12-2016

Examining Exemplary P-20 Partnerships Using a Mixed Methods Approach

Elizabeth Erin Smith
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Examining Exemplary P-20 Partnerships Using a Mixed Methods Approach

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Public Policy

by

Elizabeth Erin Smith
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, 2005
University of Arkansas
Master of Education in Higher Education, 2008

December 2016
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Dr. Michael T. Miller
Dissertation Director

Dr. Thomas E. C. Smith
Committee Member

Dr. John Gaber
Committee Member

Abstract

Historically, P-12 schools and institutions of higher education have operated independently of each other, creating a gap that acts as a barrier between high school and postsecondary institutions. This gap is blamed for many societal issues including high college remediation rates, low college-going rates among minority groups, and low six-year college graduation rates. P-20 partnerships, agreements between P-12 schools and institutions of higher education with the purpose of improving the P-20 education system, have emerged as a way to address these problems.

From laboratory schools in the 19th century to modern-day professional development schools, P-20 partnerships in teacher education have been well-documented. However, analysis of P-20 partnerships outside teacher education is lacking. This research augments the current literature by examining three exemplary P-20 partnerships outside teacher education to explore how they define and measure success and what resources they perceive to be essential to their success. These topics were investigated using a mixed methods approach from the perspective of three distinct groups: state-level leaders in P-12 and higher education, P-20 partnership leaders, and P-20 partnership participants.

While P-20 partnerships have diverse purposes, state P-20 leaders provided seven common criteria for defining exemplary partnerships. P-20 partnership leaders provided insight about the resources necessary to promote partnership success from their perspective, describing 10 essential elements for exemplary P-20 partnerships. Participant interviews and surveys were examined in light of the Community Capitals Framework, revealing that social capital, human capital, and financial capital are perceived to be the most essential resources for developing exemplary P-20 partnerships. Based upon these findings, I recommend that educators and

policymakers who desire to start or strengthen P-20 partnerships evaluate the social capital, human capital, and financial capital available in their communities and consider how those assets can be best utilized to support P-20 partnership success. Additionally, P-20 partnership leaders and participants would benefit from collaboratively assessing their work, evaluating partnership strengths against the essential elements for exemplary P-20 partnerships as expressed by the participants in this study.

Acknowledgements

I am exceedingly grateful to have been a part of the University of Arkansas community. As a low-income undergraduate student, I had a generous academic scholarship that made it possible for me to attend college, which ultimately changed my life. The taxpayers of Arkansas underwrote my education in political science through the Honors College by way of my scholarship and I do not take that lightly.

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Michael Miller, my advisor through both my Master's and Doctoral programs. Dr. Miller suggested that I should consider the Public Policy Ph.D. program instead of another program and he was right. Fellow students frequently sought my advice on matters of academic advising for the last four years-- not because of me, but because it was widely known that I had the best advisor.

I appreciate the support of Dr. Janet Penner-Williams, my supervisor for four years, who encouraged me to begin a doctoral program. Working for Dr. Penner-Williams was a wonderful experience and she has been an important example to me of how to treat people well and how to balance work and life. I am grateful for the support of many friends and colleagues within the College of Education and Health Professions including Dr. Heather Kindall and Dr. Chris Goering who frequently checked in with me to ensure I had the support I needed. I also want to thank Dr. Robert Herron and Megan Goodyear at Oklahoma Wesleyan University who enthusiastically supported my research while I worked with them. I am grateful for the example Dr. Herron provided as a humble servant leader and for the many lattes and laughs Megan provided as I stressed about getting everything done.

I have several people to acknowledge within the Public Policy, Higher Education, and Curriculum and Instruction faculty as well. I will always be thankful that I took the mixed

methods class with Dr. John Gaber because the course and the way he taught it fundamentally changed my path as an academic and researcher. I want to inspire students to use mixed methods to study problems the way Dr. Gaber inspired me. Dr. LJ Shelton also gave me specific feedback on my dissertation idea when it was essentially a concept paper and later when I was no longer in her class, she was quick to offer feedback whenever I needed it. Additionally, I want to thank Dr. Valerie Hunt and Dr. Tom Smith for serving on my advisory and dissertation committees, respectively, and providing guidance to me throughout my time as a doctoral student.

My Ph.D. experience would also have been far less enjoyable were it not for my fellow student, Leslie Yingling. Leslie and I commiserated about raising kids while working full-time while being doctoral students and she was always quick to encourage me when I needed it. I am looking forward to reading her dissertation next and am so proud of her work to promote college access for low-income, first-generation and minority students.

The support from my family served as a bolster as I pursued this degree. My mother- and father-in-law, Terry and Phillip, often kept my kids when I attended evening classes or entertained them as I wrote on the weekends. I am thankful for their support and excited to join my father-in-law as the other Ph.D. in the family. My parents, Pam and Charlie, and my siblings, Joel, Lydia, Abigail, James, and Tyler, celebrated with me and encouraged me every step of the way. I am who I am because of the other five people with whom I shared a house growing up. A person could not have a more loving, supportive family and I am thankful God chose me to be a part of yours. Thank you to my Mom and Dad for teaching me that whatever I do, I can do it for the glory of God and not for myself.

I cannot wait to tell two very special people that I am finished with “the big paper:” my children, Grace and Graham. It’s hard to believe that Graham was only a year old when I started this degree program and Grace was just four. Both of my sweet kids have unknowingly supported me during the process of writing my dissertation, from Graham interrupting me with a light saber saying he was coming to rescue me from writing my paper to Grace leaving me handwritten notes of encouragement. Someday, they will understand what a dissertation is and why it took so much time away from them to write it.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge my husband, Nathaniel, for his unending support. I have never met anyone who believes in someone as much as he believes in me; I just want to live up to who he thinks I am. Thank you, Nathaniel, for spurring me on to more and wanting me to use my career to help others. We have not had it easy over the past several years and your unconditional love helped me to stand when I did not think I could. I love you and am proud to be married to you!

Dedication

To my six favorite kids: my children, Grace and Graham, and my nieces and nephews Brynlee, Anderson, Norah, Miles, and the newest addition coming spring 2017. It is my hope that the research and work I do will contribute to an improved P-20 education system for you and your children. Thanks for making me smile so much!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

I. Introduction

A. Context of the Problem

Historically in the United States, P-12 schools (preschool through 12th grade) and higher education institutions (including technical schools, community colleges, and universities through graduate school) have operated independently of each other (Kirst, 2005). The divide between P-12 and higher education creates problems for individual students and for our workforce overall. This gap negatively affects students who aspire to attend postsecondary institutions, preventing students from pursuing desired careers and ultimately impacting job readiness and the workforce throughout the nation (Carnavale, Smith, & Strohl, 2013; National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (2010) estimates that 60% of college students nationwide take at least one remedial course due to being unprepared for college; an average of 25% of high school students who take the ACT score at college readiness levels in all four categories (National Conference of State Legislatures, n.d.). The Alliance for Education estimates that college remediation costs students, higher education institutions, and the federal government $3.6 billion each year (Alliance for Education, 2011).

Only 58% percent of college students graduate within six years (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). Expectations between senior year of high school and freshman year of college are not aligned, creating confusion and frustration for both students and educators. High school students prepare for college by taking college preparatory courses but often do not obtain the skills in reading comprehension, writing, and synthesizing large amounts of information that are necessary for college success (Kirst & Bracco, 2004). By 2020, 65% of all jobs in the United States will require some postsecondary education, with 35% requiring a bachelor’s degree and the remainder requiring other postsecondary training; if the U.S. continues

to produce college-educated workers at the current rate, there will be five million fewer people than needed to fill these open positions (Carnevale, Smith, & Strohl, 2013). While college completion rates nationwide have increased by 10% in the last three decades, it will not be enough to meet demand in the future without significant policy changes to spur additional growth (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). One cause of the problem of lackluster rates of college attainment in the U.S. is the persistent gap between P-12 and higher education (Cevallos, 2013; Domina & Ruzek, 2010; Kirst, 2005).

American colleges, originally designed to serve only a small, elite group of students, educated them with little regard for what was taught in secondary school (Kirst, Usdan, Evans, & Valant, 2011). In the late 1800s, college presidents realized that exerting influence over what was taught in high school had the potential to create an easier transition to college for students and less remediation for colleges (Kirst & Usdan, 2009). College presidents gathered to determine what high schools should teach and, for a short time, colleges accredited high schools that delivered curriculum that was aligned to collegiate expectations. However, by the 1920s, high schools were proliferating so quickly that colleges could not manage accreditation. A report called The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918) also called into question the purpose of high school and made the case for vocational training and life skills, not just college preparation. Society shifted its thinking about high school, away from a singular purpose to multi-faceted and intensified the gap between high schools and college as high schools began preparing students for more than just college (Kirst, Usdan, Evans, Valant, 2011).

The gap has grown since World War II with the democratization of higher education and diversification of P-12 education following *Brown vs. Board of Education*. As more (and more diverse) students completed high school following World War II and *Brown*, high schools

developed two tracks for students: a college-bound track and vocational track. Because college preparation was not the specific focus of high schools, the gap between P-12 and higher education grew consistently (Kirst, 2005). Venezeia, Kirst, and Antonia (2003) indicate that this is a uniquely American problem; most other developed nations utilize more centralized education powers to require greater coordination and communication between P-12 and postsecondary education on a national level.

B. Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this research project was to identify and understand the key elements that make exemplary P-20 partnerships successful. I first identified exemplary P-20 partnerships (partnerships between K-12 schools and universities, later fully defined) in each of the four types of partnerships as defined by Wilbur and Lambert (1991, 1995). My goal in identifying exemplars was to provide examples for policymakers, P-20 partnership leaders and those who wish to engage in such partnerships. The current literature on P-20 partnership focuses on describing programs but little research has been conducted to evaluate partnerships and highlight those that have been successful by some objective standard. I also sought to ascertain the types of resources needed to build and sustain successful P-20 partnerships. After selecting exemplars, I employed integrated mixed-methods research strategies to examine the success of the exemplary P-20 partnerships and investigate the resources necessary to promote success from the perspectives of the partnership leaders and participants.

C. Research Questions

There were five research questions for this project:

1. What criteria can be utilized to define exemplary P-20 partnerships?

2. Based on the examination of three exemplary P-20 partnerships, how do programs define and measure success?
3. From the perspective of P-20 partnership leaders, what are the essential elements of exemplary partnerships?
4. From the perspective of P-20 partnership participants, what are the essential elements of exemplary partnerships?
5. How can the essential elements of exemplary P-20 partnerships be viewed through the Community Capitals Framework?

D. Definitions

Studying P-20 partnerships is a complex issue, beginning with how one defines partnership (Clifford, Millar, Smith, Hora, & DeLima, 2007). While the definition of P-20 is generally accepted, what constitutes a P-20 partnership depends on who determines the definition. Another challenge in this study is defining success for P-20 partnerships and determining exemplars.

Exemplar: A P-20 partnership that is identified as outstanding in terms of its positive effect on the P-20 education system. Exemplars are highly developed P-20 partnerships that provide evidence of their success (Bronk, King, & Matsuba, 2013).

P-20: Viewing all of the individual systems of education as one entity. Scholars who study P-20 issues include preschool through graduate school in their analysis. (Clifford, Millar, Smith, Hora, & DeLima, 2007; Cox-Peterson, 2011; Dounay Zinth, 2011).

P-20 partnership: An agreement among two or more parties coming together for the good of improving the P-20 education system, where at least one party is a P-12 school and another party is an institution of higher education. This is a definition I developed for

this research after finding other definitions lacking (Clifford, Millar, Smith, Hora, & DeLima, 2007; Cox-Peterson, 2011).

<u>Success (in terms of P-20 partnerships)</u>: In this study, the parameters of success will be defined by each exemplary partnership. Due to differing partnership purposes, it is expected that the partnerships will each have their own standard by which to measure their success.

E. Assumptions

<u>Assumption Regarding the Alignment of P-20 Education</u>

Because of the historical division between P-12 and higher education, there is little coordination and communication between the two groups and they essentially function as distinct systems. In conducting this research, my assumption was that one aligned, coordinated P-20 education system would provide greater opportunities for students and better prepared candidates for the workforce. Symptoms of the divide include high college remediation rates, low college graduation rates (especially for students from racial and ethnic minority backgrounds), and college graduates who are ill-fitted for career opportunities in the workforce (Carnavale, Smith, & Strohil, 2013; National Center for Education Statistics, 2014; The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2010). Bringing together P-12 and higher education through P-20 partnerships will contribute to greater high school and college graduation rates as well as improved preparation for the workforce. I will expand upon this assumption in the review of related literature.

<u>Assumption Regarding the Knowledge of Study Participants</u>

Another assumption made in this study relates to the knowledge of the participants included. In selecting my sample, I first surveyed the heads of the department of K-12 education

and higher education in each state to asked them to recommend P-20 partnerships in their state that they view as successful and why they consider each partnership a success. Surveying state-level administrators assumes that they have specific knowledge about the kinds of P-20 partnerships that exist in their state, whether or not those partnerships are successful, and why the partnerships are considered successful. Once I identified exemplars, I interviewed and surveyed those involved in the exemplary partnerships to determine what they perceive to be the types of resources needed for exemplary P-20 partnerships. This step also assumes that P-20 partnership leaders and participants will have reflected upon what it takes to make partnerships successful and will provide that information to me.

Assumptions Related to Research Methods

I used the exemplar methodology to select exemplary P-20 partnerships. This methodology is used in development psychology to study individuals, but has not yet been applied to the study of programs. Using the exemplar methodology assumes that it is applicable outside the field of psychology. Additionally, when I selected exemplars, I selected one in each of the categories of P-20 partnerships as established by Wilbur and Lambert (1991, 1995). Utilizing this study assumes that the categories are accurate and have not changed substantially since 1995.

F. Delimitations and Limitations

This study is limited to one exemplar of each of the types of P-20 partnerships (as categorized by Wilbur and Lambert, 1995). Limiting my study to exemplars allowed me to deeply understand why the selected partnerships are successful and provide recommendations for policymakers and P-20 partnership leaders as they look to improve partnerships. One consequence of studying only exemplars is that it limits the external validity of findings.

Exemplars are, by definition, uniquely successful, which prevents a study on exemplars from generalizing findings to other programs. Another limitation relates to my definition of P-20 partnerships. While many businesses and workforce groups have recently partnered with K-12 schools and higher education, I did not include workforce groups in my definition of P-20 partnerships. Therefore, partnerships that included either a K-12 or higher education institution (but not both) and a business were not considered a P-20 partnership by my definition and were not be eligible to be studied.

This study was limited to exemplary P-20 partnerships. I chose to focus on exemplary partnerships because I sought to provide a blueprint for P-20 leaders who want to begin new partnerships or improve existing ones. Examining exemplary partnerships provides an opportunity to determine why they are successful and allows other P-20 partnership leaders to learn from their success.

I also limited my study by focusing on types of resources that can be related to the Community Capitals Framework (Flora & Flora, 2008). I chose to use CCF because I assumed that the seven types of capital would encompass the responses from P-20 leaders, but it is possible that participants could emphasize a type of resources that was not included in the CCF.

G. Significance of the Study

The gap between P-12 and higher education, which developed over time and has widened over the past 70 years, has serious consequences for individuals and society. This gap, a contributor to high college remediation rates and low college attainment rates, is perpetuated by different governance and funding structures for the two systems. Students from low-income backgrounds, students of color, and students whose first language is one other than English are disproportionately affected by the gap between P-12 schools and higher education. Only 1 in 10

people in low-income families complete bachelor's degrees compared with half of people in high-income families (White House Executive Office of the President, 2014). Low-income students are also less likely than their high-income peers to be academically prepared for college by taking a college preparatory coursework (White House Executive Office of the President, 2014). Students who are Black or Hispanic are more likely to need remedial coursework than their White peers (National Conference on State Legislatures, n.d.). Additionally, as mentioned above, the U.S. is facing a shortage of college graduates to meet workforce demands, a potential workforce disaster by 2020 (Carnevale, Smith, & Strohl, 2013). Narrowing the P-20 gap and creating better opportunities for disadvantaged students to complete college is not only the right thing to do, it can also help the U.S. meet workforce challenges.

P-20 partnerships have emerged as one way to address the gap between K-12 schools and higher education by uniting entities from both sides of the education spectrum for a common purpose (Dounay Zinth, 2011; Kirst, 2005). While many school-university partnerships exist (more than 2,322 according to Wilbur and Lambert's 1995 study), there is very little research on these partnerships. Most of the literature on this topic focuses on descriptions of partnerships. The research from this project will contribute to an area of the research that is lacking by focusing on exemplary P-20 partnerships and determining what makes them successful from the perspective of their leaders and participants. By highlighting exemplary P-20 partnerships, this study will provide information to P-20 partnership leaders about the types of partnerships that are most effective and how they are successful. Additionally, using the Community Capitals Framework (Flora & Flora, 2008) to ground P-20 partnerships will shed light on the resources needed to make school-university partnerships successful.

H. Policy Framework of the Study

I utilized the Community Capitals Framework (CCF) to serve as the theoretical basis for analyzing the resources that promote success in P-20 partnerships. CCF was developed by Flora and Flora (2008) to consider the many ways communities use a variety of resources to support community development. CCF is rooted in an assets-based approach, focusing on the capitals (or resources) available within a community and how those resources are invested to reproduce (Flora & Flora, 2008; Green & Haines, 2012). An assets-based approach focuses on development of a local community and the work of multiple organizations in developing and applying assets (Green & Haines, 2012). While Bourdieu (1986) first described social and cultural capital, Flora and Flora detail seven types of resources within each community: natural, cultural, human, social, political, financial, and built. Resources in these seven areas can be developed and utilized to form capital in other areas. Using CCF allows researchers and policymakers to focus on creating positive change in communities by recognizing existing assets and the capacity for developing additional assets.

CCF was developed for and is prominently used in the community development field. Flora and Flora (2008) created the framework to analyze change in rural communities. Since its creation, CCF has been utilized to study a variety of issues related to community development across the world including ecosystems (Gutierrez-Montes, Emery, & Fernandez-Baca, 2009), volunteer tourism (Zahara & McGehee, 2013), and mining (Owen & Kemp, 2012). CCF can be used in a variety of ways and it is utilized in community development utilized both as a planning framework and as an evaluation tool (Emery & Flora, 2006).

As a planning tool, CCF requires partners to engage in asset mapping, "…a technique that can be used to inventory available assets within communities" (Anderson, 2014, p. 304).

Asset-mapping in the planning process typically includes partners collaborating to list available resources within the domain of each of the seven community capitals. This process enables partners to see where each have strengths and begin to analyze how the strengths can bolster areas of weakness. This is a common part of planning in community development, the field where CCF is most prevalent, and it will be helpful in studying P-20 partnerships. One of the assumed purposes of partnering across traditional P-12 and higher education boundaries is that the school, institution, or organization with which another is partnering has some resource or asset that is otherwise not accessible. Groups who use CCF focus on the positive possibilities within the community by mapping resources available within the seven areas of community capitals. The underlying idea is that all people in a community benefit when partners collaborate to grow the capital in their community: "…community capitals are interconnected, meaning that activity in one area of a community capital group has an effect on all the other community capital groups" (Anderson, 2014, p. 305).

As an evaluation tool, researchers use CCF to track changes in capital that occur through community development programs. Emery and Flora (2006) studied rural community development programs and found that the initial investment of social capital resulted in positive effects in every other area of capital including more trained community leaders (human capital), more diversified leadership (political capital), increased community philanthropy (financial capital), and enhanced community green spaces (natural capital). They identified the investment of significant social capital (through the creation of a local leadership program for high school students, college students, and adults) as a catalyst for job growth, recruitment of younger workers, and increased local philanthropy. Through this study, the authors determined that an increase in one capital leads to an increase in other types of capital, which they call spiraling-up

(p. 23). They advocate for the use of CCF as an evaluation tool that can provide a more holistic view of the impact of programs on entire communities.

Using CCF to study P-20 partnerships promotes the recognition of existing resources and acknowledges that all organizations have something to contribute. This fits with my view on P-20 partnerships as collaborations among organizations with unique assets that can be utilized to benefit the educational system as a whole. Additionally, CCF incorporates resources from seven different areas, which promotes the idea that there are many types of assets within each community. P-20 partnerships are diverse and any one may include assets from each of the seven types of capitals. The interconnectedness of community capitals also reflects the interconnected nature of P-12 schools and institutions of higher education. While they exist apart of each other, postsecondary institutions rely upon P-12 schools for preparing students for higher education. Likewise, P-12 schools depend upon postsecondary institutions to provide further training in both general knowledge and areas of specialty. Viewing P-20 partnerships through a CCF lens emphasizes the interconnected nature of the two systems of education and promotes a positive view of the ways in which P-12 schools and institutions of higher education can collaborate for the benefit of the entire system.

II. Review of the Related Literature

The literature on school-university partnerships has developed since the late 1800s. Throughout the 20th century, most of the literature on this topic related to partnerships within teacher education. In 1987, the American Association of Higher Education published the first catalog of school-university partnerships following a survey of colleges nationwide. This report publicized for the first time the variety of partnerships that existed outside teacher education (Wilbur, 1987). In two follow-up studies, Wilbur and Lambert (1991, 1995) further developed a catalog of P-20 partnerships nationwide and created a typology of partnerships.

Research on P-20 partnerships is generally established on the assumption that bridging the gap between P-12 schools and higher education has significant benefits, both to individuals and society as a whole. This literature review begins with a review of my assumption that P-20 alignment leads to positive personal and societal outcomes. Because my research will highlight a variety of P-20 partnerships, not just those in teacher education, I will then examine the development of Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) typology of P-20 partnerships and literature related to each type. Following a review of the types of P-20 partnerships and examples of the research conducted in each area, I will provide historical background related to the origination and development of P-20 partnerships within the realm of teacher education.

A. The Personal and Societal Benefits of P-20 Alignment

Over the last decade, there has been an emerging theme in the literature that indicates that the divide between P-12 and higher education has consequences for students, families, workforce groups, educational institutions, and society as a whole. In conducting research on P-20 partnerships, I assume that P-12 and higher education will function better and more completely

when aligned into one system. However, the two were not designed historically to function as one and there is not complete agreement in society that they ought to be united.

While P-12 education is publicly funded, governed by a federal department, and is largely viewed by the public as a public good, higher education is much different. Higher education stakeholder groups have varying definitions of its purpose and stakeholder views have evolved over time. Higher education in the United States was originally founded as a training facility for ministers and public officials (Geiger, 2014). The public good of higher education was confirmed with the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, which set aside public land in each state to be used for institutions of higher education (Library of Congress, n.d.). During the Age of Enlightenment in the 18th century, the public embraced the idea of a liberal education: "People saw in higher education, even from the earliest times in our country, the value of higher education as a cultural purpose...and there developed early the concept of the enrichment of life through a general and thorough education" (Fawley, 1971, p. 3). The general public viewed higher education as a public good through most of the 20th century.

However, the idea that higher education should contribute to one's personal development in a way that would ultimately benefit others began to change in the mid-to-late 1900s. Berrett (2015) identifies February 28, 1967 as the date on which Ronald Reagan, then governor of California, enunciated a shift in thinking regarding the purpose of higher education when he declared that the state's taxpayers should not be "subsidizing intellectual curiosity" (Berrett, 2015, para. 6). Six years later, the Higher Education Research Institute began tracking freshmen responses to questions about why they pursue college degrees (Higher Education Research Institute, n.d.). In 1971, 37.1% of freshmen said that "Being very well off financially" was an "Essential" or "Very Important" reason to obtain a college degree. The same year, nearly 73%

of freshmen indicated that "Developing a meaningful philosophy of life" was "Essential" or "Very Important." In contrast, by 2002, 73% of freshmen indicated that "Being very well off financially" was "Essential" or "Very Important" and 41% emphasized "Developing a meaningful philosophy of life" (Berrett, 2015).

The perception among the public that college attainment should correlate with greater personal wealth has grown in concert with a number of other economic factors. Between 1975 and 2007, the percentage of college students from low-income families rose from 31% to 58%. Since 1982, the average cost of college tuition has increased from $9,139 to $20,234 (in constant 2012-2013 dollars) (U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). As the number of students from low-income backgrounds has dramatically increased, a great shift in the perception of college students has occurred related to the reason they are pursuing higher education. Students (and the general public) now associate college completion with greater earning power throughout life and less with personal growth and development and the overall public good.

As the public perspective about the purpose of higher education has changed, workforce groups have become more involved in influencing P-20 education. Workforce groups have lamented the "impending talent vacuum" due to Baby Boomers retiring and lack of skilled workforce in the next generation (Rigoni and Adkins, 2015, para. 2). The Center for Retirement Research tracks participation in the workforce and shows a substantial decline of adults in the workforce since 2000. This decline will continue through at least 2020 due to the number of Baby Boomers retiring each year (Munnell, 2014). In addition to retiring Baby Boomers, the current workforce is struggling to fill jobs in the manufacturing industry. The Manufacturing Institute blames a negative image of manufacturing among current P-20 students and decline in

career and vocational education programs in high schools for difficulty filling open positions in the trades (The Manufacturing Institute, 2015). From the perspective of workforce groups, P-20 education should provide employees needed for the workforce, both in terms of quantity and in terms of skills. As the gap in the workforce has grown over the past 15 years, workforce groups have exerted greater influence over education to ensure their needs are met. Business leaders have been outspoken about the lack of alignment between education and the workforce and have organized efforts between workforce groups and schools to create greater collaboration and communication (Business-Higher Education Forum, 2014).

There is no consensus among postsecondary educators about the purpose of higher education; often perspective is related to the type of institution. Those who work at community colleges or technical colleges are more likely to be more aligned to the perspective of the workforce. However, those who work at four-year colleges and universities tend to focus on the public good as the purpose of higher education and eschew connections to the workforce. Lagemann and Lewis (2012) (two faculty members at private colleges) describe the need for focusing on the public good of higher education:

> ...higher education has vital public purposes beyond aggregated individual economic benefits. Colleges and universities should be forums for invention and social innovation that benefit *all* of us…. And they must educate students, giving them not only the skills they need to be successful personally, but also the values, ideals, and civic virtues on which American democracy depends (p. 9-10).

I believe Lagemann and Lewis' commentary on the purpose of higher education represents the prevailing perspective on the purpose of higher education on college and university campuses today. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) concurs, advocating for a "21st Century Liberal Education" (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2015, p. 1). AAC&U defines liberal education as a way to prepare "students to understand and

manage complexity, diversity, and change" (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2015, p. 1).

Another purpose of higher education from this viewpoint relates to the research and innovation that occurs on college campuses. The federal government subsidizes much of the research at institutions of higher education, funding more than $30 billion worth of research by colleges and universities each year since 2000 (Britt, 2015; The Pew Charitable Trusts, 2015). Research conducted at institutions of higher education is often funded by taxpayers and contributes to the public good by providing greater knowledge in a wide variety of research areas.

While the public perception about the benefits of college completion has largely evolved to focus on personal economic benefits, the perception within academia remains focused on higher education as a public good. The overwhelming perspective in higher education is very similar to that of the public prior to the change in the 1960s and 1970s. In academia, completing a college degree means much more than stringing together courses that may help an individual in the workforce; it means becoming an educated, contributive member of society. However, either perspective can acknowledge the benefits of P-20 alignment.

B. Categorizing P-20 Partnerships

P-20 partnerships are one avenue for improving P-20 alignment. When reviewing the literature on P-20 partnerships, it is clear that more than 115 years of research have been devoted to describing and theorizing about partnerships between teacher education programs and P-12 schools. Until the late 1980s, though, very little was known about P-20 partnerships outside of teacher education. A major contribution to research on P-20 partnerships that helped fill this noticeable gap was the work of Wilbur and Lambert and the American Association of Higher

Education in the late 1980s through the mid-1990s (Wilbur, 1987; Wilbur & Lambert, 1991, 1995).

In 1986, the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) commissioned a study to determine the types of school-university partnerships that existed across the nation through the National Survey of School-College Partnerships (Wilbur, 1987). At the time, Wilbur worked for Project Advance at Syracuse University, a program dedicated to improving vertical alignment between schools and institutions of higher education. To begin his research on the types of school-university partnerships, Wilbur sent surveys to the chief academic officer of every two and four-year institution of higher education in the United States, asking them to forward the surveys to faculty and staff who were involved in partnerships. The surveys collected qualitative data by asking respondents to submit short abstracts of their programs. Respondents provided abstracts for 1,042 partnerships and Wilbur analyzed the responses to construct categories of school-college partnerships, shown in Table 1 below (Wilbur, 1987).

Table 1

Categories of School-College Partnerships, 1987

In-service education, faculty development, and academic alliances	Articulation programs	Tutoring Programs
Programs offering college-level instruction to pre-college students	Curriculum development	National Writing Project
Minority, disadvantaged, and at-risk students	Research on teaching and learning	Consortia
Gifted and talented students	Adopt-A-School	Miscellaneous
Preservice and training new teachers	Coordination of collaborative activities	

The next survey in this series of three, conducted in 1989 and published in 1991, was again sent to all two- and four-year colleges throughout the nation. The same method was utilized, sending the survey to chief academic officers with the expectation that faculty and staff involved in partnerships would complete the surveys. The same survey was also utilized and the authors received abstracts for 1,748 partnerships at 1,286 colleges and universities. The AAHE published the results of their survey in four volumes, organized by category, with lists of each partnership and abstracts of 343 of the submissions. They also entered each partnership into a database that was kept at Syracuse University. In the report from the second survey, Wilbur and Lambert noticed many of the same themes from the first survey and collapsed several of the 15 original categories of school-university partnerships into four overall categories, listed in the table below alongside the percentage of programs represented by each category (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991, 1995).

Table 2

Categories of School-University Partnerships, 1991

Category	Percentage of partnerships
Programs and services for students	43%
Programs and services for educators	33%
Coordination, development and assessment of curriculum and instruction	11%
Programs to mobilize, direct, and promote sharing of educational resources	13%

The largest category, programs and services for students, included dual and concurrent enrollment opportunities and programs that served as early recruiting or intervention for colleges. Wilbur and Lambert divided (1991) programs within this category into subcategories: serving underrepresented and at-risk students, college courses for high school students, enrichment and gifted-and-talented programs, and middle colleges and early colleges. Programs designed to reach underrepresented students tended to focus on early intervention (typically in middle school, but some extending into elementary school as well) and included many cultural enrichment activities in addition to a focus on college and career preparation. Wilbur and Lambert noted that these partnerships were frequently funded by outside corporations, foundations, community organizations, and state and local governments (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991). While the idea of college courses for high school students is self-explanatory, the authors noted the technology of the day and its potential to revolutionize concurrent credit: "The California State Polytechnic University-Pomona provides an example of the untapped power of technology in linking schools and colleges, in this instance by offering 'live' college courses by microwave transmission…" (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991, p. 14). Enrichment and gifted-and-talented programs focused on co-curricular opportunities for pre-college students including cultural experiences and leadership institutes. At the time of this research, middle and early colleges were just beginning to be utilized as programs to bridge the P-20 gap. Wilbur and Lambert (1991) reported six such programs submitted for their second survey.

Programs and services for educators were divided into five subcategories: in-service training and staff development; national models of faculty development and professional revitalization; recruitment and retention, preservice programs, and early career support; teacher education centers, alternative certification programs, teacher excellence awards, and school-

faculty exchanges; programs for leadership development and school management for school leaders, administrators, and counselors. The second and third subcategories included partnerships between teacher education units within colleges and universities and their local school partners. The fourth subcategory, national models of faculty development, included programs that were tied to national organizations, for example, the National Writing Project, the Academic Alliance Network, and many disciplinary-specific groups. Programs for leadership development and school management encompassed partnerships that emphasized the important role school leaders play in leading change within schools (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991).

Part three focused on coordination, development, and assessment of curriculum and instruction and was divided into four subcategories: curriculum and instructional materials and development; instructional research, evaluation, and testing; tech-prep 2+2 and coordinated vocational-technical programs; and regional and statewide inter-institutional articulation councils and agreements. The authors noted that many programs in the first subcategory focused on vertically aligning content between high school and college. Tech prep 2+2 programs were mentioned as a rapidly growing type of partnership, with the intention of collapsing the last two years of high school and first two years of college into one seamless program. Regional and statewide articulation councils and agreements typically involved linking local and state agencies, institutions of higher education, businesses, and other community organizations for the common purpose of narrowing the P-20 gap (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991).

The final category, programs to mobilize, direct, and promote sharing of educational resources, included four diverse types of partnerships: coordinating councils and consortia for school improvement, Adopt-A-School, magnet schools, and resource-sharing agreements. Many of the programs in the first subcategory, coordinating councils and consortia for school

improvement, were influenced by the work of John Goodlad or even were members of the NNER. Adopt-A-School, the second subcategory, included programs aimed at sending college faculty and students to local schools as well as guest speakers, tutors, or volunteers. The third category was comprised of magnet schools who had substantial partnerships with nearby institutions of higher education. Resource-sharing agreements, the final subcategory, included a wide variety of partnerships from colleges offering scholarships to inservice teachers to donating surplus equipment to local schools (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991).

A few significant differences existed between the responses to the 1986 survey and the 1991 iteration. First, the initial data set reported "mainly on high school/college collaboration" (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991, p. 10). The second data set showed that 868 partnerships focused on just high school while 499 were between middle schools and colleges and 381 involved elementary schools. Another discovery was that the number of partnerships dramatically increased in the 1980s. The authors asked respondents to list the year each partnership started and found that only 53 of the partnerships submitted were in existence prior to 1980, indicating that 97% of the partnerships were new within the decade prior to the second survey (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991).

For the third iteration of their survey, Wilbur and Lambert (1995) sent a survey to all institutions of higher education except for-profit and faith-based institutions. This distinction was not made in the reports on previous surveys, so it is unknown whether for-profit and faith-based institutions were included. The third survey was changed slightly; the modified survey asked how many schools were served by each partnership and if the partnership was funded by an external agency. The modified survey also gathered additional information about the schools served by the partnership regarding whether they were public or private and whether they were

located in rural, suburban, or urban locales. Another new feature was a question aimed at determining if the partnership emphasized systemic reform. The authors utilized a “panel of experts” to select 125 partnerships identified as “outstanding” which were sent surveys directly, as well as all of the partnerships that were identified in the previous editions (Wilbur & Lambert, 1995, p. vii). The directory published included 1,100 abstracts selected to represent the diversity among the partnerships submitted.

