


Best Starts for Kids: Exploring Equitable School Partnerships

Year 1 Final Report | January 15, 2020



Best Starts for
KIDS



This work was made possible by the King County Best Starts for Kids levy



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	6
Goals & Objectives	18
Results	20
Evaluation Question 1	20
Evaluation Question 2	33
Evaluation Question 3	42
A Mini Case Study: A Peek at An Equitable School Partnership	50
Discussion and Conclusions	58
Overview of Results	58
Emerging Implications for Practice	61
Limitations	65
Methods	66
Background	66
Evaluation Design	67
Data Collection	72
Data Analysis	74
Year 2 of the School Partnerships Evaluation	80
References	82
Appendices	84

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Best Starts for Kids

This work is made possible by the Best Starts for Kids levy. Best Starts for Kids builds on the strengths of families and communities so that babies are born healthy, children thrive and establish a strong foundation for life, and young people grow into happy, healthy adults. For more information on the Best Starts for Kids levy, go to www.kingcounty.gov/beststarts



Report Authors

Members of the Puget Sound Education Service District (PSED) Strategy, Evaluation, and Learning team and two independent consultants conducted this evaluation and authored this report. Team members and their roles on this project are:

- Isabel Callaway, Evaluator (icallaway@psed.org)
- Nathalie Jones, Project Manager (njones@psed.org)
- Hilary Loeb, Co-Principal Investigator (hloeb@psed.org)
- Mona Mazraani, Evaluator (mmazraani@psed.org)
- Cassandra O'Francia, Project Support (cofrancia@psed.org)
- Alessandra Pollock, Evaluator (alessandra.pollock@gmail.com)
- Pamela Raya-Carlton, Senior Evaluator (praya-carlton@psed.org)
- Sarita Siqueiros Thornburg, Co-Principal Investigator (sthornburg@psed.org)

Evaluation Advisors

We greatly appreciate the commitment and thoughtfulness of BSK School Partnerships Evaluation Advisors who helped guide this work through all phases of the evaluation. Their guidance has supported an evaluation that is relevant and helpful to those doing partnership work in schools. Evaluation Advisors include:

- Patricia Baird, Unleash the Brilliance
- Ida Batiste, Seattle Public Schools
- Don Cameron, Seattle CARES Mentoring Movement
- Lian Caspi, Dispute Resolution Center of King County
- Jackie DeLaCruz, Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association (consultant)
- Brian Gregg, Tukwila School District
- Sherryl Grey, International Community Health Services
- Katherine Gudgel, HealthPoint
- Diana Hafzalla, Center for Human Services
- James Hong, Vietnamese Friendship Association (past)
- Brandon Kennedy, Unleash the Brilliance
- Sharon Moon, Dispute Resolution Center of King County
- Haya Muñoz, STEMPaths (past) and Filipino Community of Seattle (current)
- Lee Mozena, Urban Native Education Alliance (consultant)
- Whitney Nelson, YMCA of Greater Seattle
- Khyree Smith, Austin Foundation
- Samantha Wilson, YMCA of Greater Seattle

We also appreciate the thoughtful guidance from our colleagues at Puget Sound Educational Service District:

- Matthew Gulbranson, Director of Community Partnerships
- Alicia Alcocer, Strategy, Evaluation and Learning Intern
- Shadia Amir, Strategy, Evaluation and Learning Intern (past)
- Sonnnhi Duong, Strategy, Evaluation and Learning Intern
- Roscella Fuertes, Strategy, Evaluation and Learning Intern

Evaluation Participants

We appreciate the staff from BSK and dozens of awardee and partner organizations who participated in interviews about the BSK-supported work in their organizations and schools. Awardee and partner organization participants are:

- Adam Ladage, Auburn School District
- Rhonda Larson, Auburn School District
- Khyree Smith, Austin Foundation
- Judy Buckmaster, Bellevue School District
- Shomari Jones, Bellevue School District
- Melissa Slater, Bellevue School District
- Karen DeGroot, Cascade Middle School
- Jamie Herres, Cascade Middle School
- David Bestock, Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association
- Anita Hale, Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association
- Lian Caspi, Dispute Resolution Center of King County
- Sharon Moon, Dispute Resolution Center of King County
- Kendrick Glover, Glover Empowerment Mentoring
- Theresa Hardy, Inspirational Workshops
- Sherryl Grey, International Community Health Services
- Rosaly Rivero Gonzalez, International Community Health Services
- Tess Sorbo, International Community Health Services
- Kendall Watanabe, International Community Health Services
- Randy Heath, Kent School District
- Cheri Simpson, Kent School District
- Shannon Nash, Meeker Middle School
- Angela Grutko, Meeker Middle School
- Patricia Owliaei, Meeker Middle School
- Vaudrey Brown, Mill Creek Middle School
- Scott Haines, Mill Creek Middle School
- Laura Escalona-Flores, Neighborcare
- LaTasha Jackson-Rodriguez, Restore Assemble Produce
- Reverend Jimmy James, Restore Assemble Produce
- Don Cameron, Seattle CARES Mentoring Movement
- Hazel Cameron, Seattle CARES Mentoring Movement

- Brian Gregg, Showalter Middle School
- Nichelle Page, Tukwila School District
- Terrell Dorsey, Unleash the Brilliance
- Matt Pena, Unleash the Brilliance
- Leighla Webb, Upower
- Tamthy Le, Vietnamese Friendship Association
- Michael Passian, Walk Away City Collaborative

King County and Best Starts for Kids Staff

We appreciate the King County and Best Starts for Kids staff who have provided helpful background and introductions to awardees, offered feedback on the evaluation, and participated in interviews, particularly:

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| • Ninona Boujrada | • Kristin Moore |
| • Dan Brandes | • Shukri Olow |
| • Margaret Cary | • Sara Rigel |
| • David Gistarb | • Chan Saelee |
| • Maria Guizar | • Margaret Soukup |
| • Robin Haguewood | • Anastasia Tschida |
| • Omana Imani | • Nicole Turcheti |
| • Avreayl Jacobson | • Kimberly Walker |
| • Whitney Johnson | • Sarah Wilhelm |
| • Erin MacDougall | • Eva Wong |
| • Yolanda McGhee | • Julia Yen |
| • Megan McJennett | • Samantha Yeun |

Other BSK School Partnership Evaluators

We appreciate the collaboration with those who are conducting other evaluation and measurement activities for BSK School Partnerships to support the alignment of our work. This includes:

- Public Profit Out-of-School Time (OST) Evaluation Team
- Seattle Children's Research Institute Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral To Services (SBIRT) Team
- Best Starts for Kids Data and Evaluation Team for providing data from other evaluations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



King County's Best Starts for Kids (BSK) has invested in School Partnership (SP) strategies so that "School environments are safe, supportive, respectful and engaging environments for young people, staff and families. Race, ethnicity or cultural identity does not impact access to these environments."

Equitable partnerships are critical to the success of these strategies. This report is a snapshot **of how partnerships are forming, the changes partnerships seek to make, and what schools, districts, community-based organizations (CBOs), and King County staff can do to support their continued growth.** The report is based on evaluation activities conducted during the 2018-19 academic year. This is Year 1 of a three-year evaluation period from August 2018 to December 2021. We are grateful to the organizations and schools engaged in partnerships, including BSK SP Evaluation Advisors, Participants, King County and Best Starts for Kids staff, and other BSK School Partnerships evaluators that have shaped all parts of the Year 1 evaluation.

Thanks to the work of those who came before us, like the Youth Development Executives of King County¹ and other partners, we have some understanding of what equitable partnerships look like, and how they support greater change than would be possible with one organization.

We know that Leadership and Coordination support partnerships to have a Shared Vision; Aligned, Responsive Implementation; and Mutual or Shared Accountability for Success. We believe that partnerships across multiple BSK strategy areas (i.e., HSE, OST, SBHC, SBIRT, TIRP, YD) in a school achieve synergy (the idea that "the whole is

greater than the sum of its parts"). In equitable partnerships, synergy contributes to changes in practices, policies, systems, environments, and student well-being and outcomes. Exhibit A on the next page shows how these partnership pieces fit together in support of improved academic and health outcomes for students.



BSK School Partnerships strategy areas:


1. Out-of-School Time (OST)
2. School-Based Health Centers (SBHC)
3. Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral To Services (SBIRT)
4. Trauma-Informed and Restorative Practices (TIRP)

This study also includes investments from the following two strategy areas:

1. Healthy and Safe Environments (HSE)
2. Youth Development (YD)

¹ Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit>

EXHIBIT A. EQUITABLE PARTNERSHIPS, SYNERGY, AND PPSE CHANGES AND STUDENT WELL-BEING AND OUTCOMES



EVALUATION RESULTS

There are different types of partnerships developing within and across BSK strategies.



This evaluation looked at partnerships in nine schools with multiple BSK strategy investments. These schools are in five districts (Auburn, Bellevue, Kent, Seattle and Tukwila). Through interviews and other methods² we learned that partnerships are in different stages of development.


A number of awardees and partners were just beginning program implementation and partnership development when the Year 1 evaluation data collection took place.

While we believe that synergy is achieved when organizations from multiple strategies work together, we also wanted to understand how partnership was developing within strategies. For example, this could be a TIRP awardee building a partnership with school administration, or two Youth Development awardees in one school developing a partnership with each other.

To help with this, we adapted the partnership model from Youth Development Executives of King County (YDEKC) School and Community Partnership Toolkit. YDEKC uses the categories Cooperative, Collaborative, and Integrated. Exhibit B shows BSK School Partnership examples in each category along the continuum.

² (1) Awardee and partner interviews (n=29); (2) Secondary data from awardees including awardee narrative reports and logic models; strategy-level logic models; Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral To Services (SBIRT) Interventionist Survey responses; and Healthy and Safe Environments (HSE) quarterly reports; (3) Secondary data from BSK/King County including Requests for Proposals (RFPs), Scope of Work templates, contract monitoring processes, convening agendas, and narrative report guidance (4) BSK and King County Staff Interviews (n=12)

EXHIBIT B: PARTNERSHIP TYPE DEFINITIONS AND PARTNERSHIP EXAMPLES VISUAL




* Youth Development Executives of King County School and Community Partnership Toolkit. <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/> Accessed October 1, 2019

Using the adapted YDEKC model, we assessed 31 total partnerships, of which we could categorize 26. The 31 partnerships include existing and potential within- and cross-strategy partnerships in a school. For example, a school with a TIRP and SBIRT award from BSK would have three total partnerships that are assessed: 1) a TIRP partnership, 2) an SBIRT partnership, and 3) a TIRP-SBIRT partnership. The diagram below shows the categorizations. We found these partnerships to be fairly well distributed across each distinct partnership category. **There are 10 Cooperative partnerships, seven Collaborative partnerships, and nine Integrated partnerships.**

Overall, there are numerous Collaborative and Integrated partnerships within individual strategies (no outline). Exhibit C also shows that there are two Integrated cross-strategy partnerships (thick outline) of the five cross-strategy partnerships that could be assessed. Though there is limited evidence of the cross-strategy Integrated (or synergistic) partnerships – two of nine cross-strategy partnerships – there is expressed interest in engaging and collaborating across strategies in schools where this is not yet happening. In Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation, we will continue to examine how within and cross- strategy partnerships are developing over time.



EXHIBIT C: PARTNERSHIP TYPE CONTINUUM AND PARTNERSHIP DISTRIBUTION VISUAL



A number of factors support equitable partnerships in schools.

In equitable partnerships, people that do not hold institutional power feel included and valued, have buy-in, and see themselves in the communication and decision-making processes. Those who are affected by decisions are included in and influence decision-making. Attention to **building relationships and trust** is a critical component of equitable partnerships and lays a foundation from which partnerships can build and deepen. BSK SP Evaluation Advisors emphasized that equitable partnerships are inclusive partnerships. Equitable partnerships are those that attend to issues of equity in:

1. How they function (e.g., power, decision-making, and relationship- and trust-building) as well as in
2. The changes in practices, policies, systems, school environments, and student well-being that are occurring, and to whose benefit.

In our interviews and other data collection efforts we saw manifestations of equitable partnerships in some schools. To understand how equitable school partnerships forged in service of students work, we relied on both the YDEKC Toolkit and the Authentic Community School Partnerships Framework.³ In many cases, there is overlap in the attributes of Integrated partnerships (from the Cooperative, Collaborative, and Integrated continuum) and equitable partnerships, as described below.

We looked for evidence of **equitable leadership**, including the following factors:

- Those who are part of a partnership named and described leaders beyond large institutional stakeholders (e.g., schools, districts, King County) to include CBOs, students, and/or families

- Similarly, those partners and individuals who did not hold institutional power felt included and valued in the partnership, had buy-in, and saw themselves in the communication and decision-making processes
- People who were affected by decisions were included in partnerships and influenced decision-making

We also looked for evidence of **equity-focused coordination** within partnerships, including:

- The school and partners were working toward shared goals and people understood how working together would improve performance
- Partners engaged in creating norms, protocols, and structures in inclusive ways that defined and drove decisions and communication
- Roles and responsibilities were clearly defined and agreed upon among partner organizations and within the context of the partnership's work

The Leadership and Coordination of equitable partnerships also contributed to partnerships' **Shared Vision; Aligned, Responsive Implementation; and Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success.** **In Integrated partnerships**, we observed the connection between equity-focused Leadership and Coordination and partnership characteristics in the following ways:

- **Shared Vision:** There was a clear sense of what the partnership's common purpose is, what and how contributions from partners within or across strategies would be needed or used, and how input was gathered from students, families, and staff.

³ Gulbranson, M. (2017). Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework. In preparation.

- **Aligned, Responsive Implementation:** Partners reported being very much part of, on the same page with, embedded, integrated into, or supported by the work of other partners within or across strategies.
- **Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success:** While still a mostly within-strategy endeavor, we saw varying degrees of effort for collecting, using, and sharing information with partners; and to a more limited extent, with groups such as staff, students, and parents. Partners noted constraints on sharing student data and information given confidentiality policies.

While organizations and individuals can do a lot to nurture their partnership, there are contextual factors that affect equitable partnerships in schools. Common factors that we heard from BSK awardees and partners included:

- **Leadership and staff changes in schools, districts, CBOs, and BSK:** Turnover is a challenge given the importance of relationships and trust to equitable partnerships. For the most part, interview respondents referenced changes that have required either a pause or a start-over. In some cases, such as when a position is newly created, changes in personnel can be helpful.

- **Power dynamics:** Current and longstanding power dynamics also affect partnerships. This includes dynamics within schools, between administration and teachers, as well as mistrust of schools in the broader community. School-wide shifts in leadership and decision-making, including expanding efforts to increase parent engagement and including students in leadership roles, can create supportive conditions for equitable partnerships.
- **Student support capacity:** Existing capacity to provide services to students is another important contextual factor. This includes the reality of identifying more students in need of services than existing providers/partners can support. On the other hand, the growing need is also prompting some partnerships to expand to include additional providers (e.g., for mental health services).
- **Resources:** Resources, including the people, space and funding to support partnerships, affects how partnerships develop. Shared spaces, resources, existing meetings, and staff were considered helpful to coordination and communication among partnerships. There are situations where there is not sufficient space to house partners in schools.



The Year 1 evaluation lays a foundation to understand partnership development and changes in schools over time.

In Year 1 we built a foundation for Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation. We developed our conceptual model (the Equitable Partnerships model) and learned from awardees and partners about how equitable partnerships are developing.

BSK School Partnerships are developing in service of changes to practice, policies, systems, environments, and student well-being in schools. We conducted an initial assessment of the changes partnerships want to make. This will allow us to understand changes over time in Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation.

Common **practice, policy, and system changes** that partnerships seek to affect include:

- **Improving coordination of supports**, including connecting partnerships' services and supports to existing school and district structures like multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS), and screening students to connect them to relevant supports
- **Expanding access to services and activities**, which includes demonstrating the needs of priority groups of students (e.g., homeless, English language learners, Brown and Black students), improving access to services for underserved students, and shifting policies for mental health support
- **Supporting student leadership and engagement in partnerships**, focusing on interrupting individual, institutional, and structural racism in the education system. This includes supporting students as "credible messengers" with their peers, engaging students to serve in leadership and decision-making roles, and providing student-led professional development for staff

- **Engaging families**, which includes involving families as members and leaders of partnerships, engaging them in the rollout and implementation of programs, and conducting home visits. This focus is more common within Collaborative and Integrated partnerships than Cooperative partnerships
- **Shifting staff practices**, including via professional development on topics of racial equity and racial trauma
- **Transforming discipline practices**, including addressing disproportionate impacts of discipline on students of color, shifting to restorative approaches to discipline, and providing alternatives to in-school suspension, is also a focus of almost half of the partnerships

In terms of improving **school environments**, partnerships are working to 1) improve school climate including students feeling connected and feeling safe at school, 2) support positive relationships and interactions, 3) reduce suspensions and expulsions, 4) improve attendance.

Finally, partnerships are focused on improving **student well-being outcomes**, including students' engagement in school (including school connectedness, regular attendance, decreased disciplinary issues); mental, socio-emotional, and physical health; academic and career success; healthy relationships; healthy sense of self; improving support systems for youth; and decreasing substance use.

From this initial assessment, we will seek to understand changes over time in Years 2 and 3 and how equitable partnerships relate to these changes. In particular, we expect to explore how integrated, cross-strategy partnerships (i.e., synergy) contribute to lasting change in schools.

BSK, schools, districts, and CBOs have important roles to play in supporting equitable school partnerships.

Best Starts for Kids (BSK) and King County

Interviewees consistently noted that equitable school partnership work can be challenging. BSK awardees and their partners look to the BSK initiative and King County staff for technical assistance on a range of topics, particularly for partnership development and implementation.

Throughout the Year 1 evaluation, we heard an overwhelming appreciation for BSK's equitable school partnership strategies. This extended to BSK granting practices that increase access to resources for student-centered work for organizations both traditionally and not traditionally engaged with local government, support for whole child approaches, and help to nurture partnership between schools and CBOs. In addition, BSK awardees overwhelmingly report positive relationships with BSK staff and appreciation for the responsive and comprehensive support they receive from the people connected to King County's BSK initiative.

Each strategy's requirements for awardee applications as well as strategy supports for awardees and partners were responsive to the type of programming in the strategy, as well as the size and experience of a prototypical awardee. For example, the TIRP strategy required CBOs to attend regularly scheduled school meetings, in order to encourage partnership development between those awardees and the schools in which they were working. For SBHC applicants, proposals were required to include a description of the organizations experience working collaboratively with community.

There are several steps BSK can take to support equitable partnerships:

BSK can **account for the time it takes** to develop partnerships and to create lasting change, in the following ways:

- As BSK seeks to affect changes in practice, policy, systems, environments, and ultimately student outcomes, **consider the time this work requires** in how they structure their support for school partnerships.
- Continue to provide **flexible, long-term and multi-year funding** to support ongoing relationships.
- Offer some **orientation for new school leaders** (first provided for OST awardees and partners during Spring 2019) which can mitigate the impact of staff turnover among partnership leaders.
- Continue to **devote time** to building relationships and connection within the BSK School Partnership team and to support each other working across Departments and Divisions in King County government.

BSK can also support **cross-strategy partnerships** by increasing alignment across strategies internally, in the following ways:

- Increase strategy alignment for **grant materials**, from strategy descriptions to logic models to program evaluation processes.
- Standardize **partnership criteria** and contract language across strategies.
- Align **BSK processes** as well as key messages, for example, continue to support shared site visits.
- Increase and improve **communication** about BSK grants, partners, and staff; consider how to support knowledge of resources and referrals across strategies and within regions.

Schools, districts, and CBOs

Implications for schools, districts, and CBOs will depend on the context and partnerships of each organization, its leadership and staff. As described above, the inclusion and deep, authentic engagement of CBOs, students, and families are central to equitable and integrated partnerships. Partnerships are ultimately about making a difference in the lives of students. There are several ways that schools, districts, and CBOs can increase or deepen student engagement, including:

- Include students in school-based partnerships. **Student voices** help shift beliefs and ensure that the experiences of students are considered. Continuous efforts to invite students to the table are critical.
- Set up **structures to enable shared responsibility, including among students**, to keep the partnership going.

Schools, districts, and CBOs can also develop or strengthen structures to support equitable partnerships, including:

- **Adopt approaches to manage change**, including 1) building redundancy as one way to help ameliorate the impact of turnover; and 2) capturing information that can be archived in places with high turnover. This will help institutionalize knowledge which can help prevent burdening organizations with less resources.
- **Develop coordination structures**, including those that 1) alleviate burden on the people doing the work and sustain the partnership over time; and 2) support data access and data use, such as meetings where partners can review data, understand progress, and plan next steps.
- **Connect partnership work to lasting changes in practices, policies, systems, and environments.** This includes how different partnerships can align with or intentionally complement one another in the changes they seek, strengthen family engagement, support staff growth, and connect with state- and regional-efforts for change.

Limitations & Strengths

We are confident in the results of our evaluation because we built on a strong existing evidence base; used high-quality methods; gathered extensive information from all awardees in the sample; and compared results across multiple sources of data to get a full picture of partnerships. There are some factors to consider in reviewing the report:

- Our sample included nine of 19 schools with multiple investments. With this sample, we were able to go deeper through interviews in fewer schools rather than broadly across all 19 schools through a survey or other methods. We were able to assess 31 partnerships.
- The perspectives of multiple stakeholders were included in this evaluation, through data collection and through the leadership of the BSK SP Evaluation Advisors. The Year 1 evaluation does not include the perspectives of students and families who are impacted by BSK investments. Seattle Public Schools staff, and secondary data from BSK investments made to Seattle Public Schools are not included but will be included in Year 2, as a partnership agreement has been established between BSK and the district.
- Evaluation findings may be limited by the timing of interviews in mid- to late spring, which coincides with the busiest period of the school year. Data collection at this time of year also allowed the partnerships to have the fall and winter to develop. In certain cases, we were not able to interview key informants who could give us a holistic picture of school partnerships. We plan to include these individuals in Year 2 and 3 data collection.
- The evaluation provides an assessment of partnerships at a specific moment in time during their implementation. Partnerships would likely look different if done before or after our study period due to their dynamic nature, and to the early stage of implementation of a number of BSK strategies in the 2018-19 academic year.

In Years 2 and 3, this evaluation will follow how partnerships continue to develop and how they are making a difference in schools for kids.

In Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation, we will continue the focus on our three evaluation questions:

1. What do **equitable school partnerships look like**, and what are the **factors that support** them?
2. What is the **relationship between equitable partnerships and school-wide changes** in practices, policies, systems, environments, and student well-being?
3. How do **King County processes and systems** support equitable partnerships?



We will:

- Continue to go deeper into a sample of schools with multiple investments
- Build our collective understanding about the nature of stability and change in partnerships that remain in the same category (e.g., Cooperative, Collaborative) and those that deepen, and what factors contribute to stability or change. Following partnerships over time will help us address the limitations of a point-in-time “snapshot” of dynamic partnerships taken during the busy spring from the Year 1 evaluation.
- Explore where and how changes in practice, policy, system, environment, and student outcomes are happening and how the changes at these different levels fit together and affect one another.
- Broaden the perspectives included in this evaluation (students, building leaders, and school/district staff, particularly in Seattle schools). Where relevant, we will also seek to include families in Year 3.
- Continue to explore the relationship between the number and types of BSK strategy investments and alignment across practice, policy, and system changes that awardees seek to impact.

This Executive Summary is a shortened version of the full Year 1 Evaluation Report. For information about the evaluation, please contact Sarita Siqueiros Thornburg (sthornburg@psed.org). You can find more information about PSED’s Strategy, Evaluation and Learning team at: <https://strategy.psed.org/>. For more information about Best Starts for Kids visit <https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/community-human-services/initiatives/best-starts-for-kids.aspx>

GOALS & OBJECTIVES



Best Starts for Kids School Partnerships vision is that, “School environments are safe, supportive, respectful and engaging environments for young people, staff and families. Race, ethnicity or cultural identity does not impact access to these environments.” Best Starts for Kids (BSK) has engaged the Strategy, Evaluation and Learning Team from Puget Sound Educational Service District (PSESD) to conduct an evaluation from August 2018-December 2021.

The goal of this evaluation is to describe characteristics of equitable partnerships in schools with multiple Best Starts for Kids (BSK) School Partnerships (SP) investments, and the conditions that support them, including King County processes and systems. The evaluation also explores the relationship between equitable partnerships and school-wide changes in practices, policies, systems, school environments, and key student outcomes. Specifically, the evaluation addresses three questions in the 2018-19 through 2020-21 academic years:

1. What do equitable school partnerships look like, and what are the factors that support them?
2. What is the relationship between equitable partnerships and school-wide changes in practices, policies, systems, environments (PPSE), and student well-being?
3. How do King County processes and systems support equitable partnerships?

Equity is a core value of the BSK initiative. Equitable partnerships are those that attend to issues of equity in 1) how they function (e.g. power, decision-making, and relationship- and trust-building) as well as in 2) what changes in practices, policies, systems, school environments, and student well-being are occurring, and to whose benefit. In equitable partnerships, partners and stakeholders that do not hold institutional power feel included and valued, have buy-in, and see themselves in the communication and decision-making processes. People who are affected by decisions are included in and influence

decision-making. How partners “come to the table” (e.g., relationship-focused, flexible, engaged) and what they bring with them (e.g., advocacy, knowledge, expertise, convening power, skills, structures, resources) are critical to the quality of partnership functionality and the type of partnership.^{4,5}

This Year 1 Final Report includes evaluation activities that took place during the 2018-19 academic year. This period coincided with early implementation of many of the BSK-funded School Partnership strategies.

