Development of the Partnership Protocol for Principals (DP^3)

by

Reginald Bolding Jr.

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Approved November 2022 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Ray R. Buss, Chair
James Rund
Larry Weeks

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2022

ABSTRACT

Schools across the nation have increasingly been required to fill social, emotional, and academic gaps for students. The cost to ensure the needs of students have been met has become challenging for many K-12 schools. Students in urban communities have faced additional adverse circumstances such as high family mobility, food insecurities, lack of adequate healthcare, and limited social capital. Community-school partnerships have played a critical, beneficial role in filling the needs of students when schools did not have the resources or capabilities to do so. Nevertheless, most school principals do not have tools and strategies to identify, recruit, and develop these partnerships. In this study, I created the Development of the Partnership Protocol for Principals (DP^3) to help develop principals' skills and self-efficacy to develop community-school partnerships. The DP^3 protocol was made up of a series of four steps, which enabled principals to develop their agency to be successful in identifying, recruiting, and developing partnerships. The four-step process required principals to (a) conduct a needs assessment of the state of the school and its current partnerships, (b) strategically analyze potential opportunities, (c) develop pathways for partnerships, and (d) construct a plan to implement the partnership. In this study, I used quantitative and qualitative measures to assess principals' perceptions of their skills and self-efficacy for developing partnerships. Quantitative results showed increased skills and self-efficacy. Further, qualitative data complemented these quantitative results. Qualitative data also revealed partnerships benefitted students if the partnerships were aligned to academic or cultural gaps and needs of schools. In the discussion, I have described the complementarity of the data and connected outcomes to the intervention and the research literature. Moreover, I discussed

limitations, implications for practice, implications for future research, and personal lessons learned. In conclusion, participation in the DP^3 workshops increased principals' skills and self-efficacy for developing community-school partnerships and DP^3 exhibited potential as a means to develop skills for school leaders to support their efforts in building community-school partnerships.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the five special ladies in my life, whose support and encouragement keep me motivated and optimistic about the future.

To my wife, Cymone Bolding: this would not have been possible without you. You encouraged me, you sacrificed, you lifted me up with prayers and simply supported me every step of the way.

To my daughters, Faith, Grace, and Honor: I hope this serves as an inspiration for you all to never give up and follow your dreams. It's never about how long the journey takes, but about ensuring you finish.

And to my beautiful mother, rooting me on from heaven, your vision, love, and strength continues to motivate me each and every day.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This has been a very long journey with many obstacles and challenges along the way. I'm not sure I could have made it without these people giving their time, energy, and expertise throughout the process.

I would like to give a special acknowledgement to my committee chair, Dr. Ray Buss. He supported me along the way, helped guide me throughout the process, and encouraged me to get this done. I'm forever grateful, thank you.

I also want to acknowledge my committee members, Dr. James Rund and Dr. Larry Weeks, for their guidance and support. Dr. Rund your support helped ignite my passion for this study and my perseverance to see it through. Dr. Weeks has truly been an outstanding mentor, friend, and education role model for me throughout this process.

Finally, I want to acknowledge all of the instructors who played a role in my development. Each of you made a difference in my development as a researcher and for that I am eternally grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

LEADERSHIP CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Research results have shown low-income families experienced various economic and material hardships. Among those hardships were missed rent, utility shutoffs, inadequate access to health care, unstable childcare arrangements, and food insecurity, which have been common experiences inevitably affecting students' readiness, attendance, performance, and completion rates at school (Bernstein et al., 2001).

To combat these issues, schools increasingly have been turning to partnerships that have provided resources to meet these needs. A partnership was an arrangement in which parties agreed to cooperate to advance their mutual interests. Community-school partnerships have been aligned with school and community resources to produce successful students, strong families, and engaged communities (Blank et al., 2012). Partnerships have combined quality education with enrichment opportunities, health and mental health services, family support and engagement, early childhood and adult education, and other supports (Blank et al., 2012). Partnerships developed by community schools have helped to address many economic hardships and filled gaps faced by students from underserved communities.

School districts across the country have dealt with substantial cuts to their budgets in recent years due to increased investment not keeping pace with increased costs. The decrease in revenue for districts has caused schools to seek support from stakeholders within the community. Recently, districts and schools have learned forming partnerships has served as a way to be fiscally wise. A recent Coalition for Community Schools (2007) study found on average, districts secure three dollars from community partners for

every dollar they allocated. Partners have contributed dollars or in-kind support in the form of access to family programs, health services, and other benefits (Blank et al.,2010). Community schools engaged in partnerships have a common belief in the basic principles of collective impact: a commitment to partnerships, accountability for results, respect for diversity, belief in community strength, and high expectations for all (Blank et al., 2012). Collective outcomes have been achieved when two or more organizations realized they can accomplish more by working together and sharing resources than they could by working alone (Blank et al., 2012).

Community-school partners have been attained in many different ways. Partnerships have included collaboration with local government agencies, teachers' unions, nonprofit organizations, private agencies serving youth and families, community-based organizations, faith-based institutions, neighborhood groups, businesses in the community, civic organizations, and even higher education institutions. Each partnership has served a unique purpose designed to meet the needs of the school. Developing and understanding each school's needs has been an essential element of any plan for building partnerships between schools and community organizations.

Personal Context

I have witnessed educational inequity, due in part, to the limited resources available to schools in underserved communities both as a student and as an educator. My first-hand has given me a unique perspective and insight into the challenges under-resourced schools have faced and their effects on academic achievement. As a student, my district did not have the capacity to equip schools with the resources to provide enrichment activities for students to enhance their development. This created a context

where administrators had to be innovative and think outside of the box to fill resource gaps. During my senior year of high school, the principal and social studies teacher formed a partnership with the local law school in the area. This partnership enabled high school students who were interested in law to participate in a program entitled "Street Law." It also gave law students an opportunity to fulfill pro-bono hours. This program enabled my high school teacher to modify the district curriculum by using best practices from the law school to create a class that trained high school students to discuss issues in an interactive way. During this course we learned skills that transcended the classroom. Moreover, we were able to collaborate and build networks with law professors and law students in their setting. Due to this partnership, I developed a deeper passion for the law and broadened my career choices. Further, this program was a catalyst for student investment and retention at the school.

During my time as an educator, I witnessed the profound effects community-school partnerships had in the school where I taught. My teaching experience began as a middle school special education teacher in south Phoenix. There I had the opportunity to teach incredibly gifted and talented students with amazing potential. The major obstacle my students faced was the lack of opportunities for them in and outside of school. The classroom and school day were focused primarily on test preparation. Students' daily schedule consisted of the four core subjects and either a computer course or physical education class. This presented challenges for everyone at the school primarily because students were no longer invested in learning or behaving in a way that fostered learning. Outside of some academic tasks that generated a bit of interest, students had nothing to which they could look forward and there were few things at school that engaged them.

There were no outlets for students to enrich or enhance their school experiences. Moreover, students who struggled academically were not adequately supported through tutoring or supplemental programs because they didn't exist. In addition to these dynamics, many students already came to school facing difficult challenges at home, which undoubtedly affected their school performance. These challenges included students showing up at school hungry, coming to school sick, or being severely behind academically. The resources available for support structures and greater investment in students were minimal. Nevertheless, when students have been supported, particularly using the collective action approach, it has been shown students with resources and those involved in activities and groups changed their academic outcomes (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

With this background, I explored opportunities for my students to participate in programs and activities beyond the school walls. A separate school in the district formed a partnership with an organization that I felt could capitalize on my students' interests and engage them in education. In 2009, my school partnered with the *100 Black Men of Phoenix* organization. One feature provided by this organization was to provide students with a forum to serve as beacons of leadership by creating environments where they were motivated to achieve. Students participated in various activities throughout the school year with this organization. These activities included field trips, leadership conferences, and community volunteer opportunities. Students who participated in the efforts sponsored by this organization were highly invested in the program and transferred those sentiments into their classroom performances. Staff members and I witnessed a sharp decline in incidents of negative behavior from students who participated in this program.

4

Additionally, students' overall behavior and approach to academics shifted as well. The mentorship and added engagement from the organization gave our students something to which they could look forward to each school day.

Situated Context

Currently, I have served as the Executive Director of the Arizona Coalition for Change. The Arizona Coalition for Change has served as an Arizona nonprofit organization which conducted leadership development training and civic engagement programming through community collaboration. In this role, we have often partnered with school leaders, districts, and parents. Prior to serving in this role, I worked as the Director of Public Partnerships with Teach For America (TFA). TFA has served as a national nonprofit organization recruiting recent college graduates and professionals of all academic majors and career interests to teach for two years in urban and rural public schools and become lifelong leaders in the effort to expand educational opportunity. TFA has 62,000 corps members and alumni, over 2,500 school partnerships and have affected more than one million students nationwide.

In Phoenix, TFA has been one of the largest recruiters of new teachers for traditional district schools and charter schools. One of my primary roles was to manage district and charter school partnerships. In that capacity, I established and maintained relationships with district superintendents, human resource directors, principals, and charter school administrators. TFA worked primarily with partner schools in underserved communities where the free and reduced lunch rate among students has been 70% or greater.

In addition to working with district and charter school partners, my role also included maintaining and building relationships with key stakeholders in the education-related community. These stakeholders were the Boys and Girls Clubs of Metropolitan Phoenix, Valley of the Sun United Way, Greater Phoenix Urban League, elected officials and several other organizations and community leaders who were interested in influencing the educational landscape for students. Ultimately, the goal was to create an environment where schools and community partners collectively combined their efforts to enhance and enrich student life and educational outcomes. During my first year in this role, I was able to see this work come to fulfillment in one of the communities we served. The Boys and Girls Clubs of Metropolitan Phoenix joined with one of our partnering school districts, Balsz Elementary, to form the new Balsz Boys and Girls Club. The Balsz School District has served approximately 2,900 students, many of whom currently did not have access to a safe, nurturing environment between home and school. This club provided students with a safe environment to enjoy enrichment opportunities, receive academic support, and build a strong culture of success within the neighborhood.

Partnerships were formed at the district *and* the school level. An area of focus in my work was to foster the development of more partnerships at the school level. Clearly, the school level was where partners had the opportunity to provide the most influence on the lives of students. Notably, many school leaders did not have the capacity or contextual knowledge to form these beneficial community partnerships.

My school management portfolio included approximately 30 elementary and high school principals. Through formal and informal assessments, these school leaders overwhelmingly identified obstacles to forming partnerships in their position. One school

principal advised, "I want to form partnerships with community organizations. I just don't have the time to do it. Between managing my campus and staff, I don't even have time or know where to start seeking partnerships." Another principal maintained, "Currently, I have some school partnerships, but they were started by my predecessors and I'm not sure why we still do them."