The number of responses to the school-college partnership survey grew exponentially from the first survey to the third and final iteration. The first directory included responses from 750 partnerships while the second directory included responses from 1,286 and the final survey procured responses from 2,322 partnerships (Wilbur, 1987; Wilbur & Lambert, 1991, 1995). The authors attributed the dramatic increase in respondents to three factors: wide distribution and use of the previous directory, support from local and regional agencies, and a focus on following up with institutions who did not respond initially (Wilbur & Lambert, 1995).

Sixty percent of the partnerships described in the third volume served high school students and 70% of partnerships originated with public institutions of higher education. The authors reported that 75% of the partnerships were established within the 10 years prior to the survey (1984-1994) and 50% had been in existence for less than five years. In terms of geographic location of partnerships, Wilbur and Lambert (1995) found that postsecondary institutions were frequently partnering with schools outside their local area.

For their third report, Wilbur and Lambert (1995) used almost identical category names; the categories, subcategories, and percentage of programs submitted are listed below in Table 3.

Table 3

Categories and Subcategories of School-College Partnerships, 1995

Category	Subcategories	Percentage of programs
Programs and services for students	Serving underrepresented and at-risk students College courses for high school students Enrichment and gifted and talented programs Middle colleges and early colleges Tutoring, mentoring, and counseling programs Career exploration, internships, and apprenticeships	51%
Programs and services for educators	Professional development and inservice training Recruitment, retention, preservice, early career support, and alternative certification programs Teacher education centers Teaching awards and new faculty roles	29%
Articulation, development, and evaluation of curriculum standards	Curriculum and instructional materials development Instructional research, evaluation, and testing Tech-prep 2+2 and coordinated vocational technical programs	11%

Table 3 (Continued)

Categories and Subcategories of School-College Partnerships, 1995

Category	Subcategories	Percentage of programs
Restructuring	Citywide or regional compacts Coordinated agencies, regional articulation councils and agreements, and joint governance New achievement standards and assessment mechanisms	8%

Fifty-four percent of partnerships reported that they were funded by one or more external agencies with 65% of those partnerships receiving governmental funding.

The three iterations of school-college partnership surveys commissioned by the American Association of Higher Education are the only surveys conducted to categorize and better understand all P-20 partnerships. The amount and rigor of research on programs within the different types of P-20 partnerships varies greatly.

C. Examples of P-20 Partnership Research by Category

Using Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) categories of school-university partnerships, this section provides examples of studies on P-20 partnerships within each category.

Programs and Services for Students

Programs and services for students encompass a wide range of P-20 partnerships including tutoring and mentoring programs, outreach for underrepresented students, dual enrollment programs, and enrichment for gifted and talented students (Wilbur and Lambert, 1995). Dual and concurrent enrollment programs grew in the early 21st century, from 3% of high

school students participating nationwide in 2002 to 10% in 2008 (National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships, n.d.). Most students enrolled in dual or concurrent courses complete the courses at their high schools and 30% of them are enrolled in career and technical education courses (National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships, n.d.). As dual and concurrent enrollment has grown, more research has been conducted to examine its impact on student academic outcomes. Cassidy, Keating, and Young (2010) noted that early studies indicated that dual and concurrent enrollment corresponds with increased high school graduation rates and college going rates. Additionally, studies revealed that students who have completed dual or concurrent coursework have higher college GPAs and lower remediation rates than students who do not participate (Cassidy, Keating, & Young, 2010). An (2013) found that dual and concurrent enrollment positively affected college-going rates for students from low-income families.

The largest research study related to dual and concurrent credit programs was a 10-year impact study of the Early College High School Initiative. In 2002, the Gates Foundation began the Early College High School Initiative (ECHSI) to connect underrepresented students with opportunities to obtain college credit and degrees during high school (Berger, Turk-Bicakci, Garet, Song, Knudson, Haxton, Zeiser, Hoshen, Ford, & Stephan, 2013). They aimed to dramatically increase the number of high school students who took advantage of concurrent or dual enrollment. While dual or concurrent enrollment programs were available at 53% of postsecondary institutions and 82% of public high schools, only 3% of U.S. high school students were enrolled in dual or concurrent courses when ECHSI began (National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships, n.d.; Thomas, Marken, Gray, & Lewis, 2013). Students at early college high schools took college courses alongside or in place of high school courses and

were able to complete an associate's degree by the time of high school graduation. Through this model, institutions of higher education partnered with more than 250 schools to offer college credit courses (on the high school or college campus) and students did not have to pay college tuition (Berger et al., 2013).

At the completion of a ten-year study on the impact of ECSHI, Berger et al. (2013) reported that ECSHI students graduated high school at a higher rate than comparison students (86% to 81%) and were more likely to enroll in college than comparison students (80% to 71%). Twenty-two percent of ECHSI students earned a college degree (usually an associate's degree) by the completion of the study compared with 2% of the comparison group. Berger et al. also found that the effects were stronger for female students, minority students, and low-income students. ECHSI, one example of a P-20 partnership for students, directly confronted the gap between P-12 and higher education by eliminating it altogether and providing underrepresented students with direct access to college.

Programs and Services for Educators

Wilbur and Lambert (1995) included professional development, preservice teacher training, and recruitment and retention programs for teachers in the category of programs and services for educators. Because preservice teacher training P-20 partnerships have a well-documented 115-year history, they will be addressed in depth in section D below. Recent efforts to study teacher professional development have focused on how teacher professional development impacts student achievement (Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, Shapley, 2007). Yoon et al. determined that only nine of the 1,300 studies that examined the impact of professional development could be considered rigorous studies. However, in examining the nine rigorous studies, they found that participating in "substantial" professional development (which they

defined as 49 hours or more) corresponded with an average of a 21% increase in scores on standardized student achievement exams (Yoon et al., 2007, p. iii). Other studies examined the relationship between professional development and showed that it can positively change teachers' pedagogical strategies (DeMonte, 2013). DeMonte (2013) noted the difficulty of studying the effects of professional development due to differing goals; not all professional development opportunities for teachers are explicitly designed to improve student performance on standardized exams.

<u>Articulation, Development, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Instruction</u>

Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) third category includes articulation which Mata (2014) described as the "process that facilitates the transition of students from one educational institution to another" (p. 3). Articulation can include 2+2 technical programs, transfer credit between higher education institutions, or even dual and concurrent enrollment (described above in Programs and Services for Students) (Mata, 2014). Research related to articulation programs largely focuses on describing types of articulation partnerships and the benefits of articulation programs to students and institutions. The limited research on the effectiveness of 2+2 articulation programs is mixed (Barnett and Hughes, 2010). Cellini (2005) found that technical preparation (tech-prep) programs have a positive effect on enrollment in two-year programs, but may have a negative effect on four-year college enrollment (Cellini, 2005). Similarly, Bragg, Loeb, Gong, Deng, Yoo, and Hill (2002) found that students who complete tech-prep programs did not complete four-year degrees at the same rate as similar peers. In a study comparing matched students from 9th to 10th grade, Castellano, Sundell, Overman, and Aliaga (2012) found that the students enrolled in tech-prep tended to have increased GPAs and standardized exam scores.

Clark (1998) took a different approach to studying articulation agreements by examining seven articulation agreements that focused on technical education between P-12 schools and universities in Pennsylvania. He sought to determine how to effectively implement such partnerships and found a great deal of variance in how partnerships were implemented. Clark recommended that schools help students and families understand the requirements and benefits of participating in tech-prep programs. He also found that P-12 teachers were enthusiastic supporters of articulation agreements and tech-prep programs after participating in professional development that explained the benefits available to students. Overall, there is need for additional rigorous research of articulation and tech-prep programs to determine their impact (Barnett & Hughes, 2010).

Restructuring

P-20 councils (also called P-16 councils) represent one type of partnership within Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) category of restructuring. P-20 councils typically aim to develop "a seamless system of education with aligned expectations from the earliest years of a child's development, through the K-12 system, and into and through postsecondary education" (Education Commission of the States, 2008). They frequently are comprised of representatives from P-12 education, higher education, local or regional industry, and other community organizations. While the number of statewide P-20 councils grew rapidly from 2000 to 2010 (up to 38), their prevalence had declined as of 2013 when 27 states reported having active councils (Education Commission on the States, 2008; Rippner, 2013). There is very little research examining the effectiveness of P-20 councils, at least in part due to the varying goals of each council. The bulk of the literature that exists on P-20 councils is descriptive and not analytical (Kirst & Venezia, 2004; Kirst 2005; Rippner, 2013).

While there are studies examining programs within each of Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) categories of P-20 partnerships, there is still much we do not know about them. Specifically, there is a lack of rigorous research demonstrating the effectiveness of partnerships. P-20 partnerships require significant financial and time resources from partners and are also frequently funded by external agencies. In order to prove their effectiveness, partnerships need to continue to investigate the connection between their work and measurable outcomes.

D. Programs and Services for Educators: P-20 Partnerships for Teacher Education

Programs and services for educators represented nearly a third of the partnerships described in Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) directory of P-20 partnerships. Underneath the umbrella of programs and services for educators, partnerships for teacher education represent a well-documented, frequently researched group of programs with a history stretching back more than 115 years. Partnerships in teacher education are the foundation of P-20 partnerships as they were the initial method for collaboration between P-12 schools and institutions of higher education. This section provides an overview of the historical development of P-20 partnerships within teacher education, concluding with the most recent research on professional development schools.

Laboratory Schools

While normal schools (teacher training sites) frequently operated K-12 schools to serve as practice sites for future teachers, John Dewey's creation of The Laboratory School at the University of Chicago (UC) is considered the foremost example of a teacher training site (Hausfather, 2000). Dewey began at UC in 1894 as the head of the philosophy department and sought to hire professors who shared his love of pedagogy and his interest in child and adolescent psychology. Dewey's appreciation for great pedagogy led him to establish a

department of pedagogy to train future teachers, administrators for schools (mostly normal schools at that point) and professors of pedagogy for the university level. He also noted that students would need a place to experiment with different types of pedagogy, a laboratory similar to those offered by the hard sciences. Dewey and UC faculty opened University Elementary School in fall of 1895 as the first laboratory school (Dykhuizen, 1964).

When Dewey founded the UC Laboratory School, he sought to create a living laboratory where students in education could watch K-12 students develop and grow as they (future teachers) practiced (Knoll, 2014). Dewey did not intend for the school to be a place where future teachers would just practice lecturing a class; instead, he wanted educational researchers to engage with K-12 students to experiment with new techniques and evaluate their success. Specifically, Dewey wanted to test his theories about education and be able to make adjustments as needed during implementation. His theories about interdisciplinary learning, using real-life examples, and promoting student inquiry still greatly influence educators today (Knoll, 2014; Schon, 1992). He championed problem-based learning and differentiation before either were common in the field of pedagogy. In a school modeled after Dewey's philosophy, classrooms are truly student-centered as teachers form curriculum based on students' interests. He was the first to assert that discipline problems would significantly decrease when students were provided with interesting, engaging lessons instead of rote memorization. Freedom of movement and the ability to choose activities were also common in the UC Laboratory School. Dewey asserted that schools should function as places where students would learn how to contribute to a democratic society and how to be a member of a community (Dykhuizen, 1964).

The UC Laboratory School pioneered partnerships between school and community by providing free training to local teachers and sponsoring community talks by pedagogical scholars

from around the nation (Dykhuizen, 1964). Dewey emphasized the need for coordination between K-12 schools and higher education, stating that the two systems should agree upon what should be taught in order to prepare young students for life: "It is difficult to see how these ends can be reached except as the most advanced part of the educational system is in complete interaction with the most rudimentary" (Dewey, 1956, p.79). He also felt that universities should provide guidance to K-12 schools due to the lack of federal guidance related to education as the U.S. Department of Education as we know it was not established until 1979 (U.S. Department of Education, 2015).

Dewey departed Chicago in 1904, before the Laboratory School grew to include secondary students (Wirth, 1964). Prior to 1904, it merged with two other Chicago experimental schools to contribute to its growth. When the school opened, there were 16 students and two teachers; by the time it closed, there were 140 students and 23 teachers, not including the pre-service teachers and graduate students who used the school as their laboratory (Dykhuizen, 1964). During Dewey's time at the UC Laboratory School, he emphasized student learning for the sake of growth and development, not as a means to an outcome like increased exam scores (Wirth, 1964).

Throughout the early 1900s, the number of schools modeled after the UC Laboratory School and Dewey's writings grew rapidly (Hausfather, 2000). Universities with laboratory schools were completely immersed in the day-to-day operations of the schools, and faculty and teacher candidates taught alongside P-12 teachers. Laboratory schools utilized the model of the teaching hospital, with a dual focus on education research and educating future teachers. By 1920, most large colleges and universities had established their own laboratory schools (Cassidy & Sanders, 2001). The number of laboratory schools continued to grow until a sharp decline

between the 1960s and 1980s. In 1969, 208 laboratory schools were open, but by the 1990s, fewer than 100 such schools remained (Bonar, 1992; New Jersey Laboratory School Initiative, 2014). The New Jersey Laboratory School Initiative (2014) identifies three major factors contributing to the decline of laboratory schools: lack of space and money, student population that was not representative of the larger population, and increased opportunities for pre-service teachers at public schools. Lack of diversity among the student population at laboratory schools meant that the experimentation that proved to be successful in schools on college campuses often did not translate to traditional public schools. Laboratory school students were most frequently the children of university faculty and, therefore, were typically middle to upper-middle class and from families that placed a high value on education (Cassidy & Sanders, 2001).

There is little evidence that current laboratory schools adhere to Deweyan principles. The International Association of Laboratory Schools lists more than 100 schools as members, with both U.S. and international member schools. When reviewing the website, though, there is no mention of Dewey. The organization indicates that members are "engaged in practices of teacher training, curriculum development, research, professional development, and educational experimentation" (International Association of Laboratory Schools, nd., para. 1). There are no specifics provided about whether members are expected to adhere to Dewey's educational philosophy. When Ruenzel (1995) visited a school modeled after Dewey's philosophy in rural West Virginia in 1995, he asserted that it was the only such remaining school. Critics state that even the UC Laboratory School no longer bears a resemblance to the school Dewey founded, stating: "...his well-known laboratory school remains on campus but has evolved into a good private school with few direct links to the university" (Bronner, 1997, para. 11). While laboratory schools fell out of favor for a variety of reasons, Dewey's philosophy continues to

influence school-university partnerships today. His work at the UC Laboratory School directly affected the work of John Goodlad and The Holmes Group who sought to reestablish school-university partnerships for teacher education in the latter part of the 20th century.

Simultaneous Renewal

As the number of laboratory schools declined through the 1980s, educational theorists and practitioners noted the need for a renewal in collaboration between P-12 schools and higher education (Hausfather, 2000). During this time, John Goodlad emerged as the founder of a new school-university partnership movement for teacher education. Goodlad was a teacher in Canada before joining higher education in the United States where he studied schools for more than 50 years (Osguthorpe, 1999). As a teacher with many students (up to 34 at times) in one room, Goodlad integrated subjects with each other and taught students together, ignoring grade levels and, ultimately, created the first nongraded school. Goodlad completed a Ph.D. at the University of Chicago, the institution where Dewey first studied laboratory schools, and later served as a professor while overseeing the teacher education program (Osguthorpe, 1999). As he studied education philosophy and transitioned to working in higher education, he embraced the ideas of Dewey and sought to implement Dewey's theories about education and educator preparation.

In 1960, Goodlad began overseeing the laboratory school at UCLA where he remained for 25 years. During the 1960s and 1970s, he wrote about the purpose of education and its necessity in developing a democratic society (Goldberg, 1995). He also studied laboratory schools and determined that field experiences for pre-service teacher education would be a better fit at public schools and sought to expand partnerships between public schools and universities (Cassidy & Sanders, 2001). Goodlad emphasized education as a system and did not focus on one aspect or grade level; instead, he sought to determine how to improve the entire system while

maintaining a dual focus on individual student success. Goodlad desired continuous improvement in education, insisting that there would never be a time when the perfect ideal was achieved (Ogusthorpe, 1999). In a biographical article about Goodlad, Ogusthorpe (1999) categorizes his life's work into four defining beliefs: enculturation of the young, access to knowledge, pedagogical nurturing, and stewardship of schools. Goodlad felt that society had forgotten that schools were the primary instruments for socialization and reminded educators of their duty to answer a single question: "What must our children know and be able to do in order to contribute to the democratic society in which they live?" (Ogusthorpe, 1999, p. 11). Goodlad asserted that schools contributed to segregation based on race, gender, and ability. He emphasized collaborative inquiry in the classroom and encouraged mutually beneficial relationships between teachers and students. Goodlad exhorted community leaders to provide adequate resources to local schools as schools were the places where students would learn to be members of a democratic society (Ogusthorpe, 1999).

Goodlad rejected the rigidity of traditional schools, likening them to factories, and promoted a deeper understanding of the purpose and meaning of education (Goodlad, 1979). He asserted that education is essential to a democratic society that educating all students is a moral responsibility (Goodlad, 2000; Ogusthorpe, 1999). Goodlad wrote that his educational philosophy was

> ...grounded in a concept of education as a moral endeavor serving both the individual and the common good through the development of those civil and civic dispositions espoused by the great religions and by lay thinkers in their pursuit of the ideal human condition (Goodlad, 2000, p. 86).

Goodlad saw school-university partnerships as agents for change in education. He sought to promote the democratic purposes of education and the need for equal access to quality education for all students (Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, & Goodlad, 2004). Goodlad founded the Institute

for Educational Inquiry (IEI) to "advance the agenda for education in a democracy" (Institute for Educational Inquiry, n.d., para. 1). The IEI Leadership Program served as a training ground for educational leaders who wanted to promote simultaneous renewal. IEI Leadership Program participants were school building or district leaders and college of education deans and faculty who wanted to be equipped to implement simultaneous renewal in their schools and institutions (Smith, 1999).

Goodlad's work extended to universities, specifically schools with teacher education programs. He rejected the idea of school reform, instead embracing his created term, simultaneous renewal, which he said implied "limitless possibilities and disciplined commitment to moral principles" rather than focusing on compliance (Goodlad, 2000, p. 86). Simultaneous renewal is the idea that teacher education programs and P-12 schools can and should work together to test innovations and improve the entire educational system (Goodlad, 1990). All parties experience simultaneous renewal through the exchange of ideas and using theory to inform practice. Partnerships should be mutually-beneficial and the terms should be agreed upon by all parties (Goodlad, 1991). Additionally, both sides should contribute financial and physical resources to show equal commitment.

Goodlad and two colleagues formed the Center for Educational Renewal (CER) in 1985 with the purpose of fostering simultaneous renewal. After studying P-12 schools for the first two decades of his career, he sought to understand how to promote large-scale reform through partnerships. Following the release of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, which painted a deeply pessimistic picture of P-12 education in America, Goodlad noted that policymakers attempted to cure the woes of education by proposing a variety of school reform efforts. He opposed many of those efforts because they did not appreciate the external influences that often determined what

occurred in schools on a daily basis, including the training that took place at schools and colleges of education for pre-service teachers. Goodlad saw teacher education as the primary way to influence future teachers and change schools. The CER studied teacher education across the United States by conducting more than 1,800 hours of interviews with college administrators. They found that there was a lack of prestige in teacher education, a lack of coherence among teacher education programs, a separation of theory and practice, and rigid conformity at most institutions (Goodlad, 1991). He sought to narrow the gap between theory and practice by promoting partnerships between higher education (theory) and P-12 schools (practice). Following the school reform efforts of the mid-1980s, he focused his efforts on reforming teacher education through P-20 partnerships as a way to ensure changing the culture of P-12 schools (Bellamy & Goodlad, 2008).

In 1986, the CER founded the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) to promote partnerships between school districts and teacher education programs that were designed around the principles of simultaneous renewal (John L. Goodlad Institute for Educational Renewal, n.d.). Schools, universities, and individuals joined the NNER and pledged to uphold Goodlad's principles of education as an essential piece to maintaining a democratic society. His approach with the NNER was to promote local control of school-university partnerships while providing the knowledge and resources of the CER and all of its partner schools and institutions of higher education. The NNER was to function like a collective where members would share innovative ideas related to school-university partnerships for teacher education and support one another's efforts (Bellamy & Goodlad, 2008). However, Goodlad did not set out to create a single model that would fit all school-university partnerships; instead, he emphasized local control and individuality (Goodlad, 1996). Goodlad asserted that local control

and continuous improvement were both necessary because “schools...are never ‘fixed’ once and for all” (Bellamy & Goodlad, 2008, p. 567). Instead, local control ensures that partnerships evolve over time to meet the needs of the community. Initially, the CER carefully controlled growth of the NNER to include only 18 partnerships that expressed a serious commitment to simultaneous renewal to ensure fidelity to the mission of the NNER, but later more partnerships were included. He also emphasized that the purpose of NNER partnerships was to ensure the democratic ideal of education, not to improve student learning or promote teacher professional development.

Goodlad created the NNER to create deeper linkages between local schools and the teacher preparation programs near them. To this end, he proposed twenty postulates that were necessary for schools and universities to engage in simultaneous renewal. The twenty postulates detail how to create connections between democracy and what is taught in school, how to create equitable school settings, and how higher education is a part of creating excellent schools through teacher preparation. Schools and universities within the NNER ascribe to four purposes of their partnerships: to educate children and youth, prepare educators, provide professional development, and conduct inquiry (Center for Educational Renewal, n.d.). Goodlad saw the three entities he created to each have unique purposes; the CER’s purpose was research, the NNER was designed to implement strategies researched, and the IEI trained leaders in education (Goodlad, 2000). During the mid-1990s, the NNER included more than 34 institutions of higher education and 450 partner schools (Goodlad, 1996). Goodlad’s hope for the NNER and the partnerships that it included was that they would not be just projects, “but a way of life” (Goodlad, 1991, p. 61). Prior to the partnerships between schools and universities through the NNER, Goodlad lamented that the two parties rarely interacted.

John Goodlad died in late 2014 and wrote profusely about education as a condition for democracy throughout his professional career. The NNER spurred many others to study school-university partnerships and simultaneous renewal. The NNER continues to have an annual conference and a journal (*Education in a Democracy*) with yearly issues; both the conference and the journal have a social justice focus (National Network for Educational Renewal, n.d.). The research on partners engaged in simultaneous renewal is plentiful and diverse; a recent ProQuest search for "simultaneous renewal" retrieved 589 entries. The CER and IEI encouraged evaluation of individual partnerships as well as statewide efforts.

Kozleski (1999) published a report of the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal (which included 13 districts and 50 schools) and determined that there was a need among partnerships espousing simultaneous renewal to determine how success would be defined and measured. Additionally, she found that there was little continuity of implementation across the partner school sites.

Stephens and Boldt (2004) note that there are many challenges to achieving simultaneous renewal and framed these challenges around four questions. First, who will be partners? While all parties may hope or assume that the other partners are willing, the culture of institutions suggests that some partners may be required to participate by others. Second, how will each of us simultaneously renew ourselves and help others renew themselves? This question addresses the assumption that all partners agree that both P-12 and teacher education need to be renewed. Partnering for simultaneous renewal requires partners to be willing to face their inadequacies and be open to change. Third, what will each partner contribute? Partners should clearly define roles so everyone understands the responsibilities of each other. Fourth, what does each partner receive? What would have to happen for each partner to feel that the compensation for what he

or she contributes is adequate? Compensation issues are challenging for all partners as P-12 teachers face increased accountability for student learning and higher education faculty face increased expectations of scholarly production. Stephens and Boldt suggest confronting questions directly to prevent these challenges from derailing the partnership.

The balance of power within partnerships can also present challenges. Because school-university partnerships under Goodlad's design are typically initiated by institutions of higher education, P-12 schools often do not feel like an equal partner (Jeffery & Polleck, 2010). This presents another obstacle to achieving simultaneous renewal as P-12 schools may feel like the secondary partner while the needs and wants of higher education are prioritized. Bier, Horn, Campbell, Kazemi, and Hintz (2012) note that the challenges of physical space, time, and logistics are common to many partnerships. Schools are often pressed for space to host class sessions and time in the school day to mentor pre-service teachers. Additionally, the space between a university campus and the school can be a real barrier in terms of communication between the two and the act of sharing resources. Increased federal accountability for P-12 schools is another factor to consider when evaluating P-20 partnerships. Since the implementation of No Child Left Behind in 2001, schools have been held responsible for student test results in literacy and math and have responded by safeguarding time devoted to those two subjects and offering less time for partnerships.

Since the growth of school-university partnerships devoted to simultaneous renewal began in the mid-1980s, many researchers have studied different facets of the partnerships. During the same time that Goodlad's ideas about simultaneous renewal were spreading across the country, many institutions were developing professional development schools to address the issues raised by *A Nation at Risk*, Goodlad, and others.

Professional Development Schools

Professional development schools (PDSs) are considered to be living laboratories for pre-service teachers but are different than Dewey's ideas in terms of logistics (The Holmes Group, 1995). Dewey-inspired laboratory schools were typically new schools created by a university on or very near campus for the purpose of being a living laboratory for teacher candidates. In contrast, PDSs are schools that create extensive partnerships with local teacher education programs at existing school sites.

The Holmes Group, comprised of deans of colleges of education from 17 research universities, built upon Goodlad's ideas about simultaneous renewal. The group first convened in 1983 following the release of *A Nation at Risk* with the purpose of improving teacher preparation at their institutions and starting a conversation about the need to reform teacher education across the nation. Members, who complained that lax accreditation standards and, in turn, low standards at colleges of education, promoted mediocrity in teacher education, initially desired to raise standards at their institutions and for all colleges of education to promote excellence among teachers and future teachers (The Holmes Group, 1995). However, their meetings proved to be controversial and more complex than they expected, but "in spite of the controversy, the deans forged ahead" (The Holmes Group, 1986, p. vii). Within its first year, nearly 100 institutions joined The Holmes Group and agreed to refocus on partnerships with local schools to provide clinical experiences for future teachers (Wiggins, 1986). Members of The Holmes Group included all of the top 10% of institutions of higher education and varied from large public research universities to small private colleges (The Holmes Group, 1986). Membership grew to include chief academic officers in addition to education deans. During their early meetings, the group sought consensus around an agenda and eventually adopted two

goals: “the simultaneous reform of the education of educators and the reform of schooling” (The Holmes Group, 1995, p. 10).

Between 1986 and 1995, The Holmes Group published three books comprised of their reports: *Tomorrow’s Teachers*, *Tomorrow’s Schools*, and *Tomorrow’s Schools of Education*. Two of the principles each Holmes Group institution agreed to uphold were directly connected to school-university partnerships: “connect schools of education to the schools” and “make schools better places for practicing teachers to work and learn” (The Holmes Group, 1995, p. 15). They emphasized the need to utilize outstanding practicing teachers to help prepare future teachers and a desire to promote simultaneous renewal of both P-12 education and pre-service teacher education (The Holmes Group, 1986). They advocated for the use of professional development schools where experienced teachers would mentor novice teachers and schools would welcome university faculty to test innovations and determine their effectiveness. Professional development schools should be characterized by “long-term inquiry into teaching and learning by school and university faculty working as partners” (The Holmes Group, 1995, p. 16). Their vision was for professional development schools to encompass all of the qualities of laboratory schools for research, demonstration schools for educational practices, and clinical experiences for pre-service teachers (The Holmes Group, 1990). The Holmes Group noted that there were many challenges to this approach, but that a greater connection between schools and universities was essential to improving teacher education. By the time the final volume was published in 1995, more than 250 institutions and agencies were members of The Holmes Group (The Holmes Group, 1995).

While proponents of PDSs understood that the financial commitment required would prevent every school from engaging in such a partnership, they hoped that enough schools would

be converted to PDSs to allow each teacher education program to have a partner or partners (Dolly & Oda, 1997). The number of PDSs grew very quickly in the early to mid-1990s as The Holmes Group published their three volume trilogy. During this time, though, there was uncertainty regarding the fidelity of PDSs to the original ideas of The Holmes Group or to other PDSs. Between 1990 and 2008, many scholars, universities, and state agencies defined PDSs in their own ways. All PDSs included pre-service teachers learning in public school sites, but little else was universally agreed upon in terms of PDS characteristics (Dolly & Oda, 1997). In fact, this was largely due to the lack of structure created by The Holmes Group, stating that their ideas were not a template, but "a loose setting where ideas can be tried out" (The Holmes Group, 1990, p. 6). Abdal-Haqq (1998) determined four characteristics shared by the majority of PDSs: preparation of pre-service teachers, professional development for current teachers, the use of research-based practices for P-12 student achievement, on-going inquiry into ideas surrounding teaching and learning.

The proponents of PDSs espoused the many perceived benefits to being involved in such a partnership. The in-depth relationship between a PDS and their higher education partner institution permitted longer placements for teacher candidates and greater involvement for teacher education faculty. Teacher candidates were more likely to see an entire semester or year in one school, giving them a better understanding of the arc of the year and how students progressed. Future teachers became an integrated part of the school, participating in meetings with parents, professional development with teachers, and extracurricular activities (Levine, 2002). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, the former accreditation agency for teacher education program) created standards for evaluating PDSs that focused on the creation of a genuine learning community, accountability, collaboration, diversity

and equity, and structures to support student learning and development of all parties involved (NCATE, 2001).

In 2000, the University of South Carolina (USC), long considered a leader in school-university partnerships through their work with Goodlad's NNER, hosted the first PDS conference, attended by more than 600 educators (Dolly & Oda, 1997; National Association of Professional Development Schools, n.d.a). In 2005, after additional national conferences, the educators decided to form the National Association of Professional Development Schools. This new professional association was supported by the NNER and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and sought to formalize the expectations of PDSs (National Association of Professional Development Schools, n.d.a). In 2008, the National Association of Professional Development Schools developed the nine required essentials of a PDS:

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;
2. A school-university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;
3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberative investigations of practice by respective participants;
6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;
7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;
8. Work by college/university faculty and P-12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures

(National Association of Professional Development Schools, n.d.b)

As of 2015, the NAPDS had grown to be an organization independent of USC comprised of more than 5,500 individual members (National Association of Professional Development Schools, n.d.b).

The early research literature (early through mid-1990s) surrounding PDSs generally described the partnerships and offered lessons learned for those interested in beginning similar programs (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Abdal-Haqq, 1998). Darling-Hammond (1994) noted that early research determined that pre-service teachers placed in a PDS were more likely to remain in teaching after the first five years. In-service teachers who worked at PDSs were later found to be more likely to assume leadership roles and have greater feelings of professionalism (Conkling & Henry, 2002). However, as Abdal-Haqq (1998) notes, much of the research did not provide analysis of the impact of PDSs on P-12 students.

Abdal-Haqq (1998), in her review of the PDS literature, describes the four most common types of literature up to that point: that which described the attitudes and beliefs of participating pre-service and in-service teachers as well as university faculty, descriptions of the process of collaboration and challenges faced, the roles assumed by in-service teachers and university faculty, and the inquiry taking place within partnerships. She noted the need for studies to be conducted to evaluate outcomes of PDSs, especially student achievement outcomes. When Abdal-Haqq conducted a review of the research, she found that pre-service and in-service teachers both expressed resistance from other teachers when they attempted to implement constructivist theory in the classroom. Even at PDSs, which were meant to be sites of inquiry, research, and improvement, new methods for promoting student learning were met with resistance (Abdal-Haqq, 1998). A study by Trachtman (1996) did not consider across-the-board outcomes, but individual participants reported that standardized exam scores and levels of parent

participation increased while the number of suspensions and violent classroom disruptions decreased after transitioning to the PDS model. Additional studies (including Wiseman & Cooner, 1996; Houston, Clay, Hollis, Ligons, Roff, & Lopez, 1995; Judge, Carriedo, & Johnson, 1995) point to increased standardized exams scores at schools which transitioned to being PDSs.

Through the early to mid-2000s, ongoing research from PDSs emerged as researchers sought to understand their impact on schools and universities. A four volume series, published between 2002 and 2014, covered a variety of topics related to research on PDSs. The first volume primarily described partnerships from different viewpoints while the second focused on action research that took place within PDSs and research on different types of PDS implementation (Guadarrama, 2002; Guadarrama, Ramsey, & Nath, 2005). The third volume, *University and School Connections*, provides case studies of PDSs as well as research on the use of NCATE PDS standards to evaluate them (Guadarrama, Ramsey, & Nath, 2008). The final volume, published in 2014, includes research on the role university liaisons at PDSs can play in promoting family engagement, how PDSs can impact content area instruction, and descriptions of clinically rich practices (Guadarrama, Ramsey, & Nath, 2014). These volumes have provided in-service P-12 teachers and university faculty with opportunities to share their experiences in PDSs with the wider education community.

P-20 partnerships in teacher education have developed since Dewey's laboratory school partnership in the 1890s but many of his ideas are still implemented in schools and teacher education programs today. Today's teacher education P-20 partnerships are based on decades of research and practice and these types of partnerships represent the most well-researched among Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) typology.

E. Identifying Factors that Contribute to P-20 Partnership Success

Since 2008, several studies have reviewed the larger picture surrounding P-20 partnerships. Instead of examining the effects of individual programs, these studies examined P-20 partnerships more holistically, investigating the conditions that promote their success.

Clifford, Millar, Smith, Hora, and DeLima (2008) sought to define K-20 partnerships and review the research surrounding them. They found 36 empirical studies on K-20 partnerships, 25 of which were single-case studies. Due to the nature of these studies, such that they focused on describing a single partnership, their external validity was limited. The authors also noted that 78% of these single-case studies were conducted by a researcher involved in the program, not an external evaluator. Eight of the 36 empirical studies on K-20 partnerships utilized survey research methods and the remaining three were multi-case studies. The researchers found that the majority of studies did not define partnership, while others defined it only as two or more groups involved in an activity, a definition that does not relate directly to improving education, which is typically among the goals of P-20 partnerships.

