Partnership Type Identification Checklist for Collaboratives[1]

This checklist will help organizations who are part of a multi-organization collaborative decide what type of partnership they desire and what they have capacity for. Based on selected indicators, you can identify which category best describes your partnership. To determine which category is the best fit, choose the column where you have checked the most boxes. This allows you to prepare for and to begin a conversation with your partners about what type of partnership you currently have, what you're aiming for, and what actions would move your partnership to another type.

Domain	Cooperative	Collaborative	Integrated
SHARED VISION	□ The overall vision and goals are developed and led by a single organization or agency. □ Desired outcomes for each program/service are set by each partner independently. Each partner can identify one or more program goals aligned with the lead agency's vision, but the full vision may not be shared across all partners and programs. □ No reference is made to involvement, input, or feedback from youth, families, or staff.	□ Partners discuss vision, goals, and strategic priorities with all involved giving input during the partnership planning process. □ Each individual partner can identify at least one outcome aligned with a strategic priority of the partnership's goals and plan. □ There is commitment to continue building on relationships and working together while gathering input or feedback from stakeholders, such as youth, families, and staff, in order to provide support services to students of color.	□ Partners co-construct shared vision and goals and share responsibilities for implementing them. Goals include those for *how* they will work together in partnership, in addition to *what* they want to do. □ Partners ensure the alignment of other partners (e.g. contracted organizations) to the shared vision and goals. □ Partners regularly review and set priorities and ensure alignment with emerging needs. □ There is a clear sense of what the common purpose is, what and how contributions from partners will be needed or used, and how stakeholders' input is gathered from youth, families, and staff.

---

[1] Originally adapted from Oakland Unified School District, Community Partner Identification Tool, Retrieved from http://www.ousd.org/Page/11101. Checklist for Collaboratives adapted in collaboration with School's Out Washington, with resources from PSESD, Best Starts for Kids: Exploring Equitable School Partnerships, Year 1 Final Report, Retrieved from https://strategy.psesd.org/current-evaluation-projects/best-starts-for-kids.

Domain	Cooperative	Collaborative	Integrated
LEADERSHIP	□ Leaders from each partner organization decide on the parameters of the site agreement and then, operate with autonomy. □ Partners have discussed and documented the roles and responsibilities of all parties, a site decision-making process, and have identified appropriate check-in points. Communication on an ongoing basis is limited. □ Plans to add youth and family voices is either vague or in an early stage of influencing or being part of leadership.	□ Partners communicates with one or more leaders from other organization(s) about decisions and gives/takes input, but the final say rests with a single organization. □ Partners regularly and routinely provide feedback to each other. □ Partners participate in a site-based decision-making body. Leaders recognize the need for other partners and their essential roles toward achieving youth support in their own ways and together. □ There is clear acknowledgment of the need for including perspectives of stakeholders such as youth, families, and staff, while increasing information sharing among partners.	□ Partners make decisions collaboratively and see themselves as involved in site-based decision-making. All voices are at the table and there is a structure and process for collective decisions to be made that impact the site and partnership as a whole. It is almost difficult to separate each contributing entity from one another in their interdependent efforts. □ Partners recognize each other's value and contributions. Trust exists between partners, and long-term relationships between individuals and/or organizations are common. □ Youth, families, and/or staff are valued and influence site-based priorities and decision-making, such as via leadership roles and/or input and engagement at relevant points.
COORDINATION	□ If there is a coordinator, the coordinator does not work closely with all partners. □ Coordination structures, especially around communication, attend to the most basic of partner needs and interests.	□ Coordination is helped by sharing resources including spaces or timing of activities (i.e. the how, when, and what of the work). □ There is information flow between partners and stakeholders, and there may be some regular meetings during the year to check in.	□ Every partner engages in efforts that support, facilitate, or enable the work of the other partners and all agree trust exists within the partnership. □ Regular communication between partners is supported by built-in structures such as twice per month meetings. Meetings include opportunities for giving and receiving feedback, centering relationships, and linking to shared goals.

Domain	Cooperative	Collaborative	Integrated
ALIGNED, RESPONSIVE IMPLEMENTATION	□ Each partner has set program based on their expertise that meets identified need(s) in the community. □ Each organization or agency is doing their own work, independently of each other. □ Partners can identify how each organization is addressing needs of the community. □ Partners collect and provide general participation data. □ Partners are aware of appropriate site engagement opportunities; participation by one or more partners is optional but welcome. □ Strong communication at the beginning of the partnership to establish expectations for all partners and at the end of program/activity to evaluate impact. On-going communication occurs on an as-needed basis.	□ Partners meet at least twice a year to discuss program(s) and incorporate feedback on unmet needs. Outreach is targeted mid-year if needed. □ Partners have some alignment of support for youth by identifying and leveraging resources from partners and from the larger community according to identified needs. □ Partners work together to identify and fine-tune strategies for meeting needs of youth and families if programs are not reaching intended populations. □ Partners collect and provide breakdown of their data to show needs and disparities. Partners incorporate feedback on unmet community needs into program planning for the following year. □ Partners contribute to each other's communications, e.g. newsletters, flyers, brochures, events. □ Partners have explicit agreements re: communication, e.g. response time, preferred method, etc.	□ Partners report being on the same page with, embedded, integrated into, or supported by the work of other partners and see themselves as part of a cohesive multi-organization partnership. □ Partners work closely with each other so that strategies are complimentary and impact top priorities or needs to create an ecosystem of supports. □ Partners meet at least monthly to discuss program(s) and partnership. □ Partners discuss data trends on a regular basis, to identify needs and disparities. They discuss how to revise strategies, adjust programs, and/or create new programs to address unmet community needs throughout the year. □ Partners have an identified process for conflict resolution and problem-solving with each other.

Domain	Cooperative	Collaborative	Integrated
SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SUCCESS	□ Each partner collects and provides general participation data. Data-sharing agreements between partners may not be in place, or may not be set up in time to respond to time-sensitive requests. □ Each partner may use a continuous improvement process although improvement efforts are typically focused on a single program or initiative. Continuous improvement efforts are not aligned or considered as part of a larger-scale effort. □ Each partner plans for the sustainability and resource allocation of their own program or component of the shared program. Collaborative planning is not common, although one or more partners may provide in-kind resources (e.g. space).	□ Partners work together to plan for and discuss role and strategies for impacting site needs and meeting shared goals, including fine-tuning current strategies. □ Partners collect and share some data on participants, trends, and disparities. Partners review data on priority outcomes to support equity efforts, although data collection and use may be infrequent or inconsistent, such as once during the planning phase and once at the end of the program year. □ Partners share information on program quality and improvement goals and work together to plan strategies for meeting shared outcomes. □ Partners access resources together to support identified site priorities and agree on the alignment of those resources (e.g. grants, in-kind).	□ Partners identify necessary data to track for agreed-upon site priorities. □ Partners have defined roles, legal agreements, process, timeline, and data reporting systems in place, leading to timely and relevant sharing and use of data to make course corrections and fine tune strategies in programs and partnership. □ Partners collect, share, analyze, and discuss participation and assessment data on a regular basis to support continuous improvement and equity efforts. □ Partners share data and continuous improvement efforts with stakeholder groups such as staff, youth, and families. □ Partners plan for and work together on resource allocation to ensure continuous services and sustainability of partnership and programs (e.g. grants, in-kind).