School of Education
Partnerships and Outreach Task Force

Final Report

Prepared for

Policy Council and
University Dean Gerardo M. Gonzalez

April 27, 2004

Task Force Members
Sasha Barab
Lynne Boyle-Baise
Ghangis Carter
Stephanie Carter
Carrie Chapman, Co-Chair
Sandi Cole
Jeff Daniels
Dave Kinman
Chuck Little
Carol Matern
Betty Poindexter
Charlie Reigeluth, Co-Chair

Aims of the Task Force

The Partnership and Outreach (P&O) Task Force was created to provide recommendations for accomplishing Goal 2 of the School of Education (SoE) Strategic Plan ("To strengthen the School of Education's partnerships with P-12 schools and communities."). Goal 2 was accompanied by four tasks:

Task 2.1: To define the concept and scope of SoE and community partnerships;

Task 2.2: To build into new and existing partnerships features that will strengthen the teaching, research, and service missions of the SoE;

Task 2.3: To develop a commitment to evidence-based (qualitative and quantitative) decision-making related to partnerships;

Task 2.4: To develop mechanisms to support partnership activities.

In addition, the Task Force created a fifth task:

Task 2.5: To develop mechanisms to support P-12 schools for partnerships.

Report Overview

This report consists of the following sections:

1. **Definitions of key terms**. Partnership and outreach are defined.
2. **Data**. The committee gathered information from four sources:
    a. Published Literature: The committee reviewed several publications to understand guiding principles for K-12 partnerships.
    b. 2002 SoE Outreach Study: Members of the SoE conducted a study to assess the interest in partnerships by local schools.
    c. Focus Groups: Committee members gathered data from department-based focus groups.
    d. The Indiana P-16 Report: The committee received additional information from Indiana's P-16 Plan for Improving Student Achievement.
3. **Facilitators and Barriers to P & O**.
    a. Facilitators – The committee identified six facilitators for P & O activities:
        i. Examples to faculty from current partnerships
        ii. Synergy among research, service, and teaching
        iii. The use of clinical professors
        iv. Teacher education field experiences
        v. Increased public interest in partnerships as a part of research
        vi. Continued public interest in community participation in education
    b. Barriers – The committee identified nine barriers for P & O activities:
        i. Few clinical professors
        ii. Teacher education field experiences
        iii. Emphasis on research
        iv. Lack of celebration for outreach
        v. Lack of reciprocity

vi. Lack of resources
vii. Lack of rewards
viii. Lack of coordination
ix. Lack of research assistants

4. **Recommendations**.
    a. Make Changes in the SoE's Culture for Public Service: To change the SoE culture, we address two questions:
        i. What enhancements should be made?
        ii. How should these enhancements be made in the SoE's culture?
    b. Create an SoE Office to Foster Partnerships and Outreach: Recommendations are made for:
        i. What form should it take?
        ii. What responsibilities should it have?
    c. Create a Policy Council Standing Committee for Partnerships and Outreach: Our recommendations address two questions:
        i. What form should the standing committee take?
        ii. What responsibilities should it have?

1. Definitions of Key Terms

Outreach is any activity of School of Education faculty, staff, students, or alumni that extends beyond the University to other parties to further the interests of education generally. Outreach can be short-term or long-term, and initiated by the School or other parties.

Partnership is a collaborative form of outreach. Partnership is a relationship between a member or members of the School of Education and individual(s), organization(s), or institution(s) outside the University. Partnership respects the equal worth of partners, advances mutual interests, promotes partner participation and interaction, shares goals and decision-making, elicits and responds to partner communication, is mutually beneficial, and promotes mutual change in partners. Partnership is an attitude and an activity that is critically reflective, interdependent, and evolutionary. Aspects of partnership often include planning, continuous feedback between practice and theory, tears and repairs, service, teaching, research, celebration, and evaluation.

2. Data on Partnerships and Outreach

Research and publications from university, school, and business entities have proposed guiding principles for partnerships between K-12 schools and universities (Goodlad, 1994; Osguthorpe et al., 1995; Penny & Dandridge, 1996; Essex, 2001; Smith & Edelen-Smith, 2002).

Foundation. Across a variety of sources, the overriding message of these principles is that the foundation be constructed on:

1. shared vision, mission, values and philosophies,
2. clearly defined purpose and direction,
3. mutually beneficial goals and objectives,
4. enthusiastic endorsement by top level leaders in schools and colleges, and
5. trust, mutual respect and open communication among partners.