Clifford et al. (2008) also sought to identify elements that were associated with K-20 partnership success. They used previously completed research studies to categorize the factors for success while acknowledging the many shortcomings of the research (as described above). The researchers categorized the factors for success into four groups: input factors, process factors, process outputs, and outcomes. Input factors included having formal agreements and establishing respectful relationships among partners. Communication and trust were cited as essential process factors. Process outputs included professional development for teachers, PDSs, and curriculum. Outcomes were related to organizational characteristics, growth in relationships among partners, increased student learning, and changes in teacher behavior. Across the

categories, leader will and endorsement, shared purposes and goals, open communication, established governance structure, adequate resources, and trust were the most frequently cited factors for success.

Domina and Ruzek's (2010) study on K-16 partnerships in California defined success as increased high school graduation rates and college-going rates. The authors focused on local comprehensive partnerships which they defined as those that "aim not only to build programs, but also to build a new policy framework and a new set of institutional arrangements to assist in the implementation of these programs" (Domina & Ruzek, 2010, p. 6). Comprehensive partnerships were focused on systemic change as opposed to programmatic partnerships which had a single-program focus. Partnerships that comprised this study varied greatly in form, but all included policy change as one of their goals. The authors used longitudinal data from 1990 to 2005 to determine what effect 10 comprehensive K-16 partnerships in California had on college-going in comparison with schools that did not participate in comprehensive K-12 partnerships.

Domina and Ruzek (2010) found that the districts involved in comprehensive partnerships had significantly more diverse student bodies than those involved in programmatic partnerships with higher education institutions or those that were not involved in any partnerships. Over the 15-year period studied, districts involved in comprehensive partnerships had significantly higher four-year graduation rates and higher percentages of students who qualified to directly enroll in the University of California and California State University system without being routed through a two-year institution. The positive effect of comprehensive partnerships on graduation rate grew over time and the districts involved in partnerships for more than 10 years saw the greatest increase in on-time graduations. Ultimately, districts involved in comprehensive partnerships for 10 years or more saw a 10% increase in their four-year

graduation rates after controlling for demographic changes (specifically, an influx of minority students). Additionally, districts who participated in comprehensive partnerships saw increased proportions of students enrolling in the CSU and California community college systems, again with increases growing as the length of the partnerships extend. The authors did not find similar effects for districts in programmatic partnerships. Domina and Ruzek closed by noting "…more research is necessary to understand the mechanisms through which effective K-16 partnerships work" (Domina and Ruzek, 2010, p. 21).

In a study of four P-20 partnerships in southern California, Cevallos (2013) determined three best practices among successful partnerships (with success defined as increased college-going rates for traditionally underrepresented students): focusing on student needs, creating transparent reporting systems, and finding champions for the work. Participants in this study cited benefits to students as one of the reasons they continued in their work. Implementing transparent reporting systems improved accountability and built trust between the partner groups. Cevallos notes that she interviewed many individuals working tirelessly to support the partnerships who went above and beyond their job expectations. McClafferty Jarsky, McDonough, and Nunez (2007) echoed the need for a champion to serve both as a leader of the partnership and as its advocate.

Kezar (2007) suggested that schools and postsecondary institutions forgo their individual cultures when pursuing partnerships and create a third culture unique to the partnership. She stated that the differences in culture between the two systems would result in lacking trust, poor communication, and differing or incompatible goals. While researchers frequently assume that K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions have similar cultures because they are a part of a larger educational system, Kezar emphasized the differences between them and the importance

of creating a third culture for collaboration. One perceived distinction between P-12 schools and higher education: schools are focused on practice while colleges and universities are focused on theory. This contributes to disconnects within partnerships when higher education faculty consult research and theory for decision-making guidance while school personnel rely more heavily on experience. Timing was cited as another dissimilarity; decisions are typically made slowly in higher education with input from many parties while schools move rapidly.

Kezar (2007) emphasized the need for an individual to act as a liaison between the partners to facilitate the creation of a third culture through creating shared language and goals. Goals should be created through a needs assessment involving all parties who collaborate to determine how to best address needs. Once goals are established, partners can determine what resources each group can contribute to the partnership. Partners who engage in long-term planning with each other also achieve a third culture by ensuring all parties understand the goals and how they will be addressed. Developing a communication plan as part of the long-term planning process can prevent poor communication and communication gaps, cited as frequent causes of partnership failure. Partners should develop clear policies, role expectations, and decision-making processes to promote success. Finally, the long-term planning process should include how the program will be evaluated.

In a review of research on P-20 partnerships, Nunez and Oliva (2007) noted five commonly mentioned keys to success: trust, communication, targeted financial resources, human resources, and data collection or other ways to monitor partnership impact. The authors encouraged partners to establish a unique culture and mutually beneficial goals, emphasizing a local approach that fits within the context of the partners' communities.

Rousseau (2007) noted that making college the goal for all students would address the gap between P-12 schools and higher education. Researchers play a distinct role in creating an aligned P-20 system by conducting research that reveals the problems with our current system and provides solutions for improvement. The author also cited the importance of social capital in college-going, encouraging K-12 schools to establish relationships between students and college and university faculty and staff to improve connections to higher education for students and their families.

In the last decade, more research has been conducted to examine P-20 partnerships holistically to determine what conditions promote their success. Recent studies have identified factors that contribute to the success of P-20 partnerships including extensive planning, establishing trust among partners, open communication, and creating policy change have been identified as factors that contribute the success of P-20 partnerships. One complaint about the research conducted on P-20 partnerships is that it is not rigorous enough (Clifford et al., 2008). Another aspect missing in this research is greater understanding of how P-20 partnerships define and measure success for themselves (Domina & Ruzek, 2010).

F. Conclusion

The research literature on P-20 partnerships is varied: extensive in some areas and sparse in others. P-20 partnerships in teacher education, for instance, have been well-documented since the late 1800s while other types of partnerships including dual and concurrent enrollment programs have only recently been closely examined. Additionally, little is known about the systemic conditions and resources needed to promote successful P-20 partnerships outside teacher education. The Community Capitals Framework (CCF) will be an asset for examining exemplary P-20 partnerships because it will allow me to holistically consider the types of

resources that promote their success. Previous frameworks used to examine P-20 partnership success focused on social and financial resources whereas using the CCF enables consideration of seven different types of capital. The premise of my research is grounded in the assumption that vertical alignment between P-12 schools and higher education will improve the entire P-20 system for individuals and society as a whole. There is still much to learn about how exemplary P-20 partnerships work and examining them will provide current and future partnership leaders with greater information to help them establish and grow successful P-20 partnerships.

III. Methods

A. Introduction

This research utilized a mixed methods approach to studying exemplary P-20 partnerships. Using a mixed method research design encourages the collection of multiple types of data or the use of a variety of sampling or analysis techniques within one research design. Cresswell (2012) defines mixed methods as "…a procedure for collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study or series of studies to understand a research problem" (p. 535). Mixing methods provides a better understanding than employing either method alone. Additionally, for practitioners, using mixed methods is helpful because it provides an opportunity to tell the story behind an issue while also providing numerical data. This chapter provides an overview of the methods I used to collect and analyze data related to exemplary P-20 partnerships. Overall, I employed integrated mixed methods strategies to provide a more robust picture of P-20 partnerships.

As a multistrand, multilevel project, this research occurred in three phases (see Table 4 below for a visual representation of the research methods). Phase one, addressing research question one, involved state P-12 and higher education administrators who nominated exemplars. The second step of phase one required me to utilize the exemplar methodology to select exemplars to study (Bronk, 2012). Phase two, addressing research questions two and three, consisted of interviewing the leaders of the exemplary P-20 partnerships selected for this study. Phase three, addressing research question four, utilized a survey to gather information from current and past participants in the exemplary P-20 partnerships. Data were analyzed throughout the research process, with each phase informing the next. After all phases were completed, all of the analyses were considered holistically to make meta-inferences about exemplary P-20

partnerships and their relationship to the Community Capitals Framework to address research question five.

Table 4

Research Methods by Phase

	Phase one	Phase two	Phase three
Research question(s)	1	2, 3	4
Sample	State P-12 education and higher education department administrators	Leaders of exemplary P-20 partnerships	Participants from exemplary P-20 partnerships
Method(s)	Qualitative, survey	Qualitative, document analysis & interviews	Mixed, survey

B. Research paradigms

A researcher's worldview greatly affects the way research is conducted (Morgan, 2007). Paradigms influence what questions are asked, how data are gathered, how data are analyzed, and ultimately, research findings. Pragmatists reject the idea that research can only be conducted through purely qualitative or quantitative methods. Instead, pragmatists value mixed methods and embrace using the methods that work best in any given situation (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). I approached this project with a pragmatic worldview. Ontologically, I do not believe that all things can be known and quantified. Instead, aspects of this research are open for interpretation. Using a mixed method design for research on P-20 partnerships fits within a pragmatic worldview for multiple reasons. First, it allowed me to use different types of methods

to collect and analyze data. I collected data in ways that best fit the data slices I sought and analyzed the different data slices individually to allow me to create a deeper understanding of the topic. Second, I approached the research with an open mind, willing to appreciate that there may not be a singular truth. Using mixed methods and approaching this research with a pragmatic viewpoint promoted deeper understanding of the topic.

Development

I utilized a variety of mixed method approaches for the overall research design, sampling, and data analysis of this study on P-20 partnerships. This research was conducted using a sequential approach, employing multiple methods arranged in an order so that the data collected using one method informed the next (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). My approach included a multistrand, multilevel design that used different techniques for different groups to provide multiple data slices that were analyzed to make metainferences about P-20 partnerships.

Development is a sequential approach in which the results from one method inform the next steps of the research process (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989). First instance, if a quantitative survey is the first step, the results will provide ideas about what types of questions to ask in focus group interviews that follow. Using this approach, research is specifically designed in steps with the results from step one or method one intended to be used to shape the techniques that follow (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989). Development utilizes different methods to study the same phenomenon in order to create deeper understanding about the topic. In this study, the development approach was specifically used to allow the data from one phase of the research to inform the instrumentation for the next phase.

Using development can increase internal validity because multiple methods are used to obtain data or analyze data, which improves the likelihood that the findings represent reality.

When a development design leads the researcher to collect qualitative data first, this can harm the external validity. In this case, the qualitative sample is nonrepresentative, which prevents greater transitivity of observations. Reversing the design would promote external validity by beginning with a larger, more representative quantitative sample but may decrease internal validity by not asking the right questions on a survey. Overall, utilizing a development approach to mixed method research allows the researcher to use the results from one method to inform the next steps.

Using a development approach allowed me to consider the data from each stage in forming my instruments for the next stage. For instance, after collecting and analyzing data in phase one, I altered the questions I asked during interviews in phase two. After analyzing the interview transcripts from phase two, I slightly changed the questions I asked on my final instrument, the electronic survey of exemplary P-20 partnership participants.

In my study, priority was given to the qualitative data collected. Each of the research questions was addressed by gathering and analyzing qualitative data and one was additionally addressed by gathering quantitative data. Using Morse's (2003) notation system for mixed methods research, this is considered a QUAL → quan research design with the priority given to qualitative methods of collection and analysis. The primary reason for emphasizing qualitative research for the study of exemplary P-20 partnerships is related to the lack of current in-depth research on the topic, as detailed in the Literature Review. When the quantitative methods were used to address research question four, the quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed simultaneously and integrated during that phase.

Triangulation

The concept of triangulation originated from naval military science. In the Navy, sailors use multiple reference points to determine their location (Jick, 1979). In mixed method research, triangulation means pursuing more than one source of data and comparing or integrating the data to make conclusions about the research topic (Cresswell, 2012). According to Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (1989), triangulation "seeks convergence, corroboration, correspondence of results from the different methods" (p. 127). Denzin (1978) refers to multiple types of triangulation: data, theory, investigator, and methodological. Data triangulation indicates the use of more than one data set or different analyses of one data set. Theory triangulation requires the use of multiple theories for examining data. Investigator triangulation includes the use of more than one researcher to gather or analyze data. Methodological triangulation infers the use of multiple methods to obtain data. The overall purpose of triangulation is to use multiple sources to validate findings.

This study employed both data and methodological triangulation. Methodological triangulation was achieved by using a variety of methods, including interviews, document analysis, and surveys, to formulate a holistic picture of exemplary P-20 partnerships. These methods ranged from obtrusive (interviews) to unobtrusive (document analysis). The interviews and surveys collected primary data while the document analysis provided secondary data. Utilizing methodological triangulations also made data triangulation possible in this case. Each time I used a different method I obtained different data slices that provided a slightly different perspective. These data slices were compared through triangulation to make holistic conclusions about exemplary P-20 partnerships. I also used analytic memos and a reflective journal through

the processes of collecting and analyzing data. These tools provided me with additional data sources to help me understand the data collected.

Using triangulation improves internal validity by ensuring that the study measures what it says it will measure. The type of triangulation used determines how validity is improved. For instance, when data triangulation is utilized, the researcher can better trust the findings from one source of data when another source of data confirms them. Ultimately, using triangulation can improve the credibility of results by providing multiple sources to corroborate findings.

C. Research question one: What criteria can be used to define exemplary P-20 partnerships?

Exemplar Methodology

I employed the exemplar methodology as the framework for selecting exemplary P-20 partnerships. The exemplar methodology is "...a sample selection technique that involves the intentional selection of individuals, groups, or entities that exemplify the construct of interest in a particularly intense and highly developed manner" (Bronk, King, & Matsuba, 2013, p. 2). The exemplar methodology has been used by developmental psychologists to identify individuals who are highly developed in regards to a certain trait. Prior to the use of the exemplar methodology, psychologists tended to focus on what was wrong with human behavior and not what might be considered positive.

There are three ways the exemplar methodology is typically utilized. A researcher may choose to first determine criteria for selecting exemplars after conducting a literature review. This is most often useful when there is already a robust literature surrounding the topic. In other cases, researchers survey experts and use their responses to form criteria (Bronk, 2012). A third approach is to look for outcomes (for example, winning a national award) to distinguish

exemplars. Researchers can also use a mixed approach; for instance, they may create a preliminary list of criteria and then use experts to determine the final list of criteria. According to Bronk (2012), the best method to use to determine criteria for what is considered exemplary depends on the type and purpose of the study. It is essential that researchers use a "thoughtful and systematic approach to devising nomination criteria" to limit bias and promote validity (Bronk, 2012, p. 6). For this study, I used the second approach, asking experts (the head state-level administrators of departments of K-12 and higher education) to nominate exemplars. I also utilized the same sample group to develop criteria for exemplars.

When the researcher chooses to use experts to develop a list of exemplars or a list of criteria or both, accurately determining who the experts are is key. Depending on the type of study, scholars or practitioners may be considered experts (Bronk, 2012). Once potential exemplars have been nominated, researchers may either study all of the nominated individuals who fit the criteria or may winnow the exemplars to limit the study. At this point, researchers decide whether or not to include a comparison sample. As the exemplar methodology is primarily used in psychology, a comparison group would include individuals or a group that does display the desired characteristic. Bronk et al. (2013) indicate that this can be a controversial piece to an exemplar study and whether or not it is necessary depends on the study and its purpose.

Once exemplars are selected, researchers can take many approaches to analyzing them. While it was first used in qualitative studies, the exemplar methodology has more recently been utilized in both quantitative and mixed methods research. Qualitative studies that employ the exemplar methodology typically utilize the case study approach. Colby and Damon (1994) provide an example with their study on 23 individuals noted for their moral leadership. In this

study, the authors surveyed those whom they considered to be experts (including theologians, moral philosophers, and historians) to develop a list of five criteria. These experts then served as the nominators. Once exemplars were selected, Colby and Damon spent two years conducting in-depth interviews of the 23 participants and especially focused on how their formative years influenced their later periods of moral leadership.

A quantitative approach was utilized by Walker and Pitts (1998) in surveying college students about their perception of moral excellence. The students developed a list of characteristics that exemplified a "highly moral [or religious or spiritual] person" (Walker and Pitts, 1998, p. 406). A different group of students then rated the list of characteristics using a Likert scale to indicate their perception of how applicable each characteristic was to the life of someone who was highly moral. The researchers then asked another group of students to examine the top 50 characteristics (in terms of ranking by the second group) and sort them into like groups. Because this study did not examine exemplary individuals but exemplary characteristics, there was no need to utilize a comparison group.

Matsuba and Walker (2004) used a mixed-methods approach to study moral leadership among young people. In this study, the researchers provided only vague nomination criteria to the nominators (directors of a variety of social organizations) in order to emphasize the perception of the nominators. This study did include a comparison group, with each of the 40 exemplars paired with another individual with similar demographic characteristics. Participants completed multiple personality inventories and a semi-structured interview.

The exemplar methodology has been primarily employed by psychologists thus far, however, Bronk et al. (2013) note that it would be a useful framework for social scientists. I chose to use this methodology to profile exemplary P-20 partnerships. It is a good fit for this

study because it provided a tested framework for studying exemplars. Using the exemplar methodology provided me with a structure for determining nomination criteria and selecting exemplars. Without this structure, my selections would have been less systematic and possibly be more biased based on my own perceptions and knowledge.

Sample

The sample for phase one consisted of 104 state-level administrators in P-12 and higher education. I contacted every head of the department of education and head of the department of higher education (or their equivalents) in each of the 50 states in the United States. Two states do not have departments of higher education but have multiple contacts who oversee higher education in the state. The U.S. Department of Education maintains a website with the contact information of all administrative heads of both the department of P-12 education and department of higher education in each state (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). I utilized this list to contact prospective participants via e-mail. This group comprised the sample for phase one. Prior to contacting any prospective participants, this project received approval from the University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board.

Instrumentation

The instrument for phase one was a survey sent through e-mail. The survey consisted of two parts:

1. Please nominate up to 3 exemplary P-20 partnerships in your state. Please include the name of the partnership, contact information, and a few sentences that describe the partnership.
2. Why did you select the program(s) listed above as exemplars?

The e-mail survey also included a short paragraph explaining my research and defining P-20 partnerships. I did not define "exemplary" for the participants. Instead, I was interested in their perception of what makes a program exemplary, which is why I asked question two. The content of the e-mail cover letter is available for review in Appendix A.

Data Collection

I contacted each administrator through the official e-mail addresses listed on state websites and used Google Forms to collect their responses. I sent the initial email, a reminder after 7 days, a final reminder after 12 days, and then closed the survey after 14 days.

Data Analysis

First, I categorized the nominated partnerships according to Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) typology of school-university partnerships as I sought to study one of each type. Next, I used content analysis to analyze the qualitative data provided in the answers to question two. Using *invivo* coding, I looked for themes to explain why administrators selected the programs they listed as exemplars (Patton, 2002). As themes emerged, I considered these themes to be criteria for exemplary partnerships. After applying the exemplary criteria to the nominated partnerships, I selected programs to study that were diverse in region, size, type of institution, and demographics of students served.

D. Research Questions Two and Three: How Do Exemplary P-20 Partnerships Define and Measure Success? From the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders in Higher Education, What are the Essential Elements of Exemplary Partnerships?

Sample

The sample for research questions two and three included the P-20 partnership leaders of the exemplary partnerships I selected from the nominees to study. I initially communicated with the participants in this phase by e-mail to invite them to participate.

Instrumentation

First, I conducted a document analysis of annual reports, evaluations, presentation slides, and other documents I found relating the exemplary programs on their websites (Patton, 2002). I conducted my own search of the documents available on partnership websites to find documents that described how the programs defined and measured success. I specifically looked for documents that referenced yearly evaluations and annual reports. In this step, the primary instruments used were the documents themselves. Using the completed document analysis data and the themes that emerged from analyzing data from research question one, I developed an interview protocol with open-ended questions for semi-structured interviews with the participants (Appendix B). The questions were designed to help me learn how the leaders defined and measured the success of their partnerships and what they considered to be the essential elements for exemplary P-20 partnerships.

Data Collection

For document analysis, I collected data from documents on the websites related to the partnerships. I used the search function on each partnership's website to look for annual reports, evaluations, event announcements, presentation slides, meeting agendas, and meeting minutes over the previous five years. Additionally, I used Google to search for media coverage of any partnerships or events from the previous five years. I specifically looked for documents that contained either direct or indirect references to how the partnerships defined and measured

success. I collected additional data by conducting one semi-structured phone interview with each of the participants. Each interview was between 32 and 64 minutes long. The audio for each interview was recorded. During the interview phase, I utilized analytic memos to track my perceptions, participant responses, and any other notes about the environment or tenor of the interview (Patton, 2001).

Data Analysis

Once I collected documents, I utilized content analysis to analyze the documents and look for themes pertaining to the ways partnerships defined and measured success. After the interviews were completed, I transcribed each interview. Each interview was transformed into a document and I used *invivo* coding to look for themes in each. After determining the themes to each individual participant's interview, I compared the themes across the three interviews to look for commonalities. I also compared the themes from the interviews with the themes that emerged from the document analysis. The data from both sources provided me with information to address research questions two and three.

E. Research Question Four: From the Perspective of P-20 Participants, What are the Essential Elements of Exemplary Partnerships?

Sample

The sample for research question four was participants from the exemplary P-20 partnerships that were studied. I sought permission from the P-20 partnership leaders to invite partners to participate. The P-20 leaders invited school district central office administrators (superintendents, assistant superintendents, curriculum specialists, etc.), building administrators (principals, assistant principals, counselors, facilitators, etc.), community members, and state officials. The sample was designed to gain the perspective of people who had participated in the

partnership and I asked the P-20 partnership leaders to focus on inviting P-12 representatives to participate.

Instrumentation

This portion of the research utilized a survey with both closed- and open-ended questions to gather information from the perspective of P-12 education partners (Appendix C). The questions were formulated after analyzing the data pertaining to P-20 partnership leaders' ideas about the essential elements of exemplary P-20 partnerships. I used Likert-scaled questions related to each of the community capitals to determine which types of capital were most important in building P-20 partnerships from the perspective of the participants. I also included examples of each of the seven types of community capitals. After analyzing the data from the interviews with exemplary P-20 partnership leaders, I slightly changed the survey for participants. Specifically, I removed a question that I felt was too evaluative because it asked participants to indicate if they felt the partnership was an exemplar. Instead, I asked participants to describe why they felt the partnership had been identified by state officials as an exemplar.

Data Collection

Survey data was collected through an electronic survey administered by Google Forms. I left the survey open for a two-week period. I sent an initial e-mail to potential participants to invite them to complete the survey. I sent a reminder email after seven days and a final reminder after 12 days.

Data Analysis

I used content analysis and *invivo* coding to analyze the responses to open-ended survey questions. For the Likert-scaled questions regarding community capitals, I calculated the means of each capital to determine rank order of importance for the capitals, from the perspective of the

P-12 participants. The data from both the closed- and open-ended questions were analyzed simultaneously to provide an opportunity for meta-inferences about the perspective of partnership participants.

F. Research Question Five: How Can the Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships be Viewed through the Community Capitals Framework?

The final research question did not require a new sample or additional data collection. Instead, I utilized the findings from the previous four research questions to examine how the essential elements of successful P-20 partnerships are related to the Community Capitals Framework (CCF). CCF examines the resources of a community by dividing them into seven capitals: natural, cultural, human, social, political, financial, and built. CCF is an assets-based approach which was a good fit for the data I collected from exemplary P-20 partnerships because it allowed me to categorize the key elements to successful partnerships according to the seven capitals in the CCF.

When I examined the data collected and analyzed through the previous steps, I compared the themes with the CCF. I assumed that many of the themes from this research would be complementary with human capital, social capital, political capital, and financial capital. It would make sense that successful P-20 partnerships require human resources in terms of the time and talents of people committed to making partnerships work. Social capital, the relationships that develop between individuals, are also be necessary in supporting the work of P-20 partnerships. Power and politics also likely influence (or prevent) the success of P-20 partnerships. Financial resources to fund programs are another necessity when considering successful partnerships (Emery, Fey, and Flora, 2006). While I expected to see themes emerge

from this research that would complement the concepts of human, social, political and financial capital, I was interested to see if any themes related to natural, cultural, and built capital.

IV. Results

A. Introduction

This section includes results from the three phases of data collection, sample groups, and instruments used to examine exemplary P-20 partnerships. A multilevel, multistrand mixed methods design was utilized to best fit the information desired with the most appropriate methods. This section is organized by research question, with data collection results and data analysis for each research question under their respective headings.

B. Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify and understand the key elements that make P-20 partnerships successful. The current literature on P-20 partnerships emphasizes description, and not systematic evaluation to provide practical application for current P-20 partnership leaders or those planning to initiate partnerships. Another objective of this study was to investigate the resources that are essential in building and maintaining partnerships, from the perspective of both P-20 partnership leaders and the school district administrators, teachers, community members, and state officials who are participants in the partnerships.

P-20 partnerships have been touted as a possible solution to the gap between P-12 schools and institutions of higher education (Cevallos, 2013; Domina & Ruzek, 2010; Kirst, 2005). This gap has been blamed for a variety of societal problems including the high college remediation rate among high school graduates (National Conference of State Legislatures, n.d.), low six-year college graduation rates (National Center for Education Statistics,2014), and a mismatch between the skills of college graduates and workforce needs (Carnevale, Smith, & Strohl, 2013). However, research on P-20 partnerships has been largely limited to describing different

partnerships without investigating how they defined and measured success and what contributed to their success.

To address this gap in the literature, I utilized integrated mixed methods strategies to examine exemplary P-20 partnerships. First, I used the exemplar methodology to identify exemplars by surveying 104 state-level administrators in P-12 and higher education. This instrument, a survey that gathered qualitative data, asked respondents to provide criteria for exemplary programs by providing an explanation of why they chose the programs as exemplars. I analyzed the responses using latent content analysis to develop a list of criteria for exemplars. Then, I applied the criteria to the P-20 programs nominated as exemplars to winnow the list to four, one of each of the four types of P-20 partnerships (Wilbur & Lambert, 1995).

After determining which nominated exemplars would be studied, I contacted the directors of four of the P-20 partnerships to invite them to participate in the study. After three P-20 partnership directors accepted my invitation to participate, I searched their websites for documents pertaining to how the partnerships defined and measured success and used document analysis to learn more about each partnership. Next, I conducted a phone interview with each of the P-20 partnership leaders who participated using questions that were informed by the criteria that emerged through my analysis of the state-level administrators' responses. I transcribed each interview and used latent content analysis to find themes among the responses to answer research question two. Following the interviews, I sent a survey that included both open- and closed-response questions to P-20 partnership participants. The sample for the survey included teachers, building and district administrators, community members, and state officials who had participated in the exemplary P-20 partnerships. I utilized latent content analysis to analyze the

open-response questions for this survey and descriptive statistics to analyze responses to the closed-response questions.

C. Research Question One: What Criteria can be Used to Define Exemplary P-20 Partnerships?

Data Collection Results

The electronic survey sent to 104 state-level administrators in P-12 and higher education was completed by seven administrators from six different states who nominated a total of 13 partnerships for a response rate of 6.7%. Administrators from Connecticut, Idaho, Ohio, New York, Utah, and Virginia completed the survey; four nominated only one partnership while the remaining three nominated three partnerships each. Respondents offered a brief description of each program and an explanation of why they considered the partnership to be exemplary.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data collected in phase one occurred over several steps. Using latent content analysis, I analyzed the exemplar criteria provided by respondents to look for themes among their responses (Patton, 2002). I used the research question to guide my analysis by capturing any sentences or phrases that pertained to the question (What criteria can be used to define exemplary P-20 partnerships?). After reviewing each phrase, I developed open codes for each using *invivo* coding (Saldana, 2013). Then, I grouped common open codes into themes based on their relationships to each other. After I understood the themes among the exemplar criteria, I utilized the criteria to determine which partnerships would be invited to participate in the study. Table 5 below shows the participant responses, open codes and themes that emerged from the data analysis of the exemplar criteria.

Table 5

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Exemplar Criteria

Theme	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Results	Increasing knowledge	Increasing DAP pedagogy and increasing content knowledge
	Positive outcomes	Shown positive outcomes
	Remarkable success	Remarkable success in providing college and career advising where it would not have occurred otherwise
	Results	Results they have achieved
	Remarkable outcomes	Demonstrated remarkable outcomes in college readiness, access, success, and completion
	Statistically significant results	Statistically significant results in outcomes for children
	Exemplary results	Results are exemplary
	Exemplary results	Results are exemplary

Table 5 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Exemplar Criteria

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Multiple partners	Multiple partners	Multiple partners including P-12 school, higher education institution, and community organizations
	Depth and breadth of partners	Depth and breadth of committed, active partners
	Multiple partners	Multiple partners including higher education, public schools, and community organizations
	Breadth and depth of partnerships	Breadth and depth of partnerships
	Multiple schools	Multiple schools
	Multiple partners	Multiple partners including higher education institutions, P-12 schools, and community organizations.
	Depth and breadth of partnership	Depth and breadth of partnership
Produced curriculum	Constructed units	Constructed developmentally appropriate learning units
	Pilot model units	Executed a three credit graduate course where 32 educators across sectors pilot the model units
	Published units	Published learning units on the internet

Table 5 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Exemplar Criteria

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
External recognition as a model for others	Accepted model	Codified in state law as an accepted model for state funded college and career advising
	Model	Award-winning program model
Support for students	Access for students with disabilities	Partnership advocates for access for students with disabilities
	Promotes college success	Promotes understanding of the financial aid process
	College admission	Guarantees college admission to participants who meet/fulfill all of program's criteria
	Seamless transition from primary to secondary education	Partnerships foster seamless transition from primary to secondary education with a focus on math, science, writing and comprehension
Forum for addressing education matters and sharing solutions	Forum to address matters affecting the region	Forum to address matters affecting teaching and learning in the region
	Sharing solutions across levels	Identified shared solutions across academic levels

Table 5 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Exemplar Criteria

Themes	Open Codes	:ipant Responses
Other		Stayed the course
		Expanded in size each year
		Supports excellence in teacher preparation
		Holds academic integrity as an extremely high value
		Starts in middle school

Results was the most prevalent theme, corresponding with the most open codes (n=8). Participants noted that partnerships were exemplary because their "results are exemplary" and they have "shown positive outcomes." Some respondents noted results that were specific to the types of partnership (for example, "Demonstrated remarkable outcomes in college readiness, access, success and completion") while others wrote of their success in general terms. Respondents emphasized that exemplary P-20 partnerships have success in achieving their goals and provide evidence of exemplary results.

Respondents also described exemplary P-20 partners as those that have *multiple partners*. Respondents emphasized that partnerships included "multiple partners" and multiple types of partners including a "P-12 school, higher education institution, and community organizations." Two responses also highlighted the "depth and breadth" of the partnerships.

Respondents also described *support for students* as a key element of exemplary P-20 partnerships. Within this theme, each open code described different ways that partnerships support students including "Promotes understanding of the financial aid process" and "...advocates for access for students with disabilities."

The other four themes were mentioned less frequently. Three responses were grouped into *produced curriculum*. Respondents indicated that partnerships were exemplary because they delivered a product that could be utilized in classrooms. *Community engagement*, another theme comprised of three codes, included an emphasis on the ability of partnerships to include museums and families. Exemplars were also chosen because they served as *forums for addressing education matters and for sharing solutions* in their respective regions. Additionally, some exemplars were chosen because they had received *external recognition as a model for others*, either by being "award-winning" or "Codified in state law…"

There were four open codes that did not relate directly to any of the others: stayed the course, expanded in size each year, supports excellence in teacher preparation, holds academic integrity as an extremely high value, and starts in middle school.

After analyzing the exemplar criteria responses for themes, I utilized three steps to determine which of the nominated partnerships I would pursue as case studies. First, I sorted the nominated partnerships according to Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) categories of school-college partnerships. Each partnership was given a pseudonym and organized within categories by regions within the United States. I received nominations from four regions: Northeast, East, Midwest, and West. Table 6 below shows the number of each type of partnership nominated and the number of partnerships nominated from each region.

Table 6

Nominated Exemplary P-20 Partnerships by Type and Region (n=13)

Type of partnership	Northeast	East	Midwest	West	Total
Articulation, development, and evaluation of curriculum standards	1	0	0	0	1
Programs and services for educators	2	0	0	0	2
Programs and services for students	0	3	0	1	4
Restructuring	2	0	3	1	6
Total	5	3	3	2	13

Next, I applied the exemplar criteria to the descriptions of each partnership. I looked for a natural break among the partnerships to determine the adequate number of criteria to meet to be considered. Table 7 below shows how many exemplar criteria each partnership met. Each nominated partnership met at least two of the criteria and one partnership met all five.

Table 7

Number of Exemplar Criteria Met by Nominated Partnerships (n=13)

Met 2 exemplar criteria	Met 3 exemplar criteria	Met 4 exemplar criteria	Met 5 exemplar criteria
4	3	5	1

After examining the number of exemplar criteria met by each partnership, it appeared that there was a natural break between meeting three and four of the criteria. I determined I would only examine partnerships that met at least four of the exemplar criteria, which included 46.2% of the partnerships. Within each of the categories of school-college partnerships, I chose the partnership that met the most of the seven exemplar criteria. If there were multiple partnerships that met the same number of criteria, I picked the partnership that represented a region not otherwise represented in the sample. Of the two Restructuring partnerships nominated that met at least four of the exemplar criteria, neither agreed to participate in the study, resulting in three case studies for this research. Table 8 below provides details (pseudonym, type of partnership, and which exemplar criteria it met) about the partnerships chosen through the multi-step process that also agreed to participate.

Table 8

Exemplary P-20 Partnerships by Type and Exemplar Criteria

Partnership	Type of Partnership	Results	Multiple partners	Forum for addressing education matters and sharing solutions	Produced curriculum	Community engagement	External recognition as a model for others	Support for students
Northeast Curriculum and Alignment Partnership	Articulation, development, and evaluation of curriculum standards	X	X		X	X		
Northeast Early Childhood Partnership	Programs and services for educators	X	X		X	X		
Western Mentoring Partnership	Programs and services for students	X	X				X	X

Each partnership chosen met four of the exemplar criteria. I contacted the directors of each partnership chosen by e-mail and invited them to participate in the study. The three partnerships listed above agreed to participate, both in the interview and by providing e-mail addresses for participants so they could complete the electronic survey.

D. Research Questions Two and Three: How do Exemplary P-20 Partnerships Define and Measure Success? From the Perspective of P-20 partnership Leaders, What are the Essential Elements of Exemplary Partnerships?