For this evaluation, we are focused on schools with multiple BSK School Partnership strategy investments. Strategy areas include Healthy and Safe Environments (HSE); Out-of-School Time (OST); School-Based Health Centers (SBHC); Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral To Services (SBIRT); Trauma Informed and Restorative Practices (TIRP); and Youth Development (YD). During our evaluation period, strategy areas were in varying stages of implementation ranging from TIRP, which was just beginning implementation of programming, to SBHC, which had been operating for several decades. A number of partnerships were newly forming during this time.

Exhibit A depicts the relationship among the evaluation questions, particularly how equitable partnerships relate to synergy and changes in practices, policies, systems, environments, and student well-being and outcomes.

In examining the relationships between partnerships, changes in schools, and BSK supports, we attend to issues of equity within partnerships (e.g. power, decision-making, and relationships). We also examine how and to whose benefit changes in practices, policies, systems, school environments, and student well-being are occurring.

⁴ Christens, Butterfoss, Minkler, Wolff, Francisco, & Kegler, 2019.

⁵ M. Gulbranson, personal communication, September 26, 2019, PSESD Evaluation Team Meeting.

The Year 1⁶ evaluation focuses on how equitable partnerships are developing and how BSK supports these partnerships, with an overview of the practices, policies, systems, school environment changes and student outcomes partnerships seek to affect. In Years 2 and 3, the evaluation will also address if changes are occurring, and why.

We seek to understand partnership by taking an evaluation approach that is also based in partnership. A group of Evaluation Advisors, who include members of awardee organizations from each BSK School Partnerships strategy area, helped guide each phase of our evaluation, including data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and the

development of implications for practice. We also engaged BSK School Partnership staff (this includes BSK staff who manage each of the School Partnership strategy areas, the Strategic Advisor for Trauma-Informed Systems, the 5-24 Policy and Program Manager, and BSK evaluation staff) to help interpret evaluation results and consider how they can inform improvements.

This Year 1 evaluation report is intended for those participating in, supporting, and interested in partnerships between schools and other organizations, including BSK SP evaluation staff and Program staff as well as school, district, and community-based organization (CBO) leaders and staff.




EXHIBIT A. EQUITABLE PARTNERSHIPS, SYNERGY, AND PPSE CHANGES AND STUDENT WELL-BEING AND OUTCOMES

⁶ The Year 1 evaluation timeframe is January-December 2019, with all data collected in the 2018-19 school year. The Year 2 (2020, with data collected in the 2019-20 school year) and Year 3 (2021, with data collected in the 2020-21 school year) evaluation will continue the inquiry into partnership development and supportive conditions. Years 2 and 3 will also include a deeper focus on changes to practices, policies, systems, school environments, and student outcomes. This Year 1, 2, and 3 sequencing assumes that partnership development and supports from BSK/King County in Year 1 help create the conditions for changes in practices, policies, systems, school environments, and student outcomes in Years 2 and 3.

RESULTS



In this section, we share Year 1 results for each of the three evaluation questions. Given that this is the first year of a three-year evaluation, we will build from these results through 2021.

EVALUATION QUESTION 1

WHAT DO EQUITABLE SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS LOOK LIKE, AND WHAT ARE THE FACTORS THAT SUPPORT THEM?

Equity focus areas

“[This program] is all about youth having the opportunity to dismantle institutional racism in their education. We focus on empowerment — empowering youth to be leaders, to have the opportunity, [and to] believe that they can educate their educators.” – BSK Awardee

In focusing on equity, we look at the role of adults in nurturing schools that support the success of every student, particularly those farthest from educational justice. How do adults working together foster and cultivate the kind of environment that will help students thrive in school? What does it mean for a group of adults (e.g., teachers, school administrators, and service providers from the community) to work together effectively so that their efforts help every student be successful?

Our focus on equitable partnerships includes **how** partnerships work (e.g., how partners work with each other and together) and **what** they are working on and toward, such as changes in adult practices

and changes in the school environment. In interviews, awardees and partners were asked, “What issues of equity are your partnership working on and how?” The following summary lists the aspects that were identified. Partnerships are working on these equity areas through the implementation of BSK-funded program activities in the schools such as peace circles, provision of physical activity and health education, staff training on racial trauma, and provision of mental health services.

EXHIBIT E. EQUITY FOCUS AREAS

	In Number of Interviews (Total = 29)	Percent of Interviews
Student Focus	25	86%
• Access to services, activities	18	62%
• Student leadership, decision-making	14	48%
• Discipline	9	31%
• Access to basic needs like nutritious food	7	24%
Groups or Areas That Are Overlooked (including students of color; low-income students; students in foster care; ELL students; Immigrant and refugee students; homeless children; highly-mobile students; students involved in juvenile justice system)	18	62%
Power Dynamics (i.e. attending to differences in power or influence between schools, districts, and large institutions and students, families, and CBOs)	16	55%
Staff Focus	13	45%
• Staff personal/professional growth	10	34%
Family and Student Engagement in Partnership	12	41%
Family Focus Generally	10	34%

Defining partnership

In addition to how partnerships were defined by BSK (see Methods, page 64), and for the purposes of this evaluation, we also consider how partnership is defined by BSK awardees and partners. In our interviews, we talked with awardees and their partners about partnerships, including who they would describe as their partners in their BSK-funded programs. Exhibit F describes the entities named by interviewees as partners in their efforts. Please note that awardees could be districts, schools, or CBOs.

“Until your hiring practices can change, or whatever, let’s bring in some partners who know some grassroots. And to me, that is what is making the difference, because it is not happening in the school system — it is actually happening through the community partners.” – BSK Partner

“There is so much to do [to support students], one agency cannot do it on their own. It feels like such a beautiful partnership [between the school and CBO partners]. Other [providers] don’t have a [student/family support role], or if they do, they don’t have other languages. The school understands it is fundamental and we can’t do it alone. The students just see that we work here. It is valued and we have a lot of say in interventions. And when parents and students come in, there is so much information.” – BSK Awardee

EXHIBIT F. ENTITIES IDENTIFIED AS PARTNERS IN INTERVIEWS

	In Number of Interviews (Total = 29)	Percent of Interviews
School	23	79%
CBO	21	72%
Other Partners (e.g., subcontractors, city/town, agencies or organizations in city or region, museums, private businesses/banks, community volunteers, colleges/universities, and parents)	20	69%
King County	14	48%
Interviewee’s School District	12	41%
Other School Districts	4	14%

This evaluation question examines schools and school districts that receive multiple BSK SP strategy investments and asks how the following elements impact characteristics of equitable school-based partnerships (shared vision; aligned, responsive implementation; and shared accountability for success) as well as partnership synergy.^{7,8}

- Dosage, including:
 - *breadth*, the number and type of activities
 - *reach* (e.g., whole school, targeted group of students, families, or staff), of SP strategy investments
 - *depth*, (e.g., the intensiveness of a program/intervention)
- Leadership
- Coordination among schools and school-based partners

7 Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>

8 Lasker, R.D., Weiss, E.S., & Miller, R. (2001). Partnership synergy: A practical framework for studying and strengthening collaborative advantage. *The Millbank Quarterly*, 79(2), 179–205.

Dosage

Awardee and partner interviews provided a general sense of how programs were being delivered. Interview responses indicated that many programs are delivered daily, some are offered on a weekly basis, and very few are provided on a monthly basis. Some programs are schoolwide (or Tier 1), while others are provided to specific groups of students (Tier 2 or Tier 3). And though most of the programs offered by the partnerships are for students, there are a number that are geared toward school staff.

Elements of Partnerships: Leadership and Coordination

Partnerships have several features related to how they function, including the important elements of Leadership and Coordination. In this section, we share results related to these elements, including how equity relates to both Leadership and Coordination.

Among schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments, there are certain aspects of Leadership and Coordination that distinguish Integrated partnerships.

When analyzing our data, we used look fors to assess how school partnerships are functioning and the extent to which they are equitable. Look fors are attributes used to understand and assess how equitable partnerships are developing, the changes they seek, and BSK's support for partnerships. Elsewhere in this report, we describe the look fors (see Appendix pg. 84 for complete list) and how they were identified (see Methods). Through exploratory factor analysis (EFA), we were able to determine how well the look fors underpinned or defined various aspects of partnership functioning, beginning with the elements of partnership — Leadership and Coordination⁹. Using EFA results, we were able to establish that overall, the respective




look fors for each partnership element were highly correlated with Leadership or Coordination. In other words, the look fors do a good job of describing how partnerships are functioning and the extent to which they are equitable.

Primarily for illustrative purposes, and specifically focused on equity-centered look fors, Exhibit G describes three of five look fors that characterize equitable Leadership within and across partnerships. We illustrate each equity-centered look for with a quote from an awardee or partner interview, a summary description based on interview responses, and information from other sources such as awardee narrative reports.





⁹ We also used EFA to examine how well look fors defined other constructs of interest such as the Partnership Characteristics of Shared Vision, Aligned & Responsive Implementation, & Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success.


EXHIBIT G. SAMPLING OF LEADERSHIP LOOK FORs AND TRENDS

Equitable Leadership Look For	Observed Trends and Examples (among partnerships with evidence of each look for)
CBOs, students, or families are named/ described as leaders, in addition to schools/districts/ King County	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CBO partners feel and are perceived by others as essential members of partnership leadership. Across strategies, they are described as integral to the work of steering or improvement committees at the building level. Students and parents are also identified as having leadership and decision-making roles. 2. At least one of the following is referenced: CBO partners are identified as leaders, some degree of student leadership is underway, or engagement of families as leaders is aspired to.
What does it feel or look like? 	<p><i>"In the first semester, it was always led by [a] coordinator [or] facilitator, and this semester, the kids want to lead it. And it was their idea, they came in early in the semester and said, Can I lead the check in? Now it's something that they pass around. So they like taking that role of checking in on other kids to see how they're doing...it was the most amazing thing to watch these kids just really encourage the reluctant kids to participate and make them feel comfortable talking about themselves and their projects. It was amazing to watch. I wish everybody could see that. I had to talk to [the principal] that afternoon about that, because it was so amazing."</i></p> <p><i>"We have not identified any family members to take on leadership roles, but we know the school has a PTSA and there are opportunities to connect next school year. We want to make sure we learn from and build on strengths for this year and do better."</i></p>
Partners and stakeholders that do not hold institutional power feel included and valued, have buy-in, and see themselves in the communication and decision-making processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, trust built, especially over long-term relationships, opens the partnership to inclusion of partners and stakeholders who do not hold traditional institutional power such as classified school staff, students and families, and other members of the community in providing leadership, direction, and other contributions toward the vision. 2. District and school-building administrators' inclusive leadership, advocacy, and consistent support for participation by various stakeholders are influential in facilitating equity in voice and presence, and a decrease in perceived power differences. Communication between district and school leadership and other stakeholders is equally vital.
What does it feel or look like? 	<p><i>"There is a prevailing sense across [three] partner organizations [providing four different BSK SP strategy investment programs], that they are longstanding and equal partners with the school and that they rely on one another to effectively serve students."</i></p> <p><i>"Access to and buy-in/support from the principal has been a challenge for developing partnership and implementing the work as planned. The principal is a gatekeeper for decision-making and is not accessible or approachable for [BSK strategy] partners."</i></p>
People who are affected by decisions are included in and influence decision-making	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the school, greater participation of individuals (e.g., CBO staff, students, school staff, and families) in important decision-making groups, such as task forces or committees, has been observed. 2. Student or adult advocacy for student participation in program implementation or in leadership opportunities is articulated and demonstrated. Parent advocacy is demonstrated or planned for.
What does it feel or look like? 	<p><i>"Increasing student voice is really important to us, [and] that is something we have done and will continue to increase capacity around. Students regularly attend our staff meetings, but for them to actually be together and facilitate professional development on the work they are doing in those classes, will be incorporated with the professional development given to staff. Right now, they are sitting with teachers but next year [they] will be a part of the process and have the opportunity to share with teachers what they need to be successful and comfortable in this space."</i></p> <p><i>"We have always been disproportionate with our African American students and discipline. So are we surprised that it is right now showing those are the kids that need the most mentoring? No, but how do we evaluate that? And like I said we are trying to get adult and kid voice and understand why that is happening."</i></p>

As in the case of Leadership, each of the 10 Coordination look fors made strong contributions to defining the construct of Coordination. Next, Exhibit H provides a thematic description for the three equity-centered Coordination look fors as determined from assessment of within and cross-partnership functioning. Each equity-centered look for is illustrated using either a quote from an awardee or partner interview or a summary description based on other sources such as awardee narrative reports.

EXHIBIT H. SAMPLING OF COORDINATION LOOK FORs AND TRENDS


Equitable Coordination “Look For”	Observed Trends and Examples (among those partnerships with evidence of each “Look For”)
<p>The school and partners are working toward shared goals and people understand how working together will improve performance</p>	<p>Partners, however they are defined, have a shared understanding of their work together and what they are trying to achieve, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Among more Integrated school–CBO partnerships, there is a clear understanding of how partners must work together and that neither can accomplish the changes they seek alone. 2. In most cases, the sense of a shared goal and working together to achieve it is within, but not across, strategies.
<p>What does it feel or look like?</p> 	<p><i>“Collaborative work with CBO partners have got us thinking of new work on discipline policies and procedures — what role might a CBO serve in either trying to avoid suspension or when a child is suspended, giving them additional resources that they can be referred to – to get facts sooner to avoid suspension. I don’t think that we would have come to that same conclusion if we had not been doing this work.”</i></p> <p><i>“[We build] circle community towards restorative work. [However, our school partner and we] have different views on power in circles. The way we see circle is different. What we see as change is different from what [our] partner is seeing as change. [It] feels complicated on both sides.”</i></p>
<p>Partners engage in creating norms, protocols, and structures in inclusive ways that define and drive decisions and communication</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Long-term relationships facilitate conversations around roles and responsibilities. However, changes in personnel can introduce uncertainty. 2. Cross-stakeholder coordination/meeting structures such as TIRP (Trauma Informed and Restorative Practices) Innovation Meetings are helpful.
<p>What does it feel or look like?</p> 	<p><i>“Even though a policy was not actually changed the introduction of restorative practices with the school trainings and [TIRP awardee] were put into practice with the participation of a full team including school staff, community partners, parents, and youth and [TIRP awardee] staff... What encourages us about this is the school has utilized [TIRP awardee] as an outlet to other parents to help with discipline issues. They have also come to us first to address serious issues so we may intervene and participate when making decisions about emergency expulsions/ suspensions.”</i></p> <p><i>“Knew [BSK grant] was coming and we [school & CBO] talked about it. But by time of implementation, we did not ‘get to door at same time’. Maybe because of summer break and time of grant, [there was] no time to have detailed conversation. There was no process that gave us time to see what we were doing. It takes time to build trust, wish there was more communication at start in more efficient way.”</i></p>

Equitable Coordination “Look For”	Observed Trends and Examples (among those partnerships with evidence of each “Look For”)
Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and agreed upon among partner organizations and within the context of the partnership’s work	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certain investment strategy areas have specific requirements that facilitate knowledge of roles. 2. Coordination positions, resources, and structures help in clarifying roles and responsibilities.
<p>What does it feel or look like?</p> 	<p><i>“School administration, school staff who are involved in implementation, and the CBO lead and CBO staff know their roles. School leads and staff trust the CBO and they let them do [their] job while keeping an eye to provide support when and where needed.”</i></p> <p><i>“There is no partnership as of now — this is indicative of school systems. You have people tripping over one another, trying to serve the same students. This could be the impetus to do that. I would appreciate some push from BSK — you know we have three grants serving one school; they should be pushing us to collaborate.”</i></p>



Partnership Characteristics: Shared Vision, Aligned & Responsive Implementation, Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success

There is a strong relationship between partnership elements and partnership characteristics.



We theorize that strong and equitable Leadership and Coordination facilitates the work of the partnership toward accomplishing its Shared Vision through Aligned and Responsive Implementation and Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success.

In its Partnership Toolkit¹⁰, YDEKC indicate that a “partnership ecosystem is strongest when partners and schools work together

to create optimal learning environments for students. For the most part, well-coordinated and cohesive services at the school level share certain characteristics.” Shared Vision refers to common goals and outcomes held by various stakeholders in a partnership and towards which the partnership strives. Aligned and Responsive Implementation speaks to the alignment of services to needs and efficient use of resources including through incorporation of new partners as needed.

And Mutual or Shared Accountability for Success indicates the use of data and evaluation as integral to planning and programming that ensures quality at point of service.


Based on the results of the assessments of look fors, we examined the relationship of partnership elements with partnership characteristics. We found mostly strong and a few moderate relationships among the various partnership factors¹¹ as illustrated in Exhibit I.

The correlation analysis of the school partnerships confirms a strong relationship between Leadership and Coordination ($r_s=.91$) suggesting that robust, equitable Leadership helps enable better Coordination within the partnership. And that, likewise, equitable Coordination approaches are reflective of equitable Leadership. A few other findings¹² to highlight:

- Strong, equitable Leadership is highly correlated with Shared Vision ($r_s=.80$) which suggests that Leadership in the partnership that is inclusive by sharing power and decision-making with others, including students and families, tend to help develop and also work toward Shared Vision.
- Robust Coordination is highly correlated with Aligned & Responsive Implementation ($r_s=.83$) suggesting that when Coordination structures, protocols, and resources allow for clarity of roles, responsibilities, and support regular communication, program implementation by partners belonging to different agencies becomes a focused effort that can be flexibly adapted depending on need.
- Leadership and Coordination each have a moderate relationship with the partnership's Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success ($r_s=.43$ and $r_s=.50$, respectively).

EXHIBIT I. STRENGTHS OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARTNERSHIP ELEMENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS

Note: This exhibit illustrates the strength of relationships between partnership elements—Leadership & Coordination—and partnership characteristics—Shared Vision, Aligned & Responsive Implementation, and Mutual or Shared Accountability for Success. The thickness of the double-headed arrows and the numbers beside each arrow show the strength of the relationships. The higher numbers and thicker arrows signify stronger relationships.



¹⁰ Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>, p.2.


¹¹ Spearman rank correlation (r_s or ρ) test was used. The test does not carry any assumptions about the distribution of the data and is the appropriate correlation analysis when the variables are measured on a scale that is at least ordinal. All relationships examined were determined to be statistically significant across all, but in one relationship, were significant at $p < .01$. The correlation between Leadership and Mutual Accountability for Success ($r_s = .43$) was significant at $p < .05$.

¹² We also found that the partnership characteristics—Shared Vision, Aligned & Responsive Implementation, and Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success—are statistically significantly correlated with each other: Shared Vision is correlated with Aligned Implementation ($r_s = .70$, $p < .01$) and with Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success ($r_s = .44$, $p < .05$), and Aligned Implementation is correlated with Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success ($r_s = .57$, $p < .01$).

Categorizing Partnerships

Because there are many variations in how school partnerships function, we reframed the three discrete partnership categories of Cooperative, Collaborative, and Integrated as a continuum. This continuum allowed us to accommodate the range of partnership functioning that we observed. For example, Collaborative partnerships can be considered as early, established, or highly Collaborative. Exhibit B begins with definitions of the partnership types shown in the continuum. To help illustrate each type in the Partnership Type continuum, we provide brief descriptions of various partnerships that were deemed, by assessment, as reflective of a level of a Cooperative, Collaborative, or Integrated partnership.


**EXHIBIT B. PARTNERSHIP TYPE
DEFINITIONS AND PARTNERSHIP
EXAMPLES VISUAL**



There are different types of partnerships developing within and across BSK strategies.

In Exhibit C, we illustrate the distribution of the 26 strategy-specific and cross-strategy partnerships that we categorized across the Cooperative, Collaborative, and Integrated partnerships continuum. It should be noted that there are five partnerships that were difficult to categorize given the YDEKC framework as well as the lack of cross-strategy connection at this stage.¹³

EXHIBIT C: PARTNERSHIP TYPE CONTINUUM AND PARTNERSHIP DISTRIBUTION VISUAL



And given our hypothesis that synergy can be achieved in Integrated partnerships, we determined that there is minimal evidence for partnership synergy at this point. Of particular note, there is expressed interest in engaging and collaborating across strategies in schools where this is not yet happening.

¹³ Specifically, in one school, the concept of a "cross-strategy" partnership is not relevant, as they only have investments in one BSK strategy area. We learned this after we had begun data collection and elected to keep the school in the study. In the case of another school, we only have information about one of two strategies in the school, given that we did not include data from SPS staff in Year 1 (for more information, see Limitations section). In two schools, awardees became aware of other BSK investments in their school/district through this evaluation, but there is not yet a "cross-strategy" partnership to assess. Finally, we did not assess one "within strategy" partnership for one of the schools because it was in very early implementation, partnerships between the school and CBO partnerships had not yet developed, and the school's partners were identified as other districts and King County. It was difficult to apply the categories in this context.


¹⁴ Taking an alternative viewpoint, we also could say that most of the partnerships — 16 of the 26 (62%) — that were categorized as Highly Cooperative (Cooperative 3), Early Collaborative (Collaborative 1), Established Collaborative (Collaborative 2), Highly Collaborative (Collaborative 3), and Early Integrated (Integrated 1) form a cluster of partnerships that merits consideration as a wider array of Collaborative-type partnerships. Given this perspective, we end up with six Cooperative and four Integrated partnerships toward the two ends of the continuum.

¹⁵ Cross-strategy partnerships in four of the nine schools could not be assessed.

Each *within-strategy* and *cross-strategy* partnership in the nine schools is represented in the following exhibit. Within the nine schools there are 26 partnerships identified, including five that could not be assessed.¹⁶ This analysis was intended to identify if there were patterns among partnerships in the same school.

For example, if we look at School #4, we find that its two strategy-specific school partnerships were assessed as Early Cooperative (Cooperative 1), while its cross-strategy partnership (darker-outlined circle) is grey because it could not be assessed. With School #5, we see that one of its strategy-specific partnerships was assessed as Early Collaborative (Collaborative 1), and its second within-strategy partnership was determined to be Highly Collaborative (Collaborative 3). The partnership across these two strategy areas (cross-strategy partnership) was deemed to be Highly Cooperative (Cooperative 3).

EXHIBIT J: PARTNERSHIP TYPE CONTINUUM AND PARTNERSHIP DISTRIBUTION VISUAL



¹⁶ Please note, other Exhibits only include the 26 categorized within- and cross-strategy partnerships or 21 within-strategy partnerships.

Describing Partnership Elements and Characteristics within Partnership Types

Having categorized the different within-strategy and cross-strategy partnerships, we then determined how the partnership elements of Leadership and Coordination and partnership characteristics — Shared Vision; Aligned, Responsive Implementation; and Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success — manifest within the different partnership types for the various partnerships we assessed. In Exhibit K, we show what partnership elements and characteristics look like within each partnership type based on our analysis of school-based partnerships functioning in Year 1. The descriptions are a synthesis of patterns or trends in the information gathered from interview responses and the review of secondary data from each partnership after they were assessed as Cooperative, Collaborative, or Integrated.

EXHIBIT K: THEMATIC DESCRIPTIONS OF PARTNERSHIP ELEMENTS BY TYPE OF PARTNERSHIP IN YEAR 1

Elements & Characteristics of Equity-Focused Partnerships	Types of Partnerships		
	Cooperative Partnerships	Collaborative Partnerships	Integrated Partnerships
Leadership	Single-agency leadership at district, school, or CBO level, with limited communication. Plans to add student and family voices is either vague or still in very early or nascent stage.	Leaders recognize need for partners and their essential roles toward achieving student support in their own ways and together. There is clear acknowledgment of the need for including perspectives of stakeholders such as students, families, and staff, while increasing information sharing among partners.	Given long-term relationships and built trust, CBO partners from across strategies recognize each other's contributions and are very much part of building-level work with students. Student input or feedback is sought after, and parent engagement or staff participation in work is part of the ideal status of the whole effort. The partners see themselves as involved in decision-making. Almost difficult to separate each contributing entity from one another in their interdependent efforts.
Coordination	Partnerships are defined differently depending on school and strategy. There may or may not be an identified coordinator. Coordination structures, especially around communication, are basic depending on requirements within individual strategy activities. Desire for better communication is expressed.	There is better coordination of efforts between partners within or across strategies. Coordination is helped by sharing resources including spaces or timing of activities (i.e., the how, when, and what of work). There is increased information flow between partners and stakeholders, and an acknowledgment of the need to improve the process.	With built trust, every partner engages in efforts that support, facilitate, or enable the work of other partners. Regular communication between partners is supported by built-in structures such as building-level meetings. Highly coordinated efforts are demonstrated within and across strategies.

