

A STUDY OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS' VIEWS ON
AFFILIATIONS WITH PRIVATE CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS
SUPPORTING PUBLIC EDUCATION:
A REGIONAL STUDY SITUATED IN PENNSYLVANIA'S ALLEGHENY COUNTY

By

James M. Palmiero

Bachelor of Science, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1989

Masters of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 2002

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
School of Education in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

University of Pittsburgh

2011

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

James Palmiero

It was defended on

May 24, 2011

and approved by

Dr. Mary Margaret Kerr, Professor/Department Chair, School of Education

Dr. Charlene Trovato, Clinical Associate Professor/Associate Chair, School of Education

Dr. Richard Wallace

Dissertation Advisor: Dr. William Bickel, Professor/Sr Scientist. LRDC

Copyright © by James M. Palmiero

2011

**A STUDY OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS' VIEWS ON
AFFILIATIONS WITH PRIVATE CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS
SUPPORTING PUBLIC EDUCATION:
A REGIONAL STUDY SITUATED IN PENNSYLVANIA'S ALLEGHENY COUNTY**

James Palmiero, EdD

University of Pittsburgh, 2011

The purpose of this study was to identify views held by local school board members in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County regarding affiliations with private charitable foundations supporting public education. The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with a sampling of school board members from Pennsylvania's Allegheny County. The semi-structured interview questions addressed the subjects' perceptions and beliefs concerning the practices, problems and prospects of affiliations with foundations. A purposive sampling was used to identify nine school board members as study subjects.

The results of the study demonstrate that the subjects perceived that private charitable foundations hold a responsibility to support general social welfare in their communities of interest. Moreover, the subjects also believed that the type of supports provided by the third sector should include investments in public schools that are of both financial and non-financial natures. The subjects held that charitable foundations should approach affiliations with public schools as a partner in cross sector work, which includes shared decision making and mutual benefits for all parties.

The subjects identified four themes in relation to practices affecting affiliations: disclosure, expectations, organizational culture and capacity. The subjects held that cross sector

partners need to disclose their aims, assets and assumptions of shared work prior to entering into engagements; engage in frank discussion concerning their shared work; consider the social, political and/or economic context in which shared work is taking place; and ensure that sufficient assets are secured and that personnel with expertise are sufficiently poised to address shared work.

The subjects identified four themes in relation to problems with affiliations: disclosure, expectations, capacity and continuous learning. The subjects suggested that risks exist when foundations withhold disclosure of ideological agendas underlying their interests; expectations of shared work are not clearly defined; insufficient assets are provisioned for sustainability upon the exit of donor funding; and project outcomes unmask failings of public schools.

The subjects identified one theme in relation to prospects for affiliations: expectations. The subjects held that schools and foundations need to clarify their assumptions of shared work and that verbal and written agreements should be used as a means to codify such expectations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
1.1	OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM	1
1.2	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	4
1.3	OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS.....	6
1.4	OVERVIEW OF THE SAMPLING METHODOLOGY	7
1.5	OVERVIEW OF THE DATA COLLECTION.....	10
1.6	RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY	11
1.7	OVERVIEW OF THE EXISTING RESEARCH BASE	12
1.8	SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 1	14
1.9	DEFINITION OF TERMS	15
2.0	LITERATURE REVIEW	17
2.1	INTRODUCTION	17
2.2	HISTORICAL AFFILIATIONS BETWEEN PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY	18
2.2.1	Colonial America	20
2.2.2	The 1700s.....	24
2.2.3	The 1800s.....	26
2.2.4	The 1900s To Date.....	28
2.2.5	Summary	37
2.3	PRESENT NEED FOR AFFILIATIONS BETWEEN PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY	38
2.3.1	Challenges Currently Facing Public Education	39

2.3.2	The Philanthropic Community’s Response to Public Education	41
2.3.3	Summary	46
2.4	HOW THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY FUNCTIONS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY	47
2.4.1	Foundations as Driver	48
2.4.2	Foundations as Partner	49
2.4.3	Foundations and Venture Philanthropy	50
2.4.4	Foundations as Catalysts.....	50
2.4.4	Summary	51
2.5	BOLSTERING AFFILIATIONS BETWEEN PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY	52
2.5.1	Honesty	54
2.5.2	Ownership	55
2.5.3	Culture.....	59
2.5.4	Capacity	61
2.5.5	Continuous Learning.....	63
2.5.6	Summary	64
2.6	SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 2	66
3.0	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	68
3.1	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	68
3.2	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	69
3.3	ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY	70
3.4	METHODOLOGY APPROACH.....	71
3.4.1	Field Research: Participant Interviews	71
3.4.2	Benefits and Limitations of the Methodology	72

3.5	SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS	75
3.5.1	Random Purposive Sampling.....	75
3.5.2	Criteria for the Study's Sample.....	77
3.6	RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	82
3.7	DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE	87
3.8	DATA ANALYSIS AND REPRESENTATION.....	88
3.9	SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 3	90
4.0	FINDINGS.....	91
4.1	PROFILE OF THE PARTICIPANTS.....	92
4.2	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVATE CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS	94
4.2.1	Supports for General Social Outcomes.....	94
4.2.2	Supports for Public Education, Non-Financial	96
4.2.3	Supports for Public Education, Financial	98
4.2.4	How Foundations Should Work With Schools	101
4.2.5	Summary: Roles and Responsibilities of Private Charitable Foundations	104
4.3	PRACTICES ESSENTIAL TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS	106
4.3.1	Essential Practices Concerning Disclosure	107
4.3.1.1	The Practice of Disclosure of Aims	108
4.3.1.2	The Practice of Disclosure of Assumptions.....	109
4.3.1.3	The Practice of Disclosure of Agendas.....	109
4.3.1.4	The Practice of Disclosure of Assets	110
4.3.1.5	The Practice of Disclosure of Settings.....	111
4.3.2	Essential Practices Concerning Expectations	112
4.3.2.1	The Practice of Defining Expectations and Assumptions.....	113
4.3.2.2	The Practice of Defining Expectations and Agreements	115
4.3.2.3	The Practice of Defining Expectations and Staffing.....	116

4.3.3 Essential Practices Concerning Organizational Culture	116
4.3.3.1 The Practice of Considering Organizational Culture and Aims	117
4.3.3.2 The Practice of Considering Organizational Culture and Settings	118
4.3.4 Essential Practices Concerning Capacity	119
4.3.4.1 The Practice of Considering Capacity and Agreements	120
4.3.4.2 The Practice of Considering Capacity and Assets	121
4.3.4.3 The Practice of Considering Capacity and Staffing	121
4.3.5 Essential Practices Concerning Continuous Learning	122
4.3.6 Summary: Practices Essential to Public-Private Partnerships	122
4.4 PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS	127
4.4.1 Problems Concerning Disclosure	128
4.4.1.1 The Problem of Disclosure and Aims	129
4.4.1.2 The Problem of Disclosure and Assumptions	130
4.4.1.3 The Problem of Disclosure and Agendas	131
4.4.2 Problems Concerning Expectations	132
4.4.2.1 The Problem with Expectations and Assumptions	133
4.4.2.2 The Problem with Expectations and Agreements	134
4.4.2.3 The Problem with Expectations and Assets	134
4.4.3 Problems Concerning Organizational Culture	137
4.4.3.1 The Problems with Organizational Culture and Aims	137
4.4.3.2 The Problems with Organizational Culture and Assumptions	138
4.4.3.3 The Problems with Organizational Culture and Agendas	139
4.4.3.4 The Problems with Organizational Culture and Staffing	139

4.4.4 Problems Concerning Capacity.....	140
4.4.4.1 The Problems of Capacity and Assets	140
4.4.4.2 The Problems of Capacity and Staffing	141
4.4.5 Problems Concerning Continuous Learning	142
4.4.6 Summary: Problems Associated with Public-Private Partnerships	144
4.5 PROSPECTS ASSOCIATED WITH PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS	150
4.5.1 Prospects Concerning Disclosure	151
4.5.1.1 Prospects for Disclosure and Agendas.....	152
4.5.1.2 Prospects for Disclosure and Agreements	153
4.5.1.3 Prospects for Disclosure and Assets	153
4.5.1.4 Prospects for Disclosure and Staffing.....	154
4.5.2 Prospects Concerning Expectations	154
4.5.2.1 Prospects for Expectations and Assumptions	155
4.5.2.2 Prospects for Expectations and Agreements.....	156
4.5.2.3 Prospects for Expectations and Assets.....	157
4.5.2.4 Prospects for Expectations and Staffing	158
4.5.3 Prospects Concerning Organizational Culture.....	158
4.5.4 Prospects Concerning Capacity	160
4.5.5 Prospects Concerning Continuous Learning.....	160
4.5.5.1 Prospects for Continuous Learning and Assumptions.....	161
4.5.5.2 Prospects for Continuous Learning and Setting	162
4.5.6 Summary: Prospects Associated with Public-Private Partnerships	162
4.6 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 4	167
5.0 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	172

5.1	DISCUSSION OF THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVATE CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS	174
5.1.1	The Responsibilities of Private Charitable Foundations.....	174
5.1.2	The Role of Private Charitable Foundations.....	176
5.2	DISCUSSION OF PRACTICES ESSENTIAL TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS	177
5.2.1	Discussion of Essential Practices Concerning Disclosure	178
5.2.2	Discussion of Essential Practices Concerning Expectations	180
5.2.3	Discussion of Essential Practices Concerning Organizational Culture	181
5.2.4	Discussion of Essential Practices Concerning Capacity	182
5.3	DISCUSSION OF BARRIERS TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS	183
5.3.1	Discussion of Barriers Concerning Disclosures	183
5.3.2	Discussion of Barriers Concerning Expectations	184
5.3.3	Discussion of Barriers Concerning Capacity.....	186
5.3.4	Discussion of Barriers Concerning Continuous Learning	187
5.4	DISCUSSION OF PROSPECTS FOR SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS	188
5.5	IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	189
	APPENDIX A.....	194
	APPENDIX B	198
	APPENDIX C	201
	APPENDIX D.....	203
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	204

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Stratification of participating board member's districts of origin	8
Table 2.1 Local school problems	43
Table 2.2 Forms of philanthropic relationships	58
Table 3.1 Allegheny County School Districts stratified by total expenditure (TE) per average daily student membership: 2006-2007 school year	80
Table 3.2 Allegheny County School Districts, categorized by total per student expenditures based on average daily membership	81
Table 3.3 Framework for semi-structured participant interviews	85
Table 4.1 Profile of Participants	93
Table 4.2 Categorical frequencies of subjects' references to foundations' responsibility to support general social outcomes	95
Table 4.3 Categorical frequencies of subjects' reference to foundations' non-financial responsibility to support public education	97
Table 4.4 Frequencies of subjects' references to foundations' financial responsibility for public education	99
Table 4.5 Frequencies of subjects' references to funding deficits as a justification of foundations' financial support for public education	101
Table 4. 6 Subjects' views of foundations' roles in support of public education	102
Table 4. 7 Subjects' views of partnerships with foundations	103
Table 4. 8 Frequencies of subjects' references to risks associated with foundation's role in support of public education	104
Table 4. 9 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning disclosure	108
Table 4. 10 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning expectations	112

Table 4.11 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning expectations by assumptions	113
Table 4.12 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning organizational culture	117
Table 4.13 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning capacity	120
Table 4.14 Number of subjects addressing essential practices of public-private partnerships by categories	123
Table 4.15 Frequencies of subjects' categorical references to essential practices by TE per ADM	127
Table 4.16 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning disclosure	129
Table 4.17 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning expectations	133
Table 4. 19 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning organizational culture	137
Table 4.20 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning capacity	140
Table 4. 21 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning continuous learning by assumptions	143
Table 4.22 Number of subjects addressing barriers to public-private partnerships by categories	145
Table 4.23 Frequencies of subjects' categorical references to barriers by TE per ADM	149
Table 4.24 Frequencies of subjects' references to prospects concerning disclosure	152
Table 4.25 Frequencies of subjects' references to prospects concerning expectations	155
Table 4.26 Frequencies of subjects' references to prospects concerning organizational culture	159
Table 4.27 Frequencies of subjects' references to prospects concerning continuous learning	161
Table 4.28 Number of subjects addressing prospects for public-private partnerships by categories	163
Table 4.29 Frequencies of subjects' categorical references to prospects by TE per ADM	167
Table 4. 30 Major findings by research question, situated thematically and categorically	170

1.0 OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

The efficacy of the American system of public education is at question. Although critical reviews of public schooling are not a new phenomenon, scrutiny of public education is currently flamed by popular interest in multiple measures designed to assess the quality of elementary and secondary schooling across the United States. Accountability appraisals of public schools are commonly linked to variables such as students' academic performance at the national and international levels, students' graduation and drop-out rates, safe schools measures, educational funding schemes, and competition generated by school choice options, such as school vouchers and charter schools (Bracey, 2004; Dotterweich & McNeal, 2003; Riley, 1996; Shaker & Heilman, 2004). Contemporary politics, economics and social concerns drive school leaders to account for improvement in the face of increased competition for public funds. The increased accountability measures associated with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 leave many public school systems hard pressed to address the root causes limiting school improvement when such federal legislation presents fiscal challenges for local education agencies (LEAs). Thus, school board members and district administrators assume the responsibility of leveraging the policies, practices and budgets

of their LEAs in response to the increased public pressure for improved outcomes for public school students.

As the pressures mount, education finance becomes explicitly intertwined with school improvement efforts. The complexities of improving student outcomes “render education finance policy and education policy generally one in the same” (Guthrie, 2008, p. 259). Yet, the convergence of school finance and reform policies is confounded by the longitudinal trend in which investments of per student expenditures at the national and state level have slowed and may not be adequate to address unfunded federal and state mandates for school improvement. For example, on the national level all states averaged a 69% increase in student funding during the decade spanning 1959 to 1969. Similarly, during that same period of time, Pennsylvania supported a 68% increase in student expenditures (*National Public Education Financial Survey, 1989-90 through 2004-05*, 2007). However, fifty years hence the spending increases have slowed remarkably when considering per student expenditures adjusted for inflation. In fact, the decade spanning 1989 and 1999 showed very modest increases in student level funding across the nation’s public elementary and secondary schools. Expenditures all but stalled in Pennsylvania with a 1% increase during the 1990s, whereas nationally 11% increases were averaged across states (*National Public Education Financial Survey, 1989-90 through 2004-05*, 2007). Since that time, average state increases of 11% for student level funding have remained constant. While financial investments in per student educational costs have slowed at present, the mandated improvement of student outcomes has increased. Thus, school board members must contend with the complexities associated with school finance, including limitations in state and federal subsidies in juxtaposition with educational policies that mandate increased student performance.

To that end, Acar (2001) argues that the complex problems in areas of public concern, such as improved outcomes for education, require complex solutions including broad-based coalitions among organizations from the public and private sectors. Considering the current level of support for public education by private charitable foundations, such affiliations are currently taking place. Historically, philanthropies hold an important role in providing funding that greatly influenced the policies and practices that drove public education in America (Colvin, 2005; P. Hall, 2003a; R. Hall et al., 1963; Hess; 2005; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001). Given this precedence, it is not a novel strategy for public education turn to private philanthropic agencies for assistance in advancing elementary and secondary education.

The policies and practices that school districts develop to advance their educational agendas open opportunities by which to engage the support of the third sector. Given such policies and practices, Acar (2001) cautions that partnerships between public – private agencies must be grounded in common understandings and expectations in order for effective results to lead to greater social outcomes. Furthermore, R. Hall et al. (1963) explicitly state that it is unhealthy for school districts and foundations to engage in partnerships in which purposes are not central to the shared agenda. Yet, in reference to such matters, it must be recognized that management of school districts should not be framed as the sole responsibility of the systems' paid administration. Rather, school board members are central players in establishing policies and approving contractual relationships that enable public-private partnerships (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008).

Therefore, the purview of private charitable foundations and school board members is relevant to the nature of their engagement. Private charitable foundations, as members of the third sector's philanthropic community, hold defined social contracts that are reflected in the

explicit nature of their missions. Accountability in the advancement of the philanthropic community's work resides in the approval of foundation trustees, who are primarily accountable only to themselves (Dowie, 2001; Fleishman, 2007). Thus, the philanthropic community is exempt from most of the mechanisms of accountability that affect other types of organizations (Dowie, 2001; Fleishman, 2007). Moreover, strategies employed by the third sector's philanthropic community positions foundations to invest capital in public ventures that suggest a reasonable probability of achieving the desired results. Yet, school board members hold a more limited locus of control with respect to program management. External influences greatly affect how school board members frame the social agendas for which they are responsible. Such influences include federal and state mandates, budgetary constraints, competition for public funds, and the political, economic and social agendas of the local constituency. Consistent with limited control, school board members are accountable to numerous internal and external stakeholders, given their charge of ensuring a free and appropriate public education for all students. Whereas school board members seeking private support need to meet the expectations of third sector engagement, private foundations supporting public education must assess whether their investment will lead to acceptable if not desired outcomes.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Such basic differences in the ways in schools and private charitable foundations operate hold considerable implications for their partnerships. The third sector's philanthropic community stands only to benefit in maintaining consistency with its social charter by explicitly defining its expectations when engaging public education. However, it is arguable to what extent school

board members are able to codify their views concerning affiliations with the philanthropic community when coming from a position of need and subjected to the pressures of internal and external demands. Yet, without school board members voicing their views with the same level of focus and clarity as that of the third sector, the shared agenda they embrace may fail to achieve the desired outcomes held by both parties. Therefore, this study seeks to address the following research questions:

- 1) How do school board members perceive the roles and responsibilities of private charitable foundations in support of public elementary and secondary education?
- 2) What do school board members perceive as practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?
- 3) What do school board members suggest as the most significant barriers to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?
- 4) What do school board members suggest as means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

As the contextual variables affecting school board members vary from one community to another, this study seeks to limit its focus on school board members in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County. By doing so, the new knowledge resulting from this study may inform regional perspectives on the complexities associated with cross sector engagement and inform strategies that may bolster affiliations between public education and the local philanthropic community.

1.3 OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

At presently, there are 464 independent foundations based in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that cite education as a field of interest, with nearly a quarter of such foundations based in Allegheny County (The Foundation Center, 2008). Allegheny County is home to 108 private charitable foundations, as compared to the 88 independent foundations located in Philadelphia County, coterminous with the Commonwealth's most populous city (The Foundation Center, 2008). In total the private charitable foundations based in Allegheny County hold median assets valued at \$7,548,435, as compared to \$6,786,313 for like foundations centered in Philadelphia (The Foundation Center, 2008). It must be acknowledged that the philanthropic community headquartered in Allegheny County does not necessarily limit its social charter to grantees exclusively within Allegheny County. However, by limiting the scope of the study to an area of the Commonwealth in which many large private charitable foundations hold substantial assets, this research is likely to have immediate relevance for a substantive number of cross sector projects. The richness of the qualitative data identified through this study can not be generalized to populations beyond this study. However, this researcher asserts that knowledge claims resulting from this study holds relevance for further discourse addressing cross sector partnerships supporting K-12 public education.

Within Allegheny County there are 43 public school districts. The districts are categorized as suburban school systems, with the exception of the urban status attributed to the Pittsburgh Public Schools. The districts vary in terms of their annual budgets and per student costs. The county's public schools service approximately 161,433 students during the 2006-2007 school year (*Expenditure Data for All School Entities*, 2008). The annual total expenditures of the county's public schools ranged from \$10,317,973.00 to \$602,207,613.42

based on 2006-2007 annual financial reports compiled by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Accordingly, per student expenditures varied as much as \$9,000 among the county's public schools. Student level funding ranged from \$10,357.61 to \$19,294.76 with median per student expenditures of \$13,076.42 given the total annual operating budgets of the 43 public school systems. Thus, Allegheny County is a region that reflects heterogeneity with respect to the size of the districts' student bodies and the funding levels attributed to the cost of educating elementary and secondary school students. Therefore, the diversity across public school systems enables this research to capture various perspectives held by school board members, which are informed by the subjects' experiences with differing levels of school funding and capacity to stretch dollars across LEAs of varying size.

1.4 OVERVIEW OF THE SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

Guthrie (2008) argues school finance is inseparable from educational policies, as strategies for leveraging resources with the objective of enhanced student achievement are critical for effective school reform. Thus, this researcher recognizes that school funding may influence school board member's perspectives on affiliations with cross sector partners, such as those from the philanthropic community. Therefore, the study's sampling of school board members from Allegheny County is drawn from a stratification of districts according to the districts' student level funding based on 2006-2007 data, as reported by LEAs to the Pennsylvania Department of Education. The subjects engaged in this study are unpaid elected school officials from the county's public school systems who each represent an LEA that falls within one of three strata

determined by differing levels of per pupil expenditures. For purposes of this study, Table 1.1 displays the stratification of the participating board members' districts of origin.

Table 1.1 Stratification of participating board member's districts of origin

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Randomly Selected District	Study Subjects (School Board Members)
Districts with High per Student Expenditures (Strata 1)	District (A)	Study Subject #1
	District (B)	Study Subject #2
	District (C)	Study Subject #3
Districts with Mid-Range per Student Expenditures (Strata 2)	District (D)	Study Subject #4
	District (E)	Study Subject #5
	District (F)	Study Subject #6
Districts with Low per Student Expenditures (Strata 3)	District (G)	Study Subject #7
	District (H)	Study Subject #8
	District (I)	Study Subject #9

This study seeks to examine the views of nine school board members from randomly selected public school districts. Specifically, each study subject represents one of three randomly selected districts that fall within one of three strata defined by per student expenditures from school districts within Allegheny County. As the study sample is small, each subject is intended to be either a sitting board president or vice-president. By limiting this study to school board members who assume leadership positions within their LEA's board structure, this researcher hopes to capture perspectives that may otherwise influence boards' positions on cross sector partnerships. Furthermore, as this study seeks to codify the views of school board members, this researcher accepts that the subjects' views may be informed by experience as well

as their personal perceptions of social phenomena. Thus, it is not a prerequisite for the study subjects to have direct experience with private charitable foundations. For purposes of identifying study subjects, the participants will be drawn from a stratified, random purposive sampling of possible subjects.

The selection of a random purposive sampling adds credibility and trustworthiness to qualitative research in which a small sample is targeted (Gay & Airasian, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). The random purposive sampling methodology requires this researcher to stratify Allegheny County school districts according to three strata defined by per student expenditures. Following the stratification of the county districts, this researcher will randomly select three districts from each of the three strata. An introduction to the study and an invitation to participate will be sent to both the board presidents and vice-presidents of the nine randomly selected districts. Should both the board president and vice president of any of the randomly chosen districts both volunteer to participate in this study, one designee of the district will be selected randomly. If neither the board president nor vice-president of any randomly chosen district elects to participate in this study, another district from the appropriate strata will be randomly selected for the study. The process of identifying study participants by strata will continue until a willing participant is identified or until each stratum is exhausted of possible study subjects.

Given the small sample size of school board members, a second phase of data collection may be initiated if this researcher determines it necessary to collect additional data. If a second phase of interviews are to be initiated, this researcher will randomly select one additional district from each of the three strata to participate in this study. Again, the preceding steps defining how potential subjects will be approached for participation in this study applies.

1.5 OVERVIEW OF THE DATA COLLECTION

Data collection for this study is based on semi-structured, in-depth interviews with the sampling of school board members. The individual interviews with the school board members are based on a protocol, including a common set of questions that addresses perspectives, practices, problems and prospects relating to the participants' views on affiliations with the third sector's philanthropic community in support of elementary and secondary public schooling. The common questions are designed to encourage participants to frame their views such that categorical identification of key findings may be organized in a construct that evolves from common response patterns and themes. As is commonly the case with interview protocols, additional clarification of the participants' responses is drawn out by non-scripted probing questions. The deliberate use of interviews as a qualitative data collection approach enables the researcher to most effectively identify attitudes, interests, concerns and values of the subjects (Gay & Airasian, 2003). The interview questions designed for this study seek to reveal the school board members' perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of private philanthropic partners, as well as barriers to and opportunities for development of successful public-private partnerships. Thus, the interview questions related to this study are framed in the extant research addressing public-private partnerships.

1.6 RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY

It is clear that that the body of research addressing the perspectives of agents involved in public-private partnerships is a matter of increasing significance. Thirty years ago researchers in the field of public administration had foretold of the need for interagency partnerships.

There is wide agreement that ‘mixed’ organizations will have an increasingly large role [in the future]. By ‘mixed’ is here meant organizations in which the traditional attitudes, values, and rules of ‘public’ and ‘private’ are mixed and mingled, to the extent that these old categories become meaningless for at least a large part of the organizational world...it is widely observed that because society is so complex, the scope of problems so large, the chains of cause and effect so long and complicated, the demands of the future will rest not so much on the efficient management of single, discrete organizations but on the - there is no good word here: ‘management?’ ‘coordination?’ – of chains, complexes and systems of organizations (Waldo, 1974, 278-279).

As with all generations before and after, society is faced with the collective responsibility to ensure the best social outcomes for stakeholders. In fact, this sense of moral obligation is not at all inconsistent with some motives for the philanthropic community’s commitment social agendas (Curti et al., 1963; Fleishman, 2007; Freidman & McGarvie, 2003; Hall, 1994; Schervish, 1977).

While more research needs to be conducted in this area, some literature addressing public-private partnerships suggests barriers to successful relations. Such barriers include considerable differences in the participants’ locus of control, poorly defined or unreasonable expectations across agencies, invalid accountability mechanisms, inequitable significance placed on the partnership between the agencies, frequent changes in personnel and partners, and fundamental differences in the organizational cultures of the participants (Acar, 2001; Fleishman, 2007). However, little research has specifically addressed partnerships between public education and the third sector’s philanthropic community. Moreover, the views of school

board members' perspectives on affiliations with the philanthropic community given shared agendas targeting improved outcomes for elementary and secondary public school students is obscured in the literature, if at all present. The lack of attention given the perspectives of school board members perpetuates a void in understanding. Thus, it is argued that any such void limits the successful social outcomes of shared agendas because the explicit understanding of expectations between partners is essential (Acar, 2001).

The limitations in the research addressing the perspectives, practices, problems and prospects school board members associated with engagement of the third sector's philanthropic community present problems for private charitable foundations and public education alike. However, public school students stand to be the ultimate stakeholder benefiting from such research, as today's school-aged students are affected most directly by the types of outcomes resulting from such engagement.

1.7 OVERVIEW OF THE EXISTING RESEARCH BASE

Due to limitations in research focusing on school board members perspectives on affiliations with private charitable foundations, this researcher is positioned to provide a contextual backdrop for this study through the review of literature. The historical context established through the literature review reveals that the philanthropic community supported public education in the United States, despite the lack of concerted examinations of such affiliations. As previously asserted, philanthropies historically played a role in providing funding that greatly influenced the policies and practices driving public education in America (Colvin, 2005; P. Hall, 2003a; R. Hall et al., 1963; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001). The literature also situates the present

need for affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community, which is a foreshadowing of mixed-sector solutions for public problems as posited by Waldo (1974). Scholarly writings in the field signal how the philanthropic community operates within American society, which differs from the ways in which public organizations function. Whereas non-profits such as public education are driven by explicit missions and goals, it is significant to recognize that typical foundations hold “very general mission[s]...and no inherent goals” (Fleishman, 2007, p.61). Finally, the context established by the literature also suggests improvement strategies, albeit limited at the present time, which may bolster public-private partnerships between two very different types of organizations: public education and private charitable foundations. Thus, the context framed by the extant literature establishes that: there are longstanding affiliations between the philanthropic community and public education, which at present are seen as necessary; there is significance attributed to the various roles that foundations play in supporting social issues; and there are means by which partnerships between public education and the philanthropic community may be strengthened.