Data Collection Results

Document analysis. The results of document analysis varied depending on the amount of material available from each partnership. I searched institutional and state websites for information about each partnership. As I read the documents I found, I looked for general information about the partnership and specific information related to research questions two and three. I synthesized the information found online to provide context about each partnership prior to conducting interviews with each director. The Western Mentoring Partnership had an extensive online presence including a website dedicated to the partnership, extensive information available on the state board of education website, and two external education-focused websites highlighting the partnership as an exemplar. Neither the Northeastern Curriculum and Alignment Partnership nor the Northeastern Early Childhood Education Partnership had a web presence outside press releases about their funding and newspaper articles highlighting their work in local schools.

Interviews. I conducted interviews with directors of each of the P-20 partnerships via phone as none of the participants were comfortable using Skype. I used the interview protocol in Appendix B and asked follow-up and clarifying questions as necessary. The interviews ranged in time from 32 to 64 minutes, depending on the interest of the participant and the length of their responses. After each interview, I completed an analytic memo for reflection (Appendix D) and then transcribed each interview (Appendix E). Additionally, I kept a reflection journal while coding the data and made notes in it about themes that seemed to be emerging and questions I had regarding the data (Appendix F).

Data Analysis

Document analysis. The Western Mentoring Partnership places recent college graduates in high-needs high schools throughout the state to act as college mentors. College mentors are trained in college access and success strategies and work with high school counseling staff. They schedule campus visits for students, assist students in completing college admission and scholarship applications, and promote FAFSA completion. The partnership includes 13 high schools and 11 college mentors who work closely with staff at each of the institutions of higher education in the state. The statewide program is part of an overall effort to increase the number of people in the state with college degrees. The Western Mentoring Partnership is supported by $5 million from the state and has been recognized by a national education organization as a model for improving college access. Beginning this year, state statute requires that all high schools in the state adopt a model for improving college-going, of which the Western Mentoring Partnership is one approved option.

The long-term goal of the Western Mentoring Partnership is to increase the number of high school students who continue to postsecondary enrollment and complete a baccalaureate degree. College-going rates are tracked by participating high schools as well as short-term results including the number of students advised by the college mentors, number of group presentations by college mentors, FAFSA completion rates, and number of college and scholarship applications completed. Long-term outcomes including college completion are tracked by the P-20 partnership director as well as the state department of education.

The Northeastern Curriculum and Alignment Partnership is funded by a state grant as a result of federal Race to the Top money. The partnership includes a four-year university, a local

community college, local elementary schools and three regional science centers. The goal of the Northeastern Curriculum and Alignment Partnership is to increase science knowledge among birth through third grade teachers. Additionally, participants develop and disseminate model science curriculum units for early educators in the region. Partnership staff use a statewide classroom observation tool to evaluate the units created by participants. The documents I found to analyze included a website with information on the grant, press releases about its establishment, and a website devoted to all P-20 initiatives at the institution of higher education, of which this particular partnership is one.

Very few documents related to the Northeastern Early Childhood Education Partnership were available online; for this document analysis, I found press releases and news stories about the initial creation of the partnership and, later, additional funding received from the state. The partnership is funded by the state to provide STEAM-focused (science, technology, engineering, arts, and math) professional development for early childhood educators through college courses in education. Participants can obtain a bachelor's degree in education through participation. The partnership includes teachers and teaching assistants from local public schools, state-sponsored childcare programs, and private childcare providers. The Northeastern Early Childhood Education partnership also collaborates with three regional art museums. The ultimate goal of the partnership is to improve the quality of STEM and STEAM early childhood curriculum in the state. They measure their success by the number of teachers who participate as well as using observation methods to look for student-level changes. The ultimate goals of the partnership include students developing greater persistence and utilizing the STEM design cycle in class.

Interviews. After completing and transcribing all of the interviews, I used latent content analysis, treating the transcriptions as text, to examine responses for themes related to my

research questions (Patton, 2002). I coded phrases from each interview that pertained to the research questions using *invivo* codes (Saldana, 2012).

Research question two: How do exemplary P-20 partnerships define and measure success? Overall, the exemplary P-20 partnerships I studied define and measure success based on their individual partnership purpose and goals. There is not an objective measure of success for P-20 partnerships. Partnership directors focused on short-term and long-term outcomes for individual programs as opposed to a more general explanation of how to define success for P-20 partnerships. Each of the directors mentioned specific goals for their partnerships and offered examples of how the goals are measured. However, the three partnerships studied are ultimately focused on improving some aspect of the P-20 education pipeline. Outside that very general definition of success, the partnerships each had more specific definitions of success that pertained to their individual partnership goals.

The Western Mentoring Partnership defines success, ultimately, as an increased number of people in the state with college degrees. Incrementally, they also set program goals for number of students advised, number of parent meetings, number of college applications completed, and number of classroom presentations. They also track postsecondary enrollment on the school level and aim to increase levels at each school.

The Northeastern Early Childhood Partnership sets both short-term and long-term goals to gauge its effectiveness. One long-term goal is to ensure that 90% of 3rd graders are proficient in reading by 2020, as measured by a statewide reading assessment. Another program goal is to increase the number of students taking STEAM courses in high school and enrolling in STEM-related degree programs in college. The program has only been in existence for a few years and long-term results will be available for high school courses beginning in seven years and college

enrollment in 11 years. Additionally, Northeastern Early Childhood Partnership staff track the number of teachers who attend professional development sessions and conduct classroom observations to see if the teachers implement what they learned.

The Northeastern Curriculum and Alignment Partnership defines success as increasing the number of early childhood educators with master's degrees. The ultimate goal of the partnership is to have a teacher with a master's degree in teaching in every early childhood classroom. For short-term outcomes, they also conduct observations in the classroom of participating teachers to determine if science knowledge among participants has improved. They also aim to improve science knowledge of the students in participants' classrooms, but have not yet determined how they will measure it.

The Northeastern Curriculum and Alignment Partnership leadership specifically mentioned that they would like to do more to evaluate the success of their partnership outside of the program specific goals. They know their partnership works because of the deep relationships they've built and their ability to achieve the program-specific goals, but they are interested in considering how they can measure partnership health.

Most of the conversations I had with P-20 partnership directors focused on defining and measuring success of individual programs within the partnership. Directors work with partners to set goals and design methods for measuring them. However, one director did propose that they reflect more purposefully on the partnership itself to determine what works and what could be improved. It does not seem that partnerships tease apart partnership goals and success from the specific goals and success for individual programs. However, all partnerships do aim to positively change a piece of the P-20 education pipeline, from preschool teaching about science to college graduation.

Research question three: From the perspective of P-20 partnership leaders in higher education, what are the essential elements of exemplary partnerships? I used latent content analysis to select phrases that specifically related to this research question and then assigned open codes to each phrase. The codes were grouped in 10 themes which could be seen as the essential elements for exemplary P-20 partnerships from the perspective of P-20 partnership leaders. Table 9 below lists the themes and the corresponding codes.

Table 9

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Code	Participant Responses
Committed, credible backbone organization	Backbone	I think that absent that kind of a backbone-- if everybody's in charge, nobody's in charge
	Lightning rod	If you're looking at the generalization of building this kind of partnership, from the get-go there has to be a lightning rod
	Backbone organization	backbone organization
	Credibility	It wouldn't have lasted 12 years if it didn't have that kind of credibility from day one
	Collective impact	It's only by collective impact
	Collective impact	The collective impact model...that's really what it's about

Table 9 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Committed, credible backbone organization (continued)	Backbone organizations	We are working with a couple of backbone organizations
	Convening force	What we're discovering is that in any of these partnerships...you have to have a convening force that's credible to all the parts
	Backbone organization	You have a backbone organization saying, 'we're not going away when the grant goes away'
	Committed	[Partners] work very closely together, acting out that they are committed to these outcomes...committed to the quality of education, pre-K through 16
	Credibility	They're talking to someone who has credibility
	Commitment	A commitment from a plausible entity that's going to be around for the duration of this initiative

Table 9 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Relationships that facilitate on-going conversations	Relationships	It's all about relationships
	Relationships	All of that...was built on relationships
	Early innovators, early initiators	Quickly identify those people or divisions who are the early innovators or early initiators and you spend your time with those people initially and then you build outward
	On-going conversations	The value of on-going conversations where you can pick up where you left off, so you're not always backtracking is essential
	People at the top	You need to talk to people at the top. The superintendents, principals in your area, you want to get to know them, you want to meet with them
	Critical mass	Get the critical mass
	Learn the people	Get out there and learn the people
	Personal relationship	You really have to be able to pick up the phone and talk to the person in a parallel role on a regular basis

Table 9 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Local champion	Local, regional champion	That is what is so essential-- having a local, regional champion
	People at different levels of authority	There has to be a person with some decision-making authority besides that leadership person-- that leadership person is not usually in a position to do day-to-day stuff
	People with local insight	People who have that kind of local insight
	Champion	There's a champion in place
	Influential person	Every partnership relies upon somebody who can be like Tom Sawyer, where you get enough people to whitewash the fence
	Leader on the ground	You can have your advisory group that makes some decisions, but they have to have somebody to turn to to say, 'You make sure the partners understand their assignments, convene the following groups, we need to get it done-- get the tasks, find the people to get it done'

Table 9 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Local champion (continued)	Operational responsibility	You need somebody who has operational responsibility
	Leadership at different levels	Committed leadership at all different levels...some committed people kind of in
Meet needs of the community	Need	This was the need
	Meet changing needs	Meet the changing needs
	Meet needs of community	Meet the needs of the community
	Meet needs of community	Meeting the needs of the community
	Needs	Find out what their needs are
	Needs	Find out what their needs are instead of what you can offer them
	Needs	Find out your own needs and strengths and your partner's needs and strengths
	Need	We responded to the need

Table 9 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Adequate resources	Resources	Resources-- or at least the capacity to get resources
	Money	Money...stuff
	Using resources well	It's not a matter of getting better resources-- it's a matter of using resources better
	Money not the only necessary resource	I would say that you need money, but money is really not going to determine the success
	Sharing resources	The University exists to share resources with the community
	More than money	More than financial resources
Multiple partners that represent lifespan development including P-12 schools, higher education, and the private sector	Entire spectrum of partners over a child's development	We do have the pediatric care folks involved, the OB-GYN people involved, to make sure that children from conception on have the opportunity to succeed
	Community connections	Community connections
	P-20 partnerships	Partnership between higher education, K-12 education, early education

Table 9 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Multiple partners that represent lifespan development including P-12 schools, higher education, and the private sector (continued)	Education and private sector partnerships	Vision was to get the private sector, higher education, and secondary education people together
	Prenatal to school	Prenatal to school
	Private sector	Including the private sector
Small enough to be personal	Personal	Personal level
	Individuals, communities, students	Reduce it down to the individuals, to the communities, to the students
	Do not make partnerships too large	Where you have multiple universities with huge populations, large number of school districts, their partnerships were probably too large
	Small enough to be personal	If you want a partnership to work, it can't be so large that it becomes impersonal
	Scale	Where they did work where was where an individual college decided with more proximal districts to form a smaller entity, something more on scale...rather than working with all of the region

Table 9 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Reciprocity	Reciprocal	Truly reciprocal-- they do for us and we do for them
	Reciprocal	Reciprocal-- it's a true partnership in that we do is we try to give back
	Giving back	We have been giving back to the schools
	Using strengths to benefit schools	We just need to recognize what are some of the strengths that we have that we could leverage for public schools-- especially with limited dollars. Many times we see a partnership in which the community is always doing for the university.
Collegiality	Shared learning	It wasn't [university faculty] descending from the throne and giving lessons to these lowly early educators
	Not top-down	Don't necessarily feel like you need it from top-down

Table 9 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses for Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships from the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Leaders

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Collegiality (continued)	Not talking down to educators	Sometimes if you're not careful about the conversation and expectation, you get early educators or elementary educators feeling that they're being talked down to
Shared mission and goals	Shared mission	An important shared mission
	Shared goals	Involves shared goals that are articulated together
	Outcomes and goals	Clear understanding among all partners of what the outcomes and goals are

P-20 partnership leaders indicated that exemplary partnerships feature c*ommitted, credible backbone organizations*. This theme was developed from 12 open codes addressing the need for organizations that would remain committed to the partnerships for the long-term. One participant indicated that it was essential to have "a commitment from a plausible entity that's going to be around for the duration of this initiative." Two participants specifically referenced the Collective Impact approach which describes a theory of action for change in communities (Kania & Kramer, 2011). Backbone organizations supply staff and administrative support for the partnership and coordinate efforts (Kania & Kramer, 2011). Participants emphasized the

need for a credible backbone organization and provided examples including their institutions of higher education, Head Start, and the local United Way.

Exemplary P-20 partnerships also feature *relationships that facilitate on-going conversations*. This theme, developed from 10 open codes, describes more than just establishing relationships. Participants emphasized the ability to have on-going conversations so that “you can pick up where you left off, so you’re not always backtracking…” Exemplary partnerships also require people involved in many different roles and levels of leadership. While participants expressed the importance of talking to “people at the top,” they also asserted the need for a *local champion,* someone with “local insight” who is “in a position to do day-to-day stuff.” One participant remarked, “Every partnership relies upon somebody who can be like Tom Sawyer, where you can get enough people to whitewash the fence.”

Exemplary P-20 partnerships seek to *meet the needs of the community* and participants expressed the importance of emphasizing community needs, “instead of what you can offer them.” Likewise, participants describe exemplary partnerships as depending on *reciprocity*. One participant remarked, “...many times we see a partnership in which the community is always doing for the university” but an exemplary partnership should be “truly reciprocal-- they do for us and we do for them.”

While participants expressed the need for *adequate resources*, they indicated that money is not the only important resource. One participant stated, “...you need money, but money is not really going to determine the success” while another remarked that exemplary P-20 partnerships require “more than financial resources.”

Exemplary P-20 partnerships include *multiple partners that represent lifespan development including P-12 schools, higher education, and the private sector*. All of the

partnerships included in this study specifically partner with private community organizations including museums, science centers, and local and regional workforce groups. Participants mentioned the need to create coalitions with partners who support prenatal to preschool health because waiting until elementary school to prepare students for postsecondary success was considered too late. One participant remarked, "We do have the pediatric care folks involved...to make sure that children from conception on have the opportunity to succeed."

Participants also expressed the need for partnerships to be a manageable size. One participant remarked, "If you want a partnership to work, it can't be so large that it becomes impersonal." Exemplary P-20 partnerships are *small enough to be personal*. Responses that aligned to this theme described partnerships that "reduce it down to the individuals, to the communities, to the students" and partner with "...more proximal districts to form a smaller entity, something more on scale."

Partnerships that are exemplary also depend on *collegiality* and are not top-down. Participants emphasized that exemplary P-20 partnerships engage in shared learning, not "[university faculty] descending from the throne and giving lessons…" Likewise, exemplary P-20 partnerships develop *shared mission and goals*. In addition, partners should have a "clear understanding" of the goals.

Leaders of exemplary P-20 partnerships offered insight into the essential elements of exemplary partnerships through their interviews. The leaders agree that having a committed, credible backbone organization is essential. Relationships are also key, but not sufficient. Participants noted that exemplary partnerships include relationships that facilitate on-going conversations so that the work can always be moving forward. Having a local champion who can engage with all partners and lead the day-to-day business of the partnerships is also essential.

Participants emphasized the importance of meeting the needs of the community as well as working to ensure that the partnership is reciprocal. Adequate resources are another essential element, but participants noted that money often is not the most important resource. Exemplary partnerships include multiple partners typically representing pre-school organizations (in some cases, even pediatric health experts), P-12 schools, institutions of higher education, and other community organizations. Participants asserted that partnerships should not be too large, involving too many partners, but should be small enough to facilitate personal connections. Exemplary partnerships are collegial, not top-down, and promote the development of shared mission and goals.

E. Research Question Four: From the Perspective of P-20 Partnership Participants, What are the Essential Elements of Exemplary Partnerships?

<u>Data Collection Results</u>

The three exemplary P-20 partnerships involved in the study were asked to provide e-mail addresses of local or regional partners who had participated in their partnerships, including teachers, district administrators, and community members. The three partnerships provided e-mail address for a total of 61 individuals. The Northeast Early Childhood Partnership submitted 10 names; the Northeast Curriculum and Alignment Partnership submitted 18 names; and the Western Mentoring Partnership submitted 33 names. I created an electronic survey for each partnership in Google Forms; each survey was identical other than the identifying information for the partnership.

I e-mailed each of the 61 individuals at their provided e-mail addresses to invite them to participate in an electronic survey to describe why their P-20 partnership is considered exemplary (survey in Appendix C). All of the e-mail addresses were valid; I did not have any

issues with returned e-mails. Seven days after the initial e-mail, I sent a reminder e-mail encouraging the potential participants to complete the survey. I sent a final reminder e-mail two days later and closed the survey 14 days after opening it.

Of the 61 P-20 partnership participants that comprised the sample, 34 completed the survey (55.7%). However, upon reviewing the data, one participant submitted the survey but did not answer any of the questions and another response was a duplicate; therefore, calculations are made based on 32 surveys (52.5%). Table 10 provides a breakdown of the respondents by partnership.

Table 10

Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participant Responses (n=32)

Partnership	Number of Potential Respondents	Number of Respondents	Response Rate	Percentage of Overall Respondent Group
Northeastern Curriculum and Alignment Partnership	18	15	83.3%	46.9%
Northeastern Early Childhood Partnership	10	3	30%	9.4%
Western Mentoring Partnership	33	14	42.4%	43.8%

While the Northeastern Curriculum and Alignment Partnership and Western Mentoring Partnership comprise similar percentages of the overall respondent group, Northeastern Early Childhood Partnership participants represent just 9.4% of the overall respondent group. The findings of this portion of the study, then, may be less generalizable to the Northeastern Early Childhood Partnership than to the other two partnerships.

Data Analysis

The first survey question asked respondents to choose from predetermined lengths of time that describe their length of involvement with the program: 0-2 years, 3-5 years, 6-10 years, and more than 10 years. Table 11 below describes the responses to this question.

Table 11

Number of Years of Participant Involvement in Exemplary P-20 Partnerships (n=32)

Number of Years Involved	Number and Percentage of Overall Respondent Group
0-2 Years	7 (21.9%)
3-5 Years	21 (65.6%)
6-10 Years	4 (12.5%)
More than 10 Years	0

Nearly two-thirds of respondents reported three to five years of involvement with the partnerships. An additional 12.5% report 6-10 years of involvement while 21.9% have been involved two years or less. Having 78.1% of respondents with three to 10 years of experience with their respective partnerships increases my confidence in the findings. Knowing that more than three-fourths of the respondents have at least three years of experiences with the partnership, I assume they have been involved long enough to know how the partnership defines and measures success and to have an opinion about why the partnership is considered to be an exemplar by state administrators.

Respondents were also asked to identify their role in relationship to the partnership: P-12 teacher, P-12 building administrator, P-12 district administrator, community member, or other. Those who chose other were asked to describe their role. Table 12 details the responses to this question. Two respondents chose to leave this question blank.

Table 12

Roles of Survey Respondents

Role	Number and Percentage of Overall Respondent Group
P-12 Teacher	15 (46.9%)
P-12 Building Administrator	4 (12.5%)
P-12 District Administrator	3 (9.4%)
Community Member	1 (3.1%)
Other	9 (28.1%)

P-12 teachers dominated the respondents, representing 46.9% (15 respondents). Four building administrators responded (12.5%) and three district administrators (9.4%). Despite the P-20 partnership leaders' emphasis on the involvement of community members, only one community member completed the electronic survey (3.1%). Nine respondents chose "other" and provided an explanation of their roles: school counselor (2 respondents), administrator, member of supporting state agency, higher education partner, program evaluator, project coordinator and grant manager, and support personnel. Overall, 24 of the 32 respondents (75%) were school-based partners while the remaining 25% represented the state, higher education, and other types of partners.

The survey included three open response questions about how success is defined for the partnership, why the partnership is considered an exemplary, and if there was any other information they wanted to provide. I read the responses as one text to extract ideas related to the essential elements of exemplary P-20 partnerships. After examining phrases related to the research question, I assigned open codes to each of the participant responses using *invivo* coding and then grouped them into corresponding themes (Patton, 2002).

Table 13

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Theme	Open Code	Participant Response
Create positive outcomes for P-12 students	Improved teaching	Enhanced my teaching
	Ideas for teaching	Brought back great ideas to my classroom
	Improved teaching	The staff...better equip educators so we can better teach our students
	Increased college-going rates	More students going onto higher education
	Increased college-going behavior among students	Every high school senior participated in a college visitation, completed a FAFSA, searched a college/university that has a program of interest to the student, and every senior applied to at least one postsecondary institute

Table 13 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Create positive outcomes for P-12 students (continued)	Increased content knowledge	Brings opportunities to teachers to deepen understanding of STEM/STEAM and how to implement it in your classroom daily
	Increased content knowledge and creativity	Topics that expanded your knowledge and creativity
	Greater awareness of options among students	Increased awareness of students' opportunities after high school
	Personalized attention for students	More personalized interaction made a huge impact [on students]
	Creating more engaging lessons for students	Support in making and executing creative lessons that will engage our students.
	Individual help for students	Students are receiving one-on-one help
	Increased college-going among students	Evidence that more students applied and enrolled in higher education

Table 13 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Create positive outcomes for P-12 students (continued)	Focus on students' needs	Kept the students' needs as the guide for program development
	Preparing students for life after high school	Instrumental in helping prepare [state] students for life after high school
	Helping students plan	Simply helping students make a plan to transition to after graduating
	Improved teacher quality	Improved teacher quality
	Help for students	Help high school students navigate the difficult waters of post-secondary education
	Directly aids students	Partnership to directly aid students
	Increase in college-going behavior and postsecondary enrollment	Initial program data has shown an increase in FAFSA completion, applications submitted, and students enrolling in college

Table 13 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Create positive outcomes for P-12 students (continued)	Improved teaching	Teachers are using the concepts and methodology in their classes
	Increase in postsecondary enrollment	Students who might never have considered college as an option before are applying to and attending postsecondary
Encourage collaboration among partners	Collaborate with school officials	Work closely with school counselors
	Teachers form networks and collaborate	Provide opportunity for teachers to network and learn from each other
	Collaboration	Collaboration
	Inclusive approach	Inclusive approach seeking buy-in from all stakeholders
	Teachers form networks and collaborate	I have met other teachers from other programs and got some different ideas from them as well
	Collaboration among teachers	I have developed...an ability to work with teachers from different grade levels and backgrounds

Table 13 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Encourage collaboration among partners (continued)	Collaboration among teachers	Teachers have been given the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers from different schools to gather ideas.
	Collaboration among different sectors	People from government, business and education came together
	Working together	Everyone worked well together
	Making connections	Connection between the college and schools
	Teachers collaborate	Allows teachers to collaborate together
	Collaboration	Lots of collaboration
	Collaborate	routinely collaborate
	Collaborate and learn	collaborate and learn from each other

Table 13 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Encourage collaboration among partners (continued)	Fosters productive relationships across the state	Fosters productive relationships between the State Board, school districts, and institutions of higher education across the entire state
Fill gaps to provide extra support for P-12 students and staff	Partnerships fill gaps in schools	Schools...are aware of their limitations to their time/resources and allow [the P-20 partnership] to fill gaps in the secondary ed system
	Offering support and resources	Offering not only knowledge, but support and resources
	Support in schools	More support in secondary schools to assist students
	Provide information to students and families	Provide another source of important and valuable information about higher education to students and families
	Support students in ways school staff cannot	Support students in a way that high school counselors don't have enough time to do

Table 13 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Fill gaps to provide extra support for P-12 students and staff (continued)	One-on-one support for students	Huge support to helping with working one-on-one with students who need extra support
	Support students	Work alongside staff to support [students]
	Work alongside school staff to support students	Able to work alongside staff and school counselors to help support students with their postsecondary aspirations
	Available to support	They are available whenever we want and willing to help with whatever type of support we need
	Ongoing support for teachers	Offers ongoing support to teachers
	Support	Support
	Fills a gap in schools	Provides a gap in service traditional high school counselors are not able to provide because of other commitments.

Table 13 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Fill gaps to provide extra support for P-12 students and staff (continued)	Extra support for students	Providing greater awareness and opportunities to students who need extra support
	Material support for teachers and classrooms	The lab supports us with field trips and materials for integrating STEAM topics into our classrooms
Dedicated staff	Great staff	Mostly you had great staff encouraging, organizing and presenting these programs
	Staff working tirelessly	Staff at the university work tirelessly to support the program
	Excellent leadership	Leadership is excellent
	Staff accessibility	Accessibility to the college staffing has been an impact
	Wonderful mentor	Having a wonderful mentor to model

Table 13 (continued)

Themes, Open Codes, and Participant Responses from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Themes	Open Codes	Participant Responses
Dedicated staff (continued)	Dedicated, caring staff	People who are teaching the program are dedicated and really care about the quality of education
Adequate resources	Low cost	Relatively low cost resource
	Resource-effective	Excellent use of resources
	Adequate resources	Resources to meet the needs of both partners

Five themes emerged from the analysis of open responses from exemplary P-20 partnership participants. First, respondents emphasized that exemplary P-20 partnerships c*reate positive outcomes for P-12 students*. Twenty-one open codes related to this theme and the specific responses were often directly connected to the type of outcomes desired by the individual partnerships. Some related to improved teaching, others to increased college-going rates among students, and others to providing support directly to students. Overall, though, the theme of positive change for P-12 students was apparent. One respondent remarked that their partnership was considered a success because it, "...kept the students' needs as the guide for program development." Another aspect of creating positive outcomes for P-12 students was

"personalized interaction" with students as well as professional development for teachers to "better equip educators so we can better teach our students." Despite the diverse goals within each partnership, creating positive outcomes for P-12 students is a commonality among them.

From the perspective of respondents, exemplary P-20 partnerships *encourage collaboration among partners*. Fifteen responses related to the theme of collaboration, whether referring to collaboration between individuals or institutions. One respondent who was part of a professional development-focused P-20 partnership remarked, "Teachers have been given the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers from different schools to gather ideas." A respondent from the Western Mentoring Partnership emphasized the role of an exemplary P-20 partnership in creating connections across boundaries, stating that the partnership "fosters productive relationships between the state board, school districts, and institutions of higher education across the entire state."

Exemplary P-20 partnerships *fill gaps to provide extra support for P-12 students and staff*. Respondents noted that the partnerships in which they were involved provided support schools were unable to due to limited resources: "Schools...are aware of their limitations to their time/resources and allow [the P-20 partnership] to fill gaps…" Another hallmark of exemplary P-20 partnerships is *dedicated staff*. Respondents stated that staff members were "dedicated and really care about the quality of education" and "work tirelessly to support the program. The final theme from analyzing participant responses was *adequate resources*. Respondents remarked that that their exemplary P-20 partnerships were "relatively low cost" and provided "resources to meet the needs of both partners."

Respondents were also asked to use a five point Likert scale, zero to four (zero being not important and four being essential) to rank each of the seven community capitals in terms of their

importance for P-20 partnership success. I calculated the means for each of the seven community capitals in order to determine which were ranked highest in importance by the P-20 partnership participants. Table 14 provides the means and rank order for each of the community capitals.

Table 14

Means and Rank Order of Community Capitals from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Community Capital	Mean	Rank
Natural capital	2.13	7
Cultural capital	2.81	5
Human capital	3.78	2
Social capital	3.84	1
Political capital	2.94	4
Financial capital	3.47	3
Built capital	2.47	6

In examining the means from responses from exemplary P-20 partnership participants, three of the community capitals clearly stand out as being ranked higher than others: social capital (3.84), human capital (3.78), and financial capital (3.47). The means of the other five community capitals ranged from 2.13 to 2.94.

I examined the responses within each of the three partnerships to determine if there was variance among the top-ranked community capitals among the partnerships. Table 15 shows the top-ranked capitals for each of the partnerships and their means.

Table 15

Top-ranked Community Capitals from Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

NE Curriculum and Alignment Partnership (n=3)	Social capital (4.00)	Human capital (3.67)	Financial capital (3.00) Political capital (3.00)
Western Mentoring Partnership (n=14)	Human capital (3.93)	Social capital (3.79)	Financial capital (3.21)
NE Early Childhood Partnership (n=15)	Social capital (3.86)	Human capital (3.76)	Financial capital (3.62)

The survey participants from each partnership ranked social capital and human capital as the top two types of community capital needed for exemplary P-20 partnerships. While each ranked financial capital as the third community capital, there was greater disparity among the means, ranging from 3.62 to 3.00. Additionally, one partnership included political capital as the third-highest ranked community capital with a mean of 3.00. Comparing the means of each community capital within the three partnerships shows that they largely agree upon the most essential types of capital for exemplary P-20 partnerships: social capital, human capital, and financial capital.

F. Research Question Five: How can the Essential Elements of Exemplary P-20 Partnerships be Viewed through the Community Capitals Framework?

Data Collection Results

To address research question five, I examined the results from the interviews with P-20 partnership leaders and surveys of P-20 participants to look for similarities in how the two

sample groups described the essential elements of exemplary P-20 partnerships. Once I determined the overlap between the two sample groups, I examined them within the context of the CCF to relate the essential elements of exemplary P-20 partnerships to the seven community capitals.

Data Analysis

There are many similarities among themes that emerged from analyzing the interviews of exemplary P-20 partnership leaders and survey responses from partnership participants. Table 16 shows the themes from both samples sorted into groups based on the three highest-ranked community capitals (as ranked by the P-20 partnership participants).

Table 16

Analyzed Themes Organized by Community Capitals (n=15)

Social Capital		Human Capital	Financial Capital
Multiple partners that represent lifespan development including P-12 schools, higher education, and the private sector	Relationships that facilitate on-going communication Collegiality	Local champion	Adequate resources
Reciprocity	Shared mission and goals	Dedicated staff	Adequate resources
Meet needs of the community	Small enough to be personal		
Committed, credible backbone organization	Fill gaps to provide extra support for P-12 students and staff		
Encourage collaboration among partners	Create positive outcomes for P-12 students		

The majority of the themes expressed by exemplary P-20 partnership leaders and survey participants are related to social capital, the highest ranked capital by P-20 partnership participants. Social capital can be defined as the way people form groups, collaborate within and among groups, develop a shared view of the future, form a collective identity, and engage in collective action (Flora & Flora, 2008, p. 117). Social capital emphasizes relationships, which all sample groups in this study noted as the basis for exemplary P-20 partnerships. Encouraging collaboration, bringing multiple types of partners together, being small enough to be personal,

and forming solid relationships that facilitate on-going conversations among partners are all obvious matches for social capital given the emphasis on relationships. Putnam (1993) also describes social capital as that which “facilitates coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (p. 36). When considering this explanation, meeting the needs of the community, having a shared mission and goals, reciprocity, filling gaps to support P-12 students and staff, and creating positive outcomes for P-12 students also fit within the umbrella of social capital. Having a committed, credible backbone organization is also a function of social capital because of the importance of relationships in establishing an organization's reputation.

Human capital, ranked second among community capital necessary for exemplary P-20 partnerships by P-20 participants, encompasses “the assets each person possesses: health, formal education, skills, knowledge, leadership, and talents” (Flora & Flora, 2008, p. 84). P-20 partnership leaders emphasized the need for a local champion to lead efforts and oversee day-to-day activities of the partnership. Likewise, P-20 partnership participants highlighted the importance of dedicated staff to implement the programs within the partnership. In the interviews, participants mentioned the importance of having the right person lead a partnership, one with skills that would contribute to the social capital utilized by the partnership by building relationships with others. It is not sufficient to have any type of person leading the partnership; exemplary partnerships employ a person or people with the skills to recruit partners, make connections across barriers, and ensure that partners work together toward their common goals. For exemplary P-20 partnerships, social capital and human capital are intertwined. Without the right leader who has the skills to build the partnership (human capital), the relationships (social capital), acknowledged in this study as one of the essential elements for exemplary P-20 partnerships, will falter.

The amount of financial capital needed for exemplary P-20 partnerships varies greatly depending on partnership size and goals. The Western Mentoring Partnership in this study receives $5 million in funding from the state each year. Alternatively, the other two partnerships studied are much smaller and have federal grants in yearly amounts of between $95,000 and $107,000 each. All P-20 partnership leaders expressed that they had adequate funding but hoped for more in the future in order to expand their work.

Financial capital, though, does not only include money, but also "resources...that are translated into monetary instruments" (Flora & Flora, 2008, p. 175). This definition fits with the assertion of an interviewee who specifically highlighted the importance of in-kind donations in addition to money. Another P-20 partnership leader mentioned the monetary value of time as a contribution frequently made by faculty in relation to P-20 partnerships. Because faculty may receive stipends for their work in partnerships, a donation of their time could also be considered financial capital.

Within their responses, P-20 partnership participants stated that their partnerships were generally low-cost and used their resources effectively. When describing the resources needed for exemplary P-20 partnerships, the P-20 partnership leaders mentioned financial resources much more frequently than the participants. This may be because the participants surveyed were not financially responsible for the work whereas the leaders interviewed maintained fiscal responsibility and likely spent more of their time thinking about partnership finances.

G. Chapter Summary

State leaders in P-12 and higher education described exemplary P-20 partnerships as those that achieved results, included multiple partners, served as forums for addressing education matters and sharing solutions, engaged community partners, received external recognition as a

model for others, and offered support for students. Using those criteria, I studied three exemplary P-20 partnerships by analyzing related documents, interviewing each partnership director, and conducting an electronic survey of P-12 and community partnership participants. The partnership directors described the essential elements of exemplary P-20 partnerships: committed, credible backbone organizations; relationships that facilitate on-going conversations; a local champion; meeting the needs of the community; adequate resources; multiple partners that represent lifespan development including P-12 schools, higher education, and the private sector; small enough to be personal; reciprocity; collegiality; and having shared mission and goals. Analysis of an electronic survey of P-20 partnership participants revealed that they see social capital, human capital, and financial capital as the most important types of capital for exemplary P-20 partnerships.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore how exemplary P-20 partnerships define and measure success by examining exemplary partnerships as nominated by state-level administrators in education. The study also investigated the elements necessary for P-20 partnerships to be successful, from the perspective of partnership leaders and participants. Exemplary P-20 partnerships were examined through the Community Capitals Framework to determine what types of resources promote partnership success.