EXHIBIT L: THEMATIC DESCRIPTIONS OF PARTNERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS BY TYPE OF PARTNERSHIP IN YEAR 1

Elements & Characteristics of Equity-Focused Partnerships	Types of Partnerships		
	Cooperative Partnerships	Collaborative Partnerships	Integrated Partnerships
Shared Vision	Vision is developed and led by district, school, or CBO. Not clear on how the vision is shared across all partners and across strategies. No reference is made to input or feedback from students, staff, or families.	There is commitment to continue building on relationships and working together across partners within or across strategies while gathering input or feedback from stakeholders, such as staff and families, in order to provide support services to students of color, whilst respecting different cultures.	There is a clear sense of what the common purpose is, what and how contributions from partners within or across strategies will be needed or used, and how stakeholders' input is gathered from students, families, and staff.
Aligned, Responsive Implementation	Calls for trust building. Mostly describes work as within-strategy. Even within-strategy, there is a need for more information to be shared across partners and stakeholders.	Greater alignment of support for students by identifying and leveraging resources from partners within or across strategies and from the larger community according to identified needs.	Partners report being very much part of, on the same page with, embedded, or integrated into, or supported by the work of other partners within or across strategies.
Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success	Though sparsely evinced, there is some indication of an understanding of a need for and engagement in continuous improvement activities within-strategy, though efforts are not clearly delineated.	In order to provide better aligned services for students, there is an acknowledged need to share information between partners within or across strategies by more definite means (e.g., via Google document system) while recognizing some real limitations to data sharing.	While still a mostly within-strategy endeavor (and acknowledging constraints surrounding student data), efforts of varying degrees for collecting, using, and sharing information with partners; and to a more limited extent, with stakeholder groups such as staff, students, and parents, are reported.

EVALUATION QUESTION 2

WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EQUITABLE PARTNERSHIPS AND SCHOOL-WIDE CHANGES IN PRACTICES, POLICIES, SYSTEMS, ENVIRONMENTS (PPSE), AND STUDENT WELL-BEING AND OUTCOMES?

This question addresses the extent to which, and in what ways, multiple BSK SP strategy investments in schools influence changes in PPSE and student well-being and outcomes. For Year 1, we describe the types of changes partnerships are working on (see Appendix pg. 84 for landscape), with the intent to look at changes over time in Years 2 and 3.¹⁷ Many partnerships were early in their development in the 2018–19 school year. The TIRP and SBIRT strategies were in their first year of implementation and are BSK-funded strategies in all nine of the Year 1 evaluation schools.

In this section, we share results that address each of these dimensions for changes in practice, policy, and systems; changes in school environments; and changes in student well-being and outcomes. The Year 1 results for this evaluation question include:

1. An overview of the PPSE changes and student well-being and outcomes the partnerships seek to affect, including how different types of partnerships relate to the types of changes they seek
2. The extent to which the different BSK-funded partnerships within a school are aligned in the changes they seek to affect

PRACTICE, POLICY AND SYSTEM CHANGES

Partnerships of different types seek a range of practice, policy, and system changes. These changes relate to issues of equity and racism in the education system to varying degrees.

Exhibit C shows the types of practice, policy, and system changes sought by 21¹⁸ partnerships of all types (Cooperative, Collaborative, and Integrated). We considered the changes partnerships seek by type of partnership to identify if there was a relationship between the type of partnership and the changes sought. As shown in the exhibit, there is a fairly even mix of types of partnerships working on the variety of practice, policy, and system changes, including:¹⁹

- **Improving coordination of supports (17 of 21 partnerships)**, including connecting partnerships' services and supports to existing school and district structures like multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS), and screening students to connect them to relevant supports
- **Expanding access to services and activities (15 of 21)**, which includes demonstrating the needs of priority groups of students (e.g., homeless, English language learners, Brown and Black students), improving access to services for underserved students, and shifting policies for mental health support
- **Supporting student leadership and engagement in partnerships (15 of 21)**, focusing on interrupting individual, institutional, and structural racism in the education system. This includes supporting students as "credible messengers" with their peers, engaging students to serve in leadership and decision-making roles, and providing student-led professional development for staff
- **Engaging families (15 of 21)**, which includes involving families as members and leaders of partnerships, engaging in the rollout and implementation of programs, and conducting home visits. This focus is more common within Collaborative and Integrated partnerships than Cooperative partnerships
- **Shifting staff practices (14 of 21)**, including via professional development on topics of racial equity and racial trauma

¹⁷ As implementation continues and partnerships further develop, we will look at changes over time beginning in Year 2, with an emphasis on how multiple BSK SP strategy investments are contributing to changes in school buildings, districts, and elsewhere.


¹⁸ As described earlier, we examined 31 partnerships, and 26 could be categorized. Of the 26 categorized partnerships, there are 21 within-strategy partnerships and five cross-strategy partnerships.

¹⁹ We describe the types of changes sought in 21 within-strategy partnerships (e.g., OST, SBIRT, TIRP). In later analyses, we look at where there is alignment in changes sought across strategies in a school, as an opportunity for cross-strategy partnerships to work collectively.

Transforming discipline practices (9 of 21), including addressing disproportionate impacts of discipline on students of color, shifting to restorative approaches to discipline, and providing alternatives to in-school suspension, is also a focus of almost half of the partnerships. And two partnerships (2 of 21) identified a focus on engaging the community, including involving the broader community in their programming and activities.

EXHIBIT D. YEAR 1 PRACTICE, POLICY AND SYSTEM FOCUS AREAS BY TYPE OF PARTNERSHIP

Some partnership types are more likely to seek changes to certain practice, policy and systems areas than other partnership types (n=21)



Partnerships seek a range of practice, policy, and system changes.

We analyzed the extent to which awardees from different BSK strategy investments were working towards similar practice, policy, and system (PPS) changes. Exhibit M shows instances where all BSK awardees within a school are working toward similar changes. It also highlights those PPS areas where there is alignment across the most schools (highlighted in blue). These include staff growth, access to services/activities/support, and coordination/system of student supports.

In terms of alignment of focus within schools, the schools with fewer BSK strategy investments have alignment across more practice, policy, and system changes that they seek to make. Schools with two BSK awardees (Schools 6, 3, and 5) are aligned in their focus on four PPS areas, but these areas vary by school, as follows:

- In School 6, there is alignment in awardees' focus on staff growth; student leadership, student engagement in partnership; coordination/system of student supports.
- In Schools 3 and 5, awardees are focused on staff growth, discipline, coordination/system of student supports, and family engagement.

In schools with more BSK strategy investments, there is less alignment across awardees. In one school with three BSK awardees, the awardees are aligned in their focus on three PPS areas — staff growth, access to services/activities/supports, and coordination/system of student supports. In two other schools with three awardees each, the awardees are aligned in their focus on access to services/activities/supports.

EXHIBIT M. ALIGNMENT OF PRACTICE, POLICY AND SYSTEM FOCUS AREAS ACROSS AWARDEES IN EACH SCHOOL²⁰

Practice, Policy and System Changes X = All awardees in the school are working toward this type of change							
School #	# of Awardees	Staff Growth	Discipline	Access to services/ activities/ supports	Student leadership, student engagement in partnership	Coordination/ system of student supports	Family engagement (at school and/or in partnership)
6	2	X		X	X	X	
3	2	X	X			X	X
5	2		X	X		X	X
2	3	X		X	X		
9	3			X			
1	3			X			
7	4						

CHANGES TO SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS

Partnerships of all types seek to positively affect the school environment.


As with practice, policy, and system changes, partnerships of all types seek to positively affect the school environment, as represented in Exhibit N. For most partnerships (18 of 21), this focus is on improved school climate including students feeling connected and feeling safe at school. 15 partnerships are focused on supporting positive relationships and interactions. 12 partnerships are focused on reducing suspensions and expulsions, and 11 are focused on improving attendance.²¹

²⁰ The table includes data only for seven of the nine schools. This is because the assessment of alignment across strategies requires data on multiple BSK strategy areas. In Year 1, there were seven schools where we have data on multiple strategies within a school. For the other two schools, we were able to collect data for one strategy only.

²¹ There are several instances where changes in school environments overlap with changes in student well-being and outcomes, based on the BSK SP logic model, its application to this evaluation, and the data sources used to understand the changes BSK-supported partnerships are seeking. Attendance, discipline, positive relationships, and feelings of safety at school were among the school environment changes awardees and partners described in interviews and reports to BSK. At the same time, they are also reflected in many of the student well-being and outcomes that award-ees noted as the changes their partnerships sought in their logic models. As such, these changes are noted separately among changes in environment and changes in student well-being and outcomes, in the results illustrated in Exhibits N through Exhibit Q.

EXHIBIT N. YEAR 1 SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT CHANGES BY TYPE OF PARTNERSHIP

The changes in school environments that partnerships seek are not strongly related to their partnership type (n=21)



As shown below, we analyzed the extent to which different awardees from different BSK strategy investments were working to improve school environments in similar ways within their schools. Exhibit O shows instances where all BSK awardees in a school are working toward similar environment changes. It also highlights the changes to environment where there is alignment across most schools (highlighted in blue), which include discipline (alignment across awardees in three schools) and improved school climate (alignment across awardees in four schools).

There is a varying degree of alignment within schools, including:

- In School 9, all awardees are aligned in their focus on improving all four dimensions of school environment (attendance, discipline, positive relationships and interactions, and improved school climate).
- In Schools 3 and 5, the awardees in each school are aligned in their focus on discipline (reduction in suspensions and expulsions) and improved school climate.
- Both awardees in School 6 are working toward improved school climate.

In the other schools (School 1, 2, 7), awardees are not focused on the same dimensions of the school environment.

EXHIBIT O. ALIGNMENT OF SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT FOCUS AREAS ACROSS AWARDEES IN EACH SCHOOL²²

Changes to School Environment (where young people experience positive school environments) <i>X = All awardees in the school are working toward this type of change</i>					
School #	# of Awardees	Attendance	Discipline (reduction in suspensions and expulsions)	Positive relationships and interactions (peers, partner, adults, teachers, community) / Healthy relationships	Improved school climate (students feeling connected, students feeling safe at school)
9	3	X	X	X	X
3	2		X		X
5	2		X		X
6	2				X
1	3				
2	3				
7	4				

²² The table includes data only for seven of the nine schools. This is because the assessment of alignment across strategies requires data on multiple BSK strategy areas. In Year 1, there were seven schools where we have data on multiple strategies within a school. For the other two schools, we were able to collect data for one strategy only.

STUDENT WELL-BEING AND OUTCOMES


Many partnerships are focused on improving student well-being and outcomes in similar ways.

Many BSK awardees and their partnerships are working to improve student well-being and outcomes in similar ways, as represented in Exhibit P and as follows:

- 20 of 21 awardees are focused on the improvement of students' engagement in school (including school connectedness, regular attendance, decreased disciplinary issues)²³
- 18 of 21 awardees are working to improve mental, socio-emotional, and physical health (including physical activity and physical health; students identified with symptoms of depression, self-harm/suicidality, anxiety, and trauma connected to support and services; and students with positive socio-emotional development)
- 15 of 21 awardees are focused on:
 - Academic and career success (including improved grades and increased on-time graduation)
 - Healthy relationships (including strong family, peer, and school relationships)
 - Healthy sense of self (including belief in ability to succeed and youth who are flourishing and resilient, self-care and coping skills)
- 14 of 21 awardees are focused on support systems (including that youth are not justice system-involved, youth live in supportive neighborhoods, youth have a supportive adult, youth are appropriately seeking care)
- A less common focus, among 12 of 21 awardees, is decreasing substance use

EXHIBIT P. YEAR 1 STUDENT WELL-BEING AND OUTCOMES BY TYPE OF PARTNERSHIP

Nearly all partnerships seek to impact students' engagement in schools (n=21)



23. As noted in the prior section on school environment, there are several instances where changes in school environments overlap with changes in student well-being and outcomes, based on the BSK SP logic model, its application to this evaluation, and the data sources used to understand the changes BSK-supported partnerships are seeking. Attendance, discipline, positive relationships, and feelings of safety at school were among the school environment changes awardees and partners described in interviews and reports to BSK. At the same time, they are also reflected in many of the student well-being and outcomes that awardees noted as the changes their partnerships sought in their logic models. As such, these changes are noted separately among changes in environment and changes in student well-being and outcomes.

Exhibit Q shows instances where all BSK awardees within a school are working toward similar changes to student well-being and outcomes across different BSK strategies. It also highlights those outcomes where there is alignment in the most schools (highlighted in blue), including:

- In six of seven schools, all awardees are working to improve engagement in schools.
- In five of seven schools, all awardees are working to support mental, socio-emotional, and physical health.

In addition, there were several areas with alignment across all awardees in a smaller number of schools, including:

- In two of seven schools, all awardees are working to decrease substance use, support academic and career success, and strengthen support systems.
- In one of seven schools, all awardees are aligned in their focus on healthy relationships and a healthy sense of self.

Another look at alignment shows the range of outcomes where

awardees are aligned within a school. In some schools, BSK awardees working in different areas are working to improve several of the same student well-being and outcomes. In others, awardees are working on zero, one or two common outcomes. Specifically:

- Awardees in School 9 are all focused on five common areas of student well-being and outcomes: healthy relationships; healthy sense of self; academic and career success; engagement in school; mental, socio-emotional and physical health; and support systems.
- In School 6, awardees are all working on four areas of student well-being and outcomes: academic and career success; engagement in school; mental, socio-emotional and physical health; and support systems.
- In Schools 3 and 5, awardees are all working on three common areas of focus: decrease in substance use; engagement in school; and mental, socio-emotional and physical health.
- In Schools 1 and 2, all awardees are focused on engagement in school and mental, socio-emotional and physical health.
- In School 7, there is not alignment across awardees in the student outcomes they seek to affect.

EXHIBIT Q. ALIGNMENT OF STUDENT WELL-BEING AND OUTCOMES ACROSS AWARDEES IN EACH SCHOOL²⁴

Student Well-being Outcomes X = All awardees in the school are working toward this type of change								
School #	# of Awardees	Healthy relationships	Healthy sense of self	Decrease in substance use	Academic and Career Success	Engagement in School	Mental, socio-emotional and physical health	Support Systems
9	3	X	X		X	X		X
6	2				X	X	X	X
3	2			X		X	X	
5	2			X		X	X	
1	3					X	X	
2	3					X	X	
7	4							



²⁴ The table includes data only for seven of the nine schools. This is because the assessment of alignment across strategies requires data on multiple BSK strategy areas. In Year 1, there were 7 schools where we have data on multiple strategies within a school. For the other 2 schools, we were able to collect data for one strategy only.

EVALUATION QUESTION 3

HOW DO KING COUNTY PROCESSES AND SYSTEMS SUPPORT EQUITABLE PARTNERSHIPS?

This question examines the extent to which, and in what ways, funding agency practices and cross-strategy work among BSK/King County staff help support and influence collective action in schools that received multiple SP strategy investments. In this section, we describe how BSK SP Program staff help support equitable partnership development and implementation.

(See Appendix pg. 84 for full highlights of BSK Supports by Strategy).

Across strategies, BSK staff reported improvement efforts during the interview phase of this project. This ongoing course correction illustrates a commitment to reflection and continuous improvement, as well as insights into the type of learning that will be possible with additional evaluation and continuous improvement efforts.

- SBIRT staff reported aligning contract and other timelines to the school calendar to respond to needs of awardees and partners.
- TIRP staff provide guidance across BSK strategies for partnership support.
- SBHC have learned from using braided funding across local government jurisdictions.
- SBIRT, TIRP, and OST strategies have implemented learning communities and made adjustments along the way including moving meetings outside of downtown Seattle, concentrating activities into longer and less frequent events for some partners and maintaining more frequent contact for others in order to “right size” support and sharing learning across strategies.
- Multiple strategies use technology to streamline communication, including adopting the Basecamp software to make documents accessible and share master calendar information.

- TIRP staff report providing more specific guidance on implementing successful partnership for awardees as well as providing more communication about BSK supports and requirements at recent events.

Our team heard an overwhelming appreciation for BSK’s equitable school partnership strategies. This appreciation extended to BSK granting practices that increase access to resources for student-centered work for organizations both traditionally and not traditionally engaged with local government, support for whole child approaches, and help to nurture partnership between schools and CBOs. In addition, BSK awardees overwhelmingly report positive relationships with BSK staff and gratitude for the responsive and comprehensive support they receive from the people connected to King County’s BSK initiative.

At the same time, BSK interviewees consistently noted that equitable school partnership work can be challenging. BSK awardees and their partners look to the BSK initiative and King County staff for technical assistance on a range of topics, particularly for partnership development and implementation.

The exhibits below highlight ways in which BSK programs nurtured partnerships. Exhibit R provides a list of highlights that we identified from multiple strategies, organized by phase of the grant award cycle. In the appendix, an additional matrix provides highlights of BSK supports, by strategy. Exhibit S outlines themes and related findings among the interviews with awardees, partners, and BSK staff. These findings relate to how individuals and groups work together, connections between BSK strategies, and the impact of BSK support and funding on partnership implementation.

Strategy requirements for awardee applications as well as strategy supports for awardees and partners were responsive to the type of programming in the strategy, as well as the size and experience of a prototypical awardee. For example, the TIRP strategy required CBOs to attend regularly scheduled school meetings, in order to encourage partnership development between those awardees and the schools in which they were working. For SBHC applicants, proposals were required to include a description of the organizations experience working collaboratively with community. Our analysis in Year 1 was descriptive for each strategy and did not include an analysis of whether the supports were sufficient in theory, applied as planned, or resulted in expected outcomes. These types of questions may be more appropriate for strategy-level evaluations. Year 2 evaluation activities will include more learning about Integrated and synergistic partnerships and partnerships over time and how BSK supports influence both.

EXHIBIT R. PARTNERSHIP PRACTICES THROUGH THE AWARD CYCLE

	Partnership-Focused Funding Practices (with strategies that emphasized the practice in parenthesis)
<i>Strategy Planning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community driven and youth-led planning (HSE, OST, YD)
<i>Strategy & Program Descriptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visualizations of program theory, design, or key values that include partnership, which also support shared vision (TIRP) Connection to racial equity (TIRP)
<i>RFP/RFA</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of partnership building technical assistance available (all strategies) Proposal requiring description of partnering capacity and community engagement (SBHC) Proposal requiring clear roles described for each partner (all strategies) Proposal requiring description of community (including youth) engagement in design, development and continuing through implementation (TIRP, YD)
<i>Budget</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources clearly designated for each partner (SBHC, TIRP) Funds for coordination and partnership development (OST)
<i>Scoring</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoring based clearly on RFP strategy description, proposal requirements, and connected to strategy logic model (all strategies)
<i>Contract/SOW</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide tactical support for partnership development and implementation. Require monthly meetings and participation in learning communities, for example (SBIRT, TIRP)
<i>Performance Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and report across partners (OST)
<i>Monthly/Quarterly Report-ing (Narrative and Other)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative and quantitative data on partnership function (perceptions, # of partner attendances) (all strategies)

EXHIBIT S. THEMES AND FINDINGS FROM BSK INTERVIEWS

	BSK Awardees and Partners	BSK Staff
Relationships and Expectations “It’s really helpful when you have a funder who is all in. It feels genuine; they’re on the line too, how did this funding make change/impact? From a very genuine perspective, [they] want to see your programs be successful and see impact.”	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awardees and partners view BSK staff as genuine, supportive partners in their work. Interviews included positive descriptions of trusting relationships. <p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awardees and partners report that expectations vary among BSK strategies and report some confusion as a result, particularly around performance measures. Awardees and partners report that grant program guidelines and technical assistance vary among BSK strategies. Awardees and partners appreciate open and easy communication with BSK staff. Awardees and partners appreciate flexibility and responsiveness of BSK staff. Awardees and partners want to see the whole picture of BSK supports and requirements. 	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BSK staff report that relationships, trust and being responsive are important to their work. BSK staff appreciate the strengths and expertise of awardees and partners. <p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BSK staff note that there is internal confusion about BSK strategies and contacts, and confusion about awards at individual schools. BSK staff see an opportunity to increase communication for existing staff as well as responsive on-boarding resources for new King County staff to successfully welcome a diverse workforce. BSK staff appreciate responsive focus on problems as they arise and would like to focus on more intentional time for planning. BSK staff would like more time for internal relationship building.

EXHIBIT S. THEMES AND FINDINGS FROM BSK INTERVIEWS

	BSK Awardees and Partners	BSK Staff
<p>Support for Collaboration</p> <p>“Most helpful support is allowing organizations to come together and talk about the work that they are doing individually and learning from each other.”</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Awardees appreciate learning from peers within their strategy to help with strategy implementation and to share best practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More broadly, learning communities have helped identify other awardees within strategies, other awardees in a school, and provided access to other awardees’ best practices and useful tools. <p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awardees suggest that BSK increase support for information and "how-to" on working together and partnership for CBOs and schools and school districts. • Awardees would like more opportunities for connection and collaboration with partners, specifically for information and insight sharing. • Awardees and partners report that King County-sponsored events offer valuable opportunities to learn from other practitioners. • Awardees and partners see a BSK role for providing service or referral information for serving individual students as well as for collaboration between and within strategies. • Awardees appreciate standardizing practices across the region to better support mobile students. 	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BSK staff have a deep commitment to racial equity and hope that their leadership and service can help lead to more equitable outcomes for students served by the BSK initiative. • Through events including the December 2018 BSK convening and strategy-specific learning communities, BSK staff facilitate sharing tools among awardees. • BSK staff recognize that practitioners are key teachers and may provide the most effective teaching about best practices and addressing challenges. Further, BSK staff report observing relationships and communication among connected awardees and partners after and beyond King County events, emphasizing the value of peer learning and connection. <p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BSK staff interviews revealed a current challenge in sorting awardees for learning communities when geographically arranged awardees are in varying stages of partnership implementation.

EXHIBIT S. THEMES AND FINDINGS FROM BSK INTERVIEWS

	BSK Awardees and Partners	BSK Staff
<p>Technical Supports</p> <p>“We could use more of evaluation/ performance management help. Producing some good data from this, we are not expert in that. We create surveys and don’t know what to do with them. I’m not super clear on what we are trying to collect. They’ve done some of that—we attended the webinar.”</p> <p>“...When you’re [BSK] asking the limited data people to use their limited time to make a whole new report for a one-off program, it’s been a different ask. They’ve been understanding that it’s been up and down. I can give them data, but I know it’s not accurate. It’s getting closer.”</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awardees and partners are positive about BSK technical supports and appreciate the range of assistance that has been available, including support for grant writing. <p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awardees and partners indicate a range of experience and skill with grant-related processes and would like both standardization across BSK strategies where possible as well as accurately graded/applied supports so that the amount of communication and assistance is “just right.” Awardees and partners report looking for support in most areas: performance measurement, data collection, partnership, finance, hiring, etc. Awardees and partners report that site visits may be valuable earlier in the grant cycle/year. Awardees and partners acknowledge and express some frustration that BSK is new and emergent and as a result processes may be confusing and expectations unclear. Awardees and partners suggest a BSK role for foundational and BSK-wide trainings, for example on equity, that might reach awardees, partners, as well as teachers and other front-line staff. 	<p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BSK staff want to coordinate site visits across strategies and have started to do so. BSK staff suggest training and/or internal learning communities focused on equity and social justice, anti-bias training and program evaluation.

EXHIBIT S. THEMES AND FINDINGS FROM BSK INTERVIEWS

	BSK Awardees and Partners	BSK Staff
BSK Funding “When we got BSK funded, we announced it to the school and they thought, ‘Wow, they mean something if they’re getting funded this much.’”	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awardees appreciate flexible long-term funding/multi-year grants to make deep change in schools (examples of flexibility include covering food and stipends, and support for whole-child focused activities). BSK awards signify credibility and recognition for awardees and partners. Funding that can be combined with other sources and that can be used with some flexibility within the grant cycle is valued by awardees and partners. 	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BSK staff appreciate being able to provide flexible, long-term funding/multi-year grants, to support traditionally marginalized organizations and deep change in systems. Opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BSK staff report that communication and data sharing processes and norms across departments and divisions can make contracting difficult. Collaboration among King County departments on the BSK effort requires new relationships and new ways of doing business at multiple layers of the organization, including around fiscal processes, contract monitoring, and data and file sharing.





CRITICAL CONTEXTUAL FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE PARTNERSHIPS

Context is also important to how partnerships develop and the degree of integration between schools and community partners.

Recognizing that partnership work happens in dynamic environments, we explored contextual factors. These are factors that are external to both BSK and schools that may influence three areas: 1) How partnerships develop and function; 2) the practices, policies, systems, and environment changes that partnerships are aiming to change; and 3) BSK SP Program staff support. The influence of the contexts named could be positive or less so. The contextual factors are listed as themes below according to the number of schools where awardees or partners mentioned or described relevant situations. They were gathered from interviews conducted with awardees and partners in late spring 2019, specifically in response to questions about the context of their BSK funding and partnerships, unexpected developments, and hopes or plans for the partnerships.

- Leadership & staff changes (school, CBO, BSK) [n=8]
 - For the most part, interview respondents referenced changes that have required either a pause or a start-over. As one awardee put it: “So, when you receive new staff that are not either trained or aware, you kind of have to take a step back and really go through the training process with them to bring them along – and I think that is still happening.”
 - In some cases, such as when a position is newly created (e.g., having an MTSS coordinator), the change is found to be helpful.
- Power dynamics [n=6]
 - Some partners have noted the need to “address power dynamics between administration and teachers to align goals and mission and collaborate effectively.”
 - At a district level, there was an observation regarding recognizing “a level of mistrust of schools in the community and increased scrutiny of what schools do.”
 - Several awardees and partners mentioned efforts at increasing parent engagement to support programs for students, but also to share in decision-making or leadership.