The literature review also stands to frame the context of this researcher’s study. The work of Acar (2001), Fleishman (2007), and Goren and Wurtzel (2008) provide a general framework by which this researcher situates the study of regional school board members’ views on affiliations with the philanthropic community. Acar (2001) positions considerations for improvement of public-private partnerships through four basic categories: perspectives, practices, problems and prospects. Goren and Wurtzel (2008) suggest five core findings that suggest means by which to bolster affiliations between public education and private charitable foundations: honesty, mutual ownership, cultural sensitivity, capacity and continuous learning. Fleishman (2007) addresses the various roles by which foundations operate in American society:

driver, partner and catalyst. Thus, this researcher frames both this study's research instrument and the subsequent knowledge claims through a framework that combines Acar's (2001) categorical claims and Goren's and Wurtzel's (2008) findings. This researcher also addresses school board members' perceptions of the role private charitable foundation play in support of public education given the lenses Fleishman (2007) provides.

1.8 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 1

In summary, increasing social pressures on public education call for educational reform. Such demands are echoed in state and federal mandates that drive school improvement efforts.

Whereas school finance policies and educational policies are reiterative and essentially interrelated, school board members are called to address demands for school reform. Yet, from both a national and regional perspective, trends concerning school finance over the past fifty years suggest that while public funds have not short-changed public education they are not aligned to fully support student achievement (Guthrie, 2008). Thus, the lack of aligned resources position school board members to engage the philanthropic community's support in school reform. However, it is arguable whether affiliations between public education and private charitable foundations are rooted firmly in clearly defined understandings and expectations. Extant literature suggests that explicit definition of expectations between agents engaged in public-private partnerships stands to bolster resulting efforts. Because little research stands to codify the perceptions of school board member's views on affiliations with the philanthropic community, this research study seeks to fill the void.

It must be acknowledged that the scope of perspectives held by numerous school board members is too broad to assess in a single study. Therefore, the researcher is drawing participants from Pennsylvania's Allegheny County - a region rich in diversity among its public schools and home to a large number of private charitable foundations. To contextualize the study and its suggested implications, the ensuing review of literature frames affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community as having a long-standing history, which is perceived to be necessary given today's social needs. The review of literature also points to the various roles that foundations play in supporting social issues, such as public education, and suggested means by which such public-private partnerships may be strengthened.

1.9 DEFINITION OF TERMS

Districts - see School district

Local educational agency – an education agency at the local level that exists primarily to operate public schools or to contract for public school services (*The Condition of Education*, n.d.).

Partnerships – an umbrella term to describe different types of collaborative undertakings between public, private and/or nonprofit organizations, ranging from simple coordination of efforts between two organizations coming from different sectors, to more comprehensive initiatives involving a significant number of individuals and organizations representing all three sectors (Acar, 2001, p. 59).

Philanthropic community – see Private charitable foundations

Private charitable foundations - entities established as nonprofit, charitable trusts with the principal purpose of making grants to unrelated organizations or institutions or to individuals for scientific, educational, cultural, religious, or other charitable purposes serving the common welfare; whereas funds are derived from one source, either an individual or a family; and whereas the entities are recognized by the Internal Revenue Service as charitable organizations according to section 501 of the Internal Revenue Tax Code (What is a Foundation: FAQ, 2008).

School district - a geographic area within a state, whereby a public school system operates as a governmental entity with the responsibility for operating public schools in that geographic area (*School District Demographics System*, n.d.).

School board members – elected local officials, at least 18 years of age and no less than 1 year residents of the district, who are provided the authority by Pennsylvania School Code to establish, equip, furnish and maintain the public schools of the district; employ the necessary qualified personnel to operate the schools; and levy taxes, borrow funds, obtain grants and expend funds as outlined in the Pennsylvania School Code (*School Districts*, 2007).

Third Sector – charitable and mutual benefit organizations, including private charitable foundations, that are certified by the Internal Revenue Service as meeting the requirements of sections 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) of the federal tax code; also known as the nonprofit, independent, voluntary, public interest, and/or the social sector – in which the other two sectors are the public sector (government) and the profit sector (business) (Fleishman, 2007).

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Improving student achievement is a complex matter that requires many aspects of school policy to converge on this single issue (Guthrie, 2008). In order to address most effectively such complexities, systems benefit when engaging partners across both the public and private sectors (Acar, 2001; Waldo, 1977). When considering cross sector initiatives, school board members' perspectives are found to impact the establishment of successful affiliations with the private, philanthropic community (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Yet, there is a dearth of research that explicitly examines the perspectives of school board members' views on engagement with private charitable foundations. Moreover, little is actually known about effective practices that are based on, or informed by, the perspective of third sector grantees in terms of their positions on implementation of cross sector work (Buteau et. al., 2008).

Given the limited research in this area, the following literature review seeks to address four complementary issues that intersect public education in the United States and the third sector's philanthropic community.

- 1) What evidence substantiates historical affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community?
- 2) What evidence suggests that affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community are desired presently?

- 3) How does the philanthropic community operate within American society?
- 4) What are the relevant findings concerning improvement strategies that bolster affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community?

Thus, the literature review establishes several positions upon which the ensuing study is framed: that affiliations between the philanthropic community and public education are not a new phenomenon and are desired presently; that the philanthropic community operates from a different paradigm from that of the non-profit sector in leveraging means by which to achieve its core mission; and that limited findings exist and suggest strategies by which to bolster affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community. By establishing such positions, this researcher's study of regional school board members' views on affiliations with private charitable foundations may contribute new learnings to inform complex, cross sector engagement.

2.2 HISTORICAL AFFILIATIONS BETWEEN PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY

The education of our nation's elementary and secondary students is perceived to be an issue of concern due in part to domestic interest in the United State's global position as an economic, political and social force. The implications associated with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002), moderate rankings on the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Studies (TIMMS) and reverberations of the 1983 report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* have reinvigorated attention on the quality of American Schools and public education's ability to meet the needs of this democratic nation (Spring, 2005). As a result of such concerns, public education is driven to address school

reform in effort to improve student performance, demonstrate fiduciary responsibility with program management, and reinvigorate the democratic ideal of public schooling, at large.

In today's politically charged climate, strong public-private partnerships need to be established in order to address successfully the complex social issues challenging public education (Waldo, 1974, Acar, 2001). While school administrators and school board members seek to leverage policies and practices that support improved outcomes for students, they are also responsible for establishing and maintaining supportive relationships with outside agencies (Christensen, Aaron, & Clark, 2005; R. Hall et al., 1963). Given the challenges facing our nation's schools, a healthy partnership between public education and the third sector's philanthropic community is important (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Yet, such partnerships are not a twenty-first century phenomena. In fact public education has benefited historically from the support of private philanthropic agencies in the advancement of elementary and secondary education.

For over three centuries the American public educational system has been driven by a concern for the public's welfare and the desire to grow a citizenry that is capable of governing a democratic nation. From such concerns, private support for free schooling has been a longstanding force that helped to forge what is now recognized as our national system of public education. Philanthropies and private charitable contributions have played historically a role in providing funding that greatly influenced the policies and practices that drove public education in America (Colvin, 2005; P. Hall, 2003a; R. Hall et al., 1963; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001). Arguably, private philanthropy sparked the free school movement and helped to advance education as the nation continued to grow.

To recognize that public education has relied on private interests to support the advancement of public schooling in the United States is to recognize that the relationship between the public and private sectors needs to be examined. Therein, it is important to outline the salient aspects of private support for public education from a historical perspective.

2.2.1 Colonial America

A pattern of voluntary, private support for matters concerning the public's welfare was notably evident in Colonial America. Curti (1958) and others suggest that the presence of charitable support in the American Colonies resembled the British tradition of providing benevolent contributions for public benefit (Curti, 1961; Hammack, 1989). Based on such tradition, support for social services in the colonies was ambiguous in terms of separation between public and private, philanthropic funding (Freidman & McGarvie, 2003; Hammack, 1989). Distinctions between the work of public, governmental agencies and philanthropic agents were uncertain and not well defined by colonial legislators. Thus, early free schooling in the new colonies was linked to private charitable funding (Curti, 1958; Grossman, 2000; P. Hall, 1994).

In the southern colonies early dependence on philanthropic support for free schools was characterized by the contributions of two notable Virginians: Benjamin Syms and Thomas Eaton (Curti, 1961; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Curti (1961) and others cite Syms' charitable support of free schooling based on his bequest of 200 acres of land, and the land's subsequent revenue, which Sym's designated for the expressed purpose of providing for the education of children (Curti, 1961; Duck, 1995; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Syms' gifting, conferred in 1653, was intended to endow free schooling in the adjoining parishes of Elizabeth City and Poquoson, Virginia. Within a few years of Syms' gifting, Dr. Thomas Eaton founded an even larger bequest in support of free schooling. In 1659

Dr. Eaton established the Eaton School in Elizabeth City, Virginia with the intent to educate children, thus eliminating the barriers otherwise presented by a family's inability ability to pay for educational services (Curti, 1961; Duck, 1995; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001; Urban & Wagoner, 2000).

Motivations for Syms' and Eaton's charitable actions have been attributed to their ethical concern for the poor and underprivileged. Such charity is underscored by Urban and Wagoner (2000) suggestion that 17th century educational philanthropy in the colonies was driven by the understanding that the poor could not afford to embrace the prevailing European precept that education was primarily a private, family matter. Arguably, Syms and Eaton filled a void in the southern colonies' burgeoning system of public schooling in supporting those who could not otherwise afford what was then considered to be the privilege of education. As such, the southern colonies evidenced a distinctive perspective given the role of the public sector and philanthropic agents in advancing public education. Duck (1995) and others reiterate that the southern colonies, unlike New England, held no predisposition or legal tradition by which the local government provided financial support for free schooling (Duck, 1995; Urban & Wagoner, 2000).

As per the northern colonies, in 1647 the Massachusetts' General Court enacted the Old Deluder Satan Act, requiring towns with 50 or more families to provide instruction for reading and writing at the expense of the student's parents or shared by all families in the community (Burton, 1997; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). The enactment of the Old Deluder Satan Act evidenced the establishment of statutory law in support of public schooling. Within ten years of Massachusetts' establishment of the Old Deluder Satan Act, the general court of New Haven ordered that free schools be founded and funded by the "common stock of the town" (Urban &

Wagoner, 2000). Burton (1997) and colleagues suggest that such legislative action in the New England Colonies was generally regarded as the primary means by which to develop a literate populous for moral and religious reasons (Burton, 1997; Duck, 1995; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Yet, despite such legislative actions, colonial support for schooling was generally based on a pattern of voluntary financial support (Curti, 1958).

Reinforcing the noted ambiguities between statutory law for public schooling and private funding, Kaestel (1972) argues that colonial arrangements for free schooling were clearly haphazard. The implementation of free schooling in New England was lax given that many towns failed to fully embrace educational mandates (Burton, 1997). As a case in point, Burton (1997) references Cambridge's record on public education, and the philanthropic interventions of the town's more notable citizens, as examples of the public and third sectors' educational partnerships during the mid-1600s.

Cambridge, then part of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, turned their only private grammar school into a public school as mandated by the Old Deluder Satan Act. However, Cambridge observed only the letter of the law. While Cambridge established a public school, it did not provide a mechanism by which to communally fund or house the school. Henry Dunster, then president of Harvard College, personally took the lead in funding the construction of the first public school house in Cambridge in response to the community's lack of financial support (Burton, 1997). Dunster's efforts and endowment enabled Cambridge's public school to have a fixed location when the original grammar school could no longer be housed in rented rooms, barns, shops and meeting houses (Burton, 1997). In spite of the fact that the town was unwilling to repay Dunster, by the 1650s Cambridge had a free school given the financial support of Harvard's president.

The actions of Edward Hopkins, also exemplified private philanthropy's initial ties with 17th century public schooling in the northern colonies. Hopkins, Governor of Connecticut in the 1640s, left his estate in trust as indicated:

to give some Encouragement unto those forreign Plantations for the breeding up of Hopeful youth in the way of Learning at the Grammar School for the publick Service of the County in future times (Burton, 1997, p.148).

According to Burton (1977), Hopkin's legacy was to be quartered and allocated to four public grammar schools: the Cambridge school and three other schools, each of which was to be situated in Hartford, Hadley and New Haven, Connecticut. At the same time Hopkins also made a second bequest, held in trust for his wife, Ann Yale. Ann Yale Hopkin's trust stipulated, as per Edward Hopkins bequest of £500, that any sums not expended by the time of Ann's death was to be given to the Cambridge grammar school in order to supplement the headmaster's salary and to tuition four non-resident students (Burton, 1997).

For the northern colonies, Christianity was at the center of religious learning. The Puritans held education as the safeguard of Christianity, protecting the populous from the external, uncivilized influences (Burton, 1997; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). As such, private and public education was generally driven by the need to fulfill a moral purpose. Yet, for the southern colonies opportunities for schooling were more limited than those found in New England. Aside from a few free schools, education was generally endowed by wealthy planters and supplemented by Sunday schooling offered by religious societies. Duck (1995) argues that there was little opportunity for children in the southern colonies to receive a formal education unless they belonged to the planter aristocracy. Subsequently, the philanthropic interests exemplified by Eaton, Syms, Dunster and Hopkins, working in tandem with weakly enforced

regional laws mandating public education, advanced an otherwise unorganized system of free schooling in the new colonies.

2.2.2 The 1700s

In the century following the sporadic establishment of free schools in Colonial America, private support for public education continued to grow. Yet, despite the American founding fathers desire to have a common educated citizenry, there was general disagreement in the colonies over the means by which to achieve the goal (Tyack, 1966).

During the early 18th century, the cultural plurality of the middle colonies drove the tendency for the populous to establish separate schools. In contrast to New England, the middle colonies held no legal tradition requiring the formation of free schools (Duck, 1995; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). As such, Urban and Wagoner (2000) argue that education was predominantly provided for by the efforts of various religious groups in the Mid-Atlantic.

However, an exception is taken in that Tyack (1966) and others reference the efforts of Benjamin Franklin as typifying 18th century American philanthropic support for public schooling in the middle colonies (Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001; Tyack, 1966). Tyack (1966) recognizes Franklin for his work in rallying the private sector's intervention in support of a free public education. The recognition of Franklin's commitment to a system of free schools leads Lenkowski and Spencer (2001) to include Franklin's name among those they consider as the actual founders of American Philanthropy. Franklin and his contemporaries, including Winthrop, Mather and Penn, are credited as having advanced education as a means to improve the mobility of the poor (P. Hall, 1994; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001; Tyack, 1966). Franklin's efforts to actively petition wealthy citizens of the middle colonies to endow charity schools to

support the instruction of disadvantaged children in reading, writing, arithmetic and moral education is widely regarded (P. Hall, 1994; McCarthy, 2003; Tyack, 1966).

Still, as Franklin's action characterize the philosophical perspectives of many, Allen (1969) points out that proposals for a publicly funded system of education, with the implied intent to develop future generations of political leaders, were widely rejected by local legislators during the 1700s. The public's lack of interest in supporting a domestic system of free schools was partially based on the popular belief that the authority of the government at all levels should remain limited (Allen, 1969). In turn, families, churches and private citizens of the new republic continued to directly support public educational initiatives when the local government failed to intercede (Kaestle, 2001). However, according to Kaestel (1972), philanthropists were not interested in organizing schools based on social needs. Rather, private support for free schooling was based on a moral imperative.

Private charitable societies in New England also advanced the philanthropic community's work in caring for the swelling numbers of impoverished colonials. Frequently motivated by their strong religious convictions and sense of moral purpose, the business class engaged in philanthropic expenditures that were designated to support the common good (Heyrman, 1982). According to Heyerman (1982), numerous charity schools were established for the education of indigent children given the financial backing of wealthy New England parishioners. Such charitable contributions were consistent with the philosophical tenants associated with the era of the American Enlightenment and the nation's early industrialization.

As advocates for the political representation of all and skeptics of rugged individualism, Enlightenment thinkers held the perspective that education was the catalyst for social change and the mainstay of civil society (Jones, 2003). William Maclure, 18th century philanthropist,

educational reformer and father of American geology, personified such perspectives. Maclure's philanthropic work advanced the popular belief that society could be balanced through equal educational opportunities for all people (Burgess, 1963; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001). Subsequently, Maclure's beliefs became a brief reality, given his personal financial backing of the New Harmony School in Indiana (Burgess, 1963). Although the Harmonist community which Maclure helped to establish eventually failed, it is argued that Maclure's philanthropic interest in education exemplified the private sector's interest in the moral merits associated with education and self-governance (Burgess, 1963; Freidman & McGarvie, 2003; Tyack, 1966).

From the work exemplified by Maclure and Franklin to the financial backing provided by wealthy New Englanders, examples of 18th century philanthropic interest in free education notably affected the social, economic and political infrastructure of American life in the 1700s.

2.2.3 The 1800s

By the 19th century, the trickle of individual benevolence and philanthropic backing for free schooling had become a swell of support (Curti, 1961). As suggested by Grossman (2000), many philanthropists of the 19th century chose to endow public schooling for a more practical reason: the ethical desire to provide both literacy and moral education for the nation's newest citizens. Such moral intervention stemmed from the private sector's concern over the poverty, crime and corruption that was commonly associated with many of the nation's larger cities (P. Hall, 1994; Kaestle, 1972).

Moreover, the widespread abuse of the nation's cheap, uneducated, immigrant labor force by industrialists during the 1800s spurred a backlash by philanthropists and humanitarians (Freidman & McGarvie, 2003). Recognizing the nation's concern for the welfare of the poor, Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard University from 1869 to 1909, called for reformation of

the nation's educational system to combat the physical and moral deprivation of the country's urban underprivileged (P. Hall, 1994). Such sentiments were also echoed by John Eaton, United States Commissioner of Education from 1870-1886, who wrote:

We must weigh the cost of the mob and the tramp against the cost of universal public education (Eaton, 1877, p viii).

Subsequently, the third sector called for state and federal intervention to solve the growing issues concerning the poverty stricken, uneducated swelling urban populous (P. Hall, 1994).

Yet, federal, state and local systems experienced difficulty responding to the public's demands for the public support of education in basic literacy and morality for all children. Kaestle (1972) argues that regional politics, exacerbated by tradition, often prevented substantive changes in educational provisions despite local ordinances that called for the systematic establishment of free educational services during the early 1800s. Further complicating the regional discord in codifying public education, Hall (1994) suggests that the level of federal and state support for public schooling during the 19th century was compromised by the pace with which the nation's population swelled.

However, Grossman (2000) and others have found that free schooling in late 1800s evidenced some early success in systematically addressing the educational needs of the impoverished. The result of such work supported the social imperative to transform the underprivileged into productive citizens (deMarrais & LeCompte, 1999; Grossman, 2000; Kaestle, 1972). As politics, tradition and corruption hampered the ability of government agencies to fully respond to the plight of the urban poor, it was the philanthropic actions of industrial tycoons such as Rockefeller, Morgan and Carnegie who drew attention to free schooling by financially backing the movement (P. Hall, 1994).

By way of example, in 1889 Andrew Carnegie urged his colleagues to support their communities by placing within reach “the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise” (Carnegie, 1889, p 23). In turn, the philanthropic community responded by endowing schools, as well as parks, libraries and other public facilities, with the intensity that typified their industrial pursuits (Curti, 1958; P. Hall, 1994). In fact, according to Curti (1963), 19th century philanthropic support for educational causes rivaled health and welfare for the largest share of contributors’ charitable spending.

By the end the 19th century, free schools for the educational welfare of all children had been established in every state in the Union (deMarrais & LeCompte, 1999). As such, it is argued that the widespread institution of public education in the 1800s resulted from three primary motives: public concern for a safe and orderly society; industry’s desire in a trained and manageable workforce; and the third sector’s interest in humanitarian stewardship (Curti et al., 1963; Freidman & McGarvie, 2003).

2.2.4 The 1900s To Date

The turn of the 20th century continued to mark both the evolution of public schooling and private philanthropists support for educational concerns. As compulsory attendance laws were instituted in every state of the Union between 1880 and 1920, public schooling became a means for business leaders to do more than fulfill their humanitarian interests. Business and industry leaders sought to transform America’s public schools in order to bolster the human capital necessary to sustain a stable domestic economy (Biebel, 1976; P. Hall, 1994; Tyack, 1976). Yet, such motives were generally framed in noble terms. Curti (1961) references Robert Crane,

Chicago plumbing magnate, as expressing in 1907 what was otherwise felt by those for whom charity was a priority:

It is a sort of second robbery for those possessing [wealth] to give it for any purpose other than directly improving the lot of the poor (p. 154).

Still, as the country had rapidly industrialized, a new powerful, capitalist, urban society had emerged, further necessitating the need for a system of free public education. In order to meet the burgeoning needs derived from the nation's rapid growth, federal, state and local government sought assistance from private partners (Nagai, Lerner, & Rothman, 1994). At the same time, wealthy Americans began to establish institutions to carry on philanthropic work to address the root causes of social problems within the United States.

During this period, a significant innovation in charitable gifting patterns took effect (Frumkin, 2004). Prior to the First World War hundreds of millions of private dollars were invested in the creation of private, philanthropic grant-making foundations (Freidman & McGarvie, 2003; P. Hall, 1994; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001; Nagai et al., 1994). Notably, Andrew Carnegie, in effort to improve public education, established two of his most important philanthropies around the turn of the 20th century: the Carnegie's Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Carnegie Corporation of New York (P. Hall, 1994). Private foundations, such as Carnegie's, greatly simplified philanthropists' direct responsibility for overseeing personal charitable donations to worthy causes through the development of agencies responsible for the management of grant-making and charitable contributions (Freidman & McGarvie, 2003).

However, there were secondary benefits to be gained from foundation's philanthropic support of public causes. Tax privileges for non-profit, private foundations and charities were introduced as part of the Internal Revenue Code in 1917 (P. Hall, 2003b). As a result of changes

in the tax code, Bieble (1976) suggests that the level of private foundations' support for education in the early half of the 20th century was motivated by moral imperative as well as the extensive legal privileges and protection from governmental regulation that benefited the newly formed charitable agencies. Thus, charitable support for public schooling more commonly resulted from the expenditures of private foundations established by the nation's industrialists, merchants and financiers, as opposed to third sector funding previously driven by the contributions of concerned individuals (Frumkin, 2004; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001).

Private grant-making foundations in the early 1900s were poised to advance educational innovations at new and unprecedented levels (Biebel, 1976). For example, the education of blind, crippled, deaf and minority students was integrated as part of public education's agenda only after private philanthropy target such subgroups in their social agendas (Curti, 1958; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Such educational innovations were complemented by philanthropic expenditures that ranged from support for vocational programming, kindergartens and the advancement of the arts and humanities in public schools to the actual construction of public schoolhouses (Biebel, 1976; Curti, 1958; Nagai et al., 1994; Sealander, 1997; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Lenkowsky and Spencer (2001) also credit philanthropists for advancing progressive era reforms, including standardized testing as a means to increase the efficiency in managing swelling school enrollments and scientific management techniques, often associated with Taylor's concept of scientific management (deMarris & LeCompte, 1999). Yet, criticisms over the private sector's involvement in public schooling surfaced during the same time period.

Prior to the outbreak of World War II, charitable foundations were criticized because their public endowments were viewed as both ineffective and injudicious (Curti, 1958). Such criticism stood in contrast to the idealistic social agendas and underlying moral imperatives

established by most charitable foundations of the day. Curti (1958) countered such criticism, arguing that 20th century “philanthropy was intended to patch the shortcomings in the existing order and thus to preserve a status quo that did not deserve preservation” (p. 431). Yet, despite those who defend the actions of the third sector, aspersions existed given the limited extent to which others found foundations successful in actually determining their impact on the public good (Nagai et al., 1994).

Progressives saw philanthropists as self-serving people who donated money as a convenient mechanism to achieve respectability and fame (Nagai et al., p. 17).

Thus, charitable foundations became increasingly suspect, perhaps in part due to the actual lack of accountability and full-fledged partnership established between the public and third sectors (Acar, 2001).

Still, the free education of Americans in the early part of the 1900s was advanced by the programs and policies supported by third sector funding. In particular, school funding remained a common agenda shared by both the public and third sector. In 1936 Dr. John Norton, professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, then noted authority on school finance, argued that taxation-based funding schemes for public education in the United States were inadequate ("New Finance Plans for School Urged," 1936).

The unequal ability of the states to support education, as shown by the range in average annual expenditure from \$35.00 per pupil in the poorer states to nearly \$150.00 in New York and New Jersey, demonstrates the impossibility of equalizing educational opportunity. Aid is necessary to insure an adequate minimum education to each American child (p. 339).

Norton's plea for financial relief contextualized the significance of third sector interventions, especially when considering the wide-spread impact of the Great Financial Depression of 1929 on the economic infrastructure of America in the 1930s and 1940s.

As the Depression devastated the nation's economic infrastructure, educational agencies continued to depend on the third sector for financial support. Biebel (1976) points out education's reliance on the private sector during the 1930s, referencing the following educational agencies as having solicited significant emergency financial relief from John D. Rockefeller's General Education Board: the Progressive Education Association (PEA), the American Council on Education (ACE) and the various affiliates of the National Educational Association (NEA). As but one example, Rockefeller's foundation was one of many charitable trusts active in decade following the Great Depression. In full, between 1930 and 1939 there were 185 active, large foundations in the United States, representing an 841% increase in the number foundations recognized during the first ten years of 20th century (*Number of Larger Foundations by Decade of Establishment and Asset Range*, 2005).

The rate at which foundations were established more than doubled in the 1940s and 1950s (*Foundation Establishment: From the Turn of the 20th Century to Today*, 2005). It was during this era that advent of educational television was realized. The upstart of public television's educational programming was supported in large part by the Kellogg, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations (Havinghurst, 1981). By 1950 the Federal Communications Commission procedurally reserved television channels for public service broadcasting. Although this educational innovation was not explicitly limited to access within our nation's public schools, the possibilities associated with educational television was just being realized. In 1951, a \$300,000 grant from the Kellogg foundation enabled the establishment of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (Havinghurst, 1981). Within the subsequent year, the philanthropic community's support for the production of educational television programs began. It was also during this same period that national concern over the United States' international standing was

sparked by early Soviet success in the space race. Thus, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 was passed for the purpose of stimulating advancement of high school education in science, math and modern world languages (deMarrais & LeCompte, 1999). Again, investments in improving high school programming were broadly supported by the third sector's concern for our nation's standing in the burgeoning global market (Havighurst, 1981). In turn, as the complexity of the political landscape in the 1950s increased, so too did the philanthropic community's support for public education. It follows that during this period of American history more third sector money was granted for educational purposes than at any other time (Havighurst, 1981).

In the decades spanning 1959 and 1969, the philanthropic community's involvement with public education continued. The 1960s brought a sense of innovation to the educational scene. The third sector's philanthropic community became interested in supporting initiatives that focused on different way of using basic resources, such as time, space and facilities. The Ford Foundation and its Fund for the Advancement of Education initiatives thus became the vanguard, supporting changes in education's physical landscape (Meade, 1992). Other examples of the philanthropic community's partnerships supporting public education during this era included the following: the Grant Foundation's involvement with child study programs for the training of teachers and the advancement of teachers' education; the Ford Foundation's Comprehensive School Improvement Program, Teacher Education Program and National Assessment of Educational Progress; the Carnegie Corporation's financing of the Education Testing Service; and the Rockefeller Foundation's Program for Equal Opportunity (Havighurst, 1981). It is significant to note that during this period that congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. While the federal government sought to

ensure improved educational outcomes for all students, including those otherwise traditionally marginalized, the third sector kept pace by continuing support for elementary and secondary schooling.

