

Community/School Partnerships: A National Survey

Brett Pawlowski, President
DeHavilland Associates

Objectives of the Survey

- Understand How They Work with Partners
- Identify Types of Partnerships
- Gauge Importance of Current/Future Partners
- Look for Differences in Segments

Key Findings

- Top Current Partners: Individual Businesses
- Most Desired Partners: Business Coalitions
- Most Frequently Cited: Individual Businesses (82.2%)
- Total Value: 43.6% at \$25K/less; 83% at \$200K/ less
- Local is King

I. Current Practices

- **Primary Liaison:** School/district leader or group
- **Partnership Design:** Most work collaboratively to set objectives and design programs
- **Tracking Partnerships:** A mixed bag
- **Tracking Outcomes:** Most do track outcomes

Partnership Solicitation

- 31% have dedicated staff
- 33.8% initiate public communications
- 39.3% apply to solicitations
- 42.4% work through facilitators
- 72.7% work through informal networking

Value of Partnerships

	All	Dist.	School
Less than \$25,000	43.6%	32.7%	63.7%
\$25,000 to \$50,000	17.2%	17.3%	17.6%
\$50,000 to \$200,000	22.2%	26.8%	14.2%
\$200,000 to \$500,000	6.8%	10.1%	1.5%
\$500,000 to \$1 Million	3.3%	3.0%	2.0%
\$1 Million or More	6.9%	10.2%	1.0%

II. Types of Partnerships

- **Most frequently mentioned:**
 - Individual Business = 82.2%
 - Parent Organization = 76.1%
 - Local Nonprofits = 46.4%
 - Business Coalitions = 45.6%
 - Booster Club = 44.9%

Coalitions as Partners

- Funds: Ranked 7th at 25.4%
- Volunteers: Ranked 5th at 25.4%
- Goods and Services: Ranked 5th at 23.2%
- Expertise: Ranked 3rd at 26.9%

- Survey did *not* reflect direct student support

III. Current and Future Partners

- **Importance of Current Partners**
 - Coalitions 5th overall
 - 3rd by suburban schools
- **Importance of Future Partners**
 - Coalitions 1st overall
 - 2nd among principals

IV. Looking for Segments

- Two breakouts:
 - School or district
 - Urban, suburban, or rural
- No differences between schools and districts beyond the obvious
- Differences between settings, however...

Differences in Current Practices

	U	S	R
School Foundation	38.9%	65.1%	28.7%
Capturing Partner Info	87.9%	87.4%	78.1%
Measure Outcomes	75.6%	73.8%	64.5%
Dedicated Staff	35.6%	36.2%	25.7%
Find through Facilitators	45.5%	53.3%	34.3%
Find through Networking	78.0%	77.0%	68.2%

Differences in Partnership Value

	U	S	R
Less than \$25,000	38.5%	26.9%	56.6%
\$25,000 to \$50,000	15.4%	23.4%	14.5%
\$50,000 to \$200,000	16.2%	24.8%	23.6%
\$200,000 to \$500,000	11.5%	10.3%	2.1%
\$500,000 to \$1 Million	4.6%	4.8%	1.7%
\$1 Million or More	13.9%	9.7%	1.6%

Participation in Urban Partnerships

	U	S	R
Other local foundations	40.2%	32.9%	29.4%
Regional/nat. foundations	28.8%	23.0%	13.5%
Local nonprofits	59.1%	48.7%	38.4%
Regional/nat. nonprofits	25.0%	15.1%	7.3%
Postsecondary institutions	26.5%	24.3%	12.2%

Participation in Suburban Partnerships

	U	S	R
Individual businesses	81.8%	85.5%	81.2%
Business coalitions	50.0%	56.6%	36.3%
Parent organizations	72.0%	84.2%	73.9%
School-run foundation	9.8%	19.7%	13.1%
External education fdn.	33.3%	45.4%	22.9%
Alumni club	17.4%	27.0%	17.1%

Participation in Rural Partnerships

	U	S	R
Booster clubs	48.0%	22.7%	55.5%

Conclusions

- Schools/districts have room to improve
- Schools/districts not recording significant value from partnerships
- Differences in schools/districts by location
- Coalitions very attractive as partners

For More Information:

Brett Pawlowski, President

DeHavilland Associates

704.944.3134

brett@dehavillandassociates.com

www.dehavillandassociates.com