- Student support capacity [n =6]
 - A number of awardees and partners expressed concern about the number of students who need services and the current capacity to serve that is being exceeded by the numbers.
 - Concurrent with concerns, there were several awardees and partners who are planning to increase services and figuring out ways to do it. Identification of additional providers to accept referrals (e.g., for mental health services) is one approach.
- Resources (e.g., people; space; use of funding; use of existing structures) [n=6]
 - While there were situations where sharing space among partners was reported as insupportable because of physical space limitations, on the whole, shared spaces, resources, existing meetings, and staff were deemed helpful to coordination and communication.
- Perception/Experience with BSK programs [n =5]
 - References were made to roll-out issues, specifically for SBIRT, and general challenges that are present when starting new programming.
 - There was acknowledgment that BSK investments are impacting how their district or school systems work.
- Plans for other funding, including for sustainability [n=5]
 - Even in Year 1, some awardees and partners have begun to consider how to sustain the partnerships and even expand or scale up services.
- Strong community and/or school connections [n=4]
 - Long-term relationships exist between awardees and their partners in a number of schools. Relationships came before BSK and were long standing between CBOs and schools; in other cases, schools and CBOs had done initial work through BSK mini-grants and this work was a continuation.
 - Some awardees and partners bring to the work a strong sense of the qualities of the community (language diversity, immigration) and serve as advocates.
- Being grounded in the relationships they have built with schools and their community, some awardees and partners are able to serve as the connector to community resources.
- Changing demographics [n=3]
 - Some awardees and partners referenced changes in community and student demographics, with greater student mobility, growing diversity of languages and cultures, growing population of recent immigrants, and growing population of students in poverty. In a particular community, there was mention of increased substance use and gang involvement among youth.
- State context [n=2]
 - There were references to efforts at the state level to shift discipline systems toward more restorative approaches, as well as shifts in state funding.
- Diversity representation gap (school staff/CBO staff: students) [n=2]
 - There were references for the need to improve diversity and representation among the program staff. In one program, there are plans “to offer opportunities for youth to return as staff.”





A Mini Case Study: A Peek at An Equitable School Partnership²⁵

Mill Creek Middle School has two BSK investments—SBIRT and TIRP. It is highlighted for two main reasons. One, because the information gathered for the school come from a variety of perspectives – from the TIRP CBO awardee, Restore Assemble Produce (RAP), school leadership and staff, and Kent School District (KSD) leaders. Two, in examining the types of the partnerships found in the school, we assessed its SBIRT partnership to be Collaborative, its TIRP partnership to be Integrated, and overall, its cross-strategy partnership to be Integrated as well. In Mill Creek Middle School, SBIRT partners could refer students to services provided by RAP and RAP supported SBIRT activities in multiple ways, from the SBIRT introduction to parents and students, to its roll-out and full implementation in the school. SBIRT partners share an office with Mill Creek school counseling staff while RAP staff were present in the school every day which facilitated communication and collaboration across the board.

The *vision shared* across partners in Mill Creek Middle School, is to provide equitable access for students to programs and services; improve climate of the school; and eliminate suspensions and expulsions. According to one of the KSD leaders, the school's vision is aligned with district vision of student success, with SBIRT as one component supporting students to address trauma through behavior & mental health, and with TIRP growing the students' ability to cope and expand their social emotional skills.

Of the Mill Creek Middle School population, the School Principal spoke about the high diversity in the school. Compared to other middle schools in the school district, Mill Creek Middle School was noted to have very high numbers of students of color, English language Learners, low-income students and homeless students.²⁶ And as the School Principal stated, the diversity in the student population “... speaks to...our various needs.” And as a school leader stated, the diversity in the student population “...speaks to...our various needs.”

Trusting Relationships & Leadership. Given its myriad needs, the school has looked to accessing services provided by different community organizations for their students. And in 2017-18, RAP received a TIRP mini grant and their experience working with a school paved the way for understanding how to partner and work collaboratively within a school setting. Mill Creek Middle School became the partner for the TIRP mini grant awarded to RAP. The mini grant set up the opportunity for Mill Creek Middle School administration and staff to build and establish a trusting relationship with RAP leadership and staff and this relationship has supported the first-year full implementation in 2018-19 of both TIRP and SBIRT strategies at the school. The relationship between Mill Creek Middle School, RAP, and KSD and its SBIRT partners has been nurtured by a predominantly positive regard for one another that were expressed by the various actors—RAP's executive director, RAP's TIRP Coordinator, the Mill Creek Middle School counselor who has helped lead the SBIRT work in the school, the School Principal and other school leaders including the Assistant Principal, and the KSD Student and Family Support Services directors. Moreover, RAP leaders and school partners report on the status of power sharing and the need for a clear focus on equity.

²⁵ All six interviewees—two school, two district, and two CBO partners—who contributed to our understanding of how the BSK school partnerships in Mill Creek Middle School functioned in schoolyear 2018-19 were invited to review the case study. Those who reviewed provided comments, clarifications, suggestions and other feedback.

²⁶ Data reviewed to help compare Mill Creek Middle School with other middle schools in the school district are from <https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard/ViewSchoolOrDistrict/>.

“Our RAP partner is on our student school improvement plan team. She’s on our leadership team. So the work they’re doing, and the work we already have in line with our school improvement plan and vision for our school, is aligned already, but the RAP is on that team and we have several students on that team as well.” – School Principal

“Being able to work with a group of agencies, partners that utilizes your talents and your energies in a manner that makes this all work for the student and the families. That’s what it’s all about...” – School Counselor

*“The [TIRP] grant focuses on racial trauma. The power dynamics of partners were unified, it allowed us to conduct the racism pieces of the professional development of the staff. [The] Principal supported this work; he said that our staff needs this. The issues and behaviors that students are displaying-it is not their fault. Their behavior is not the only issue. Equity states that [staff] have to understand their role in the trauma. I have to give props to the principal for sharing his power.”
– RAP Executive Director*

This perception of *shared leadership* is also experienced by the school counselor who stated that because of her interest in SBIRT and area of expertise, the school’s administration trusted her to write the grant for her school and help shape the implementation of SBIRT in Mill Creek Middle School alongside SBIRT district and community partners. For SBIRT efforts, the close collaboration and communication was further facilitated by shared space.

“How schools are different in partnering with CBOS or with one another? [With CBOs] It looks incredibly different in every building. The one at Mill Creek Middle School, they’re kind of part of their school success team. And so there’s a team of people that all focus on school success. So a portion of that is the [full-time mental health] counselor, a portion of that is their behavior interventionists, as well as our people from [another CBO]. And so they work alongside each other in the same workspace. And it’s a team.” – Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Assistant Director

Flexibility & Roles. In turn, the school's administration, school staff, and district personnel acknowledged the leadership role of the TIRP CBO awardee which, in turn, made space for the voices of other stakeholders in the school community to be heard. The RAP Executive Director was included as a school representative in SBIRT meetings, and as one of the providers of support for identified Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. In addition, this TIRP awardee will be gearing up to be part of SBIRT screening efforts in Year 2. The school counselor referred to RAP as a 'gap filler', i.e., an organization that provided needed services where there were none.

"Right before SBIRT, RAP saw a need for a consistent mentoring program which was an area that RAP saw, and then worked to quickly fill. RAP did establish groups; started meeting with students; got buy in from students, formed norms/rules/meeting times and talked with parents. Although a lot of our students were over 13, RAP thought it important to include parents and explain parents' participation and support needed. This mentoring program was highly successful and the students continued. It was all about the students and whatever was going on with them. Basically, RAP met all of Maslow's hierarchy of needs so that students would continue to return and participate in the program. RAP provided a consistent continuum of care for them." – School Counselor

"Beginning with the administration, specifically with the principal, vice-principal, and school counselor staff and after school programs, our innovative team meetings helped clarify our willingness to assist in any way to help each sector from the school meet their specific goals. This helped them to see we were interested in what they cared about." – RAP Executive Director

The *changes in Practice, Policy, Systems & Environment* that the equitable school partnerships at Mill Creek Middle School are seeking to achieve are aligned with their expressed vision for student access to supports, reduction in suspensions and expulsions through increased attendance, and school staff growth in adopting and utilizing restorative practices. One recent district-wide change that impacts Mill Creek Middle School as well as other schools in the district is a new suicide prevention policy.

"A continuation of building stronger systems and structures that allow for kids to be able to be identified and triaged so they can actually get the supports they need. I think that will be through regular collaboration, regular team/partner meetings, also through our students of concern and our student support team meetings – and of course just making referrals to counselors." – School Principal

"Another big shift for us in a focus area is attendance, so we trained all of our teachers to say, hey, when a kid returns from an absence, it's as simple as saying, "Hey, I am really glad that you are here today" instead of, "Do you know what you missed? You need to make up that work you missed." Instead, "Hey, we missed you and want to make sure you get back on track. Here is a folder of some things you missed or click on these links so that you can get caught up. I am really glad you are here today." Just that simple shift in what teachers say was a huge impact to dramatically improve attendance during the last quarter of our school year. So just a simple way that teachers – they do not even realize it, but it's an implicit bias they have shown through the way that they question and respond to kids that we have to overcome and that's one thing that we are doing too." – School Principal

"Collaborative work with CBO partners have got us thinking of new work on discipline policies and procedures – what role might a CBO serve in either trying to avoid suspension or when a child is suspended, giving them additional resources that they can be referred to – to get facts sooner to avoid suspension. I don't think that we would have come to that same conclusion if we had not been doing this work."

– Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Executive Director

"To make change happens, it takes times. Internally and externally, processes have to be changed. To move from a less punitive model, practices have to be restorative. Half of the principal's staff, he chose personally. Restorative work [is] needed for disciplinary actions. Needs a chance for this to be implemented in the schools." - RAP TIRP Coordinator

"Through PD classes on Racism and Racial Trauma - our approach of telling the truth, but telling the truth in love, opened the eyes of many of the teachers whom we encountered and attended the classes. They know now that the students know the difference between racism and are not just saying things because, but it is a real experience to them. The teachers now know that we as a community-based organization we'll hold them accountable to certain implicit and explicit biases when parents and students share racial trauma issues. The school staff also knows they can trust us to come in and address a racial situation in fairness."

- RAP Executive Director

"We did not have a clear suicide prevention policy or procedure district wide – or what we had was really weak – so we actually have been able to take it on and make it strong. Influence not just the middle school but the whole system and as we have been implementing that this year, we have been learning a lot and making changes and adjustments along the way and will continue to do so." – Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Executive Director

"[T]he biggest change that we've had beginning of this year because we knew where we were going to do this, we put in place our suicide prevention policy. The district previously did not have one. And so we've put that in place. Along with putting that policy in place. We ended up having collaborative work sessions, along with our counselors, our psychologists, and our nurses around how to have a screening tool that we all can use within our schools, as well as have supporting documents to build safety plans for our students, flow charts to know exactly the steps we're taking to follow our policy and what trainings we're going to need in the future and this year. So along with that policy, we ended up having Crisis Connections come out and do training with all of the counselors, nurses, and psychologists."

– Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Assistant Director

TIRP and SBIRT partners in the school acknowledged the importance of *King County-BSK Team support* to their work. School partners were complimentary of BSK for its responsiveness to the needs of students and schools and for convening of meetings that brought different awardees and districts together enabling networking and learning as a larger community.

"This particular grant-they have an awesome team. We are always having meetings. We have cohorts of grantees coming together. There have been convening. We are helping with resources for one another. I can go on and on. Any technical assistance-bookkeeping, evaluation. They are setting us up to win. They are there for whatever we need. Email, calls, or both." – RAP Executive Director

"I think that the support I've seen has been just phenomenal...a preventative model which was groundbreaking. Now King County is linking all Districts to have a model that works for our traumatized students, but also serves as a preventive model for students who may fall under the radar. Such examples could be our highly capable students who are feeling pressure of their academic world to just students having a bad day or no one has asked me how I feel to no one really cares. So this model encompasses all students, irrespective of their levels of trauma. However, most kids, all persons at some point in their lives are going to experience some type of trauma. Both the SBIRT and TIRP models speak to that and it is ultra-important to see the scope for every student and for different families. You want to be able to see everyone with a wider lens." – School Counselor

"[BSK staff] has been amazing at contacting me back immediately and troubleshooting errors and that kind of thing. So, she has been a wonderful asset to this project. As far as other things, BSK SBIRT staff have been really good about connecting us with other districts so that we could utilize similar materials and that kind of thing."

– Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Assistant Director

*Year 2 Opportunities for Coordination, Services and Support:*²⁷ The various partners in the school have identified opportunities that can further buoy their work of serving students in the school. One aspect would be ensuring equal access to services for all students in need, including by improved identification and referral of students by teachers to counselors. Another is a continuing need to support staff around secondary trauma as part of their focus on trauma-informed approaches, while also attending to staff's role in the trauma that students experience. Also expressed was a desire for cross-stakeholder training; assistance in supporting collaboration across strategy areas within schools; and more opportunities for connecting with other districts just as connections are made between awardees in different BSK strategy areas. Finally, it was noted that there is limited bandwidth to onboard partners at the school level, so district and BSK support for onboarding processes and protocols would be helpful.

"It's unique to have community partners as part of this work. Need training to be able to do that work together, because that is needed as well. We have a contract with them and what we have found is that communication and that relationship continues to need to be fostered throughout. And make sure that if there are struggles that are happening in building around the community partner, they need to be addressed early. [Otherwise,] people get frustrated with the purpose for the partnership in the first place."
- Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Executive Director

"[Cross-strategy work] takes some coordinating at King County level as well... There needs to be opportunities to do things district by district. Everyone would need to come together a couple of times a year. King County overseeing these grants, community partners who receive these grants, and the schools that are involved. So, if they don't show up at these meetings, there needs to be some accountability If the meetings are on the book long before, people should be able to rearrange schedules and things, understand that this is natural priority attached to your funding, people will make it a priority. We all work better when there is some accountability to it – bottom line." – Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Executive Director

"I would love to see there be some kind of an onboarding for community partners. The Assistant Principal was talking about this just this morning with me. That is that any community partners need to come in with MOU. They should have a clear purpose. They should also understand the way that they can have access to student information, like Skyward." – School Principal

"We run the data structure at the counselor meetings. Going into this, I did not realize that there would be as much district level work needed as there has turned out to be. We found out once we got the grant. We thought that it would be just work in the schools individually but it has turned out to be much bigger for district because there are so many things that we need to be thinking about around screening, trainers, data collection, legal applications and things that go along with it."
– Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Assistant Director

"Glad the work is getting done. I do not see anything so insurmountable that cannot be worked out. I also believe that it is a benefit to award grants to districts and CBOs. Just takes a little more work to sort it all out but it is worth the work."
– Kent School District Student and Family Support Services Executive Director

²⁷ We note that the areas of opportunity in school, district, and CBO collaborations can pertain to collaborations amongst various organizations in general, and not specifically to the BSK-funded work only.

Indeed, strong as they have been, Mill Creek Middle School coordination structures are experienced as being at maximum capacity and with increasing demands of partnership requests (e.g., school or student data), it has been challenging to respond to requests and maintain partnerships with limited resources and people power. Although a concerted effort to maintain high level of organization and coordination in order to maintain high quality programs/partnerships is made, it still requires significant effort of administrative staff at both the school and district levels. There is expressed hope and anticipation for assistance from BSK School Partnerships program staff to help school, district, and CBO partners address challenges and further improve collaborative work with each other to achieve better integrated services for students that will support positive outcomes.





DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS



In this section, we provide a summary of the Year 1 results, share some implications for practice for BSK, school and CBO leaders and staff, as well as others engaged in or interested in engaging in school-based partnerships, and explain the limitations of the Year 1 evaluation. We also outline implications for Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation. In summarizing the results and implications for practice, we note feedback and priorities from the BSK SP Evaluation Advisors, where relevant.

OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

Below, we provide a summary of results by evaluation question and overall based on the Year 1 evaluation of partnerships in schools with multiple BSK strategy investments. **Relevant feedback from the Evaluation Advisors, who reviewed and discussed emerging findings in July and October 2019, is noted in red.**

*Question 1 (Q1): What do **equitable school partnerships look like**, and what are **the factors that support them**?*

Q1.1: In the nine schools that are part of the Year 1 study, relationship-building is crucial to how school partnerships developed and how they worked.

1. **Relationships are central to strong partnerships.** In general, relationships between school and community partners that began through prior opportunities to work together (such as through a BSK mini-grant) have allowed partnering organizations a head start in developing partnerships that are ready to provide student services.

2. **Developing trust in partnerships takes time.** Relationships are enabled and sustained by trust among partners. Trust supports sharing of leadership and decision-making roles and better coordination of program implementation and service provision.

→ **Advisors emphasized the critical importance of relationships and trust in partnerships, and this process is not easy or quick. They noted the implications of relationships and trust-building in multiple areas:**

- **The impact of changes in leaders and staff on relationships, and the sense of starting over when turnover happens**
- **How trust and relationships can support the practical work of partnerships, such as data sharing to support the partnership's work with students and families; and**
- **The need for relationship-building across BSK strategy areas to support cross-strategy partnerships.**

For more on relationship-and trust-building as they relate to leadership and coordination, see Results section, pg. 22.



Q1.2: Based on an assessment of 21 within-strategy partnerships (based on individual BSK strategy investments in HSE, OST, SBHC, SBIRT, TIRP, and/or YD), and of 5 cross-strategy partnerships (i.e., across two or more of the BSK strategy investments in the nine schools) using the YDEKC School and Community Partnership Toolkit, **we identified 10 Cooperative, seven Collaborative, and nine Integrated partnerships.**²⁸

→ **Advisors highlighted various aspects of developing and strengthening cross-strategy partnerships, which require the same intentionality as within-strategy partnerships. These include a shared purpose of “whole child” supports across multiple strategies, cross-strategy relationship-building, dedicated coordination, and strengthening partnerships among CBOs as well as between CBOs and schools/districts.**

For more on categorization of partnerships, see Results section, pg. 28.



Q1.3: **Leadership and coordination look and feel different in different types of partnerships.** The quality or type of school partnerships varied especially when considering leadership and coordination attributes related to equity.

- Integrated partnerships consistently demonstrated many equitable attributes in leadership (e.g., through power-sharing) and coordination (e.g., working towards common purpose) that then relate to strong partnership characteristics of shared vision, aligned and responsive implementation, and mutual or shared accountability for success.

→ **Advisors reinforced that equitable partnerships are inclusive partnerships. They highlighted the collective and complementary expertise that students, families, CBOs,**

schools and districts have to offer. Advisors particularly noted the importance of student leadership and family engagement in partnerships, two areas in which many CBOs have expertise to share with schools, districts, and other CBOs.

For more on leadership and coordination in different types of partnerships, see Results section, pg. 31.



*Question 2 (Q2): What is the **relationship between equitable partnerships and school-wide changes in practices, policies, systems, environments (PPSE), and student well-being?***

Q2. 1: Within- and cross-strategy partnerships are working on a range of practice, policy, system and environment changes to impact a range of student outcomes. There were indications of alignment in a number of efforts especially in schools with fewer BSK strategy investments.

- Partnerships of different types seek a range of practice, policy, and system changes especially related to access to improving student access to and coordination of supports, student leadership, family engagement, and staff growth. These changes relate to issues of equity and racism in the education system to varying degrees.
- There is a focus on improving school climate and environment across awardees in all nine schools. Most partnerships are focused on helping students feel connected and safe; on promoting positive, healthy relationships with peers and adults inside and outside of their schools; and on finding alternative pathways to addressing discipline concerns.
- Many awardees and partners are focused on improving student outcomes and well-being in similar ways in the areas of student engagement and mental, social, and physical health.

²⁸ From YDEKC School and Community Partnership Toolkit: In a Cooperative partnership, CBO and school partners operate autonomously from one another. Program goals are primarily established by the primary awardee (CBO or school), though they may share one or more goals with the other partner organizations. In a Collaborative partnership, CBO and school partners share goals and communicate about progress on a regular or semi-regular basis. The school and the partner organization(s) maintain ultimate decision-making authority over their own activities. In an Integrated partnership, the CBO partner(s) play(s) a major role in site planning processes, and shares data, resources, and decision-making authority with the school.

- **Advisors reinforced that changes in practices, policies, systems and environments take time. While these changes have been an expectation from BSK, it is important to understand they will not happen quickly.**
- **Advisors also noted the importance of understanding the changes a partnership seeks to accomplish, to support alignment between schools and CBOs, and to inform how the partnership should function and what supports are helpful. For example, partnerships focused on shifting adult beliefs or strengthening engagement between schools and families are different from those that are focused on providing services to students.**
 - **In particular, it is important to consider the supports and needs of partnerships working to shift beliefs and practices as well as policies and systems related to personal, institutional, and structural racism.**

For more on the practice, policy, system, and environment changes and student outcomes partnerships seek to impact (including alignment across strategies), refer to Results section, pg. 33.



Q3.2: BSK awardees and their partners consistently noted that equitable school partnership work can be challenging, and they look to the BSK and King County staff for technical assistance, particularly for partnership development and implementation.

- **Advisors note the significance of BSK's role in building relationships and convening awardees to facilitate peer learning.**
- **They emphasized that cross-strategy collaboration within BSK/King County will help cross-strategy partnerships in schools.**
- **Advisors emphasized that helpful supports are different across partnerships, and can depend on the focus of the partnership, such as providing services to students or shifting adult beliefs.**

For more on BSK supports for equitable partnerships, refer to Results section, pg. 42.



Overall: **Context matters.** The work of the partnerships has been influenced by realities of school and school district systems (e.g., data sharing requirements and limitations; administrative systems) and events (e.g., leadership and staff changes; new statewide requirements impacting discipline policies).

- **Advisors reinforced the challenge of leadership and staff changes, and the impact this turnover has on the relationships and trust that take time to build.**

For more on context affecting equitable partnerships, changes in schools, and BSK supports, refer to Results section, pg. 48.



*Question 3 (Q3): How do **King County processes and systems** support equitable partnerships?*

(See Appendix pg. 84 for full highlights of BSK Supports by Strategy)

Q3.1: BSK awardees expressed overwhelming appreciation for BSK's equitable school partnership strategies and the support BSK provides for their work.

- **Both cross-strategy supports and BSK practices within individual strategies were conducive to promoting partnership development.**

EMERGING IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

In the following table we summarize areas for consideration and possible action by various stakeholder groups to strengthen equitable partnerships and facilitate their combined efforts to support students. The suggestions and recommendations for practice are based on Year 1 evaluation results, input and feedback from School Partnerships Evaluation Advisors, and BSK Program staff in discussion with the PSED Evaluation Team. **Implications identified and prioritized by Evaluation Advisors are noted in red.**

There are several overarching points to keep in mind when considering the specific actionable implications for practice below.

- The **role BSK plays** is important and may look different depending on the SP strategy and what makes sense for a specific context. For example:
 - Where training or technical assistance are suggested, BSK may **facilitate but not necessarily provide** the training/technical assistance. This may include foundational training, particularly around equity, for all BSK implementers.
 - BSK can continue their **work to center communities**. They can consider how they support leaders from the community; how they, with power as a funder, affect conversations and spaces; and how they use and share their power and influence to further their work towards equitable partnerships.
 - These implications include activities that BSK is already doing that it can expand upon, and others that some strategies are already doing that other strategies can learn from. This can support individual strategies as well as the **collective work of BSK School Partnerships** and foster cross-strategy connections within BSK/King County, the same way it supports cross-strategy connections in schools and districts.
- In addition to context-specific considerations, there are several moves BSK could make to nurture **alignment across strategies** in support of partnership:
 - Increase strategy alignment for **grant materials**, from strategy description to logic models to program evaluation processes.
 - Standardize **partnership criteria** and contract language across strategies.
 - Align **BSK processes** as well as key messages; for example, continue to support shared site visits.
 - Increase and improve **communication** about BSK grants, partners, and staff; consider how to support knowledge of resources and referrals across strategies and within regions.
- It **takes time** to develop partnerships and to create lasting change.
 - This is true for BSK, as they seek to affect changes in practice, policy, systems, environments, and ultimately student outcomes. They can **consider the time this work requires** in how they structure their support for school partnerships.
 - Similarly, schools, districts, and CBOs are **simultaneously working** to implement programs and provide services to students and create the relationships and structures for cross-partner change.
 - BSK can continue to provide **flexible, long-term and multi-year funding** to support ongoing relationships.
 - Offering some **orientation for new school leaders** (first provided for OST awardees and partners during Spring 2019) can mitigate the impact of staff turnover among partnership leaders.
 - BSK staff can continue to **devote time** to building relationships and connection within the BSK School Partnership team and to support each other working across Departments and Divisions in King County government.
 -

EXHIBIT T. IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE		
	BSK/King County Staff	School, District, and CBO Leaders and Staff <i>Note: Implementation of these implications for practice will be different depending on the context and work of different schools, districts, and CBOs.</i>
Equity: Shared Power- Student Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offer technical assistance and support for promoting and developing student leadership in schools including through identifying, tapping expertise of schools and CBOs. For example, BSK could ask (and compensate) CBOs and schools to share experiences and lessons learned from having students serve in leadership bodies, steering committees or supporting student-led professional development for teachers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include students in school-based partnerships. Student voices help shift beliefs and ensure that the experiences of students are considered. Continuous efforts to invite students to the table are critical
Equity: Shared Power- Family Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family and other adults in the community as partnership leaders: Provide opportunities for sharing strategies and planning across partnerships, including those organizations and partnerships that are already engaging families in their partnerships 	
Leadership: Managing Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify strategies to help ameliorate the impact of staff turnover²⁹, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help partnerships build a system of shared leadership to sustain the work and avoid depending on one person, including training and support for building leaders to develop shared leadership Create opportunities to learn from the community or school partners who have experienced these changes and have sustained (and grown) their partnerships through these changes Provide tools or resources that describe the story of partnerships, including successes, challenges, and how partnerships have continued to grow through turnover and changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop strategies to build redundancy as one way to help ameliorate the impact of turnover Set up structures to enable shared responsibility, including among students, to keep the partnership going Capture information that can be archived in places with high turnover. This will help institutionalize knowledge which can help prevent burdening organizations with less resources

²⁹ There are a number of resources regarding strategies to reduce turnover. For example, strategies to reduce turnover among principals include: Provide high-quality professional learning opportunities, improve working conditions to foster job satisfaction, ensure adequate and stable compensation, support decision-making authority in school leadership, reform accountability systems to ensure that incentives encourage effective principals to stay in challenging schools to support teachers and improve student learning. From Levin, S. and K. Bradley, Understanding and Addressing Principal Turnover: A Review of the Research. March 12, 2019. Accessed December 2, 2019 at <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/nassp-understanding-addressing-principal-turnover-review-research-report>.