Yet, with federal legislation designed to support the needs of educationally deprived students, the educational scene grew progressively more complex in the decades spanning 1969 and 1989. In response to the federal government's increased financial investments in educational research during the mid-1970s, the third sector's philanthropic community began to turn its attention away from elementary and secondary education (Havighurst, 1981; Leonard, 1992). Subsequently, private philanthropic funding for education dropped steadily throughout the early 1980s (Dowie, 2001). During this period, philanthropic agencies turned their attention to both human services, which were generally unsupported during the Regan presidential administration, and other educational ventures including pre-school education and the expansion and reorientation of post secondary schooling (Havighurst, 1981; Dowie, 2001). Yet, it was certain that the philanthropic community did not pull its attention away from elementary and secondary education in full. A notable example was the Ford Foundation's continued work with policy on general school finance (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007). However, following the National Commission on Excellence in Education's release of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, the philanthropic community's interest in elementary and secondary education again surged (Leonard, 1992).

Thus, there was an increase in grant making activity taking place during the latter part of the 1980s. In general terms, the number of large foundations established by the end of 1989, with at least \$1 million in assets or awarding grants of \$100,000 or more, increased 373% over those that were established in the preceding decade (*Number of Larger Foundations by Decade of Establishment and Asset Range*, 2005). Such growth was significant in that elementary and

secondary schooling stood to benefit, given that approximately 25% of philanthropic dollars were earmarked for education (Colvin, 2005; Dowie 2001; Ridings, 2000).

However, the 1990's evidenced a notable change in strategies generally employed by the third sector's public-private schools partnerships. Poor school performance, as suggested by low test scores and high student drop out rates, moved philanthropic agencies to reconsider the nature of their support for the nation's public school system (Dowie, 2001). The third sector's interests shifted during this period of time to the advancement of reform agendas directed at elementary and secondary education (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007; Lagemann, 1992). Thus, during the 1990s the philanthropic community began to target reform agendas that addressed school finance, teacher quality, curriculum, governance and management, student performance, accountability, and school choice options (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007). New third sector funders, including the Annenberg, Hewlett, William Penn, Annie Casey, Gund, Edna McConnell Clark, and Robert W. Woodruff foundations, joined the ranks of other private charitable foundations to support the advancement of school reform agendas (Dowie, 2001). Tony Cipollone, senior advisor for the Annie Casey Foundation, as interviewed by Dowie (2001), framed well the spirit of school reform embraced by foundations during the 1990s.

Public education is the most complex system in our society, with more moving parts than any other. The best role that a foundation can hope to play in the ongoing quest for better schools is as catalysts of reform. In the process, of course, they must also foot the bill for persuading the public that implementing new systems will be worth the price (p. 40).

Cipollone's assessment of the role of the third sector's philanthropic community in supporting public education stood to foreshadow much of the work advanced by private charitable foundations during the first years of the new millennium. The early years of the 21st century evidenced yet an increasing number of philanthropists engaging in educational

grantmaking supporting school reform (Colvin, 2005). The nature of such reform minded supports commonly included the establishment of effective demonstration projects, improvement of educational policy, and advancement of educational research (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007). It was also during these years that the third sector's focus on transforming America's schools was mirrored by federal legislation, given the school improvement mandates driven by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Spring, 2005).

Acknowledging the national drive for school reform, the Bill and Melinda Gates, Annenberg, and Eli and Edythe Broad Foundations are but three examples of the philanthropic community's latest commitment to improving America's public schools. The Broad Prize for Urban Education, recognized as the single, largest, non-competitive series of private investments in public schooling, has awarded \$2 million annually to urban school districts since the award's inception in 2002 (*The 2008 Broad Prize for Urban Education*, 2008). By intent, the Broad prize was designed to support urban school districts evidencing the greatest overall performance and improvement in student achievement while reducing the learning gaps for minority and poor students (Aarons, 2008). The Broad Prize for Urban Education was intended to advance urban school reform by espousing the following: 1) reward districts that improve achievement levels of disadvantaged students; 2) restore the public's confidence in our nation's public schools by highlighting successful urban districts; 3) create competition and provide incentives for districts to improve; and 4) showcase the best practices of successful districts (*The Broad Prize for Urban Education*, n.d.). According to the Foundation Center's comprehensive database, in the eight years spanning 2000 and 2008, the Gates Foundation invested a staggering \$1,200,686,204 in its efforts to leverage public – private partnerships for school improvement. Since 2002 the Gates Foundation has focused its work on high school reform, allocating its funding for the

development of new schools designed to prepare students for post-secondary education and to increase high school graduation rates (Colvin, 2006). To accomplish such goals, the Gates Foundation engaged other philanthropic organizations including the Carnegie, Walton, Ford, W.K. Kellogg, and Annenberg Foundations in its high school reform initiatives (Colvin, 2006). However, the Annenberg Foundation not only worked to support high school reform, it also invested funding for grantmaking at the elementary school level. According to the Foundation Center, the Annenberg Foundation expended \$210,025,589 between 2002 and 2008 for initiatives at the primary and secondary levels. Thus, the preceding examples of the philanthropic community's investments in educational reform suggest that America's public schools were the beneficiaries of private funds supporting public education.

2.2.5 Summary

Across three centuries of our nation's history, private philanthropy and third sector investment strategies have been major forces in shaping educational policies and practices (Lagemann, 1992). Initially, private donors provided direct financial support for the establishment of free schools and expansion of educational opportunities for all youth. As the nation grew, so did its wealth. In turn, the swelling urban population outgrew the limits of our burgeoning nation's system of free, public schools. With the tax privileges afforded the wealthy through the Internal Revenue Code in 1917, the third sector was formed and stepped forward in turn to address the shortcomings of public schooling. Over the course of the past 100 years, the philanthropic community not only remained active in supporting public – private partnerships with schools, it played an important role by exponentially increasing investments made in public education (Hess, 2005). Whereas the philanthropic community once generally supported the establishment

and advancement of school programs, newer strategies have positioned private charitable foundations to leverage school reform agendas designed to improve outcomes for today's elementary and secondary school students. Spanning the establishment of free schools in the American Colonies to 21st century school reform agendas, private philanthropy and the third sector's philanthropic community have evidenced long standing support for America's public schools (Curti, 1961; Fleishman, 2007; Hess, 2005; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001).

2.3 PRESENT NEED FOR AFFILIATIONS BETWEEN PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY

Private charitable foundations have played a significant role in shaping the landscape of American education (Hess, 2005). Yet, the philanthropic community's engagement is still required.

Civic, social and political environments in which the new economy operates are escalating in complexity, and educational institutions at every level have struggled—and sometimes failed—to keep pace with the multiple expectations for graduates. Now more than ever, foundation support is needed to promote innovation in teaching and learning to meet these challenges (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006, p. 1).

Looking forward, solutions for the complex problems affecting public education may be addressed through multi-sectorial work involving partnerships between the third sector and public schools (Acar, 2001). However, in order to better situate the need for the philanthropic community's continued engagement, the following two issues are briefly considered: challenges currently facing public education and the philanthropic community's response to public education. By considering the preceding issues, the context for the advancement of public-private school partnerships is established.

2.3.1 Challenges Currently Facing Public Education

As private support for public education rises, public support for public education is waning. Domestic anti-tax sentiment, coupled with the realization that most demographics indicate that there are more family units with no children in public schools, creates a fiscally contentious relationship between public education and the citizenry who otherwise funds it (Ray, Candoli, & Hack, 2005). Moreover, the implications associated with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002), moderate rankings on the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Studies (TIMSS), and reverberations of the 1983 report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* draw question to the quality of American Schools and public education's ability to meet the needs of this democratic nation (Hess, 2005; Spring, 2005). Subsequently, public education is at a crossroads. Schooling is at the top of the national political agenda, with an unprecedented expansion of the federal government's role in setting policy for public education (McGuinn, 2004; Shaker & Heilman, 2004). The increased accountability measures associated with NCLB and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 leave many public school systems hard pressed to address the root causes presenting barriers to school improvement when such federal legislation stands as unfunded mandates. Moreover, the level of federal intervention in today's public educational system challenges the autonomy of schools. Arguably, such federal imposition of policy and subsequent unfunded mandates is an imposition of complex values on local education agencies (Smith, Fey, Heinecke, & Kahn, 2004). Yet, as the pressures mount, education finance becomes explicitly intertwined with school improvement efforts.

The complexities of improving student outcomes “render education finance policy and education policy generally one in the same” (Guthrie, 2008, p. 259). Yet, the convergence of school finance and reform policies is confounded by longitudinal trends that, until most recently, suggest a slowing of increases associated with per student educational expenditures at the national and state level. For example, looking back on funding levels nationally, all states averaged a 69% increase in student funding during the decade spanning 1959 to 1969. However, fifty years hence, the spending increases slowed remarkably considering per student expenditures adjusted for inflation. In fact, the decade spanning 1989 and 1999 evidenced modest increases of 11% on average in student level funding across the nation’s public elementary and secondary schools (*National Public Education Financial Survey*, 2007). Since that time, average state increases of 11% for student level funding have remained constant. It remains to be seen whether current financial investments in per student educational costs are adequate to address learners’ needs against a backdrop of federal and state mandates for school improvement.

School officials, including administrators and board members, are challenged by the complexities associated with the intersection of school finance and educational policies. Yet, for the level of local, state and federal funding supporting public education, little funding remain available for school reforms and improvement efforts.

Almost all of the billions spent on schools, however, is already spoken for, claimed by current teachers and the always escalating costs of salaries, health benefits, books, supplies, and maintenance. That leaves precious few public dollars available for experimentation, or what in the private industry would be called R&D, research and development. That is where foundations – especially those that are thoughtful, strategic, and focused – can have an outsized impact relative to their spending (Hess, 2005, p.23).

Thus, school officials are called to understand, define, and manage today's schools in relation to a highly complex social backdrop in which cross sector affiliations appear to be a means to achieve desired school reforms.

However, the need to look to cross sector partnerships for support is not a mere recent phenomenon. Acknowledging such challenges for public institutions, over thirty years ago Waldo (1974) foreshadowed the need for coordinated, interagency partnerships to address matters of such public concern. A quarter century later, Acar (2001) also posited that complex problems in areas of public concern, such as improved outcomes for education, require complex solutions addressed by broad-based coalitions among organizations from the public and private sectors. Most recently, Bacchetti and Ehrlich (2006) aptly defined the interplay between the needs of public education and the third sector:

Education needs philanthropic foundations to enliven imagination, spur improvements and test solutions. Foundations need education to increase individual and collective capacity to act effectively in the world (p. 1).

The third sector recognizes the need for such affiliations. The philanthropic community holds an enduring theme, seeking to “level the educational playing field by helping schools compensate for social and economic disparities (Hess, 2005, p. 24). In short, private philanthropic support for public education is needed and the philanthropic community recognizes the role it may assume to better social outcomes for the citizenry.

2.3.2 The Philanthropic Community's Response to Public Education

In relation to the escalating complexity of public schooling, educational institutions struggle to keep pace with the expectations commonly held for our nation's citizens (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006; Hess, 2005). Foundation leaders overtly question whether the quality of American

education has risen over the past three decades (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007). Not surprisingly, the third sector asserts pessimism over educators' ability to improve student achievement and increase educational capital (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006). The lack of such confidence in America's public schools leads to the third sector's concern for the economic and political status of the United States. Such apprehensions include perceived threats to America's declining position in the global economy (Getty, 2007). To that end, national interests underscore the third sector's attention to public education.

Let's stipulate that there is a problem and that it's serious. The United States may now be the world's only superpower, yet study after study shows our students ranking poorly in academic skills compared with their peers on other lands (Finn & Amis, 2001, p. 10).

The third sector is acutely interested in emphasizing education, "...as a poorly educated nation is a declining nation" (Ridings, 2000, p. 7). In fact, 92% of program officers at philanthropies cite that public education is both critical to the future of a democratic nation and should be protected at all costs (Loveless, 2005). Thus, private charitable foundations continue to seek opportunities to leverage their assets to assist school reform agendas and public schooling (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007; Hess, 2005).

In fact, the perceptions behind the third sector's interest in advancing school reform are well defined by survey research most recently conducted by Loveless (2005). Loveless' findings are based on the perceptions of 128 foundation program officers who were asked to identify local school problems. Nearly one quarter (71%) of the survey respondents in Loveless' study indicate that academic standards are currently too low for students, as are today's expectations for student performance. Similarly, nearly a quarter (71%) the surveyed program officers cite that not enough math, science and technology skills are presently taught in schools. Over half (61%) of the survey respondents report that today's school experience too much violence. Based on the

perception of foundation program officers, Loveless (2005) reports that student discipline, basic skills and student accountability are among the major school barriers that limit student achievement in America's public schools. The following table presents the results of Loveless' findings.

Table 2.1 Local school problems

Perceptions of foundation program officers	Percentage of program officers responding "very serious" or "somewhat serious"
Schools are not getting enough money to do a good job.	75
Kids are not taught enough math, science and computers.	71
Academic standards are too low and kids are not expected to learn enough.	71
Classes are too crowded.	66
There's too much drugs and violence in schools.	61
Schools are not clear and specific enough about what they want kids to learn.	51
There is not enough emphasis on the basics, such as reading, writing and math.	42
Schools don't teach kids good work habits such as being on time to class and completing assignments.	41
Too many teachers are more concerned with making kids feel good about themselves than with how much they learn.	30

Whereas the third sector is generally concerned that student discipline, skills and accountability are key issues presently troubling public education, Loveless (2005) notes additional perceptions of foundation program officers (Table 2.1). For example, three quarters (75%) of program officers find that public schools are under funded. The perceived funding deficit further underscores the third sector's interest in investing in school reform initiatives. However, there appears to be division among program officers as to whether clear and specific learning standards are established by schools (Loveless, 2005). Fifty-one percent of program officers indicate that the lack of standards presents a problem for local schools. There is also an absence of agreement among program officers whether the following school problems are serious issues generally challenging America's public schools: academic emphasis on reading, writing and mathematics; student work habits; and student self-esteem valued at the expense of performance expectations (Loveless, 2005). While regional differences may drive program officers perceptions of key school issues, there is general consensus that school funding needs to be addressed as a means by which to reduce student barriers to achievement.

Given such findings, it is important to recognize that the third sector's emphasis on educational programming predicated its action. In fact, it is anticipated in the future that the number of private charitable foundations involved in education is expected to grow (Colvin, 2005; Ridings, 2000). While philanthropy in 21st century America is set to flourish, the third sector remains committed to employing school reform initiatives intended to achieve improved social outcomes for public education (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006; Finn & Amis, 2001). The current and anticipated levels of third sector support for public education is significant. Whereas, the instrumental and strategic use of third sector capital to support public education substantially differs from that of the funding mechanism currently deployed by the schools systems

with which they engage (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007). Thus, the third sector is able to leverage change that public education alone appears unable to accomplish.

Therein, the third sector recognizes that it is positioned to strategically advance school reform agendas to redress poor student performance by directing money, energy and influence in ways the educational system cannot. Philanthropies are uniquely positioned, as the third sector agencies are exempt from most of the mechanisms of accountability that affect other types of organizations (Dowie, 2001; Fleishman, 2007; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Such non-profit organizations:

...have more freedom to decide which ... pressures they will respond/attend to, as long as they operate within the current laws and accepted norms (Acar, 2001, p. 30).

It is certain that private charitable foundations are generally exempt from the political, social, and economic constraints exercised by public education's stakeholders (Finn & Amis, 2001). Likewise, Fleishmann (2007) points out that public school have greater constraints imposed on their work. Examples of the multiple constituencies that constrain public schools and their decision-making process include, but are not limited to: students, parents, alumni, faculty, professional and support associations, tax payers, local government officials, local business and industry, police and fire departments, county providers, state and federal departments of education, and accrediting organizations (Fleishmann, 2007). Thus, the third sector is both positioned and prepared to leverage their assets in critically important ways that lead to innovation, reform and change with little limits otherwise externally imposed on their partnerships (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007).

2.3.3 Summary

Partnerships between the public education and the third sector are need as much now as they were in the past three hundred years of our nation's history. Presently, the efficacy of the American system of public education is at question. Scrutiny of public education is currently flamed by popular interest in multiple measures designed to assess the quality of elementary and secondary schooling across the United States. Thus, education is at the top of the national agenda (Loveless, 2005; McGuinn, 2004; Shaker & Heilman, 2004). Yet, unfunded federal and state mandates and longitudinal trends given per student expenditures suggest funds for public elementary and secondary schools may not be adequate to address the complex barriers to improved social outcomes demanded of the public education system. Therein, foundation leaders recognize that national interests are at stake "...as a poorly educated nation is a declining nation" (Ridings, 2000, p. 7). To this end, the third sector is uniquely situated to assist in addressing the concerns regarding America's public schools by directing money, energy and influence in ways the educational system alone cannot. Unfettered by most eternal accountability mechanisms, the third sector has greater latitude than do public schools in the strategic and intentional use of assets to affect improved educational outcomes. Thus, the continued engagement of public schools and the third sector stands to affect better results than systems in which cross sector strategies are not employed. It stands that healthy, strong partnerships between public education and the third sector benefits our nation's schools (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008).

2.4 HOW THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY FUNCTIONS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

Public-private partnerships stand to affect positive change given the complexity of social problems that presently exist. As previously addressed, cross sector strategies suggest stronger outcomes than single sector reform efforts. Specific to the issues facing public education, the third sector's philanthropic community is situated to strategically advance school reform agendas to support student achievement by directing money, energy and influence in ways the educational system cannot. The philanthropic community is also positioned to leverage cross sector change given that it operates differently than public organizations.

Compared to public organizations, private – nonprofit organizations - have more freedom to decide which internal accountability mechanisms they will establish... as long as they operate within the current laws and accepted norms (Acar, 2001, p.30).

Unlike public schools, the philanthropic community is exempt from most of the mechanisms of accountability that affect other types of organizations and is primarily accountable only to themselves (Dowie, 2001; Fleishman, 2007). Dowie (2001) suggests that the philanthropic community operates “behind a veil of privacy long defended by founders, their families, and the fiduciaries appointed to oversee them” (p. x). It is because private foundations operate differently than those with whom they frequently affiliate that it becomes necessary to recognize the roles foundations assume within contemporary American society.

Yet, little is understood on how exhaustive a role the philanthropic community may play in support of public education and school reform (Hess, 2005). High profile grantmaking captures public attention. However, upon deeper analysis, identifying the actual scope and impact private foundations have on public schooling is challenging.

There is some ambiguity in defining exactly what constitutes philanthropic support of K-12 education. Is support of afterschool programs part of supporting elementary and secondary schools? How about mentoring programs? Or literacy programs for parents? ... Note that programs can 'directly concern' school activities without themselves being school activities (Greene, 2005, p.51).

Yet, despite not being able to fully appreciate the scope of activities, private philanthropy's role in elementary and secondary education still seems to be growing (Lenkowsky, 2005).

Therein, when put into play, the roles foundations assume in supporting social issues may take on a number of variations. Fleishman (2005) asserts that there are three general roles which define how America's philanthropic community operates. The three roles are categorically identified as that of Driver, Partner, and Catalyst. Each role is not necessarily exclusive in terms of the ways in which the philanthropic community affiliates with cross sector partners. However, there are fairly clear distinctions between the various roles.

2.4.1 Foundations as Driver

Foundations operating as Drivers of innovations and change hold a high level of direct involvement in their grantmaking. As Drivers, foundations plan strategies by which to address targeted problems and thus charge grantees to implement the strategies under the grantmakers' control (Fleishman, 2005). For example, between 2002 and 2005, the Gates Foundation invested more than \$1.2 billion to create 820 new high schools and to restructure roughly 750 large, comprehensive high schools into smaller learning academies. Therein, Colvin (2005) suggests that the Gates Foundation identified, in this one instance of their work, a school reform model that centered on smaller learning communities in which academic rigor, with relevance to students' lives, was valued and in which supportive school-community relationships were fostered. Thus, instead of backing demonstration high school reform projects for evaluation and eventual replication, in this occasion the Gates Foundation identified high school reform as a

targeted issue to be addressed by a specific strategy that was implemented under the foundation's direction. Of the three roles identified by Fleishman (2005), caution is suggested for foundations choosing to assume responsibility as drivers of change as it requires foundation staff to actually hold requisite skill sets in the areas in which the strategies are developed.

2.4.2 Foundations as Partner

Whereas the role of driver positions philanthropic agents as highly involved in all aspects of grantmaking strategies, the role of partner shifts the public-private affiliation to a position in which there is more shared control and responsibility between foundations and their grantees (Fleishman, 2005).

The role of partner is likely to be appropriate whenever a foundation has a strategic objective that can be accomplished by working with an existing, usually non-profit, organization that shares with the foundation both the goal and the strategy for attaining it (Fleishman, 2005).

For example, in the winter of 2005, both the Broad and Gates Foundations invested in a project of the Standard and Poor's School Evaluation Services: SchoolMatters.com (Colvin, 2005). In this case, Colvin (2005) suggests that Broad's interest in quality schooling and market force models attracted his attention to Standard and Poor's return on resources framework, which analyzes and makes public school level achievement and performance data. Thus, the Broad Foundation shared a belief held by Standard and Poor's Evaluation Services that schools can improve given an engaged community and increased competition for educational services. There are benefits associated with foundations positioned as Partners in cross-sector, social reforms. Despite losing some level of control over the reform strategy, foundations that engage affiliates through their role as Partner recognize more cost-effective grant management with less demanding commitments of foundations' time and energy (Fleishman, 2005).

2.4.3 Foundations and Venture Philanthropy

Venture philanthropy, a more recent approach, is essentially described as a role in which foundations engage more in cross sector work than when operating as Partners but are less directly involved than when operating as Drivers of reforms (Colvin, 2005; Fleishman, 2005). Venture philanthropy is likened to “a role that is more aggressive, more ‘muscular’ than that assumed by many philanthropies in the past” (Colvin, 2005, p. 36).

Such venture philanthropists want grant recipients and foundations to be held fiscally accountable for the money they spend, as if shareholders somewhere – aged pensioners or widows and orphans – would suffer if they used it for poetry, or “wasted” it on an experimental project that ultimately failed (Dowie, 2001, p. xv).

If it is such that grantees should not be able to achieve agreed-upon targets, venture philanthropists may delay funding their projects, assign new management to the projects, or withdraw financial support for the projects all together (Colvin, 2005). In this type of role, the philanthropic community works closely with its grantees and exercises its ability to leverage influence and financing in return for a level of involvement and responsibility for the programs they support (Fleishman, 2005).

2.4.4. Foundations as Catalysts

The third and most common role assumed by the philanthropic community is that of Catalyst (Fleishman, 2005; Hess, 2005). As Catalysts, Fleishman (2005) suggests that foundations are situated on the opposite end of the continuum from the high levels of responsibility otherwise assumed by philanthropies operating as Drivers of reform. When operating as Catalysts, foundations assume both little control and hold little accountability for outcomes generated by

their grantees' work (Fleishman, 2005). There are many reasons for which foundations commonly choose to work as Catalysts. Fleishman (2005) asserts that:

Some problems are simply not ripe enough to lend themselves to a clear-cut strategic solution. They may be too big, too complex, or too unwieldy; they may be relatively new and little-understood; or they may require intervention by government agencies or the for-profit sector (p. 8).

Yet, there are advantages to the work accomplished when foundations operate as Catalysts for reform. New solutions to social problems are explored, experimentation is fostered, awareness is raised, organizations are established, and the public becomes better educated through the cross sector work accomplished when the philanthropic community advances Catalysts projects (Fleishman, 2005).

2.4.4 Summary

The philanthropic community is positioned to operate differently than organizations in the business and public sectors. Free from many of the accountability mechanisms associated with non-profit and commercial agencies, private charitable foundations are generally accountable to themselves, having the latitude to directing money, energy and influence in ways the educational system alone cannot. Therein, the third sector's philanthropic community assumes varied roles in advancing their agendas. Fleishman (2005) categorizes the roles foundations play in civic life as that of Drivers, Partners and Catalysts. Functioning as Drivers of social agendas, foundations identify problems and establish reform strategies which grantees are charged to implement. The role of Drivers is time and labor intensive for philanthropies. Moreover, philanthropies operating as drivers require staffs that hold expertise in the reform areas addressed. Lesser involvement is required when foundations function as Partners with cross sector affiliates. Foundations, operating as Partners, award funding to grantees that hold the same goals and

strategies for social reforms. However, as Partners, foundations defer a level of control of the projects to their affiliates. Venture philanthropy, as a more recent role assumed by foundations, requires a lesser degree of control than that of Drivers and more direct involvement than that of Partners. Venture philanthropy engages grantees and holds them accountable for achieving agreed upon outcomes. Finally, the third and most common role the philanthropic community assumes is that of Catalysts. Catalysts seed innovation and experimentation in support of reform in areas in which the complexities of social problems may be too new or unwieldy to strategize or in which existing efforts require additional support. It would be incorrect to assume that the various roles the philanthropic community holds are mutually exclusive (Fleishman, 2005). Yet, each of the roles hold significance in explaining the different approaches the philanthropic community may take when affiliating in cross sector work. Understanding how the philanthropic community functions in society holds relevance when considering means by which public-private partnerships may be bolstered for better social outcomes.

2.5 BOLSTERING AFFILIATIONS BETWEEN PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY

It remains certain that public education stands to rely on private foundations to support efforts to better improve outcomes for students as much as the third sector relies on public education to produce the social capital required of today's citizens in a global economy (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006). Given such dependencies, it is important to develop a more sophisticated knowledge base regarding key aspects of such partnerships (Acar, 2001). Arguably, little has been written on "inter-organizational networks and public-private partnerships" (Acar, 2001, p.1). To that end, the interplay between the third sector and public education leads to limited studies and findings

that are able to suggest means by which cross sector agendas are best designed to maximize outcomes. Moreover, of the literature that exists concerning implications for improving partnerships between the third sector and public education, findings are generally framed from the perspectives of the foundations by the third sector. Thus, the limitations in the literature present problems for private charitable foundations and public education alike.

Despite the dearth of research, there is every reason to believe that the use of multi-organizational, multi-sectorial collaboratives will increase in the future (Acar, 2001, Colvin, 2005). The intensified presence of public-private partnerships is attributed to a combination of factors, including but not limited to: globalization, communication technologies, fiscal constraints and budget deficits, and the increased complexity and interdependence of issues (Acar, 2001). The cooperative engagement of public education and the third sector's philanthropic community is, and is projected to be, as relevant and important as it was over the course of our nation's preceding three centuries. Thus, a context for this researcher's work is situated by recognizing the extant literature concerning improved outcomes for public-private partnerships between education and private charitable foundations. As such, the following findings addressing implications for improved outcomes are organized by five themes: honesty, ownership, culture, capacity; and continuous learning.

The five articulated themes addressing implications for improved outcomes are drawn from *Urban Districts and National Foundations: Making the Marriage Work* (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Whereas, in June of 2007 the Aspen Institute Education and Society Program, in partnership with the Spencer Foundation, assembled ten superintendents from some of the nation's largest urban districts alongside ten senior program officers from major national foundations holding sizable investments in urban education. The outcome of the assemblage is

reported in Goren's and Wurtzel's (2008) white paper, which identifies five major challenges to effective partnerships between public schools and the third sector. While the following findings are not limited to the outcomes identified in the white paper, the subsequent findings are aptly organized by the themes Goren and Wurtzel (2008) identified.