I interviewed 10 principals from four school districts and identified three major themes regarding partnerships. First, school principals did not feel like they had the time, capacity, or knowledge to identify and seek school partners. Second, schools engaged in partnerships did not have metrics in place to determine whether the partnership was beneficial or successful. Third, school principals thought community partnerships were essential for the success of their schools.

TFA – Phoenix developed its organizational vision to include aspects of community-school partners. In the past, TFA focused heavily on classroom level change through student achievement data. The core of the program has continued to focus on student achievement and excellent teaching for students, but a new approach was added. The organization began placing more emphasis on schools and communities. We were focusing on achievement and student life outcomes on a school-wide level. This prompted TFA to reconsider and examine its organizational vision. The vision changed to being focused on helping to create "20 exceptional schools in low-income communities fueling public action." To attain this vision, TFA leaders suggested we must work with school and community leaders in a systematic way to produce school-relevant outcomes. The community-school partnerships model was best positioned to meet this

goal and assist in changing the trajectory of schools facing major obstacles in the communities they served.

One of the most fundamental components to producing strong community-school partnerships was developing efficacious school leaders who established and maintained community-school partnerships. School leaders had the potential to form partnerships to assist them in meeting the vision and goals of their schools. The former principal at Camelback High School, was one example of an effective school leader who successfully led a community-school partnership. Prior to 2009, Camelback High School was a campus filled with drugs, violence, gangs, and poor academic achievement. He fundamentally believed that for his school to succeed, there needed to be structural system changes and students had to feel invested in a positive culture at the school. His vision was simple, he wanted teachers to be able to focus on teaching and learning and students to enjoy coming to school.

He recognized there were resource and knowledge gaps at the school and district level. To overcome these gaps and to attain his vision, he sought out partners in the community to provide support in those areas not available through the school. Fortunately, the principal connected with a businessman and together they sought out a partnership with Social Venture Partners - Arizona (SVP). SVP Arizona cultivated philanthropists, strengthened nonprofits, and invested in collaborative solutions building powerful relationships to tackle social challenges. Proponents at SVP were interested in helping to transform what was once one of the highest performing schools in the state, but now had become one of the lowest.

In his first step in moving the school forward, the principal focused on rebuilding a strong school culture. Students, teachers, families, and visitors had to feel welcome and safe at the school. Unfortunately, the campus had become a place where neither staff members nor students were overwhelmingly excited to be there. He averred, "we treated each other badly." The campus was an environment where adults pushed students off campus as quickly as possible after school. To make the required changes in the school environment, he, his partners, and school staff members realized a customer service-oriented approach toward teaching was warranted. To build a strong cultural environment, the principal wanted to keep students at school.

Through the SVP partnership, investors provided sufficient funds to build enrichment facilities and areas for students to stay after school. To create a safe environment, he took steps to remove gang members and problematic students from the school. Additionally, the SVP partnership provided professional development for school faculty and staff members, which was conducted by staff members from the Ritz-Carlton. Professional development centered on taking a world class customer service approach toward their work and customers (i.e., students, teachers, visitors, etc.).

Throughout the course of this partnership, investors have helped to fund college scholarships for students. Moreover, the implementation of a peer tutoring program based on a program used in Memphis, TN, along with a host of other projects and activities helped to improve the culture and systems of the school. As a result, the school has built a school culture that created an environment where students, teachers, and parents wanted to be. Next, the principal worked on creating an environment focusing on learning and

achievement. Through the SVP partnership, he was able to build different structures and networks that laid the foundation to move to the next step.

Nevertheless, this example of partnerships at the school level has not been typical. Over the course of four years, the partnerships developed at Camelback High School have yielded millions of dollars in scholarship funding for students, increased academic gains, decreased dropout rates, and improved student attendance rates (Silver and Associates, 2013). All of this resulted from having a school leader who first had a school vision and knew where to seek partnerships. Nevertheless, the more typical case has been one where school leaders did not have the time, the expertise, or the efficacy to develop these beneficial partnerships. Thus, the challenge is to overcome three critical matters:

    a.   how do school leaders identify the needs of their schools;

    b.   how do school leaders identify potential, appropriate partners; and

    c.   how do school leaders develop the expertise and efficacy to better benefit their schools and students?

These questions lead to two research questions that guided the conduct of this study.

1. How and to what extent did participation in a program for developing partnerships affect participants' perceptions of their (a) skills and (b) self-efficacy for developing partnerships?

2. How did participation in a program for developing partnerships affect participants' perceptions of the benefits of the program for students?

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH GUIDING THE PROJECT

In this chapter, I have presented related literature, theoretical perspectives, and research guiding this project. In the first section, literature related to community-school partnerships was presented. Following that section, information regarding the theoretical perspectives used to conduct this study were discussed. In the last section of this chapter, I provided a summary of implications for this project.

Community-School Partnerships

Community-school partnerships have been described in various ways by researchers. The term community-school partnership indicated a connection between multiple parties. Communities in relationship to schools can be described as those individuals and institutions that have a stake in the education of children (Epstein, 2010). For the purpose of this project, the related literature on community-school partnerships that has been discussed was limited to parties other than parents. Although parent-school partnerships have been and continue to be very important, the focus here was on other entities that could form partnerships with schools.

Community involvement can be defined as the connection between schools and members of the community such as individuals, businesses, non-profit groups, as well as other formal and informal institutions (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Sanders, 2003). According to Bauch (2001), community-school partnerships were defined as the development of a set of social relationships within and between schools and their local communities that promote action.

Community partnerships often targeted parent involvement, but other community support was also vital to school success (Sanders, 2001). Sanders surveyed 443 schools that joined the National Network of Partnerships Schools (NNPS) and found partnerships came in a variety of forms. Partnerships occurred between schools and businesses, service organizations, churches, and libraries. The goal of these partnerships was to provide services to children that would increase their success in school. For example, non-profit, Boys and Girls Clubs have created programs designed to allow students to complete homework in a quiet safe location after school each day. Alternatively, businesses have supported schools by donating funds to hire tutors or provide students with school supplies.

In the same study, Sanders (2001) also found respondents identified barriers inhibiting the development of community-school partnerships. The most frequently identified barrier was leadership. Specifically, results from the study suggested school leaders lacked expertise in developing community-school partnerships. That is to say, school leaders did not possess the knowledge and experience needed to establish strong community-school partnerships.

Steiger (2007) discovered several characteristics of partnerships that were important to school and community leaders. Steiger conducted a wide-ranging survey of schools and determined there were two main characteristics that resonated with the success of all parties who participated in partnerships. First, results from the study suggested collaboration was an important characteristic of successful partnerships. Second, evaluating the partnership on a regular basis was essential. With respect to collaboration, business partners and principals who were surveyed believed active and

engaged partnerships from all parties were necessary. Value was added to the partnerships by bringing together two sets of perspectives and experiences. Second, with respect to evaluation, developing a mutually beneficial plan and having a vision in place allowed stakeholders to judiciously evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership.

Johnson (2007) examined the characteristics of sustainable partnerships, the role of social capital, and the leadership role necessary to create effective partnerships. Sustainability was considered to be essential to the ongoing success of any partnership. Sustainability allowed the partnership to continue to function by being transferred from one set of leaders to the next. In the study, Johnson identified the following characteristics of sustainable partnerships: (a) continuity of philosophy, (b) shared vision, (c) informal and formal communication, (d) attainable goals, and (e) flexibility. In addition, the leaders also had a viable understanding of the culture of the organization as well as its history and philosophy.

First, continuity of philosophy allowed partners to view themselves as more than being part of a transactional relationship. Parties involved truly believed they would only fail or succeed together when seeking to meet their aligned objectives. These partners viewed each other as being critical; without the other their work would not have been complete. Second, partners with a shared or common vision enabled individuals to rally behind each other to find the most efficient and effective ways of reaching their goals.

Third, informal and formal communication were vital to any strong sustainable partnership. Communication enabled those involved to monitor and adjust the progress of the partnership. Moreover, it allowed partners to cultivate deeper understanding and relationships with one another. Fourth, to ensure success, attainable goals were

13

established. These goals were the driving forces behind the partnership, and they determined its length. Fifth, to create a sustainable partnership each party exhibited flexibility. Both business leaders and principals understood their partnership was an additional responsibility and it only succeeded when each party worked to meet each other's needs.

Outcomes and Benefits of Partnerships

Partnerships allowed for developing improved school structures and amplifying already existing structures. For instance, partnerships provided schools with funding for afterschool programs if the school lacked these resources. Second, community-school partnerships brought in experts to support staff members with ongoing professional development in many areas. Moreover, as the age of accountability has continued to grow, it was important to link community partnerships with indicators of school success (Wang & Boyd, 2000).

Collaboration between schools and the community led to students who were more successful in school, continued their education, and enjoyed school (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Sheldon (2003) conducted research examining the relation between quality school-family-community partnerships and student performance using state assessments as indicators of student performance. Results from the study showed schools that were deliberately trying to improve their partnerships showed a higher number of students performing at or above grade level as compared to schools where partnerships were not being nurtured. Thus, when schools worked in partnership with the community to improve academic performance, students benefited by receiving additional support, which led to improved academic achievement (Bryan, 2005).

Community-school partnerships have also demonstrated benefits in areas outside of academic achievement. In fact, community-school partnerships have been shown to play an important role in influencing student attendance and dropout prevention (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002). Espstein and Sheldon conducted a survey of school administrators from 18 schools that were part of the National Network of Partnership Schools. Results showed that using a comprehensive community-oriented approach at the schools led to increased attendance rates. Specifically, results showed awards, which were often funded by community partners, were effective at influencing the achievement of attendance goals. Awards such as parties, gift certificates, or recognition at assemblies fostered positive changes in attendance.

Types of Partnerships

Community-school partnerships have often been differentiated into four categories: (a) business partnerships, (b) school-university partnerships, (c) service-learning partnerships, and (d) school-linked service integration (Sanders, 2003).

Business partnerships were described as an arrangement between the school and business working to meet an outcome. These types were generally characterized as beneficial for students, families, communities, and the businesses themselves (Bucy, 1990). The success of such partnerships was largely determined by how thoughtfully these partnerships were planned and with whose input. Results from the research literature have shown when top-down approaches to planning of partnerships occurred, the likelihood of unsuccessful implementation was greatly increased (Mickelson, 1999).

Generally, schools have benefitted from business partnerships in a number of ways. According to Nelson et al. (2007), business partnerships have provided schools

15

with financial contributions, internships and scholarships, guest speakers and teaching materials, advisors and consultants, fundraising assistance, and employment for parents and students. Hoff (2002) examined school and business partnerships from the business point of view to determine methods of strengthening the relationships and increasing student achievement. He surveyed over 300 businesses to attain better understandings of businesses' view of the partnership, motivation for partnering, expected outcomes, and their role in school reform. Results indicated business partners desired: (a) a stronger role in the development of goals for the partnership, (b) a stronger link between their services and improved academic achievement, (c) improved feedback on outcomes, (d) a clear plan of action with identified leaders to carry out the goals, and (e) a school's guidance of the partnership based on clear objectives and accountability measures.