EXHIBIT T. IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE		
	BSK/King County Staff	School, District, and CBO Leaders and Staff <i>Note: Implementation of these implications for practice will be different depending on the context and work of different schools, districts, and CBOs.</i>
Coordination: Supporting integration and creating synergy in cross-strategy partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lift up and share the strengths and wisdom (e.g., through convenings) of those who are part of Integrated and/or cross-strategy partnerships to learn what they have done that allows the work to happen over time and attends to the centrality of trust and relationships 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and expand structures to support coordination among SP strategies within BSK • Offer resources and supports for developing and growing cross-strategy partnerships. Commit time and resources for relationship-building. This could include planning/meeting time, mini-grants or a “pilot” period. • Identify if/how BSK supports for Out-of-School Time place-based collaboratives can inform “place-based” partnerships across multiple BSK strategies in the same school • Identify if/how partnership structures like TIRP Innovation Meetings could inform structures to support cross-strategy partnership • Provide training and support for schools working with CBOs and CBOs working with schools, to support technical capacity as well as relationship building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set up structures to alleviate burden on the people doing the work and sustains the partnership over time
Coordination: Data sharing, data use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify where there is alignment in the PPSE and student outcomes changes sought across awardees in a school, and opportunities to work together for data collection and use 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide technical assistance and support, specifically how to access and use data and identifying where to build on what is already in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop structures that support data access and data use, such as meetings where partners can review data, understand progress, and plan next steps
Coordination: Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase and improve communication about BSK grants, partners, and staff. Develop resource lists or summaries of who (or which partnership) is doing what and where. This will support referrals and help partnerships’ “whole child” approach • Align BSK processes as well as key messages; for example, continue to support shared site visits 	

EXHIBIT T. IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE		
	BSK/King County Staff	School, District, and CBO Leaders and Staff <i>Note: Implementation of these implications for practice will be different depending on the context and work of different schools, districts, and CBOs.</i>
Practice, Policy, Systems, Environment, and Student Well-being Outcomes: Family Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lift up and share the strengths and wisdom (e.g., through convenings) of those organizations effectively engaging families. Partnerships want to do family engagement work but do not necessarily know how. Focused support or technical assistance in this area would be important for Integrated partnership, and could include training for school and CBO staff 	
Practice, Policy, Systems, Environment, and Student Well-being Outcomes: Staff Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with district, school, and union leadership to coordinate allocation of training time and professional development priorities for teachers and others. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide or fund foundational training, particularly around equity, for all BSK implementers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate with and train school staff about ways that help them to engage with students in positive and restorative ways
Practice, Policy, Systems, Environment, and Student Well-being Outcomes: Overall	In cases where there is not alignment in PPSE and student outcomes, identify where: 1) there are opportunities to better align across strategies , or 2) it makes sense for different strategies' partnerships to work on different but complementary changes .	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify expectations for changes to practice, policy, systems, environment, and student outcomes, including expectations of alignment across awardees in a school and breadth/depth of focus on these changes • Emphasize flexible long-term funding and multi-year grants to help support deep change in schools 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect to state-level efforts regarding priority changes (e.g., recent shifts in state discipline policy related to the use of expulsion and suspension, and new state standards for social and emotional learning) 	

LIMITATIONS

We have four categories of limitations to consider in reviewing results and conclusions from the Year 1 evaluation. In the section on Year 2 of the School Partnerships Evaluation (pg. 80), we describe in more detail how we plan to address these limitations in the Years 2 and 3 evaluation.

1. **Small sample size:** As described in the methods section that follows the guidance of the BSK SP Evaluation Advisors regarding how to approach learning about BSK-supported partnerships in a way that was relationship-focused and open-ended, and included multiple perspectives on school partnerships. To do this, we selected a sample of nine schools with multiple investments. With this sample, we were able to conduct interviews (rather than administering a survey) and were also able to interview multiple individuals, including awardees, partners, and school leaders in many of the schools. This approach provided a deeper understanding of partnerships in these schools but limited the number of schools we could include. As such, the results from the Year 1 evaluation should be understood as specific to these nine schools.
2. **Partial perspectives:** There is a range in the number and type of perspectives we were able to include to inform our understanding of how partnerships are developing, the changes these partnerships seek, and how BSK supports affect this work. In Year 1, we focused on understanding the experiences and perspectives of those most directly involved with BSK and with developing partnerships in schools. This primarily included SP awardees and BSK staff. The perspectives included in this evaluation are partial, to varying degrees, as follows:
 - a. For the four Seattle schools, we interviewed awardee organizations outside of Seattle Public Schools (SPS). We were not able to conduct interviews with SPS staff or include data from SPS narrative reports as we did not secure a research approval from SPS. Now that a partnership agreement between SPS and BSK/King County has been established, we plan to complete the approval process in Year 2 in order to include SPS staff (at both the district- and school-level) in this evaluation.
 - b. The adult perspectives from the other five schools (in Auburn, Bellevue, Kent, and Tukwila School Districts) vary. In two schools, we interviewed and included narrative report data from all awardees, as well as building leaders (principals and/or assistant principals) and staff, as well as district leaders. In the others, we interviewed district staff but not building leadership. Similarly, we did not conduct interviews with partner organizations (i.e. organizations that are not BSK awardees but are collaborating with awardees to implement the BSK-supported work) in Year 1.
 - c. Among all schools, we do not have firsthand perspectives or experiences of students. As the emphasis of the Year 2 evaluation shifts to understand if and how changes are happening in schools, and the impact of these changes, hearing directly from students will be critical.
 - d. Similar to students, we did not interview or hear directly from families in Year 1. As we deepen our understanding of Integrated partnerships in Year 2, we intend to include families in the evaluation, particularly in those schools where families are leaders, members or participants in school-based partnerships.
3. **Evaluation timing:** We conducted many of our interviews in late April through early June, when there are demands on staff time as the academic year ends. This likely contributed to the challenges we had with interviewing everyone we had hoped. In Year 2, we will be able to start data collection earlier in the year. Programs will also be further in their implementation, including the development of partnerships.
4. **"Snapshot" of dynamic partnerships:** We know that partnerships evolve over time. The results described in this report reflect data collection from a moment in time, from January through summer 2019. We plan to follow these partnerships in Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation, in order to understand the shifts and changes that occur in their continued development.

METHODS



In this section we outline the methods of this evaluation, including the evaluation design and our approach to data collection and analysis. Where relevant, we distinguish how we addressed Evaluation Questions 1 and 2, which are focused on a school as the unit of analysis, from Evaluation Question 3, which focuses on supports from BSK as a whole.

BACKGROUND

The BSK SP evaluation is a mixed-methods study that uses quantitative and qualitative approaches to better understand the implementation and outcomes of the collective work of SP investments. It aims to deepen understanding of partnerships and their influence on changes to practices, policies, systems, school environments, and student outcomes for the purpose of learning and improvement.

For this evaluation, we are focused on schools with multiple BSK School Partnership strategy investments. Strategy areas include Healthy and Safe Environments (HSE); Out-of-School Time (OST); School-Based Health Centers (SBHC); Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral To Services (SBIRT); Trauma Informed and Restorative Practices (TIRP); and Youth Development (YD). During our evaluation period, strategy areas were in varying stages of implementation ranging from TIRP, which was just beginning implementation of programming, to SBHC, which had been operating for several decades.

BSK and PSESD's commitment to racial equity is reflected in both the focus of the evaluation (the "what" of the evaluation) and our approach to the evaluation (the "how" of the evaluation), in three ways:

- We reflect manifestations of racial equity in the questions and topics in our interviews with SP awardees, schools, and partners.³⁰
- We endeavor to understand the changes to practices, policies, systems, environments, and student outcomes that SP awardees and partners seek, attending to changes that are

meant to address individual, institutional, and structural racism in the education system and to impact students furthest from educational justice, including students of color, low-income students, and limited English-speaking residents of King County.³¹

- We work closely with those organizations and schools engaged in partnerships in the evaluation. BSK SP Evaluation Advisors, including members of awardee organizations from each of the BSK SP strategies, have shaped the evaluation design, data collection, analysis, and conclusions and recommendations included in this Year 1 report. (See Appendix pg. 84 for a list of BSK SP Evaluation Advisors.)

The BSK School Partnerships Logic Model (see Appendix pg. 84 for BSK School Partnerships Logic Model) guides sequencing and emphasis for each year of the evaluation. The Year 1 (2018-19 school year) evaluation focused primarily on partnership development in schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments and the ways in which supports from BSK/King County are influencing partnerships in these schools. A brief literature summary that elaborates on the connections among characteristics of partnerships is included in the Evaluation Design section that follows.

Year 1 includes an exploratory inquiry of the current state of key practices, policies, and systems that awardees and partners seek to change. We explore the changes that partnerships seek to affect rather

³⁰ A BSK awardee is defined as the organization that holds the contract with BSK. BSK partners are those organizations working with awardees to implement the funded program(s).

³¹ King County (2016). Best Starts for Kids Implementation Plan. Retrieved November 2019, from <https://www.kingcounty.gov/~media/elected/executive/constantine/initiatives/best-starts-for-kids/documents/BSK-Plan-final.ashx?la=en>

than the changes that are actually happening. Much of BSK-funded work was still in early implementation, with partnerships newly forming in the 2018-19 school year. We also describe how awardees and partners are seeking to affect school environments (i.e., school climate and culture) and student well-being and outcomes, including students' mental, socio-emotional, and physical health.

In this mixed methods study, we validate the data we collected to substantiate our results in several ways:

- We included different stakeholders to understand a range of perspectives and experiences with BSK investments, including those of awardees, partners, and school leadership and staff, as well as BSK program and contract staff.
- We combined existing and new data to leverage what has already been collected, and to gather complementary data to fill any gaps or provide additional information.
- We worked with BSK SP Evaluation Advisors to guide and inform the design, data collection, analysis, and reporting phases of this evaluation.

In addition to working with BSK SP Evaluation Advisors, we conducted the analysis in ways that combined multiple perspectives. To better understand and interpret emerging results, we used group analysis processes with the PSESD Evaluation Team, BSK SP Evaluation Advisors, and BSK SP Program staff.

EVALUATION DESIGN

The three evaluation questions are informed by literature on the topics of equity, leadership, coordination, synergy and dosage, as described briefly below.

EQUITY

Equity is a core value of the BSK initiative. Equitable partnerships are those that attend to issues of equity in 1) how they function (e.g. power, decision-making, and relationship- and trust-building) as well as in 2) what changes in practices, policies, systems, school environments, and student well-being are occurring, and to whose benefit. In equitable partnerships, partners and stakeholders that do not hold institutional power feel included and valued, have buy-in, and see themselves in the communication and decision-making processes. People who are affected by decisions are included in and influence decision-making. How partners “come to the table” (e.g., relationship-focused, flexible, engaged) and what they bring with them (e.g., advocacy, knowledge, expertise, convening power, skills, structures, resources) are critical to the quality of partnership functionality and the type of partnership.^{32, 33}

Equitable partnerships are the focus of this evaluation. If a school was to have equity at its heart, what would students experience? A student, no matter who she is or where she comes from, will feel “safe... to take risks, stretch, learn, and authentically engage day in, day out” alongside adults they interact with in the school. It is a place where adults and especially the “faculty hold themselves to the highest expectations and professional responsibility, while doing what is necessary to understand themselves and their students racially and culturally.”³⁴ This evaluation emphasizes how students experience equity in schools as well as how equitable partnerships can and do develop among schools, CBOs, parents, families, and students. In order to understand how equitable school partnerships that are forged in service of students work, we relied on two primary works, the

³² Christens, Butterfoss, Minkler, Wolff, Francisco, & Kegler, 2019.

³³ M. Gulbranson, personal communication, September 26, 2019, PSESD Evaluation Team Meeting.

³⁴ Linton & Davis, 2013, p. 1

YDEKC Partnership Toolkit³⁵ and the Authentic Community School Partnerships Framework.³⁶ From the latter resource, Gulbranson (2017) provided us with the means or indicators to help us examine how school and community partners “show up” when they work together. He described leadership and coordination actions that promoted racial equity in partnerships such as transparent communication and decision-making, power-sharing, responsiveness, and inclusiveness. These descriptions influenced what we looked for in school partnerships. From the YDEKC Partnership Toolkit, we were able to glean additional equity-promoting actions from descriptions of the characteristics of partnerships (i.e., shared vision, aligned and responsive implementation, and shared accountability for success). Moreover, the YDEKC Partnership Toolkit is also the basis for the typology of partnerships (i.e., Cooperative, Collaborative, Integrated) that we adapted in this school partnerships evaluation.

LEADERSHIP

The identification of a partnership’s leaders is critical, especially for partnerships that are collaborating for equity and justice.³⁷ In addition, there are several other aspects of leadership that affect how a partnership functions. Many of these aspects were reflected in responses of awardees and partners to interview questions (see Appendix pg. 84 for interview protocols). They are related to visioning, trust-building, power-sharing, inclusive decision-making, and coordination through the facilitation and support of program implementation, including through mobilization of resources and other community partners. School and community leaders who communicate often and transparently with one another and who ensure the inclusion of student and family perspectives are able to mobilize talents and resources for their shared goals.³⁸ These are important leadership functions^{39, 40}, especially as they help move partnerships towards integration and synergy.^{41, 42} Leadership is an element of equitable partnerships explored in this evaluation.

SYNERGY

Synergy is the degree to which the partnership combines the complementary strengths, perspectives, skills, values, and resources of all the partners in the search for better solutions to issues that matter to the community, and it is generally regarded as a product of strong and trusting working relationships among partners.⁴³ Synergistic partnerships are built on and facilitated by leadership that is centered on equity⁴⁴ and allow for deeper and more authentic engagement of students, families, and community partners. Such partnerships provide community members with the greatest stakes of “equal or more powerful voice than agency professionals, setting up structures so decision making is shared, focusing efforts in disadvantaged communities, and prioritizing PSE [policy, systems, and environment] change.” These real changes become possible as partnerships “embrace strategies with real potential to challenge the status quo and lead to transformative change in power, equity, and justice.”⁴⁵

COORDINATION

Coordination is the concept of organizations and individuals working together in an organized way, where partners engage in creating norms, protocols, and structures in inclusive ways that define and drive decisions and communication. Leadership work could include coordination (e.g., convening and communication across partners) or the facilitation of program implementation. Coordination plays a critical role in providing services, especially in well-established institutions such as schools and school districts.^{46, 47} In a study of Safe Schools and Healthy Students grantees from 2005 and 2006, researchers reported on the importance of school resources and school involvement in planning and implementing programs and activities.⁴⁸ Structures and processes that support coordination through communication, for example, are shown to be key to partnership functioning.^{49, 50, 51} Coordination is another partnership element that we examine in this study.

³⁵ Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>

³⁶ Gulbranson, M. (2017). *Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework*. In preparation.

³⁷ Wolff, et al., 2016.

³⁸ Green 2017

³⁹ Butterfoss, Lachance, & Orians, 2006.

⁴⁰ Butterfoss, Goodman, & Wandersman, 1996.

⁴¹ Jones & Barry, 2011.

⁴² Lasker, Weiss, & Miller, 2001.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Jones & Barry, 2011.

⁴⁵ Kegler, Wolff, Christens, Butterfoss, Francisco, & Orleans, 2019, p. 55

DOSAGE

In planning and evaluating community-level initiatives focused on policy and environment change, it is useful to estimate “population dose”.⁵² Population dose is defined as the product of “reach” and “strength,” where reach is the number of people touched by the community change (e.g., living near a newly installed walking trail), and strength is the estimated effect on each person reached (e.g., the estimated increase in minutes of daily walking for each person living near the trail). The expectation is that high dose would produce the greatest change in behavior and in outcomes.⁵³ For this evaluation, we seek to understand if and how dosage affects equitable partnerships and the changes they affect in schools. Dosage refers to the number of BSK strategies as well as the number of students reached by awardees in the schools being studied.

DEFINING PARTNERSHIP

There are many ways of defining and describing the concept of “partnership.” For the purposes of this evaluation, we begin with how BSK defines those investments that are considered “School Partnership” (SP) investments. BSK SP Program staff identified schools that are BSK awardees or where the school was working with a CBO or other awardee to implement BSK-funded work in their school. Beyond defining School Partnerships to inform the scope of this study, we also distinguish two types of partnerships for understanding how BSK-supported work is developing in schools:

- ***Within-strategy partnerships*** are those partnerships (between schools, CBOs, students, families, and/or others) that are implementing BSK-funded work in one BSK strategy area (e.g., Healthy and Safe Environments; Out-of-School Time; School-Based Health Centers; Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral To Services; Trauma-Informed and Restorative Practices; and Youth Development).⁵⁴

- ***Cross-strategy partnerships*** are those partnerships (between schools, CBOs, students, families, and/or others) that are collaborating across two or more BSK strategy areas (e.g., a partnership where OST, TIRP, and SBIRT awardees are working in the same school, and working together and with the school to support students in that school).



46 Robles, Venkateswaran, & Feldman, 2016.

47 Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>

48 Ellis and colleagues, 2012, p. 291.

49 Butterfoss, et al., 2006

50 Butterfoss & Kegler, 2002, p. 164

51 Robles, et al., 2016

52 Cheadle, et al., 2012

53 Ibid, p. 74. A good illustration of how the methodology works can be found in a study conducted on Community Health Initiative where the authors demonstrated the relationship between combinations or levels of reach and strength (e.g., low-reach and low-strength strategies; high-reach and high strength strategies) in school and workplace physical activity examples (Schwartz, Rauzon, & Cheadle, 2015).

54 There is one instance of a CBO in this evaluation which is funded through two different BSK strategies to support their work in the same school. The CBO considers both strategies as supporting their partnership with the school as a whole, so we consider this as a single partnership, funded by two BSK strategies.

TYPES OF PARTNERSHIP

The YDEKC School-Community Partnership Toolkit⁵⁵ provides a starting point for characterizing different types of partnerships. We adapted it to the BSK context to understand how partnerships are working and to what end.⁵⁶ We include a key quote from our interviews to illustrate the three partnership types.



COOPERATIVE:

In a Cooperative partnership, CBO and school partners operate autonomously from one another. Program goals are primarily established by the primary awardee (CBO or school), though they may share one or more goals with the other partner organizations.

"... [Need for] dialoguing about program throughout and we cannot move without buy-in from school. [We have to] learn first, can't jump in and start helping. We are coordinating implementation of work with school and we need to get in step with school leadership."



COLLABORATIVE:

CBO and school partners share goals and communicate about progress on a regular or semi-regular basis. The school and the partner organization(s) maintain ultimate decision-making authority over their own activities.

"The key to me of how it worked was that everybody came to the table and said how can we make it all work. No one came in and said my piece is more important than yours, but everyone came, thought how can we fit these pieces together, and focused on that, with the kids foremost in your mind. [It was] not about competing but about finding a solution."



INTEGRATED:

The CBO partner(s) play(s) a major role in site planning processes, and shares data, resources, and decision-making authority with the school. We also looked at the degree to which Integrated cross-strategy partnerships are **synergistic**, with the hypothesis that strongly or well-integrated cross-strategy partnerships achieve synergy. Synergy is the degree to which the partnership combines the complementary strengths, perspectives, skills, values, and resources of all the partners in the search for better solutions to issues that matter to the community, and is generally regarded as a product of strong and trusting working relationships among partners.⁵⁷

"I feel that that the group was really good at making sure voices were heard: student voices, family voices, and different community stakeholders."

⁵⁵ Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>

⁵⁶ We adapted the YDEKC Toolkit and partnership types to apply to a range of BSK-supported partnerships. It was most easily applied to school-CBO partnerships, though we also adapted it to apply to district-level grants where partners were the district central office and schools, or where the district worked with vendors to implement a new curriculum.

SCHOOLS WITH MULTIPLE BSK SP STRATEGY INVESTMENTS

For this evaluation, we are focused on schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments. Strategy areas include Healthy and Safe Environments (HSE); Out-of-School Time (OST); School-Based Health Centers (SBHC); Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral To Services (SBIRT); Trauma Informed and Restorative Practices (TIRP); and Youth Development (YD). From an original count of 19 schools that have multiple BSK SP strategy investments, we focused Year 1 on nine schools that were selected through a combination of random sampling and BSK SP Program Lead nomination.

Guidance from both BSK SP Program staff and SP Evaluation Advisors emphasized the importance of hearing a well-rounded range of perspectives about how partnerships are developing in schools. While we initially intended to focus on awardees working in schools with multiple strategy investments, they encouraged us to talk with awardees as well as school leaders, staff, and key partner organizations doing work in these schools. As such, we decided to select a 50 percent sample of schools with multiple strategy investments. This selection allowed us to include multiple perspectives from as many schools with varying combinations of strategy investment as possible throughout our initial interviews. The schools included in the Year 1 evaluation are listed in Exhibit U. (Refer to Appendix pg. 84 for more information on identifying schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments and selecting the sample schools.)

EXHIBIT U. YEAR 1 EVALUATION SCHOOLS	
DISTRICT	SCHOOL
AUBURN	CASCADE MIDDLE SCHOOL
BELLEVUE	HIGHLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL
KENT	MEEKER MIDDLE SCHOOL
	MILL CREEK MIDDLE SCHOOL
SEATTLE	INTERAGENCY PROGRAMS
	MEANY MIDDLE SCHOOL
	SEATTLE WORLD SCHOOL
	WASHINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL
TUKWILA	SHOWALTER MIDDLE SCHOOL



DATA COLLECTION

In Exhibit V, we describe each data source from the Year 1 evaluation, including its purpose and what it includes. The range of perspectives and information we have for each school varied depending on the individuals we interviewed as well as the secondary data we reviewed.

- In Auburn, Bellevue, Kent, and Tukwila we interviewed individuals from awardee organizations, including both CBOs and districts.
- In Bellevue, Kent, and Tukwila we also interviewed district staff who were not awardees but were familiar with the BSK-funded work in their districts.
- In both Kent schools we interviewed school leadership as well as school staff members familiar with the BSK-funded work in their schools.
- Among the four Seattle schools the range of perspectives and data sources are more limited, as we did not secure a research approval from Seattle Public Schools (SPS) in order to include SPS employees or SPS reports in Year 1. Given the limited access, data sources for the four Seattle schools are limited to interviews and reports from CBO awardees. See Limitations in the Discussion section for more information about Seattle Public Schools in Year 1 of the evaluation.

Our focus on interviews is the result of guidance we received from the BSK SP Evaluation Advisors. Our first data collection was planned as a survey of organizations and school leaders in schools with multiple BSK investments. In sharing our plans for a survey, BSK SP Evaluation Advisors noted 1) the importance of building relationships, particularly early on in the evaluation; 2) the challenges of a survey for capturing valid data when partnerships are developing in different ways in different contexts; and 3) the importance of understanding what is happening in a more nuanced and open-ended way. As such, we used interviews as our primary data source in Year 1 to build relationships and take a more open-ended and exploratory approach to understanding how partnerships are developing.

EXHIBIT V. DATA SOURCES		
Data Source	Purpose of Data Source	What does this include?
Awardee and Partner Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To gather first-hand perspectives of interviewees with a focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building relationships Understanding the nuances of how partnerships are developing Informing future work to define and further explore partnerships and changes in schools 	29 interviews ⁵⁸ with awardees and partners including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awardees including CBOs, districts, and schools (20) School administrators or staff partners (5) District partners (3) Subcontractor partners (1)
Secondary Data from Awardees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To leverage existing data collection to minimize the reporting burden on awardees To compare information from secondary data that is new, confirmatory, and/or different from what was shared in interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awardee narrative reports (21) Awardee logic models (22) Strategy-level logic models (3) SBIRT Interventionist Survey responses (4) HSE quarterly reports (2)
Secondary Data from BSK/ King County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide context for Evaluation Question 3 analysis To support BSK in continuous quality improvement efforts To inform key topics to address in BSK/King County interviews 	BSK/King County information and materials including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests for Proposals (RFPs) Scope of Work templates Contract monitoring processes Convening agendas Narrative report guidance
BSK and King County Staff Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To gather BSK School Partnership leads' perspectives on how funding agency practices and cross-strategy work among BSK/King County staff help support and influence partnerships in schools that received multiple SP strategy investments To understand how and to what extent fiscal and contract monitoring processes differ among the Departments and Divisions that support BSK awardees, to inform Question 3 analysis, and to understand how results can support continuous quality improvement 	12 interviews with BSK staff ⁵⁹ representing different SP strategy areas including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Partnerships overall (3) HSE (2) SBHC (3) SBIRT (2) TIRP (2) 1 interview with King County Contract, Procurement and Real Estate Services Manager


⁵⁸ These interviews included 37 people, as several interviews included more than one person. The interview list is included in Appendix pg. 82. Interview protocols for awardees and partners, school administrators, and district staff are included in Appendix pg. 84.

⁵⁹ The interview list is included in Appendix pg. 82. Interview protocols for BSK and King County staff are included in Appendix pg. 82.