As Wilbur and Lambert (1991, 1995) discovered, P-20 partnerships proliferated during the 1990s as a way to narrow the gap between P-12 schools and institutions of higher education. They identified four types of partnerships, with many aimed to promote college readiness, reduce college remediation, increase the number of college attendees from racial and ethnic minority backgrounds, and increase six-year college graduation rates (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991, 1995). The growth among partnerships happened quickly, with very little research to support claims of effectiveness. This study adds to the research literature on P-20 partnerships by analyzing how exemplary programs define and measure success and providing insight into the resources necessary for building and maintaining successful partnerships. Ultimately, P-20 partnership leaders and policymakers can use the results from this study to inform their work in narrowing the gap between P-12 schools and institutions of higher education.

Data was collected in three phases from three sample groups using three different instruments through a mixed methods research design. Using a development mixed methods strategy, I created a research design to obtain and analyze different data slices to provide a greater depth of understanding about P-20 partnerships. First, I utilized an electronic survey to

elicit nominations of P-20 partnership exemplars from state-level administrators in P-12 and higher education. I also asked the nominators to provide criteria for exemplars and used their criteria to select the three partnerships to examine as case studies. For each case study, I interviewed the P-20 partnership leader and then used an electronic survey with both closed- and open-ended questions to gather data from P-20 partnership participants (district administrators, building administrators, teachers, and community members).

State leaders in P-12 education and higher education provided criteria to identify exemplary P-20 partnerships: results, multiple partners, a forum for addressing education matters and sharing solutions, produced curriculum, community engagement, external recognition as a model for others, and support for students. Interviews with directors of the leaders of three exemplary P-20 partnerships revealed 10 essential elements for exemplary P-20 partnerships: committed, credible backbone organization; relationships that facilitate on-going conversations; local champion; meet needs of the community; adequate resources; multiple partners that represent lifespan development including P-12 schools, higher education, and the private sector; small enough to be personal; reciprocity; collegiality; and shared mission and goals.

Participants from the three exemplary P-20 partnerships ranked the seven community capitals according to their necessity for exemplary P-20 partnerships. The respondents agreed that social capital, human capital, and financial capital were the most essential resources for exemplary P-20 partnerships. According to respondents, exemplary P-20 partnerships exhibit the following five characteristics: create positive outcomes for P-12 students, encourage collaboration among partners, fill gaps to provide extra support for P-12 students and staff, dedicated staff, and adequate resources.

B. Conclusions

This research provides a deeper understanding of exemplary P-20 partnerships than what has previously been available. State-level education administrators provided exemplar criteria that confirm the definition of P-20 partnerships I developed through this research: an agreement among two or more parties coming together for the good of improving the P-20 education system, where at least one party is a P-12 school and another party is an institution of higher education. In the survey of state administrators, they included multiple partners as an essential piece to exemplary P-20 partnerships, as well as results. Likewise, exemplary P-20 partnership leaders noted the need for partners that truly represent the entire P-20 system. Exemplary P-20 partnership participants emphasized that partnerships exist to create positive outcomes for P-12 students, improving the overall P-20 education system. This research confirmed the definition for P-20 partnerships I set forth at the beginning of the study.

Leaders and participants of exemplary P-20 partnerships agree that social capital, human capital, and financial capital are essential in building and maintaining exemplary partnerships. Research participants emphasize the foundational importance of bridging social capital, which people together over boundaries that typically exist (Flora & Flora, 2008). In the case of P-20 partnerships, bridging social capital works to bring educators from across the spectrum together as well as community organizations. Leaders of exemplary P-20 partnerships noted that the relationships that made their partnerships strong had developed over many years. While the partnerships themselves were fairly new (all in existence for less than 10 years), the leaders had been working in their communities and building relationships as educator for many more years prior to beginning the formal partnerships. Exemplary P-20 partnership leaders and participants agreed that collaboration among multiple partners from diverse areas of society is key.

Goodlad's (1990) ideas about simultaneous renewal are reflected in the emphasis exemplary P-20 leaders place on partnerships being reciprocal and collegial. Exemplary partnerships also have shared mission and goals, something achieved because there is a committed, credible organization leading the way. Meeting the needs of the community and filling gaps to provide extra support are other characteristics of exemplary P-20 partnerships. Ultimately, exemplary partnerships make a positive impact on their communities, which contributes to their on-going success.

Human capital is another essential for exemplary P-20 partnerships. Good ideas are not enough to make change; instead, the partnership must have a leader or leaders and dedicated staff who can oversee day-to-day implementation of the partnership. The staff involved in working for the partnership must be skilled in building relationships, uniting groups across boundaries, and understanding strengths of all partners. Human capital, in this way, can be invested to create greater social capital and promote partnership strength, an idea Emery and Flora (2006) called spiraling up. Exemplary P-20 partnership leaders and participants noted that it is essential for one of the champions of the work to be someone who understands the local context of the partnership work. The exemplary partnerships studied for this research were led by people who had been a part of the community for many years; not only did they have the education, training, and skills necessary to lead the partnerships, they also had existing bonding social capital within the community.

While financial capital is essential for exemplary P-20 partnerships, P-20 leaders and participants had slightly different views on the types of financial capital that are necessary. Exemplary P-20 partnership participants emphasized money while P-20 partnership leaders emphasized the importance of in-kind donations (such as equipment and office space). Certainly

financial capital is necessary in order to make partnerships work, because creating programs cost money. However, as one P-20 partnership leader stated, "You need money, but money is not going to determine success."

C. Policy Recommendations

P-20 partnerships have the opportunity to narrow the gap between P-12 schools and higher education, smoothing the transition for students and ultimately providing greater opportunities for postsecondary access and success. The exemplary partnerships I studied demonstrated positive outcomes for their local and state communities. Current P-20 partnership leaders, state and local policymakers, and leaders in P-12 and higher education who are interested in developing P-20 partnerships can learn from the exemplary partnerships examined in this study. This research should be disseminated to P-20 educators as well as state P-12 and higher education administrators who support and fund P-20 initiatives in their states.

As they develop new partnerships, leaders and participants should be aware of the necessity of investing in and utilizing social capital, human capital, and financial capital. Educators, policymakers, and community members who want to begin or strengthen P-20 partnerships should carefully examine the types of social capital, human capital, and financial capital available within their communities and collaboratively determine how to leverage those resources to build exemplary partnerships. As leaders and participants in this study described, relationships are the foundation of exemplary partnerships. Additionally, exemplary partnerships have dedicated people who understand the local context both leading the partnerships and overseeing the daily work. Financial resources are also essential, but leaders and participants should think beyond money and consider what other in-kind donations can be made to support partnership work.

Second, educators and community members can use this research alongside policy theory to determine how to approach developing P-20 partnerships. Each of the partnerships established shared mission and goals at a time when there was a policy window open for the work they were doing (Kingdon, 1995). For the Western Mentoring Partnership, it was the state board of education conducting a survey about college achievement in the state and determining they needed to increase the number of college-educated adults in their state in order to compete with surrounding states for new industry. The leader of this exemplary P-20 partnership was clearly a policy entrepreneur who saw the open policy window and matched a solution to the problem. This partnership utilized social capital, human capital, and financial capital to ensure the partnership would be successful. This model is one that could be replicated in other states and regions for emerging or existing P-20 partnerships; when the local environment is ripe for improving education, the P-20 partnership can come forth as a solution and focus on securing and investing social capital, human capital, and financial capital.

Another noteworthy point discovered through interviewing exemplary P-20 partnership leaders is that partnerships rarely reflect on how the partnership is working. Instead, they measure its success by the achievement of the partnership-specific outcomes. Partners steamed ahead with implementation and even evaluation of program-specific outcomes but did not reflect upon their collaboration. One exemplary P-20 partnership leader noted the necessity of this if they want to scale their work, indicating that they need to be more reflective of why their partnership is effective so they can help others who want to start similar initiatives. A recommendation for both new and existing partnerships, then, is to purposefully take time to reflect upon their relationships and their partnership work. This could be an inquiry-led process to come to a greater understanding of partnership effectiveness. I would encourage questions

such as: Are the methods of communication we use working for us? How could we improve relationships among partners? Do all partners understand their roles? Are all partners doing what the others expect of them? Are our partnership meetings an effective use of all partners' time? How does the community view our work? Have we established a shared vision for our partnership? How do we know if all partners agree with the vision?

D. Discussion

P-20 partnership research for most of the last century has focused on partnerships between P-12 schools and postsecondary teacher education programs. Within the last 10 years, research on P-20 partnerships like those studied in this research has emerged. Clifford et al. (2008) examined the P-20 partnership literature and found it lacking because the majority of studies were single-case studies conducted by a researcher involved in the partnership. My research meets the higher standard they set forth for research on P-20 partnerships by using a multi-case study and an external evaluator. Also, Clifford et al. recommended that future studies begin by explaining how P-20 partnerships were defined in order to move toward a shared definition. At the beginning of this study, I created a definition for P-20 partnerships that relied upon two previous definitions but also added an important component requiring that P-20 partnerships include both at least one P-12 school and one institution of higher education. The definition used in my research is the most comprehensive definition of P-20 partnerships yet and having a comprehensive definition will be a significant contribution to the literature, especially if it is used by others in research going forward.

Cevallos (2013) described four P-20 partnerships that defined partnership success as focusing on student needs, creating transparent reporting systems, and finding champions for the work. Her research was conducted on four partnerships within one region. My research, which

included partnerships in different regions and of varying sizes, confirmed some of Cevallos' work by finding that creating positive P-12 student outcomes and having a local champion are elements exemplary P-20 partnerships. The need for a local champion was echoed by McClafferty Jarsky, McDonough, and Nunez (2007) and Kezar (2007).

While the findings from my research echoed some of the previous findings regarding elements for successful P-20 partnerships, it provided greater detail in explaining why partnerships are viewed as exemplars and utilized a more diverse sample than previous studies. Additionally, my research established a more comprehensive definition of P-20 partnerships than has previously been utilized in the literature.

Before data collection, I hypothesized that the essential elements of exemplary P-20 partnerships would most closely relate to human capital, social capital, political capital, and financial capital. The essential elements of exemplary P-20 partnerships from the perspective of both partnership leaders and participants were connected to social capital, human capital, and financial capital. The exemplary partnerships studied are strong in part because of the relationships they have among partners that facilitate on-going conversations. Additionally, they are led by individuals who are skilled and adept at bringing P-12 schools and institutions of higher education together. Both P-20 partnership leaders and partnership participants also described the importance of financial capital, although the participants emphasized money while the leaders acknowledged the importance of other types of financial capital. Political capital was the fourth-ranked capital by the exemplary P-20 partnership participants, but the mean was much lower than that of the top three. I was surprised that political capital did not rank higher and that it was not mentioned by any of the exemplary P-20 partnership leaders as an essential resource. This especially surprised me in the case of the Western Mentoring Partnership, which is funded

by the state legislature. As this research grows and more P-20 partnerships are studied, it will be interesting to see if social capital, human capital, and financial capital continue to be the most often cited resources necessary for success.

E. Recommendations for Future Research

There are tools available online to evaluate partnerships in community health (Jolley, Lawless, & Hurley, 2008) and partnerships between nonprofits (Sterne, Heaney, & Britton, 2009). There are also tools to evaluate educational partnerships between P-12 schools and business (Bloom & Watt, 2015). However, there are no tools that can be specifically used to evaluate P-20 partnerships. In the future, I plan to use this research on exemplary P-20 partnerships to create a tool that can be utilized to evaluate P-20 partnerships. The tool would be collaborative and it would be essential that all stakeholders be involved in using it to evaluate the partnership. An evaluation tool for P-20 partnerships would include opportunities for the inclusion of multiple types of feedback, both qualitative and quantitative data, and would serve to facilitate conversations among partners.

A P-20 partnership evaluation tool would provide a map for beginning partnerships and feedback for existing partnerships, focusing on social capital, human capital, and financial capital and the essential elements for exemplary partnerships identified through this research. Once an evaluative tool is developed, beginning P-20 partnerships could utilize it to explore the assets available in the community and determine how the assets could be developed to promote success for the partnership. Additionally, policymakers and funders could use a P-20 partnership evaluation tool to guide decisions regarding funding and to provide guidance to potential partnership leaders about exemplary practices. Existing partnerships could utilize the tool to

examine their strengths and establish areas for improvement, providing a systematic way for determining how to improve their work.

Within P-20 partnership research, there is a continued need to establish the effectiveness of partnerships in addressing the symptoms of the gap between P-12 and higher education including high college remediation rates, low college-going rates, and low college graduation rates. The three partnerships studied each sought to improve the P-20 education system in different ways, with individual goals, definitions of success, and methods for measuring their success. Future research that categorizes P-20 partnerships by their goals and then analyzes their success would be helpful in understanding what works and what should be replicated. Wilbur and Lambert's (1995) typology of school-university partnerships would serve as an important resource for this work, but they chose to categorize partnerships based on definitions of their work and not necessarily their expected outcomes or established goals. Creating a new typology of P-20 partnerships based on partnership outcomes or goals would provide better opportunity to determine which types of partnerships are most successful in addressing the symptoms of the gap between P-12 schools and higher education.

Additional research should be conducted to determine if the essential elements for exemplary P-20 partnerships discovered through this research are generalizable to other exemplary partnerships. It would also be helpful to use the methods established in this study to examine more diverse partnerships. This study did not examine a restructuring partnership (from Wilbur & Lambert, 1995, categories of school-college partnerships) and, therefore, it is unknown how restructuring partnerships might be alike or may differ. Greater geographic diversity would also be beneficial in future studies as two of the partnerships in this study were from the same region. It would be helpful for future research to examine P-20 partnerships in light of

institutional type, as well, to determine if there are differences in partnerships that focus on rural, suburban, or urban areas and if the elements that promote partnership success are consistent across institutional type. Overall, there are significant opportunities for future research on P-20 partnerships that can bolster the evidence of their effectiveness in narrowing the gap between P-12 schools and postsecondary institutions.

F. Chapter Summary

Research on exemplary P-20 partnerships identified social capital, human capital, and financial capital as essential elements for their success, according to partnership leaders and participants. This chapter provided policy recommendations as well as directions for future research on P-20 partnerships.

References

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Alliance for Excellent Education (2011, May). *Saving now and saving later: How high school reform can reduce the nation's wasted remediation dollars*. Retrieved from http://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/SavingNowSavingLaterRemediation.pdfd

An, B. (2013). The impact of dual enrollment on college degree attainment: Do low-SES students benefit? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 35*(1), 57-75.

Anderson, P. (2014). Preserving place: Williston, ND and the use of the Community Capitals Framework for boomtown community development. *Housing and Society, 41*(2), 297-314.

American Association of Colleges and Universities (2015). *The LEAP challenge*. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/LEAPChallengeBrochure.pdf

Barnett, E., & Hughes, K. (2010, October). *Community college and high school partnerships*. New York, NY: Community College Research Center. Retrieved from http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/community-college-high-school-partnerships.html

Bellamy, G., & Goodlad, J. (2008). Continuity and change in the pursuit of a democratic public mission for our schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(8), 565-571.

Berger, A., Turk-Bicakci, L., Garet, M., Song, M., Knudson, J., Haxton, C., Zeiser, K., Hoshen, G., Ford, J., & Stephan, J. (2013, September). *Early college, early success: Early College High School Initiative impact study*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/resource/early-college-early-success-early-college-high-school-initiative-impact-study-2013

Berrett, D. (2015, January 26). The day the purpose of college changed: After February 28, 1967, the main reason to go was to get a job. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/The-Day-the-Purpose-of-College/151359/

Bier, M., Horn, L., Campbell, S., Kazemi, E., & Hintz, A. (2012). Designs for simultaneous renewal in university-public school partnerships: Hitting the "sweet spot." *Teacher Education Quarterly, 39*(3), 127-141.

Bloom, M., & Watt, D. (2015). *Evaluating education-business partnerships*. The Conference Board of Canada Centre for Skills and Post-Secondary Education. Retrieved from

http://www.conferenceboard.ca/Libraries/EDUC_PUBLIC/evaluating_ebp_workbook.sflb

Bonar, B.D. (1992). The role of laboratory schools in American education. *National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, 17*(1), 42-53.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Bragg, D., Loeb, J., Gong, Y., Deng, C.-P., Yoo, J-S., & Hill, J. (2002). T*ransition from high school to college and work for tech prep participants in eight selected consortia*. St. Paul, MN: National Research Center for Career and Technical Education. Retrieved from http://www.nrccte.org/resources/publications/transition-high-school-college-and-work-tech-prep-participants-eight-selected

Britt, R. (2015). Universities report continuing decline in federal R&D funding in FY 2014. *National Science Foundation InfoBriefs, 16*(302). Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2016/nsf16302/

Bronk, K. (2012). A grounded theory of youth purpose. J*ournal of Adolescent Research, 27*, 78-109. Retrieved from http://jar.sagepub.com/content/27/1/78

Bronk, K., King, P., & Matsuba, K. (2013). The exemplar methodology. In K. Matsuba, P. King, and K. Bronk (Eds.), *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 142*(4), 1-12.

Bronner, E. (1997, September 17). End of Chicago's education school stirs debate. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1997/09/17/us/end-of-chicago-s-education-school-stirs-debate.html?pagewanted=all

Caracelli, V., & Greene, J. (1993). Data analysis strategies in mixed methods research. In V. Plano Clark and J. Cresswell (Eds.), *The mixed methods reader* (pp. 239-250). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Carnevale, A., Smith, N., & Strohl, J. (2013, June). *Recovery: Job growth and education requirements through 2020*. Retrieved from https://georgetown.app.box.com/s/tll0zkxt0puz45hu21g6

Cassidy, J., & Sanders, J. (2002, April). A university lab school for the 21st century: The early childhood development center. *Early childhood literacy: Programs and strategies to develop cultural, linguistic, scientific, and healthcare literacy for very young children and their families, 2001 yearbook*, 1-19.

Cassidy, L., Keating, K., & Young, V. (2010, January). *Dual enrollment: Lessons learned on school-level implementation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from
http://www2.ed.gov/programs/slcp/finaldual.pdf

Cellini, S. (2005). Smoothing the transition to college? The effect of tech-prep programs on educational attainment. *Economics of Education Review, 25*, 394-411.

Center for Educational Renewal (1995). *Partner school compact*. Retrieved from http://www.ieiseattle.org/Publications/compact.htm

Cevallos, L. (2013). *Best practices of P-20 partnerships for increasing college access and persistence for under-represented students* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/1nw7d24m

Clark, W. (1998). *Articulation agreements between public high schools and postsecondary institutions: Development, implementation, and results*. Retrieved from http://www.cord.org/uploadedfiles/williamclark.pdf

Clifford, M., Millar, S., Smith, Z., Hora, M., & DeLima, L. (2008, August). *K-20 partnerships: Literature review and recommendations for research*. Retrieved from
http://scalemsp.wceruw.org/files/research/Products/partnership_literature_review.pdf

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1994). *Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Conkling, S., & Henry, W. (2002). The impact of professional development partnerships: Our part of the story. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 11*(2), 7-13.

Cox-Peterson, A. (2011). *Education partnerships: Connecting schools, families, and the communit*y. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Cresswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4^{th} ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

DeMonte, J. (2013). *High-quality professional development for teachers: Supporting teacher training to improve student learning*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from
http://www.sheeo.org/sites/default/files/PD%20Research%20-%20High%20Quality%20PD%20for%20Teachers%2007-2013.pdf

Dewey, J. (1956). *The child and the curriculum: And the school and society*. Chicago, IL:

University of Chicago Press.

Denzin, N. (1978). *The research act*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Dolly, J., & Oda, E. (1997). Toward a definition of professional development schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(1), 178-186.

Domina, T., & Ruzek, E. (2010). Paving the way: K-16 partnerships for higher education diversity and high school reform. *Educational policy, 26*(2), 243-267. Retrieved from http://epx.sagepub.com/content/26/2/243

Douney Zinth, J. (2011). P-20 governance. *ECS State Notes: P-16, P-20*. Retrieved from http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/91/14/9114.pdf

Dykhuizen, G. (1964). John Dewey: The Chicago years. *Journal of the History of Philosophy, 2*(2), 227-253.

Education Commission on the States (2008). *P-16/P-20 Councils*. Retrieved from http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbprofall?Rep=PCA

Emery, M., & Flora, C.B. (2006). Spiraling-up: Mapping community transformation with the Community Capitals Framework. *Community Development, 37*(1), 19-35.

Emery, M., Fey, S., & Flora, C. B. (2006). Using community capitals to build assets for positive community change. *CD Practice, 13*, 1-19. Retrieved from https://www.uvm.edu/extension/community/toec/plenary_article_community_capital_toec2016.pdf

Fawley, P. C. (1971). *The changing purposes of higher education*. Paper presented at colloquium at the University of Arizona. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED051777

Ferrara, J., Nath, J., & Guadarrama, I. (Eds.) (2014). *Creating visions for university-school partnerships*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Flora, C. B, & Flora, J. L. (2008). *Rural communities: Legacy and change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Geiger, R. L. (2014). *The history of American higher education: Learning and culture from the founding to World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Goodlad, J. (1979). An agenda for quality education in schools. *Compact, 13*(3), 5.

Goodlad, J. (1999). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1991). School-university partnerships. *Education Digest, 8*(56), 58.

Goodlad, J. (1996). Sustaining and extending education renewal. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(3), 228-234.

Goodlad, J. (2000). Education and democracy: Advancing the agenda. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(1), 86-89.

Goldberg, M. (1995, March). A portrait of John Goodlad. *Educational Leadership, 52*(6), 82-85.

Green, G. P., & Haines, A. (2012). *Asset building and community development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Greene, J., Carcelli, V., & Graham, W. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. In V. Plano Clark and J. Cresswell (Eds.), *The mixed methods reader* (pp. 121-149). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Guadarrama, I. (Ed.). (2002). *Forging alliances in community and thought: Research in professional development schools*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Guadarrama, I., Ramsey, J., & Nath, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Advances in community thought and research: Research in professional development schools*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Guadarrama, I., Ramsey, J., & Nath, J. (Eds.). (2008). *University and school connections: Research studies in professional development schools*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Guadarrama, I., Ramsey, J., & Nath, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Creating visions for university-school Partnerships: Research in professional development schools*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Gutierrez-Montes, I., Emery, M., & Fernandez-Baca, E. (2009). The sustainable livelihoods approach and the Community Capitals Framework: The importance of system-level approaches to community change efforts. *Community Development, 40*(2), 106-113.

Hausfather, S. (2000). Laboratory schools to professional development schools: The fall and rise of field experiences in teacher education. *The Educational Forum, 65*(1), 31-39.

Higher Education Research Institute. (n.d.). *About the CIRP freshman survey*. Retrieved from http://www.heri.ucla.edu/cirpoverview.php

The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of The Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

The Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional*

development schools. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

The Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education: A report of The Holmes Group*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED399220.pdf

Houston, W., Clay, D., Hollis, L., Ligons, C., Roff, L., & Lopez, N. (1995). *Strength through diversity: Houston consortium for professional development technology centers*. Houston, TX: University of Houston College of Education.

Jeffery, J., & Polleck, J. (2010). Reciprocity through co-instructed site based courses: Unintended and intended learning for both pre-service and in-service teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 37*(3), 81-100.

Jick, T. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. In V. Plano Clark and J. Cresswell (Eds.), *The mixed methods reader* (pp. 105-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jolley, G., Lawless, A., & Hurley, C. (2008). Framework and tools for planning and evaluating community participation, collaborative partnerships and equity in health promotion. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia, 19*(2), 152-157.

John L. Goodlad Institute for Educational Renewal. (n.d.). *The legacy*. Retrieved from http://www.bothell.washington.edu/getattachment/research/centers/goodladinstitute/about-us/goodlad-legacy-brief.pdf

Judge, H., Carriedo, R., & Johnson, S. (1995). *Professional development schools and MSU: The report of the 1995 review*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

International Association of Laboratory Schools (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from http://www.laboratoryschools.org/about-us

Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2001, 36-41.

Kezar, A. (2007). A tale of two cultures: Schools and universities in partnership for school reform and student success. *Metropolitan Universities, 18*(4), 28-47.

Kingdon, J. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policy*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.

Kirst, M. (2005, June). *Separation of K-12 and postsecondary education governance and policymaking: Evolution and Impact*. The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research. Retrieved from http://web.stanford.edu/group/bridgeproject/Separation%20of%20K-12%20and%20Postsec%20Ed%20Governance%20and%20Policymak.pdf

Kirst, M., & Bracco, K. (2004). Bridging the great divide: How the K-12 and postsecondary split hurts students, and what can be done about it. In M. Kirst and A. Venezia (Eds.), *From high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in postsecondary education* (pp. 1-30). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kirst, M. W., Usdan, M. D., Evans, B., & Valant, J. (2011). *The role of intergovernmental relations in K-12 to higher education transitions*. Retrieved from https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/Draft_IntergovRelations_K12_HigherEd_Feb4.pdf

Kirst, M. W. & Usdan, M. D. (2009). The historical context of the divide between K-12 and higher education. In National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (ed.), *States, Schools, and Colleges: Policies to Improve Student Readiness for College and Strengthen Coordination Between Schools and Colleges.* Retrieved from http://highereducation.org/reports/ssc/ssc_Cha_1.pdf

Kirst, M. & Venezia, A. (2004). *From high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in postsecondary education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knoll, M. (2014). Laboratory, University of Chicago. In D.C. Phillips (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy* (pp. 455-458). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kozleski, E. (1999, April). *The educational renewal agenda: A synthesis of our findings*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec.

Lagemann, E., & Lewis, H. (2011). *What is college for? The public purpose of higher education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Levine, M. (2002, March). Why invest in professional development schools? *Educational Leadership, 59*(6), 65-68.

Library of Congress (2015). *Morrill act*. Retrieved from https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/Morrill.html

The Manufacturing Institute (2015). *The skills gap in U.S. manufacturing 2015 and beyond*. Retrieved from http://www.themanufacturinginstitute.org/~/media/827DBC76533942679A15EF7067A704CD.ashx

Mata, S. (2014, December). *Successful strategies for implementing an articulation program from high schools to community/technical colleges*. Norco, CA: National Center for Supply Chain Technology Education. Retrieved from http://www.supplychainteched.org

Matsuba, M., & Walker, L. (2004). Extraordinary moral commitment: Young adults involved in

social organizations. *Journal of Personality, 72*(2), 275-297.

McClafferty Jarsky, K., McDonough, P., & Nunez-A.M. (2009). Establishing a college culture in secondary schools through P-20 collaboration: A case study. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 8*(4), 357-373.

Morgan, D. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. In V. Plano Clark and J. Cresswell (Eds.), *The mixed methods reader* (pp. 29-66). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Munnell, A. H. (2014, February). The impact of aging Baby Boomers on labor force participation. *Center for Retirement Research Briefs, 14*(4). Retrieved from http://crr.bc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/IB_14-4-508.pdf

National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (n.d.). *Fast facts about dual and concurrent enrollment*. Retrieved from http://www.nacep.org/research-policy/fast-facts/

National Association of Professional Development Schools (n.d.a). *Vision/purpose/history*. Retrieved from http://napds.org/visionpurposehistory/

National Association of Professional Development Schools (n.d.b). *Nine essentials*. Retrieved from http://napds.org/nine-essentials/

National Center for Education Statistics (2014). *Graduation rates: Fast facts*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=40

National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (2010, June). *Beyond the rhetoric: Improving college readiness through coherent state policy*. Retrieved from http://www.highereducation.org/reports/college_readiness/CollegeReadiness.pdf

National Conference of State Legislatures (n.d.). *Hot topics in higher education: Reforming remedial education*. Retrieved from http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/improving-college-completion-reforming-remedial.aspx

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2001). S*tandards for professional development schools*. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=FcHbf2B%2b670%3d&tabid=499

National Network for Educational Renewal (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from http://www.nnerpartnerships.org/about-us/

New Jersey Laboratory School Initiative (2014). *Decline*. Retrieved from http://www.scottkukan.net/laboratory-schools/decline/

Nunez, A. M., & Oliva, M. (2009). Organizational collaboration to promote college access: A P-20 framework. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 8*(4), 322-339.

Osguthorpe, R. T. (1999). John I. Goodlad: Pedagogue of renewal. *Journal of Thought, 34*(4), 7-24.

Owen, J., & Kemp, D. (2012). Assets, capitals, and resources frameworks for corporate community development in mining. *Business and Society, 51*(3), 382-408.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

The Pew Charitable Trusts (2015, June). *Federal and state funding of higher education: A changing landscape*. Retrieved from http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2015/06/federal-and-state-funding-of-higher-education

Putnam, R. (1993). The prosperous community: Social capital and public life." *The American Prospect, 13*, 35-42.

Rigoni, B., & Adkins, A. (2015, January 28). As baby boomers retire, it's time to replenish talent. *Business Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/businessjournal/181295/baby-boomers-retire-time-replenish-talent.aspx

Rippner, J. (2013). *The role of state P-20 councils in promoting collaboration between K-12 and higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/rippner_jennifer_a_201312_phd.pdf

Rousseau, S. (2007). Educational reform: Toward a K-16 framework. *Metropolitan Universities, 18*(4), 48-66.

Ruenzel, D. (1995, February). Looking for John Dewey. *Teacher Magazine, 6*(5), 32-38.

Saldana, J. (2012). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Schon, D.A. (1992). The theory of inquiry: Dewey's legacy to education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 22*(2), 119-139.

Smith, W. (1999). Leadership for educational renewal. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(8), 602-605.

South Australian Community Health Research Unit (2006). *Collaborative partnerships*

evaluation tool. Retrieved from http://som.flinders.edu.au/FUSA/SACHRU/Toolkit/PDF/3.pdf

Stephens, D., & Boldt, G. (2004). School/university partnerships: Rhetoric, reality, and intimacy. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(9), 703-707.

Sterne, R., Heaney, D., & Britton, B. (2009). *The partnership toolbox*. WWF-UK. Retrieved From http://www.wwf.org.uk/wwf_articles.cfm?unewsid=3211

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Thomas, N., Marken, S., Gray, L., & Lewis, L. (2013, February). *Dual credit and exam-based courses in U.S. public high schools: 2010-11*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013001.pdf

Trachtman, R. (1996). *NCATE PDS standards project: Preliminary survey findings*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2015). *Digest of education statistics: 2013 (NCES 2015-011)*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=76

U.S. Department of Education (2015, November). *Office of Postsecondary Education homepage*. Retrieved http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/index.html

The White House Executive Office of the President (2014, January). *Increasing opportunity for low-income students: Promising models and a call to action*. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/white_house_report_on_increasing_college_opportunity_for_low-income_students_1-16-2014_final.pdf

Venezia, A., Kirst, M., & Antonio, A. (2003). *Betraying the college dream: How disconnected K-12 and postsecondary education systems undermine student aspirations*. Retrieved from http://www.stanford.edu/group/bridgeproject/betrayingthecollegedream.pdf

Walker, L., & Pitts, R. (1998). Naturalistic conceptions of moral maturing. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 403-419.

Wiggins, S. (1986, October). Revolution in the teaching profession: A comparative review of two reform reports. *Educational Leadership, 44*(2), 56-59.

Wilbur, F. (1987). *National directory of school-college partnerships: current models and practices*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Wilbur, F., & Lambert, L. (1991). *Linking America's schools and colleges: guide to partnerships and national directory*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Wilbur, F., & Lambert, L. (Eds.). (1995). *Linking America's schools and colleges* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Wirth, A. (1964). John Dewey's design for American education: An analysis of aspects of his work at the University of Chicago, 1894-1904. *History of Education Quarterly, 4*, 83-105.

Wiseman, D., & Cooner, D. (1996). Discovering the power of collaboration: The impact of school-university partnership on teaching. *Teacher Education and Practice, 12*, 18-27.

Yoon, K., Duncan, T., Lee, S., Scarloss, B., Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf

Zahara, A., & McGehee, N. (2013). Volunteer tourism: A host community capital perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research, 42*, 22-45.

Appendix A

Survey for State-Level Administrators

You are invited to participate in a voluntary student on exemplary P-20 partnerships. A P-20 partnership consists of an agreement between two or more parties coming together for the good of improving the P-20 education system, where at least one party is a P-12 school and another party is an institution of higher education. You have been invited to participate in this study because of your position as a state-level administrator in education. This study is a piece to my dissertation research as I complete a Ph.D. in Public Policy-Education Policy.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the two-question survey through **this link**. The survey will remain open for 14 days. The purpose of this survey is to identify exemplary P-20 partnerships across the nation; once I have received nominations, I will conduct research with the leaders and participants of the partnerships for deeper investigation. The questions on the survey are:

Please nominate up to 3 exemplary P-20 partnership programs in your state. Please include the name of the partnership, contact information, and a few sentences that describe the partnership.

Why did you select the program(s) listed above as exemplars?

This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Arkansas, approval #16-06-812.

If you have any questions about this survey, please feel free to contact me by e-mail or phone. I truly appreciate your time and willingness to participate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth E. Smith
Ph.D. Candidate in Public Policy-Education Policy
University of Arkansas

Appendix B

Interview Protocol for P-20 Partnership Directors

Introduction

You have been selected to participate in this voluntary study a director of a nominated P-20 partnership. We sought nominations of exemplary P-20 partnerships from directors/commissioners of education and higher education in each state and your partnership was nominated. Thank you for agreeing to participate. Prior to this interview, we spoke on the phone and discussed the informed consent, which I sent you by e-mail. This document states that this interview is voluntary, there are no known risks to participating, and that you agree for this interview to be recorded. Can you please confirm that you have read and signed the informed consent?

As we have previously discussed, this interview is one piece to my dissertation research. I have already reviewed documents from your website and the next step will be surveying individuals who have participated in the P-20 partnership you oversee.

This research is design to investigate how P-20 partnerships define and measure success. I am not seeking to evaluate the P-20 partnership you oversee as you have already been selected as an exemplar.

I have planned this interview to be about 45 minutes to one hour in length. Please feel free to ask me any questions you have as we move through the questions I have planned. Again, I appreciate truly your participation.