Business partnerships have been quite diverse and came in many different forms. For example, business partnerships included companies providing use of their employees to serve as mentors for individual students, donating school equipment, and/or funding awards for improved student attendance.

Universities, as community partners, have played an important and unique role in schools. They have demonstrated the potential to increase collaborative capacity of the key stakeholders through the provision of professional development. According to Melaville (1998), universities brought a high degree of credibility and organizational capacity to the creation of community-school initiatives. Nevertheless, typically universities' focus has been on the discovery of untapped laboratories for service, learning, and research from schools. The literature on effective university partnerships

emphasized the importance of shared vision, open communication, structures and processes for joint decision making, and reflective evaluation.

Several examples of university partnerships included Pennsylvania's Center for Community Partnerships (CCP), which emphasized creating partnerships between universities and local schools that focused on education as well as providing services and resources to students, families, and community members (Harkavy, 2005). One partnership that emerged from this model was the one between the University of Pennsylvania and public schools in West Philadelphia. Over 60 faculty and 2,300 students have been participating in this partnership. The partnership capitalized on the America Reads Program, which was an elementary reading program designed to address achievement gaps in reading (Harkavy, 2005). The partnership enabled the university to provide tutoring support for students using a data-driven approach. This partnership has been linked to the dramatic growth in test scores for students involved in the program.

Service-learning partnerships have provided students with opportunities to assist individuals or agencies in addressing social or environmental problems or community needs. Like the business and university partnership literature, service learning also emphasized the importance of careful, inclusive planning for program success. Field experiences have included such diverse services as working with emotionally or physically disabled children, planting community gardens, or assisting with infant care in local hospitals (Sanders, 2003). The goals of service-learning included building stronger neighborhoods and communities, creating more active and involved citizens, and "reinvigora[ting] traditional classrooms" (Halsted & Schine, 1994, p. 251). Studies suggested when service learning was tied to coursework, it helped students to gain a more

comprehensive understanding of academic subjects (Alvarado, 1997) and positively affected their reflective judgment (Eyler et al., 1997).

School-linked service integration has been a practice where schools, social service agencies, non-profits, individuals, and health providers attempted to provide more efficient services to children and families who needed them. Service integration has been shown to include different levels of support including agencies working together to tackle a problematic issue. It has also included frontline service providers working to support programs at schools. Service integration has also occurred between on-site service providers and the parents and families they served (Bruner, 1991). For example, schools have partnered with an organization that provided dental coverage to all students in the school. One additional type of partnership the literature discussed was full-service and model schools. Full-service and model schools have been based on a concept where partnerships were a key component of how the schools functioned and operated. Across the country, selected high schools incorporated workforce development into their curriculum to enable their students to gain "real world" experience from the classroom. These programs utilized partnerships to provide students with an opportunity to build their knowledge and skills. Full-service schools integrated community involvement throughout the design of the school. Success for full-service schools occurred when schools and community members worked collaboratively to meet the needs of students (Abrams & Gibbs, 2000).

Implications of Community-School Partnerships Literature for the Project

There are two implications for the project based on the related literature on community-school partnerships. First, the literature identifies lack of leadership as one

major barrier to forming community-school partnerships (Sanders, 2001). This project will address this barrier by developing and implementing the Development of the Partnership Protocol for Principals (DP^3) as a systematic method for teaching school leaders on how to develop partnerships. Regardless of their level of experience with respect to developing community-school partnerships, principals will benefit from this project because DP^3 will take into account varied levels of experience.

The second implication from the community-school partnership related literature deals with sustainability. Johnson (2007) describes five characteristics for building sustainable partnerships. Each of these characteristics will be utilized during the planning stages of this project to ensure sustainability. Further, the sustainable practices discussed in the literature inform multiple components of the project including various aspects of the proposed protocol.

Theoretical Perspectives

Two theoretical frameworks guided this action research project. The theoretical perspectives included Albert Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) self-efficacy theory and James MacGregor Burns (1978) transformational leadership theory.

Self-efficacy Theory

Bandura (1977, 1986, 1997) described self-efficacy as the beliefs individuals had about their personal capabilities and resources to meet the demands of a specific task. Research based on self-efficacy theory has shown that personal efficacy influenced the goals people choose, their aspirations, how much effort they exerted on a given task, and how long they persisted in the face of difficulties, obstacles, and disappointments (Maurer, 2001). Individuals with greater senses of self-efficacy believed they could

succeed at accomplishing a specific task. Those who exhibited high levels of self-efficacy were also individuals who were motivated, persistent, goal-directed, resilient, and clear thinkers under pressure (Bass, 1990). These traits were also described as characteristic of individuals who had been successful in leadership roles (Bass, 1990).

Sources of Efficacy

The research literature on self-efficacy indicated four "sources" of efficacy information influenced self-efficacy. The four sources of self-efficacy information were: (a) mastery experiences, (b) vicarious experiences, (c) social persuasion, and (d) emotional and physical arousal.

As the term suggested, mastery experiences referred to previous incidents that influenced self-efficacy. Previous successes increased expectations that one would succeed in the future and fostered increased self-efficacy, whereas repeated failures decreased such expectations and the attendant self-efficacy (Staples et al., 1998). According to Bandura (1977, 1997), performance outcomes based on past experiences were the most important source of self-efficacy. Mastery experiences, for example, included such things as having built community-school partnerships in the past and experiencing success. These experiences were the most influential source of efficacy because they provided the most authentic evidence of whether one could marshal the appropriate resources to succeed in the task (Bandura, 1997).

Further, literature suggested success built a robust belief in one's personal efficacy. Alternatively, failures undermined it, especially if failures occurred before a sense of efficacy was firmly established. For example, if a school principal had been working to create a community-school partnership with a local non-profit organization

for years, but no partnership ever materialized, the principal may very well have viewed the attempt to develop a partnership as a failure. On the other hand, if a principal has experienced successfully collaborating and building partnerships in the past their sense of self-efficacy would be increased as they attempted to create a new partnership.

By comparison, vicarious experiences represented the situation where individuals developed self-efficacy by observing others' performances. When individuals saw others who were similar to themselves succeed by sustained efforts, the observer began to believe they had the ability to perform similar endeavors (Bandura, 1986). Nevertheless, vicarious experiences could have had the opposite effect on someone; witnessing someone fail decreased individuals' self-efficacy. For example, when students saw other students of the same ability level going to the whiteboard and correctly solving mathematics equations, students' beliefs they would be successful increased. On the other hand, if individuals joined a program to prevent them from smoking, and these individuals witnessed several other people fail to quit smoking after participating in the program, then they may have been concerned about their own chances of success, leading to low self-efficacy.

Social persuasion referred to individuals' beliefs they could or could not accomplish a task based on an influencers' encouragement or discouragement. The influence that social persuasion has on individuals depends on the credibility, trustworthiness, and expertise of the persuader (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Examples of social persuasion included a teacher or mentor who verbally expressed encouraging words to a student or mentee prior to or when the student was performing a task.

The final source of efficacy is emotional and physical arousal. Emotional and physical arousal was defined as individuals' personal responses about a given task or experience. People have experienced sensations from their body and how they perceived this emotional arousal influenced their beliefs of efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1997). For example, a physiological arousal might occur if an individual was in a variety of scenarios such as making a presentation in front of a crowd, taking an exam, or competing for a reward. Each of these tasks could cause agitation, anxiety, sweaty palms, and/or racing heart that could have affected self-efficacy (Redmond, 2010).

Implications of Self-Efficacy for the Project

The implications of self-efficacy for the project are based on the sources of efficacy. Those implications are discussed in the following section. Implications based on mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, and social persuasion are suggested.

With respect to the present project, the implications of mastery experiences as a source of efficacy are one of the primary aspects of the project. The objective is to foster mastery experiences that will enable participants to continue forming effective community-school partnerships in the future. Additionally, each participant in this study comes to the project with his own mastery experiences already achieved with respect to development of community-school partnerships, which may be positive or negative. In the instances of negative experiences, this will require the use of other sources of self-efficacy information to play a larger role in overcoming these experiences.

In terms of this project, vicarious experiences will not be a major factor. In general, participants will work autonomously when seeking community-school partnerships. Although the literature indicates vicarious experiences as a source for

22

improved self-efficacy, the professional constraints of elementary school principals often require them to work in relative isolation without benefit of a model. Thus, it is anticipated that vicarious experiences will not play a role in the project.

With respect to the present project, the implications of social persuasion as a source of efficacy are substantial. Although social persuasion is not the primary source of self-efficacy, it is likely to play a major role in this project because of the coaching participants will receive from the researcher. The researcher will provide support for each participant and utilize social persuasion as a tool to increase their self-efficacy.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational leadership has been defined as a leadership approach that caused change in individuals and social systems. James MacGregor Burns (1978) first introduced the concept of transformational leadership in his descriptive research on political leaders, but this term has now been used in many forums and settings. Strong school leadership has been shown to be vital for school and community partnerships to operate effectively (Ferguson, 2005b; Johnson, 2007; Marzano, 2003; Sanders & Harvey, 2002; Wang & Boyd, 2000). Transformational school leaders who created a culture of collaboration in which the value of stakeholder input was appreciated were more successful in obtaining desired outcomes (Northouse, 2010).

According to Burns, the transformational approach has created substantial change in the lives of people and organizations. It has fostered the redesign of perceptions and values and changed expectations and aspirations of employees. Two primary types of leadership lead Burns (1978) to his transactional approach. Those types were "transforming leadership" and "transactional leadership." Burns theorized that

transforming and transactional leadership were mutually exclusive, but transactional leadership was more "give and take," whereas transformational leadership required articulation of an energizing vision and challenging goals. Bass (1985) posited the extent to which leaders were transformational, was assessed first, in terms of their influence on their followers. These leaders encouraged followers to come up with new and unique ways to challenge the status quo and to alter the environment to support being successful.

Four elements served as the foundation of transformational leadership: (a) individualized consideration, (b) intellectual stimulation, (c) inspirational motivation, and (d) idealized influence. First, individualized consideration has been defined as the degree to which leaders attended to followers' needs, acted as a mentor or coach to the followers, and listened to followers' concerns and needs. Leaders provided empathy and support, kept communication open, and placed challenges before the followers. These leaders also showed respect and celebrated the individual contributions follower made to the group. Leaders recognized followers had wills, aspirations for self-development, and had intrinsic motivation to perform their tasks.

Second, intellectual stimulation referred to the degree to which leaders challenged assumptions, took risks, and solicited followers' ideas. Leaders with this style stimulated and encouraged creativity. These individuals developed and encouraged their followers to think independently. For these individuals, unexpected situations were seen as opportunities to learn. The followers asked questions, thought deeply about things, and determined better ways to execute their tasks.

