Framework for Assessing School-Community Partnerships

***Note: “Partners” refers to a school and a community partner***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Principles</th>
<th>Evidence of Strong Implementation</th>
<th>Evidence of Weak Implementation</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Common Purpose**                                                             | • Community partner understands school’s vision for increasing learning time, including its school-wide instructional focus  
• School understands the expertise/strengths of community partner  
• The partnership supports a set of desired outcomes for students which is articulated, documented, and shared between partners  
• Partners have a system in place to determine whether the desired outcomes have been met | • Partners are unclear on each other’s goals and strengths  
• Partners do not share a set of common goals for students – each institution has its own agenda  
• Desired outcomes are not established at the outset, or are established but never revisited to assess and adjust | Weak - Strong |
| **Complementary Content**                                                      | • Community partner meets an unmet need at the school, providing a service, program, or resource that the school can’t provide  
• Programming aligns with the state curriculum standards and school-wide achievement goals | • Programs and services are duplicated by multiple partners and/or school  
• Programming is not aligned with the standards or school-wide achievement goals | Weak - Strong |
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<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>There is clear, consistent communication between partners on two levels: between leader of the school and the leader of the community partner, and between the teachers and staff that work directly with students.</td>
<td>• Expectations are clearly communicated in the planning and implementation phases of the partnership, including the roles and responsibilities of each partner • There are systems in place for teachers and community partner staff to communicate regularly around curriculum, instruction, assessment and student needs • The leadership of the school and community partner meet and communicate regularly to monitor the partnership</td>
<td>• Expectations, roles, and responsibilities are not articulated at the outset of the partnership or revisited as it develops • There are no formal systems in place for communication among teachers and staff or the leadership of the school and community partner organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility and Adaptation</strong></td>
<td>Both partners are flexible in adapting existing programming to create a customized partnership that fits the unique context of increased learning time.</td>
<td>• Partners adapt existing or create new programming to meet the needs and goals of students • The school supports the community partner’s needs around enrollment, space, scheduling, orientation to school policies, PD, etc</td>
<td>• Programming provided by community partner is inserted into the school day without being customized to meet the needs of students • School does not provide the support necessary to embed community partner’s programming into school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Continuous Improvement and Sustainability | The partnership is a multi-year endeavor, with responsibilities for relationship-building, fundraising, and continuous improvement shared by both partners | **•** Partners provide opportunities for teachers and community partner staff to build collegial relationships  
**•** Financial sustainability planning is on-going and collaborative  
**•** Systems are established to ensure continuation of the partnership if there is a change in leadership  
**•** There is a multi-year vision of how the community partner will be integrated in the school | **•** There are little or no opportunities for teachers and partner staff to build relationships  
**•** Sustainability planning is limited or not shared between partners  
**•** The partnership is reliant on individual, rather than institution relationships  
**•** Little strategic thought is put into whether a partnership should continue or end | **Weak** 🧵 **Strong** 🧵 |

**Notes:**