PFS

PARTNERSHIP RUBRIC

Rhode Island
Campus Compact

AICU
Rhode Island

Leveraging the educational assets of the state's institutions of higher education, *Rhode Island Partnerships For Success* enhances PK-16 school-based partnerships that prepare students to realize their own goals in higher education, careers, and active citizenship.

THIS RUBRIC is an evaluative tool designed to assist partnership practitioners in identifying the current phase of their partnership and to highlight ways to deepen effectiveness and improve overall partnership practice in the following five focus areas:

Collaborative Relationships

Mutually Beneficial Outcomes

Communication & Learning

Responsiveness to Community Needs

Improvement of Partnership Practice

COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Partnerships are built on collaborative relationships that involve the input and participation of all parties as a means for success. Collaborative planning and shared investment in the partnership is continuous and includes stakeholder involvement beyond the partners.

	PLANNING & SHARED INVESTMENT	STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT
emerging partnership	• Planning is inconsistent and one-sided; does not allow for full partner involvement. • Partners have begun to discuss the needs (partner, community, and/or issue-based) that will be addressed through the partnership. • Partners understand the foundation for the partnership, but a Shared Agreement of the "three R's" (roles, responsibilities, resources) does not exist.	• Stakeholders (participants, community partners, funders, advocates, champions) are not fully identified or engaged in partnership development. • Alignment with partnering institutions' missions, visions, and priorities is not established.
developing partnership	• Planning of partnership activities involves collaboration among partners. • Partners have identified the needs that will be addressed through the partnership. • A Shared Agreement is in development, but not all pieces are clearly defined.	• Identified stakeholders begin to participate in the planning and implementation of partnership activities. • Alignment with partnering institutions' missions, visions, and priorities is identified; partners work to gain institutional support and to communicate institutional benefits of partnership publicly.
transformative partnership	• Planning takes place well in advance of project launch with full involvement of partners. • Partners meet on a regular basis to maintain the relationship, determine outcomes, and to create plans to address identified needs. • A Shared Agreement document exists; indicating mutual understanding and commitment to the three R's.	• Opportunities are intentionally created to support ongoing stakeholder engagement. • Alignment with partnering institutions' missions, visions, and priorities is established; partnership has champions within lead institutions and receives support, prioritization, and dedicated resources.

MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL OUTCOMES

Partners work from a shared vision toward clearly defined goals and outcomes that are mutually beneficial. Partnerships are data-driven, with an emphasis on the assessment of learning outcomes.

	RECIPROCITY	ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES
emerging partnership	• The outcomes of the partnership } primarily benefit one partner. • There is no shared vision for the partnership.	• Learning outcomes for students and practitioners are unclear due to a lack of prioritization and goal-setting. • Assessment is driven by external funding requirements rather than partners' goals.
developing partnership	• Mutual benefit exists in partnership outcomes. • Partners have agreed on an internal set of goals or a shared vision for the partnership.	• Students' learning outcomes are documented but not evaluated; learning outcomes of practitioners are unknown. • Assessment is driven by partners' goals, but without clear methods or evaluation systems in place.
transformative partnership	• Partnership actively works towards mutually beneficial outcomes; those outcomes are clearly understood and publicly communicated. • Actions are taken to build on partners' shared vision and to ensure that partners' needs are met.	• Learning outcomes at both the student and practitioner level are clear and well documented. • A data-driven assessment system is in place to evaluate success in meeting stated outcomes, resulting in continuous improvement of the partnership.

COMMUNICATION & LEARNING

Partners actively listen and learn from one another and inform each other's practice through shared experience, reflection, and knowledge. Two-way communication is initiated by, and flows easily between, the partners.

	COMMUNICATION	REFLECTION
emerging partnership	• Communication flows mostly one-way; there is a lack of exchange between partners. • A system for sharing work between partners is not in place or prioritized.	• Reflection on partnership does not occur on a regular basis. • Stakeholders are not provided a space to reflect on their experience or to offer their perspectives within the partnership.
developing partnership	• Two-way communication takes place informally between partners, but does not contribute to continuous improvement in the partnership. • Documents and other programmatic materials are shared on an ad hoc basis.	• Reflection is scheduled, but without a clear purpose. • Stakeholders may be prompted to reflect on their experience, but there is no structure in place to incorporate reflections.
transformative partnership	• Communication methods that encourage active-listening are in place and prioritized; partners feel empowered to voice issues, share ideas, and initiate dialogue. • Final products and documents have shared authorship and are exchanged on a regular basis.	• Individual and collective reflection is a formal part of the assessment process. • Stakeholders are involved in continuous reflection; strengths and weaknesses are openly discussed; steps are taken to build on strengths and to address areas for improvement.