2.5.1 Honesty

Fifty years preceding Goren's and Wurtzel's work, the American Association of School Administrators' (AASA) Committee on Foundations framed suggestions and guidelines to help bolster the relationships between the third sector and public education. The committee's work appears to have been driven by the recognition that school administrators had not established a position by which educational institutions could assert guiding principles to inform their engagement with philanthropies (R. Hall, et al.; 1963). Therein, on behalf of AASA, R. Hall et al. (1963) cautioned:

Doubtless, in some instances [there are purposes for a grant proposal] other than the purpose the grant is to achieve. To the extent that this is true, it is unhealthy for foundations, school administrators and other educators (p. 11).

Yet contemporary findings suggest the concept of honest conversation between multi-sectorial partners is still viewed as an obstacle which needs to be addressed.

Therein, the extant literature is clear. Participants need to be willing to accept the consequences of engaging in straightforward and forthcoming discourse when engaging in cross sector initiatives. Such risk-taking requires partners to reasonably determine and disclose their expectations, commitments and limitations associated with their public-private endeavors. For example, Goren and Wurtzel (2008) contend that both the third sector and public education must fully assume responsibility for being realistic, frank and honest in establishing agendas, defining

responsibilities and reporting outcomes associated with the shared work. Ehrlich and Bacchetti (2005) surmise that not only do communication problems exist between foundations and education; but, the only means by which to overcome said challenges is through blunt and candid exchanges. Yet, Ehrlich and Bacchetti (2005) cite that a barrier to this type of healthy cross sector discourse is grounded in public education's fear of not receiving third sector funding when expressing matters concerning their systems' limitations. Confounding the matter, a lack of trust between partners tends to be exacerbated given that the third sector operates with a different level of overall accountability than that of public education (Finn & Amis, 2001; Fleishmann, 2007; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). There appears to be a predisposition of doubt given matters concerning capacity, sincerity and commitment to cross sector agendas as public education and private charitable foundations operate within different sectors that express success by different measures (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). To best address the challenge, Acar (2001) proposes that "mapping and mutually adjusting" expectations and building relationships are the best viable means by which to ensure improved outcomes for public-private partnerships.

2.5.2 Ownership

A second challenge for improved public-private partnerships is the tension over who owns the reforms. Ownership of the reform needs to be shared and uncontested (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Yet, the importance of shared ownership is not new concept. In fact, some fifty years earlier AASA cautioned that the lack of ownership of an agenda may lead to eventual advancement of proceedings at the expense of education (R. Hall, et al., 1963). Despite the longstanding realization that shared ownership is an important aspect of public-private partnerships, there are impediments to shared ownership. One such barrier is a tendency for public educators to feel like "beggars" when seeking third sector funding in support of school improvement efforts

(Ehrlich & Bacchetti, 2005). The subordination of a public-private partner stands to compromise the associate's voice, commitment and follow-through with cross sector work. To better ensure a true sense of co-ownership of public-private agendas, the third sector needs to be wary of engaging partners from the public sector that hold perspectives or operational practices deemed incompatible with the core missions of the shared work (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Likewise, thoughtful engagement of all partners in the co-design of the shared agenda is essential (Acar, 2001; Frumkin, 2005; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). The incidental subordination of partners is apt to be brought about when there is a lack of meaningful engagement between associates (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). While it is important to instill a sense of mutual ownership in cross sector work and educational reform agendas, ownership is otherwise impacted by the level of frank, honest and substantive discourse and shared responsibilities held between partners.

Uncontested, co-equal ownership in shared partnerships is but one facet to improved multi-sector relations. Therein, it is recognized that ownership of cross sector work is firmly grounded by the thoughtful engagement of all partners, school district personnel and third sector agents alike, in the co-design of shared agendas (Acar, 2001; Frumkin, 2005; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Even so, the concept of ownership must be considered further in terms of participants' levels of engagement. For example, Frumkin (2005) suggests that the third sector consider the type of relationship they establish with their public sector partners (see Table 2.2). Ultimately, an effective, collaborative relationship in which both partners operate as co-owners of the shared work is dependent upon two variables: engagement and values (Frumkin, 2005). As such, the ideal cross sector relationship is achieved when private partners initiate a high level of engagement with their public partners, while at the same time the both partners share common purposes and core values. Frumkin (2005) refers to cross sector partnerships that have both high

levels of multi sector engagement and congruence of values as truly collaborative relationships. At the other extreme, cross sector partners that share little by way of values and interaction tend to have contractual relationships. Contractual relationships, while typically non-threatening for all parties involved, lead to the detachment of public partners in truly owning the shared work (Frumkin, 2005). Thus, over time, the social outcomes associated with the shared work are riddled by matters concerning fidelity and sustainability of implementation. An auditing relationship, which is more tense than a contractual relationship, is based on little commonality given the partners' core values, while a significant level of engagement is initiated by the third sector partners. An auditing relationship tends to develop "procedural hurdles...designed to maintain some semblance of accountability" (Frumkin, 2005, p. 292). Thus, meaningful assessments of the outcomes derived from the shared work are mired in the public partner's need to comply with accounting processes. Finally, a delegating relationship tends to form when the cross sector partners hold common purposes and visions for their work but little engagement is initiated by the third sector. Thus, the type of cross sector relationship facilitated by foundations stands to affect both the districts' sense of ownership of cross sector work while defining the type of relationship the agencies will experience.

Table 2.2 Forms of philanthropic relationships

		Level of Values Congruence between Donor and Recipient	
		Low	High
Engagement of Donor with Recipient	Low	Contractual Relationship	Delegating Relationship
	High	Auditing Relationship	Collaborative Relationship

Therein, ownership of shared agendas presents a balance of issues for which all parties need to assume responsibility.

Engagement is something that must neither be declared by donor fiat nor postulated by a recipient. Instead, engagement needs to emerge from communication between the two parties and should aim to find a level of fit and alignment that will satisfy both sides of the philanthropic exchange (Frumkin, 2005, p. 294).

Moreover, Acar (2001) identifies relationships as a recommendation for establishing successful cross sector partnerships. Furthering Acar's point, Goren and Wurtzel (2008) point out that schools engaging in cross sector work need to have school board members actively engaged in the process.

Boards pose a large and often overlooked challenge. Foundations for the most part pay scant attention to building the capacity, skills and knowledge of elected and appointed board members (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008, p. 5).

If for no other reason, there is significant value-added benefit to the thoughtful engagement of school board members given the turn-over rate of school administrators in today's high-stakes educational environment. It is very likely that community leaders, such as school board

members, are likely to remain in place long after school administrators who are responsible for managing school reform agendas matriculate. If school board members hold a sense of ownership of the cross sector work, the social outcomes associated with shared agendas stand a better change of weathering changes in school leadership (Acar, 2001; Goren & Wetzel, 2008). Moreover, without the backing of school board members, cross sector reform initiatives are subject to struggle with the establishment and sustainability of projects. Thus, an argument is made that school board members' views on partnerships with private charitable foundations supporting public education are relevant in overcoming the challenges facing multi-sectorial work. Ultimately, public-private partners that establish distributive ownership of cross sector agendas better ensure sustainable social outcomes resulting from shared work.

2.5.3 Culture

A third challenge for public-private partnerships is the need to employ strategies by which to overcome social barriers that may results from cultural differences (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Therein, both sectors operate with differing levels of overall accountability and are subject to dissimilar sets of primary stakeholders (Finn & Amis, 2001; Fleishmann, 2007; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Moreover, both public education and the third sector are quick to assume that their workplace realities are not recognized by their cross sector partners (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Ehrlich and Bacchetti (2005) assert that public education frequently identifies the third sector with investments in shared work for the purpose of identifying reform agendas that may ultimately lead to transferability across systems. In contrast, Erlich & Bacchetti (2005) find that districts and schools are generally focused on cross sector work that meets their immediate, regional need for improved student outcomes. Thus, a mismatch between aspirations can be counterproductive to the outcomes expected of cross sector work (Ehrlich & Bacchetti, 2005).

Similarly, another inherent cultural difference held by cross sector partners is the manner in which public schools and the third sector respond to the social, political and economic demands that drive educational reform. Public education is driven by high-stakes, public accountability measures. Such pressures often lead school officials to seek short-term changes for immediate results whereas the third sector is generally more interested in addressing long-term problems and solutions through systemic reform agendas (Ehrlich & Bacchetti, 2005). Finally, the social and racial composition of the cross sector agents may create stressors and barriers to healthy public-private partnerships. For example,

Foundations are perceived to be largely funded, run and staffed by elites who do not reflect the racial composition of the schools they are trying to reform. Foundation staff and their designated intermediaries may not have the cultural and practical experience to understand the work on the ground, and districts and communities may see them as out of touch interlopers (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008, p.6).

Hence, cultural barriers between partners will transcend those most commonly associated with class and race.

Acar (2001) echoes the significance of cultural barriers, identifying both sectorial and personal differences as among the most frequently cited difficulties facing accountability in public-private partnerships. Thus, strategies need to be considered by which partners may overcome such differences. Goren and Wurtzel (2008) suggest that efforts should be taken to diversify the experience and backgrounds of cross sector partners to include those who represent, recognize and understand the community in which the shared work is situated. Moreover, partners need to be willing to openly discuss cultural issues and their possible impact on the shared work (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Thus, cultural differences between public-private partners, irrespective of whether the differences are real or perceived, need to be explicitly

addressed in order to ensure sectorial and personal difference do no hamper the outcomes of resulting cross sector engagements.

2.5.4 Capacity

The capacity of both public and private partners is yet another essential consideration in ensuring improved outcomes for cross sector work. Capacity issues are framed by two lenses: the capacity to assess whether a proposed cross sector agenda is the appropriate means by which to affect increase social outcomes and the capacity of the cross sector agents to effectively implement the proposed agenda (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Thus, public-private partners need to consider both readiness and need for the engagement of shared work at the same time as they evaluate their organizations' ability to implement multi-sector work scopes.

The capacity to assess the need for multi-sectorial work, particularly in the area of school reform, is best situated by partners who suspend their opinions, seek to make data informed decisions and are willing to draw upon researchers and intermediaries in the field who have expertise in the agenda items under consideration. Frequently, both public schools and their third sector partners lack the capacity, expertise and time to identify root causes that present barriers to desired social outcomes (Ehrlich & Bacchetti, 2005; Finn, 2001). It is important to recognize that private, philanthropic charities regularly invest in programs that align with their core missions and areas of interests. Yet, public school partners need to determine whether willing third sector partners are engaging in shared work that aligns with the assessed needs of their educational institutions (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008; R. Hall et al., 1963). Therein, preferences and opinions need to be suspended. Rather, the need to initiate, continue, modify or terminate educational programming requires data informed decisions (Wallace, 1996). School partners must be certain that cross sector strategies are consistent with data informed decisions and are

central to their educational agendas (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Moreover, public-private partners need to consider the role of educational researchers and intermediaries who have the knowledge, skills and expertise to inform the strategies comprising shared agendas (Ehrlich & Bacchetti, 2005; Finn 2001; R. Hall et al., 1963).

At the district level there is often limited analytical capacity to review and determine the right strategy. Similarly, most foundations lack the staff capacity to provide significant, non-financial resources to districts on a regular basis (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008, p. 7).

Recognizing the potential for such limitations, it behooves public-private partners to engage in frank, objective and open discourse concerning the alignment of shared objectives and strategies, while engaging outside expertise when necessary (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008).

It is also necessary for public-private partners to critically assess their agencies' infrastructures when considering their capacity to implement cross sector work. Leadership and staff turnover is a significant problem in both foundations and school districts (Acar, 2001; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Public-private partners need to consider whether their agencies are able to implement shared agendas given available human capital (R. Hall et al., 1963). Moreover, in deference to the systems' infrastructures, reasonable implementation timelines and expectations needs to be jointly established (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). As resources vary across partners, the third sector needs to give serious consideration to support provisions that match their partners' needs (Ehrlich & Bacchetti, 2005). Thus, readiness and need alone are not sufficient capacity indicators. Cross sector partners need to also consider whether their infrastructures have requisite resources and supports in place to reasonably implement shared agendas. Honest and frank discourse, co-ownership, and culturally sensitive approaches to cross sector work lead to critical appraisals concerning the capacity of public-private partners for improved social outcomes.

2.5.5 Continuous Learning

Among the issues concerning capacity, Ehrlich and Bacchetti (2005) suggest that cross sector partners engage experts in the field who have the knowledge, skills and expertise to inform the strategies comprising shared agendas. Therein, it follows that continuous learning among and between public-private partners, and those they engage in cross sector work, is yet another challenge for improving outcomes of cross sector work. Long-term learning is often not central to cross sector agendas nor is new learning adequately shared between public-private partners.

Both foundations and districts feel pressure to label their efforts successes and to gloss over or walk away from failures. Foundations are often concerned with self-preservation, brand identification, and leverage. Thus, they can be risk-averse and ambivalent about learning from mistakes. Districts likewise have little interest – or capacity – to examine failures. Once the initial terms of a grant are set, modifications based on what has been learned through implementation are often seen as failure rather than transparency and continuous learning. The tendency is to say everything is going well, even when all the parties know there are problems (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008, pp 7-8).

Thus, willing partners need to be risk-takers in assessing success and failures in order to better ensure improved social outcomes for public-private educational ventures (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006).

Bacchetti and Ehrlich (2006) have identified four recommendations that support and reinforce the need for long term learning resulting from multi-sector engagement in public-private partnerships. First among the recommendations is openness. Whereas, Goren and Wurtzel (2008) argue that honesty is an essential facet to improved outcomes for cross sector work, openness holds a different implication as it relates to continuous learning. Openness is the reversal of information-poor environments, whereby partners make transparent detailed information concerning their proposals, programs, and results (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006; Ehrlich & Bacchetti, 2005). Second, objective external reviews should be leveraged at key

stages throughout the implementation of shared work (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006). Critical, shared analysis of such program evaluations provide opportunities for stakeholders to learn from successes as well as failures; provides opportunities to make mid-course corrections to programming for continuous improvement; and stands to inform others outside the partnership such that they may avoid mistakes-in-the-making (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Third, professional development is essential. Bacchetti and Ehrlich (2006) suggest that a consortium of leaders from education and the third sector develop a curriculum that addresses how cross sector partners should work together to build educational capital. Fourth, lessons learned need to be deliberately disseminated to the broader field through cross sector intermediaries, researchers and collaboratives, while strategically using of information technologies for greater accessibility (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006). It is recognized that cross sector collaborations are a necessary means by which to resolve complex social problems (Acar, 2001). Thus, in order to support cross sector work public-private partners need inform field and themselves by objectively, if not boldly, developing a community of practice based on continuous learning.

2.5.6 Summary

Presently, there is a dearth of literature addressing the interaction, cooperation and accountability between organizations from multiple sectors. Yet, there are now and will be more interactions between organizations that cut across jurisdictions and sectors (Acar, 2001; Colvin, 2005). In fact, Waldo (1974) foreshadowed more than a quarter century ago the larger role of mixed organizations, both public and private, in addressing complex social problems such as public education. As cross sector partners look to the future, there are general implications that should be considered in ensuring improved outcomes for cross sector work.

The following five implications concerning cross sector work are framed by the findings of Goren and Wurtzel (2008) as based on their work with school superintendents and senior program officers from major national foundations. First, honesty needs to be established between partners. Both the third sector and public education need to be willing to critically assess when cross sector relationships are a match worth pursuing by the disclosure of expectations, commitments and limitations associated with proposed public-private endeavors. Second, co-ownership of shared work needs to be firmly established. To that end, the ideal balance for the third sector to establish with its partners in public education is a collaborative relationship that encompasses shared values and purposes along with a high level of engagement (Frumkin, 2005). Third, cultural divisions need to be both recognized and addressed. Both partners need to be willing to engage in conversation concerning the impact of cultural differences on their shared work, while securing personnel who best represent the communities being served. Fourth, the capacities of the partners to assess both the need for shared work and the implementation of shared agendas are important facets of improving outcomes. Thus, it is important to note that when necessary intermediaries with expertise in the proposed strategies should be engaged as associates of such partnerships. Fifth, continuous learning must be central to the shared work, with efforts committed to the establishment of a community of practice based on full disclosure of the successes and failures of the cross sector initiatives. While Goren's and Wurtzel's (2008) recommendations are five in number, the suggestions are neither absolute nor mutually exclusive. Rather, the recommendations represent a commitment between partners to open themselves to one another for a greater social outcome that transcends the sum of any vulnerabilities they would otherwise seek to protect.

2.6 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 2

The complexities of issues confounding American public education in the twenty first century require all school matters to converge on improved outcomes for students (Guthrie, 2008). Yet, in order to address dense social problems, cross sector engagement is necessary (Waldo, 1977; Acar, 2001). Among those who need to be actively involved in matters concerning both school improvement and cross sector work are school board members. Without the active and meaningful ownership in cross sector agendas targeting educational reform, school board members stand to be an obstacle rather than an advocate for change (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Yet, little research exists that explicitly examines the perspectives of school board members' views on partnerships with private charitable foundations supporting public education.

Therefore, the preceding review of literature establishes a context that supports the following four assertions. First, a longstanding partnership between the third sector and public education has existed throughout the evolution of America's public educational system, dating as far back as our nation's colonial period. Second, present day public-private partnerships between the third sector and public education are seen as a significant means by which to leverage improved social outcomes for public schooling. Third, there is significance attributed to the various roles that foundations play in supporting social issues as each role holds a different implication for public-private partnerships. Fourth, the extant research suggests means by which to bolster outcomes associated with cross sector work. Accordingly, the context framed by the review establishes longstanding partnerships between the third sector and public education are not a new phenomenon; such partnerships are needed at the present time; the role of the philanthropic community in civic life affects its affiliations with public organizations; strategies

by which to bolster public-private partnerships between public education and private charitable foundations need to be considered for improving social outcomes.

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Complex problems in areas of public concern, such as improved outcomes for education, require complex solutions, including broad-based partnerships among organizations from the public and private sectors (Acar, 2001). Such cross-sector partnerships currently exist and are evidenced, for example, by the current level of support for public education by private charitable foundations. Yet, private support for public education is not simply a recent response to issue of general, public concern. With respect to education, there exists an historical precedence of longstanding support for America's system of public schooling by private philanthropists and third sector agents across this nation's past three centuries (Colvin, 2005; P. Hall, 2003a; R. Hall et al., 1963; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001). However, little is actually known about effective practices that are based on, or informed by, the perspective of third sector grantees in terms of their positions on assistance with implementation of cross sector work (Buteau et. al., 2008). It is only most recently that the research literature suggests means by which public-private partnerships may be improved to better ensure the desired social outcomes of multi-sectorial, shared work. Given this developing body of findings, it is now recognized that school board members may present obstacles for change when not afforded opportunities for active and meaningful engagement with cross sector agendas that target educational reform at the local

school level (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Thus, more attention needs to be given to the perspectives of school board members as the discourse on cross sector work continues to evolve.

The purpose of this study is to identify views held by local school board members in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County regarding affiliations with private charitable foundations supporting public education. This study seeks to address the following research questions.

3.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- 1) How do school board members perceive the roles and responsibilities of private charitable foundations in support of public elementary and secondary education?
- 2) What do school board members perceive as practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?
- 3) What do school board members suggest as the most significant barriers to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?
- 4) What do school board members suggest as means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

To that end, this chapter develops the rationale and methods supporting the study of regional school board members' views concerning third sector partnerships. First, this researcher's theoretical base is considered in relation to the study. Second, the study's design is reviewed, including the research method and the selection of the study's participants. Third, the study's research instrument, including its theoretical construct, is described. After which, data collection, analysis and representation is explained.

3.3 ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

Given an interpretivist's paradigm, Ginsburg (1998) posits that educational structures and processes result from both the meanings individuals' associate with situations and actions taken in response to the interpretations of situations. Thus, this study seeks to identify knowledge claims that emerge from the expressed views of a targeted sample of school board members on third sector partnerships. By codifying the views of the study's sampling on the role of private charitable foundations supporting public education, the field stands to gain a more sophisticated understanding of school board members' perspectives, including associated problems and prospects, given cross-sector engagement. Cohen and Crabtree (2006) assert that research findings, from an interpretivist lens, are created through the course of any investigation and may be derived from discourse between the researcher and respondents. To that end, interviewing as a qualitative research methodology involves the joint construction of meaning between the researcher and participants (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Thus, the study's research methodology involves semi-structured, in-depth interviews of a sampling of school board members. The interpretivist paradigm also considers the context in which research subjects are situated (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). Therefore, the composition of this study's sampling seeks to account for differences among participating school board members. The subjects for this study are drawn from a random purposive sampling limited to Pennsylvania's Allegheny County and are stratified by total per student expenditures based on average daily membership of the school board members' districts.

Hence, it stands that this researcher assumes an interpretivist social, theoretical perspective. To that end, this study seeks to identify research findings that are drawn from the subjects' views on partnerships with the third sector, derived from the subject's understandings of cross-sector affiliations, and are framed by contextual similarities and differences within the sampling.

3.4 METHODOLOGY APPROACH

Whereas it is acknowledged that this researcher assumes an interpretivist position, further explanation of this study's research design follows. It is widely recognized that the research method to be used in any study needs to align with purpose of the investigation.

We must first understand our problem and decide what questions we are asking, and then we must select the mode of disciplined inquiry most appropriate to those questions (Shulman, 1998, 15).

The research design for this study stems from the nature of the research questions being posed.

The following sections extend the rationale for the study's research method, citing both its benefits and limitations, and delineate the means by which the survey data will be collected, analyzed and reported.

3.4.1 Field Research: Participant Interviews

As this study seeks to identify the views of school board members in relation to partnerships with third sector agencies, the research design employed herein is based on a methodology that leads to the analysis and reporting of knowledge claims based on the expressed perspectives of the study's sample. Such disciplined inquiry is grounded in an ethnographic approach. Wolcott (1998) frames a field researcher's work as that which focuses on cultural understandings that are

revealed by what people do and say in the course of their dealings and interactions. To that end, participant interviewing is one type of research technique employed by field researchers.

Interview methods involve fieldwork in which the researcher collects data by interacting with the study's participants by asking questions and obtaining information through peoples' own words (Gay, L.R., 1987; Gay & Airasian, 2003; Wolcott, 1998). It follows that for the purpose of this study participant interviews enables this researcher to collect data derived from the expressed perspectives of school board members' views on third sector engagement.

3.4.2 Benefits and Limitations of the Methodology

It is significant to note that this researcher's selection of an interview methodology stands to access more robust data than that which might otherwise be collected through other means. Gay & Airasian (2003) assert that the interview process is more than "pulling out information" from research participants. For example, interview methods hold distinct advantages, including collection of in-depth data not possible with questionnaires and surveys (Gay, L.R., 1987; Wolcott, 1998). The interviewer stands to accrue more accurate and honest responses from the study's participants since the interviewer is positioned to: clarify both the research study and the interview questions; follow-up with the respondents on unclear or incomplete responses by asking probing questions; and adapt the interview situation to accommodate the respondents' needs (Gay, L.R., 1987). This researcher seeks to take advantage of the flexibility of interview methodology in this study by conducting semi-structured interviews.

Semi-structured interviews holds a pre-determined order for the interview questions in which the study's participant responses are open ended and recorded nearly verbatim for analysis at a later time and in which probing questions may be posed by the researcher to seek clarification on participants' responses (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Whereas other field research

methods, including participant observation and examination of records, also leads to knowledge claims based on cultural perspectives, interview methods enable this researcher to directly engage the study's sampling of school board members in order to capture robust data for content analysis.

However, there are also limitations associated with interview methodologies. Considering the interpretivist paradigm, it is acknowledged that "findings emerge through dialogue in which conflicting interpretations are negotiated among members of a community" (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). Thus, given the presence of the researcher in the research setting, it stands that interviewer-interviewee contact may pose a threat to the validity of interview studies (Gay, 1987; Gay & Airasian, 2003). Observer bias and observer effect present the two main threats to the validity of data gathered through qualitative research methods (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Observer bias refers to the perspectives the research brings to the study, which may subsequently influence the researcher's data (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Observer effect refers to the actual impact of the researcher on the study's subjects, which may bias the interviewee's reaction to the researcher (Gay, 1987; Gay & Airasian, 2003). In addition to observer bias and effect, it must also be recognized that interview studies are both time consuming and labor intensive, subject sample sizes are generally smaller in scale, and the researcher requires communication and interpersonal proficiencies beyond that of basic research skills (Gay, 1987). Yet, steps may be taken to address the limitations associated with interview methods.

Gay and Airasian (2003) advise that field researchers consider several strategies to improve a study's validity. This researcher assures the following actions will be taken during the course of this study. Concerted efforts by this researcher will be exercised to ensure the interview participants' trust and comfort in effort to gather honest and frank responses from the

interviewees. The purpose of the study will be reiterated by this researcher during the participant interviews, with assurances made to the study's subjects that strict confidentiality will be maintained for the purpose of this research project. Verbatim accounts of the telephone interviews will be audio recorded, supplemented by this researcher's field notes, and transcribed immediately thereafter for future analysis. This researcher's thoughts, reflections and concerns regarding the investigation will be recorded during the study, will be referred to when the data is analyzed, and will be reported as part of the presentation of data. The interview participants will be asked to review a hard copy of their transcribed interviews, with the option to provide this researcher with additional clarifying comments and/or corrections to the transcription.

A field researcher's transformation of data evolves from the structures imposed by the researcher on the collected data (Wolcott, 1998). Qualitative researchers do not claim to be able to eliminate bias in their work (Gay and Airasian; 2003). However, by being aware of the limitations associated with qualitative methods, such as participant interviews, this researcher commits to employing strategies to enhance the study's validity and to self-report observer biases and noted effects.

3.5 SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

As the mode of disciplined inquiry has been identified as participant interviews, this section reviews the sampling method to be employed in this study. A stratified, random purposive sampling procedure will be employed in order to collect interview data that is robust and accounts for the both the perspectives and contexts of the study's sampling of school board members. Therein, this section addresses the nature of random purposive samplings including the reasoning behind the section of this sampling procedure and the criterion for establishing the study's sample.

3.5.1 Random Purposive Sampling

A random purposive sampling requires the researcher to identify a nonrandom sample of possible study participants, from which a random selection of subjects is identified to participate in the study (Gay & Airasian, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Random purposive sampling adds credibility to qualitative research in which a small sample is targeted (Gay, R.L., 1987; Gay & Airasian, 2003). However, in order to better understand the features associated with a random purposive study, it is necessary to understand purposive sampling.

Purposive sampling is one of several types of nonprobability sampling methods. Purposive sampling procedures drawn from a deliberate selection of participants as based on criterion established by the researcher (Gay & Airasian, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Given that this research study focuses on the perceptions of school board members from Pennsylvania's Allegheny County, it is already implied that there is a level of non-randomness associated with the study's participants. Moreover, as this researcher chooses to consider the subjects' district of origin from the perspective of per pupil expenditures, the criterion associated

with selecting the study participants becomes increasingly defined. For purposes of this study, this researcher has knowledge of the participating school board members' districts and the per student expenditures associated with the subjects' districts. Thus, this researcher has prior knowledge of and a criterion for selecting the sample, which is consistent with purposive sampling techniques.

Purposive sampling techniques are appropriate when researchers are dealing with small survey samples (Gay & Airasian, 2003). As this researcher intends to interview nine school board members, the selection of this type of nonprobability sampling is appropriate. However, as this researcher previously indicated that the per student expenditures of the subjects' districts are considerations, it is necessary to stratify the purposive sampling. Stratified purposive sampling involves dividing the purposively selected sample into smaller categories (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Thus, this researcher intends to draw a sample of school board members from Pennsylvania's Allegheny County who are categorized to represent school districts with differing levels of per student expenditures. For purposes of this study, the strata of the purposive sampling of Allegheny County school board members are defined by one of three categories:

- 1) district with high per student expenditures;
- 2) district with mid-range per student expenditures; and
- 3) district with low per student expenditures.