Implementation. The implementation of quality partnerships involves:

1. activities that are integrated into the school and university culture,
2. clear management processes and structures, and
3. mechanisms that define and assess specific, measurable outcomes.

Continuity. To sustain and keep the partnerships at a high quality over time, continuity is built upon:

1. support at the highest level within the school and university,
2. detailed internal and external communications plans that clearly illustrate expectations of all parties, and
3. recognition of all partnership participants in meaningful ways.

Evaluation. Finally, the evaluation component must include:

1. a determination of strengths, weaknesses and future directions, and
2. clear definitions of success for all partners.

In June of 2002, an outreach study was conducted to determine the perceptions of the educational community regarding the School of Education (SoE) at Indiana University and determine interest in partnership development and professional development needed by local school corporations. The study was conducted by Dr. Ron Barnes, Dr. David Kinman and Dr. David Reetz (2002). Focus group sessions were conducted across the state of Indiana with leaders in education consisting of state officials, superintendents, principals, university faculty and deans of education. The extent to which the leaders interviewed are representative of those throughout Indiana is not clear, and some groups, such as classroom teachers, may be underrepresented. A total of twelve focus groups were conducted. Five themes emerged that embody the primary issues discussed and provided the Task Force direction for building partnerships and future outreach initiatives with Indiana schools.

- **Theme 1: Strengthening Teacher Preparation.** Focus group participants stated a need for strengthening the preparation of teacher candidates in the areas of data management, classroom management, standards-based teaching, technology, generalist skills, special education and literacy. This theme points to the need for increased communication between Indiana K-12 schools and all of the SoE teacher preparation programs as to content area changing needs.
- **Theme 2: Professional Development.** The primary concerns involved assisting educational administrators with Indiana Public Law 221, getting teachers up to date on Indiana academic standards, curriculum frameworks and providing more convenient professional development opportunities. Increasing and improving the quality of partnerships between K-12 schools

and the SoE directly related to the content needs and ways in which professional development is offered are a focus of this theme.

- **Theme 3: Faculty Development.** Focus group participants emphasized a need for more minority faculty, additional content specialists, increased involvement of faculty in schools, and more user friendly data production. Issues of SoE faculty diversity and increasing the School's visibility and presence through outreach to K-12 schools are the concern of this theme.
- **Theme 4: Education Leadership.** The need to better understand charter schools, training teachers for positions in educational leadership, and proficiency with data management was suggested. Additionally, a need to increase access to leadership programs was discussed. This theme's focus was centered on the need for improved access to quality leadership preparation in a partnership between K-12 schools and the SoE.
- **Theme 5: Continue to Enhance Partnerships and Communication Opportunities.** Participants expressed a significant need for the SoE to develop and maintain open channels of communication with schools throughout Indiana. Emphasis was placed on creating a user friendly, non-bureaucratic atmosphere. Educators expressed a strong need for a personal university contact. Increasing and improving the depth and breadth of communication avenues between K-12 schools and the SoE was the focus of this theme.

In an effort to personalize the input directly to the Bloomington and Indianapolis faculties, during October and November, 2003, members of the Task Force conducted departmental focus groups getting input on issues of outreach and partnership. Participants were asked to vision beyond what they are doing now and the discussions explored what "ideal" partnerships would look like. Ideas on how partnerships and/or outreach would be supported within the SoE structure were also solicited. It should be noted that, in spite of efforts on the part of Task Force members, a small number of faculty was involved in the focus groups, and their views may not be representative of the SoE faculty as a whole. A wide variety of partnerships were conceived by the focus groups, including P-12 classrooms and schools, underserved communities in the state, hospital, Community Corrections and mental health organizations, business entities throughout the country, other research and service institutes within the Indiana University system, and other institutes of higher education in the United States.

Ways in which these envisioned "ideal" partnerships could best be supported by the SoE were contributed by the focus groups. Ideas were brought forward in the following areas:

a. Increase the acknowledgement or give course credit for field work supervision or on-going partnerships with schools.
b. Reduce or rid the barriers within the higher education structure in the SoE that act as disincentives to participation in outreach and partnerships.
c. Receive help from a central "clearing house" or liaison in finding collaborative partners with similar interests and possible research outside the SoE and in the broader community.
d. Receive help from a central "clearing house" to support student work and research interests.
e. Develop and build capacity for on-going relationships, even after the grant monies are gone.