Third, inspirational motivation was considered to be the degree to which the leader articulated a vision that was appealing and inspiring to followers. These leaders used inspirational motivation to challenge followers with high standards, communicated optimism about future goals, and provided meaning for the task at hand. Followers must have had a strong sense of purpose if they were to be motivated to act. Purpose and meaning were the foundations for driving the group forward. Followers were willing to invest more effort in their tasks; they were encouraged and optimistic about the future and believed in their abilities.

Finally, idealized influence provided a role model for highly ethical behavior, instilled pride, and garnered respect and trust. Individuals used others' high levels of performance as a standard, which they strived to achieve. Transformational school leaders have demonstrated the ability to utilize these elements to inspire and empower others to follow their vision.

Implications of the Theory of Transformational Leadership for the Project

There are two implications based on the theory for this project. First, the theory of transformational leadership suggests leaders influence their followers and this occurs when leaders encourage collaboration and value the input of other key stakeholders. This project requires participants to seek and create partnerships. Therefore, during this project participants will be encouraged to seek the support of their staff and leadership teams. This is an essential and important component for the implementation of the community-school partnership. For example, in developing the school goals that serve as the target, which will drive the partnerships, it will be incumbent on the principals to collaborate with staff to establish the goals.

Second, transformational leadership seeks to enable leaders who are visionary. One important component of this project will be that leaders begin with a vision in mind. To develop strong community-school partnerships these leaders need to have a direction for the partnership in mind as they lead. Collaboration and vision are two necessary components of transformational leadership, and this project indirectly builds upon both.

Summary of Implications Leading to the Project

Taken together, the related literature suggests a number of benefits accrue to schools and students when there are strong community-school partnerships to augment school resources. Students receive the opportunity to enhance their schooling experience through community-school partnerships and build on the existing programs and resources that are in place. A partnership organized between the school and the community can lead to positive changes in the school. Specifically, five contributions that partnerships with the community make to schools include: (a) upgraded school facilities, (b) improved school leadership and staffing, (c) higher-quality learning programs for students, (d) new resources and programs to improve teaching and curriculum, and (e) new funding for after-school programs and family supports (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Thus, the literature has shown profound influences from partnerships, which inform this project.

Moreover, the theoretical perspectives of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986, 1997) and transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) are key components to this project. The literature on self-efficacy and leadership reveal that highly efficacious individuals display characteristics that are consistent with strong leadership abilities. These perspectives help to shape this project by taking account of one's own personal beliefs and how those can be transformed into leadership actions.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

In this chapter, I have described in detail the action research method being used in this project. I have included information about the setting and participants, role of the researcher, a description of the instruments and the intervention, the action plan for the study, and procedures for data collection and analysis.

Setting

The setting for this study was three urban public schools. The first school was located in central Phoenix in the Osborn School District and enrolled approximately 475 students in grades K-6. The school was positioned just east of a housing development and surrounded by local businesses. The neighborhood in which it is located had a large refugee population. Approximately, 90% of the student population were minority and more than half of the students qualified for free and reduced lunch. The student demographic was 52% Latino, 22% African American, 10% Euro-American, 7% Native American, 5% Multiple Races, and 3% Asian. The median household income in this community was approximately $42,000 per year. This school currently had two existing community-school partnerships.

The second school was located northeast of downtown Phoenix in the Phoenix Union High School District and enrolled approximately 2,200 students in grades 9-12. This school was situated just south of a high-income Phoenix neighborhood and located less than a mile from major companies and law firms. Approximately, 94% of the student population was minority and the majority of students qualified for free and reduced lunch. The student demographic composition was 75% Latino, 9% African American, 6%

27

Euro-American, 4% Mixed Races, 3% Native American, and 1% Asian. The median household income in this community was approximately $67,000 per year. This school currently had seven community-school partnerships.

The third school was located in south Phoenix in the Phoenix Union High School District and enrolled approximately 2,100 students in grades 9-12. The school was situated in a high residential community. Approximately, 97% of the student population was minority and the majority of students qualified for free and reduced lunch. The student demographics were 78% Latino, 15% African American, 3% Euro-American, 2% Mixed Races, and 1% Native American. The median household income in this community was approximately $43,000 per year. At the beginning of the study, this school was engaged in eight formal community-school partnerships.

Participants

The participants in the study were two high school principals and one elementary principal who led each of the school campuses described above. The first school principal was located in the Osborn School District and currently was completing their third year as the leader on this campus. They previously served as a principal for 10 years in multiple school districts. Prior to their role as principal, they were a classroom teacher for eight years. The second principal served in the Phoenix Union High School District and was finishing their second year as the head administrator at the school. They previously worked as an assistant principal in the school. Prior to joining the district, they worked as a principal in an elementary school district and as a teacher for five years. The third principal worked in the Phoenix Union High School District and was finishing their first year as an administrator on campus. They worked at the school as an educator the last

four years. Additionally, prior to joining the district, they were a teacher at an elementary school located within the boundaries of the high school attendance area.

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher was one of researcher-practitioner. From a practice point of view, I developed the workshops, facilitated efforts with the participants to guide them through each individual step of the Development of Partnership Protocol for Principals, and supported participants during the implementation of the protocol. From the research point of view, my primary function was developing the research instruments, gathering data including administering the survey, monitoring and collecting journal entries, and conducting participant interviews. Additionally, I analyzed the quantitative and qualitative data.

Instruments

This study employed a mixed method design. This approach enabled me to explore various types of data through different lenses. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed. Using mixed methods provided me with the opportunity to develop a deeper, richer understanding of the phenomena being studied (Greene, 2007).

Reflective Journals

The Development of Partnership Protocol for Principals (DP^3) required each participant to engage in multiple reflective questions after participating in learning during each stage of the protocol. The purpose of this reflection was to capture principals' rationales for their thinking and performance after each step and to give them time to monitor and adjust their courses of action. During this study, participants were given

wide ranging autonomy with respect to identifying school needs, prioritizing these needs, identifying potential partners, selecting specific partners to best meet their needs, and so on. Participants understood their contexts more fully than anyone else. The reflective journal allowed participants to share their reasoning and approach to their actions as they proceeded through the protocol, as well as providing information about how their context may have contributed to those decisions. This allowed me to uncover best practices, unforeseen challenges, and steps for further development of the protocol. Examples of prompts included: "Describe what actions you performed during this stage of the protocol," and "What level of support did this stage of the protocol cause you to seek?" The complete set of reflective journal prompts has been included in Appendix A.

Semi-Structured Interview

Participants in this study brought a vast amount of experience to this project. They all faced different challenges across diverse contexts. Semi-structured interviews allowed participants to bring their perspectives, which could lead to new ideas and discoveries. Principals were interviewed after the implementation of the intervention to gain a better idea of the opportunities and challenges they faced concerning community-school partnerships. Moreover, these questions allowed me to gauge principals' levels of knowledge and experience with community-school partnerships. The interviews consisted of nine open-ended questions centered on community-school partnerships and principal self-efficacy. Examples of items included, "Tell me about your thoughts with regard to building and managing community-school partnerships," and "From your perspective, what are the key elements to building an effective community-school

partnership?" The complete set of interview questions has been provided in Appendix B.

Principal Community-School Partnership Survey

Principals completed two surveys, which assessed principals' perceived skill set with respect to developing community-school partnerships and principals' self-efficacy about developing community-school partnerships. Principals completed both of these instruments following the intervention. Immediately after the intervention, principals completed the post-intervention assessment, then one week later, they completed the retrospective, pre-intervention assessment. These instruments contained several sets of items. There were 10 Likert-scale items – five each assessing principals' perceptions of their (a) skills and (b) self-efficacy for developing community-school partnerships and six open-ended, demographic items on the post-intervention assessment survey. By comparison, there were 10 Likert-scale items, on the retrospective, pre-intervention assessment survey. These 10 Likert-scale items were constructed by the researcher and authenticated for content validity by a panel of current and former school principals. Respondents answered the Likert-scale items using a six-point, Likert-scale, which ranged from 6 = *Strongly Agree*, 5= *Agree*, 4 = Strongly Likely Agree, 3 = Strongly Likely Disagree, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree. Examples of the post-intervention assessment survey perceived skill questions included, "I possess the skills to create school-community partnerships," and "I have strategies that are useful in building school-community partnerships." Examples of the post-intervention assessment survey self-efficacy questions included, "I am confident I can use my abilities to develop school-community partnerships," and "I am certain I can use my skills to develop partnerships

with community organizations." For the retrospective, pre-intervention survey, participants were asked to think back to before their participation in the study and answer the same questions. Thus, examples of retrospective pre-intervention assessment survey skill items included, "Prior to participating in the project, I possessed the skills to create school-community partnerships," and "Prior to participating in the project, I had strategies that were useful in building school-community partnerships." The self-efficacy items were constructed in a similar manner and examples included, "Prior to participating in the project, I was confident I could use my abilities to develop school-community partnerships." The complete set of survey items for the post-intervention assessment has been provided in Appendix C, whereas the full set of survey items for the retrospective, pre-intervention assessment has been provided in Appendix D.

Intervention

The intervention for this action research study consisted of a suite of procedures and actions principals took to improve or develop community-school partnerships. In the suite of activities, also referred to as the DP^3, principals engaged in a four-step process to enhance how they capitalized on community-school partnerships to improve academic achievement, school culture, and/or student enrichment. The four-step process required principals to (a) conduct a needs assessment of the state of the school and its current partnerships, (b) strategically analyze potential opportunities, (c) develop pathways for partnerships, and (d) construct a plan to implement the partnership. The rationale for the development of the DP^3 was to provide principals with a strategic approach to enriching or developing school partnerships.

During the four-step process, it was essential for principals to gather the information they needed to form these partnerships. The first step required principals to conduct a needs assessment of the state of the school and its current partnerships. In this stage, principals completed a needs assessment survey and answered guiding, probing questions to begin the process. The needs assessment survey focused on three constructs: academic achievement, school culture, and student enrichment. The probing questions included:

1. What are my campus' strengths? …weaknesses? (determined through the use of the needs assessment survey)

2. What are my current partnerships? (if applicable)

3. What is the desired outcome of these current partnerships? (if applicable)

4. Have metrics been established to assure the effectiveness of these partnerships? (if applicable)

As explained earlier, principals who participated in the research may have already had partnerships, but they did not have specific goals established for these partnerships. This process helped participants to align and narrow the focus of what needed to be accomplished.

The second step of the DP[3] engaged principals in a process of strategizing and prioritizing their schools' greatest areas of need. First, the principal reviewed the results of the needs assessment. This provided them the opportunity to focus on this specific issue. During this phase principals reviewed the resources to which they currently had access to assist in solving the issue. After principals exhausted their search for resources, they moved on to the next phase.