The goal of stratifying the purposive sampling is to discover elements relevant to the study's findings that may be similar or different across the stratified groups (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

However, researchers need to consider the credibility of a stratified purposive sampling given that bias may be inherent in nonrandom samples. Thus, this researcher will facilitate a

random selection of participants from each of the three strata of the purposive sampling. The random selection of study subjects from each of the three defined categories stands to increase credibility for the study.

Sample size in qualitative studies is typically too small to allow the results to be representative of an entire population; but, randomization of the selection does offer an explanation as to why certain cases were excluded as well as a systematic method to make the sampling manageable (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 282).

In a random purposive sampling, each of the members within each of the strata of the purposive sampling has an equal and independent chance of being selected for participation in the study (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Thus the value added aspect of using “random sampling with a stratified purposive sampling is to add trustworthiness to the study” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 282). Thus, a random purposive sampling will be employed as a means to collect data for this qualitative study, in which a small, stratified purposive sampling will be engaged.

3.5.2 Criteria for the Study’s Sample

It is established that a stratified, random purposive sampling will be used for purposes of this study. Therein, it is necessary to detail the criteria used for the stratification of the sample. Pennsylvania’s Allegheny County is a region that reflects heterogeneity with respect to the funding levels attributed to the cost of educating elementary and secondary school students. Moreover, presently there are 464 independent foundations based in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that cite education as a field of interest, with nearly a quarter of such foundations based in Allegheny County (The Foundation Center, 2008). As this study focuses on the perceptions of school board members’ affiliations with the philanthropic community, this researcher has concluded that Allegheny County school board members stand to have an awareness of the local philanthropic community given the larger number of charitable

foundations headquartered within the county proper. Moreover, as there is heterogeneity in terms of student level funding across the county's districts, this researcher again has concluded that there is sufficient diversity among county school board members by which to identify possible research subjects for the three strata of the random purposive sample. However, for purposes of this study, each subject is intended to be either a sitting board president or vice-president. By limiting this study to school board members who assume leadership positions within their LEA's board structure, this researcher hopes to capture perspectives of board members who stand to influence colleague board members. Furthermore, as this researcher is intent on capturing qualitative data, this researcher accepts that the subjects' views may be informed by experience as well as their personal perceptions of social phenomena. Thus, the study subjects do not require first-hand experience as county school board members who have dealt with direct affiliations with private charitable foundations.

Given the stratification of the random purposive sample, it is necessary to consider total student expenditures based on the average daily student membership (ADM) of each of the school districts in Allegheny County. Data collected and analyzed for the purpose of defining total expenditures per ADM is specific to the 2006-2007 school year, as reported by the Pennsylvania Department of Education (*Expenditure Data for All School Entities*, 2008). The highest total expenditure per ADM of the schools districts within Allegheny County is \$19,294.76, which is attributed to the Pittsburgh Public Schools. The county's lowest total expenditure per student based on ADM, in the amount of \$10,375.61, is attributed to South Allegheny School District. The Moon Areas School District, with a total expenditure per ADM of \$13,076.42, represents the median cost for educating a student in a public school district in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County.

In order to determine the stratification for the random purposive sample according to per student expenditure, the Allegheny County schools districts are ranked from highest to lowest according to cost attributed to educating a student based on the districts' average daily membership. All school districts with total expenditures per ADM above the 66th percentile (\$13,652.28) are identified as districts with higher per student expenditures. All schools districts with total expenditures per ADM at or below the 66th percentile but above the 33rd percentile (\$12,568.14) of the ranked county districts are identified as districts with mid-range per student expenditures. All schools districts with total expenditures per ADM at or below the 33rd percentile of the ranked county districts are identified as districts with low range per student expenditures. Table 3.1 displays the stratification of Allegheny County school districts according to the cost of educating a student.

Table 3.1 Allegheny County School Districts stratified by total expenditure (TE) per average daily student membership: 2006-2007 school year

District	Percentile			District	Percentile		
	TE	Rank	Range		TE	Rank	Range
Pittsburgh Public	\$19,294	99	High	Carlynton	\$13,049	47	Mid
Quaker Valley	\$17,320	97	High	East Allegheny	\$13,046	45	Mid
Wilkinsburg Boro.	\$16,822	95	High	North Hills	\$13,003	42	Mid
Allegheny Valley	\$15,173	92	High	South Park	\$12,862	40	Mid
Duquesne City	\$15,104	90	High	Bethel Park	\$12,684	38	Mid
Fox Chapel Area	\$14,864	88	High	Upper Saint Clair	\$12,620	35	Mid
Cornell	\$14,651	85	High	Penn Hills	\$12,568	33	Low
Deer Lakes	\$14,548	83	High	Baldwin Whitehall	\$12,462	30	Low
Woodland Hills	\$14,502	80	High	West Mifflin Area	\$12,417	28	Low
Keystone Oaks	\$14,223	78	High	Northgate	\$12,398	26	Low
Clairton City	\$14,044	76	High	McKeesport Area	\$12,162	23	Low
Montour	\$13,825	73	High	Pine-Richland	\$11,972	21	Low
Gateway	\$13,765	71	High	Hampton Township	\$11,971	19	Low
Chartiers Valley	\$13,741	69	High	Brentwood Borough	\$11,897	16	Low
Avonworth	\$13,652	66	Mid	Steel Valley	\$11,860	14	Low
Sto-Rox	\$13,415	64	Mid	Shaler Area	\$11,844	11	Low
Mt. Lebanon	\$13,371	61	Mid	Highlands	\$11,830	9	Low
South Fayette Twp.	\$13,339	59	Mid	Elizabeth Forward	\$11,487	7	Low
Riverview	\$13,342	57	Mid	West Jefferson Hills	\$11,322	4	Low
West Allegheny	\$13,308	54	Mid	Plum Borough	\$10,668	2	Low
North Allegheny	\$13,142	52	Mid	South Allegheny	\$10,357	0	Low
Moon Area	\$13,076	50	Mid				

Having stratified Pennsylvania's Allegheny County school districts by total per student expenditures (TE), the distribution of districts per strata follows as such. Fourteen Allegheny County school districts are categorized as having high range per student expenditures. Given the criterion for establishing TE, fourteen Allegheny County schools are categorized as having mid-range per student expenditures. Finally, fifteen of the Allegheny County school districts are categorized as having low range per student expenditures. As detailed, this study's stratification of Allegheny County school districts is framed by three categories defined by the districts' total per student expenditures. The following three tables display in total the 43 Allegheny County

school districts according to the three stratified categories based on total per student expenditures.

Table 3.2 Allegheny County School Districts, categorized by total per student expenditures based on average daily membership

Allegheny County Districts with High Total Expenditures per Average Daily Membership	Allegheny County Districts with Mid-Range Total Expenditures per Average Daily Membership	Allegheny County Districts with Low Total Expenditures per Average Daily Membership
Allegheny Valley	Avonworth	Baldwin-Whitehall
Chartiers Valley	Bethel Park	Brentwood Borough
Clairton City	Carlynton	Elizabeth Forward
Cornell	East Allegheny	Hampton Township
Deer Lakes	Mt. Lebanon	Highlands
Duquesne City	Moon Area	North Gate
Gateway	North Allegheny	McKeesport Area
Fox Chapel	North Hills	Penn Hills
Keystone Oaks	Riverview	Pine Richland
Montour	Sto-Rox	Plum Borough
Pittsburgh Public	South Fayette Township	Shaler Area
Quaker Valley	South Park	South Allegheny
Wilkesburg Borough	Upper Saint Clair	Steel Valley
Woodland Hills	West Allegheny	West Jefferson Hills
		West Mifflin

Thus, this researcher intends to draw a sample of school board members, either sitting board presidents or vice presidents, from Pennsylvania's Allegheny County who represent school districts with differing levels of per student expenditures. In order to do so, this researcher will randomly select three districts from each of the three strata identified for purposes of this study, as Tables 3.2 delineates. An introduction to the study and an invitation to participate will be sent to both the board presidents and vice-presidents of the randomly selected districts. Should both

the board president and vice president of any of the randomly chosen districts volunteer to participate, one designee of the district will be randomly selected. If neither the board president nor vice-president of any randomly chosen district elects to participate in this study, a replacement from the appropriate strata will be randomly selected to fill the void. The process of identifying study participants by strata will continue until such time as a willing participant is identified or until such time as each stratum is exhausted of possible study subjects.

Given the small sample size of study participants as defined, this researcher recognizes that the data may not be sufficient to result in robust knowledge claims. A second phase of data collection may be initiated should this researcher determine it necessary. If a second phase of interviews are to be initiated, this researcher will continue to adhere to the stratified, random purposive sampling method as defined. Therein, this researcher will randomly select one additional district from each of the three strata to participate in this study. Again, school board presidents and vice-presidents from the randomly selected districts will be introduced to the study and asked to voluntarily participate as a subject. However, should a stratum be exhausted of possible board leadership as study participants, this researcher will draw from school board members at-large given a randomly selected district from within a stratum.

3.6 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Presently, there are limitations in the extant research addressing perspectives of grantees on affiliations with the third sector's philanthropic community (Buteau et. al., 2008). Moreover, there is very little by way of knowledge claims concerning public-private partnerships framed by the perspective of school board members. Yet, it seems apparent that cross-sector engagements

stand to serve as a viable strategy by which to address the complexity of problems presently associated with public education (Acar, 2001; Colvin, 2005). Since a paucity of findings exists, there is not a clear theoretical framework to either adopt or replicate for purposes of this study. Even so, the framework for this researcher's semi-structured participant interviews is informed by the work of several researchers and scholars: Acar (2001), Goren and Wurtzel (2008) and Fleishman (2007).

Acar's (2001) study on the critical issues and challenges facing accountability in partnerships between K-12 schools and nonprofit organizations focuses on the perceptions of forty practitioners, most of whom were individuals from the third sector. Therein, Acar (2001) organizes the major issues pertaining to accountability in public-private partnerships through four lenses: perspectives, practices, problems and prospects. Thus, this researcher adopts the same four lenses by which to frame the semi-structured interview protocol used for purposes of this study.

Likewise, Goren and Wurtzel (2008) are among the few researchers to explore collaborations between urban school superintendents and foundation program officers. The findings that Goren and Wurtzel (2008) suggest as essential for ensuring strong, functional partnerships between K-12 schools and private charitable foundations are essentialized into five themes: honesty, ownership, culture, capacity and continuous learning. While it may be arguable as to whether Goren and Wurtzel's (2008) findings are complete and exhaustive, their thematic representation of findings serve this researcher as another construct by which to inform the study's research instrument. However, whereas Goren and Wurtzel (2008) speak of honesty in partnerships, this researcher refers to concepts of disclosures for purposes of this study. As Goren and Wurtzel (2008) address ownership issues, as in mutual agenda setting practices, this

researcher refers to outcomes and expectations associated with public-private partnerships. While Goren and Wurtzel (2008) thematically speak to culture, including race and class, this researcher addresses matters concerning organizational cultures. Such distinctions may seem arbitrary. Yet, this researcher is able to more broadly situate the study's semi-structured interviews, without unduly biasing participant responses, by redefining the labels associated with three of the five themes established by Goren and Wurtzel (2008).

This study's research instrument is framed by the intersection of Acar's (2001) lenses and the previously referenced themes, which are based on the findings of Goren and Wurtzel (2008). Thus, for each of the themes framed by Goren and Wurtzel (2008) an interview question is situated by one of Acar's four lenses. For example, the following series of interview questions addresses school board members' views on disclosure - a finding directly linked to the work of Goren Wurtzel (2008). Therein, this researcher superimposes a question, based on the theme of disclosure, framed by four different lenses: perspectives, practices, problems and prospects.

- 1.a) As a board member, what information would you want to see shared between schools and foundation? Why? (disclosure, situated by practices)
- 1.b) What, if anything, is the incentive for schools and foundations to share such information? (disclosure, situated by perspectives)
- 1.c) Describe what problems could result from sharing information between schools and foundations. (disclosure, situated by problems)
- 1.d) What can school and foundations do to be certain they are sharing important information with one another? (disclosure, situated by prospects)

A visually representation of the framework for this researcher’s interview questions follows (see Table 3.6).

Table 3.3 Framework for semi-structured participant interviews

	a) Perceptions	b) Practices	c) Problems	d) Prospects
1) Disclosures	Question 1.a	Question 1.b	Question 1.c	Question 1.d
2) Expectations	Question 2.a	Question 2.b	Question 2.c	Question 2.d
3) Organizational Culture	Question 3.a	Question 3.b	Question 3.c	Question 3.d
4) Capacity	Question 4.a	Question 4.b	Question 4.c	Question 4.d
5) Continuous Learning	Question 5.a	Question 5.b	Question 5.c	Question 5.d

However, in addition to the series of interview questions that fall within this researcher’s framework, all participants are asked to address two additional items.

1. I am wondering if your district has received any foundation grants since you have been on the school board.
2. Some people use the words ‘driver,’ ‘catalyst’ and ‘partner’ to describe how foundations best work with schools. Using those same words, how do you think foundations should work with school? Tell me why.

It is the last of the two interview items in which Fleishman’s (2007) scholarly work is grounded.

Fleishman (2007) argues that foundations play three different roles in modern American society: driver, partner and catalyst. Therein, the second item listed above specifically addresses school board members’ perception of how the third sectors’ philanthropic community should affiliate with public education. Thus, this study’s subjects are prompted to select driver, partner or catalyst as a term they believe best describes how foundations might approach their work with schools. In addition to selecting a term to describe the role foundations should play in such public-private relationships, the subjects are asked to explain their answer.

The interview questions used in this study are deeply rooted in constructs established by others who contributed to the discourse on public-private partnerships. As this study's interview questions are unique to this project, this researcher found it necessary to pilot the research instrument prior to its use within the field. A draft version of the interview questions was administered to four volunteers, each of whom was a school board member and/or an educator within the tri-county area. As a result of the pilot, this researcher refined the interview questions for clarity. In particular, the interview questions were revised in effort to simplify terminology and to ensure that all items scored greater than 60.0 on the Flesch Reading Ease Formula. Thus, all interview questions, were they to be read by the subjects, would be considered standard or fairly easy in terms of readability. Additionally, the pilot enabled this researcher to monitor the interviews for pragmatics, such as how long it took the subjects to complete the interviews, what strategies this researcher might employ to best facilitate the interviews and how effective this researcher was on scripting, recording and transcribing the qualitative data prior to the actual execution of the study.

In summary, this researcher found a dearth of findings specific to school board members' views on affiliations with the third sector's philanthropic community. Thus, extant literature and scholarly works were used to frame this study's research instrument. The work of Acar (2001) and Goren and Wurtzel (2008) significantly influenced the framework for this study's interview questions. Additionally, Fleishman's (2007) critique of the role of foundations in American society stands to limit the participants' selected responses for how foundations should best work with schools. This researcher's piloting of the research instrument lead to refinements of the interview protocol prior to its actual use in the field.

3.7 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

Semi-structured, in-depth subject interviews were conducted in a face-to-face setting individually selected by each of the subjects. In doing so, the following steps were followed. This researcher directly contacted potential study subjects in writing in effort to introduce the purpose of the study, explain the nature of the sampling procedure and interview methodology, describe measures to ensure confidentiality, explain the scheduling process for the interviews and inform participants how to volunteer for the study. To facilitate the written correspondence between potential interview subjects and this researcher, school board presidents and vice-presidents from the public schools in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County received the written introduction to the study via first-class mailings. The mailings were sent to potential study participants' addresses, as noted in the contact sections of the Allegheny County school districts' websites. Enclosed in the hard-copy mailings were participant response forms and pre-addressed, stamped return envelopes in which the potential subjects returned their notice to be considered as a volunteer participant in the study.

The subjects selected for the study were contacted by this researcher via email or phone, as per the preference of the participants as noted on their response form. The purpose of the contact was to facilitate the scheduling of the face-to-face interviews at location, on a date and time that accommodated each of the study's subjects. Pilot testing of the survey instrument, as previously referenced, assisted this researcher in advising the interviewees on how much time to anticipate for the administration of the interview. Data collection was completed in one session, per participant. However, no absolute time limit was imposed on the interviews. As previously stated, each face-to-face interview was audio recorded, supplemented by this researcher's field notes, and transcribed thereafter. Finally, prior to the data analysis, each interviewee was

afforded the opportunity to review a hard copy of their transcribed interview for the purpose of verifying the transcription for accuracy, clarity and meaning.

3.8 DATA ANALYSIS AND REPRESENTATION

For purposes of this study, content analysis is the method by which the interview data is examined in an effort to distill findings. Interview data are frequently subjected to review by content analysis (Krippendorff, 2004). Content analysis, commonly used by researchers in the social sciences, is a method by which to study the substance of communications. Per this method, the researcher reviews transcripts of participant interviews in which the subject's conceptions' are coded and tabulated for frequencies (Krippendorff, 2004). Glesne (1999) describes the coding procedure as a progressive process of sorting and defining. Following this reiterative coding process the researcher draws qualitative inferences. The assumption being in content analysis that words, phrases and themes most frequently referenced by the subjects point to important concepts.

Thus, this researcher held to the following rules for analyzing the study's data. For organizational purposes, this researcher established that the data analysis was to focus on the issues presented by the study's subjects, resulting from reviews of the subjects' responses situated as a series of linked cases. The coding categories for the content analysis were not determined prior to the data collection. Rather, this researcher followed an interactive and reiterative process by which categories were permitted to emerge from the data as the interviews were transcribed, sorted and organized. The frequencies of words, phrases and concepts presenting within the data were noted during the coding process. The level of generalization

permitted for the emergent coding scheme permitted words, phrases and concepts to be coded categorically, as opposed to coding words and phrases based on their exact notation within the transcriptions. Thus, translation rules were established to support the generalization of words, phrases and concepts as cases for the coding process.

Organizing the data for analysis and representation was an important consideration. This researcher advanced the content analysis using a qualitative data analysis tool, Weft QDA. The classifying, coding, search, review and query features of Weft QDA assisted in organizing the study's data for analysis. In preparing for the analysis of the data, all audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed to a written, electronic format. The transcribed files were saved as separate text documents and imported into Weft QDA. Utilizing the open-ended categorizing features of Weft QDA, the transcriptions were coded by sections, directly corresponding with each of the interview questions. All texts, coded by questions, were then linked together thus enabling this researcher to view in juxtaposition all subjects' responses by interview items. A grounded coding scheme was derived from the analysis of the reorganized data, in which categorical labels were attributed to relevant phrases and/or concepts grounded within the texts. This researcher codified the categories that emerged from the content analysis, utilizing the search, review and query functions within Weft QDA. Additionally, this researcher cross analyzed the grounded findings in relation to per-student funding levels by district.

In order to frame the presentation of findings, the grounded categories emerging from the content analysis was framed by the study's four research questions. For purposes of presenting the research findings, tables were developed situating findings within the intersection of the study's themes and categories. Findings were also identified as major and minor, with major findings being those that were expressed by a majority of the study's subjects.

3.9 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 3

The purpose of this study is to identify views held by local school board members in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County regarding affiliations with private charitable foundations supporting public education. In order to facilitate this study, this researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with a sampling of school board members from Pennsylvania's Allegheny County. A random purposive sampling was used to identify nine school board members as study subjects. The study subjects each represented a school district that was categorized as having high, mid or low range per-student expenditures based on average daily membership. As this researcher holds an interpretivist's view, the stratification of the sample was necessary to account for the context from which the school board members originated. All subject interviews were conducted face-to-face, in a location selected by each subject. Collected data was analyzed through a method commonly used by social scientists - content analysis.

4.0 FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to identify views held by local school board members in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County regarding affiliations with private charitable foundations supporting public education. This chapter presents the findings from the field research conducted during the study. The findings are organized by each of the study's four research questions, whereas the questions situate the subjects' thoughts on perspectives, practices, problems and prospects given public-private partnerships (Acar, 2001).

- 1) How do school board members perceive the roles and responsibilities of private charitable foundations in support of public elementary and secondary education? (perspectives)
- 2) What do school board members perceive as practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations? (practices)
- 3) What do school board members suggest as the most significant barriers to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations? (problems)
- 4) What do school board members suggest as means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations? (prospects)

While organized by each of the research questions, the findings from questions two, three and four are also framed by themes identified as essential to successful collaborations between schools and private charitable foundations: disclosure, expectation, organizational culture,

capacity and continuous learning (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Given the intersection of the subjects' thoughts in relation to the predetermined themes, analysis of the cases situates all findings in one of seven emergent categories: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and settings.

All findings from each of the research questions are identified as major or minor. Major findings are those in which five or more of the subjects present cases that are grounded within a category resulting from the content analysis. Minor finding are those in which four or less of the subjects present cases that are grounded within a category.

The methodology employed in this study is qualitative in nature. Thus, the use of tables in the following sections is purposively designed to illustrate the findings in relation to the categories that emerged as a result of the content analysis. However, the tables are not suggestive of quantitatively derived findings.

4.1 PROFILE OF THE PARTICIPANTS

This researcher contacted eighty-eight potential subjects in writing. Forty-three of the potential subjects were the school board presidents from Allegheny County's public schools while the remaining 45 potential subjects were the corresponding school board vice-presidents. In response to the invitation to participate in the study, fourteen potential subjects indicated they were willing to be interviewed, five potential subjects declined the invitation to participate in the study and 69 potential subjects did not respond to the written invitation. Of the fourteen potential subjects who volunteered to participate in the study, six represented districts with high total expenditures (TE) per average daily membership (ADM), three represented districts with

mid-range TE per ADM and five represented low TE per ADM. As the study required three subjects from each of the three strata of the random purposive sample, it was necessary to randomly select study participants from among those who volunteered from districts with high and low TE per ADM. All three volunteers from districts with mid-range TE per ADM were accepted into the study without further need for random selection.

Of the nine subjects selected to participate in this study, five were board presidents and four were board vice presidents (see Table 4.1). Four of the nine study subjects stated that they had prior experiences as a school board member in a district that has been the recipient of a grant made available by at least one private charitable foundation.

Table 4.1 Profile of Participants

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Demographics:		
		Board President	Board Vice- President	Prior Grant Experience
High	1	0	1	0
	2	1	0	0
	3	1	0	1
Mid-range	4	1	0	1
	5	0	1	0
	6	0	1	1
Low	7	1	0	0
	8	1	0	0
	9	0	1	1
Total		5	4	4

4.2 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVATE CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

Several questions in the study's interview protocol focus on bringing forward the perceptions held by school board members as they relate to affiliations between public schools and private charitable foundations. However, in order to address the study's first research question, findings are drawn from two targeted interview items.

- 1) What responsibility do foundations have in supporting public education? (general, situated by perspectives)
- 4) Some people use the words driver, catalyst and partner to describe how foundations best work with schools. Using those same words, how do you think foundations should work with schools? Tell me why.

The review of findings in the following sub-sections frames the subjects' views on the third sectors' roles and responsibilities for public schooling.

4.2.1 Supports for General Social Outcomes

Slightly over half of the participants in this study situate their views on the responsibilities of private charitable foundations in supporting public education by speaking to their perceptions of foundations' broader civic imperatives. In total, five (56%) of the nine subjects specifically address issues concerning the third sector's potential to support general social outcomes. Public education is referenced by the subjects within the scope of general social outcomes and is thus presented as a major finding.

In thirteen separate instances throughout the course of the interviews, five subjects speak of broad social supports as an imperative of the third sector. Given these cases, the subjects' references to general social outcomes serve to situate perspectives concerning the third sector's accountability for public education. Upon further examination of the subjects' thoughts on

general social outcomes, three minor categories emerge in the analysis of the texts: inform, improve and invest (see Table 4.2).

Table 4. 2 Categorical frequencies of subjects' references to foundations' responsibility to support general social outcomes

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Categories:			Total by Subject	Total by Strata
		Inform	Improve	Invest		
High	1	0	0	1	1	3
	2	0	0	0	0	
	3	0	2	0	2	
Mid-range	4	2	2	2	6	8
	5	1	0	1	2	
	6	0	0	0	0	
Low	7	0	0	0	0	2
	8	0	2	0	2	
	9	0	0	0	0	
Total		3	6	4	13	13

The first category, inform, relates to the subjects' belief that private charitable foundations have the responsibility to direct, influence or shape work within communities of interest. In particular, one subject's comment on the issue succinctly illustrates this point.

I think the foundation should be supporting where they want society to go
(Subject #5).

With respect to the second category, improve, the subjects' comments relate to the third sector's accountability to support or affect community enhancements. Subject response cases that conceptually align with improvements do not offer examples of civic improvements beyond that which suggests broad outcomes, including but not limited to educational outcomes. The responses that are grounded by this category are plain in asserting that foundations stand to contribute to social wellbeing.

I think that foundations can be...an attribute to the community...and could come into the community as well as the school. And, I think that would benefit not just the school population but the community itself (Subject #8).

The final category, invest, points to the establishment or empowerment of third sector supports that stand to bolster people or institutions within communities of interest. For example: “[With] issues of society, [foundations] see where they can help out where people are not getting resources” (Subject #4).

Given unique subject cases, at least one board member from each of the three strata of the random purposive sampling make reference to private charitable foundations’ support for social outcomes. Of those subjects, two represent districts with high total expenditures (TE) per average daily student membership (ADM), two represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and one represent a district with low TE per ADM.

It is worth noting that of the five subjects who identified that foundations stand to support social outcomes, only one study participant provides a justification for the imperative. Central to the subject’s rationale is the belief that societal changes over time have disadvantaged children and youth reared in the 21st century. However, this subject provides no additional detail as to the types of disadvantages that are inherently faced by today’s younger generation.

4.2.2 Supports for Public Education, Non-Financial

Six (67%) of the nine study participants speak of third sector accountabilities for elementary and secondary education by framing educational concerns that are not otherwise explicitly linked to school funding. Issues addressing non-financial support of public schooling present in thirteen separate instances throughout the course of the interviews. Cases in which the subjects speak of

non-financial, third sector supports for schooling present as a major finding and are once again framed by the following minor categories: inform, improve and invest (see Table 4.3).

Table 4. 3 Categorical frequencies of subjects' references to foundations' non-financial responsibility to support public education

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Categories:			Total by Subject	Total by Strata
		Inform	Improve	Invest		
High	1	0	0	2	2	5
	2	0	2	1	3	
	3	0	0	0	0	
Mid-range	4	0	0	3	3	7
	5	1	0	0	1	
	6	0	0	3	3	
Low	7	0	0	0	0	1
	8	0	1	0	1	
	9	0	0	0	0	
Total		1	3	9	13	13

The following excerpt from Subject #5 is featured as an extension of the first category - inform. This reference speaks directly to the way in which private charitable foundations stand to inform the work of public education.

If [foundations] think more people should be working in a certain industry, then they should support that within schools. Or, if they think a particular attitude should be prevalent in youth, then they should be supporting that (Subject #5).

The second category is similarly developed. Given the concept of improvement, the subjects hold a presumption that foundations' play a role in addressing issues specific to concerns about the quality of public education. In the following case, for example, a subject situates an implied responsibility for foundations to address school reform.

I don't want lower standards. The higher the standard could be the better our kids are going to be (Subject #2).

Lastly, in nine separate occasions across four specific subject cases, references are made to foundations' investments in public education. Plainly stated:

I mean education is an investment in the future of our society. And so to the extent the foundations can contribute to help us make a better investment, you know, I think it's very worthwhile (Subject #6).

Subjects representing each of the strata from the random purposive sampling speak of supports for public education as a likely imperative for private charitable foundations. Of the subjects speaking to these issues, two represent districts with high TE per ADM, three represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and one represents a district with low TE per ADM.