DATA ANALYSIS

To understand how equitable partnerships are developing and the changes these partnerships seek to affect (Questions 1 and 2), we analyzed data by school. Through a multi-step process, we analyzed interviews and documents from awardees by school and across schools. Exhibit W includes an overview of each step, with additional details that follow.

EXHIBIT W. EVALUATION QUESTIONS 1 AND 2 ANALYTICAL APPROACH



1. **Coded interviews:** To begin analyzing data from the 29 awardee and partner organizations, we coded (or categorized) interview transcripts in order to identify themes related to a topic (e.g., Leadership; Vision; Practice, Policy, Systems, and Environment Changes; Unexpected Developments) in each of the nine schools. This process included two parts—developing codes and applying codes—as described below.
 - a. To develop codes, we employed a top-down/bottom-up approach to identify relevant topics. We included codes based on the concepts from the literature review (top-down) as well as codes that emerged in the interviews (bottom-up). We coded all interviews using Dedoose, a qualitative analysis tool. (See Codebook in Appendix pg. 84)
 - b. To determine how and when to apply codes, we calibrated across the five PSESD Evaluation Team members who coded interviews to support consistency in coding.

To calibrate coding, we met as a group and coded one interview together so we could discuss and apply the codes to develop a shared understanding of when and how to apply the codes. Following this group coding process, we coded five more interviews in pairs, so that two team members were able to discuss and align their application of codes. Based on these calibration conversations, we were able to fine tune and finalize the codebook. Following this calibration process, we were each assigned to code a subset of the remaining 23 sets of transcribed interviews.

2. **Developed “look fors”:** The codes described above allowed us to categorize the topics interviewees addressed. Within each topic we developed a set of “look fors,” or attributes of equitable partnerships. Look fors focus on concepts of racial equity (based largely on the Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework) and partnership (based largely on the

YDEKC School and Community Partnership Toolkit).^{60, 61} These look fors are fundamental to our analysis and understanding of the strengths of partnerships as well as opportunities for improvement, both in individual partnerships and schools and across partnerships and schools. Looks fors played a critical role throughout the phases of our analysis, as described further below. (See Appendix pg. 84 for a list of look fors that includes Advisor feedback, and additional background.)

3. **Synthesized interviews and secondary data:** After coding all data from interviews with awardees and schools, districts, and other partners, the PSESD Evaluation Team synthesized the data in pairs for each school, beginning with Auburn, Bellevue, Kent, and Tukwila schools.⁶² Through this process, we reviewed coded data for a given parent code (i.e., overarching topic, such as vision or coordination) and related child codes (i.e., more specific topics; for the parent code of “coordination”, child codes include communication, coordination structures, and data-sharing). We then developed themes related to the topic/parent code (and related sub-topics/child codes) for that school. With themes identified, we did a preliminary assessment of strengths and opportunities within each topic area using the look fors described above.

As a team, we then discussed themes, strengths, and opportunities for each school to identify commonalities across schools.

We then shared the results of this synthesis process with the Evaluation Advisors for their feedback, questions, and suggestions. We requested their feedback on our preliminary assessment of strengths and opportunities, in particular, as it related to their own understanding and experience with school-community partnerships.

We then shared the emerging findings, with Advisor feedback incorporated, with BSK SP Program staff at a separate meeting.

We also conducted secondary data collection and analysis related to equitable partnerships and changes to practice, policy, systems, environment, and student outcomes. The purpose of this analysis was to triangulate the data we collected from interviews and to assess how the information either reinforced what we heard in interviews and/or included any new, supplementary, or contradictory information.

4. **Applied look fors to assess and categorize partnerships:** We revised and applied look fors based on the Authentic Partnership Framework, the YDEKC toolkit, Advisor feedback, and PSESD Evaluation Team assessments.^{63, 64} Using evidence from school summaries of interviews, secondary data review, and logic model analysis, we identified evidence of partnership dimensions (and associated look fors) within and across strategies by school. We assessed partnership elements (Leadership, Coordination), characteristics (Shared Vision; Aligned, Responsive Implementation; Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success), and synergy (we considered synergy specific to cross-strategy partnerships).

We held two sessions with the PSESD Evaluation Team to deepen our preliminary analysis and include all nine schools. In the first meeting, we used the checklist from the YDEKC toolkit as a guide to categorize partnerships in nine schools as Cooperative, Collaborative, or Integrated using assessments and summaries presented at team consultations. We then examined how our constructs of interest (such as Leadership, Coordination) related to each partnership category. We began by conducting an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to assess how well the look fors defined or reinforced Leadership and Coordination.⁶⁵ As described above, interview and secondary source data (such as narrative reports) were coded and

⁶⁰ Gulbranson, M. (2017). *Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework*. In preparation.

⁶¹ Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>

⁶² We began with an analysis that focused on schools in these districts because of limitations of the data for Seattle schools because we did not interview SPS staff. For more information, see Limitations section.

⁶³ Gulbranson, M. (2017). *Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework*. In preparation.

⁶⁴ Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>

⁶⁵ We also used Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to examine how look fors for other constructs of interest such as Shared Vision, Aligned & Responsive Implementation, Mutual Accountability for Success as well as Partnership Synergy, and Practice, Policy, Systems, & Environment Changes. The use of factor analysis with a small sample has been shown to be admissible. de Winter, Dodou, & Wieringa (2009) demonstrated “that when data are well conditioned (i.e., high levels of loadings, low number of factors (f) [or constructs], and high number of variables (p) [or items]), EFA can yield reliable results for N well below 50, even in the presence of small distortions.” (p.147)

analyzed using the look fors. Each within-strategy partnership and cross-strategy partnership in the nine schools were scored on each look for. Based on the Authentic Partnership and YDEKC frameworks and on feedback from the School Partnerships Evaluation Advisors, look fors that were equity-centered were distinguished from those that were not. Look fors were then scored on 3-point scales: low (no reference made or no evidence from any source), medium (some evidence from at least one source), or high (evidence from multiple sources). Look fors that were identified as equity-centered were scored on a scale of 0, 1, or 2; and non-equity-centered look fors were scored 0, .5, or 1. Look fors that could not be assessed were not scored. Using EFA results, we were able to establish that the Leadership and Coordination look fors had high loading values. Said differently, each of the look fors that help “define” or “describe” each element was correlated highly with the partnership element in question—Leadership or Coordination—taken as a whole. To begin to illustrate the two partnership elements, we then identified three of the equity-focused look fors within Leadership and Coordination that helped differentiate partnerships.⁶⁶ These exercises helped the team identify Leadership and Coordination strengths and opportunities across school sites.

Another part of the cross-school analysis was focused on Question 2. We generated a cross-school matrix highlighting which PPSE changes and student outcomes each awardee is focused on impacting. We compared these intended changes and outcomes within school partnerships to provide context and understand alignment among the changes that awardees seek to affect. This preliminary type of analysis for Question 2 was adopted as a Year 1 approach given that several strategies (particularly SBIRT and TIRP) were in their first year of implementation. Given this early stage of implementation, we focused on understanding what changes partnerships are focused on affecting to understand how this focus aligns


across partnerships in a given school. This landscape provides information that can be helpful to identify opportunities for greater coordination, alignment, and synergy across strategies in the future.

5. **Shared and validated preliminary results:** We developed preliminary results to share with BSK SP Evaluation Advisors and BSK SP Program staff. Based on their knowledge and experience working on the various strategy investments, we sought their feedback and input on additional analysis and next steps.

In order to understand King County processes (Evaluation Question 3), we implemented a separate analytical approach. While we analyzed data for each school (as our unit of analysis) for Questions 1 and 2, we analyzed data within and across BSK strategies (as our unit of analysis) for Question 3. The process we followed to analyze Question 3 data is summarized in Exhibit X.

⁶⁶ Using EFA, these are look fors that had an equity focus and item loadings that were equal or greater than .75. High look for or item loadings provide confidence that the look fors help distinguish one partnership from another. See Appendix pg. 82 for EFA Results.

EXHIBIT X: EVALUATION QUESTION 3 ANALYTICAL APPROACH



1. **Reviewed documents from King County and BSK:** The PSESD Evaluation Team reviewed documents compiled by BSK's Evaluation Manager and BSK SP Program staff. The PSESD Evaluation Team coded the material and conducted descriptive thematic analysis to identify the frequency of partnership-related content by subject area and to identify areas where BSK grant solicitation and contract products and processes contribute to components of partnership functioning and synergy.⁶⁷ Specific document review methods were as follows:

- The PSESD Evaluation Team developed a matrix and document review guide collaboratively and with feedback from the BSK SP Program staff.
- Two PSESD Evaluation Team members reviewed an initial set of data and calibrated their coding to ensure analytic alignment.
- One PSESD Evaluation Team member conducted an initial review, recording insights in a detailed matrix with descriptive and interpretive analysis as well as in a Word document with highlighted results.
- A second PSESD Evaluation Team member reviewed a portion of all documents and reviewed all matrix analysis

for key insights.

- The PSESD Evaluation Team reviewed and revised draft findings that were prepared by one of the team members.
2. **Coded interviews:** To analyze interviews with BSK awardees and partners in schools with multiple strategy investments, and with King County/BSK staff, the PSESD Evaluation Team coded interviews using codes that reflect a hybrid top-down (deductive)/bottom-up (inductive) approach. PSESD identified codes based on the interview questions, including the type of support provided by BSK, the quality of the support, and the ways in which the support influenced equitable partnerships based on key partnership frameworks (deductive). We also identified emergent concepts from the interviews (inductive).
3. **Developed emerging themes:** The PSESD Evaluation Team then reviewed coded excerpts to identify themes across schools and strategies related to King County supports, based primarily on look fors from the online Grantmakers for Effective Organization's Smarter Grantmaking Playbook.⁶⁸ The team organized claims and emerging themes by strength and opportunity for improvement and reviewed all claims as a group to triangulate results.
- The process was repeated twice for awardee and partner

⁶⁷ PSESD recognizes that for the Out of School Time (OST) strategy, Schools Out Washington (SOWA) is the contracted grant maker.

⁶⁸ Published online by Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, a network of grantmaking organizations that aims to identify core grantmaking strategies to achieve community transformation.


interviews, with two team members completing one review with a subset of 12 interviews and three team members completing a second review across all 29 interviews.

- BSK staff interviews were reviewed by one staff member for emerging themes and then triangulated by two additional staff members.
 - We compared the emerging recommendations to look for from the online Grantmakers for Effective Organization's Smarter Grantmaking Playbook in order to assess how and if the emerging recommendations resonated or if anything was missing.
4. **Shared and validated emerging themes:** Emerging themes were reviewed by BSK SP Evaluation Advisors in June as well as by BSK SP Program staff at the June 2019 School Partnership meeting. BSK SP Evaluation Advisors provided feedback on recommendations related to King County supports at the October Advisors Meeting.
- a. Continuous improvement with emerging themes was a focus of the July and August BSK SP Program staff meetings.
 - b. Emerging themes and recommendations were shared in two interim reports: a Document Review Memo in March 2019, and a Question 3 Memo in August 2019.





YEAR 2 OF THE SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS EVALUATION



In addition to the implications for BSK and King County as well as school, district, and CBO leaders and staff, the Year 1 results also impact the Year 2 evaluation. The implications for the Year 2 evaluation follow.

- We will continue to build our understanding about the nature of stability and change in partnerships, i.e., those that remain as Cooperative or Collaborative partnerships in the same category and those that deepen, and what factors contribute to stability or change. Following partnerships over time will help us address the limitations of a point-in-time “snapshot” from the Year 1 evaluation.
- As such, we will also deepen understanding of Integrated partnerships and explore what would it take for partnerships to be more equitable and to achieve synergy across multiple BSK investments.
- With BSK, we will identify additional schools with Integrated or synergistic partnerships to help us understand more about what has facilitated or challenged their development. This helps to address the limitation of the small set of schools, particularly those with Integrated partnerships, included in Year 1.
- In terms of changes in practice, policy, system, environment, and student outcomes, we will explore where and how changes are happening and how the changes at these different levels fit together and affect one another.
- In Year 2, we will address another limitation of the Year 1 evaluation by broadening the perspectives included in this evaluation (students, building leaders, and school/district staff, particularly in Seattle schools). Where relevant, we will also seek to include families in Year 3.
- We will continue to explore the relationship between the number and types of BSK strategy investments and alignment across practice, policy, and system changes that awardees seek to impact.



REFERENCES

- Brown, C. (1984). The Art of Coalition Building in Butterfoss, F.D., & Francisco, V.T. Evaluating Community Partnerships and Coalitions with Practitioners in Mind. *Health Promotion Practice*, April 2004, Vol. 5, No. 2, 108-114.
- Butterfoss, F.D., & Francisco, V.T. (2004). Evaluating Community Partnerships and Coalitions with Practitioners in Mind. *Health Promotion Practice*, Vol. 5 (2), 108-114.
- Butterfoss, F.D., Goodman, R. M., & Wandersman, A. (1996). Community Coalitions for Prevention and Health Promotion: Factors Predicting Satisfaction, Participation, and Planning. *Health Education & Behavior*, Vol. 23, 65-79.
- Butterfoss, F.D. & Kegler, M.C. (2002), Toward a comprehensive understanding of community coalitions: Moving from practice to theory. In R. DiClemente, L. Crosby, & M. C. Kegler (Eds.), *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research* (pp. 157-193). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Butterfoss, F.D., Lachance, L.L. & Orians, C. E. (2006). Building Allies Coalition: Why Formation Matters. *Health Promotion Practice*, April Supplement, Vol. 7 (20), 23S-33S.
- Cheadle, A., Schwartz, P.M., Rauzon, S., Bourcier, E., Senter, S., Spring, R., & Beery, W.L. (2012). Using the Concept of “Population Dose” in Planning and Evaluating Community-Level Obesity Prevention Initiatives. *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol 34 (1), 71-84.
- Christens, B.D., Butterfoss, F.D., Minkler, M., Wolff, T., Francisco, V.T., & Kegler, M.C., (2019). Learning from Coalitions’ Efforts to Promote Equity and Justice, *Health Education & Behavior*, Vol. 46(1S), pp. 110S-114S.
- de Winter, J. Dodou, D. & Wieringa, P.A. (2009). Exploratory Factor Analysis with Small Sample Sizes. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, Vol. 44, 147-181.
- Ellis, B., Alford, A., Yu, P. Xiong, S. Hill, G., Puckett, M. Mannix, D. & Wells, M. E. (2012), Correlates of perceived effectiveness of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 35, 287-292.
- Green, T. (2017). Community-Based Equity Audits: A Practical Approach for Educational Leaders to Support Equitable Community-School Improvements. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 53(1), pp. 3-39.
- Gulbranson, M. (2017). Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework. In preparation.
- <https://beststartsblog.com/2016/10/13/equity-is-fundamental-to-the-community-we-want-to-build/>.
- <https://www.geofunders.org/what-we-offer/the-smarter-grantmaking-playbook>.
- Jones, J. & Barry, M.M. (2011). Exploring the relationship between synergy and partnership functioning factors in health promotion partnerships. *Health Promotion International*. Vol. 26 (4), 408-420. Downloaded from <https://academic.oup.com/heapro/article-abstract/26/4/408/585177> by guest on 10 September 2018.

- Kegler, M.C., Wolff, T., Christens, B.D., Butterfoss, F.D., Francisco, V.T., & Orleans, T. (2019). Strengthening Our Collaborative Approaches for Advancing Equity and Justice, *Health Education & Behavior*, Vol. 46(1S), pp. 5S-8S.
- King County (2016). Best Starts for Kids Implementation Plan. Retrieved November 2019, from <https://www.kingcounty.gov/~media/elected/executive/constantine/initiatives/best-starts-for-kids/documents/BSK-Plan-final.ashx?la=en>.
- King County Department of Community and Human Services. "About Best Starts" from <https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/community-human-services/initiatives/best-starts-for-kids/background.aspx>. Accessed December 4, 2019.
- Lasker, R.D., Weiss, E.S., & Miller, R. (2001). Partnership synergy: A practical framework for studying and strengthening collaborative advantage. *The Millbank Quarterly*, 79(2), 179-205.
- Levin, S., & Bradley, K. (2019, March). Understanding and Addressing Principal Turnover: A Review of the Research. Accessed December 2, 2019 at <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/nassp-understanding-addressing-principal-turnover-review-research-report>
- Linton, C. & Davis, B. (2013). *Equity 101 Book 2: Culture*. Chapter 1: A School Culture of Equity. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, A Sage Company.
- Merrill, M., Taylor, N.L., Martin, A. J. Maxim, L.A., D'Ambrosio, R., Gabriel, R. M., Wendt, S. J., Mannix, D., & Wells, M. E. (2012). A Mixed-Method Exploration of Functioning in Safe Schools/Healthy Students Partnerships. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 35(2), 280-286. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2011.11.003
- Robles, J. Venkateswaran, N. & Feldman, J. (2016). Perspectives from the field in Year 3: Impact and effectiveness of RTT-D collaboration Executive Summary. Prepared under contract to Puget Sound Educational Service District, RTI International.
- Shwartz, P. Rauzon, S. & Cheadle, A. (2015). Dose Matters: An Approach to Strengthening Community Health Strategies to Achieve Greater Impact. Discussion Paper, National Academy of Medicine, Washington, DC. <http://www.nam.edu/perspectives/2015/dosematters>.
- Wolff, T., Minkler, M., Wolfe, S.M., Berkowitz, B., Bowen. L. Butterfoss, F.D., Christens, B.D., Francisco. V. T., Himmelman, A.T., & Lee, K. S. (2016, Winter). Collaborating for Equity and Justice: Moving Beyond Collective Impact. *The NonProfit Quarterly*, 42-53.
- Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>.

APPENDICES



List of Abbreviations	85
Glossary of Terms	86
BSK School Partnerships Evaluation Advisors	88
BSK School Partnerships Logic Model	89
Interview Protocols	90
Evaluation Design	94
Data Collection: Interviewee Lists	97
Data Analysis: Secondary Data Protocols	99
Data Analysis: Interview Codebook	100
Data Analysis: Look fors	104
Exploratory Factor Analysis Results	110
Landscape of Changes in Practice, Policy, & Systems by Partnership Type	116
Landscape of Changes in School Environments by Partnership Type	118
Landscape of Changes in Student Well-Being Outcomes by Partnership Type	120
Highlights of BSK Supports by Strategy	122

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BSK	Best Starts for Kids
CBO	Community-based organization
DCHS	Department of Community and Human Services
EFA	Exploratory Factor Analysis
GEO	Grantmakers for Effective Organizations
HSE	Healthy and Safe Environments
MTSS	Multi-tiered System of Support
OST	Out-of-School Time
PPS	Practice, Policy, and System
PPSE	Practice, Policy, System, and Environment
PSESD	Puget Sound Educational Service District
RFA	Request for Application
RFP	Request for Proposal
SBHC	School-Based Health Center
SBIRT	Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment
SOW	Scope of Work
SP	School Partnership(s)
SPS	Seattle Public Schools
TIRP	Trauma Informed and Restorative Practices
YD	Youth Development
YDEKC	Youth Development Executives of King County

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Aligned, responsive implementation: Within a partnership, aligned, responsive implementation means that services align with needs and that partners use a data and equity lens to identify community needs and disparities. In aligned, responsive implementation, there is an efficient use of existing assets, new partners are incorporated when needed, and there is a focus on building trust and relationships among partners (from the YDEKC School and Community Partnership Toolkit).

Awardee: An awardee (of BSK) is an organization that holds a contract (or contracts) with BSK. BSK awardees include community-based organizations (CBO), schools, school districts, and healthcare providers.

Collaborative partnership: CBO and school partners share goals and communicate about progress on a regular or semi-regular basis. The school and partner organization(s) maintain ultimate decision-making authority over their own activities (adapted from the YDEKC School and Community Partnership Toolkit).

Cooperative partnership: In a Cooperative partnership, CBO and school partners operate autonomously from one another. Program goals are primarily established by the primary awardee (CBO or school), though they may share one or more goals with the other partner organizations (adapted from the YDEKC School and Community Partnership Toolkit).

Coordination: Coordination is the concept of organizations and individuals working together in an organized way, where partners engage in creating norms, protocols, and structures in inclusive ways that define and drive decisions and communication. The school and partners are working toward shared goals, and people understand how working together will improve performance. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and agreed upon among partner organizations and within the context of the partnership's work (from Authentic Partnership Framework).

Dosage: Dosage is the product of reach and strength of a program or intervention. Reach is the number of people touched by a program or intervention, and strength is the estimated effect of this program or intervention on each person reached (adapted from Cheadle, et al., 2012).

Equitable partnerships: Equitable partnerships are those that attend to issues of equity in 1) how they function (e.g., power, decision-making, and relationship and trust-building) as well as in 2) what changes in practices, policies, systems, school environments, and student well-being are occurring, and to whose benefit. In equitable partnerships, partners and stakeholders that do not hold institutional power feel included and valued, have buy-in, and see themselves in the communication and decision-making processes. People who are affected by decisions are included in and influence decision-making (from Authentic Partnership Framework).

Evaluation advisors: Evaluation advisors include awardee organizations from each BSK School Partnerships strategy area who helped guide each phase of our evaluation, including data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and development of recommendations.

Integrated partnership: The CBO partner(s) play(s) a major role in site planning processes, and shares data, resources, and decision-making authority with the school (from the YDEKC School and Community Partnership Toolkit).

Investment: A BSK investment is a contract awarded by BSK to an awardee. Thus, a school with multiple BSK investments is one that has received an award and is working with at least one other BSK awardee, or it is a school that is working with more than one BSK awardee.

Leadership: The concept of leadership includes both questions of who serves as leaders of partnerships and how they lead. In equitable partnerships, CBOs, students, and families are named and described as leaders, in addition to institutional leaders like schools, districts, or King County. Leadership approaches can include visioning, trust-building, power-sharing, inclusive decision-making, and the facilitation and support of program implementation including through mobilization of resources and other community partners.^{69,70}

Look fors: Look fors are characteristics used to understand and assess how equitable partnerships are developing, the changes they seek, and BSK's support for partnerships. Look for's focus on concepts of racial equity, based on the Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework, and partnership, based on the YDEKC School & Community Partnership Toolkit. Look fors related to BSK supports are based primarily on the Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (GEO) Smarter Grantmaking Playbook.

Mutual accountability for success: Within an equitable partnership, mutual (or shared) accountability for success includes building evaluation and data sharing to support continuous improvement and high-quality services. The partnership collects and uses sufficient quantitative and qualitative information disaggregated by race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, or gender to effectively support equity efforts. Partners discuss data trends and check their understanding and interpretation with communities from which data are collected. In addition, partners leverage their collective resources to create and execute a sustainability plan.⁷¹

Narrative reports: BSK awardees are required to submit regular narrative reports to King County to document program changes, successes, and challenges for their BSK contract.

Partner: Partners are organizations or agencies working with BSK awardees to implement the funded program(s). Partners include CBOs, schools, school districts, and healthcare providers.

Shared vision: A shared vision guides and brings focus to an equitable partnership in a school by focusing on what families, youth, educators, youth development professionals, and other partners want for the partnership and the students it serves. A shared vision based in equity acknowledges inequities of systems, schools, and opportunities for students, and is focused on addressing those inequities. In equitable partnerships, a shared vision and related goals speak to how partners want to do their work (i.e., process goals), not just what partners want to do.⁷²

School Partnerships Program staff: This includes BSK staff who manage each of the School Partnership strategy areas, the Strategic Advisor for Trauma-Informed Systems, the 5-24 Policy and Program Manager, and BSK evaluation staff.

School Partnerships strategies: BSK School Partnerships include six strategies: Healthy and Safe Environments (HSE), Out-of-School Time (OST), School-Based Health Centers (SBHC), Screening, Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT), Trauma Informed and Restorative Practices (TIRP), and Youth Development (YD).

Synergy: A partnership that has maximized synergy has achieved the full potential of collaboration. Synergy is the degree to which the partnership combines the complementary strengths, perspectives, skills, values, and resources of all the partners in the search for better solutions to issues that matter to the community. It is generally regarded as a product of strong and trusting working relationships among partners.⁷³ For the purposes of this evaluation, synergy is defined as a product of equitable partnerships across BSK strategies.

69 Butterfoss, Lachance, & Orians, 2006.

70 Butterfoss, Goodman, & Wandersman, 1996.

71 Adapted from Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>


72 Adapted from the YDEKC School and Community Partnership Toolkit and Gulbranson, M. (2017). Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework. In preparation.

73 Lasker, Weiss, & Miller, 2001.

BSK SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS EVALUATION ADVISORS

Name	Organization
Patricia Baird	Unleash the Brilliance
Ida Batiste	Seattle Public Schools
Don Cameron	Seattle CARES Mentoring Movement
Lian Caspi	Dispute Resolution Center of King County
Jackie DeLaCruz	Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association (consultant)
Brian Gregg	Tukwila School District
Sherryl Grey	International Community Health Services
Katherine Gudgel	HealthPoint
Diana Hafzalla	Center for Human Services
James Hong	Vietnamese Friendship Association (past)
Brandon Kennedy	Unleash the Brilliance
Sharon Moon	Dispute Resolution Center of King County
Lee Mozena	Urban Native Education Alliance (consultant)
Haya Muñoz	STEMPaths (past), Filipino Community of Seattle (current)
Whitney Nelson	YMCA of Greater Seattle
Khyree Smith	Austin Foundation
Samantha Wilson	YMCA of Greater Seattle

BSK SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS LOGIC MODEL



INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Interview Protocol for Awardees and Partners Working in Schools
We conducted 60–75 minute interviews with awardees and partners working in schools, using the protocol below.