Questions related to participant background and general questions about P-20 partnerships

First, I'd like to ask you general questions related to your background as a director of a P-20 partnership and general questions about the partnership you oversee.

1. Can you tell me a little bit about your P-20 partnership?
2. How did you first get involved with P-20 partnerships?
3. How long have you been the director of this partnership?
4. How do you define P-20 partnerships?
5. How would you describe the P-20 partnership you oversee?
6. Can you describe your partners? How many different schools do you work with? Do you work with non-school partners?
7. How did you cultivate partnerships with these schools and non-school partners?

Questions related to how success is defined and measured

Now I'd like to learn more about how you define and measure the success of the P-20 partnership you oversee.

8. Generally speaking, how do you know if your P-20 partnership is successful?
9. In terms of your partnership, what would you consider to be a failure?

10. Has there ever been a time when you've experienced what you would describe to be a failure in terms of working with this P-20 partnership? If so, can you describe that to me?
11. What do you think was the cause of the failure?
12. How do you measure the success of your partnerships?
13. Do individual programs within the partnership have measures of success or do you evaluate success of the partnership as a whole? Or both?
14. Have you ever compared the success of your P-20 partnership to that of other partnerships?

Questions related to essential elements for successful P-20 partnerships
The final topic for my questions is related to the elements that you think are necessary for your P-20 partnership to be successful.

15. What do you think it takes for a P-20 partnership to be successful?
16. If you were speaking to a new P-20 partnership director, what would you tell them should be their first priority?
17. Is there anything else you want to tell me related to your work in P-20 partnerships?

Conclusion
Again, thank you so much for being so generous with your time. I will be in touch with you in the next week to complete the next step, surveying P-20 partnership participants. I look forward to completing this study and sharing the results with you!

Appendix C

Survey for Exemplary P-20 Partnership Participants

Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey. This research seeks to understand how P-20 partnerships define and measure success and what elements make them successful. This survey will ask questions about your experience as a partner with (name of P-20 partnership program).

1. How long have you been involved in (name of P-20 partnership program)?
    a. 0-2 years
    b. 2-5 years
    c. 5-10 years
    d. More than 10 years

2. What is your role in the partnership?
    a. I am a P-12 teacher who is/was involved in the program.
    b. I am a P-12 building administrator who is/was involved in the program.
    c. I am a P-12 district administrator who is/was involved in the program.
    d. I am a community member who is/was involved in the program.
    e. Other (please explain)

3. How do you define success for this partnership? (Open response)

4. This partnership was nominated by the state department of education as an exemplary P-20 partnership. What do you think this partnership is viewed as successful? (Open response)

5. When you think about partnerships between P-12 schools and colleges and universities, what types of capital (assets or resources) are important in making them successful? Please rank the different types of capital (assets or resources) on a scale of 0 to 4.

0	1	2	3	4
Not important at all	Of little importance	Of average importance	Very important	Absolutely essential

    a. Natural capital (for example parks, landscape, natural beauty)
    b. Cultural capital (for example traditions and heritage)
    c. Human capital (for example skills and abilities of people)
    d. Social capital (for example relationships between people and/or organizations)
    e. Political capital (for example power to influence rules and systems)
    f. Financial capital (for example money to invest in projects)
    g. Built capital (for example buildings or roads)

6. Is there anything else you'd like to share about your experience with (P-20 partnership) and what makes this partnership successful? (Open response)

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix D

Analytic Memos for Interviews

Analytic Memo #1: Northeast Early Childhood Partnership

I am so appreciative of [participant's] generosity in answering all of my questions and sharing about his experiences. He was a K-12 educator for 40 years, with 31 years as a secondary principal. His confidence is evident as he speaks about P-20 partnerships.

He was unable to use Skype due to lack of broadband dependability, so I did not get to actually see him. I know that we spoke while he was in his home office. There was no background noise on his end, but a weed eater outside my window briefly interrupted our conversation. I would have appreciated seeing him face-to-face over the computer screen, but a phone call worked.

He is only employed part-time by the institution but jokes that he works 60 hours a week for part-time pay. His dedication to his work and to improving life in his region is evident. Doug occasionally used humor to make a point and spoke easily about his experiences overseeing the partnership.

Analytic Memo #2: Northeast Curriculum and Alignment Partnership

[The participant] was kind and patient with all of my questions and spoke passionately about his work. I had technical difficulties at first and was not able to use my preferred method for calling and recording. I was afraid I would not be able to hear the recording using my backup method, but it worked. He had an accent that was just thick enough that I occasionally could not understand what he was saying (the fact that he was on speakerphone was surely another factor), but he happily clarified when I asked.

He initially asked a few questions about how I would maintain confidentiality and I was happy to provide him with that information. He approved of the pseudonym I'd given his organization and I offered to send him my transcript so he could review it and he agreed.

Within about the first 5 minutes, it became clear that he was very knowledgeable in P-20 partnerships in teacher education. I was worried at first that he would focus the entire interview on that topic. So, I tried to word the questions a bit more broadly so he would speak to partnerships in general. About 15 minutes into the interview I found out that he also oversees the institution's P-20 initiatives. This was great news! We were able to focus more on his work through that center and not just on teacher education. At the end of our call, he offered to send me a spreadsheet with a list of all of the partnerships between the university and the community over the past year. I thanked him for that.

Although I was worried at first that this participant was not the right person to talk to, the interview turned out to be really helpful. However, he e-mailed me the next day and insisted I speak to someone else on his staff. This person was more closely linked to the P-20 partnership that was nominated. I obliged, more because I felt like I needed to do as he asked than because I felt like I would have a better interview with the second participant. When I coded the interview transcripts, I treated the two interviews as one because they were about the same partnership.

My interview with the second participant was easier because I already knew a lot about the partnership from the other participant. She was also very experienced in teacher education partnerships but also could speak more specifically about the Northeast Curriculum and Alignment Partnership that was nominated. Some of the things that I didn't quite understand from the first interview were clarified in the second. She indicated that she thought the research was exciting and she was happy to participate.

Analytic Memo #3: Western Mentoring Partnership

It was really exciting to talk to [participant] about all that is happening in his state. It sounds like there is a lot of momentum moving toward improving college-going and graduation rates throughout the state. When [participant] picked up the phone, he sounded excited to share with me and immediately began telling me all about his work. It was 28 minutes into the interview before I asked one of my planned questions!

His work is a little different than the other partnerships, which I think is great. He is housed at the state board of education but works with higher education and K-12 education to make the Western Mentoring Program happen. He's been an educator for 40 years and clearly is very invested in education in the state. He expressed excitement for my research and being a part of it.

He spoke loudly and clearly which made it much easier to understand than my last interview. I think it'll make my transcription a lot easier, too. Immediately after the interview, he sent me the names of partners to contact for the survey. He also asked his assistant to send me program evaluation documents and the survey he conducted in 2012 that led up to this work. I was so impressed by the work he is doing and truly thankful for his generosity.

Appendix E

Interview Transcripts

Interview with Northeast Early Childhood Partnership Director
August 10th
12:30- 1:27pm CST

ES: Elizabeth Smith, Interviewer
P1: Participant 1

(Opening chatter not transcribed. Transcription begins at 12:32pm)

ES: Ok, I'm going to start out with questions-- just general questions related to your background as a director of this partnership. Um, so can you start by telling me a little bit about what you do?

P1: Um, this partnership, uh, was based on a grant, a [...] grant to the states that was targeting STEM education in Pre-K through second grade.

ES: Ok.

P1: And, uh, prior to, uh, Northeast Early Childhood Partnership getting this grant through the state, um, I was the director of [another P-20 partnership] which is a Race to the Top, uh, created with Race to the Top money--

ES: Ok.

P1: And I also coordinated the rant in our area. So I was working in the field of early education and professional development for educators through the college through the Race to the Top funding and when this grant came through I was asked because of my connections in the field to step in and coordinate the grant.

ES: Ok. So it- it's, um- I've read everything-- what I could find online, so I know a tiny bit about the partnership. And it sounds like it's kind of just included in with the other work you're doing?

P1: Yeah, well, my professional resume is that I was in public K-12 education for 30, for 40 years actually. And for 31 of those years I was a secondary administrator--

ES: Wow!

P1: I was a middle school principal for 14 years and a high school principal for 17 years.

ES: Ah.

P1: And that was all in the [...], so I knew the players pretty well, so when the Race to the Top funding came through right after my retirement, the folks in the region came to me and asked me if I would take that on as a part-time position, which I did.

ES: Ok. (Laughter)

P1: And this kind of-- this grant was written to build on the partnerships we had established and had been working with.

ES: So are you still part-time?

P1: Yeah. (Laughter)

ES: Wow! I feel like all I've read indicates that you are doing a lot as a part-time person.

P1: My wife sometimes jokes that I've perfected the 60 hour a week part-time job.

ES: (Laughter) How nice for you to do that for them part-time! So how long have you-- when was it that you retired and transitioned to overseeing these partnerships?

P1: 2009, so I've been doing it for seven years now.

ES: Ok. Ok. So if someone asked you to explain what a P-20 partnership is or a school-university partnership is, what would you say to them?

P1: I think it is a partnership based on shared outcomes and goals, with clearly defined roles for partners. And clearly defined desired outcomes for all members of the partnership. I mean, to put it in vernacular-- if it's going to work, all partners have to have both skin in the game and something to gain from the partnership.

ES: Wow. Yeah, that's really nice. Mm-hmm. So how would you describe the partnership or partnerships that you oversee? You kind of told me already about how you got there and a little bit about the funding...

P1: Well, [...] county is a relatively small county of 134,000 right now. And because we are fairly small-- we have a community college, two private colleges, and one four year state university campus in the county and we're a little bit physically, geographically isolated from other parts of the state-- a high percentage of our professional development for educators at all levels are provided by the state university campus.

ES: Ok.

P1: And a high percentage of our students graduating from the high schools in the area go to [local partnership university].

ES: Ok.

P1: We've got a pretty good established relationship between the K-12 and the campuses already. In addition to that, the former president of [local partnership university], she just left last year and she had been there for 12 years, [president of local partnership university], had formed something called the [local partnership for improving education].

ES: Yes.

P1: And her vision was to get the private sector, higher education, and secondary education people together to increase the number attending-- aspiring to and attending-- having access to college education. When it get started, we quickly realized that secondary education, even elementary education wasn't early enough to start.

ES: Yeah.

P1: And so we are really right now, if you look at our partnership, it's prenatal to school including the private sector.

ES: (Laughter)

P1: We do have the pediatric care folks involved, the OB GYN people involved, in making sure that children from conception on (laughter) have the opportunity to succeed. Because if you don't have neonatal care, if you don't have prenatal care, if you don't have health visits when you are a child, when you don't have the educational opportunities, what we can do in high school if you have grown up in poverty for those who aspire to colleges, it's really too late to start. So that concept is out of the [local partnership for improving education]. It started a decade ago of dealing with the building block and, candidly, when Governor [...] found out about the [local partnership for improving education] and the work we were doing in the [county], he pretty much picked our brains and that was the basis for him creating the [local programs for improving education] with the Race to the Top.

ES: Ah.

P1: So, it would be that partnership between higher education, K-12 education, early education, um, so that was an intentional best practice that was shared throughout the state.

ES: OK.

P1: Um, I have to say that, um, the [local partnership for improving education] still exists and we're continuing to do our work and the [local partnerships for improving education] in the other areas of the state, they faded away after the Race to the Top money passed.

ES: Ok, ok. So when did that happen? When did the Race to the Top money begin and end?

P1: Well the [...] grant part of it, it ended a year ago December. And the Race to the Top two years before that. So, it's been over for a while, um... Again, we found the whole time we were

doing the [local partnerships for improving education] that when you get greater [large city] area or you get into the [large city] where you have multiple universities with huge populations, large number of school districts, their partnerships were probably too large.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: Their partnerships, where they did work, was where an individual college decided with more proximal districts to form a smaller entity, something more on scale with what we have in the [county] rather than try to go with the whole [large city] area. So you have [other state university] in [suburban area] working with the [suburban school district] and a couple other suburban [...] school districts rather than working with all of [the region] trying to do something.

ES: Yeah.

P1: So the other partnerships do exist and they are healthy, but I think they had to be pared down. So I think the lessons learned if you're looking at the general thing--

ES: Yes!

P1: If you want a partnership to work, it can't be so large that it becomes impersonal.

ES: Uh-huh, Mm-hmm.

P1: You really have to be able to pick up the phone and talk to the person in a parallel role on a regular basis and, uh, if it gets to the point where you're counting on the Vice President of Academic Affairs from four colleges and the superintendents from 35 school districts and so on and so forth to have a conversation it just doesn't happen.

ES: Yeah.

P1: When you're talking about two academic deans and, you know, 13 superintendents, it's manageable.

ES: It's doable. Ok. So the [local partnership for improving education] is still going strong?

P1: Yeah, it's been going back to being called the [local partnership for improving education], but it's still going on, still doing work. And it's partnering with, you know, the [county] United Way and the colleges and the private sector and early education components and superintendents. I mean, we still have members of our [local partnership for improving education] and the Dean of Graduate and Continuing Education still sit every month at the meeting of the superintendents' roundtable. So they are there for every meeting. I still am the chair of the early education subcommittee of the [local partnership for improving education] and I'm also on the [county] United Way Board and the chair of their early education impact council. Because the United Way is a partner here in doing their work on K-16, so we're still very active and very connected even though there's no grant funding per se to make it happen.

ES: Wow. Uh-huh. So who, um, does the university fund it? Where is the money coming from now?

P1: It's a combination. [Local partnership university] is obviously funding the salary for the Dean of Graduate and Continuing Education. The superintendent's roundtable is actually giving a small stipend to a retired superintendent who is our liaison for the [local partnership for improving education] for the K-12 stuff.

ES: Ok.

P1: And the [county] United Way is funding the early education coordinators in the county.

ES: Wow.

P1: So you have some private sector, you have some actual corporate donations that are supporting one of the positions in early education. So, the private sector donated money through the United Way, funding from K-12 for services, and in-kind donation of service through universities.

ES: Wow. That's very unique. How cool. Oh, sorry if you hear the weedeater that just picked up outside my office. (Laughter)

P1: Ok.

ES: Um, can you tell me a little more about specifically about the Northeast Early Childhood Education program? Can you describe how many different schools you work with and, um, I know that you have none school partners for that as well, so can you describe your partners?

P1: Ok. Originally we had three schools districts...and we had two, uh, non K-12. We had the [county] Head Start and uh...anyway, two pre-k programs.

ES: Ok, uh-huh.

P1: And in the last year, in expansion of that grant, we added the largest district in the county. They had not wanted to be part of it when we originally came in. They were going through a transition with an retiring superintendent and an acting superintendent and just didn't think they had the capacity to join in at the beginning.

ES: Yeah.

P1: Now that they have stabilized, they are moving forward. And, and, so we are working with four school districts now and the two early education components. Plus we have partnerships with three museums...

ES: So cool. I mean, as I read about that, I've never--I've not ever heard about that-- bringing museums in for these partnerships especially with pre-K through 2. Is that-- did you all get that

idea from somewhere or did that just make sense for your community? How did those partnerships come out with the museums?

P1: When the [county] United Way, um, through some of the work that had been done through the [local partnership for improving education], the [county] United Way decided that they wanted to support early education and the first five years of a child's life.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: They formed something called .... and their goal was that 90% of all third graders would be proficient in reading by the end of the third day. Which was a lofty goal for a county whose rate was around 50% at the time.

ES: Yes.

P1: The libraries were natural partners, but the [county] Museum jumped in and said, "We want to be part of that. And we're going to put some money into early education." And they actually got-- besides their education specialist that most museums had-- they had an early education specialist there.

ES: Wow, ok.

P1: Then [local museum] that had always had some educational outreach formed, uh, a physical space in the museum called the kids space. And it does-- it has interactive art exhibits that teachers can bring groups of kids with and they got some, uh, cultural council funding so that kids from the [school district] and [another school district] which are, you know, low-income districts--

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: -- And children in every grade in the elementary have an annual visit to the museum. Because the sense is that maybe kids growing up in poverty, their families don't get there.

ES: Yeah.

P1: And we, in addition to that, we have a thing where the museum, through the library, parents can take their kids to the children's library and they can pick up free passes for the family to go to the museums also.

ES: Wow, cool.

P1: So the museums were kind of in the conversation before the [local partnership for improving education] grant was written.

ES: Ok.

P1: And they were written into the grant, one was added after the grant was written that had a new children's person appointed also because they saw what the others were doing and kind of said, "Me, too. Me, too. We'd like to be a part of this."
ES: (Laughter) Awesome. Yeah. How cool... Sorry, just typing things. OK, awesome. So, you kind of talked a little bit about just then that it kind of started, at least with the museums in a different town and spread. But, um, what was the impetus, maybe even going back to the president who founded the [local partnership for improving education]. Do you know, how did this whole initiative start in bringing together K-12, higher ed, private, public sector? Um, how did that all get started?

P1: [County] County is small and it's somewhat hemmed in by what we call mountains-- they're really hills (laughter)--

ES: Yes, got it. (Laughter)

P1: But it's somewhat isolated. For years we have been stuck at about a third of our adult population having college, any kind of postsecondary degrees, and the businesses located here... [Local corporation] has a plant, [another local corporation] is here that makes all of the currency paper--

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: We have some fairly large industries. [Corporation] used to be here but they pulled out and [corporation] used to be in [local town] and they pulled out. And one of the reasons they pulled out and the labor market is shrinking was, uh, workforce issues. You know, we have a mismatch between skills of our population and the skills that we need to grow our community wealth and well-being. And the sense was that the private sector was saying to the general public and to the colleges, "We're having trouble recruiting people to come here."

ES: Mm-hmm.

P1: Uh, why can't we grow our own workforce? Why can't we get more of our college students to go to college? So the private sector buy-in was you know, you do connecting activities for the high schools and you do internships with kids and so on and so forth as part of our [local partnership for improving education] and, uh, at the same time the college will encourage students to consider, um, majors that will better match the needs of the community.

ES: Ok.

P1: That's where a lot of the STEM stuff comes in, because a lot of its technology, science, and engineering based. So, the sense was if the [county] were going to slow the decline that we were experiencing and grow our economy, um, education had to be a core, a key component of that. And that involved getting a higher percentage of our adult population to have degrees and that meant a higher percentage achieving well in school and aspiring to and having access to a college education.

ES: Mm-hmm. Ok, that makes sense. Ok, thank you! Now I'd like to ask you more specifically a set of questions about how you define and measure the success of your partnerships. Specifically, um, the Northeast Early Childhood Partnership grant, um, and when I asked you earlier how you defined P-20 partnerships, what you said leads me to believe that you've thought a lot about this. You said that P-20 partnerships should have specific, defined goals and outcomes. So, generally speaking, how do you know if your partnership is successful?

P1: Ok, one of the things we're working on is the impact model, community impact model, where all the partners efforts are put in and you name some outcomes. And when you do that, you have to have some short-term outcomes that you can point to as early wins. Uh, but you also have the long-term goals that, um, you want to keep your eye on on the horizon.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P1: Uh, one of the things about some of these partnerships is they do things like the ... did, which is that they say in 2012 that they want 90% of the 3rd graders to be proficient in reading by 2020. Which is a great aspirational goal, but how do you tell in 2013, 2014, you know--

ES: Yeah.

P1: So, with this grant, we look at both some short-term outcomes that we wanted to see that the early education teachers, the early education, uh, institutions, whether they are K-12, pre-K through second grade, or the Head Start, um, components could visibly see in teacher outcomes.

ES: Ah.

P1: And then we wanted to look at longer outcomes for the children. In other words, if we had this successful integration of curriculum in pre-K to 2 for STEM or STEAM because we added the arts in, are we seeing years down the road in middle that science fair, high school science fair, are more kids taking more STEAM courses, are arts having a resurgence as well as in technology and science?

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: And are, ultimately, are more kids entering our state colleges and universities and pursuing STEM-related fields? So, we basically look at for short-term outcomes-- and tell me if I'm giving you too much detail--

ES: No, this is great.

P1: What we look at for the educators-- and remember, for [state] those early educators don't need college degrees. They basically need three to six credits of training and they're good for their training. We are moving now toward having at least one bachelor degreed person in every classroom.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P1: But at the time we started this, one of the goals we wanted to work on was to get the teachers familiar with the actual standards that they should be teaching to pre-K through two. Right? You know, we hear about all of the standards and the tested grades later on, but for pre-k through two there are standards also in literacy, mathematics, and in the other domains as well as social-emotional development.

ES: Yeah.

P1: And you should be intentionally planning lessons to be integrating these things for outcomes for kids. So one quick thing we could look for is could we teach teachers to create developmentally appropriate integrated lessons for kids.

ES: Ah. And so you built-- I saw that you built-- that you have a build your own curriculum tool?

P1: Yeah, yeah. And actually we do six workshops a year and whether it's at the college or museum, we expose the teachers to the content embedded in activities that they could use in age appropriate ways with children for their lessons. And their assignment out of that is that they need to design and implement a lesson based on that. And we have a coach who goes into their classroom with them. She started out by demonstrating what the lessons would look like for 6 months and then started working with them to implement their lessons and then she gives them feedback.

ES: OK.

P1: So, the firsts data point, the first cog that we want to see turning that's going to have impact down the road is are we getting these teachers to understand that well-planned, intentional lessons that integrate curriculum can meet the demands that are placed on literacy and math but also integrate the arts, integrate science, pique the children's curiosity, get them to understand the world they live in.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: Because what we're finding in education is that you get all of the phonics and everything and then you get into fourth grade and you start expecting them to read for content, they don't have the general information to understand what they are reading. So we are trying to say to use the science, use the art, use all of these experiences as vehicles. You can use them all as vehicles to teach the counting and math and all-- but you can include some content underneath as you do it. So that's the number one outcome. The number two outcome is part of the college strategy was to get these people who may not have ever aspired to a college degree on campus. So these workshops as either at the museum or the college classroom--

ES: Ok.

P1: -- So in addition to these workshops, I partnered with the state department of early education and care put their funding into training that I would coordinate for them in the [county]. Instead of taking place haphazardly at this early education center or that one where the teachers all had to take whatever was offered, we would do mini-conferences that would be held at the colleges. The colleges hosted them for free, give them the technology and everything they would need. But we would have, you know, 75 to 100 teachers, early educators there, and they would have four to six different offerings to take. And that, between those trainings and the Northeast Early Childhood Partnership trainings, our goal was to get those early educators on campus and comfortable in a campus setting.

ES: Yeah, yeah.

P1: And then we created a plus two degree program that targeted incumbent early educators to create the pool of people with bachelor's degrees in early education to meet the demands of the new standards for the feds and the state. Because we were-- Head Start was going to close down because they couldn't get enough bachelor degreed people.

ES: Wow.

P1: So we are now with our fourth cohort of people who within two years and a summer, if they come in with a hodge podge of courses they've taken throughout the year, we can get them, um, a bachelor's degree. And if we're careful about it and we make sure they apply for all PELL grants and early education scholarships and [...] scholarships, we've actually gotten the first two cohorts graduating at no expense to themselves.

ES: Wow!

P1: The number two outcome so for this, talking about skin in the game for the partners, was we're going to manage to get your teachers to the bachelor's level at no cost to you and at no cost to them. And we're going to provide-- arrange to provide-- the professional development that is mandated for early education to be meaningful and high quality. It's haphazard the way it was done in the past.

ES: Yeah, yeah.

P1: So that matches what I was saying earlier. The early educators themselves are getting training that they are required to get, but it's higher quality. They are getting degrees. Uh, the programs involved are seeing themselves get-- their teachers doing better planning and they are also getting professional development at no cost to them.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P1: And then the final one is the one that's going to look down the road.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: Are we seeing the students actually responding in the positive fashion we want. In the early grades, of course, all assessment is formative and observational. You're not giving a standardized test to see this.

ES: Right.

P1: So, we're using observational methods as part of the assessment, [name of local assessment] as a tool to monitor students' progress pre-K through grade 2. And, basically, the teachers are observing the children and seeing if after they do these kind of exercises, are they seeming to be more persistent in seeking out answers, are they questioning the world in a more positive way, are they beginning to show that interest-- create an interest that would lead to the artistic or design cycle of thinking at young grades.

ES: Cool. So what have you see with that when you look at the aggregate data from observations? Have you learned anything interesting?

P1: It's early, but the program supervisor and early education coordinators in the district are telling us that definitely because the teachers are structuring their lessons to incorporate the kind of experiences that enhance kids using those skills, that the kids are becoming more comfortable with that kind of learning.

ES: Cool.

P1: In other words, rather than preparing kids to sit down and be lectured to, you're preparing kids to work in teams, to do discovery learning. And they're seeing that. They're seeing groups of kids be given toothpicks and marshmallows and asked to build towers in pre-K. And they didn't do that kind of stuff before. They did blocks, but they didn't do things where there was a challenge or something like that.

ES: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Cool. Thank you! So this is sort of a weird question, but I think, to me, whenever I think of success, it goes along with failure, too. So, in terms of your partnerships, have felt moments that you felt like things didn't go as planned or maybe even if you didn't, um, what would you perceive to be a failure? Is there a situation in which maybe you didn't see-- you would perceive, that could be seen as failure? So the opposite of success for you in that program.

P1: Well, we actually had-- in the first year, we had a system failure basically.

ES: Oh.

P1: We sat down and, you know, I-I didn't write this grant, it was given to me and we tweaked it and we got it going and we did a pretty good job. And with the teachers who were actually the workshops, we were seeing progress. Um, but that was a small percentages of the teachers.

ES: Uh-huh. Yeah.

P1: I mean, you're getting 40 or 50 teachers out of 200 in this cohort of teachers. And we weren't touching the other ones. And we brainstormed for that, because we felt that this would be-- this would not have the impact on the children or the educational programs in the schools and programs that we wanted to see. And one of the women who was in the program participating, she said, "You know what you really need is a coach. You need to hire somebody to go into all of the classrooms to demonstrate theses lessons and to recruit people." And that's where-- the coach wasn't in the original grant.

ES: Oh, ok.

P1: So I went to the department of higher education in the year two funding cycle and said, you know, I need more money and this is why. And [name of state administrator] from the department of higher education said, "It sounds good." And she gave us the money.

ES: (Laughter) Wow!

P1: And we added that person and it really took off. It was doing ok the first year, but it wouldn't have achieved the outcomes we wanted. We just realized that we didn't have enough, you know, octane in there to get all the classrooms.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: And by hiring this person full-time, um, and again [local partnership university] gave her office space in-kind and photo copying and, you know, all that kind of stuff she'd need to be able to work and stuff. Um, so, the salary is paid by the grant but all of the other stuff is paid by the college.

ES: Yeah.

P1: She took us up, you know, not one notch but probably three notches.

ES: Wow.

P1: Um, the other thing that I think that we will see as a failure if it comes to pass-- and this is the one thing that we're worried about-- is that if the grant ends, any grant and this is true of this one, and people just revert back to past practice. They don't internalize their learning, that would be a failure.

ES: Yeah.

P1: So what we're working on now in the last year with the early school districts and programs is making sure that there is capacity, internal capacity, to maintain momentum. One of the challenges there, particularly in the early education component, is that there is large turnover.

ES: Yeah.

P1: There are large numbers of, uh, early educators because they are paid so little, that if they get another opportunity to go into K-12 education or even to go into retail or something like that, they can make more money.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: So, we're working now on making sure there are, um, at least one but in most cases, several, people at each site who are most likely to stay because they've been there long-term who are willing to take a leadership role. And this year, upcoming, those people are working very closely with our coach to be trained as mini-coaches themselves.

ES: Cool- train the trainer.

P1: Yeah. And I think the other thing that we learned early on is that you had to make sure when you're talking to college people who generally are teaching college-aged students, uh, that they have to understanding that a) this cohort of educators is not coming right out of high school and has not-- probably not-- had recent academic classroom experience.

ES: Uh-huh, yeah.

P1: And so you have to meet their needs. And number two is if you're talking to a physics professor, an astrophysics guy, or a biology professor and you're asking them to teach a course for early educators, you have to make sure they understand where the four year old, five year old, six year old kids are.

ES: (Laughter) Yeah.

P1: Because one of our early toe stubs was we had a very good math professor who came in and she did a very good thing on origami and paper folding to teach numeracy. And-- it was cool, but physically four and five year olds couldn't do the same folds that she had.

ES: Right, they can't do it.

P1: So, it's that kind of thing that your partners have to understand all of the players and where they are and so--

ES: How did you do that? Did you just have conversations with faculty members or did you have some sort of a training? How did you, kind of, address that?

P1: We addressed that in this way-- at both [local partnership university] and [local partnership community college] we have professors that teach early education courses. So, if one of the professors, the biology professor and the physics professor, want to develop a workshop, I say, "Talk to [name of early education professor] about kids and about what you are going to do, because he is going to be able to tell you, 'That won't work with five year olds.'"

ES: Yeah.

P1: So, we learned that you need to have that conversation and people were very willing to do it. And in the museums, candidly, what happened is that [county museum] went out and hired an early education specialist and added her to their educational outreach component.

ES: Ok.

P1: Um, and when [local museum] asked to come in, the women who was their education specialist asked to come in, she actually came from a background in early education. When she heard what we did the first year, she wanted to get in year two.

ES: Cool! Ok.

P1: So, you know, it's something that, you know, if you're going to be doing a pre-K through 16 type partnership, um, there has to be candid conversations between early educators and college educators and K-12 educators about where they are and where their students are.

ES: Ok. Awesome. I think I'd like to-- well, maybe one more question. This might not be applicable given the work that you're doing. Have you ever tried to compare, um, what you were doing to other similar partnerships? Have you heard of similar partnerships that just focus on PK-2 and bring in art museums and things? It sounds pretty unique to me, but I don't know if, um, you've heard of similar ones.

P1: Well, there were six [local partnerships to improve education] established in the state of [state] and we met regularly.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: And they didn't-- they weren't in any means the same. Some of them were just a college in a school district trying to work on early math intervention. [University] worked on pre-K through two math training for teachers. Uh, so, we talked a lot about the scope. When we first met, the people from the other colleges looked at me like I had three heads. They said, "You've got too many partners."

ES: (Laughter)

P1: And I said, "Yes, but we're small. You're thinking about if you tried to do this with all of your districts and all of your museums and you have 10 museums and 20 districts."

ES: Right.

P1: But we're small enough to do this. So, yes, we talked about scale and what you can do and how the partnerships work. And my original description of skin in the game, I think that perspective came a lot from hearing the other partners because in some cases, the buy-in from the institution of higher education, the college, faded after it was cool to have a grant.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: Because they didn't see that there was much in it for them.

ES: Yeah.

P1: You know, what's the gain for college? And, in-- I intentionally, I am not an employee of [local partnership university], but I'm working through [local partnership university] and [local community college], I made it clear to them that the outcome for them, if they really continued to have energy for this, was public relations and, and so they had something coming out of it.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: I saw in some of the other partnerships once the initial thing was there, the college backed away and you couldn't get the college faculty to buy-in to what the college faculty had committed them to.

ES: Yeah.

P1: So, I think that's one of the things. And the other component is that, again, I think that some of these partnerships between colleges and in early education in particular, but even K-12 education that I was in, I think that sometimes, uh, if you're not careful about the conversation and expectation, you get early educators or elementary educators feeling that they're being talked down to.

ES: Yes, uh-huh.

P1: And, I think that we were very lucky that the faculty members that we dealt with at both colleges, um, were part of the conversation early and they understand that this was a partnership. It wasn't them descending from the throne and giving lessons to these lowly early educators.

ES: (Laughter) Yeah, ok. Great. This, um, next question really relates to what you were just talking about, but I want to ask you again just in case you think of anything else. What do you think, what are the resources, what do you think it takes for a P-20 partnership generally to be successful?

P1: Have you heard the term backbone organization?

ES: Um, I don't know. That doesn't sound familiar to me.

P1: Ok, what we're discovering is that in any of these partnerships, um, you-you have to have a convening force that's credible to all the parts.

ES: Ok, so that's the backbone?

P1: Yeah. And so, we- we are working with a couple of backbone organizations. One is [local partnership university], which is a state university, as a convenor, and the other is the [county] United Way, and their focus on early education.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: And with that, all the partners know that you're going to have a commitment from a plausible entity that's going to be around for the duration of this initiative.

ES: Yeah.

P1: And, I- I think that absent that kind of a backbone-- if everybody's in charge, nobody's in charge.

ES: Yes, yeah.

P1: So, the backbone that we have-- the [local partnership university], the college, the president committed to it, Dean of Graduate and Continuing Education heading up initiatives now and as a part of his job responsibilities. And you have the [county] United Way, the chairman of the [county] United Way making the commitment and getting private sector commitment to hire an early education coordinator, uh, and that- that salary is guaranteed. It's originally through the grant, but when that person was hired they were told that when the challenge grant ended, after two years, they were going to continue the funding for the position and they have.

ES: Right. Ok.

P1: So, when you have a backbone organization saying, we're not going away when the grant goes away. And when we set that goal for 2020, we're on it. And beyond. And so, you know, you have [local partnership university] publicly stating and very publicly acting out and [local community college] as a public community college partner, they work very closely together, acting out that they are committed to these outcomes. They are committed to the quality of education, pre-K through 16, and they are willing to partner actively, not just verbally.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P1: Um, and they are going to be in the game as long as it lasts. That's having an organization-- two-- that, when you go to the private sector for something, whether it's finances-- and it usually isn't finances it's usually job shadowing or internships or something like that-- um, they- they're talking to someone who has credibility.

ES: Yeah, ok. So, I mean, that's something that has been built over time. Right?

P1: Yes, but I'm saying that as you-- if you're looking at the generalization of building this kind of partnership, from the get-go there has to be a lightning rod.

ES: Yeah.

P1: In [county] county, we have been collaborating for years. You know-- I was a high school principal. I also represented on the regional employment board because I had vocational programs at my high school-- that kind of thing.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: You wear multiple hats. But until [name of former president] as president of [local partnership university] called a meeting and got the president of [local corporation] and the, uh, editor of the [name of county paper], which is the local newspaper--

ES: Hmmm.