Indiana's P-16 Plan for Improving Student Achievement (Indiana's Education Roundtable, 2003) provided the Task Force with additional information on university-school partnerships. The plan calls for an educational system in which the vast majority of students successfully complete education beyond high school. Each sector of Indiana's educational system has an important part to play in ensuring all students have the tools necessary to succeed at every level. The plan calls for a seamless

system of education with greater alignment across the education sectors: pre-Kindergarten, K-12 and higher education. Throughout the document, collaboration and partnerships between schools and universities is emphasized.

Education is a public service. The development and sustenance of reciprocal partnerships with the communities and the schools that we, the faculty, serve is a natural manifestation of this mission. However, in order for faculty to commit our time to partnership and outreach, we need to value it highly among ourselves. This Task Force discussed partnership and outreach with SoE faculty. We learned that many members of the faculty already are engaged in outreach, particularly through their participation in field experiences for teacher education, but our committee got the sense that these activities, and other partnerships, are not strongly valued school wide. Next, we suggest facilitators and barriers for partnerships and outreach within the SoE.

3. Facilitators and Barriers

We do not have adequate data about and voice from our partners' and potential partners' facilitators and barriers to partnerships. Therefore, our first recommendation (below) will be to gather such data. However, from our limited data and experience, the following may be some of their barriers to partnering.

Facilitators

A major facilitator for partnerships and outreach is the expectation that stronger linkages to schools and communities will lead to increased quality and diversity for our education programs. Faculty, teachers, community leaders, and other interested parties can grow from greater knowledge of each other's capacities, ideas, and concerns. Building bridges among those with mutual interests in education can foster reciprocity, develop innovative projects, and share responsibility for teacher preparation. Other facilitators include:

- **Current projects:** Currently there are partnerships that are living examples of collaboration. These partnerships create a positive perception of IU as a partner and help develop sustained relationships in the schools. These examples can assist others interested in forming partnerships.

- **Synergy among research, service and teaching:** Outreach and collaborative partnerships can provide viable venues for research and have the potential to simultaneously impact research, teaching and service. This is especially important in the current funding climate in which there is an emphasis on practical impact of research.

- **Clinical professors:** Service is a major focus for the work of clinical professors. This group, though quite small, can provide leadership for outreach efforts. Clinical professors often bring a great deal of practical experience to the position which brings added credibility with schools. They also have numerous connections and relationships already established in public schools.

- **Teacher Education field experiences:** Early field experiences (prior to student teaching) demand an enormous commitment of time from faculty involved in teacher education. Many faculty regularly visit schools and work with teachers as part of this effort. Student teachers and

university supervisors are a very real presence in schools and provide an excellent avenue for positive, sustained relationships with individual teachers and schools throughout the state.

- **Increased public interest in partnerships as part of research:** Many proposals now call for evidence of cross-institutional commitment for research projects. More publications report evidence gathered by university and school faculty as co-researchers.
- **Continued public interest in community participation in education:** Community participation in education has long been advocated by minority groups to increase their involvement in schools. Interest in community participation remains high.

Barriers

Building bridges takes an enormous amount of time and effort. Strong collaborations depend upon the development of mutual purpose, trust, and reciprocity among partners. Given demands for a robust, regular publication record and an active scholarship agenda for SOE faculty, it is a difficult choice to spend time on building and sustaining collaborative relationships. Likewise, the many demands on schools with new legislation and increased accountability reduce time for university partnerships. Other barriers to outreach and partnership include:

