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103
(619) 293–8439

* * * * *

Program: **New Beginnings** (1989)

Description: Interagency collaboration seeks to integrate and improve existing services to children and their families, develop alternative approaches and strategies to respond to family needs, and bring about institutional change through closer working relationships and policy revision.

The chief executive officers of each participating agency manage New Beginnings.

Partners: City of San Diego
San Diego Department of Health, Probation, Social Services
San Diego Unified School District
San Diego Community College District
San Diego Housing Commission

San Diego (continued)

Focus: K–12 students and their families in San Diego County with an initial focus on the San Diego Unified School District. A demonstration of the New Beginnings approach is being conducted at one elementary school in San Diego's Mid-City community.

Contact: New Beginnings
2807 Fairmont Avenue
San Diego, CA 92105
(619) 527–6200

Seattle

Program: **Partners in Public Education** (1980)

Description: Program matches schools with a corporate or community sponsor to develop strategies which enhance students' learning and working experiences.

The PIPE board, composed of school district, staff, business, and community people, governs partnership activities. Partners follow guidelines established by the advisory committee.

Partners: Seattle Public Schools
Seattle Chamber of Commerce

Focus: All K–12 students

Contact: Seattle Public Schools
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98109
(206) 298–7200

Tacoma

Program: **Eugene P. Tone School Project** (1988)

Description: Comprehensive educational program for homeless children assists student transitions into mainstream public school programs. The Tacoma School District provides transportation, students' breakfasts and lunches, and funding. The Citizens Support Committee manages acquisition of services.

Partners: Tacoma School District
Tacoma/Pierce City YWCA
Citizens Support Committee

Focus: K–8 homeless students

Contact: Tone School Project
3110 43rd Street
Tacoma, WA 98409
(206) 596–1898

ED/OERI 91–30

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1991 - 311-989 - 816/53060

ISBN 0-16-036037-4

90000

9 780160 360374

United States
Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208–5572

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, $300

Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Education
Permit No. G–17

FOURTH CLASS BOOK RATE

PIP 91-860