P1: -- To be the three people who were convening this meeting to look at college access and aspirations, you know, it- it wouldn't have lasted 12 years if it didn't have that kind of credibility from day one.

ES: Yeah. Yeah. Definitely. So, um, another question. If you were speaking to a new partnership director, someone who was taking on a P-20 partnership, what would tell them should be their first priority?

P1: Well, I think the first priority is to make sure that you- you have a clear understanding among all partners of what the outcomes and goals are, not only overall, but for their role in it. I mean, I think that understanding the outcomes, the outcomes defines roles. And if you don't know what you're aiming to do, it's very hard to define what you have to do. And if you don't have first the goals and then the responsibilities clearly defined, um, you're going to fumble.

ES: Uh-huh. Yeah. Mm-hmm. Ok. Those are all my questions for you. Is there anything else you can think of relating to me studying successful partnerships and what it takes to make a partnership successful? Anything else you what to tell me or think I should know?

P1: Again, I think that one thing-- besides that leadership person-- that leadership person is not usually in a position to do day-to-day stuff. Ok?

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: There also has to be a person with some, uh, decision-making authority. Um, you know, if it's the [county] United Way, it can't be the head of the [county] United Way. There has to be somebody below that. If it's a college, it can't be the college president. It's, in this case, a dean.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P1: You need somebody who has operational responsibility.

ES: Yeah, definitely.

P1: You know, you can have your advisory group that makes some decisions, but they have to have somebody to turn to to say, "You make sure the partners understand their assignments, convene the following groups, we need to get it done-- get the tasks, find the people to get it done."

ES: Mm-hmm. What other sort of resources do you see-- I mean, it sounds like for you all, there's been grant funding to support this for some times and then other institutions, higher ed, private sector have stepped in, so it doesn't necessarily sound like financial resources have been a challenge for you.

P1: You know, it's- I keep saying... I think this is as a principal myself. It's not a matter of getting better resources--

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: It's a matter of using resources better.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P1: And a lot of times, I-- you know-- like the little model I referred to, doing the professional development for early educators, a lot of money was being wasted. And very few people were getting quality early education. But, nominally, the department of early education could say they were spending money.

ES: (Laughter)

P1: And nominally, the programs could say that they were meeting the requirements.

ES: Yeah.

P1: And nominally, the educators were saying, "I got enough hours of training." But, without any additional resources, just by partnering and getting all of the people together who had to do the same thing, and getting it coordinated, you ended up with high-quality stuff that's actually coordinated and it's actually costing less per person per training.

ES: Wow! Cool.

P1: And, of course, there's a lot of in-kind stuff that people don't think about giving. I mean, when I talk to people at other parts of the state about having college campuses host full-day training workshops, um, I was told by the other people, "Yeah, there's a charge of $800 or $1000 for the four classrooms, blah, blah, blah." And I said, "Wait a second: this is when college is not in session. The classroom is not being used. There are no personnel requirements." "Oh no, there is always a charge or that."

ES: Ah.

P1: So, what you need to do, is you need to get the institutions who control that to understand that as a community outreach, that's an in-kind donation. It's costing them nothing.

ES: Yeah. Right.

P1: But, in fact, they are getting a lot of good will. But, it's kind of a mind set.

ES: Uh-huh.

P1: And, it took a while but now [local community college] and [local community college] are hosting this year, so other colleges are realizing it's something that-- that is good public relations, good recruitment, and it doesn't really cost them anything.

ES: Yeah, yeah. That makes sense. Awesome. Thank you so much for your time! Thanks for answering all of my questions. I can't wait to write this all up and think about it a lot.

NE Curriculum and Alignment Partnership Interviews
August 11, 2016
1:00-1:40pm CST

ES: Elizabeth Smith, Interviewer
P2: Participant #2

(Opening introductory chatter not transcribed.)

ES: Can you start by telling me, just generally, about the partnership you oversee?

P2: Well, the partnership is with the [school district] and, uh, it incorporates six schools at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels.
ES: Ok.

P2: Uh, the partnership was first developed by the need for schools to have our students as, not workers, but to give them practice. And, um, so, the [school district] is our neighbor school, so what we do is-- the partnership essentially is that they will take our student teachers and they will mentor them for one semesters and, um, through what we call a three-way program, a three way model. The program supervisor, which comes from the university, the classroom teacher, and the student teacher-- they form a group, they meet, they plan for that particular student's success in his or her field work.

ES: Uh-huh. Ok.

P2: So, the partnership is one in which, for the longest while, it was essential they taking our students and mentoring them.

ES: Yes.

P2: Of late, the partnership has become a lot more reciprocal-- it's a true partnership in that what we do is we try to give back to those communities. And what we do is try to help their English Language Learners, we would set up workshops, we would actually go into the schools and teach our methodology classes.

ES: Oh, uh-huh.

P2: Yes. And, uh, we involve the principals in our practicum sessions. Every Wednesdays the teachers will have a class from 3 to 5. In that class, they will raise issues, they will talk about difficulties they are having. But at the same time, it is presenting them with a wide range of educational issues that they should, um, if not currently dealing with them-- it probably orients them to some of the issues they are going to have. Building principals and superintendents and (sic) have all come in based on the topics to provide our students with that experience.

ES: Ok.

P2: So, we have been giving back to the schools. Schools around, we have actually rebuilt their libraries because the need was there.

ES: Oh, wow!

P2: We have held professional development for teachers, uh, prior to school starting at 8:30. We've gone into the schools and done that and also done professional development in the afternoons along with tutoring for their students for the state assessment tests.

ES: Ok.

P2: And, uh, so, that is... It was as recently as ten years ago that the partnership became truly reciprocal. They do for us and we do for them.

ES: Right, so more of the idea of simultaneous renewal.

P2: Exactly, exactly. We also, we also include the principals and superintendents in curricular changes that we are proposing to find out to what extent those changes, uh, you know, how the impact the expectations for our teachers.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: Also, we listen to what they have to say about all students, whether or not they think they are well-prepared or if there are areas of-- for improvement that they think we ought to focus on, um, we will listen to them on that. One of the areas that they certainly told us that they need some improvement in was in the area of instructional technology.

ES: Ah.

P2: Yeah, what we have done is actually gone out, we have actually hired a teacher from that same system, brought them in to teach faculty about the use of iPads in the classroom-- how they can be educationally effective.

ES: Cool.

P2: We've also bought an iPad cart and provide training to the whole faculty-- how to integrate those for instruction.
ES: Ok. And so, um, when you were nominated, also, the person who nominated you, which would have been somebody at the state department, mentioned specifically the [Northeast Curriculum and Alignment Partnership].

P2: Right, right.

ES: So do you oversee that partnership as well?

P2: Well, I am the associate dean. There is someone else and-- this email actually came to the chair.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P2: And the chair actually bumped it up to me.

ES: Ah!

P2: That person who directly oversaw that program is […] and she says that also would be willing to talk with you about it.

ES: Ok, great. Great. So it sounds like, um, you, then, I'm guessing, are in a college of education or school of education?

P2: Yes, yes.

ES: So, how did you first get involved in P-20 partnerships in general?

P2: Well, (laughter) when I came to the university, it was already there.

ES: Yeah, ok.

P2: But what I have done is that I have certainly grown the partnership from a limited number of schools to the number we have right now. And even now we are seeking three additional partners to come and join us. And the reason for that is, when you have a limited number of schools, they become overwhelmed.

ES: Yes.

P2: And we constantly ask them to make-- to accept visitors in their classroom and sometimes it can be very intrusive. So, what we're trying to do is we are trying to, uh, include some additional partners so as to reduce the burden on just a few schools in the area.

ES: Ok.

P2: But, in terms-- I guess, to answer your question: how did we come to be involved in the partnerships? I could say, um, partnerships have always been-- if you read the history of [university] (sic), we were one of the first schools to begin to teach an apprenticeship program.

ES: Wow!

P2: Which was, um, placing students in the classroom of teachers who were considered veteran teachers. You go back to the history; our school was used as a lab school to try to develop that relationship. So, I would say the whole idea of partnership has been at the core of the history of this, um, university.

ES: Ok, awesome. Great. So, how would define-- if someone asked you what a P-20 partnership is, how would you define it for them?

P2: Ok, I would say a P-20 partnership is a relationship in which both, uh, the university and administration in public schools interact and make changes to the program so that our teacher education candidates can be well-prepared to meet the changing needs of the classroom.

ES: Ok. I really like what you said earlier, too, about it being a true partnership if it's reciprocal.

P2: Yes. Because, the reason for that is that, uh, many times we see a partnership in which the community is always doing for the university.

E**S:** Yes, yes.

P2: But when you really think about it, there is so much more that a university can do. We just need to recognize what are some of those strengths that we have, that we could leverage for public schools- especially with limited dollars.

ES: Yes.

P2: We can't hire a consultant to come in, but we can, actually, uh, provide that service.

ES: Yes, ok. Can you describe the type of schools you work with and, um, do you have any partners in, um partnership programs that are non-schools? Non-school partners-- any other community organizations?

P2: Um, schools we work with are essentially... We work with (sic)... we work with elementary, middle, and secondary. Uh, at this time we are not, uh, involved in partnerships with any private institutions.
ES: Uh-huh, ok.

P2: However, we do provide, uh, on a need basis-- because we have something called a [P-20 partnership]—

ES: Oh, cool!

P2: It's actually on our website. And, uh, what we do is that we accept, uh, requests from any school that reaches out to use for assistance, whether it's going to be workshops. Whether it's just to... hear about strategies of teaching, or whether it's to hold a class for them. We respond to those needs.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: So, even though we have our designated partners, we are also a university in the community-- we really respond to community needs.

ES: Cool! And I'm looking at the website right now-- I just Googled it when you said that-- and it looks like it's across the university, so it's not just within education.

P2: Yes, that is correct. Not just education. And what I've been doing over the last year is actually going to all the chairs and finding out what are those things that they are doing for the community. Because, you know, just talking to them... The thinking was that it was just the education department.

ES: Right.

P2: But it's not. Every, every one of our divisions, uh, reaches out to these schools.

ES: Yeah.

P2: And we love that. When you think about it, they really do more than the education department is currently doing. And that was actually-- that was a pleasant surprise, to find out how much was really being done.

ES: Yeah, yeah. That's really part of my dissertation, too, is, um, I'm including some teacher ed partnerships, but then some outside teacher ed. Because, I think, most of the literature I found when I did my literature review and I work in-- I oversee a P-20 partnership, too-- and most of the literature is about partnerships in teacher ed.

P2: Uh-huh, yes.

ES: And, so one thing, you know, I'm trying to do is highlight some programs at least that are outside teacher ed.

P2: Mm-hmm.

ES: Because, like you said, a lot of people are doing things and being from a college of education background myself, I just had no idea.

P2: Right, right.

ES: Very cool. So, how did you-- it sounds like partnerships have always been essential to your institution. Um, what kind of things do you find yourself doing now to cultivate your partnerships?

P2: Well, currently we are involved in developing a pipeline for teachers of color.

ES: Oh, cool.

P2: And that has because, uh, 87 percent of the students who graduate from our program are white.

ES: Ok.

P2: And, uh, we have a very growing diverse population of students in public schools-- close to about 60 percent, 66 percent to be exact. And, they are being taught by—

ES: By white teachers.

P2: Correct. And so the call came from the public schools that, "Send us some teachers of color and we will hire them."

ES: (Laughter) Yeah.

P2: And, uh, so, together, [university] and [school district] and [community college] are working together to develop a pipeline of teachers of color. And our launch date is the fall of 2017 for our first cohort.

ES: Ah, neat. So you're going to do a cohort model, so you're recruiting specifically—

P2: Yes, yes.

ES: Ok.

P2: And we have all the-- a lot of the mentoring is going to come from internal and external.
ES: Uh-huh.

P2: We've worked it out so that coming in students-- they can either come straight in or through a pathway at the community college. Uh, while they're here, they will receive support and mentoring for passing state licensure tests.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: Um, they will-- we're helping them... In some cases, they still don't have the finances to pay tuition, so we will help them with vouchers.

ES: Uh-huh. Wow.

P2: But I think that what's more important is that outside of the, um, the support they get while they're here, our partners in the community-- the public schools and we have some other partners, too—

ES: Mm-hmm.

P2: -- who guarantee taking these students and hiring them.

ES: Yeah, that's great. Yeah.

P2: And, so, the partnership works in that, ok, yes, you're going to take our students, you're going to mentor them when they're doing their student teaching. And at the same time, uh, you said you wanted these teachers and you also say you will hire them. So, I think the partnership works very well.

ES: Ok. Wow, that's exciting. So, is that being paid for just by the community college and you all or is someone funding that externally?

P2: Yeah, so, we have some grants and we are currently-- our president and the president of the community college and the partner superintendents are seeking funding-- local funding.

ES: Cool, ok. It sounds like, um, you have been in partnerships for a while. How long have you been in your current job?

P2: I've been here eighteen years.

ES: Ok, awesome. Ok. So, generally speaking, how do you know if P-20 partnerships at your institution are successful?

P2: Ok, well, uh, first, we have a program, I think it's the school psychology program. Very successful program, 100 percent of our graduates have been placed. And that program came as a result of superintendents who were part of our formal partnerships who told us that this was the need.

ES: Ok.

P2: And, uh, we responded to the need. And, so, currently it is one of those areas where we are able to place 100 percent of our graduates.

ES: Wow.

P2: That is one way we measure our success. I would say also another way that we measure success is not by any, uh, proven analytical method, but, um... just like hearing what they have to say about our teachers.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: They believe our teachers are strong. When there is an outlier they also let us know.
ES: Mm-hmm.

P2: And in terms of measuring the quality of our program, we also do so through the passing of national exams—

ES: Yes, licensure?

P2: Mm-hmm. And I think another one that is used currently is how many of them pass on the first try.

ES: Yes.

P2: Now, also, how long they remain in the teaching workforce.

ES: Yeah-- so do you all track that?

P2: Yes, we don't track it personally, but the department of elementary and secondary education does that.

ES: Ok, and then they send that to you?

P2: Actually-- it's actually public information.

ES: Ah.

P2: If you go to the site and you pull up our school, you'll see that the first year, it's like 100 percent. Second year-- from second to fourth year it goes all the way down to about 96 percent. So, so, you know there is very good longevity for graduates.

ES: Yeah, yeah. That's very high!

P2: Yes. So, you will find-- the thing is that most of our teachers remain in the area.

ES: Wow... So, conversely, what would you... as someone involved in P-20 partnerships, what would you consider to be a failure?

P2: Hmm.

ES: You know, I like to think of success and failure hand in hand, so, have you ever had a moment when you thought, "Oh, this didn't work?"

P2: Yeah, yeah. I would say that, um, there is much more we would like to do for the schools.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: Um, being in an urban area, there are many schools that are-- don't have the resources. And many times they need financial resources and even if they don't need the actual dollars, they probably need a tool that they can use.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: Uh, we are-- because of the bureaucracy, we are unable to use monies that are appropriated to us, even-- let's say we're not even using it—

ES: Yeah, you still-

P2: -- Or let's say it's going to be returned to the treasury-- we can't just appropriate it to a needy school. And that, that's frustrating.

ES: Yeah, yeah.

P2: And I actually think that's a big loss.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P2: Also, too, one of the failures is the extent to which we get public school teachers who are in-service to actually choose us to receive their professional credits.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: And that is because of the system. They can actually go out of the system. They don't have to go to any designated school, but they can actually go out of the system for their professional development. And they get their professional certification and-- and so, that is one frustration on our part, you know that there are students, teachers who we would give credits to and then on their own they would go and receive the certification somewhere else.

ES: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

P2: So, that is really frustrating. But I really can't think of a failure right now. I know when you speak with […], she's going to tell you of some glorious success that she's had in early childhood with teachers who had no degree. And she was able to devise a program that brought them to their bachelor's degree and some of them to their master's degree.

ES: Wow!

P2: And you're actually talking there about, um, preschool teachers and Head Start teachers. Generally, the salary is not very good there because-- but that is changing because all of them are getting a bachelor's degree and some of them a master's degree.

ES: Yeah, mm-hmm.

P2: Uh, so that, I know, has been a very success program.

ES: Ok, I'll ask her about that, too.

P2: Sure.

ES: Ok. Um, sorry. Great! Um, this is sort of a different question. And I don't think it always applies. But have you ever tried to compare the, um, success of your P-20 partnership programs to others? And, if so, what does that look like?

P2: Um, yes.

ES: Ok.
P2: I think that whenever we speak about our, uh, program to sister institutions, they're always interested in the particular model we have. We have a model called clinical professor model.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: And what that is is that we will take a full-time, tenured teacher from [school district] for 2 years, sometimes 3. We will pay 50 percent of their salary and the public school will pay the other 50 percent. They will come here on campus and act like faculty.

ES: Wow, that is very cool!

P2: They mentor our teacher candidates, will place them in the field, and they will actually be the one who-- because he or she knows the system-- they are able to develop, um, proper placements. They are able to say, "This will be a good match." They also teach the class here, the practicum class.

ES: Oh.

P2: And I think that whenever we speak of that model, the clinical professor model, um, it's the envy of the other institutions. They want to know how we are able to do that.

ES: Yeah, yeah. I mean, you must have a very close relationship with the school district to make that happen.

P2: Yes, we do. And I will say that is one of the big differences among us, is that we have this model. And I think we're the only ones here that have that model.

ES: Uh-huh, ok. So the final topic-- I have a few more questions—

P2: No problem.

ES: Thank you! I have a few more questions about, generally what you think it takes for P-20 partnerships to be successful. So, when you think about resources that it takes to be successful, assets, or types of capital, or whatever you want to call them. Um, what do you think-- what does it take to make these types of partnerships successful?

P2: You know, I- I would say that you need money, but money is really not going to determine the success.

ES: (Laughter) Uh-huh.

P2: I think the success of a P-20 partnership is based on the... philosophy of the- the philosophy of faculty that are all about meeting the needs of the community.

ES: Ah, yeah.

P2: Um, that the university exists to share resources with the community. The resources that we share are generally not, uh, in- in terms of financial resources. It's more than financial resources.

ES: Yeah. Hmm.

P2: And-- and time is the one thing that we don't have. (Laughter)

ES: Yeah! (Laughter)

P2: So, in order for successful partnership, you need-- faculty needs to make sacrifices based on the fact that they understand why we are doing this. That this is going to improve the schools. It's going to, uh, make for better relationships with the schools. And at the end, the students sitting in the classrooms are the ones that benefit.

ES: Yeah. Hmm.

P2: So, I would say that would be one-- faculty, um, philosophy about community and, two-- uh, let's see... I had a thought there that just slipped...

ES: (Laughter) It happens.

P2: But, success-- we're talking successful partnerships...

ES: Yeah, so you were saying that faculty need to kind of understand their role and the reason they're involved and they ultimate goal of improving students.

P2: Yes, yes. I would say that, too, I believe that we should have a centralized-- having a centralized kind of uh, clearinghouse where the community, where schools in the community can initially make their requests.

ES: Yeah.

P2: It's important because sometimes you have schools asking for almost everything. Schools have to do decide whether or not they have the resources to meet all of these needs. And also, too, decide which of these needs they believe are more critical, uh, for the site to meet. And I think over the last couple of years we've been able to do that. Part of that is recognizing that it's better when it's streamlined in a way that we know exactly where our assistance is going. It's just not one of those things that we thought of before, but at the end of the year, I can tell you what are all of the initiatives that we support.

ES: Yeah. Mm-hmm.

P2: I expect that makes it successful. And I think that making a deliberate attempt to-- to meet the needs of the community, uh, because you know, no partnership is going to exist if, you know, you're not doing anything for me.

ES: Right, yeah.

P2: And, so, sometimes we would go very far with one of the requests in an attempt to find some faculty who was able to go out to the community to either judge the science fair—

ES: (Laughter)

P2: Or judge a competition or to go to STEM nights. We try to go to those things, so that we could have some idea as to how effective we are in the society.

ES: So is that-- when you think about the [P-20 partnership], do you determine its success by how many requests it has met? Or how do you determine that success?

P2: Yes, yes, I think that is a good question. I would say, right now, um, the success for us is measured-- for example, we work with schools in the area that are considered, like, level four.
ES: What does that mean?

P2: A level four school is a school that's not performing very well.

ES: Ok.

P2: And if they fall below that, they are placed in receivership where the state comes and reorganizes it and basically takes it over.

ES: Ok, yeah.

P2: So, schools that are teetering on the edge of level four, we try to go ahead and provide professional development to their teachers. We try to get them from a level four to maybe a level three and get a level three to a level two.

ES: Yes.

P2: So, that is one way that we know and can certainly see the impact of our collaboration.

ES: Yes. Ok, that makes a lot of sense.

P2: Mm-hmm.

ES: Um, ok. If you were speaking to a new P-20 partnership director, what would you tell them should be their first priority?

P2: Ok, um... I would, first of all, you need to talk to people at the top. The superintendents, principals in your area, you want to get to know them, you want to meet with them, you want to let them know what you can offer them.

ES: Uh-huh, uh-huh.

P2: And I that would be the first place to go. And also, to find out what their needs are.

ES: Yeah.

P2: And, maybe first to find out what their needs are instead of what you can offer them! (Laughter)

ES: (Laughter)

P2: Because you may be offering them something they don't need or something they already have.

ES: Yeah.

P2: And, actually, I think that is so crucial.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P2: You know, to ask them what their needs are and see how you can meet them before asking them to take 25 of your students off the bat.

ES: Right, right. Ok, great. That was my last official question. Um, is there anything else you think might help me as I, as I try to find out—

P2: Well, I would say, too, one of the things we do is that every year, um, we have-- actually, I do have a, a spreadsheet that I put together with all of the activities.

ES: Oh, wow.

P2: From different departments. That's something that, if you like, I could send that to you.

ES: Yes, sir, I would love that.

P2: Then you can take a look at that and see all of the different activities that we have done throughout the year.

ES: Yes.

P2: But, for example, there is a university program called [Northeastern Reading Partnership].

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: And they ask faculty and staff, whether they are in the registrar's office or in enrollment, to go out to schools and to read to the kids.

ES: Yeah.

P2: So, we try to get not just education department, but even staff members to go out and to read to the kids.

ES: Uh-huh.

P2: You know, and that is something that we do on an annual basis. So, things like that that don't cost money, just cost time and dedication—

ES: Yeah.

P2: We don't say no to any request (sic)...

ES: Mm-hmm. Awesome. Ok. Thank you so much!

P2: I will say now, if you have any additional questions, feel free to call and...

ES: Mm-hmm, ok. I would love that spreadsheet for sure.

P2: I'm going to send it out to you right now.

ES: Awesome!

Interview with 2nd Director of NE Curriculum and Alignment Partnership
August 15, 2016
9:00-9:32am

ES: Elizabeth Smith, Interviewer
P4: Participant #4

(Opening chatter not transcribed.)

ES: Um, so I have a few-- probably about 10 questions I'd like to ask you if that's ok.

P4: Sure.

ES: Awesome. Thank you. So, can you start by telling me a little about the partnership you oversee?

P4: Um, you know, it involves a number of them. I would say, primarily, the teacher education partnership is the most... it's been going on for over 120 years.

ES: Yeah, [...] told me about the great tradition--

P4: -- Yeah, it really is. It's in the DNA. Um, but, it also involves some partnerships... um, we have one that I'm doing right now that is an [state grant].

ES: Uh-huh.

P4: That we wrote with [school district], but this is an early childhood grant that involves, um, the schools and Head Start program which is administrated by the schools and a couple of non-profit organizations that do science education and the, um, local early childhood, early education and care organization.

ES: Ok. So, um, what are the local non-profits that are working with you on that one?

P4: One is [urban conservation society] and the other is [regional science museum].

ES: Cool. And, so, this is the [NE Curriculum and Alignment Partnership]?

P4: Yeah.

ES: Ok, cool. So it's specifically focused on science. Does it involve mostly PD for teachers to improve science teaching? Or are there other aspects of that?

P4: I mean, there is-- it is PD. It also has been involving a bunch of graduate classes.

ES: Ok.

P4: Because that's the format that most of the folks are most interested in and engaged in.

ES: So, are they taking graduate courses to-- toward a Master's in Teaching?

P4: They are, they are.

ES: Ok.

P4: In early childhood education.

ES: OK, cool. So, are they mostly-- are they birth through kindergarten teachers?

P4: Yes. Well, birth through grade 2.

ES: Yeah, I know how they define early childhood is a little bit different in each state.

P4: Yeah, I think we're going nationally birth to grade 2.

ES: Ok, ok. So, how did you get involved... Well, maybe I should ask you first-- how long have you been at [university]?

P4: Um, 19 years?

ES: Ok, cool. So, have you been involved with-- I mean, in teacher ed, I imagine you've been involved with P-20 partnerships that whole time?

P4: Yeah, yeah.

ES: Ok. How long has this specific-- the [NE Curriculum and Alignment Partnership] -- been around?

P4: Um, we finished three years and we have two before we're done.

ES: Ok. I think [...] told me that the [state grant] money came through Race to the Top. Is that right? Am I understanding that right?

P4: It might have. You know... yeah, it's probably Race to the Top. It's certainly federal money when you trace it back to the original source.

ES: It's federal money, ok. So, is it something that the institution is supposed to institutionalize the cost after the funding runs out? Or is it something that will run for a set period and then be completed?

P4: Yeah, we don't have to assume it.

ES: Ok, ok. Great.

P4: Although, we are working very hard so we can continue it.

ES: Ok. So, how many teachers are a part of it every year?

P4: 36.

ES: So, do they finish the program, like their graduate courses, in one year? Or do they continue one?

P4: It's optional and they're all in different places. But, um, 20 of them, um are going to finish-- well they're not all going to finish, but they're going to have completed the requirements for graduation in June-- next June.

ES: Awesome.

P4: So we're really happy about that. Um, the other partner is a community college as well.

ES: Ok. What's their role?

P4: Well, um, we do a number of things we them. But, um, they really are a co-partner in the training of early childhood teachers.

ES: Ok. Yeah.

P4: You know, a large proportion of our graduates, especially in the early education and childcare licensure field, come to us from them.

ES: Uh-huh. OK, that makes sense. Um, so, you said the teachers-- are the teachers all from your local public school district or are they from a variety of districts?

P4: The vast majority are. There are a few that are from other high-need districts.

ES: Ok, ok. Um, so... high-need, ok. Thank you. I'm going to ask you sort of more generally some more general questions since you've been involved with public schools for so long. I'm wondering how-- if you were describing a P-20 partnership to someone else, how would you describe or define what a P-20 partnership is?

P4: I think a partnership involves shared goals that are articulated together and that there are efforts to plan, implement, and evaluate those goals.

ES: Thank you. That's really concise. Um, so, what kind of things to do you and maybe the other faculty at your institutions do to cultivate partnerships with both your schools and your non-school partners? How do you build those relationships?

P4: I mean, all over time and, despite that, we sit in the same room and come up with plans and do it.

ES: (Laughter)

P4: So, it's all much more pragmatic and opportunistic than that. And, [city] is a very good community for partnerships.

ES: Hmm.

P4: For example, there is an early childhood education agency called [agency name] which is no longer a daycare center, it's an advocacy group. And they do a lot to bring all of the early childhood partners together in the same room. And, so, I might be sitting with some early childhood principals, um, in one of those meetings in September and in October I'm going to go to one of our six early childhood/elementary professional development schools as department chair at the request of the principal. Then, we work with the, um, the academic director of Head Start who was part of the [state grant] as a faculty member and is now involved in another early edu project which is a national collaboration project that the person who nominated us has sort of roped us into as well.

ES: (Laughter)

P4: And there are also community connections. So, you might-- a science educator who teaches in [state grant] designed a course for us for our first year seminar program, so we get to meet her there.

ES: Uh-huh.

P4: So that means that we get invited to certain science things and on the good days we show up and broaden the relationship. So, it's a web and threads get hung out a lot in lots of different ways. It's not pretty-- it's messy.

ES: (Laughter)

P4: It's pretty dense. The library reading program in [city]--

ES: Yeah, [...] told me briefly about that.

P4: Yeah, and so, for that one, you know, I might get six invitations to that one-- one from from [faculty member] and one from one of our professional development principals who absolutely loves it and one from the library--

ES: (Laughter)

P4: And, you know, there it is... and one from the president that says, "We want you to participate in this!"

ES: Yeah. I love your metaphor of the web. I think that really describes what you're talking about. That's great. So, for your partnership, for this-- specifically this [NE Curriculum and Alignment Partnership]-- how do you know if that partnership is successful? And how do you define success for it?

P4: Yeah. I mean, so, we aren't as good as we should be at taking the temperature of our partnership.

ES: Hmm.

P4: I think we all know that we have good partnerships. I think, um, there are people who can pick up the phone and talk to us and we can pick up the phone and talk to them at a number of different levels. But, um, except at our meetings, we really don't get into, "Well, how's the partnership going" and those kinds of things, "What could we do to make the partnership better?"

ES: Yeah.

P4: And I think I realize that pretty strongly. The state has a state P-16 partnership convening and they did a whole workshop and we were the community that they asked to come. And, so, there were people from the schools and-- it was mostly the schools and us. And there were people that we have very, very deep connections with. The personnel director that spoke was also our, um, former clinical professor for us. And the professor who spoke had also been a [school district] school teacher who had been a clinical professor. So, the connections were extremely, extremely deep. But, you know, when they said, "And what instruments do you use to measure the success?" The answer is none.

ES: Well...

P4: What we do have is lots of assessment of the success of the various projects.

ES: Uh-huh.

P4: So we do know that our work together is creating a major impact on the science knowledge of the teachers that we're addressing. And it's making not as much impact on their pedagogical skills. And we're all working very hard to see if we can't measure the impact of that on the children.

ES: Yeah-- so can you tell me more about that? How do you discern the impact on the teachers and what are you thinking about doing for looking at student learning impact?

P4: Ok, so, the impact on the teachers-- we do it with [partner university] as part of the grant requirement.

ES: Ok.

P4: It's some surveying and some pre-test post-test.

ES: Ok.

P4: And the first year we got great teacher science knowledge results and not much pedagogical results. When we looked at it it didn't really surprise us because, um, these are all skilled teachers. They and we all knew that they had lots to learn about the science and in some ways less. Second year, um, I had a great big group of them from Head Start actually and they came up with some specific pedagogical skills that probably should be improve and could be improved and we did get some pedagogical improvement that year. Again, it was survey and some observational stuff...

ES: Hmm.

P4: And we tried to get kids results in science. And that was not terribly successful. You know, there are very good input measures in early childhood, but there aren't many good output measures.

ES: Yeah.

P4: So, that's what we're going with this group doing research to get their master's degree. It's a group of 20 experienced early childhood teachers and they've been involved in a science teaching course and, um, they worked all spring to validate some instruments and we're hopeful that if we're a little bit more careful we'll be able to measure some differences in kids.

ES: Cool.

P4: It's not going to be easy.

ES: Yeah, it just isn't. Right?

P4: It just isn't. It just isn't. And we're were in a meeting earlier this week and one of the projects, um, in [state grant] that's been very successful in getting kids is in math. And, yeah, I can get kids results in math--

ES: -- It's a little easier to measure.

P4: Yeah, I could get kids results in math, too, but getting the results in science is going to be a little bit harder! (Laughter)

ES: Yeah, it's trickier.

P4: So, we're working on it. And we know they're there... we just don't if we can measure them.

ES: Yes. I totally understand.

P4: Welcome to the wonderful wacky world of early childhood education.

ES: Yeah. Well, I mean... in a lot of ways education in general. What I oversee now in my position is a content-rich, um, professional development program for teachers and it's just difficult to measure the impact of that sort of teacher learning on students. It's just very difficult.

P4: Yeah, yeah.

ES: And so I am in the same boat as you. I'm with you.

P4: Yeah, yeah.

ES: So, I like to think of, um, success and failure hand in hand. So, I'm wondering, in terms of this partnership, what would you consider to be a failure? Like, how would you know if it didn't go well? Or, um, you know, if you're goals weren't achieved?

P4: (Sigh). So, certainly if we thought bad things were happening to candidates or to children.

ES: Yes.

P4: Or if we thought our candidates, um, were not, um-- were getting messages from the partners weren't the messages we were hoping would be sent. That would be one.

ES: Yeah, yeah.

P4: And that happens sometimes. That happens on a classroom level. It can sometimes happen on a school level.

ES: Can you describe one of those times to me? Like, um, what happened and, maybe, what you all learned from that and if there was something you changed as a result of that?

P4: Um, there's one that's sort of coming up now. And, you know, a lot of these urban schools are really in danger of being level three and four schools.

ES: Yeah, [...] explained the levels to me.

P4: So, the principals are really delighted to work with us and certainly in any number of cases they do things that they think are going to make differences to their children. We have literacy programs in a couple of the professional development schools. We have science programs in some. We do math in the schools.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P4: One of our schools,which is a favorite one to work at, um, was having trouble demonstrating progress. And the new principal really is working very, very hard to implement an RTI process. Um, but the-- that means that everything is focused on directed, small-group literacy

instruction. And sometimes the student teachers don't get to even see math taught before the time it is that they're supposed to take over the classroom and teach math.

ES: Yes, uh-huh.

P4: Um, you know, and that's a problem. And at the end of the day, we discuss it and we discuss it with the students and we discuss it with the principal and with the teachers and, um, I don't know how that one's going to turn out.

ES: Yeah, mm-hmm.

P4: I don't know how that one's going to turn out. And I understand it and we may have to agree to part company for just a little while... but I hope we don't.

ES: I think that's pretty common... At least in my experience we've had-- there have been issues like that, too, with schools who go to a very scripted curriculum and then interns-- student teachers-- can't implement their own units which they have to be graded on.

P4: (Laughter) And we aren't rigid about that, we can't be. We started working in a district where we don't have a lab school and it;s the real world and our students, I think, are much more reflective and thoughtful because they do have to come back and say, "How come this isn't exactly like you said it was going to be?" And then you say, "Well, you tell me how come." And then all of the sudden they are empowered.

ES: Uh-huh, yeah.

P4: And that's fine, that's a step, that's not a waste. But when they come back and say, "I haven't seen any math yet and I've gotta start teaching it next week. What am I going to do?" That's a little bit more of a problem.