- **Few clinical professors:** The number of clinical professors is quite small. Among the SOE faculty they do not carry the weight or respect given to tenure track staff. Their leadership in partnerships is likely to remain limited.
- **Teacher Education field experiences:** Many faculty are so involved in field experiences as part of teacher education that they do not have the time nor feel the need for participation in other kinds of partnerships. The incentives and rewards for public school faculty who supervise practicums, internships and student teachers are minimal.
- **Emphasis on research:** Partnerships often are seen as a service and discounted (especially in terms of the work involved) in merit, tenure, and promotion decisions. If time for partnership takes away from time for research or for teaching, the review of faculty members typically suffers. Unless partnerships become the focus for research, there is little incentive to undertake them.
- **Lack of celebration for outreach:** Quite a few projects in outreach and partnership are ongoing, but they are not lauded. Unless a faculty member takes the initiative to present his/her work in a research venue, the work remains in a shadow in the SoE.
- **Lack of reciprocity:** The SoE frequently is not considered a good partner. Instead, it is commonly thought of as a dominating partner. Faculty go to schools or communities with an agenda in mind. The major benefit seems to be for faculty research or service. Partnerships need to emphasize reciprocity, from development to leadership to evaluation of projects.
- **Lack of resources:** There are very few resources to mount research into partnership efforts. Grant money is hard to find for local studies. Research assistants are employed only by grants. Often, faculty members try to create the partnership and then study it themselves. This type of investigation demands a lot of energy and time, and often results in limited case studies. Likewise, it is no secret that school districts continue to struggle with funding and their budgets have limited dollars that could be used in a discretionary way.
- **Lack of rewards:** Faculty are rewarded for number and quality of publications, not for outreach initiatives. Salary increases depend solely on merit reviews. There is scarcely a place for notation of outreach activities on merit forms. Building partnerships is nice, but does not really

count for outstanding ratings. From the perspective of school personnel, there is typically no reward from the district for participating in university partnerships. Release time for teachers to be engaged in partnerships and salary increases related to these partnerships are limited.

- **Lack of coordination:** There is no coordination in the SoE for partnership and outreach activities. Faculty work as lone investigators, without knowledge of others possibly engaged in similar work. Likewise, even within single districts, there is often little coordination with university partnership activities.
- **Lack of research assistants:** There is no pool of research assistants from which to draw for help on outreach projects.

Given this climate, the Task Force has learned that few potential partners "THINK IU FIRST." By this we mean that few partners naturally turn to IU as a source of public service, a leader in outreach activities, and a place to go first for information and assistance. Instead, the message we seem to give is that we are disinterested in partnership and busy with our own research agendas. We do believe that it is possible to change this image over time. This requires that the SoE seriously addresses the barriers to outreach and partnership and truly celebrates efforts in their behalf.

4. Recommendations

Based on the aims of the Task Force and the data we have gathered, we offer three major recommendations:

1. Make changes in the SoE's culture for public service,
2. Create an SoE office to foster partnerships and outreach, and
3. Create a Policy Council standing committee for partnerships and outreach.

Each of these is discussed next.

1. Make changes in the SoE's culture for public service

Our recommendations address two questions:

- What enhancements should be made in the SoE's culture?
- How should these enhancements be made in the SoE's culture?

What enhancements should be made?

We recommend that the SoE's culture be enhanced by:

a. Cultivating a stronger sense of duty to serve the public in Indiana. An apt slogan could be "Think Service."

b. Placing greater value on field studies that combine service with research. This would include recognizing the value of:
   - doing research through service,
   - doing service through research.

   An example could be for a faculty member and graduate student to work with a partner to design and implement an instructional program (or administrative practice or policy) based on a theory or model, and then conduct design-based research to find ways to improve the

design (of the program or practice or policy) and thereby identify possible improvements to the theory or model upon which it was based.

c. Placing greater value on "field teaching" that combines service with teaching. This would include recognizing the value of:
   - using learning activities (in our courses) that provide service,
   - providing service that affords learning for our students.

   An example could be for a faculty member to assign a collaborative class project that entails a team of five students working with a teacher to create an instructional program for a part of a course that will be implemented late in the semester.

How should these enhancements be made in the SoE's culture?

We recommend that these enhancements be made by conducting a publicity campaign and by instituting greater incentives for partnership and outreach activities.

The publicity campaign should:

- Promote service by tying it to self interest (e.g., identifying ways that it can contribute to one's research and teaching) and by tying it to altruism (e.g., identifying important civic needs that individuals in a public university ought to be addressing).
- Recognize service by providing public and private praise to individuals who have done significant service, and by giving awards for significant service.

The incentives should include:

- Including a more prominent slot for partnership activities and accomplishments on the annual report.
- Giving high points on merit reviews and promotion and tenure decisions for service.
- Providing internal grants for engaging in service.
- Providing some course load relief for significant service.

2. Create an SoE office to foster partnerships and outreach

In addition to enhancing the SoE's culture for public service, we recommend that an institutional capability be created to foster partnerships and outreach. Our recommendations here also address two questions:

- What form should it take?
- What responsibilities should it have?

What form should it take?