It is worth noting that the justification of the third sectors' responsibility to support public schooling, exclusive of concepts directly linked to donor funding, presents in only one subject's case. The explanation in this case explicitly points to the moral obligation of private charitable foundations to support public schooling. Subject #5 speaks to this concept of moral obligation in five separate occasions throughout the course of the interview.

4.2.3 Supports for Public Education, Financial

Six (67%) of the nine study participants speak directly to foundations' responsibility to financially support public education. Such references are noted on eleven different occasions thorough out the interviews and are thus presented as a major finding. Again, the following categories are used ground the subjects' responses: inform, improve and invest (see Table 4.4).

Unlike the findings from the preceding two sub-sections, there are no cases in which the subjects address views concerning the intersection between financial supports and the third sector's responsibility to either inform or improve public schooling. Rather, when speaking of educational funding, the subjects are clear in stating the appropriateness of foundations' financial

investment in public education. Thus, direct financial investments in schools, as opposed to indirect financial investment used to inform or improve schooling, presents as a major finding.

Table 4. 4 Frequencies of subjects' references to foundations' financial responsibility for public education

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Categories:			Total by Subject	Total by Strata
		Inform	Improve	Invest		
High	1	0	0	1	1	5
	2	0	0	2	2	
	3	0	0	2	2	
Mid-range	4	0	0	2	2	2
	5	0	0	0	0	
	6	0	0	0	0	
Low	7	0	0	2	2	4
	8	0	0	2	2	
	9	0	0	0	0	
Total		0	0	11	11	11

Plain language concerning the subjects' views is typified in the following three examples.

Subject #8, "I think that foundations can be used as an alternate funding source. Subject #7, "I think you look for foundations to provide additional resources for programs."

I think foundations have a resource, again, which is money wherever they get it. And, if they see because of the situation of education [in] Pennsylvania not being funded like it should be...[they should help the] communities and people (Subject #4).

Again, based on the analysis, there are no subject cases addressing third sector funding for purposes of informing or improving education. Rather, the focus of the subjects' statements suggests that foundations should consider financial investments in public education, without extending voice as to how the investment could inform or improve outcomes. In fact, subject responses imply that when donor funds are used to invest in the prospects of public schooling,

latitude on the use of the funds should remain at that discretion of the schools. For example, Subject #2 gives voice to this matter.

Give us a little leeway and don't tie our hands. I don't want to get monies and not be able to use them (Subject #2).

Similarly, Subject #6 also speaks to this matter; however, less directly.

You know what, as a district, we want to be able to run this program; but, we don't need [the foundation] looking over our shoulder (Subject #6).

Of the subjects addressing issues concerning third sector funding for public education, three represent districts with high TE per ADM, one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

Justifications situating the subjects' views on the third sectors' financial accountability to schools are grounded by the following minor categories: general, state or local-level educational funding deficits. In fifteen separate cases, the subjects speak directly to financial shortfalls as a means to justify affiliations with private charitable foundations (see Table 4.5). Eight of the fifteen cases rationalizing investment of third sector's dollars in public education are grounded in board members' concern over local educational funding deficits. Four of the fifteen cases justifying the third sectors' direct investment in schools are grounded in concerns stemming from general funding deficits. All remaining cases are grounded by concerns resulting from state-level funding deficits.

Table 4. 5 Frequencies of subjects’ references to funding deficits as a justification of foundations’ financial support for public education

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	General Funding Deficits	State – Level Funding Deficits	Local – Level Funding Deficits	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	1	0	0	1	5
	2	0	0	4	4	
	3	0	0	0	0	
Mid-range	4	1	3	1	4	5
	5	0	0	0	0	
	6	0	0	0	0	
Low	7	2	0	3	5	5
	8	0	0	0	0	
	9	0	0	0	0	
Total		4	3	8	15	15

4.2.4 How Foundations Should Work With Schools

The three preceding subsections unpack the subjects’ views on the responsibilities of private charitable foundations to inform, improve and invest in social outcomes and, in particular, public education. Yet, the subjects’ views on how the third sector should advance this responsibility also need to be examined. Analysis of the subjects’ views on how private charitable foundations should work with schools brings to light their preference for engagement through partnerships.

Eight (89%) of the nine subjects explicitly speak to their preference for foundations to approach public schools as partners (see Table 4.6). Thus, the third sector’s role as partner presents as a major finding.

Table 4. 6 Subjects' views of foundations' roles in support of public education

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Categories:		
		Driver	Partner	Catalyst
High	1	0	1	0
	2	0	1	0
	3	0	1	0
Mid-range	4	0	1	0
	5	0	1	0
	6	0	1	0
Low	7	0	1	0
	8	0	1	0
	9	1	0	0
Total		1	8	0

Stated in a subject's own words,

I don't want [foundations] to have full control. It's got to be a partnership. It's got to be what they expect, what we want, and what we expect. And, it's got to be a two way street (Subject #2).

Whereas Subject #2 speaks to the concept of partnering with the third sector, Subject #3 conceptually emphasizes the same point by framing the importance of shared work between donor and recipient.

I think that we should be working together, in tandem, so that [we] can both meet [our] objectives and work together (Subject #3).

Members of all strata of the random purposive sampling explicitly identify their preference for foundations to assume the role of partner when engaging education. Of these subjects, three represent districts with high TE per ADM, three represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

The subjects speak of their preference for the third sector to partner in effort to inform, improve and invest in education. However, only three subjects were able to explain what they

mean in terms of partnering. In examining the subjects' explanations, the following two minor categories emerge as findings: shared decision making and mutual benefit (see Table 4.7).

Table 4. 7 Subjects' views of partnerships with foundations

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Categories:				Total by Subject	Total by Strata
		Shared Decision Making	Mutual Benefit				
High	1	0	0		0		
	2	2	2		4		5
	3	0	1		1		
Mid-range	4	0	0		0		
	5	0	0		0		0
	6	0	0		0		
Low	7	0	0		0		
	8	1	0		1		1
	9	0	0		0		
Total		3	3		6		6

While several subjects explain what they believed to be salient aspects of partnerships, one subject suggests a present risk. The risk, in this case, is associated with the concept of dependency.

If you're going to partner with the foundation, the school might be too dependent on them (Subject #6).

However, further analysis of all cases reveals that the subjects perceive greater potential for risk when the third sector assumes a role in which they drive investments in education for the purpose of informing or improving outcomes (see Table 4.8). In ten separate occasions six subjects, representing all levels of the random purposive sampling, speak of problems where foundations function as drivers. Thus, the risk of foundations operating as drivers presents as a major finding. As an example, the following is highlighted.

School boards would be giving up some of their decision making if it were to be run or driven by a foundation and I think that [is] not for me, personally (Subject #8).

Likewise:

If there was too much foundation directing too much in the direction that they would want to go, then that is manipulative. It is a risk. You never want anyone to fully have too much control over what goes on in schools (Subject #5).

However, no references are made to the potential risk associated with role of the third sector serving as a catalyst to inform, improve or invest in educational outcomes.

Table 4. 8 Frequencies of subjects' references to risks associated with foundation's role in support of public education

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Categories:		
		Partner	Driver	Catalyst
High	1	0	0	0
	2	0	2	0
	3	0	1	0
Mid-range	4	0	0	0
	5	0	1	0
	6	1	2	0
Low	7	0	3	0
	8	0	1	0
	9	0	0	0
Total		1	10	0

4.2.5 Summary: Roles and Responsibilities of Private Charitable Foundations

The first research question this study seeks to address targets the subjects' perspectives on the roles and responsibilities of private charitable foundations supporting public education.

- 1) How do school board members perceive the roles and responsibilities of private charitable foundations in support of public elementary and secondary education?

Given the following summary of findings, results are situated as either major or minor. Major findings are those which are derived from five or more subject cases situated within a category emerging from the content analysis. Minor finding are those in which four or less subjects present cases grounded by a category.

Specific to the role of private foundations, eight of the nine study subjects believe that foundations should approach public education as a partner for cross sector work. Thus, the subjects' suggestion that foundations should approach public education as a partner is a major finding of this study. Minor findings suggest that such partnerships include aspects of mutual benefit and shared decision-making.

In contrast, one subject suggests that the role of foundations is to serve as a driver of cross sector work, while no subjects speak to foundations as catalysts for change. However, the subjects speak of risks with respect to foundations' potential to drive public-private partnerships. Risks associated with foundations operating as drivers presents as a major finding in this study.

With respect to third sector responsibilities for supporting public education, several major and minor findings are identified. The first major finding situates the subjects' belief that foundations have an imperative to support public education based on their broader responsibility to improve general social outcomes in their communities of interest. Given the suggested imperative to support general social outcomes, minor findings position the work of the third sector to purposively inform change, improve efforts and/or financially support communities of interest. The second major finding suggests that the subjects' hold no ambiguity over the responsibilities foundations hold for public education in ways that are not otherwise explicitly

tied to financial supports. In other words, the subjects believe that the third sector needs to impart understandings and technical assistance that stands to benefit public education. Minor findings frame the subjects' beliefs that the third sector can support public education through non-financial means by way of informing, improving and advancing school improvement efforts. The third major finding clearly suggests that foundations are responsible for financially supporting public education. In fact, the subjects view foundations' investments in public education as a direct responsibility. Given the subject cases, there is no discussion of third sector funds being used to inform agendas for school change or to leverage work to effect school improvement. Rather, as a major finding, all cases suggest that foundations should directly invest funds in public schools to support public schools.

Thus, major subject findings position foundations to support general social outcomes, including direct and indirect invests in public education. However, a minor finding suggests a rationale, given the subjects' thoughts on this responsibility. Four of the subjects discuss foundations' support of public education in response to general, state and/or local funding deficits.

No significant response pattern, in relation to the first research question, is attributed to the subjects' representation of districts with high, mid-range and low total student expenditures by daily average membership.

4.3 PRACTICES ESSENTIAL TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

The preceding findings situate the subjects' views on the role and responsibilities of the third sector in advancing supports for public education when affiliating with schools. To complement those findings, this section speaks to the practices the subjects view as essential to cross sector

partnerships. Thus, the following findings stand to address this study's second research question.

- 2) What do school board members perceive as practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

Herein, the focus on essential practices intersects the following themes: disclosure, expectations, organizational culture, capacity and continuous learning (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). As a result of the analysis of subject cases within these intersections, the following categories ground the subjects' views: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and settings.

Aims refer to matters concerning the core missions of educational entities and private charitable foundations. Assumptions refer to the resulting work and anticipated outcomes associated with affiliations between private charitable foundations and public schools. Agendas refer to underlying ideological plans that stand to influence the work in which foundations and public schools engage. Agreements refer to meaning making processes in which assumptions of shared work are made clear, including both written and verbal communications. Assets refer to the financing and budgetary implications of shared work. Staffing refers to personnel committed to support public-private partnerships. Settings refer to the social, political and/or economic contexts of the entities.

4.3.1 Essential Practices Concerning Disclosure

All of the participants in this study hold views concerning disclosure as a practice necessary to support affiliations with private charitable foundations. In thirty-seven separate instances throughout the course of the interviews the subjects speak of the need to share information between donor and recipient. Given the subjects' focus on disclosure, five overarching

categories emerged in the analysis of the texts: aims, assumptions, agendas, assets, and settings (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning disclosure

		Categories:						
Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Assets	Settings	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	1	0	2	2	0	5	16
	2	1	1	2	1	3	8	
	3	2	1	0	0	0	3	
Mid-range	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
	5	1	1	2	1	0	5	
	6	1	0	1	0	2	4	
Low	7	2	0	0	1	0	3	11
	8	2	1	0	2	0	5	
	9	1	2	0	0	0	3	
Total		11	6	7	8	5	37	37

4.3.1.1 The Practice of Disclosure of Aims

Eight (89%) of the subjects make reference to the importance of reporting the overarching aim or mission of the affiliating organizations. Such references present as a major finding and are noted in eleven separate cases in which the subjects speak of the importance for both schools and foundations to share with one another the core tenants of their organizational purposes. From the schools' perspectives, "[foundations] need to know what the priorities are for the district" (Subject #8). Conversely, private charitable foundations need to share with their affiliates the intent of their social charter.

Well, I would want to know the mission statement of the foundation and what their objectives were for working with us or wanting to work with us (Subject #8).

Likewise, “what are the goals and objectives of the foundation” (Subject #1)? Of the eight subjects addressing the practice of disclosing organizational missions, visions, goals and/or objectives, three represent districts with high TE per ADM, three represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.3.1.2 The Practice of Disclosure of Assumptions

Five (56%) of the nine subjects speak to the importance of disclosing assumptions of cross sector relationships. Assumptions refer to the resulting work and anticipated outcomes associated with affiliations between private charitable foundations and public schools. Disclosure of assumptions, which presents as a major study finding, is noted in six occurrences throughout the course of the five subjects’ interviews. Plainly framed:

Both sides need to be serious about what they are doing and need to be completely open about what they are after (Subject #9).

Similarly, “...both parties need to know the expectations” (Subject #5). Of the five subjects who address the practice of disclosing assumptions of the partnership, two represent districts with high TE per ADM, one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.3.1.3 The Practice of Disclosure of Agendas

Four (45%) of the nine subjects speak to the importance of disclosing information between partners that may otherwise stand to influence or bias the work in which foundations and public schools might engage. For purposes of this study, the practice of disclosing agendas presents as a minor finding. Thus, slightly less than half of the subjects feel that an essential practice in

establishing cross sector relationships is the upfront, honest release of information that would suggest possible political or social biases that could influence shared work. For example, Subject #5 speaks to this matter in a brief, concise manner.

What is the political context? What does the foundation want to get out of [the relationship], really (Subject #5)?

Similarly, Subject #1 extends the practice of divulging agendas by sharing a theoretical scenario that explicates a risk if the practice were not followed.

I would not feel comfortable partnering with an organization, a foundation, no matter what their level of interest was if the majority donor was the Klu Klux Klan, for example. So, I mean that would be something that I would want some knowledge of from a foundation perspective (Subject #1).

In the seven cases in which disclosure of agendas is addressed, there are no occasions in which the subjects speak of the need for public schools to divulge such information. Rather, the subjects place the expectation of disclosure on the third sector. Of the four subjects who address the practice of disclosing motivations or agendas, two represent districts with high TE per ADM, two represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and zero represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.3.1.4 The Practice of Disclosure of Assets

For purposes of this study, the practice of disclosing information about assets presents as a major finding. Six (67%) of the nine subjects, representing all strata of the random purposive sampling, discuss the need for cross sector partners to share information concerning organizational and project funding. In total, there are eight distinct cases in which the practice of sharing financial information is referenced. For instance, “I would want to know from a foundation where some of their dollars come from” (Subject #1).

However, only two of the eight cases speak to disclosure of project specific funding.

I just want to know basically the amount of the [project] money so that if somebody comes to me and asks me, [I would know] (Subject #4).

I would also, probably, like to know a little bit about [the foundation's] budget, their current operating budget, to make sure they have what they say they have to sustain any projects that we would get into (Subject #8).

4.3.1.5 The Practice of Disclosure of Settings

Matters concerning the disclosure of information about the settings in which shared work may take place situate as a minor finding of the study. Two (23%) of the nine subjects present a total of five references concerning the practice of sharing information relevant to setting. In these situations, setting refers to the social, economic, geographic and/or political contexts of affiliating entities. To further unpack meaning given these cases, the following quote from Subject #2 categorically illustrates the construct of setting.

I think [the foundation] needs to know the climate here in [my district]. It's made up of three communities (Subject #2).

However, setting also applies to a broader context.

We are talking public education, here. And, it's almost like the foundation needs to understand that if you are giving money to a public school there are certain things that you are not going to do. There [are] places you are not going to go. There are certain things you are not going to be able to just specify. And, [you need] an understanding of what the school code says (Subject #6).

Of the subjects speaking to the practice of sharing information about settings, all cases speak of the importance of private charitable foundations understanding school contexts. No references were made concerning the practice of foundations sharing with their partners the context in which the foundations implement their social charter.

No voice concerning this matter is expressed by a subject representing a district with low TE per ADM. The cases presented herein are provided by subjects representing districts with high and mid-range TE per ADM.

4.3.2 Essential Practices Concerning Expectations

All of the participants in this study hold views concerning expectations inherent to affiliations with private charitable foundations. In twenty-four separate instances throughout the course of the interviews the subjects speak of their expectations and, in many cases, present suggested practices that address their expectations of cross sector affiliations. Given the subjects' focus on expectations, three overarching categories emerged in the analysis of the texts: assumptions, agreements, and staffing (see Table 4.10).

Table 4. 10 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning expectations

Categories:						
Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Assumptions	Agreements	Staffing	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	2	1	0	3	9
	2	3	0	0	3	
	3	2	0	1	3	
Mid-range	4	1	1	0	2	7
	5	2	0	2	4	
	6	1	0	0	1	
Low	7	0	1	0	1	8
	8	1	2	2	5	
	9	2	0	0	2	
Total		14	5	5	24	24

4.3.2.1 The Practice of Defining Expectations and Assumptions

Eight (89%) of the nine study participants speak of expectations concerning the work associated with cross sector projects and such projects' subsequent outcomes. Expectations of this nature are categorically referred to as assumptions and are thus situated as a major finding. The subjects' cases that address expectations present in fourteen instances throughout the interviews. However, the cases are broadly grounded by assumptions of cross sector work. Thus, it is necessary to further ground the cases by the following sub-categories: planning, implementation, oversight and results (see Table 4.11).

Table 4.11 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning expectations by assumptions

		Sub-categories:							
Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Planning	Implementation	Oversight	Results	Total by Subject	Total by Strata		
High	1	1	0	1	1	3			
	2	0	2	0	0	2		7	
	3	2	0	0	0	2			
Mid-range	4	0	1	0	0	1			
	5	0	0	2	0	2		4	
	6	0	0	1	0	1			
Low	7	0	0	0	0	0			
	8	0	1	0	0	1		3	
	9	1	0	0	1	2			
Total		3	4	4	2	14		14	

Three subjects speak clearly about their expectation that the assumptions, or aspects of cross sector work, are planned and detailed. Thus, planning categorically presents as a minor finding. To illustrate planning as a sub-category, the following case is featured from among the four cases noted.

Well, [we] have to have a plan. How are [we] going to execute that plan? You know, the: how, why, when and time frame. All those things, and what would be realistic [needs to be addressed]. And, how are we going to get there (Subject #3)?

Such views are expressed by subjects that represent districts with both high and low TE per ADM. No subjects from districts with mid-range TE per ADM speak of the importance of planning as a core practice of affiliations between schools and foundations.

In four different cases, three subjects also reference implementation of cross sector work. Again, this sub-category presents as a minor finding. An example is drawn from Subject #2 in order to explicate implementation as a sub-category of assumptions and expectations. Subject #2 simply states that partners need to “do it the way you planned it and put it together.” As least one subject from each of the strata of the random purposive sample speak to the fidelity of implementation of cross-sector work.

Three subjects highlight oversight as an essential practice and expectation of shared work. Again, this sub-category presents as a minor finding. However, Subjects # 2, #5 and #6 provide four cases that emphasize the importance of reporting structures that include, but are not limited to oversight committees and/or individuals responsible for the documentation of financial expenditures and findings related to project outcomes. Two the subjects presenting these cases represent a district with mid-range TE per AMD. The remaining single subject speaking of this matter represents a district with high TE per ADM.

Lastly, Subjects #1 and #9 caution that it is reasonable to expect that not all outcomes “might turn out to be exactly what [was planned] for” (Subject #9). Moreover, if the work does not result in the assumed outcomes, the subjects suggest that there is still merit to the affiliation.

[Foundations] have to expect success and failure with regard to whatever type of situation [we] may be working on, together... We have to expect that we will both grow (Subject #1).

Thus, a standing practice concerning the assumptions of cross sector affiliations is to anticipate varied outcomes and to learn from the outcomes, irrespective of whether the results evidenced are anticipated. Herein, results categorically presents as a minor finding. Of the two subjects framing this issue, one each represents a district with high and low TE per ADM.

4.3.2.2 The Practice of Defining Expectations and Agreements

Matters concerning expectations and agreements situate as a minor finding of the study. Nearly half (45%) of the study’s participants expect that operational agreements be established beyond static, contractual documents. The means identified by the subjects by which to clarify agreements conceptually align with open, clear, on-going communication.

I would expect that we had someone that we could talk to.....I see that [agreements are] something that needs to be worked out and communicated (Subject #8).

Likewise, another example to illustrate this theme follows.

I think that communication is a reasonable expectation on both parts (Subject #1).

Of the subjects speaking to expectations for establishing agreements, one represents a district with high TE per ADM, one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM, and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.3.2.3 The Practice of Defining Expectations and Staffing

Matters concerning expectations and staffing presents as a minor finding within this study. In five separate instances three (34%) of the nine subjects speak of their expectations of staffing to support cross sector work. In these cases the subjects' expectations are clear - staffs need to be identified and committed to cross sector projects. Subject #3 identifies alignment of staffing as a priority for successful partnerships with the third sector.

I think that's the number one thing. You have to have somebody that's doing the day-to-day work, every day, even if it is for half a day, every day (Subject #3).

Moreover, Subject #5 extends this issue by signifying the importance of consistency with staffing.

If you are [administering] a project and one week you are dealing with one person, and the next week you are dealing with somebody else, then it is not consistent (Subject #5).

One member from each of the strata of the random purposive sample speaks of expectations concerning staffing.

4.3.3 Essential Practices Concerning Organizational Culture

In twelve cases, seven (78%) of the nine subjects discuss matters concerning practices that can lead to understandings of organizational aims and settings (see Table 4.12). The following subsections unpack the implications of practices supporting cultural understanding.

Table 4.12 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning organizational culture

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Aims	Settings	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	0	1	1	8
	2	1	3	4	
	3	0	3	3	
Mid-range	4	0	1	1	2
	5	0	0	0	
	6	1	0	1	
Low	7	0	2	2	2
	8	0	0	0	
	9	0	0	0	
Total		2	10	12	12

4.3.3.1 The Practice of Considering Organizational Culture and Aims

Two (23%) of the nine subject in this study reference practices that relate to bridging cultural divides that could result from the differing missions, visions, purposes, goals and/or objectives of foundations and schools. Thus, the consideration of practices situated by aims constitutes a minor finding of the study. A response taken from Subject #6, which is presented as follows, reinforces the need for understanding that which informs aims of cross sector partners.

[We] probably need to know something about each other's cultures. And, in a lot of ways we don't really know that until you have the opportunity to become an insider (Subject #6).

Subject #6 suggests that understandings are derived from "firsthand experiences" that are acquired from operating within the paradigm of the partnering entity. However, Subject #2 advances this matter differently. Instead of firsthand experience, Subject #2 states that

investigation into the stated aims of the partnering entity is a strategy by which to develop a better cultural understanding of the cross sector partner.

Our administration [should be] reading [the foundation's] mission statement and finding out who is on [the foundation's] board (Subject #2).

Of the two study participants who voice practices concerning the understanding of private-public partners' aims, one represents a district with high TE per ADM and one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM.

4.3.3.2 The Practice of Considering Organizational Culture and Settings

Practices addressing organizational culture and settings represent a major study finding. Five (56%) of the nine study subjects hold views associated with organizational culture that are grounded by the concept of settings. Again, settings refer to social, political and/or economic context of the entity. Broadly framed:

A foundation really needs to understand what the district needs are and understand how to meet those needs [instead of] trying to impose their will or their desire (Subject #1).

In this case, Subject #1 infers general implications for practices that are intended to achieve more robust understandings of partners and bolster cross sector relationships. However, Subject #1 offers no specific examples of how such practices may be enacted. Unlike the prior case, Subject #4 speaks with more specificity concerning the political aspects of settings for cross sector work.

Know the players. You've got to know who you're dealing with. I don't care who it is. I'm not saying [you need to] to play down and dirty; but, you have to know what the interests are. You have to know where they're coming from (Subject #4).

As a final illustration of the intersection of culture and setting, Subject #7 speaks of diversity.

I think from a foundation perspective, they really, truly need to understand the diversity of the school district they are going into (Subject #7).

Although the only study participant who speaks of diversity, Subject #7 does not define, in either an implicit or explicit manner, the meaning of diversity.

In total, there are ten cases in which the subjects' reference practices concerning organizational culture and setting. Of the cases, eight are expressed by the three subjects who represent districts with high TE per ADM, one case is expressed by a subject representing a district with mid-range TE per ADM and one case is expressed by a subject representing a district with low TE per ADM.

4.3.4 Essential Practices Concerning Capacity

All study participants identify with capacity related concerns as essential elements of affiliations between schools and private charitable foundations. In twenty-one separate cases throughout the course of the interview, the subjects speak of means by which to ensure that capacity to execute cross sector work, based on project-related assumptions, is codified. In grounding the subjects' responses concerning practices associated with capacity, all comments fall within the following three categories: agreements, assets and staffing (see Table 4.13).

Table 4.13 Frequencies of subjects' references to essential practices concerning capacity

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	0	0	1	1	5
	2	0	1	1	2	
	3	0	0	2	2	
Mid-range	4	0	0	1	1	9
	5	1	1	1	3	
	6	0	3	2	5	
Low	7	0	2	1	3	9
	8	0	1	3	4	
	9	0	0	2	2	
Total		1	8	14	23	23

4.3.4.1 The Practice of Considering Capacity and Agreements

While it is recognized that the concept of agreements reoccurs as a theme throughout this study's findings, there is only one occasion in which it situates given capacity-related practices. That is to say, Subject #5 speaks to the practice of communicating beyond the limits of a contractual document to ensure that both donor and recipient have the capacity to execute the terms of their shared work.

The school district needs to know if a foundation is going to be able to be consistent with follow-through. The foundation needs to know if there is going to be follow-through with the school district, consistent with the guidelines (Subject #5).

Thus, considerations of practices categorically intersecting capacity and agreements present as a minor finding in this study. The single subject presenting this view represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM.

4.3.4.2 The Practice of Considering Capacity and Assets

In considering capacity for cross sector work, a greater focus appears to be framed by financial considerations. Half of the study subjects (56%) address budgetary concerns as they relate to cross sector projects. Thus, matters concerning practices associated with capacity and assets presents as a major finding. As described by the subjects, capacity in relation to assets affects both the immediacy of project implementation as well as long range preparedness for sustaining projects over time. For example, Subject #7 speaks to a district's financial readiness to engage in cross sector work.

From a school district perspective, capacity wise, they have to give the foundation supports to do this project. So, resources, things along that line....The school district have to absorb the cost for the long term (Subject #7).

Similarly:

If receiving this money requires some sort of contribution from the district, [then] certainly the financial aspects need to be on board (Subject #6).

Short term implications are also spelled out by the subjects. Simply stated, the subjects speak of the importance in assessing whether there "is enough in the budget to fulfill the project" (Subject #8). Of the five subjects addressing practices concerning budgetary capacities, one subject represents a district with high TE per ADM, two subjects represent districts with mid-range TE per AMD and two subjects represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.3.4.3 The Practice of Considering Capacity and Staffing

Given all matters concerning capacity, issues concerning staffing are the most commonly referenced. All subjects speak to the practice of examining staff capacity to execute cross sector work. Thus, practices addressing capacity and staffing result as a major finding of this study. In examining the fourteen cases addressing staffing capacity, two distinct types of practices present.

First, the subjects bring to light the importance of examining the expertise of staff to implement programming associated with shared work. Five of the fourteen cases address staff capabilities. Four of the five cases speak to assessing the expertise of foundations' staff to support the implementation of donor funded projects, without any reference being made to the capabilities of school personnel. All remaining cases concerning capacity and staffing relate to the importance of having enough personnel positioned to execute cross sector projects.

[We] need to make sure that the actual foundation actually has the staff to [engage in the project]....We actually need to have the staff to complete and uphold any agreement or contract that we enter into with a foundation (Subject #8).