ES: Yeah, it's a practical problem.

P4: Yeah, yeah.

ES: Ok. Have you ever compared the success of your P-20 partnerships in general to other partnerships? And if so, what would that look like?

P4: No... And that's a really interesting question. I'm trying to think. So, the university has a wonderful partnership with our local art museum. It's really been invested and successful. And i'm pretty good friends with the person who has been implementing the partnership. I've never asked her how she measures.

ES: Yeah, sure-- I have the benefit of getting to think about it.

P4: But, I guess, if I was going to think of a partnership, those might be the two strongest ones that I know about. And they're both ones that have been invested in. You know, she's given

time to make the partnership happen and faculty are encouraged to do it. And I think our P-12 partnership works the same way. And I supposed the partnerships that don't work just don't get that kind of investment.

ES: Yeah. I think that's a really good point and something that we take for granted.

P4: Yeah, I mean-- you know, in the P-12 partnership-- and you're right, we do take it for granted-- it has been deeply invested in over a long time. A lot of people in the education department, part of their jobs is to foster these partnerships.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P4: Um, and it has to become a goal. Oh-- there are some others. There's an urban studies one with, um, seniors that has done some wonderful things. So, I guess I also think if you're going to compare them, multiple people and multiple funding sources, not just a one shot deal based on one grant. It's, you know, it is a web. Because no matter how strong that one rope might of been, that rope can be cut and then the partnership is at risk.

ES: Yes. Yeah, yeah.

P4: I don't even know if I started to answer your question.

ES: Um, I like everything you said, though, so I think that's great. I mean, I think you're talking about what it takes to make partnerships successful and that was what I was going to ask you next. Very generally, what do you think it takes-- what kind of resources or assets or-- what do you think, just generally, that it takes for a partnership to be successful?

P4: An important shared mission.

ES: Yes. Yeah, that's good.

P4: Because you know you can go anywhere without it. And then, some committed leadership at all different levels. And, um, some committed people kind of in the middle or the bottom, too.

ES: Yeah, yeah.

P4: Um... Resources-- or at least the capacity to get resources.

ES: Can you, like, tell me more specifically what type of resources you're talking about.

P4: Well, money. Stuff.

ES: (Laughter) Yeah, ok. Thanks.

P4: A little-- you know, I mean, mini-grants can go a really long way, both for teachers and for, you know, on the faculty level. Something like this [state grant]-- there's another one, um, which

had an ELL grant and is one we're crossing our fingers about and could come in in August. And, you know, those-- when you get those, it's a ton of work but, boy, you get to do some stuff.

ES: Yeah, yeah. Thank you. That's great. Um, if you were speaking to a new P-20 partnership director, what would you tell them should be their first priority? What should they do first?

P4: Get out there and learn the people.

ES: Did you say, "Get out there and learn the people"? I just want to make sure.

P4: Yeah. You know, find out your own needs and strengths and your partner's needs and strengths. And don't necessarily feel like you need it from a top-down, but find the place where you can actually start and put a stake in the ground and start working around.

ES: Yes. Awesome.

P4: Um, I also think it's real easy to want to control partnerships. But I think good ones aren't going to be controlled easily-- you're going to find people don't things you've never heard of.

ES: Yeah! (Laughter)

P4: (Laughter) And I would say accept that your partnership is going to have stuff going on that you can't keep track of.

ES: I love that! Yeah, yeah. Ok, well that was my last question.

P4: Ok!

ES: Is there anything else you want to tell me related to your work and related to my research?

P4: No. I think it's fun research and it's been a delightful time and I hope you find really good-- I think you'll have a good time with this!

Western Mentoring Partnership Interview
Thursday, August 11th
10:00- 11:05am CST

ES: Elizabeth Smith, Interviewer
P3: Participant #3, Director of the Western Mentoring Partnership

(Introductory chatter not transcribed. Transcription begins at 10:04am.)

P3: It might help you as we have a conversation to understand my perspective on things.

ES: Yeah!

P3: So, um, I was an elementary school principal for 32 years.

ES: Oh, wow!

P3: Loved the job. Taught kindergarten prior to that. I was the first male to get my childhood education in the state of [state].

ES: No.

P3: Yeah, yeah.

ES: No-- you're not being sarcastic, you're being serious?

P3: I am serious.

ES: Wow, that's amazing!

P3: Yes, my wife is a special ed teacher. Right out of college we spent two years teaching in Australia. Um, and, uh, I taught in immigrant schools and she taught in a detention center.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: And, so, we came back and, um, the experiences of working overseas with immigrant-- so all of my schools and all of the school districts were high-needs, high-risk, high special ed population, that type of stuff.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: At my last school, we had 22 different languages spoken.

ES: Wow!

P3: Yeah, so... for the last three years, I met with every fifth grade student twice a year one-on-one, sometimes with translators, and just went through all of the kind of-- "What do you plan to do after you leave [elementary school] and what are your plans for middle school? How about high school? What do you plan to do after that?" And because of the immigrant population that were from all over the world-- Afghanistan, Tibet-- all over... every single one, for three years, every single one of the refugee kids had a plan.

ES: Wow.

P3: They knew that there was going to be something that they wanted to do after high school and they had those kinds of aspirational goals. And they were reasonable. Every one of the other-- the maturity of the other students, who were very, very low-income, you know, could not get past being on American Idol or being on TV or being a basketball player making millions.

ES: Hmm.

P3: And, so, when I knew I was going to retire, I took those experiences and said, "Oh my goodness, you've got to be doing some things very, very differently. The refugee experience certainly would allow you to have a unique perspective because many of their parents had professional jobs in other countries but would never be able to get them in Idaho.

ES: Yeah.

P3: And, so, then I worked as an education policy advisor for a business association here.

ES: Interesting.

P3: Um, for a while... and the state board of Idaho contracted with this business group for me to do a statewide survey on postsecondary and college access across the state of [state]. And I learned a lot in focus groups, community forums with small towns and everything in between. I wrote a report and at the same time our office of performance evaluation, um, wrote a report that was pretty similar on barriers to postsecondary education.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: And from that point, uh, the state board hired me to do some contact work with the [state grant to promote college-going] and then I took over for the director about 2.5 years ago.

ES: OK.

P3: And, so, we just-- with the movement of the grant and the programs that were grant requirements and then the expansion it's been, uh, an amazing, uh, journey for myself. And, so, I love the work.

ES: Yeah, I mean, I loved reading about it. So, I tried to go through and do a document analysis before we talked, so I looked for everything I could find online about the [Western Mentoring

Partnership]. I read press releases from the Lumina Foundation, newspaper articles, um, you know, just random applications to be in the program, stuff like that. And, it's similar to something started in Arkansas called RAZORCoach which is a little bit different because it took, um, students who were studying school counseling and made them a peer mentor kind of thing.

P3: Mm-hmm.

ES: But it wasn't as focused as the [Western Mentoring Partnership] where you have-- at least, the articles I read, the students had graduated from that high school mostly, so I don't know if that's normal-- but you have students who just graduated from college, so really you're only four years ahead of them, so they could really speak the language.

P3: Right. Yeah, yeah. In our case in [state], many of them have graduated from the high schools that they, uh, are in. And then we had amazing kind of behind the scenes work with the college mentors with them in that this year the legislature funded a bill that they had passed the year before. It's called Senate bill [...].

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: And, they passed the bill two years, two legislative sessions ago, that school districts need to provide college advising and here are a set of models that can be used. And there has to be professional development and stuff. I learned a lesson that when I was asked to write a concept paper what should be in there because, um, I was surprised when legislative services took the concept paper and turned it into statue--

ES: Oh, wow! (Laughter)

P3: Yeah-- it was a little crazy! And the legislature didn't fund it the first year. Well, this last year, they put 5 million dollars into that. And there's already talk about increasing appropriations for next year.

ES: Wow!

P3: The [Western Mentoring Program] is one of seven different models that are a possibility with that. And, uh, with the [state grant to promote college-going] we created a website called [...] which is a college and career website.

ES: Ah.

P3: And if you look at it after August 15th, you'll see the phase two of the enhancements we have there.

ES: Cool!

P3: But in the For Educators section, there's a description there, there's a webinar on the [Western Mentoring Partnership], there's a two page paper on that that's there. And we directed all of the school districts to that site to look at the possibilities that are out there.

ES: Ok. Wow.

P3: So, October 1 all school districts will have to submit to the state board how they are using the college and career money because [state] as many a conservative state, they both love local control and hate local control at the same time.

ES: (Laughter) Yeah... I live in Oklahoma, I understand.

P3: Yes, you do. So, this first year, they love local control and everyone gets to decide what they want to do with that.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: So, we'll see what happens after those plans are recorded, as I was telling the grant evaluator this morning. So, we'll find with 16, uh, college mentors at 11 different sites in [state]. For the last year, all of the 11 sites except one are continuing the [Western Mentoring Program] or expanding.

ES: Ok, great.

P3: Um, the one that isn't able to do that is because the appropriations that they got were 10 thousand dollars and even though the legislation allows them to, uh, pool their resources with nearby school districts, that's a local control thing and they didn't want to do that.

ES: Oh, uh-huh.

P3: All of the sites, as I said, are continuing or expanding. We'll know after October 1st how many sites have chosen to do the [Western Mentoring Partnership], but some of our greatest success comes from-- in [state] we have a college application week. So, last year, uh, out of 11 different sites, um, six of them had 100% of their senior classes fill out at least one or more college application during college application week.

ES: Wow! And were they even tracking that before they started the [Western Mentoring Partnership]?

P3: Some of them were. As a state, we're a little decentralized in terms of the data that was there.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: But we brought in, um, [college mentors] from the [...] school district that we had just started to talk with legislature, provide testimony, which, you know, sometimes you have to go for the heart strings.

ES: Yeah. (Laughter) Nothing more powerful than students.

P3: Yeah, yeah. And, so, the previous year at [school district], they'd only had 30% of their students fill them out.

ES: Wow. Yeah, I think I read an article about [school district].

P3: Yeah, and so, this-- the extension of the program also created some positive unintended consequences. And that is that when there's just a handful of you guys, the [college mentors], then you actually talk to each other, you form relationships with each other if you ride on the bus with the campus visit. There was a great, kind of, development of a cohort feeling that was very helpful. Then, anecdotally over the whole time of the [Western Mentoring Partnership], five of the [college mentors] have either become high school counselors or are in a program to become a school counselor.

ES: Wow! Cool! Oh, that's huge. Do you all have a counselor shortage in [state] like we do?

P3: We have a huge counselor shortage and the pipeline in the entire state-- we have less than 45 in the pipeline in the entire state.

ES: Whoa! Oh, man.

P3: And, uh, two of the universities had to eliminate their programs because of statewide programs prioritization across the state.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: And, so, we have huge issues with that. But, you know, one of the potential spin-offs of the college mentors-- my ability to look at other [statewide college-going grant] programs and other things like that-- we are, um, going to-- the state board is going to, uh, consider requiring, um, all secondary teachers to take a college/career advising class during their preservice education.

ES: Ah.

P3: But, that's probably three years down the line. But we could never have gotten to that conversation without some of the other things going on. And, you know, teachers in the whole college/career are the most under-utilized resources.

ES: Yes, hmm.

PS: We have not involved them in this type of intentional conversation in the past. But, there is some really interesting information... I have a part-time assistant, uh, if you're interested, she could send you the 2012 statewide summary that we did.

ES: Yeah, that would be great!

P3: And, um, with recommendations in them. We surveyed high school students, parents of high school students, teachers, and then education stakeholders and had about 1100 survey responses.

ES: Wow.

P3: So I'll have her name is [...] and she's on her way to her 20th high school reunion.

ES: Oh, wow!

P3: But I'll have her send that to you. That's kind of the beginning part of this whole journey for the [Western Mentoring Partnership] and also the other kinds of things. But it's a time capsule of (sic) perspectives in 2012 and even program perspectives with that.

ES: Uh-huh, ok.

P3: You know, my sense from your eagerness in your voice to look at a variety of different sources and things, I think this might be really helpful.

ES: Awesome, thank you! I appreciate-- I mean, more data-- that's amazing.

P3: Yeah, and, uh... I'm not sure what your time table is for completing your research, but in the month of September, if the data analysts here in [state] are on track, they will be, uh, reviewing the student- level data that we have taken over the last three years.

ES: Ok, can you tell me about that? What kind of data, um, what kind of data points are you looking at from the student level?

P3: So, um, we track as much as we could classroom presentations, individual meetings, grade levels of students, numbers of individual applications that they assisted with. But, all of the [Western Mentoring Partnership] sites are required to do the application week, so all the applications filled out during that time aren't included-- these are additional ones.

ES: Oh, wow.

P3: So, scholarships, um... parent meetings and, um, campus visits.

ES: Ok. So, I read online, um, about those things being included in evaluation. And then you're looking at postsecondary enrollment. So you've been going for a couple years; long-term are you going to stick with postsecondary enrollment? Or do you have other things you're going to

look at? What's your major, um-- how will you know that this program has been successful when you look back on it?

P3: Well, um, we will continue with postsecondary enrollment. I was, um... Last year the state of [statea] and state board instituted something called Direct Admissions.

ES: Yeah, ok.

P3: Ok, so this year-- this fall we're in our second year with this. And, um, senior staff here-- and it's a very small organization, our state board, even though we have statewide oversight. And my position is grant funded, however, after the first of October, I'll be a contractor doing similar things.

ES: Ok.

P3: So, um, last fall all of the seniors received a letter sent by the Governor and state board that indicated, based upon SAT or ACT scores and a GPA at the end of their junior year, that they were automatically admitted to either all 8 [state] public colleges and universities or just the community colleges-- the 4 community colleges and one of the four year colleges.

ES: That's so cool!

P3: Right. Absolutely! And the whole idea for that was to create the expectation, the ritual that something is going to happen. Unfortunately it kind of got a late start-- we had some issues with getting the data out. And sometimes agencies over promise and under-deliver...

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: ...And so we did a little of that this year. Last year we promised that we would have the information by November 1st, which is when we were going to do college application week or the week after.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: We missed the mark on half of the schools and we were doing it right up until Thanksgiving. So this year, September 6th, students and their parents-- that was the other thing, parents got the same letter as their student--

ES: Ah, oh cool.

P3: So, this year, the first letter goes out September 6th. Then we are going to open the Direct Admissions application through the Next Steps website October 1st, timed with the new FAFSA opening with that. We're opening our Opportunity Scholarship October 1st. Then there will be reminders, um, letters sent out October 16th. And then from Halloween until the first week of November is when our college application week will be. So we're timing things, instituting the times of things.

ES: Yeah.

P3: There's a lot of new interventions that are going to make data analysts a little crazy because this hasn't been a straight line--

ES: Yeah, yeah.

P3: But, uh, they assure me that there are definitely ways to look and to parcel those things out.

ES: Ok.

P3: We're also looking at the number of students from the [Western Mentoring Partnership] who have applied for the [state] Opportunity Scholarship, which is a 3.0 GPA. But it's a last dollar scholarship: 70% need, 30% merit. And it's renewable, and so we're also tracking renewal rates of those scholarships. And, so, uh, this year the legislature put in an additional $10 million dollars because it has been successful with that.

ES: Wow.

P3: And the renewal rate for this year, uh, not separated out for just the [Western Mentoring Partnership] sites, but the renewal rate currently is running 78%.

ES: Oh, wow.

P3: So, those are the type of journey things that are going on state-wide. And the college mentor are a significant part of those because for representatives, this is what's possible.

ES: Yeah.

P3: When a legislator spends half a day in a high school, you know, with [college mentors], taking whoever comes in, all the walk-ins and everything else, that makes a difference

ES: Mm-hmm.

P3: And when all schools have to have, uh-- there's a required senior project in the state of [state] -- and when a growing number of high school senior projects are including college visits or college application completion, those are the types of things that from the visibility of the [college mentors] have worked out. And, so, uh, we also started to see, for this summer, a 30 second I'm Ready commercial which is on the bottom of my e-mails that have been going out. In two weeks, they'll be another 30 second commercial that will go out-- it is also for Direct Admissions. Students and their parents actually receive their Direct ADmissions letter. You know, we're trying to put a face on-- it's doable, it's practical, it's something that can happen.

ES: Yeah.

P3: And the colleges and universities, because we don't have that many, are also pulling on the same line at this point. For the same thing.

ES: Uh-huh, ok.

P3: But, my favorite anecdote-- and then I promise you can ask questions.

ES: (Laughter) No, it's so great!

P3: (Laughter) So, in 2012 when I was doing the first report, I was doing a community meeting in [...], which is in North [state].

ES: Ok.

P3: It's a heavy mining, timber industry. At that point, the zinc and silver market was done and the mines, uh, were beginning to open up because they were able to, um, improve the refining process, so they were getting ore that they were processing.

ES: Ok.

P3: But they were starting to hire. I was at a high school, [...] High School in a lunch room. And there's always hot and crowded and the most uncomfortable chairs.

ES: (Laughter) Uh-huh, yeah.

P3: So, we had a good turnout of some teachers, some people from the community, some students and the whole shtick was to ask some opening questions about college and career, their value, what did they think was important and that kind of stuff.

ES: Ok.

P3: We had a really good conversation for about half an hour and, uh, with enough coffee and cookies there was a break and then we came back. And at the back of the room there was this young man in his letterman's jacket with all of his medals on it and everything else. And he stood up and said, "You know, I don't have to do anything after high school. I just got a job at the mines at 16 dollars an hour and I put a down payment on a big four by four. I don't need to go to college."

ES: Oh.

P3: And he went on, you know, and everything. And what he didn't realize was that his dad had just entered the room. Dad was in his work clothes, overalls with dust, came up behind his son and heard his son say, "I don't need to do anything, I got a job at the mine and I'm going to get a big truck." Dad came up behind him, slapped him on the back of the head and said, "You dumb shit! Don't you remember how many years we were on food stamps?"

ES: Wow...

P3: And on and on and the whole thing. That was definitely a showstopper.

ES: Um, yeah.

P3: So, we weren't able to bring that community meeting back up, but at the same time of showing the good, bad, and the ugly of the whole thing, it was an important conversation to have.

ES: Yeah.

P3: And it was the type of thing that when you are able to talk with policymakers to be able say, "You know, life is different. You can't make career choices or college choices without financial consideration. And we're not saving them-- we're not helping them." How do we have those type of expectations? And, frankly, [Western Mentoring Partnership], the college mentors bridge that gap. They say, "I did it. You can do the same thing."

ES: Yeah, yeah.

P3: So, as promised, Elizabeth, that's my last anecdote.

ES: No, that's so great. And I appreciate all of that. And, um, that answers a lot of my questions right there. I don't have to ask you to describe the partnership or how you measure success. You've already answered that, so that's great. Thank you! I do have one more question before I move on to the questions I'm supposed to ask you.

P3: (Laughter)

ES: It's a question of understanding. How is-- can you describe the role of higher education in the [Western Mentoring Partnership] program?

P3: So, uh, when I took over the [Western Mentoring Partnership] program, the first thing I did was to-- when I was doing the training for the[college mentors], college recruiters and admissions officers were invited into that training with them. They did sessions with them and then that set an expectation for them. Plus, we set up some required activities for the college mentors to do with them. One of them is in September the state organization called [...], the state organization of admissions officers--

ES: Yeah, yeah.

P3: Yep. They have their campus state tour-- five campuses, five days with counselors across the state. So I required all of the [college mentors] to go to that. But, more than that, the [college mentors] became a real, um, linchpin for the college recruiters because they often... I say, the [college mentors] were doing the triage for counselors. They were doing the front line

by being able to arrange visits for a college recruiter because there's a kid that needs something. They were able to do some of the work for them.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: And, so, that's been an incredible relationship with the college recruiters and the near peers. And [state admissions organization] is a huge supporter of the [Western Mentoring Partnership] just because of those types of things.

ES: Ok.

P3: And,believe me, [state] does not a very good transportation system, so doing five campus visits in five days for an old man like myself...

ES: (Laughter)

P3: Rental cars, drive, rental cars, go, sleep there, catch a plane, another rental... Anyhow, so, I bonded a lot with people-- with young people who were a third of my age and learned a lot from them, too.

ES: (Laugher). Cool, ok. Thank you. Ok, so, as you know, my research is about P-20 partnerships: partnerships between K-12 schools, higher education, other organizations. And, so, what I'm looking for-- I think I already told you this in the email, but I sent an email survey out to all 50 states, um, to the department of higher ed, the department of education commissioners and asked them to nominate exemplary partnerships in their state.

P3: Mm-hmm.

ES: And, so, my purpose is, um, now I'm interviewing you and the directors of three other of the exemplary partnerships. And then I'm going to do a case study profile from our interview, from the document analysis that I've done. And then, I'll send a survey-- the last step is a survey to people who have participated, um, in terms of adults who've participated, whether it's counselors, superintendents, building principals, and I'm going to get take. And what I'm wanting their take and your take on is what does it take to make these partnerships successful? Um, you know, it's not easy, as you've indicated to bring partners together, to make things sustainable, to bridge the gap between K-12 and higher ed, p-12 and higher ed. And, so, that's what the focus of my research is. How are these partnerships successful? What makes them successful? What assets have they utilized to ensure their success? Um, so--

P3: Yeah, well, I'll just say... It's all about relationships.

ES: Yeah.

P3: Whether it's [Western Mentoring Partnership] or it's building relationships with a school district or whether it's building relationships with colleges or universities, it's all about that type of ability to put a face to a name and having an on-going, continual dialogue.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P3: So often in education what we try to do is similar to, you know, that book that you might read right before you fall asleep at night.

ES: (Laughter)

P3: And it's a really good book and sometimes you don't have the time to read it but you have to go back a chapter or maybe two to remember what it's like or you stop doing it. SO the value of on-going conversations where you can pick up where you left off, so you're not always backtracking is essential.

ES: Yeah.

P3: And, you know, in my generation, face to face was the biggest value and that's how you built relationships-- with coffee and meetings and going there and sitting down with them or doing bus duty while you're talking, you know, those types of things. But, in addition to that, I have almost (sic) the electronic age with emails and texts and those types of things and SnapChat, which, you know, the young people, the college mentors, they would rather do a text or something like SnapChat than even email.

ES: Yes.

P3: So, it really is about having the type of contact that allows you to make that continual forward motion with them. And it is relationship-building at first. And then, you know, I spent my career using a belief that, uh, you begin with the coalition of the willing, celebrate their successes, and then you act as if everyone else is going to join on.

ES: Oh, I love that.

P3: And with that, you've got the program very, very far. Another aspect of the [statewide grant to promote college-going], we created what's called the [...] which has-- we're moving to a non-profit and I'll have [...] send you a brochure with that.

ES: Awesome.

P3: In less than a year, in four regions of our state, over 500 people, over 200 non-profits or service clubs have come together and through a series of meetings identified some college and career goals.

ES: Wow.

P3: And the [statewide grant to promote college-going] is providing a small 10 thousand dollar grant for some of those goals. So we're set up statewide and we're in the process of moving to a non-profit because the grant monies are gone.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: But all of that, too, was built on relationships and, uh, we're still in our infancy and, um, and yet, it is about having- having good people doing good things. And having enough of them to build the support units to be able to say-- you know, one of our support mentors at one of our schools said, "This [college mentor], he's not making it. Can you come up and spend a day here? Can you see what you can do?" And instead of firing somebody who is brand new, who is learning something new, who is working with teachers who were their teachers four years ago...

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: You know, those are the types of things that keep that forward momentum.

ES: Yeah, ok. Mm-hmm. Thank you... I'm just writing that down a little bit. Um, let me go back and see... So, when you think about partnerships like this, P-20 partnerships, if you were describing P-20 partnerships to someone who'd never heard that term, how would you define that for them? Not just the [Western Mentoring Partnership], specifically, but more generally.

P3: Yeah. So, what I do is I say, "There's so much work that needs to be done to help our young people with college and career decisions that no single person or program can do it by themselves. And it's only by the collective impact."

ES: Yeah. Mm-hmm.

P3: And the collective impact model, which we've had to modify because of not having huge numbers around. But, that's really what it's about.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: You know, in some of the parts of the state-- one of the things that set off the [...] is that I started "Career and Coffee" and that's just because it started off in coffee shops.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: A few people saying, "Let's get together and talk." And it evolved to once a month, down here, then it started to grow, so we started one in North [state] now there's two in North [state]. And now we're starting over in Eastern [state]. And when you have the same or similar people at events that all support that P-20 partnership, then you begin to get the critical mass.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P3: That comes sometimes with numbers, but sometimes comes when there's a champion in place.

ES: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

P3: That is what is so essential-- having a local, regional champion.

ES: Yeah. I think that's cool that you say that. I mean, that's going to be a theme. Every person I've talked to so far mentions that, like, the importance of someone to move it forward who can really be, like, day-to-day on the ground, um, the person kind of pushing it forward.

P3: Mm-hmm, yep.

ES: Ok. Awesome. Can you describe-- I, I've read this, but I'll ask you, too. Can you describe the schools that are a part of the [Western Mentoring Partnership]? I've read that they have to be at least 50 percent first-generation, low-income, or minority student populations.

P3: Right.

ES: So, they're all serving low income students. Are they mostly rural? Or suburban? What are they like?

P3: So, um, (laughter)...it was important to me having worked in school districts that we had [Western Mentoring Partnerships] in every possible type of school that represent [state] schools in general.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: So we have [Western Mentoring Partnerships] in large high schools that we call metropolitan areas, but they're still under 100 thousand easily.

ES: Oh, ok.

P3: So we have [Western Mentoring Partnerships] in high schools that have 2000 or more students and we usually have two [college mentors] there. I wanted them in rural and remote-- we had one in a high school that had 400 students that is 40 miles every direction to another, another, um town.

ES: Wow, mm-hmm.

P3: And then, because of our [religious subgroup] population, I wanted, uh, schools that were in the [those] parts of the state-- where there's a heavy [religious subgroup] presence there.

ES: Ok, mm-hmm.

P3: And that was because of the mission-service role that the [religious subgroup] place upon their young people but also the value in terms of community and outreach with that.

ES: OK.

P3: Um, I wanted them in schools with a high, very, very high second language learner population. Uh, and, that was [school district] where most of the students-- so many of these students-- English was their second language and parents were working in cheese factories or something like that.

ES: Ok.

P3: And then I also wanted a couple sites in border communities because often times the [state] students would go across the state line into [border state] or [border state] because it was closer to a college or university to them.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: Um, we intentionally selected just a whole wide demographic after we started our expansion originally with it.

ES: Ok, ok. Thank you! That's great. Um, ok. So we've talked about the specific ways... No-- I'm going to ask you a different question. Sorry! (Laughter)

P3: That's ok!

ES: We've talked a little bit about, um, you said that the key is building relationships.

P3: Yep.

ES: Obviously you, having been in education in the state for 30 years probably already have a lot of relationships--

P3: Yes. I was state president of the state administrators association--

ES: Ah.

P3: I had done legislative work.. and yeah, yeah, that helped.

ES: Yeah. So how did you, now that you're in this role, what did you do-- what is helpful when you're trying to cultivate the partnerships, um, with your partners? What sort of things do you do to maintain and build partnerships?

P3: So, um, I mentioned earlier that teachers are a severely under-utilized resource in this whole thing.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P3: And now I'm going to expand that to teachers and counselors. And I'll just have to tell you those life-long educators in any way, um, I will reach out to those I know or those even in the

community as kind of gateway people. They... You know, all of this is like throwing a rock into a pond. About every ripple happens as a result of what you have done over time.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P3: And so, you know, maintaining those types of things relies upon the fact of having those people who have that kind of local insight, personal perspective, mainstays in that community because of service clubs or because of colleges and universities because they're part of that community or because they were a teacher... Those are the types of things that I think keep everything going.

ES: Yeah.

P3: And, at the same time, because we are on such positive trajectory statewide in terms of policy, and making some increases in funding and have some strategy with that, um, has been unheard of in my 42 years in education. We're in this small but critical, incredible, unique time frame with that.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P3: Which I point out to everybody-- this is a perfect storm of where we need to be going, so let's not screw up on it.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: So, I think those are the things that kind of tie people together.

Transcription paused form 50:54 to 52:45:15 as we talked about national school funding issues.

ES: In terms of your partnership, what would you consider-- I like to think of success and failure kind of hand-in-hand.

P3: Right.

ES: So, what would you consider to be a failure?

P3: So, to me, a major failure would be one if the legislature stops the funding.

ES: Yeah.

P3: Which would mean that, um, that the traditional funding model wouldn't be adequate for school districts to continue that program. And it would have been so short-lived that we would have not had a large enough documentation of success.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: We've had good success. But, um, we're still in the seventh inning of this, we're not at the end of the game. And, you know, I think that would be a real loss for it.

ES: Yeah.

P3: We're also seeing, um, starting with our community colleges, they are funded what are called [college mentors at community colleges] which are different from recruiters and the outreach folks, but the transitions coordinators do a lot of the types of things that our [college mentors] do, only they're spread out among a bunch of schools. So it really is about making the contacts, making it personal, uh, helping kids be held accountable, those types of things. So, the loss of funding after a program is just really fairly new, that would be awful.

ES: Mm-hmm. Yeah. But like you said, it sounds like there is such positive momentum in the state, that that would be kind of shocking.

P3: Yep. Yeah.

ES: Ok, um, thank you. Um, so generally speaking, not just for your program or in [state], but what do you think it takes to make P-20 partnerships successful?

P3: Um... One of the drivers in [state] has been, um, a conversation where business and industry can suck the air out of the room by saying, "No one's doing anything fast enough, good enough to turn this around."

ES: Yes.

P3: So, um, I think a state or region can only live with that for a certain amount of time before, inevitably, something happens where someone tries to begin to either counter or demonstrate, "Oh yeah, we are." So, that was a real driver in [state]. And, frankly, one of the reasons I left being a policy advisor for a business group was I learned a new vocabulary, I learned a timetable which doesn't work in any schools. In any schools… you could not make decisions with it.

ES: (Laughter)

P3: And it was a very helpful experience for me. Frustrating, but it has been very helpful.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: Uh, I think, you know, as I sit back, the unintended outcomes of that have created the environment we are in right now.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: So, to that extent, I guess it was a good thing. Now we have to not engage in the, "Oh, yes we are" kind of thing, but to be able to, on a scale that is appropriate, again reduce it down to the individuals, to the communities, to the students-- that type of stuff.

ES: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

P3: Every time we try to respond to this with a number, uh, we are giving them the wrong information. We have to put it on a personal level. And so, you know, I think whether that environment was necessary or not, we had to go through it.

ES: So you're telling me there's hope in Oklahoma? (Laughter) Maybe that's a change agent? It's a motivating factor?

P3: Yes, yes. You know, I have a rich inner life and some of those times when those conversations got so intense and accusatory and everything else, there are times when you really have to ask if the conversation can be helpful. And the answer can be yes. What they're trying to do is create a call to action.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: From the P-20 area, we can do something similar but not in a dueling manner with them. Because all of this is a call to action, Elizabeth, I mean, that's what sustains, you know, the type of meaningful change in education. It's that-- being able to articulate a need, a value, and then move forward with it.

ES: Uh-huh. Yeah. So, if you were talking to a new P-20 partnership director, what would tell them should be their first priority?

P3: Um... (Laughter) I would say that you have to move from a helicopter point of view at 30 thousand feet to a 100 feet. And the only way you do that is to do a, uh, look, learn, and listen tour and do it quickly. Quickly identify those people or divisions who are the early innovators or early initiators and you spend your time with those people initially and then you build outward.

ES: Uh-huh, yeah.

P3: You know, our problems often are that we can't make the switch from 30 thousand feet down to ground level. Uh, and unless you're able to do that, you go nowhere.

ES: Yes, yeah. Right-- I mean, yeah. It can't just be all vision, vision, vision-- someone has to do it. That's great... That was my last question. Um, so is there anything else you want to tell me about your work or anything else I should know about what it takes to make an exemplary P-20 partnership work?

P3: You know, I think (laughter), I think the last thing is-- It's very personal to me to realize that I'm not an expert in anything.

ES: Uh-huh.

P3: Uh, every partnership relies upon somebody who can be like Tom Sawyer. Where you get enough people to whitewash the fence... Uh, and that's what I see my role being and that's what I've seen happen when partnerships begin to work.

ES: Mm-hmm.

P3: Uh, we tend to try to move forward based upon our strengths. And while that works well for a lot of people, personally I know what I'm not good at. And I also know how to get people who are really excellent at it involved. And I think there lies what makes the difference between something that works and then something that begins to work well and takes on a life of its own. And that's where we are, I think.

ES: Ah, very cool... Sorry, just typing. That's great. Thank you so much for your time and for all of your insight and information.

Appendix F

Reflective Journal for Coding

I kept a journal for reflection during coding as a place to leave myself notes regarding what I was thinking while coding the interview transcripts. I followed the same process as I approached each transcript. First, I read the transcript through and also read the analytic memos I made from the notes I took during the interview. Next, I reviewed the research questions to keep them at the forefront of my mind. Then, I reviewed each transcript and highlighted sentences or phrases that pertained to the research questions. After that, I reviewed the sentences or phrases and used *invivo* coding to assign open codes to each. I then reviewed each coded phrase and started to group codes into like groups. Finally, I reviewed the like groups to find the emergent themes.

I was somewhat surprised by the themes that emerged. While I was interviewing, I definitely heard the participants mention the need for an organization to act as a galvanizing force as well as individuals to be champions of the work, so I expected those to be themes that emerged. The other themes were not as apparent as I listened to the interviews but came through as I treated the transcripts as text. I was surprised that money was not of more importance to the participants. Instead, it they really emphasized the need for people to move the work forward.

Appendix G: IRB Approval Letter

Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board

July 8, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Elizabeth Smith Michael Miller
FROM:	Ro Windwalker IRB Coordinator
RE:	New Protocol Approval
IRB Protocol #:	16-06-812
Protocol Title:	*Examining Successful P-20 Partnerships Using a Mixed Methods Approach*
Review Type:	☒ EXEMPT ☐ EXPEDITED ☐ FULL IRB
Approved Project Period:	Start Date: 07/06/2016 Expiration Date: 07/05/2017

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (https://vpred.uark.edu/units/rscp/index.php). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 354 participants. If you wish to make *any* modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.