We recommend the creation of an Office for Partnerships and Outreach (OPO), headed by an assistant dean. This office should be affiliated with IU's Office of Community & School Partnerships.

What responsibilities should it have?

The OPO (Office for Partnerships and Outreach) should assume responsibility for carrying out all the tasks listed under Goal 2 of the SoE's Strategic Plan (see appendix). More specifically, it should:

- Periodically redo all parts of task 2.1, especially e (identify and evaluate current partnerships) and g (assume greater leadership in the state and nationally in defining and implementing partnerships). Widely publicize IU's commitment to partnerships and to cultivate a culture of "Think IU First" for partnerships. Convene an advisory board of stakeholders, including COAS faculty, and hold a series of community-based focus groups for a, c, d, and f. This should result in a report of findings and recommendations for consideration by both the OPO and the Committee.

- Do tasks 2.2a-c by
  - annually surveying all departments in the SoE,
  - distributing an annual report that describes what was done during the past year and identifies plans and wishes for the next year.
- Do tasks 2.2d-e and 2.2h-j by
  - monitoring public needs and SoE faculty needs/interests, which should include fostering a rich collaborative dialogue among IU, partnership schools, and community organizations,
  - matchmaking between the public and SoE faculty,
  - ensuring reciprocity,
  - using focus-group activities to increase faculty awareness of how partnerships and outreach can help their research and teaching,
  - collaborating with the Center for Evaluation and Educational Policy.
- Do task 2.2f by helping all departments to find ways of partnering with our graduates.
- Do task 2.2g by
  - matchmaking with external agencies and other IU campuses,
  - matchmaking between the public, SoE faculty, and COAS faculty,
  - holding conferences,
  - paying faculty to conduct workshops for teachers.
- Do task 2.2h by encouraging participating SoE faculty to recruit graduate students.
- Do all of task 2.3 by collaborating with the Center for Evaluation and Educational Policy.
- Do all of task 2.4, by
  - fostering changes in the SoE culture as described earlier,
  - involving partners on an advisory board,
  - cultivating contacts with funders interested in partnerships and outreach,
  - cultivating contacts with state and national leaders who may have an interest in partnerships and outreach,
  - collaborating with various IU centers in submitting proposals for external funding to support its efforts,
  - maintaining an active web site to promote and share information about partnerships.
- Do task 2.5 (a new task to be added to the goals): Develop mechanisms to identify and respond to the needs of P-12 schools and communities. This task includes
  - developing channels of communication with current and potential partners to help them communicate their needs to us,
  - developing mechanisms to respond to those needs,
  - finding ways to make parking easier for partners.

3. Create a Policy Council standing committee for partnerships and outreach.

In addition to enhancing the SoE's culture for public service and creating an institutional capability for fostering partnerships and outreach, we recommend that the Policy Council forms a standing committee for partnerships and outreach. Our recommendations here also address two questions:

- What form should it take?
- What responsibilities should it have?

What form should it take?

Committee membership should include members of all stakeholder groups for partnerships and outreach activities. In identifying new members for this Committee each year, Policy Council's agenda committee should consider recommendations sent forward by current members of the Partnerships and Outreach Committee. The assistant dean for partnerships and outreach should be an

ex-officio member of this Committee, and other staff in the OPO should serve on the Committee as appropriate. Committee members from outside IUB should be given special status (e.g., adjunct faculty status), complete with parking privileges. Furthermore, facilitative logistics should be arranged, such as paying for release time for community members and occasionally meeting on community member sites.

What responsibilities should it have?

This Committee shall make recommendations to the Policy Council and Dean regarding policy matters related to partnerships and outreach activities in the School in general and the OPO in particular. Also, the OPO should provide information to the Committee as requested. In essence, the relationship between the Committee and the OPO should be similar to that between the Committee for Teacher Education and the Office of Teacher Education. The Committee provides a vehicle for the SoE faculty in general and the Policy Council in particular to influence the OPO.

REFERENCES

Barnes, R., Kinman, D., & Reetz, D. (2002). *Educational partnerships: Voices from the education community, Strategies for success.* Bloomington, IN: School of Education.

Essex, N.L. (2001). Effective school-college partnerships, a key to educational renewal and instructional improvement. *Education, 121*(4), 732-735.

Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Indiana's Education Roundtable (2003). *Indiana's P-16 Plan for Improving Student Achievement.* http://www.edroundtable.state.in.us/P-16Plan.htm.