As all subjects gave voice to this matter, representation from all strata of the random purposive sample is equal.

4.3.5 Essential Practices Concerning Continuous Learning

The nine subjects interviewed do not discuss views on practices that support continuous learning.

4.3.6 Summary: Practices Essential to Public-Private Partnerships

The second research question this study seeks to address targets the subjects' thoughts about practices that are essential to affiliations with the third sector.

- 2) What do school board members perceive as practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

The findings, given this research question, are situated within the following grounded categories emerging from the content analysis: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and setting (see Table 4.14). This summary situates the finding as either major or minor.

Table 4.14 Number of subjects addressing essential practices of public-private partnerships by categories

		Categories:						
		Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Settings
Themes:	Disclosure	8	5	4	0	6	0	2
	Expectations	0	8	0	4	0	3	0
	Organizational Culture	2	0	0	0	0	5	0
	Capacity	0	0	0	1	5	9	0
	Continuous Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The first major finding identifies the significance of practices that ensure the capacity of cross sector partners to engage in cross sector work. Such practices include considerations that address both the staffing of projects with sufficient quantities of personnel as well as ensuring that those assigned to support the shared work have the requisite skills to successfully execute the assumptions of the public-private partnership.

The second major finding identifies practices that emphasize the importance of clarifying expectations of assumptions for cross sector. Such practices include setting expectations for project planning, implementation and oversight as well as the determination of reasonable results. However, such actions, in and of themselves, are minor findings as no single set of actions are framed by a majority of the subjects. Rather, only when all actions are aggregated as expectations of project assumptions does the finding situate as a major consideration.

The third major finding situates the disclosure of aims as practices essential for successful public-private partnerships. Such disclosure confirms the importance of partnering entities being made aware of one another's' "goals and objectives" (Subject #1).

The fourth major finding addresses the disclosure of assets as it impacts cross sector work. Given the subjects' perspectives, it is important to understand the fiscal solvency of private partners in order to ascertain whether the third sector is able to sustain their financial commitments to shared work. Additionally, the subjects voice interest in understanding where foundations receive the funding they use to execute their social charters. Both issues of solvency and sources of funding apply only to partners engaging schools and districts.

The fifth major finding resulting from the analysis of subjects' cases speaks to the importance of cross sector partners understanding one another's organizational culture as impacted by the settings in which they operate. In such cases, the subjects indicate that partners need to recognize the people, the needs and the diversity of the affiliating public-private entities.

The sixth major finding addresses matters that concern the financial capacities of public-private partners to advance work in support of public education. For purposes of this study, these matters categorically situate as those pertaining to assets. Of importance to the subjects are practices that ensure that funding for cross sector work is secured and that in-kind fiscal and non-fiscal contributions are confirmed before engaging in shared work.

The last major finding relates to disclosing the assumptions of cross sector affiliations between partners. Specifically, the subjects state that "both parties need to know the expectations" (Subject #5). Thus, the subjects speak to the practice of sharing information between schools and foundations that situates their understandings of the work entailed in the partnership as well as the outcomes that are anticipated as a result of the shared work.

In total, there are seven major finding that address practices that school board members perceive as essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations. Again, the major practices include the following:

- 1) ensuring capacity of staffing to support cross sector work;
- 2) clarifying expectations of the assumptions of cross sector work;
- 3) disclosing aims of public-private partners;
- 4) disclosing assets in relation to shared work;
- 5) understating organizational cultures and settings for shared work;
- 6) guaranteeing capacity given assets to support or sustain shared work and
- 7) disclosing assumptions of cross sector affiliations.

However, six minor findings exist in relation to essential practices.

The first minor finding frames the disclosure of ideological agendas as an important practice for public-private partnerships. The subjects speaking to this set of practices voice the need to understand any political, social or economic biases that stand to influence the work of schools and foundations.

The second minor finding speaks to the subjects' position on practices that support illuminating expectations and agreements. Given this topic, there is a dearth of detail provided by the subjects. However, beyond that of a contractual agreement, the subjects want to ensure practices that facilitate communication. Furthermore, the subjects reference the importance of knowing which personnel are to be deemed primary project contacts.

The third minor finding addresses practices that clarify expectations in relation to staffing shared work. Such practices are intended to ensure that staffing needs are addressed and that each partnering entity can ensure consistency in staffing cross sector work.

The fourth minor finding addresses practices specific to disclosure of setting. The practices the subjects associate with this matter suggest the importance of schools and foundations sharing information about the climate of the communities in which they are situating

their work. Predominantly, the cases position schools and districts to share information about their communities in order for the third sector to better frame the partnerships. No cases suggest that foundations need to share information about their communities of interest.

The fifth minor finding addresses essential practices supporting the understanding of organizational culture in relation to the aims of cross sector partners. These cases suggest that public-private affiliates need to understand one another's missions and visions in practice.

The last minor finding situates as a practice concerning capacity and agreements. As such, a single subject speaks to the need to have assurances from third sector partners concerning their ability to "be consistent with follow-through" (Subject #5). In other words, this subject wants to know that private partners have the capacity to execute their responsibilities for the assumptions of cross sector work.

In total, there are six minor findings that address practices that school board members perceive as essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations. The minor practices include the following:

- 1) disclosing agendas held by cross sector partners;
- 2) clarifying expectations of the agreements codifying shared work;
- 3) clarifying expectations concerning staffing of public-private ventures;
- 4) disclosing information about the settings in which cross sector work is situated;
- 5) understating organizational cultures and partners' aims and
- 6) ensuring capacity to execute shared work by defining agreements.

In relation to essential practices by categories, there appears to be no specific patterns resulting from the subject's membership framed by the study's purposive sampling: high, mid-range and low TE per ADM (see Table 4.15).

Table 4.15 Frequencies of subjects' categorical references to essential practices by TE per ADM

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Settings	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	10	38
	2	2	4	2	0	2	1	6	17	
	3	2	3	0	0	0	3	3	11	
Mid-range	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	28
	5	1	3	2	1	1	3	0	11	
	6	2	1	1	0	5	2	2	13	
Low	7	2	0	0	1	3	1	2	9	30
	8	2	2	0	2	3	5	0	14	
	9	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	7	
Total		13	20	7	6	16	19	15	96	96

However, the subjects, at large, speak most frequently of practices that are categorically situated by assumptions of cross sector work. The second most common category of practice of which the subjects speak is that pertaining to staffing matters. The third most common set of cases align with practices situated by assets or financial concerns. Categorically, practices specific to settings of cross sector work represent the fourth most frequently cited set of subject cases. Respectively, aims, agendas and agreements represent the final three categories situating the subjects' voice on matters concerning essential practices.

4.4 PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

The preceding findings situate the subjects' views on practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations. However, this study also seeks to categorically

frame barriers the subjects associate with cross sector affiliations. Thus, the findings presented in this section address this study's third research question.

- 3) What do school board members suggest as the most significant barriers to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

The focus on barriers presented in the following sub-sections is grounded in a manner consistent with the findings that resulted from the second research question. Herein, the focus on barriers intersects the following themes: disclosure, expectations, organizational culture, capacity and continuous learning (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). As a result of the analysis of subject cases within these intersections, the following categories ground the subjects' views: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and settings. The definition of the categories remains constant.

Aims refer to matters concerning the core missions of educational entities and private charitable foundations. Assumptions refer to the resulting work and anticipated outcomes associated with affiliations between private charitable foundations and public schools. Agendas refer to underlying ideological plans that stand to influence the work in which foundations and public schools engage. Agreements refer to meaning making processes in which assumptions of shared work are made clear, including both written and verbal communications. Assets refer to the financing and budgetary implications of shared work. Staffing refers to personnel committed to support public-private partnerships. Settings refer to the social, political and/or economic contexts of the entities.

4.4.1 Problems Concerning Disclosure

Eight (89%) of the nine study participants perceive risks or barriers associated with public-private partnerships that can result from disclosure of information. In twelve separate instances

throughout the course of the interviews the subjects speak of barriers to affiliations associated with the sharing of information. Given the subjects' focus on disclosure, three overarching categories emerge in the analysis of the texts: barriers as they relate to aims, assumptions and agendas (see Table 4.16). The following sub-sections unpack these findings.

Table 4.16 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning disclosure

Categories:						
Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	1	1	1	3	4
	2	0	0	0	0	
	3	1	0	0	1	
Mid-range	4	0	0	0	0	3
	5	0	1	1	2	
	6	0	0	1	1	
Low	7	0	0	1	1	3
	8	0	0	0	0	
	9	0	1	1	2	
Total		2	3	5	10	10

4.4.1.1 The Problem of Disclosure and Aims

Two (22%) of the nine subjects express concerns regarding the disclosure of organizational goals or missions, which aligns categorically with the concept of aims. As a minor finding, such references are noted in only two cases of all cases addressing problems associated with disclosure of information. In both cases the subjects speak from a deficit perspective. In other words, if school board members are not provided information about the missions, visions and purposes of third sector affiliates, collateral harm may result. For example, Subject #1 situates this concern in a fabricated scenario in order to typify this problem.

I would imagine that [it is possible that] a person out there [could] hear that [a] particular organization kills rabbits. So,...if we don't have that information, I think we have a risk [for] our school district's inhabitants (Subject #1).

Thus, these two subjects suggest that a problem arises when public schools and districts do not have access to information that ensures that foundations “have the students’ best interest (Subject #3)” as a priority. Both subjects that speak to this matter represent districts with high TE per ADM.

4.4.1.2 The Problem of Disclosure and Assumptions

The preceding finding suggests that foundations need to assume responsibility for disclosure of aims. However, the following finding places responsibility for disclosure of project assumptions squarely in the hands of school personnel, which presents as a minor finding in this study. Three (33%) of the nine subjects speak of barriers to successful public-private partnerships as they relate to project assumptions held by public schools engaging in cross sector work. Given these cases, the subjects suggest that school personnel need to be forthright in expressing their intentions for affiliations or else risk both negative public relations and future opportunities for cross sector partnerships.

If you are developing relationships with foundations and you were not forthright, you risk trust issues. And, if you have any sense or desire for an ongoing relationship with that foundation, or any other foundation, you as a district can make yourself look bad and not be taken seriously....horrible things could happen if you are not honest (Subject #1).

The subjects recognize that public schools and districts, operating from a point of financial need, may in essence be “making a sales pitch...[that makes] you want to tell the [foundations] what you think they want to hear” (Subject #9). Yet, by being forthright about project assumptions, there exists a risk that foundations may choose not to affiliate.

If a school district shares too much information with the foundation and the foundation decides that they could possibly not get the results they want from schools [the grant may not be awarded] (Subject #5).

Thus, the subjects speak of problems inferring that too much or too little disclosure of information concerning assumptions of affiliations can lead to undesired outcomes. Given these cases the undesired outcomes result in lost opportunities and negative public relations.

The subjects speaking to this issue each represent a district with high, mid-range and low TE per ADM.

4.4.1.3 The Problem of Disclosure and Agendas

The problems associated with the disclosure of agendas fall within the most common set of concerns amongst all cases aligning with disclosure. In total, five (56%) of the nine subjects discuss their perceptions on ideological agendas that may create problems or barriers for successful public-private partnerships. Thus, the disclosure of agendas situates as a major findings in relation to potential cross sector barriers. Similar to the finding concerning problems with disclosure of aims, the subjects frame this matter from a deficit perspective. Again, this means that when there is an absence of disclosure of agendas, donor recipients are placed at a disadvantage.

Schools need to know that there is not some hidden agenda that is not really good for kids (Subject #5).

As another example, Subject #9 also speaks to this matter, but with a more impassioned approach.

It might be that there is something underlying [the work], something under the surface that you can't see, that you think: "Ok, if that does come to the surface, or God knows what comes to the surface" [it would] embarrass us. I think that is the big risk (Subject #9).

It also appears that the subjects believe it to be the responsibility of foundations to disclose such information, rather than public schools and districts. As implied in the subjects' responses, all cases infer or reference agendas held by the third sector. There are no cases in which the subjects imply that public schools hold unstated, ideological agendas underlying their interest in affiliating with the third sector. Of the subjects speaking to problems with disclosure of agendas, one represents a district with high TE per AMD, two represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.4.2 Problems Concerning Expectations

Eight (89%) of the nine study participants perceive risks associated with public-private partnerships given actual cross sector work. In twenty separate instances throughout the course of the interviews the subjects speak of barriers in relation to project ownership and expectations. Given the subjects' focus on expectations, three overarching categories emerged in the analysis of the texts: barriers as they relate to assumptions, agreements and assets (see Table 4.17).

Table 4.17 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning expectations

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Assumptions	Agreements	Assets	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	2	0	0	2	8
	2	0	0	3	3	
	3	0	0	3	3	
Mid-range	4	1	0	1	2	4
	5	0	0	1	1	
	6	1	0	0	1	
Low	7	0	3	3	6	8
	8	0	0	0	0	
	9	1	0	1	2	
Total		5	3	12	20	20

4.4.2.1 The Problem with Expectations and Assumptions

Four (44%) of the nine subjects speak to problems or barriers with public-private partnerships given assumptions each entity holds for cross sector work. Thus, this matter situates as a minor finding of the study. Such barriers, as noted in five cases, address the potential for projects to fail based on how cross sector work is executed. For example, Subject #6 speaks of project creep and abandonment.

To me the risk is that we abandon the program because there is just too much to comply with - the requirements of the foundation. Or that the program becomes something that you never intended it to be because you are trying to satisfy the requirements of the foundation (Subject #6).

The subjects speak not only of concerns over failed expectations of cross sector work, they also voice unease over the potential for subsequent problems, including negative press (Subject #6), fractured relationships (Subject #1) and the need to return expended or unexpended funds to donors (Subject #4).

Of the subjects voicing such concerns, one represents a district with high TE per ADM, two represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and one represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.4.2.2 The Problem with Expectations and Agreements

Problems associated with expectations and agreements situates as a minor study finding. Only one (11%) of the study subjects notes concerns over the potential to overlook the significance of verbal and/or written agreements in cross sector work. Such oversight is situated, from the perspective of this subject, as a barrier to successful donor recipient relationships.

You have to understand what the foundation is giving you and what the foundation is expecting in return. Because, I think a lot of times that kind of information has the potential to get lost. School districts are struggling for money. School districts see the money up front but they don't read the fine print. Then, all of a sudden it could be something, there could be some type of project the foundations expecting that is not in the school district's best interest (Subject #7).

Subject #7 expands on this topic by situating communication as the potential threat to cross sector agreements framing shared work.

It is all part of communication. I think that is the biggest barrier. There has to be clear expectations and understandings of what is expected. If not it could be a potential for problem (Subject #7).

Subject #7 represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.4.2.3 The Problem with Expectations and Assets

When considering problems and expectations, the most frequently cited cases are attributed to matters concerning assets or project funding. Thus, problems with expectations and assets presents as a major finding of this study. Six (67%) of the nine study subjects reference the intersection between assets and expectations as potential barriers in twelve separate cases. These

cases suggest that when expectations are not clear the funding of cross sector work can be compromised. These twelve cases are further grounded by the following three sub-categories: problems of financial waste, loss and replacement (see Table 4.18). Each of the sub-categories presents as minor findings of this study.

Table 4.18 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems with expectations by assets

Sub-categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Waste	Loss	Replace	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	0	0	0	0	6
	2	0	2	1	3	
	3	0	0	3	3	
Mid-range	4	0	1	0	1	2
	5	1	0	0	1	
	6	0	0	0	0	
Low	7	2	1	0	3	4
	8	0	0	0	0	
	9	1	0	0	1	
Total		4	4	4	12	12

Three (33%) of the nine subjects who give voice to the problems associated with expectations and assets situate the waste of funds as a potential issue. Plainly stated, when assets are expected as a result of cross-sector relationships there stands to be the likelihood for funds to be poorly used.

Money gets wasted. Students don't get the benefit of the investment (Subject #5).

Stated another way:

For the [recipient] it is like found money. They get to play with it for a couple of years (Subject #9).

Additionally, three (33%) of the nine subjects also speak of the loss of funds as a problem and potential barrier to affiliating with the third sector. Subject #2 describes a possible scenario as a means to situate the problem.

If money has already been granted to us, and we started spending that money, and the kids start getting used to whatever we [have] spent the money on, and we have this fantastic program going on, and then all of a sudden ... the funding is gone (Subject #2).

The implication in Subject #2's scenario is that cross sector work on which schools have come to rely is supported by provisional funds that, once they are no longer available, stand to risk the future of the investments.

Or, in the words of Subject #4:

I think the district really has the risk because the power is in the purse strings and the foundations hold the money... Again, the money is coming from the foundation. I think that the district is at more risk than the foundation. The foundation has the power (Subject #4).

Finally, two (22%) of the nine subjects address the problem of expectations and assets by speaking to the issue of supplanting or replacing core district funds. Subject #3 speaks clearly to this matter.

I think sometimes that school districts are guilty of expecting foundation[s] to fund educational programming and I don't think that's fair to the foundation[s] or to the community (Subject #3).

Again:

I think sometimes if you go after money from a foundation that the school district should be paying for it (Subject #3).

Of the six subjects referencing the intersection between assets and expectations as potential barriers, two represent districts with high TE per ADM, two represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.4.3 Problems Concerning Organizational Culture

Five (56%) of the nine study participants speak of barriers to public-private partnerships resulting from differences between agencies' organizational cultures. The subjects speak of risks in relation to sectorial differences, given the ways in which cross sector partners operate, in eight separate instances throughout the course of the interviews. The subjects' responses to problems concerning organizational culture align with the following grounded categories: aims, assumptions, agendas and staffing (see Table 4.19).

Table 4. 19 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning organizational culture

Categories:							
Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Staffing	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	0	0	0	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
	3	2	0	1	0	3	
Mid-range	4	0	0	0	0	0	
	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
	6	0	0	0	0	0	
Low	7	1	0	0	0	1	
	8	0	1	0	1	2	5
	9	1	1	0	0	2	
Total		4	2	1	1	8	8

4.4.3.1 The Problems with Organizational Culture and Aims

One third (33%) of the nine subjects speak of potential problems resulting from inherent differences associated with the missions of public schools and private foundations. Thus, problems intersecting organizational culture and aims situate as a minor finding. The four cases

that address problems resulting from differing aims represent the most common set of problems the subject voice across the theme of organizational culture. The subjects suggest that the differences in multi-sectorial partners' missions could lead to potential liabilities for public schools and districts.

You know, we're required under the public school code to follow laws; whereas, [foundations] don't have to follow.... the same rules. So, there is just the liability issue down the line (Subject #7).

Subject #9 also suggests that schools are primarily focused on local outcomes, as it relates to their mission, whereas foundations have broader interests. Thus, Subject #9 infers that differences between site-specific and generalizable outcomes can create potential problems.

I think the foundation people are genuinely looking for something that is going to make a difference and can be applied elsewhere. So, they want to see implications that can be broad based. School districts pretty much have more of a parochial point of view (Subject #9).

Of the three subjects voicing potential problems that could result from differences between the partners' organizational aims, one represents a district with high TE per AMD and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.4.3.2 The Problems with Organizational Culture and Assumptions

Problems concerning organizational culture in relation to assumptions of shared work are a minor finding of this study. Two (22%) of the nine study subjects speak of problems with the assumptions of cross sector work that can result from differences in the organizational cultures of cross sector partners. The two subject speaking to this matter express concern that cross sector work may be conceptualized and framed differently by public-private affiliates given the differing paradigms in which they function.

Right there you have a different mindset: consumer and producer. So, [the cross sector partners] are going to have different expectation, different out looks from one another right off the bat (Subject #9).

Thus, the implied barrier presented in these cases suggests that differing assumptions, as inherent in the cultural perspectives of diverse affiliates, stand to jeopardize successful outcomes resulting from cross sector work. The two subjects presenting such cases represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.4.3.3 The Problems with Organizational Culture and Agendas

One subject, representing a district with high TE per ADM, points out that ideological perspectives hold potential risk when partners engage in cross sector work. Thus, the barrier this problem presents situates as a minor finding of this study. Although risks are not otherwise defined in this matter, this subject does believe that it is the nature of the third sector's philanthropic community to hold inherent political perspectives. Such perspectives can present problems for public schools affiliating with private charitable foundations.

Maybe...[certain foundations] are just too political. I see that as a problem (Subject #3).

4.4.3.4 The Problems with Organizational Culture and Staffing

One (11%) of the nine subjects identifies a problem within the crossroads of culture and staffing. Given that this barrier is identified by one subject, it is deemed a minor finding. The subject addresses potential implications for cross sector work as impacted by cultural diversity, or lack thereof, amongst staff. In this case, the subject situates cultural diversity as that which relates to race and ethnicity.

There could be a problem culturally if I am in a primarily white district and the [foundation] is comprised ofsome other cultural make-up. We could have difficulty with the actual community in which the school is located (Subject #8).

The subject speaking to this matter represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.4.4 Problems Concerning Capacity

Five (56%) of the nine study participants perceive potential barriers to public-private partnerships in relation to the abilities of cross sector agents to effectively implement shared work. In nine separate instances throughout the course of the interviews the subjects speak of risks to public-private partnerships resulting from the entities' capacities to advance shared work and achieved defined outcomes. The subjects' concerns align with the following grounded categories: assets and staffing (see Table 4.20).

Table 4.20 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning capacity

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Assets	Staffing	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	1	0	1	1
	2	0	0	0	
	3	0	0	0	
Mid-range	4	0	0	0	1
	5	1	0	1	
	6	0	0	0	
Low	7	1	1	2	7
	8	1	1	2	
	9	1	2	3	
Total		5	4	9	9

4.4.4.1 The Problems of Capacity and Assets

Given the context of shared work, five (56%) of the study's nine subjects speak of concerns specific to funding cross sector work. The barriers concerning capacities to financially support

cross sector work presents as a major finding of this study. In total, the five subjects speaking to this matter each present one case. In each of the five cases, the problems infer risks given public schools' abilities to sustain projects once donor funding is no longer available. Subject #7 speaks to this issue in the following manner.

The foundation looks at this as a short-term investment with outcomes. But, the school district has to absorb the cost for the long term (Subject #7).

The problem inferred by Subject #7, and echoed in the other cases situated within this category, is that public schools may enter into cross sector work only to find themselves unable to sustain the projects once donor supports are exited. Of the five subjects who speak to the potential for districts to struggle with sustaining projects resulting from public-private partnerships, one represents a district with high TE per ADM, one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM and three represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.4.4.2 The Problems of Capacity and Staffing

Three (33%) of the nine subjects give voice to concerns over the potential lack of capacity school personnel have to implement the assumptions of public-private partnerships. These concerns situate this problem as a minor finding. Given the four cases framed by the subjects, two different types of potential problems present: limited staff expertise and shortages of personnel positioned to execute cross sector projects. Subject #7 speaks to provisioning staffing commensurate to project demands.

If the district doesn't have the capacity to provide staff....that's going to be a problem (Subject #7).

However, two of the three cases concerning problems with capacity address potential for risks where foundation personnel hold little or no experience with the ways in which schools operate.

Subject #9 states:

In education you have educators, people who are dealing with teaching and learning and curriculum. You don't necessarily have people in foundations that have that kind of background (Subject #9).

All three subjects addressing concerns situated within the intersection of capacity and staffing represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.4.5 Problems Concerning Continuous Learning

Six (67%) of the nine study participants see potential problems for public-private partnerships resulting from information that can be gleaned from cross sector work. All concerns voiced by the subjects are associated categorically with assumptions of public-private partnerships. Thus, the intersection between continuous learning and assumptions of shared work presents as a major finding of this study.

Throughout the course of the interviews, the subjects frame nine cases in which project assumptions, or project-related outcomes, present as possible threats for public education. While the problems associated with continuous learning are categorically restricted to assumptions, the range of cases is further grounded by the following sub-categories: efficiency and efficacy (see Table 4.21). Implications associated with efficiencies presents as minor finding and implications associated with efficacy presents as a major finding in relation to barriers resulting from continuous learning and assumptions of shared work.

Table 4. 21 Frequencies of subjects' references to problems concerning continuous learning by assumptions

Sub-categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Efficiency	Efficacy	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	0	2	2	4
	2	0	1	1	
	3	1	0	1	
Mid-range	4	0	1	1	3
	5	0	0	0	
	6	1	1	2	
Low	7	0	0	0	2
	8	0	0	0	
	9	1	1	2	
Total		3	6	9	9

Three (33%) of the nine study subjects express concern for learning implications associated with the efficiency by which public schools are able to engage in shared work. As suggested by the subjects, an inherent risk presents when exposing the ability of schools to be successful partners in cross sector work. For example:

I guess the administration would be looked at. You know, “What were you doing?” “What were you thinking?” “Why didn’t this work (Subject #3)?”

Of the three subjects voicing this type of concern, one represents a district with high TE per ADM, one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM and one represents a district with low TE per ADM.

Five (56%) of the study subjects speak of another point concerning problems with continuous learning. Different from efficiency, or the ability to operate well, the subjects in these cases speak of efficacy, or the ability to achieve desired results. The difference between operating well and achieving desired results may seem subtle. However, the implications as

voiced by the subjects are distinctly different. Herein, the subjects speak of the possibility that the outcomes of shared work might suggest that public schools are incapable of achieving success due to inherent systems limitations.

I think that there is a good possibility that some districts will have to look at what it is that they are doing to prepare their students for postgraduate activities. I think that there is a risk...We have lesson plans that are 10 years old and by God they worked for me. So, why would I want to figure out how to teach history so that it's meaningful for kids today (Subject #1)?

In response to this problem, the study participants squarely suggest that the onus is on public schools to ensure “excellent” (Subject #1) and brave this challenge.

Of the subjects speaking to this matter two represent districts with high TE per ADM, two represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and one represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.4.6 Summary: Problems Associated with Public-Private Partnerships

The third research question this study seeks to address targets the subjects’ thoughts about problems associated with public-private partnerships.

- 3) What do school board members suggest as the most significant barriers to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

The findings given this research question are situated within the following grounded categories emerging from the content analysis: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets and staffing (see Table 4.22). This summary situates the finding as either major or minor.

Table 4.22 Number of subjects addressing barriers to public-private partnerships by categories

		Categories:						
Themes:		Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Settings
	Disclosure	2	3	5	0	0	0	0
	Expectations	0	4	0	1	6	0	0
	Organizational Culture	3	2	1	0	0	1	0
	Capacity	0	0	0	0	5	3	0
	Continuous Learning	0	6	0	0	0	0	0

The first major finding, specific to problems associated with cross sector partnerships, relates to financial implications of cross sector work in terms of expectations. In other words, the subject speak to problems that can result should public-private partners fail to reach common, clear expectations on how assets are to be expended for grant-funded projects. The subjects suggest that when expectations are not clear the funding of cross sector work can be compromised. Compromised funding, as detailed by the subjects, is situated by the following sub-categories: wasting funds, losing funds and supplanting funds. Again, the sub-categories that explicate the subjects' thoughts on compromised funding present as problems. However, these problems are minor concerns in that no single categorical description of compromised funding is framed by a majority of the subjects. Only when the sub-categories are aggregated do they present as a major finding.

The second major finding that presents as a barrier addresses continuous learning and assumptions of cross sector work. In these cases the subjects express concerns for understandings that result from public-private partnerships. The risks inherent in these learnings suggest that schools may be seen as inefficient and/or ineffective in their operations. Of the two

types of concerns, public perception of the ineffectiveness of schools presents as a major risk, whereas inefficiencies of schools presents as a minor risk.