Next, still within step 2, the principals completed a power mapping activity allowing them to identify potential resources in the community. Principals conducted research to develop a list of the key stakeholders in their community with a vested interest in the well-being of the school. This list included businesses, faith-based organizations, professionals, non-profit organizations, and so on. As a result, this phase required some principals to engage in more research than others. During this process, principals developed a profile on each of these entities to determine whether they could be useful. Third, after this list was created, principals narrowed those stakeholders to a small group of targets who were best positioned to assist with their issue. Then, principals entered the third step.

The third step of the DP^3 required principals to develop pathways for forming and cultivating relationships with potential partners. Principals selected a partner they wanted to approach. Once this potential partner was identified the principal conducted research to find their influencers, their vision, and their possible motivation for wanting to partner. After this was completed, principals contacted the potential partner. Principals met with this potential partner with a vision in mind of what the partnership should look like. This allowed the partner to express what they could and could not bring to the table. Once this occurred, principals moved to the final step.

The final step of the DP^3 required principals to form the partnership with the proposed partner. Together, the partners established metrics to determine what success would look like during the partnership. For example, metrics might have included student participant numbers or funds spent for scholarships. This allowed all parties to have

focused goals that could later be evaluated to determine whether the partnership was working as intended.

Procedure

The implementation of the intervention began in July 2022 with an Orientation Session. Prior to implementation, IRB approval to conduct the study was obtained. The IRB approval letter has been included in Appendix E.

The procedure began with the construction of three workshops. In mid-July, principals individually participated in an orientation. During this time, participants were engaged in a planning session to learn the steps of the protocol and the support plan to be provided to each participant. Once this took place, each participant began the intervention. Next, during Workshop 1, I implemented Step 1 and Step 2 of the intervention. This consisted of the needs assessment and the power mapping activity, following the identification of school gaps. In September, I implemented Workshop 2 offering Step 3 of the intervention, which required principals to develop an understanding of their potential community partners visions, motivation, interests and goals for partnering. In mid-September, I offered the final workshop, Workshop 3, which included construction of a partnership plan by the principals. After each workshop, principals were required to respond to prompts in their reflective journals. Once the workshops were completed, principals took the post-intervention assessment and a week later they took the retrospective, pre-intervention assessment. Participants took these surveys on an individual basis. When the intervention assessments were completed, I conducted the semi-structured interviews. Table 1 outlines the detailed timeline for the intervention and data collection processes.

Table 1

Intervention and Data Collection Timeline

Date	Activity and Instrument Used in Data Collection
July	Principal Orientation Session
August	Principals completed Workshop 1 during this phase. They then recorded their thoughts and results in their reflective journals.
September, early	Principals completed Workshop 2 during this phase. They then recorded their thoughts and results in their reflective journals.
September, mid-	Principals completed Workshop 3 during this phase. They then recorded their thoughts and results in their reflective journals.
October, early	Principals completed the Post-Intervention and the Retrospective Pre-Intervention Principal Community-School Partnership Surveys during this phase.
October, mid-	The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with each individual principal during this phase.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In the three previous chapters, I have presented a description of the problem, the

theoretical foundations and frameworks informing this study, and the method including

the intervention and the approach used in developing and implementing the research. I

have presented the results derived from the study in this chapter. I analyzed data from

quantitative and qualitative sources. For the sake of clarity, I have restated the research

questions below.

> RQ1: How and to what extent did participation in a program for developing
>
> partnerships affect participants' perceptions of their (a) skills and (b) self-efficacy
>
> for developing partnerships?
>
> RQ2: How did participation in a program for developing partnerships affect
>
> participants' perceptions of the benefits of the program for students?

In the first section of this chapter, I have described the sources of data and data analysis

procedures. Next, I discussed the quantitative data and results. In the third section, I

reported qualitative data and results including key assertions that emerged by interpreting

the qualitative data.

Quantitative and Qualitative Data Sources

Quantitative data were derived from one primary source, the survey data from the

post-intervention and the retrospective, pre-intervention Likert surveys. The post-

intervention survey consisted of 10 items, which assessed two constructs–participants'

perceived skills and self-efficacy with respect to developing community partnerships.

The retrospective, pre-intervention survey was structured with 10 items assessing the same two constructs. Descriptive statistics were computed for the surveys.

Qualitative data came from two sources. These sources included reflective journals and semi-structured interviews.

Data Analysis Procedures

To begin the process for quantitative data, I transferred the quantitative data into SPSS (IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 27.0) and analyzed the quantitative survey data. To analyze the qualitative data, I collected the reflective journal data from participants and the interview data.   I transcribed the interview data from participants. The qualitative data were entered into HyperRESEARCH (HyperResearch 4.5.4, 2022) and analyzed using the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The process started with structural and process coding (Saldaña, 2016). During this procedure, the qualitative data was coded using initial codes with key words and/or short phrases. Subsequently, words or phrases were grouped together to create theme-related components (categories). These theme-related components were gathered into themes. Then, themes enabled me to develop assertions, which were supported compared with original quotes from the participants' reflective journals and interviews.

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

I have presented the results in two sections; one for the quantitative data and a second for the qualitative data.

Results for the Quantitative Data

As noted previously, the quantitative data in this study were from the retrospective, pre-intervention survey and from the post-intervention survey. These data

were used to help answer RQ1, which focused on participants' perceptions of their skills and their self-efficacy for developing partnerships.

Post-intervention and Retrospective, Pre-intervention Surveys

To assess the reliability of the retrospective, pre-intervention survey and the post-intervention surveys, I used SPSS to compute Cronbach's alpha. The two constructs for both surveys were (a) perceived skills and (b) perceived self-efficacy, and each construct was assessed using five items. Consistent with typical guidelines for reliability, reliabilities of .70 and higher were considered to be acceptable levels of reliability. For the retrospective, pre-intervention survey the Cronbach's alpha for the skills and self-efficacy scales were .95 and .92, respectively. The reliability for the post-intervention survey scales for skills and self-efficacy were .92 and .92. These reliability coefficients exceeded an acceptable level of reliability for each set of items assessing these constructs.

Following the analysis of the reliability of the surveys, to better understand the effects of the intervention, I have presented descriptive statistics in the table below based on an analysis using SPSS to examine the differences between the retrospective, pre-intervention and the post-intervention surveys. In Table 2, I have presented means and standard deviations for the two constructs–skills and self-efficacy, which was critical to answering Research Question 1.

Table 2

Means and SDs* for Pre- and Post-Intervention Scores

Construct	Pre-Intervention	Post-Intervention
Skill for Developing Community Partnerships	3.80 (0.53)*	5.33 (0.42)
Self-efficacy for Dev. Comm. Partnerships	4.33 (0.42)	5.53 (0.50)

Note. SD means standard deviation and those have been presented in parentheses.

From Table 2, it was clear the means increased substantially from the pre-intervention scores to the post-intervention scores. For the skill for developing community partnerships variable, the increase was 1.53 points on the 6-point scale. By comparison, the self-efficacy for developing community partnerships variable increased by 1.20 points on a 6-point scale.

Summary of Survey Data. The survey data indicated participants' scores increased substantially for perceptions of skills and perceptions of self-efficacy for forming partnerships. Scores on the skills scale increased by 1.53 points; whereas, those on the self-efficacy scale rose by 1.20 points. Thus, participation in the Development of the Partnership Protocol for Principals (DP³) intervention fostered substantial gains as evidenced in the results.

Results from Qualitative Data

In this section, I have presented results for the qualitative data. Reflective journal entries and semi-structured interviews were the data sources and the qualitative results provided answers for RQ1 and RQ2. For the qualitative data, I combined the journal

reflections and the semi-structured interview because the content was comparable, and

participants used common ideas and phases in these data. Table 3 displays the themes, the

subordinate theme-related components, and the higher-level assertions that emerged from

the data. Quotes from the data were used to support the themes and assertions.

Table 3

Themes*, Theme-related Components, and Assertions Based on the Qualitative Data

Themes and Theme-related Components	Assertions

Aligning partnerships to meet the needs of the campus
   1. Needs assessments were completed for a prior school year.
   2. Intentional selection of partners
	1. Principals gained a new level of strategic thought on how to use needs assessments during partnership recruitment.

Lack of dedicated personnel for cultivating long-term partnerships
   1. Partnerships needed to be prioritized
   2. Every partnership must have had a clear convenor or manager
	2. Principals claimed dedicated partnership recruitment, development, and cultivation must be a part of their role or someone else's role to ensure it was done.

Structural challenges with school and district policies
   1. Every school was different
   2. Many partnerships were developed by district office where staffing was available
	3. Principals maintained partnerships should be executed at the school level to have the greatest effects on students.

Tools and strategies for developing and cultivating partnerships
   1. Minimal professional development on partnerships
   2. Partnerships were self-guided with self-assured results
	4. The Principal's community school protocol was one of the most effective tools received to building partnerships and the principal benefitted from its development.

Students' needs and perceptions 1. The partnership determined effects	5. Principals asserted partnerships benefited students if partnership was aligned with an academic or cultural gap at the school.

*Note. Themes have been presented in italics.

Theme 1–Aligning Partnerships to Meet the Needs of the Campus

Assertion 1 - Principals gained a new level of strategic thought on how to use needs assessments during partnership recruitment. Following the first workshop, principals wrote about a common theme in their reflective journals. This assertion highlighted a new way of thinking for principals when reviewing and conducting needs assessments. The theme-related components for this assertion-theme pairing were (a) needs assessment and (b) partner identification for principals.

Needs Assessments. Principals described they all previously completed a needs assessment for their school, followed by later describing how they viewed the document as more of a professional development and academic tool for their staff than as a partnership tool for themselves. For example, Rich (all participants were provided with pseudonyms) shared this thought in his interview,

> Understanding the kind of partnerships to seek is half of the battle. Many times, as
> principals, people come to us with some type of cool new partnership idea ….
> having a strong understanding of our gaps from the needs assessment will give me
> more agency to determine if I should accept or decline it. I'm starting to view it
> less as a PD tool and more as a key lever for partnership.

Rich continued on to discuss how by viewing partnerships through a new lens, he could determine how to close a gap or add enrichment, which required a new frame of thinking for him as noted when he said,

> So many schools are struggling for resources right, everyone is extending their
> hand out to get the community to partner with a school. But I am convinced if we

can clearly articulate our needs that will be a better long-term relationship for

them and our schools.

Another principal experienced a similar frame of thought as illustrated in the following

quote. While we were conducting our interview Nikki stated,

My school leadership team and I get together each quarter and examine our

strengths and weaknesses as a campus. We look at everything from academics to

school climate. This experience has given me a new way to push the conversation

even further. I'm thinking we should begin the process of creating a running list

based on our needs assessment and quarterly meetings.

Intentional Selection of Partners. Principals recognized partnerships could

provide value to their school, students, and community. One common theme mentioned

in the reflective journals was a questioning of where to narrow the focus for recruitment.