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1. **What is your role, and how does it relate to the work in ____ school?**
2. **Who do you serve in doing this work in ____ school(s): staff, students, families, others?**
 - a. Do you work with a few, some, or all (in the groups you serve)? How often do you work with them?
3. **Who do you consider to be your partner(s) in working in ____ school(s)? How are they partners?**
 - a. Listen for partners included in BSK data, and ask about those they don't name.
4. **Do you know about other BSK-funded work in this school, in ____ strategy area(s)? If so:**
 - a. Have you connected to those working in other BSK strategy areas in this school?
 - b. How often? What has been the focus, goal or outcomes of your connections (e.g., coordinating programs and services, developing relationships, learning about school and partner services/context)?
 - c. How did you find each other?
5. **Is there a person/role at the school who coordinates across the BSK strategy areas?**
 - a. *What part(s) of your relationship with the coordination works?*
 - b. *What would be more helpful?*
 - c. *Do you have any other suggestions about this role?*
6. The bulk of this conversation will focus on the partnership at ____ school. **Confirm with the interviewee how they think**

about the partnership – within strategy, across strategy, etc.

VISION

7. **Can you describe the partnership vision at ____ school(s)?**
8. **How was the vision developed, who was involved? Who wasn't at the table?**

EQUITY

9. **What issues of equity is your partnership working on and how?** *Some parts of equity to prompt your thinking are: power dynamics, how families and students are engaged in the partnership, groups or areas that may be overlooked, how the partnership addresses differences in opportunities for students, or other equity issues you have observed or experienced.*

LEADERSHIP

10. **Who are considered the leaders of the partnership? Describe their leadership.** *Some parts of leadership to help prompt your thinking are: how leaders support trust, attend to power dynamics, create opportunities for shared power, and how they engage those who are less willing or able to speak up or be involved.*

COORDINATION

11. **How would you describe coordination across organizations that are part of this partnership?** *Some parts of coordination to help prompt your thinking are: alignment across organizations, communication, decision-making, using data to inform your work, and how the partnership contributes to synergy or the idea that the "whole" of the partnership or collaboration is greater than the sum of its parts.*
12. **How is your partnership in ____ school(s) developing, in expected and/or unexpected ways? What do you hope happens with this partnership in the future?**

POLICY, SYSTEM, AND ENVIRONMENT CHANGE

13. **What changes is this partnership trying to achieve in ____ school(s), related to policies, systems, and environments?** *(You can think of these as changes that you are working on to happen for the whole school building or even the whole district or community, and ultimately benefit students, families, and communities. Some examples are improved school climate, moving from punitive to restorative discipline, increasing access to healthy affordable foods.)*

BEST STARTS FOR KIDS SUPPORTS

14. BSK has a range of processes and practices intended to support awardees and the implementation of their grants. These include grant materials, contract monitoring processes, technical assistance, and performance measurement and evaluation, as well as ongoing relationships with BSK staff:
 - Grant materials include applications, contract, scope of work, and requirements.
 - Contract monitoring processes include monthly calls or meetings, King County auditing procedures, and other checks on contract compliance.
 - Technical assistance includes support from King County staff with reporting, evaluation, or program implementation.
 - Performance measurement and evaluation includes evaluation and performance measurement requirements, support with developing performance measures and/or evaluation plans, support with collecting and analyzing data, and evaluation or performance measure reporting requirements and processes.
 - Relationships with BSK staff
 - a. How have supports from King County/BSK been helpful to your partnership in ____ school(s)?
 - b. How could King County/BSK improve their supports for your partnership?

CONTEXT

15. Each school is part of a community, and neither exist in a vacuum. We call this reality “context”. **What factors in this context affect your partnership and the changes you seek?**
16. **Who are key partners who could also speak to the BSK-supported partnership in ____ school(s)?**
17. **Is there anything we didn’t ask about, but should have?**

Interview Protocol for District Awardees and Partners

We conducted 30–45 minute interviews with school district awardees and partners, using the protocol below.

1. You were suggested as someone we should talk to to understand the BSK-funded work for ____ (strategy/strategies for which they were suggested). Can you describe your role **as it relates to this BSK-funded work?** [For district staff] What is the broader role of the district in supporting this work?
2. What **policy and system factors** have been or could be influenced by this work? Have there been, or do you expect, policy or system changes related to this work?
3. As the ____ (BSK strategy/strategies) work is implemented, what have been **key partnership** (i.e., the district and partner organizations working with one another, with King County, or with other orgs you would identify as partners in this work) **successes?** What have been **key partnership challenges?**
4. What are your hopes for **connecting/ coordinating** across the various BSK strategies in the future?
5. How have **supports from King County/BSK been helpful** to your partnership in this district and/or in ____ (schools in the district with multiple BSK investments)?
6. How could **King County/BSK improve their supports** for your partnership(s)?
7. We are also interested in the broader **district context related to partnership**. How do district-level and district-wide partnerships relate to partnerships in individual school buildings?

Interview Protocol for School Principals

We conducted 30-minute interviews with school principals, using the protocol below.

1. What has it been like to have the BSK investments in your school? (How has having them affected your daily work, if at all?)
2. How would you describe how the implementation of BSK investments at your school is going?
 - a. From your perspective, how has having the strategies in your building impacted school building staff?
 - b. And, how has the implementation impacted students, student life and the school community as a whole?
3. What changes to building-level systems and environments do you think can better support the work?
4. What have been the expected and unexpected developments that have occurred during implementation?
5. What are your hopes for the investment activities?

Interview Protocol for BSK School Partnership Staff

We conducted 45–60 minute interviews with BSK School Partnership staff using the protocol below.

Introduction

1. What is your role with BSK?
2. What is your vision for school-community partnerships?

Technical Supports

3. How were documents created and vetted in your program? (For all questions, probe for collaboration and alignment across programs and concerns about administrative burden.)
4. What were the strengths of the proposal technical assistance and review process? What would you envision changing in the year ahead?
5. What was the contracting process like for you and your programs' grantees? What would you envision changing in the

year ahead?

6. Most strategies require participation in formal or informal learning communities. What is easy and what is hard about convening learning communities?
 - a. How do these communities support partnership development?
 - b. What is the impact of learning communities for individual practitioners? For strategies across awards? And, how do they support internal BSK program alignment and collaboration?
 - c. How do you hope learning communities will work in the future?
7. How have requirements and supports changed over time within your strategy?
 - a. How have those changes influenced partnership development at schools with multiple investments? Is this the same or different for awardees with multiple BSK awards?
 - b. What requirements do you work with for projects and strategies? What King County systems help with equitable partnership support, and what and how might systems impede that work?
 - c. How is awardee reporting different than for other King County funding streams?

Relationships

8. How successful do you feel in supporting awardees? What are things you do that are helpful? Do you know about the ways in which these practices are implemented across BSK strategies?
9. What lessons from relationships with awardees are you eager to apply in future work? Can you share a time that you were able to take action based on awardee feedback?
10. Where are the opportunities for supporting BSK staff collaboration?
11. What are your hopes for internal collaboration across BSK

programs? What steps do you think should be taken to achieve these hopes?

Partnership Development and Equity

12. What is your ongoing role in supporting equitable partnership with their awardees and partners?
 - a. How do you support racial equity in your day-to-day work?
13. How would you describe the supports needed for equitable partnerships (between BSK and grantees; between grantees and schools)?
14. What is your role in building partnership between awardees and schools and districts?
15. What did we not ask, but should have? Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Interview Protocol for King County Contract Monitoring Staff

We conducted a 60-minute interview with a King County Contract Monitoring staff person using the protocol below.

Introduction

1. What is your role with BSK?
2. What is your role in building partnership between awardees and schools and districts?

Technical Supports in Contracting

3. How were BSK contracting documents created and vetted? Is this similar to or different from other King County contracts you've worked with? If so, how?
4. What was the contracting process like? What would you envision changing in the year ahead?

Relationships

5. How successful do you feel in supporting awardees? What are things you do that are helpful? Do you know about the ways in which these practices are implemented across BSK strategies or across King County?

6. What lessons from relationships with awardees are you eager to apply in future work? Can you share a time that you were able to take action based on awardee feedback?
7. What are your hopes for internal collaboration across BSK programs? What steps do you think should be taken to achieve these hopes?

Partnership Development and Equity

BSK has communicated a strong commitment to racial equity and we are hoping to learn more about how this commitment is supported in the contracting department.

8. What is your ongoing role in supporting equitable partnership with their awardees and partners?
 - a. How do you support racial equity in your day-to-day work?
9. How would you describe the supports needed for equitable partnerships (between BSK and grantees; between grantees and schools)?

Other

10. What did we not ask, but should have? Is there anything else you'd like to add?

EVALUATION DESIGN

Below, we describe how we identified schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments and how we identified the sample of nine schools for Year 1 of the evaluation. This study focuses on schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments because this is a specific area of interest for BSK SP Program staff. The study does not include districts with multiple district-level BSK School Partnerships investments for two related reasons. The two districts with multiple district-level investments, Northshore and Snoqualmie Valley, are demographically

different⁷⁴ than districts that have schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments (Auburn, Bellevue, Federal Way, Highline, Kent, Renton, Seattle, Tukwila, and Vashon), making comparisons across schools and districts difficult. In addition, we wanted to honor BSK and PSESD's commitment to racial equity and focus our resources on schools with a greater percentage of students of color. (See Exhibit Y for demographics of schools included in the Year 1 evaluation.)⁷⁵

EXHIBIT Y: EVALUATION QUESTION 3 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	% STUDENTS OF COLOR (2018-19)
AUBURN	CASCADE MIDDLE SCHOOL	61%
BELLEVUE	HIGHLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL	68%
KENT	MEEKER MIDDLE SCHOOL	76%
	MILL CREEK MIDDLE SCHOOL	87%
SEATTLE	INTERAGENCY PROGRAMS	90%
	MEANY MIDDLE SCHOOL	63%
	SEATTLE WORLD SCHOOL	96%
	WASHINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL	61%
TUKWILA	SHOWALTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	89%

⁷⁴ OSPI Report Card. Retrieved February 2019, from <https://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/>.

⁷⁵ OSPI Report Card, <https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/> Accessed September 25, 2019

Identifying the Population

BSK provided a data file that enabled us to identify schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments. The original intent of this data file was to create a map of schools with BSK School Partnerships investments and was based on BSK SP Program staff knowledge of where investments from their strategy area were made. The PSESD Evaluation Team worked with BSK SP Program staff to update this data file in March 2019, to ensure accurate and up-to-date information of which strategies were funded and actively being implemented in which schools. With updated information for each school, we clarified the definition of “schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments” using the following criteria:

- A school has investments in multiple SP strategies in the data file provided by BSK.
- School-Based Health Center Enhancement funding is not considered in determining that a school has multiple investments (however, if a school has SBHC enhancement funding in addition to multiple other BSK SP investments, this investment will be addressed as part of the broader partnership context).
- Schools with multiple TIRP investments but no other strategy investments are not considered as “multiple BSK SP strategy investments” for this evaluation.
- Schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments where the awardee organization is the same for multiple investments (e.g., an awardee organization that received both Youth Development and Out-of-School Time grants) are included.
- Funding from the City of Seattle Families and Education Levy and Prevention and Wellness Initiative (CPWI) are not counted as BSK SP investments, but are accounted for as part of a school’s broader funding and partnership context.

Sampling of Schools with Multiple BSK SP Strategy Investments

With up-to-date information about which SP strategy investments had been made and were being implemented in which schools, we identified which schools had multiple BSK SP strategy investments,

as well as how many investments and in which combinations. There were 19 schools with multiple strategy investments, in the following combinations:

- HSE and YD
- SBIRT and SBHC
- TIRP and HSE
- TIRP and OST (one school had multiple TIRP investments and OST)
- TIRP and SBHC
- TIRP and SBIRT
- YD and OST (one school had SBIRT and SBHC Enhancement funding, as well)
- YD TIRP (one school had SBHC Enhancement funding, as well; and one had multiple TIRP investments and YD)

Guidance from both BSK SP Program staff and BSK SP Evaluation Advisors emphasized the importance of hearing a well-rounded range of perspectives about how partnerships are developing in schools. While we initially intended to focus on interviewing awardees in all schools with multiple strategy investments, they encouraged us to talk with awardees, as well as school leaders, staff, and key partner organizations doing work in these schools. As such, we decided to select a 50% sample of schools with multiple strategy investments. This allowed us to include multiple perspectives through our initial interviews in as many schools with varying combinations of strategy investments as possible.

We planned to draw the sample via a mix of random sampling, stratified by strategy combinations and purposive sampling (i.e., including singular or unique mix of BSK SP strategies). At the same time as part of purposive sampling approach, we acknowledged that BSK SP Program staff, being closest to implementation realities, would have recommendations for schools to include in the sample. Therefore, we invited BSK guidance on how school partnerships are developing and which schools they would prioritize for our study. BSK SP Program staff from each strategy were also invited to choose one school to include in our sample (up to six schools total). We also responded to

guidance to exclude one school, due to concern that including this school may be harmful to a sensitive relationship between the school and its partners.

As such, we had a universe of 18 schools from which we would select nine. In addition to any schools suggested by BSK SP Program staff, remaining schools would be selected through a random sample, with the aim of representing each strategy in proportion to the current population or universe of schools with multiple strategy investments. As we began inviting individuals to participate in interviews and talking with awardees and partners, the status of where BSK investments were being implemented was further clarified. Those updates are noted in italics below.

The final Year 1 sample of nine schools included the following combinations:

- **3 schools with TIRP and SBIRT (1 identified by BSK SP Program staff and 2 identified via random sample)** — we selected 3 of 6 total schools with this combination of BSK SP strategy investments.
- **1 school with HSE in combination with some other strategy** (identified by BSK SP Program staff) — this is the only school with a school-level HSE investment among schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments.
- **1 school with OST, TIRP, and SBIRT investments** — this is the only school with this combination among schools with multiple BSK SP strategy investments.
- **1 school with TIRP and OST investments** (identified via random sample) — we selected 1 of 3 total schools with this combination.
- **1 school with TIRP and YD investments** (identified via random sample) — we selected 1 of 3 schools with this combination. We learned new information from interviewees about this school, which had two TIRP investments in 2019–20. We kept the school in the study given that we had already begun interviews there.
- **1 school with YD and OST investments** (identified via

random sample) — we selected 1 of 2 schools with this combination.

- **1 school with SBHC in combination with some other strategy** (identified via random sample) — we selected 1 of 2 schools with SBHC in combination with another strategy.

DATA COLLECTION: INTERVIEWEE LISTS

Awardee and Partner Interview List (the listing indicates when individuals were interviewed individually or in pairs and small groups)

Name(s)	Organization
Adam Ladage	Auburn School District
Rhonda Larson	Auburn School District
Khyree Smith	Austin Foundation
Judy Buckmaster	Bellevue School District
Melissa Slater	Bellevue School District
Shomari Jones	Bellevue School District
Jamie Herres	Cascade Middle School
Karen DeGroot	Cascade Middle School
David Bestock and Anita Hale	Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association
Lian Caspi and Sharon Moon	Dispute Resolution Center of King County
Kendrick Glover	Glover Empower Mentoring
Theresa Hardy	Inspirational Workshops
Sherryl Grey, Rosaly Rivero Gonzalez, Tess Sorbo, Kendall Watanabe	International Community Health Services
Cheri Simpson	Kent School District
Randy Heath	Kent School District
Angela Grutko	Meeker Middle School
Patricia Owliaei	Meeker Middle School
Shannon Nash	Meeker Middle School
Scott Haines	Mill Creek Middle School
Vaudery Brown	Mill Creek Middle School
Laura Escalona-Flores	Neighborcare
LaTasha Jackson-Rodriguez and Rev. Jimmie James	Restore Assemble Produce
Don Cameron and Hazel Cameron	Seattle CARES Mentoring Movement
Brian Gregg	Showalter Middle School
Nichelle Page	Tukwila School District
Terrell Dorsey and Matt Pena	Unleash the Brilliance
Leighla Webb	Upower

Name(s)	Organization
Tamthy Le	Vietnamese Friendship Association
Michael Passian	Walk Away City Collaborative

BSK and King County Staff Interview List

Name(s)	BSK/King County Teams
Avreayl Jacobson, Megan McJennett, Sarah Wilhelm	School Partnerships overall
Ninona Boujrada, Robin Haguewood (interview from evaluation planning period, September 2018)	Healthy and Safe Environments
Erin MacDougall, Samantha Yeun, Sara Rigel	School-Based Health Centers
Chan Saelee, Margaret Soukup	Screening, Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment
Nicole Turcheti, Yolanda McGhee (interview from evaluation planning period, September 2018)	Trauma Informed and Restorative Practices
Dan Brandes	King County Contract, Procurement and Real Estate Services

DATA ANALYSIS: SECONDARY DATA PROTOCOLS

Protocol for secondary data document review

We reviewed secondary data sources including awardee narrative and quarterly reports and SBIRT interventionist surveys, using the following questions as guidelines to compare information from these documents to what we heard in interviews:

- Who is served by this grant (students, staff, families), and how many (all/school-wide, targeted)?
- What changes is the grantee working to impact at the practice, policy, system, environment, or student level?
- How does this document reinforce what we learned from interviews about this school?
- Is there anything that is different or contradictory to what we learned from interviews about this school?
- Is there any new or updated information about partnership or Program Policy System and Environment (PPSE) changes in this school?
- Do they describe BSK supports that would be helpful? If so, what supports?

Protocol for BSK document review

Across BSK/King County documents and strategies, we analyzed documents for demonstrations of the following:

- Connections between requirements in grant (including budget), contract and scope, monitoring (either monthly or in narrative reports), and fiscal reporting.
- Scoring of grants that emphasizes or rewards partnership (whether in development or existing).
- Technical assistance artifacts (plans or summaries) that address partnership function.

In addition, we attended to key context:

- Distinction between where strategies are very explicit or less explicit about partnership development.

- Length of time of strategy implementation or when RFPs were released.
- Timeline for RFPs and how that may impact partnership development.
- The range of familiarity with King County processes for awardees within each strategy.

We identified how documents addressed key partnership constructs, including:

- **Leadership:** equity-focused leadership, cultural responsiveness, asset-based perspectives, communication, convening, and governance.
- **Coordination:** decision-making, administration, and resource management and sharing.
- **Shared Vision:** common agenda or goals, commitment to community, time commitment, clarity of structure, and scope of work.
- **Aligned, Responsive Implementation:** centering of community, collective decision-making, information sharing, data use, and agreed-upon efficient use of resources.
- **Shared Accountability for Results:** evaluation, effective use of non-financial resources, adaptability, and mutually reinforcing activities.
- **Synergy:** totality of concerted and collaborative comprehensive efforts, enhanced services, benefits for partners, and sustainability.

DATA ANALYSIS: INTERVIEW CODEBOOK

We used a codebook (codes, sub-codes and definitions listed below), to code interviews related to Evaluation Questions 1, 2, and 3. We shared draft codes with BSK SP Evaluation Advisors for their feedback. **Topics identified by Evaluation Advisors as being particularly important to how partnerships and BSK-supported work is being implemented are indicated in red.**

Evaluation Question 1

Evaluation Question 1: In schools and school districts that receive multiple BSK School Partnerships investments, how and why do dosage (both breadth and reach), leadership, and coordination among schools and school-based partners impact characteristics of school-based partnerships, including shared vision; aligned, responsive implementation; shared accountability for success; and partnership synergy)?

Concept	Parent Code/Topic (sub-codes/child codes in parentheses) with definition, where relevant
Dosage	Group served (students, staff, other)
	Breadth (schoolwide, targeted)
	Frequency (daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, other regular schedule)
Vision	Vision process (co-constructed, led by CBO, led by school or district)
	Clarity of structure and scope of work: how the partnership will work together in pursuit of a shared vision is articulated and clear
	Commitment of time: time is committed to be able to work toward achieving the vision
	Commitment to community: voice, perspectives, and needs of community are prioritized in the vision (this can be internal or external community)
	Community engagement: The vision itself is focused on engaging the community
	Common agenda/goals: the vision is broadly shared, a broad group of people and roles share this focused mission for the partnership
	Connection to school: effort to engage students, family, and community to feel a connection to school
	Parent engagement
	Staff growth: staff growth can include building accountability mechanisms and/or professional development
	Student well-being and success (equitable access to opportunities; mental, physical, nutrition and social needs; preventing prison pipeline; strengthening student voice): Focus on student overall well-being and academic achievement
	System of care: Systematic efforts to connect different services and supports to students/families

Evaluation Question 1: In schools and school districts that receive multiple BSK School Partnerships investments, how and why do dosage (both breadth and reach), leadership, and coordination among schools and school-based partners impact characteristics of school-based partnerships, including shared vision; aligned, responsive implementation; shared accountability for success; and partnership synergy)?

Concept	Parent Code/Topic (sub-codes/child codes in parentheses) with definition, where relevant
Coordination	Coordinator role (Yes/no/not sure): person/role at the school or district who coordinates within or across the BSK strategy areas
	Alignment of services and organizations: includes coordination of services to students or staff within or across organizations
	Communication
	Coordination structures: examples are meetings, Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) teams, work groups
	Data sharing and use
	Decision-making
	Relationships/relationship-building
	Resources: provided space, classroom time, and other logistical supports
Leadership	Who are leaders (BSK, CBO, cross-stakeholder group, families, school/district, students)
Hopes	Demonstrate collective impact: synergistic efforts where the whole is greater than sum of its parts (i.e., relationship building, integration of partners into school community)
	Scale up
	Sustain or secure further funding
	Sustain the work
	Expected/unexpected developments

Evaluation Question 2

Evaluation Question 2: Taken altogether, to what extent and in what ways do Multiple BSK School Partnerships investments in schools influence changes in the following areas? A. Schoolwide practices, policies, and systems b. School environments c. Key student well-being and outcomes

Concept	Code/Topic (sub-codes in parentheses)
Practice, Policy, System, and Environment Changes	Deeper understanding of community and cultures: deeper understanding particular to outside school community and culture of families and students
	Discipline
	Family engagement
	School climate and culture
	Staff growth: focus on professional development and training for staff
	Student transportation
	System of student supports: can include academic supports, basic needs, social services

Overarching concepts that apply to Evaluation Questions 1 and 2	
Concept	Code/Topic (sub-codes in parentheses)
Equity	Family and student engagement in partnership: families and/or students are considered members of partnership and play a role in shaping the vision and work of the partnership
	Family focus: partnership is focused on addressing equity of services/supports for families
	Groups or areas that are overlooked: partnership pays attention to groups that may be traditionally overlooked and makes efforts to include them
	Power dynamics: attending to the differences in power between schools, districts and large institutions, and students, families and CBOs
	Staff focus: partnership is focused on addressing equity with staff
	Equity not addressed
Context	Changes in school/district/org/leadership
	Funding
	Other
Other	Partners (CBO, school, interviewees district, King County, other district, other partner)
	Knowledge of other BSK funded work (Yes/No): interviewee's knowledge of multiple BSK-funded work in the school/district
	Program implementation: focus on getting program up and running
Equity	Family and student engagement in partnership: families and/or students are considered members of partnership and play a role in shaping the vision and work of the partnership
	Family focus: partnership is focused on addressing equity of services/supports for families
	Groups or areas that are overlooked: partnership pays attention to groups that may be traditionally overlooked and makes efforts to include them
	Power dynamics: attending to the differences in power between schools, districts and large institutions, and students, families, and CBOs
	Staff focus: partnership is focused on addressing equity with staff
	Equity not addressed
Context	Changes in school/district/org/leadership
	Funding
	Other
Other	Partners (CBO, school, interviewees, district, King County, other district, other partner)
	Knowledge of other BSK funded work (Yes/No): interviewee's knowledge of multiple BSK-funded work in the school/district
	Program implementation: focus on getting program up and running

Evaluation Question 3

Topic/Parent Codes	Sub-topic/Child Codes	Sub-Child Codes
Process/ system	Type: Technical	Materials Contract monitoring processes Technical assistance Performance measurement and evaluation Funding
	Type: Relational	Supportive Not supportive
Way process/ system supports of equitable partnership	Explicit partnership expectations in written materials	Equity Collaboration Coordination
	Learning community	Stakeholder engagement Leadership development Capacity building
	Progress monitoring/site visits	Meeting with BSK staff Meeting with BSK staff and other grantees
Staff activities timing	Description of current practices	
	Advice about future practices	Alignment across program areas Change in frequency of practice Clarity of communication to grantees Reduce administrative burden Funding Internal BSK relationships Consistency of BSK materials Consistency of BSK practices
	Past practices	

DATA ANALYSIS: LOOK FORs

Look fors of Equitable Partnerships, Practice, Policy, System and Environment Change and Student Well-Being and Outcomes, and BSK Supports

We developed a set of look fors or characteristics of partnerships, PPSE changes, and BSK supports, to understand strengths and opportunities in each of these areas. These look fors include concepts of racial equity (based largely on the Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework) and partnership (based largely on the YDEKC Toolkit).^{76, 77} In their Partnership Toolkit introduction, YDEKC indicated that “(f)or the most part, well-coordinated and cohesive services at the school level share certain characteristics.” They described the partnership characteristics in the following illustration in Exhibit Z. For the purposes of the current study, we adapted the Partnership Characteristics by focusing the first characteristic on Shared Vision and referring to the third characteristic as Mutual/Shared Accountability for Success. The look fors that we used for each of the Partnership Characteristics specify and expand on the YDEKC descriptors for each characteristic by adding equity-centered descriptors.