RESPONSIVENESS TO COMMUNITY NEEDS

Partnerships form and evolve according to community needs and intentionally solicit the input of those engaged in the partnership. Partners are attuned to the fluidity of needs, assets, and changes within the communities they serve.

	COMMUNITY CONTEXT	INNOVATION
emerging partnership	• Partnership (activities, outcomes, programming) is not rooted in community needs. • Partners have separate agendas focused on distinct sets of community needs. • Partnership has not connected to relevant community members/stakeholders.	• Partners are in the process of building a strong connection between institutions. • Partners do not take risks or welcome new ideas.
developing partnership	• Partnership is responsive to an identified community need. • Partners operate from a shared agenda based on an identified community need. • Partners have identified key community members/stakeholders to engage in partnership process.	• Partnership enhances existing institutional culture through the cultivation of new knowledge and external engagement. • Partnership takes appropriate risks and is characterized by creativity and flexible thinking.
transformative partnership	• Partnership intentionally considers community context in the construction of action plans and shares them publicly. • Partnership is responsive, evolving to address the needs, modes, and conditions of the community in which it seeks to affect change. • Partners mobilize and build on community assets by fully engaging community members/stakeholders.	• Partnership has a bold vision that challenges conventional wisdom and practices to inspire institutional growth. • New ideas are openly shared and valued; efforts are made to incorporate new approaches into partnership activities.

IMPROVEMENT OF PARTNERSHIP PRACTICE

Successful partnerships support the continuous improvement and sustainability of partnership practice, both internally and externally, and clearly articulate the value and impact of the partnership through effective documentation and storytelling.

	DOCUMENTATION & STORYTELLING	SUSTAINABILITY
emerging partnership	• Partnership is in pilot stage and still forming the components of its story. • Documentation of partnership has not begun.	• Partners operate moment-to-moment with limited discussion of the future. • No plan exists for the sustainability of the partnership between institutions. • Partnership activities are not at a point to be celebrated.
developing partnership	• Partnership story is understood and shared with internal audiences (partners, stakeholders) and, increasingly, with external audiences. • Documentation of partnership (photos, student-generated work, published articles, etc) is collected on an ad hoc basis but not utilized in developing partnership story; nor is it consistently shared.	• Sufficient interest and planning documents exist to ensure the possibility of partnership sustainability. • The sustainability of the partnership constitutes part of planning meetings at the partner institutions. • Celebration of partnership activities is planned but not prioritized.
transformative partnership	• Partners and stakeholders actively contribute to the creation of the partnership story and consistently communicate that story to garner support (sustainability, fundraising), to engage additional stakeholders, and to encourage similar practices at other sites. • A system for ongoing documentation (through two or more media) is in place and actively used to communicate the value of the partnership through grant applications and reports, website and social media, newsletters, and during partnership celebration and planning.	• Tangible products of the partnership are archived and easily accessible, such that the partnership could continue, even if turnover occurs with partners. • Institutions recognize that the partnership holds the potential for institutional capacity-building and, together, author a sustainability plan for the partnership. • Celebration of partnership activities takes place with all stakeholders and is publicly shared.

This rubric was developed by Rhode Island Partnerships for Success (PFS) with the input of a subcommittee of PFS advisory council members:

Kyleen Carpenter, *Blackstone Academy Charter School*

Kerry Condon, PFS *AmeriCorps*Vista*

Susan Connery, *Johnson & Wales University*

Todd Flaherty, *The College Crusade of Rhode Island*

Liz Garofalo, *Rhode Island College*

Carie Hertzberg, *Rhode Island Campus Compact*

Patricia Mulcahey, *Association of Independent Colleges & Universities of Rhode Island*

The Rhode Island Partnerships for Success (PFS) *Partnership Rubric was produced under the leadership of Rhode Island Campus Compact* (RICC) *and the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities* (AICU RHODE ISLAND).

www.ripartnerships.org