During interviews principals described how the needs assessment and power mapping

activity from Workshop 1 assisted them in identifying a profile of a partner. Nikki stated,

In our community and in our district, there seems to be a firehose of nonprofits

and businesses who all say they support education. But what does that really

mean? I don't have the time or capacity to really meet all of these people to

determine that. But by narrowing our focus and understanding the profile of a

partner we are seeking, [it] allows me to engage in a different way.

Mike also discussed a similar viewpoint during his interview and reflective journal. He

asserted,

One of the most impactful aspects of this program for me is having a direction to

walk in. Now, I have formed partnerships in the past, but these were what I would

44

call, partnerships of convenience. They were easy. The whole process we were told here allows me to create partnerships of intention.

Theme 2–Lack of Personnel for Cultivating Long-term Partnerships

Assertion 2 - Principals claimed dedicated partnership recruitment, development, and cultivation must be a part of their role or someone else's role to ensure it was done. One common theme principals discussed was the role partnerships played among their broader duties as the school leader. There were two theme-related components (a) partnerships need to be prioritized and (b) every partnership must have had a clear convener or manager.

Partnerships Needed to be Prioritized. During Workshop 2 and Workshop 3, principals discussed in their reflective journals the importance of being aligned with partners and how school and community dynamics consistently changed. Mike stated,

> I believe any good partnership should be one that is continuously monitor[ed] and adjusted as needed. One of the limitations to the role of principal is, if we don't prioritize consistent contact with our partners, it's easy to get so caught up with everything else we have on our plate. This protocol works for me because we are really clear about the expectations of the school and the partners are really clear about their expectations. [With] the clarity you [can] better prioritize …partnerships [and] relationships..

Rich included a response in his reflective journal about principals having the time and ability to meet with partners. He revealed his thoughts about the difficulty it presented when he said,

It's important that you have a leader who is committed to really cultivating these partnerships. That is important because if there is something the partner isn't delivering on you want to have someone who is comfortable letting them know that. In the same vein, you also have to make sure the school leader can do this while also handling school management, behavior, etc.…

Every Partnership Must Have Had a Clear Convener or Manager. All of the school principals in the study have observed what they called successful and unsuccessful partnerships. Some of the commonalities they noted with unsuccessful partnerships occurred during turnover of leadership and when a clear coordinator of the relationship was not identified. During the interview, Nikki stated the people executing the partnership and the people meeting about the partnership were not always the same individuals. She mentioned,

Whether its district office or at a school building, there must be really clear expectations on everyone's role. Someone may be in charge of recruiting the partners, someone else may be in charge of planning the event, action, or items with the partners, and another person may be in charge of keeping the ongoing relationship. Either way, that must be clearly defined for any partnership to occur [function] well.

Mike expressed a similar sentiment in his written reflective journal when he stated, "I think one of the most important things about all relationships and partnerships is making sure that everyone knows their role. No one should question what they need to do."

Theme 3–Partnerships Occurred at the School Level and District Level

    Assertion 3 - Principals maintained partnerships should be executed at the school level to have the greatest effects on students. This assertion emerged from two theme-related components including (a) every school was different and (b) many partnerships were developed by district offices where staffing was available.

    Every School Was Different. During the interviews, two of the three principals talked extensively about the partnerships they had on their campuses. In those conversations, they also revealed some of the partnerships were initiated or were cultivated by personnel in the district office. Both indicated that although these partnerships were beneficial, they were misaligned with what was happening "on the ground." Additionally, they mentioned it was nearly impossible to make adjustments because the school did not know who the decision makers were on the partner side. For example, Mike stated,

> The school district has a partnership with a large nonprofit organization. This organization provides a uniform level of support to all students in the district. Every student in this district has the ACT/SAT cost covered for them. He mentioned that for some students, college is not the path they want to take. So for them the resources could be better used for certifications or application fees for trade schools. Students on the campus have indicated to Mike their plans, but since this is a district-wide initiative and priority these students' needs may not be directly aligned.

For Nikki, she mentioned her student population is different from most of the schools in her district. Whenever a district-wide policy or partnership was created, it caused her and

her team to make adjustments to the policy or partnership to meet the needs of their population. In her view it would be easier for the district, school, and students to let more things happen from the ground up.

Many Partnerships Were Developed by the District Offices Where Staffing Was Available. For companies or non-profits that wanted to help students, it was easier for them to interact with the district office personnel. Almost all of the principals found this to be problematic because the district office staff members may not have had the same level of understanding of students' needs as the teachers who see them every day. For example, Rich met with a group of students who were exploring careers in aviation. Shortly after that meeting, at a conference, he met with a company seeking to hire students who wanted to have careers in this field. This company reached out to the district office to talk about a partnership. But the district office personnel mentioned they were going to turn down the partnership because there were not enough students at that school interested in aviation. In the interview, Rich said, "they never even called and asked us."

During Workshop 2, Mike talked about the difficulty he was having in forming a partnership requiring his students to leave campus. The struggle included needing district and governing board approval for this request. He indicated all these school field trips required the school board to approve them. In his view, this has caused students to miss out on opportunities to engage with and explore the community.

Theme 4–Tools and Strategies for Developing and Cultivating Partnerships

Assertion 4 - The Principal's school community protocol was one of the most effective tools received to build partnerships and the principals benefitted from its

development. Reflective journals, interviews, and workshops all provided insights into the type of professional development principals received in their roles. The following theme-related components were aligned with Theme 4: (a) minimum professional development on partnerships, and (b) partnership development was self-guided with self-assured results.

Minimal Professional Development on Partnerships. All three principals participated in the three workshops. In each workshop principals were exposed to different tools and strategies to identify, recruit, develop, and maintain these partnerships. Although school leaders often had opportunities to participate in professional development, these three leaders indicated they never had received training this thorough and practical on community-school partnerships. A quote from an interview with Nikki supported this statement when she said,

> I've seen the tools you built into these workshops work separately, but the way we put them all together works perfectly. We identified our gaps and located people to be potential partners. We took time to understand their motivations and our motivations for partnering. We set metrics for a partnership and that already has me excited about the future.

Both Mike and Rich also indicated that these workshops provided opportunities to take immediate action to do what was best for students and the community. Specifically, Rich maintained,

> I felt like I had the ability to form community partners prior to the study, but to be honest, I think there were so many things I missed out on. Because of the

professional development tools, tips, and tricks we got here I know these agreements will be strong in the future.

Partnership Development was Self-Guided with Self-Assured Results. The workshops consisted of lessons in which each principal participated. After the workshops, they were required to complete the actions they learned. All three of the principals expressed beliefs that the workshops made them feel more prepared to set up partnerships. For example, Nikki stated,

> The accountability from week to week helped motivate me and the entire process was put together in a way that was manageable. While as principals we have a number of things going on at once, this project showed me that I still have the ability to execute partnerships at a high level. Due to the protocol, I have a better idea of how I would structure the development and recruitment of these partnerships.

During the interviews, the school leaders stated they felt strongly empowered to develop community school partnerships. When asked, they stated,

> Nikki: "100%"

> Rich: "Oh absolutely"

> Mike: "I certainly do believe so."

Students Benefited from Community-School Partnerships

Assertion 5 - Principals asserted partnerships benefited students if the partnership was aligned with an academic or cultural gap at the school. Principals suggested the major reason for entering into any partnership was to provide some type of

positive effect for students. This assertion is derived from this theme-related component the partnership determined effects.

The Partnership Determined the Effects. According to the reflective journals and the interview, principals maintained the actual partnership itself mattered greatly in determining whether it would positively affect students. Several principals commented there were other factors playing a role in how a partnership would benefit students. Rich stated,

> In order for these partnerships to have a benefit, we have to make sure that we are going after the right partnerships. When I say we, I mean, principals, teachers, superintendents, everyone. That starts with making sure there is a purpose behind why we are bringing the partnership in the door.

The other principals had a similar view and believed purpose played a major role. For example, Nikki said, "if we are just beginning in partnerships for the sake of partnerships, I think it hurts the kids rather than helps them. The purpose behind each partnership should align with needs assessment."

> Mike stated, "the way the partnership is managed and the purpose behind the partnership will determine whether or not it has an impact on students."

Principals claimed a large effect could be made on students if school leaders followed the steps from the workshop. For example, Rich maintained, "if they use a process that determines what a school is missing, and they try to fix that or they see what a school is doing right, and they try to amplify it."

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The problem driving this action research project is the absence of strong

professional development tools and strategies for principals to create meaningful

community-school partnerships. In the preceding chapters, I describe the need for

community-school partnerships because limited resources are available for low-income

schools. Moreover, in these chapters, I discuss the important role principals play in the

role of identifying, recruiting, developing, and maintaining these partnerships. An

intervention called the Development of the Partnership Protocol for Principals (DP[3]) was

created to provide principals with the tools and strategies to develop community-school

partnerships. This study is designed to examine how principal participation in the DP[3]

influences their perceived skills, self-efficacy, and the benefits to students. In this

chapter, I discuss the findings of the study, limitations, the implications for practice,

implications for future research, and conclusions.

Complementarity and Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Data

Complementarity between quantitative and qualitative data is defined as

elaborating, enhancing, or illustrating the findings of one method with those from the

other method (Greene, 2007; Greene et al., 1989). Results from this study reveal

complementarity in the area of perceived skill and self-efficacy in the primary findings.

Results from the post-intervention survey indicate principals who participated in

the DP[3] increased their perceived levels of (a) skills and (b) self-efficacy for developing

community-school partnerships. Principals' mean scores for skills and self-efficacy

increased by 1.53 and 1.20 points, respectively for the post-intervention survey. This

finding is *enhanced* by qualitative data from principals' reflective journals and interviews, which suggest principals believed their participation in the DP³ contributed to their increased skills and confidence related to pursuing and developing these partnerships. Qualitative data also *elaborate* and give greater meaning to the increases in quantitative scores. Specifically, participants reveal prior to participation in the intervention, they lacked a framework for developing partnerships which affects their confidence in developing these relationships.

Complementarity data can also *enrich* understanding of a finding (Greene, 2007; Greene et al., 1989). The quantitative data indicate beliefs that principals lack skills to form partnerships, but the qualitative data later suggested principals believe if they have a framework like the DP³ they can be successful.

Collectively, the qualitative data and quantitative data are complementary. In this study, the qualitative data provide greater depth. Notably, the qualitative data are consistent with the quantitative data and help us to "unpack" the quantitative data.

Discussion of Findings

In my role as a non-profit manager and public official who works with public schools, I have a vested interest in their success. As the Arizona student population continues to grow, the allocation of resources to schools will continue to be a topic of discussion. To close achievement and opportunity gaps for students, it is likely that community-school partnerships will play critical roles. Research results show school leaders are vital for school community-school partnerships to operate effectively (Ferguson et al., 2005). As such, results in this study include findings related to their perceived skills, self-efficacy, and students benefit from their participation in the DP³.

Therefore, the discussion of findings is presented in three sections that examine principals' perceived skills and self-efficacy.