Osguthorpe, R.T., Harris, C.R., Harris, M.E., & Black, S. (eds). (1995). *Partner schools: Center for educational renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Penny, S. & Dandridge, W. (1996). *On common ground: In this challenge there is real opportunity.* Yale-New Haven Institute, 6, 9.

Smith, G.J. & Edelen-Smith, P.J. (2002). The nature of the people. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(6), 335-348.

Appendix
Goal 2 of the School of Education Strategic Plan

Goal 2: Strengthen the School of Education's Partnerships with P-12 Schools and Communities

Task 2.1 Define the concept and scope of SoE and community partnerships.

For this goal to be attained, there must be a clear understanding of the nature of SoE and community partnerships.

a. With broad input from stakeholders, determine the meaning of partnerships for the SoE, including how partnerships can serve to strengthen the teaching, research, and service missions of the SoE.
b. Review the research literature on the topic of partnerships.
c. Establish a statement of purpose and goals for the development of partnerships and disseminate to stakeholders.
d. Assess the educational needs of the State of Indiana.
e. Identify and evaluate current partnerships, describing their effectiveness.
f. Establish a collaborative approach to partnerships, assuring mutual benefits to all those involved in the partnership.
g. Assume greater leadership in the state and nationally in defining and implementing university/school/community partnerships.

Task 2.2 Build into new and existing partnerships features that will strengthen the teaching, research, and service missions of the SoE.

The teaching, research and service activities of the SoE can be strengthened with partnerships that afford faculty and students at all levels an opportunity to engage in teaching, research, and service activities that extend beyond the boundaries of the university campus.

a. Examine all educational programs and identify those that might benefit from new partnerships.
b. Examine partnerships that enhance the research activities of the faculty and students of the SoE.
c. Examine partnerships that provide outreach opportunities for faculty and students, thus enhancing our service mission.
d. Develop partnerships that will strengthen all three missions of the SoE.
e. Design mechanisms for documenting, evaluating, and strengthening existing partnerships.
f. Develop partnerships with our graduates to sustain a relationship that supports their life-long learning.
g. Develop partnerships that provide professional development experiences that attend to the needs of practicing teachers.
    - Work collaboratively with school districts, service centers, the Indiana Professional Standards Board, and other external agencies as well as other IU campuses to provide adequate funds and staffing for professional development on topics such as action research, classroom evaluation, portfolio development and other topics of interest to practicing teachers.
    - Ensure that professional development opportunities are flexible in time, location and format in order to cater to the needs of practicing teachers.

h. Develop partnerships as sources of potential graduate students and contexts for graduate students' research activity.
i. Develop partnerships that integrate service-learning experiences in various courses.
j. To cultivate productive partnerships with schools and communities:
   - Create study groups of teachers and/or administrators with SoE faculty, students, and staff.
   - Involve P-12 teachers as partners in designing more meaningful field experiences for students.
   - Sponsor collaborative action research developed and implemented jointly by faculty and practicing teachers.
   - Include various stakeholders from the P-12 community in various committees on and off campus.
   - Involve faculty more effectively in placing, observing, and supervising their students in field experiences.

Task 2.3 Develop a commitment to evidence-based (qualitative and quantitative) decision-making related to partnerships.

All partnership activities should be assessed and plans/decisions based on research evidence.

a. Design a mechanism for assessing the quality of existing partnerships and their impact on SoE programs.
b. Involve stakeholders in the assessment of partnerships.
c. Conduct research that will shed light on the collaborative process for establishing and maintaining partnerships.
d. For each goal, establish specific objectives that can be measured and evaluated.
e. Disseminate through multiple forums (e.g., meetings, conferences, published reports) the results of the evidence-based analysis.

Task 2.4: Develop mechanisms to support partnership activities.

It is necessary to have incentives, support, and funding, for faculty and students who are involved or interested in partnerships with P-12 schools and communities.

a. Review tenure, promotion and merit review guidelines to ensure that they acknowledge the validity of partnership activities in teaching, research, and service endeavors at the local, state, and national levels.
b. Create mechanisms for funding and supporting partnerships of various kinds. These mechanisms should include partnerships with state and federal governments, foundations, and other vital education groups.
c. Enhance mechanisms to support faculty to seek funding for new partnerships or for enhancing existing partnerships.
d. Assume a more active state and national leadership role in promoting partnerships.
e. Establish global as well as local partnerships.