EXHIBIT Z LOOK FORs OF EQUITABLE PARTNERSHIPS, PRACTICE, POLICY, SYSTEM AND ENVIRONMENT CHANGE AND STUDENT WELL-BEING AND OUTCOMES, AND BSK SUPPORTS

Shared Vision and Leadership	Aligned, Responsive Implementation	Shared Accountability for Success
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared vision Common goals and outcomes Collaborative decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services aligned with needs Efficient use of existing assets Incorporation of new partners when needed Trust and strong relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality at the point of service Evaluation as an integral component of programming Use of shared data for planning

We used look for assessments to examine the relationship of the partnership elements Leadership and Coordination with the partnership functioning characteristics Shared Vision, Aligned & Responsive Implementation, and Mutual Accountability for Success.

Look fors that are equity focused (based on the Authentic Partnership Framework, BSK SP Evaluation Advisor feedback, and/or PSESD Evaluation team assessment) are highlighted in blue. **We shared the draft look fors with the BSK SP Evaluation Advisors for their feedback and additions. The look fors they prioritized are indicated in red.** For BSK supports, we identified look fors based on Grantmakers for Effective Organization’s Smarter Grantmaking Playbook.

⁷⁶ Gulbranson, M. (2017). *Authentic Community-School Partnership Framework*. In preparation.

⁷⁷ Youth Development Executives of King County (n.d.). School and Community Partnership Toolkit. Retrieved November 2018, from <https://ydekc.org/resource-center/school-community-partnership-toolkit/>

EXHIBIT A.1. LOOK FORs OF EQUITABLE PARTNERSHIPS

Equitable Partnerships	
Concept	Look Fors
Leadership	CBOs, students, and families are named/described as leaders, in addition to schools/districts/King County
	People who are affected by decisions are included in and influence decision-making
	Partners and stakeholders that do not hold institutional power feel included and valued, have buy-in, and see themselves in the communication and decision-making processes
	Partners are clear on their role and how it contributes to achieving the vision
	School and organizational leaders support and build the voice of students, families, and staff
Coordination	Partners engage in creating norms, protocols, and structures in inclusive ways that define and drive decisions and communication
	Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and agreed upon among partner organizations and within the context of the partnership's work
	The school and partners are working toward shared goals, and people understand how working together will improve performance
	There is a person or team (can be from the school, partner organizations, parent volunteer, or combination) that serves as the central point of contact for community partners and others providing support services; this person/team works closely with school leadership
	There are structures (e.g., scheduled meetings, partners sharing a workspace) to support regular communication among partners
	Partners communicate regularly with each other
	Partner organizations are aware of and share the services and supports provided by other organizations
	Organizations communicate about and are open/flexible to learn from what is working (and not working) to be able to better support each other and students
	There are resources (time, funding) committed to coordination
	Partners identify the need for and value of sharing data and information about students

Equitable Partnerships	
Concept	Look Fors
Vision Process	Students, families, partner organizations, and school leadership and staff feel they are part of the vision and can speak into the process of developing and refining the vision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is clear how partners will work together in service of the vision Families /caretaking adults, students, school leadership and staff, and partner organizations are engaged in how the vision will be achieved The process of developing and refining the vision builds relationships, trust, and a sense of belonging Families, students, school leadership and staff, and partner organizations buy in to the vision
	The vision process attends to the differences in power between schools, districts and large institutions, students, families, and CBOs
	The vision of the partnership and how it supports the broader vision are not static and evolve over time
Shared Vision	The vision acknowledges and addresses inequities of systems, schools, and opportunities for students, and is focused on addressing those inequities
	The vision is explicit about supporting/improving outcomes for students of color
	Partners have a common understanding of systemic barriers to positive educational outcomes, especially for students of color, and are committed to working together to address them
	Goals speak to how partnership wants to do their work (process goals), not just what they want to do (humanistic mindset/quality in relation to quantity)
	The vision reflects what families, students, school leaders and staff, and partner organizations want for the partnership and the students it serves
	Common outcomes have been identified and are the focus for helping to achieve the vision

Equitable Partnerships	
Concept	Look Fors
Aligned, Responsive Implementation	Services are aligned with vision and needs — partners use data and an equity lens to identify community needs and disparities; partners make sure there is a structure in place to identify individual student needs
	Partners efficiently use existing assets — take advantage of partnership, strengths, and opportunities already present in the community, without overburdening one resource and also not reinventing the wheel and duplicating efforts
	Partnership incorporates new partners when needed – if there are needs identified that current partners do not have the expertise in filling, the partnership responds by finding partners that can fill that need.
	Partnership builds trust and strong relationships — partners communicate continuously and engage in opportunities to connect, share, collaborate, celebrate, and learn together; partners set up clear and regular communication for progress and goals; partners give, receive, and value robust feedback
	Community partners' efforts are reflected in school improvement goals
	School and community partners commit to working toward school improvement goals
	Partners share information about students (and understand limitations to sharing) in order to provide and improve supports
Shared Accountability for Success	Partners build evaluation into program to promote continuous improvement and engage in improvement efforts by collecting and sharing data to improve services to students; partners commit to high-quality point of service by participating in quality improvement processes
	The group collects and uses sufficient quantitative and qualitative information (disaggregated by race and ethnicity, free or reduced price lunch enrollment, language, and/or gender) effectively to support equity efforts
	Partners discuss data trends and check their understanding and interpretation with community from which data are collected

Equitable Partnerships	
Concept	Look Fors
Partnership Synergy	Partners think about the partnership's work in creative, holistic, and practical ways
	Partners develop realistic goals that are widely understood and supported
	Partners plan and carry out comprehensive interventions that connect multiple programs, services, and sectors
	Partners understand and document the impact of the partnership's actions.
	Partners incorporate the perspectives and priorities of community stakeholders, including the target populations
	Partners communicate how the partnership's actions will address community problems
	Partners recognize that what the partnership is trying to accomplish would be difficult for any single organization to accomplish by itself
	Partners obtain support of community (i.e., immediate school community [includes students, school, and district staff] and larger community where students live [may include neighborhood, local businesses, places of worship, local town/city agencies, etc.])

Practice, Policy, System, Environment Changes and Student Outcomes	
Concept	Look For
Practice, Policy, System, and Environment Changes	Partners acknowledge the inequities of education system and focus on PPSE changes in order to improve outcomes for students of color
	There is a focus on changing school environment (climate and culture) particularly for students of color, including the knowledge, attitudes, behavior, and skills (KABS) of staff
	There is alignment in the PSE changes and student outcomes across BSK investments
Student Well-Being and Outcomes	Partners are focused on affecting student well-being and outcomes, with special attention to students of color.
	Add in Years 2 & 3: Within investments areas, organizations articulate relationships between PSE changes and student well-being and outcomes, including changes in KABS
	Add in Years 2 & 3: Students indicate that the same student KABS changes are happening for them

BSK Supports	
Concept	Look For
Learn for Continuous Improvement	Develop a learning mindset, including learning together
	Use evaluation for improvement, not just proof (tracking the results and the impact of past philanthropic investments)
	Provide due diligence as a process while removing unnecessary burden
	Increase learning capacity through funding evaluation and resourcing learning communities
Support Nonprofit Resilience	Support leadership development
	Support capacity building for core operations and processes, including communications
	Support financial sustainability
Collaborate for Greater Impact	Develop deliberate mindset, preparation, and approach for collaboration in networks
	Facilitate connections and collaboration
	Engage in movements and networks
	Evaluate network outcomes and processes for improvement
	Support grantee capacity to engage in collective impact
Strengthen Relationships with Nonprofits	Engage stakeholders
	Share decision-making in thoughtful ways
	Build and maintain authentic relationships
	Employ empathy as a core value

Overall (relevant to all three evaluation questions)	
Hopes	Partners describe the need for ongoing planning, create a sustainability plan, leverage resources, and get help with identifying diverse funding sources, aligning strategies, and make time to combine efforts in creating and executing a sustainability plan
	Partners express hope to maintain their current type/level of partnership or for partnership to shift/deepen over time
	Partners describe synergy as their hope for the future of the partnership
Context	Includes changing demographics, increasing diversity, and a teaching/school staff that do not reflect students
	The ways that existing relationships (among partners/school) including ways staff/ leadership transitions affect relationships and trust building that is necessary for authentic partnerships
	Broader district context for supporting partnerships

EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS

We used Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)⁷⁸ to determine how well the Look-fors underpinned or defined various aspects of partnership functioning.

EXHIBIT B.1. ELEMENT: LEADERSHIP COMPONENT MATRIX

	Component
	1
Community-based organizations, students, families are named/described as leaders, in addition to schools/districts/King County	.938
People who are affected by decisions are included in and influence decision-making	.896
Partners and stakeholders that do not hold institutional power feel included and valued, have buy-in, and see themselves in the communication and decision-making processes	.899
Shared leadership: Partners are clear on their role and how it contributes to achieving the vision	.916
School and organizational leaders support and build the voice of students, families, and staff	.873
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. a. 1 components extracted.	

LEADERSHIP: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.850
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	102.068
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

LEADERSHIP: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.091	81.811	81.811	4.091	81.811	81.811
2	.402	8.049	89.860			
3	.235	4.691	94.551			
4	.163	3.267	97.818			
5	.109	2.182	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						

⁷⁸ Tests for Appropriateness of Data (or Data Adequacy): Bartlett's Test of Sphericity - A significant result (Sig. < 0.05) indicates matrix is not an identity matrix; i.e., the variables do relate to one another enough to run a meaningful EFA. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy: Excellent: .90s; Good: .80s; Average: .70s; Fair: .60s; Poor: .50s; Very Poor: <.50.

EXHIBIT C.1. ELEMENT: COORDINATION COMPONENT MATRIX

	Component	
	1	2
Partners engage in creating norms, protocols, and structures in inclusive ways that define and drive decisions and communication	.851	
Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and agreed upon among partner organizations and within the context of the partnership's work	.767	
The school and partners are working towards shared goals and people understand how working together will improve performance	.868	
There is a person or team (can be from the school, partner orgs, parent volunteer, or combination) that serves as the central point of contact for community partners and others providing support services; this person/team works closely with school leaders	.848	
There are structures (e.g. scheduled meetings, partners sharing a workspace) to support regular communication among partners	.834	
Partners communicate regularly with each other	.833	
Partner organizations are aware of and share the services and supports provided by other organizations	.639	
Organizations communicate about and are open/flexible to learn from what is working (and not) to be able to better support each other and students	.728	
There are resources (time, funding) committed to coordination		.821
Partners identify the need for and value of sharing data and information about students.	.743	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. a. 2 components extracted.		

COORDINATION: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.624
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	91.197
	df	36
	Sig.	.000

COORDINATION: Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.913	59.130	59.130	5.913	59.130	59.130
2	1.672	16.717	75.847	1.672	16.717	75.847
3	.963	9.633	85.480			
4	.456	4.557	90.037			
5	.263	2.635	92.672			
6	.243	2.432	95.104			
7	.178	1.784	96.888			
8	.120	1.205	98.092			
9	.099	.989	99.082			
10	.092	.918	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						

EXHIBIT D.1. CHARACTERISTIC: SHARED VISION ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX

	Component	
	1	2
Students, families, partner organizations, and school leadership and staff feel they are part of the vision and can speak into the process of developing and refining the vision	.546	
The vision process attends to the differences in power between schools, districts and large institutions and students, families and CBOs		.596
The vision of the partnership and how it supports the broader vision are not static and evolve over time	.775	
The vision acknowledges and addresses inequities of systems, schools, and opportunities for students, and is focused on addressing those inequities		.864
The vision is explicit about supporting/improving outcomes for students of color		.802
Partners have a common understanding of systemic barriers to positive educational outcomes, especially for students of color, and are committed to working together to address them	.775	
Goals speak to how you want to do your work (process goals), not just what you want to do (Humanistic mindset/quality in relation to quantity)	.742	
The vision reflects what families, students, school leaders and staff, and partner organizations want for the partnership and the students it serves		.754
Common outcomes have been identified and are the focus for helping to achieve the vision	.783	.
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

SHARED VISION: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.624
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	91.197
	df	36
	Sig.	.000

SHARED VISION: Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.532	50.355	50.355	3.289	36.541	36.541
2	1.666	18.509	68.864	2.909	32.324	68.864
3	.926	10.293	79.157			
4	.641	7.123	86.280			
5	.529	5.882	92.162			
6	.312	3.466	95.628			
7	.195	2.162	97.790			
8	.155	1.722	99.511			
9	.044	.489	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						

EXHIBIT E.1. CHARACTERISTIC: ALIGNED & RESPONSIVE IMPLEMENTATION COMMUNALITIES	
	Initial
Services are aligned with vision and needs – partners use data and equity lens to identify community needs and disparities. Make sure there is a structure in place to identify individual student needs	1.000
Partners efficiently use of existing assets – take advantage of partnership, strengths, opportunities already present in the community, without overburdening one resource, and also not reinventing the wheel and duplicating efforts*	1.000
Partnership incorporates new partners when needed – if there are needs identified that current partners do not have the expertise in filling, respond by finding partners that can fill that need	1.000
Partnership builds trust and strong relationships – partners communicate continuously and engage in opportunities to connect, share, collaborate, celebrate, and learn together. Partners set up clear and regular communication for progress and goals. Part	1.000
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. a. Only one component was extracted. The solution cannot be rotated.	

**ALIGNED & RESPONSIVE IMPLEMENTATION
KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.773
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	55.061
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

**MUTUAL/SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SUCCESS
KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.499
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	15.151
	df	3
	Sig.	.002

**ALIGNED & RESPONSIVE IMPLEMENTATION
Total Variance Explained**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.141	78.529	78.529
2	.524	13.092	91.621
3	.186	4.660	96.281
4	.149	3.719	100.000
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.			

MUTUAL/SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SUCCESS Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	1.866	62.211	62.211
2	.995	33.168	95.378
3	.139	4.622	100.000
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.			

**EXHIBIT F.1. CHARACTERISTIC: MUTUAL/SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY
FOR SUCCESS COMMUNALITIES**

	Initial
Partners build evaluation into program to promote continuous improvement, engage in improvement efforts by collecting and sharing data to improve services to students. Partners commit to high-quality point of service by participating in quality improvement	1.000
The group collects and uses sufficient quantitative and qualitative information disaggregated by race & ethnicity, FRPL, language, or gender effectively to support equity efforts.	1.000
Partners discuss data trends and check their understanding and interpretation with community from which data are collected.	1.000
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. a. Only one component was extracted. The solution cannot be rotated.	

LANDSCAPE OF CHANGES IN PRACTICE, POLICY, & SYSTEMS BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE

EXHIBIT G.1. CHANGES IN PRACTICE, POLICY, & SYSTEMS BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE									
		Practice, Policy and Systems Changes ¹							Cross Strategy
School #	Individual Strategy Partnership Type ²	Staff Growth	Discipline	Access to Services/ Activities/ Supports	Student Leadership, Student Engagement in Partnership	Coordination/ System of Student Supports	Family Engagement (at school and/or in partnership)	Other PSE Changes	Cross Strategy Partnership Type ³
1	Cooperative 2			x	x				Cooperative 1
1	Not Categorized			x		x	x		
1	Integrated 1	x	x	x	x	x	x		
2	Integrated 3	x		x	x	x	x		Integrated 1
2	Integrated 1	x		x	x				
2	Integrated 1	x		x	x	x	x		
3	Collaborative 2	x	x	x		x	x		Integrated 2
3	Integrated 2	x	x		x	x	x		
4	Cooperative 1	x	x		x	x	x	x	Not Categorized
5	Collaborative 1	x	x	x		x	x		Cooperative 3
5	Collaborative 3		x	x	x	x	x		
6	Cooperative 3	x		x	x	x			Not Categorized
6	Cooperative 3	x	x		x	x		x	

1 Note: 1 Cells that are marked X and highlighted indicate areas of change identified by a partnership. The information reflected in the table are based on a review of Year 1 Narrative Reports and PSED Evaluation Team Analysis of all secondary documents in addition to Narrative Reports (e.g., SBIRT Interventionist Surveys, HSE Quarterly Reports).

2, 3 Cooperative 1 = Early Cooperative; Cooperative 2 = Established Cooperative; Cooperative 3 = Highly Cooperative
Collaborative 1 = Early Collaborative; Collaborative 2 = Established Collaborative; Collaborative 3 = Highly Collaborative

EXHIBIT G.1. CHANGES IN PRACTICE, POLICY, & SYSTEMS BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE

		Practice, Policy and Systems Changes ¹							Cross Strategy
School #	Individual Strategy Partnership Type ²	Staff Growth	Discipline	Access to Services/ Activities/ Supports	Student Leadership, Student Engagement in Partnership	Coordination/ System of Student Supports	Family Engagement (at school and/or in partnership)	Other PSE Changes	Cross Strategy Partnership Type ³
7	Cooperative 3			x		x			Collaborative 2
7	Integrated 1			x	x	x	x		
7	Integrated 2					x	x		
7	Collaborative 2	x		x	x		x		
8	Collaborative 2	x	x		x	x	x		Not Categorized
9	Cooperative 2	x	x	x		x	x		Not Categorized
9	Collaborative 1	x		x	x	x	x		
9	Cooperative 2			x	x				

LANDSCAPE OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE

EXHIBIT H.1. CHANGES IN SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE						
		Changes to School Environment (where young people experience positive school environments) ¹				Cross Strategy
School #	Individual Strategy Partnership Type ²	Attendance	Discipline (reduction in suspensions and expulsions)	Positive Relationships and Interactions (peers, partner, adults, teachers, community) / Healthy Relationships	Improved School Climate (students feeling connected, students feeling safe at school)	Cross Strategy Partnership Type ³
1	Cooperative 2		x	x		Cooperative 1
1	Not Categorized				x	
1	Integrated 1	x	x	x	x	
2	Integrated 3	x		x	x	Integrated 1
2	Integrated 1	x		x	x	
2	Integrated 1					
3	Collaborative 2		x		x	Integrated 2
3	Integrated 2	x	x	x	x	
4	Cooperative 1	x	x	x	x	Not Categorized
5	Collaborative 1		x		x	Cooperative 3
5	Collaborative 3	x	x	x	x	
6	Cooperative 3				x	Not Categorized
6	Cooperative 3	x	x	x	x	

1 Note: 1 Cells that are marked X and highlighted indicate areas of change identified by a partnership. The information reflected in the table are based on a review of Year 1 Narrative Reports and PSESD Evaluation Team Analysis of all secondary documents in addition to Narrative Reports (e.g., SBIRT Interventionist Surveys, HSE Quarterly Reports).

2, 3 Cooperative 1 = Early Cooperative; Cooperative 2 = Established Cooperative; Cooperative 3 = Highly Cooperative
Collaborative 1 = Early Collaborative; Collaborative 2 = Established Collaborative; Collaborative 3 = Highly Collaborative
Integrated 1 = Early Integrated; Integrated 2 = Established Integrated; Integrated 3 = Highly Integrated

EXHIBIT H.1. CHANGES IN SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE

School #	Individual Strategy Partnership Type ²	Changes to School Environment (where young people experience positive school environments) ¹				Cross Strategy
		Attendance	Discipline (reduction in suspensions and expulsions)	Positive Relationships and Interactions (peers, partner, adults, teachers, community) / Healthy Relationships	Improved School Climate (students feeling connected, students feeling safe at school)	Cross Strategy Partnership Type ³
7	Cooperative 3					Collaborative 2
7	Integrated 1			x	x	
7	Integrated 2				x	
7	Collaborative 2			x	x	
8	Collaborative 2	x	x	x	x	Not Categorized
9	Cooperative 2	x	x	x	x	Not Categorized
9	Collaborative 1	x	x	x	x	
9	Cooperative 2	x	x	x	x	

LANDSCAPE OF CHANGES IN STUDENT WELL-BEING OUTCOMES BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE

EXHIBIT I.1. CHANGES IN STUDENT OUTCOMES BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE									
		Student Well-Being Outcomes ¹							Cross Strategy
School #	Individual Strategy Partnership Type ²	Healthy Relationships	Healthy Sense of Self	Decrease in Substance Use	Academic and Career Success	Engagement in School	Mental, Socio-Emotional and Physical Health	Support Systems	Cross Strategy Partnership Type ³
1	Cooperative 2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Cooperative 1
1	Not Categorized			x		x	x		
1	Integrated 1	x	x		x	x	x	x	
2	Integrated 3	x	x		x	x	x	x	Integrated 1
2	Integrated 1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
2	Integrated 1			x		x	x		
3	Collaborative 2			x		x	x		Integrated 2
3	Integrated 2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
4	Cooperative 1	x	x		x	x	x	x	Not Categorized
5	Collaborative 1			x		x	x		Cooperative 3
5	Collaborative 3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
6	Cooperative 3				x	x	x	x	Not Categorized
6	Cooperative 3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

1 Note: 1 Cells that are marked X and highlighted indicate areas of change identified by a partnership. The information reflected in the table are based on a review of Logic Models, Year 1 Narrative Reports and PSES Evaluation Team Analysis of all secondary documents in addition to Narrative Reports (e.g., SBIRT Interventionist Surveys, HSE Quarterly Reports).

2, 3 Cooperative 1 = Early Cooperative; Cooperative 2 = Established Cooperative; Cooperative 3 = Highly Cooperative
Collaborative 1 = Early Collaborative; Collaborative 2 = Established Collaborative; Collaborative 3 = Highly Collaborative
Integrated 1 = Early Integrated; Integrated 2 = Established Integrated; Integrated 3 = Highly Integrated

EXHIBIT I.1. CHANGES IN STUDENT OUTCOMES BY PARTNERSHIP TYPE

School #	Individual Strategy Partnership Type ²	Student Well-Being Outcomes ¹							Cross Strategy
		Healthy Relationships	Healthy Sense of Self	Decrease in Substance Use	Academic and Career Success	Engagement in School	Mental, Socio-Emotional and Physical Health	Support Systems	Cross Strategy Partnership Type ³
7	Cooperative 3								Collaborative 2
7	Integrated 1	x	x		x	x			
7	Integrated 2			x		x	x		
7	Collaborative 2	x	x		x	x	x	x	
8	Collaborative 2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Not Categorized
9	Cooperative 2	x	x		x	x		x	Not Categorized
9	Collaborative 1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9	Cooperative 2	x	x		x	x	x	x	

HIGHLIGHTS OF BSK SUPPORTS BY STRATEGY

The tables below highlight ways in which BSK programs nurtured partnerships, with highlights unique to a particular strategy area listed in the left column. The right column notes areas for further exploration and discussion.

	<i>Unique Highlights</i>	<i>For Further Exploration (if applicable)</i>
Healthy and Safe Environments (Public Health)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community driven and youth-led planning • New mini-grant program to support new community partnerships • Scope template includes connections with other programs and other BSK efforts • Logic model includes developing new partnerships, strengthening relationships, mobilizing community, and shared policy agenda. These concepts are repeated in RFP, contract, and reporting in strong “through line” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance pay necessitates applicants to prepare two budgets — with and without pay. How did that work out for awardees at the end of the first cycle? • The “how” of doing partnership may benefit from additional detail; were awardees able to successfully negotiate needed partnerships?
Out-of-School Time (OST) (Department of Community and Human Services and School’s Out Washington)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy design was clearly developed in collaboration with community • Place-based awards require partnerships and can spend up to 15% on coordination • Strategy-level performance measures include strength of coordination and alignment among place-based awardees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the aggregation of quality results at the site-level rather than organization-level encourage collaboration/partnership functioning? If so, how? • This strategy’s external evaluation may be worth probing to follow up on strategy-level performance measure results, including and in addition to the January 2019 memo
School-Based Health Centers (Public Health)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very specific ways to partner listed in scope of work/contract; MOU/letter of support very detailed • Logic model makes a clear connection between partnership as resource, collaboration as activity, relationship as resource, and school connectedness as short-term outcome with improved school climate as long-term outcome • Request for Application (RFA) response required documentation of how applicants had worked for and within the community in past projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons can be generalized from this very specific partnership implementation to other strategies? Are the relationships transactional or vendor-based? • RFA is technical and helps scaffold a planning process for the centers; what capacities for planning, writing, and budgeting does this require for awardees? How does this translate for a wider range of awardee partners?

	<i>Unique Highlights</i>	<i>For Further Exploration (if applicable)</i>
Screening, Brief Intervention & Referral to Treatment (DCHS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logic model and SOW include internal meetings and strategy learning circles • Language around support and collaboration are consistent through documents 	N/A
Trauma Informed and Restorative Practices (Public Health)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on racial equity, with visual and narrative explanations in RFP and one-pager • RFP focus on partnership, community design, cultural relevance, and resource sharing; explicit requirement for letter of support/MOU • Monthly meeting requirements in SOW/Contract provide “how-tos” for partnership development 	N/A
Youth Development (DCHS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear complementary approach with OST strategy, re: dose, quality improvement, and age requirements for youth that are served • Youth engagement key part of program design requirements • Logic models for each of four strategies require a section to list key partnerships and connection across BSK strategies 	N/A



Strategy, Evaluation and Learning
Puget Sound Educational Service District

800 OAKESDALE AVENUE SOUTHWEST

RENTON, WA 98057
WWW.STRATEGY.PSESD.ORG

P: 425-917-7600
TTY: 425-917-7833



@PSESD



@PSESD



Puget Sound ESD



PugetSoundESD121