Growth in Skill Development for Principals

Educators and school leaders participate in professional development training and courses throughout their career. Sometimes the professional development received is relevant to the education leader and other times it is not. In this study, my goal was to provide principals with content they could use in their practices and contexts immediately, while also ensuring the skills gained could be used in the future. The quantitative and qualitative data indicate principals increased their knowledge and skills with the growth of additional strategies to develop community-school partnerships. Moreover, principals maintain the DP^3 is one of the most beneficial professional development opportunities they experience in their careers.

Increases in Principals' Self-Efficacy

The data show increasing self-efficacy for principals as they engage in matters related to developing community-school partnerships. The post-intervention survey data reveal principals perceived self-efficacy grew substantially as compared to the retrospective, pre-survey data. During the interviews principals' comments also demonstrate they are more confident in their abilities to effectively develop community-school partnerships. According to Bandura (1977, 1997), performance outcomes based on past experiences are the most important source of information about self-efficacy. Thus, affording opportunities for participants to attain successes in implementing the DP^3 skills and observe those successes displays the influences mastery experiences have on their self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

Limitations

In every study, researchers must take into account the potential threats to validity and factors other than the intervention that may have influenced the outcomes in a study. This study is no different and I present those limitations, here. The first limitation to consider is the Hawthrone effect (Smith & Glass, 1987). Consistent with typical action research methodology, I was the research-practitioner, observer, and data gatherer for this study. In this role, I work to develop the intervention, deliver the content of the workshops to each participant, provide support to participants between sessions, conduct interviews, and gathered reflective journal and Likert scale data. My constant communication and interaction with each participant to ensure each step of the intervention was followed could influence some of the outcomes rather than the intervention itself.

A second limitation is the small sample size for the study. Only three school principals serve as participants. Given the small sample size, variations in Likert-scale responses could affect the mean scores. With that said, there are no large differences among principals' scores for the quantitative data. Notably, the small sample size also creates some limitations on the quantitative data analyses I can conduct, which results in using descriptive statistics only.

Another limitation is the length of the study. In the study, I offer the DP^3 intervention over the course of six weeks. This requires participants to learn the content and then engage in implementation of the action within a condensed time framework. A final limitation is the threat of history, which results when some participants avail themselves of opportunities outside the study, which may influence the outcomes. For

example, some of the participants in the study may spend additional time reviewing

online resources connected to developing community-school partnerships other than

those being offered in the DP^3 program. In such an instance, their scores might be

affected by this additional work rather than the DP^3 program itself.

Implications for Practice

Using the skills and strategies to identify, recruit, develop, and maintain

community-school partnerships is essential for all school leaders. Schools across the state

and nation engage in partnerships every day. But these partnerships must be meaningful

relationships helping to close student achievement and opportunity gaps. Principals must

be intentional about with whom they choose to partner and understand why they are

partnering with a particular organization and what goals they are trying to attain through

the partnership. Notably, principals must devise a way to assess the successes or failures

of their community-school partnerships. Moreover, principals must have the agency and

skills required to pursue these partnerships.

Data indicate school principals have not previously been given the tools and

strategies needed to develop their partnership skills to engage in developing community-

school partnerships. Notably, data from this action research study suggest school

principals' perceptions of their own skills, self-efficacy and students' benefits from

partnerships increase after taking these workshops. If we want principals to begin to

engage in developing high quality partnerships, intentional efforts must be provided to

them so they can learn these skills.

Moreover, I believe this study has implications for practice beyond this research.

School principals of all experience levels can improve their skills and self-efficacy with

respect to developing community-school partnerships with practice and development. I believe every school leader, both incoming and seasoned, should be encouraged to take professional development training that includes similar components as the ones in this study. Additionally, I encourage school districts to allow principals to develop and maintain relationships with outside partners. In cases where the district office serves as the convener, there can be a misalignment between schools' needs and partners' ability to meet those needs.

Implications for Future Research

Results from this study suggest three areas of future research. The first area pertains to assessing the effectiveness of district-wide initiated partnerships as compared to school-initiated partnerships. During this study, a common idea emerged from principals' responses indicating they prefer partnerships to be created at the school campus level. Assessing how the formation of these partnerships play a role in the long-term outcome and cultivation of partnerships could help to establish further best practices for district and school leaders.

The second implication for future research is analyzing how principals' development of partnerships externally affects their self-efficacy, skill building, and internal management. We all recognize the stories of leaders being strong and effective in one setting and struggling in another. Future research could provide the profession with insights on commonalities or characteristics strong school leaders exhibit during implementation of partnerships and how they might carry these over into their work in the school setting. This seems like an area worthy of additional work.

The third and final implication for future research in this study involves viewing the partnership from the "community" perspective. Non-profits, businesses, organizations, community groups and more all have a reason why they seek out community-school partnerships. It would be important for academics to have a better understanding of why these partnerships are perceived as being beneficial from the "community" members' perspectives. Some companies may decide to partner for brand awareness, whereas others may partner for professional development reasons. The rationales behind committing to partnerships can be vast and unique. Notably, when school leaders understand how these partners think about opportunities, it will support principals' strategies as they consider and develop community-school partnerships in the future.

Personal Lessons Learned

I have spent the last 15 years in the field of education in some way or another. My unique experience ranges from teaching middle school special education more than a decade ago to serving in the education non-profit sector to working as an education policy maker. One thing that has remained consistent despite the changing context is the fact, I have never witnessed or heard of strong schools in Arizona that operate without some type of community-school partnerships. These partnerships range from employees who work at Intel who are serving as tutors teaching mathematics and science concepts to middle school students to non-profits picking students up after school and dropping them off at a local church for enrichment programs. This is why I am so passionate about utilizing resources in the community to form partnerships.

My experience as an action-researcher has had a considerable effect on me. The benefit action research provides is rich because action researchers are in close proximity to those who are involved and the effects of the work. This process shapes the way I think about research. In traditional research, there is a perception that you have to be multiple steps removed from a context to conduct research on it. By comparison, the action research approach, in my opinion, can be even more powerful and effective because the researcher has "skin in the game." Notably, in action research, the outcomes of the research, the lessons learned, the implications all matter more to the researcher because they are working in that context.

Through this experience I gained a love for historical research and the role it plays in everything we do today. In many cases, academic research is just like the judicial system or political system. By this I mean, current practice or policy is rooted in knowledge and decisions from the past. Present day events are important, but often precedent informs your thinking and direction. The research I reviewed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation shaped how I constructed my questions, my intervention, and even the interpretation of the results.

Academically, I gained deeper knowledge and understanding of the importance of mixed methods research. I also learned how the complementarity of the methods provides an opportunity for you to make an even stronger case for your results as you answer your research questions. Qualitative data plays a unique role in studies and gives greater insight than quantitative data ever could. For example, in this study, the interviews and journal entries allow me to go beyond the surface information provided by the

quantitative data. With that said, quantitative data has the ability to provide a more accurate depiction of what is measured without influence from those asking the question.

Conclusion

The debate on whether strong schools build strong communities or whether strong communities build strong schools is a false dichotomy. The reality is both are needed to afford a thriving context that provides an opportunity for students to be successful. Today, public school systems across the nation continue to seek additional assistance to provide the best opportunities for their students. Some of these opportunities are part of the current school system and readily available for leaders to leverage on a routine basis. Nevertheless, other opportunities are out of reach for many of these school leaders, so we thought.

The growth of community-school partnerships has the potential to transform our education system like we have never seen before. Many schools, particularly high schools, are creating curriculum and partnerships that provide opportunities for students to learn a trade, skill, or knowledge in school and immediately put it to use in the private sector once students graduate. These models, often called CTE or Career and Technical Education, produce some of the highest academic outcomes for students, *and* they also provide students with a skill they can use for a lifetime. Nevertheless, community-school partnerships do not have to be limited to these kinds of models.

Community-school partnerships should be as common as mathematics and science classes in our schools. District and school leaders must prioritize developing meaningful partnerships that will provide opportunities for our students and campuses to grow. Unfortunately, too many partnerships are not aligned with the needs of schools.

That is why the Development of the Partnership Protocol for Principals (DP^3) is needed now more than ever. This tool provides principals with the step-by-step process needed to develop a community-school partnership that will have a direct effect on campuses. The findings in the study suggest principals, regardless of experience levels, can learn a great deal from the protocol about developing community-school partnerships. I look forward to seeing the role it plays in building strong community-school partnerships in the future.

REFERENCES

Abrams, L. S., & Gibbs, J. T. (2000). Planning for school change: School community collaboration in a full-service elementary school. *Urban Education*, *35*(1), 79-103.

Alvarado, V. (1997). *Service-learning, an effective teaching strategy for Texas middle schools*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*,191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance*. Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. Free Press.

Bauch, P. A. (2001). School-community partnerships in rural schools: Leadership, renewal, and a sense of place. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *76*, 204-221.

Bernstein, J., Boushey, H., & Brocht, C. (2001). *Hardships in America: The real story of working familie*s. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from www.epi.org/publications/entry/books_hardships/

Blank, M. J., Jacobson, R., & Melaville, A. (2012). *Achieving results through community school partnerships: How district and community leaders are building effective, sustainable relationships.* Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://login.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1 14014 506?accountid=4485

Bruner, C. (1991). *Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services*. Education and Human Services Consortium.

Bryan, J. (2005). Fostering educational resilience and achievement in urban schools through school-family-community partnerships. *Professional School Counseling*, *8*, 219-227.

Bucy, H. (1990). *School-community-business partnerships. Building foundations for dropout prevention*. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.

Epstein, J. L., & Sheldon, S. B. (2002). Present and accounted for: Improving student attendance through family and community involvement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *95*, 308-318.

Eyler, C. (1997). A new institution: The emerging educational community in an effective professional development school. *Action in Teacher Education*, *19*(2), 55-62.

Ferguson, C. (2005). *Developing a collaborative team approach to support family and community connections with schools: What can school leaders do?* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Research Development Laboratory.

Gray, B. (1991). *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. Jossey-Bass.

Greene, J. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry.* John Wiley & Sons.

Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11*(3), 255-274. doi: 10.3102/01623737011003255

Halsted, A., & Schine, J. (1994). Service learning: The promise and the risk. *New England Journal of Public Policy*, *10*, 251-257.

Harkavy, I. (2005). University-assisted community school program of West Philadelphia: Democratic partnerships that make a difference. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *107*, 35-43.

Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hoff, D. L. (2002). School-business partnerships: It's the school's turn to raise the grade! *The School Community Journal*, *12*(2), 63-78.

Hogue, M. L. (2012). *A case study of perspectives on building school and community partnerships*. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/4076/

HyperRESEARCH 4.5.4. Computer Software, ResearchWare, Inc., 2022. <http://www.researchware.com/>

Johnson, C. H. (2007). *The role of social capital in creating sustainable partnerships*. ProQuest.

Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Maurer, T. J. (2001). Career-relevant learning and development, worker age, and beliefs about self-efficacy for development. *Journal of Management*, *27*,123-140.

Melaville, A. (1998). *Learning together: The developing field of school-community initiatives.* Mott Foundation.

Mickelson, T. (1999). International business machinations: A case study of corporate involvement in local educational reform. *Teachers College Record*, *100*, 476-512.

Nelson, J. L., Palonsky, S. B., & McCarthy, M. R. (2007). *Critical issues in education.* McGraw-Hill Inc.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership theory and practice.* Sage.

Redmonda, B. F. (2010). *Self-efficacy theory: Do I think that I can succeed in my work? Work Attitudes and Motivation.* The Pennsylvania State University: World Campus.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Sage.

Sanders, M. G., & Harvey, A. (2002). Beyond the school walls: A case study of principal leadership for school-community collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, *104*, 1345-1368.

Sanders, M. G. (2001). The role of ―community in comprehensive school, family, and community partnership programs. *The Elementary School Journal*, *102*(1), 19-34.

Sanders, M. G. (2003). Community involvement in schools: From concept to practice. *Education and Urban Society*, *35*, 161-180.

Sheldon, S. B. (2003). Linking school-family-community partnerships in urban elementary schools to student achievement on state tests. *The Urban Review*, *35*, 149-165.

Smith, M. L., & Glass, G. V. (1987). *Research and evaluation in education and the social sciences.* Prentice-Hall.

Staples, D., Hulland, J., & Higgins, C. (1998). A self-efficacy theory explanation for the management of remote workers in virtual organizations. *Journal of Computer-Meditated Communication*, *3*(4).

Steiger, J. B. (2007). *Characteristics of successful school-community partnerships.* Dissertation Abstracts International.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.

The Coalition for Community Schools. (2007). Community schools: Partnerships for excellence. Democracy & Education, 16(4), 75-82.

Wang, M. C., & Boyd, W. L. (2000). *Improving results for children and families: Linking collaborative services with school reform efforts*. Information Age Publishing Inc.

APPENDIX A

REFLECTIVE JOURNAL PROMPTS

Context:
- Each participant will keep their own written journal.
- After completing each stage of the protocol each principal will answer the questions below in a written journal.
- The participant is required to record and store their own journal.

Reflective Journal Questions:

1. Describe what actions you performed during this stage of the protocol.

2. What level of support did this stage of the protocol cause you to seek? Who supported you? Describe what they did in detail.

3. Were you successful in completing this step? To what extent? Why or why not?

4. Going back through this step again, what would you change or do differently?

APPENDIX B

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Context
- The researcher will interview three elementary school principals who participated in the Development of the Partnerships Protocol for Principals.
- These principals will be interviewed before the intervention and after the intervention.

Getting Started
- Interviewer will greet the interviewee
- Interviewer will provide an overview of the topic and will state the approach for the interview.
- Interviewer will ask if there are any objections to the interview being recorded for accuracy and transcription purposes.
- Interview will assure interviewee of confidentiality.
- Ask interviewee if they have any questions before starting.

Interview Questions:

1. Tell me about your thoughts with regard to building and managing community-school partnerships.

2. How would you describe an effective community-school partnership?

3. From your perspective, what are the key elements to building an effective community-school partnership?

4. Describe your approach to building such partnerships.

5. From your perspective, how proficient are you at building and managing effective community-school partnerships?

6. With respect to community-school partnerships, how confident are you in your abilities to develop them? ……………to manage them?

7. What is the greatest challenge you face leading a community-school partnership? What is the greatest opportunity in leading a community-school partnership?

8. How are community-school partnerships important to the success of

   students?

9. What role do community-school partnerships play in changing school

   culture?

Closing
- End interview and state appreciation for the interviewee's time. Explain any next steps and provide information how they can contact the interviewer should they have any further comments or questions.

APPENDIX C

POST-INTERVENTION SURVEY

Principal Community-School Partnership Survey (Post-Intervention)

Please answer the following questions. To allow us to match your answers for the two types of assessment, please create a unique identifier known only to you. Use the first three letters of your mother's first name and the last four digits of your phone number. For example, if your mother's first name was Sarah and your phone number was (602) 543-7654. The code would be Sar7654.

* Required

1. My code is _____(like Sar7654, above) *

   _____

Principal Experience Questions

2. In which school district/charter do you work? *

   _____

3. How many years have you been a principal? *

   _____

4. How many years have you been at this school? *

   _____

5. How many community school partnerships have you managed or currently worked with? *

   _____

6. How many community school partnerships did you have prior to your participation in the project? *

   _____

Post-Intervention Assessment

7. I possess the skills to create school-community partnerships. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ( ) Strongly agree

   ( ) Agree

   ( ) Strongly likely agree

   ( ) Strongly likely disagree

   ( ) Disagree

   ( ) Strongly disagree

8. I have the tools to build partnerships with community partners. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ( ) Strongly agree

   ( ) Agree

   ( ) Strongly likely agree

   ( ) Strongly likely disagree

   ( ) Disagree

   ( ) Strongly disagree

9. I have strategies that are useful in building school-community partnerships. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ( ) Strongly agree

   ( ) Agree

   ( ) Strongly likely agree

   ( ) Strongly likely disagree

   ( ) Disagree

   ( ) Strongly disagree

10. I have the abilities to work with community partners. *

    Mark only one oval.

    ( ) Strongly agree

    ( ) Agree

    ( ) Strongly likely agree

    ( ) Strongly likely disagree

    ( ) Disagree

    ( ) Strongly disagree

11. I have the abilities to establish school-community partnerships. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ◯ Strongly agree
   ◯ Agree
   ◯ Strongly likely agree
   ◯ Strongly likely disagree
   ◯ Disagree
   ◯ Strongly disagree

12. I am confident I can use my abilities to develop school-community partnerships. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ◯ Strongly agree
   ◯ Agree
   ◯ Strongly likely agree
   ◯ Strongly likely disagree
   ◯ Disagree
   ◯ Strongly disagree

13. I am certain I can use my skills to develop partnerships with community organizations. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ◯ Strongly agree
   ◯ Agree
   ◯ Strongly likely agree
   ◯ Strongly likely disagree
   ◯ Disagree
   ◯ Strongly disagree

14. I am convinced I can develop school-community partnerships. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ◯ Strongly agree
   ◯ Agree
   ◯ Strongly likely agree
   ◯ Strongly likely disagree
   ◯ Disagree
   ◯ Strongly disagree

15. When it comes to establishing partnerships with the community, I am self-assured that I can do so. *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Strongly agree
- ( ) Agree
- ( ) Strongly likely agree
- ( ) Strongly likely disagree
- ( ) Disagree
- ( ) Strongly disagree

16. I am certain I can work with community partners to move my school forward. *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Strongly agree
- ( ) Agree
- ( ) Strongly likely agree
- ( ) Strongly likely disagree
- ( ) Disagree
- ( ) Strongly disagree

APPENDIX D

RETROSPECTIVE, PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY

Principal Community-School Partnership Survey (Pre-Survey)

Please answer the following questions. To allow us to match your answers for the two types of assessment, please create a unique identifier known only to you. Use the first three letters of your mother's first name and the last four digits of your phone number. For example, if your mother's first name was Sarah and your phone number was (602) 543-7654. The code would be Sar7654.

* Required

1. My code is _____(like Sar7654, above) *

    _____

Retrospective, Pre-Intervention Assessment

2. Prior to participating in the project, I possessed the skills to create school-community partnerships. *

    Mark only one oval.

    ◯ Strongly agree

    ◯ Agree

    ◯ Strongly likely agree

    ◯ Strongly likely disagree

    ◯ Disagree

    ◯ Strongly disagree

3. Prior to participating in the project, I had the tools to build partnerships with community partners. *

    Mark only one oval.

    ◯ Strongly agree

    ◯ Agree

    ◯ Strongly likely agree

    ◯ Strongly likely disagree

    ◯ Disagree

    ◯ Strongly disagree

4. Prior to participating in the project, I had strategies that were useful in building school-community partnerships. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ( ) Strongly agree

   ( ) Agree

   ( ) Strongly likely agree

   ( ) Strongly likely disagree

   ( ) Disagree

   ( ) Strongly disagree

5. Prior to participating in the project, I had the abilities to work with community partners. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ( ) Strongly agree

   ( ) Agree

   ( ) Strongly likely agree

   ( ) Strongly likely disagree

   ( ) Disagree

   ( ) Strongly disagree

6. Prior to participating in the project, I had the ability to create effective school-community partnerships. *

   Mark only one oval.

   ( ) Strongly agree

   ( ) Agree

   ( ) Strongly likely agree

   ( ) Strongly likely disagree

   ( ) Disagree

   ( ) Strongly disagree

7. Prior to participating in the project, I was confident I could use my abilities to develop school-community partnerships.   *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Strongly agree
- ( ) Agree
- ( ) Strongly likely agree
- ( ) Strongly likely disagree
- ( ) Disagree
- ( ) Strongly disagree

8. Prior to participating in the project, I was certain I could use my skills to develop partnerships with community   * organizations.

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Strongly agree
- ( ) Agree
- ( ) Strongly likely agree
- ( ) Strongly likely disagree
- ( ) Disagree
- ( ) Strongly disagree

9. Prior to participating in the project, I was convinced I could develop school-community partnerships.   *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Strongly agree
- ( ) Agree
- ( ) Strongly likely agree
- ( ) Strongly likely disagree
- ( ) Disagree
- ( ) Strongly disagree

10. Prior to participating in the project, when it came to establishing partnerships with the community, I was self-assured that I could do so. *

Mark only one oval.

- ⬭ Strongly agree
- ⬭ Agree
- ⬭ Strongly likely agree
- ⬭ Strongly likely disagree
- ⬭ Disagree
- ⬭ Strongly disagree

11. Prior to participating in the project, I was certain I could work with community partners to move my school forward. *

Mark only one oval.

- ⬭ Strongly agree
- ⬭ Agree
- ⬭ Strongly likely agree
- ⬭ Strongly likely disagree
- ⬭ Disagree
- ⬭ Strongly disagree

APPENDIX E

IRB-APPROVED STUDY DOCUMENTS

EXEMPTION GRANTED

Ray Buss
Division of Educational Leadership and Innovation - West
602/543-6343
RAY.BUSS@asu.edu

Dear Ray Buss:

On 3/11/2015 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Development of the Partnership Protocol for Principals (DP3)
Investigator:	Ray Buss
IRB ID:	STUDY00002002
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Journal Prompts, Interview Items, Surveys, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • Reggie Bolding HRP-503a - PROTOCOLSOCIAL BEHAVIORAL 121014 TRACK CHANGES updated 021715 Track Changes updated 022415.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • Recruitment and Consent Form, Category: Consent Form;

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal Regulations 45CFR46 (2) Tests, surveys, interviews, or observation on 3/11/2015.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc:
  Reginald Bolding Jr