The third major finding, which is framed as a problem associated with cross sector work, addresses the disclosure of agendas. Framed from a school-centric perspective, the subjects suggest that there may be unstated ideological agendas that are held by third sector partners. Thus, the subjects are concerned that such agendas, should they come to the surface, present “big risk[s]” for public schools and districts, compromising creditability and the assurance of student wellbeing (Subject #9).

The fourth and final major finding addresses capacity related issues and concerns in which public schools and districts may not have sufficient assets to sustain programming once donors exit cross sector relationships. In these cases, the subject speak plainly to the concern that districts might not be prepared to maintain work that has been underwritten by third sector affiliates. Thus, schools and districts are positioned to eliminate programming due to financial restrictions.

There are four major finding that address problems that school board members associate with public-private partnerships. The major findings include problems concerning the following:

- 1) clarifying expectations of assets in relation to shared work;
- 2) learning from the assumptions of shared work;
- 3) disclosing agendas of cross sector partners and
- 4) guaranteeing capacity given assets to support or sustain shared work.

However, nine minor findings exist in relation to essential problems.

The first minor finding that emerges as a problem relates to expectations of project assumptions. In these cases, the subjects speak to the potential for projects to fail based on how

cross sector work is implemented. Should project implementation be skewed, for any number of reasons, schools and districts could be subject to public scrutiny, fractured relationships and financial penalties.

The second minor finding addresses potential problems of public-private partnerships resulting from differences intersecting the affiliates' organizational cultures and aims. The subjects recognize that public-private entities operate differently and that such differences inherently suggest troubles. Thus, the subjects voice their concern over risks that may result based on cross sector work that fails to account for the needs of the local school and community. Problems may also result from work that fails to consider state and federal regulations that operationally drive public education.

The third minor finding identifies capacity-related problems in relation to staffing cross sector work. Thus, the subjects express concerns as to whether cross sector partners have both the available staffing and personnel with requisite expertise to successfully execute cross sector work.

The fourth minor finding situates problems concerning the disclosure of assumptions in relation to public-private partnerships. The subjects infer that there may be a lack of open, honest disclosure as schools and districts position themselves to be "making a sales pitch" to foundations (Subject #9). Moreover, the subjects acknowledge that if too much information pertaining to their thoughts on cross sector work were to be shared it could result in the loss of potential donor funding.

The fifth minor finding speaks to the problems relating to disclosing organizational aims. The subjects presenting these cases suggest that foundations may not be forthcoming about their

social charter, mission and vision. Thus, school board members may not recognize the social or political implications of partnering with the third sector.

The sixth minor finding, situated as a potential barrier for public-private partnerships, resides in the intersection between organizational culture and the assumptions of shared work. The matter persists as the subjects believe that the inherent differences of cross sector cultures stand to frame the way each affiliate approaches cross sector work. Thus, differing mindsets given shared work and the outcomes associate with shared work present challenges to successful relationships.

The seventh minor finding suggests that organizational culture and agendas present risks for public-private partnerships. This concern is framed by a single subject, who suggests that it may be the nature of the third sector to ideologically hold political positions, otherwise stated or unstated, that may be incompatible with institutions such as public schools.

The eighth minor finding situates organizational culture and staffing as a potential barrier for cross sector work. Simply framed, a single subject expressed concern over the potential lack of racial/ethnic diversity in personnel representing any cross sector partner. Thus, this case infers that partnering entities may fail to have the cultural sensitivity to frame their approach to cross sector partners.

The final minor finding targets matters concerning expectations of cross sector work and means by which partners establish agreements to execute such work. Such concern is framed by a single subject, whereas the subject acknowledges that communication barriers exist, especially when schools and districts are “struggling for money...[and] do not read the fine print” (Subject#7). Thus, the subject infers that financially-driven desperation may lead public schools and district to fail to attend to the particulars of cross sector arrangements.

In total, there are nine minor findings that address barriers to public-private partnerships.

The minor findings include problems concerning the following:

- 1) clarifying expectations of assumptions of cross sector work;
- 2) understating organizational cultures and partners' aims;
- 3) ensuring capacity of staffing for cross sector work;
- 4) disclosing assumptions of cross sector affiliations;
- 5) disclosing aims of public-private partners;
- 6) understating organizational cultures and assumptions of shared work;
- 7) understating organizational cultures and partners' agendas;
- 8) understating organizational cultures and staffing of shared work and
- 9) clarifying expectations of agreements codifying shared work.

In relation to barriers by grounded categories, there are at least half as many cases in which issues are cited by subjects representing districts with mid-range TE per ADM as compared to subjects representing districts with high and low TE per ADM (see Table 4.23).

Table 4.23 Frequencies of subjects' categorical references to barriers by TE per ADM

Categories:								
	Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Settings	Total
High TE per ADM	4	7	2	0	7	0	0	20
Mid-Range TE per ADM	0	6	2	0	3	0	0	11
Low TE Per ADM	2	6	2	3	7	5	0	25
Total	6	19	6	3	17	5	0	56

The subjects, at large, speak most frequently of barriers that are categorically situated by assumptions of cross sector work. The second most common category in which problems are identified pertains to assets relating to funding multi-sectorial work. The third most common sets of problems are situated by both organizational aims and agendas. Categorically, barriers specific to staffing of cross sector work represent the fourth most frequently cited set of subject cases. Finally, the least frequently addressed category situating the subjects' voice on matters concerning barriers is that with pertains to agreements. There are no subject cases addressing the intersection of barriers to cross sector work and the settings in which the work may take place.

4.5 PROSPECTS ASSOCIATED WITH PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Thus far the study's findings situate the subject's views on: 1) the roles and responsibilities of the third sector in support of public education, 2) essential practices the subjects identify as inherent in advancing public-private partnerships and 3) potential barriers that stand to otherwise mitigate successful engagement of private charitable foundations. However, this study also seeks to categorically frame prospects to ensure successful cross sector relations. Thus, the findings presented in this section address this study's final research question.

- 4) What do school board members suggest as means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

The prospects suggested by this study's subjects are grounded in a manner consistent with the findings resulting from the second and third research questions. Herein, the focus on prospects intersects the following themes: disclosure, expectations, organizational culture,

capacity and continuous learning (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). As a result of the analysis of subject cases within these intersections, the following categories ground the subjects' views: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and settings. As is the case in the preceding two sections of this chapter, the definition of the categories remains constant.

Aims refer to matters concerning the core missions of educational entities and private charitable foundations. Assumptions refer to the resulting work and anticipated outcomes associated with affiliations between private charitable foundations and public schools. Agendas refer to underlying ideological plans that stand to influence the work in which foundations and public schools engage. Agreements refer to meaning making processes in which assumptions of shared work are made clear, including both written and verbal communications. Assets refer to the financing and budgetary implications of shared work. Staffing refers to personnel committed to support public-private partnerships. Settings refer to the social, political and/or economic contexts of the entities.

4.5.1 Prospects Concerning Disclosure

Six (66%) of the nine study participants voice prospects for public-private partnerships specific to the disclosure of information. In fourteen separate instances throughout the course of the interviews the subjects speak of prospects for affiliations that relate to sharing information. Given the subjects' focus on disclosure, four categories emerge in the analysis of the texts - prospects as they relate to agendas, agreements, assets and staffing (see Table 4.24). The following sub-sections unpack these findings.

Table 4.24 Frequencies of subjects’ references to prospects concerning disclosure

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Agendas	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	0	0	1	1	2	6
	2	0	0	0	0	0	
	3	1	0	0	3	4	
Mid-range	4	0	4	0	0	4	5
	5	1	0	0	0	1	
	6	0	0	0	0	0	
Low	7	0	1	0	0	1	3
	8	0	0	1	1	2	
	9	0	0	0	0	0	
Total		2	5	2	5	14	14

4.5.1.1 Prospects for Disclosure and Agendas

Two (22%) of nine study subjects make a single reference to the prospective benefits of sharing ideological positions that may be held by parties entering into shared work agreements. As the matter of disclosure of agenda presents twice, this is a minor finding. In order to unpack meaning herein, it suffices to provide a single example.

There should not be any hidden motives (Subject #5).

Subject #3 also discusses the implications for this prospect when stating that issues of “ethics” and “motives” can only be called into question when agendas otherwise remain undisclosed. Thus, it is implied by these subjects that schools and districts reduce potential liabilities when they are aware of possible agendas that may stand to influence cross sector work.

One of the two subjects speaking to this matter represents a district with high TE per ADM, whereas the other subject represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM.

4.5.1.2 Prospects for Disclosure and Agreements

In relation to this study, agreements refer to meaning making processes in which assumptions of shared work are made clear, including both written and verbal communications. Thus, two (22%) of the nine study subjects give voice to the significance of verbal understandings. These subjects presents five cases, which comprise a minor finding, in which verbal communication should be exercised for the purposes of increasing understandings between cross sector affiliates. Three of the five cases present as short scenarios. For example, Subject #4 role plays a conversation, assuming the perspective of a foundation's program officer.

Look, we are interested and we've decided we are going to give you the money. This is how we work. We will be working with 'so-and-so.' If you need us, this is the contact person (Subject #4).

For a more abbreviated example, the case presented by Subject #7 suffices: "they need to exchange information."

Of the two subjects voicing this prospect, one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM and one represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.5.1.3 Prospects for Disclosure and Assets

Subjects #1 and #8 emphasize that disclosure of financial interests, as a proactive measure, hold benefit when ensuring successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations. The two cases framed by these subjects comprise a minor finding intersecting prospects and disclosure. The subjects, representing 22% of all study subjects, are associated with a district that has high TE per ADM and a district that has low TE per ADM.

4.5.1.4 Prospects for Disclosure and Staffing

Three (33%) of the nine study subjects speak of staffing disclosures as a means by which to ensure successful cross sector partnerships. The three subjects make five cases, thus situating prospects of disclosing information about staffing as a minor finding. Of the five cases, the subjects provide a dearth of details. The cases are broad and suggest general prospects for sharing staffing information. Stated without flourish or detail, Subject #8 suggests, “disclose your staffing.” In short, the subjects note that disclosure of staffing-related issues should include staff “credentials” (Subject #3), in addition to “backgrounds” and “references” (Subject #1).

Of the three subjects who discuss these prospects, two represent districts with high TE per ADM and one represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.5.2 Prospects Concerning Expectations

Eight (89%) of the nine study subjects speak of means to improve public-private partnerships by addressing matters specific to expectations of cross sector work. The eight subjects present forty separate cases in which they explain their views on how schools and foundations can address their expectations of shared work in ways intended to ensure positive outcomes. The forty cases are situated by five of the seven grounded categories used throughout this study: assumptions, agreements, assets and staffing (see Table 4.25).

Table 4.25 Frequencies of subjects' references to prospects concerning expectations

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Assumptions	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	0	2	0	0	2	9
	2	0	3	0	1	4	
	3	1	2	0	0	3	
Mid-range	4	1	2	1	0	4	19
	5	2	1	1	0	4	
	6	3	5	0	3	11	
Low	7	3	2	0	3	8	12
	8	0	0	0	0	0	
	9	1	2	0	1	4	
Total		11	19	2	8	40	40

4.5.2.1 Prospects for Expectations and Assumptions

For purposes of this study, assumptions refer to the resulting work of cross sector projects leveraged by private charitable foundations and public schools. Six (67%) of the nine subjects in this study discuss means by which to address expectations of shared work in effort to bolster relationships. The six subjects present eleven cases, which situates prospects for expectations and assumptions as a major finding of this study. Collectively, the subjects speak to action steps which, when presented in juxtaposition, theoretically forms a plan for clarifying work-related expectations. The steps in this skeletal plan range from preplanning tasks to work-related oversight.

With respect to clarifying expectations for cross sector projects, Subject #9 speaks to the prospect of developing articulated applications in response to foundations' requests for grant proposals.

Calls for proposals have to be very specific and the submissions from the school districts have to be very specific to try to reduce...misunderstandings (Subject #9).

To frame the resulting work, Subject #7 puts forth a single case suggesting the development a “vision statement” to guide the implementation. Five subject cases suggest that planning the implementation of shared work is necessary to ensure that “everybody is prepared for what they need to be doing” (Subject #6). Directly stated, as yet another example:

You have to have everybody on board with the plan. And, I think that everybody needs to know the plan (Subject #3).

Lastly, four subject cases address the importance of defining intervals in which the public-private partners would hold one another accountable in efforts to “keep on top” of the shared work.

Of the six subjects speaking to prospects that situate in the intersection of expectations and assumptions, one represents a district with high TE per ADM, three represent districts with mid-range TE per and ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.5.2.2 Prospects for Expectations and Agreements

The most commonly cited set of prospects relating to expectations of shared work is that which is grounded categorically by agreements. The prospect for expectations and agreements is a major study finding. Eight (89%) of the nine subjects discuss written and verbal communications as a means to explicate shared work between cross sector affiliates. The eight subjects present nineteen separate cases in which they address the practical role agreements play in bolstering public-private partnerships. Of the nineteen cases situated within the intersection of expectations and agreements, eight of the cases reference written agreements, six case reference verbal agreements and the remaining five cases are otherwise undefined.

All eight cases referencing the prospects of written agreements are framed directly, without detail or flourish. Thus, it suffices to provide a single example to illustrate this point.

Written documents. I think that there has to be some written expectations (Subject #1).

Six subjects present cases which endorse verbal communications as a means to make meaning between partners and thus enhance relationships. In the words of Subject #4, coming to agreement on expectations relates “to open dialogue.” The five undefined cases speak to agreements as a means to codify expectations in the broadest of terms. Such terms are neither exclusive to written or verbal forms of communication. For example, according to Subject #7, “communication what’s to be expected from both parties.”

Of the subjects speaking to these matters, three represent districts with high TE per ADM, three represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.5.2.3 Prospects for Expectations and Assets

Clarifying expectations in relation to assets supporting cross sector work present as a minor finding of this study. Two (22%) of the nine subjects speak specifically of prospects associated with establishing expectations for reporting on financial expenditures. Subjects #4 and #5 both voice the importance of ensuring transparency in the management of cross sector funding for shared work. Thus, it is implied that such transparency stands to bolster relationships between cross sector partners, eliminates the potential for “improprieties” and reduces risks for both parties (Subject #4).

Both subjects voicing these prospects represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM.

4.5.2.4 Prospects for Expectations and Staffing

Four (44%) of the study's nine subjects speak of defining expectations of staffing in effort to ensure the success of public-private partnerships. Prospects for clarifying expectations relating to staffing situations as a minor finding of this study. Concerning this topic, eight unique cases are presented by four subjects. Of the eight cases, one addresses the significance of establishing requisite "levels of expertise" (Subject #9) for project-related personnel. Two cases address the importance of coming to agreement on the amount of staff required by cross sector partners to successfully execute the assumptions of shared work. For example, as succinctly framed by Subject #6, "make certain you have the resources, the personnel resources." The remaining five cases address the types of personnel or types of staffing structures that the subjects believe necessary to successfully support cross sector work. Examples of key personnel and/or structures include the following: superintendent and board liaison (Subject #7), team designated by the district to work with the foundation to clarify expectations (Subject #7) and committees comprised of staff from "both sides who are policing to make sure that what's being expected of both sides is actually being done" (Subject #2).

Of the four subjects speaking to these matters, one represents a district with high TE per ADM, one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM and two represent districts with low TE per ADM.

4.5.3 Prospects Concerning Organizational Culture

All prospects concerning organizational culture situate categorically by staffing-related issues. Prospects given organizational culture and staffing situate as a minor finding of this study. One subject from each of the three strata of the random purposive sample presents cases on

organizational differences. As such, Subjects #3, #5 and #9 speak directly to these matters (see Table 4. 26).

Table 4.26 Frequencies of subjects' references to prospects concerning organizational culture

Category:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Staffing	Total by Strata
High	1	0	
	2	0	2
	3	2	
Mid-range	4	0	
	5	1	1
	6	0	
Low	7	0	
	8	0	3
	9	3	
Total		6	6

In total, the three subjects frame nine cases concerning prospects related to staff and organization culture. All nine of the cases reference cross sector partners' need for staff to understand the paradigms in which the other operates. As a case in point:

It almost like if you could embed somebody in the other world for a while. I don't know if a foundation, whether corporate or not, could afford to have somebody embedded in a school district long enough to figure out what is going on out there (Subject #9).

However, in each of the cases the subjects infer that it is primarily the third sector that needs to have personnel that hold the expertise to understand how schools and districts operate. Again, Subject #9:

If somebody from the foundation ... has somebody on its staff, or among its advisors, [such as] somebody from the education sector, they may understand that culture better than if they didn't have such a person at their disposal (Subject #9).

Thus, implied in these cases is the imperative for staff to reach out to their cross sector partners, possibly assuming their mantle, in order to gain a deeper insight into their beliefs, customs and practices.

4.5.4 Prospects Concerning Capacity

Only one (11%) of the study's nine subjects references a capacity building prospect as a means to ensure the success of public-private partnerships. The capacity building prospect is in direct categorical relation to staffing matters. Thus, prospects given capacity and staffing situate as a minor finding of this study. Given this single case, the subject posits that it is important for cross sector partners to ensure that there is "enough staff, [and] that there is qualified staff" available to execute the assumptions of cross sector work (Subject #8). No additional detail is provided.

Subject #8 represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.5.5 Prospects Concerning Continuous Learning

Four (44%) of the nine study subjects speak of continuous learning as a means to enhanced public-private partnerships. The four subjects offer eight separate cases in which they explain how aspect of continuous learning can be seen as prospects by which to ensure the success of future cross sector partnerships. The eight cases are situated by two of the seven grounded categories used throughout this study: assumptions and setting (see Table 4.27).

Table 4.27 Frequencies of subjects' references to prospects concerning continuous learning

Categories:

Districts Stratified by per Student Expenditures	Study Subjects/ Interview Number	Assumptions	Setting	Total by Subject	Total by Strata
High	1	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	
	3	0	0	0	
Mid-range	4	0	0	0	3
	5	1	0	1	
	6	1	1	2	
Low	7	0	0	0	5
	8	0	1	1	
	9	4	0	4	
Total		6	2	8	8

4.5.5.1 Prospects for Continuous Learning and Assumptions

Three (33%) of the nine study subjects put forward prospects that can result from continuous learning as it relates assumptions of cross sector work. Such prospects situate as a minor finding. Subject #9, who represents a district with low TE per ADM, voices considerations per this matter in four separate cases. In all four cases, the subject speaks of the importance of learning from disappointments and failures, “experience is the best teacher” (Subject #9).

Disappoint[ment]....it might cause [partners] to hesitate the next time they work through a proposal. But, that could be good because they might now know what types of questions to ask to prevent that disappointment for reoccurring (Subject #9).

While such disappointments given project-based outcomes may result, the subject further suggests that new learning can be applied in future situations, standing to bolster potential relationships. Similarly, Subjects #5 and #6 talk of lessons that districts and schools could learn when engaging with the third sector - lessons that could be carried into the future. All six cases

made by the subjects plainly suggest that learnings resulting from cross sector work benefit public schools and districts.

Of the subjects addressing these matters, two represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM and one represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.5.5.2 Prospects for Continuous Learning and Setting

Two (22%) of the nine subjects reference continuous learning as prospects for cross sector work in that it can help partners better understand the context in which one another operates.

They can learn a lot about the climate in which each of them operates, because that is very different (Subject #8).

Whereas Subject #8 infers that both public-private partners stand to learn more about one another based on prior experiences, Subject #6 situates a case that squarely addresses the need for foundations to gain deeper insight into educational settings.

I would hope it would be a learning process for the foundation; that the foundation learns what the situation really is with education: the limitations, the constraints, the funding challenges, the mandates – federal and state (Subject #6).

Such prospects situate as a minor finding of this study.

Of the subjects speaking of continuous learning and setting, one represents a district with mid-range TE per ADM and one represents a district with low TE per ADM.

4.5.6 Summary: Prospects Associated with Public-Private Partnerships

The fourth research question this study seeks to address targets the subjects' thoughts about prospects for public-private partnerships.

- 4) What do school board members suggest as means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

The findings given this research question are situated within the following grounded categories emerging from the content analysis: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets and staffing (see Table 4.28). This summary situates the finding as either major or minor. Major findings are those in which five or more of the nine study subjects present cases grounded by an overarching category. Minor finding are those in which four or less of the nine study subjects present cases that are grounded by an overarching category.

Table 4.28 Number of subjects addressing prospects for public-private partnerships by categories

		Categories:						
		Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Settings
Themes:	Disclosure	0	0	2	2	2	3	0
	Expectations	0	6	0	8	2	4	0
	Organizational Culture	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
	Capacity	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	Continuous Learning	0	3	0	0	0	0	2

The first major finding addressing prospects of shared work situates the importance of establishing expectations through written and/or verbal agreements.

The second major finding, which addresses means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships, concerns the detailing of expectations given the assumptions of cross sector work. Per this prospect, the subjects recommend a variety of considerations including the development of articulated and exhaustive grant proposal, establishing vision statements for public-private ventures, cross sector planning for implementation and defining expectations for project oversight.

Thus, two major findings address prospects for ensuring the success of public-private partnerships. The major findings include the following:

- 1) clarifying expectations of agreements codifying shared work and
- 2) clarifying expectations of assumptions of cross sector work.

However, ten minor findings present as prospects for successful cross sector relationships.

The first minor finding intersects expectations and staffing as it relates to public-private ventures. Given these cases, the subjects suggest that strong relationships require partners to specify what constitutes a sufficient number of personnel, holding requisite levels of expertise, for the execution of project assumptions.

The second minor finding suggests prospects for better understandings of organizational cultures in relation to staffing implications. Therein, the subjects speak plainly to the importance of third sector personnel having prior experiences with public education. Inferred as the rationale for this prospect are the subjects' beliefs that the only way for staff to understand public schools is to have worked public schools.

The third minor finding relates to learning implications and the assumptions of shared work. The subjects presenting these cases speak to the importance of ensuring that cross sector partners are open to learning from success as well as failures of cross sector work in ways that suspend critical judgment or blame.

The fourth minor finding situates the prospect of disclosing agendas in effort to ensure the success of cross sector ventures. In short, the subjects presenting these cases speak to their belief that there should not be "any hidden motives" (Subject #5). Thus, potential ideological agendas need to be bared through discourse.

The fifth minor finding speaks to the prospects of disclosing agreements for shared work. Inherent in this finding is the subjects' imperative for discourse between partners. In other words there is much to be gained when cross sector partners meet and discuss both the ways in which they work as well as the implications of managing their work.

The sixth minor finding relates to the disclosure of assets committed to public-private ventures. Thus, proactive disclosures of financial interests hold benefit to ensuring successful cross sector relationships and reducing risks for improprieties.

The seventh minor finding addresses staffing related disclosures. Disclosures of staffing hold relevance as prospects for ensuring the success of partnerships between public schools and private charitable foundations. Specifically, prospects reside in partners sharing information concerning personnel and details addressing staff credentials and references.

The eighth minor finding supports prospects for clarifying expectations of assets in relation to shared work. Thus, strong relationships require commitments for financial transparency within public-private partnerships in order to mitigate risks associated with mismanagement of funds.

The ninth minor finding suggests prospects for learning implications and the settings in which cross sector work is situated. Given the consideration of settings, better relations can result when public-private partners understand the context in which the other operates. The inference is that such understandings better position cross sector partners for future engagements, as context counts.

The last of the minor findings speaks to ensuring capacity of staffing for cross sector work. Partners need to ensure that there is sufficient staffing, with requisite skill sets and expertise, attributed to executing the assumptions of cross sector work.

In total, there are ten minor findings that address prospects school board members perceive as essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations. The minor findings include the following:

- 1) clarifying expectations concerning staffing of public-private ventures;
- 2) understating organizational cultures and staffing of shared work;
- 3) learning from the assumptions of shared work;
- 4) disclosing agendas held by cross sector partners;
- 5) disclosing agreements for shared work;
- 6) disclosing assets in relation to shared work;
- 7) disclosing staffing for shared work;
- 8) clarifying expectations of assets in relation to shared work;
- 9) learning from the setting for cross sector work; and
- 10) ensuring capacity of staffing for cross sector work.

In relation to prospects by grounded categories, the fewest cases are presented by subjects that represent districts with high TE per ADM. The most frequent set of cases are presented by subjects that represent districts with mid-range TE per ADM (see Table 4.29).

Table 4.29 Frequencies of subjects’ categorical references to prospects by TE per ADM

Categories:								
	Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Settings	Total
High TE per ADM	0	1	1	7	1	7	0	17
Mid-Range TE per ADM	0	8	1	12	2	4	1	28
Low TE Per ADM	0	8	0	5	1	9	1	24
Total	0	17	2	24	4	20	2	69

The subjects speak most frequently of prospects that are categorically situated by agreements associated with cross sector work. The second most common category of prospects of which the subjects speak pertains to staffing related matters. The third most common sets of cases align with prospects situated by the assumptions of shared work. Categorically, prospects specific to assets or the funding of cross sector work represent the fourth most frequently cited set of subject cases. Finally, the least frequently addressed categories situating the subjects’ voice on matters concerning prospects are those that pertain to agendas and settings. Again, there are no subject cases addressing the intersection of prospects for cross sector work and the aims of the affiliated entities.

4.6 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 4

The purpose of this study is to identify views held by local school board members in Pennsylvania’s Allegheny County regarding affiliations with private charitable foundations supporting public education. This chapter presents findings that resulted from field research

conducted during this study. All results, presented in this chapter's preceding subsections, are situated as major or minor findings.

The study's first research question frames the subjects' perspectives on the roles and responsibilities of the third sector.

- 1) How do school board members perceive the roles and responsibilities of private charitable foundations in support of public elementary and secondary education?

Given the role of private charitable foundations, the major findings are listed as follows.

- 1) Foundations need to approach supports for public elementary and secondary education as a partner of cross sector work.
- 2) Foundations present risks for public schools and districts when serving as a driver within the context of cross sector work.

Given the role of private charitable foundations, the following minor finding holds relevance for discussion.

- 1) Partnerships are defined as having attributes suggestive of shared-decision making and mutual benefit.

Given the responsibilities of private charitable foundations, the major findings are listed as follows.

- 1) Foundations have an imperative to support public education given their broader responsibility to improve general social outcomes for their communities of interest.
- 2) Foundations hold a responsibility to support public education given non-financial means, including sharing of understandings and provisioning technical assistance.
- 3) Foundations hold a responsibility to financially support public education through direct financial invests in support of programming.

Given the responsibilities of private charitable foundations, the following minor findings hold relevance for discussion and are thus presented.

- 1) The non-financial means by which foundations can support public education includes informing change, supporting the improvement of outcomes and endorsing the institution of public schooling.
- 2) Beyond direct invests in public education, the financial means by which foundations can support public education includes informing change and supporting the improvement of outcomes.
- 3) Rationales for suggesting that foundations have a responsibility to support public education are informed by general, state and local funding deficits.

Based on both the perceived role and responsibilities attributed to the third sector, there appears to be no specific patterns resulting from the subjects' membership as framed by the study's purposive sampling: high, mid-range and low total expenditures by average daily attendance.

The study's remaining three research questions address the subjects' perspectives on practices, problems and prospects for public-private partnerships.

- 2) What do school board members perceive as practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations? (Q2- practices)
- 3) What do school board members suggest as the most significant barriers to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations? (Q3 - problems)
- 4) What do school board members suggest as means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations? (Q4 - prospects)

For purposes of this chapter summary, research questions two, three and four are thus situated in juxtaposition (see Table 4.30). The purpose in summarizing the study's remaining questions in tandem is twofold. First, the construct of the study's interview items situates the subjects' response cases for all three of the research questions within the following themes: disclosure, expectations, organizational culture, capacity and continuous learning (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Second, the content analysis applied within this study successfully grounds the findings within the follow categories: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and setting. Thus, all major findings for the remaining three research questions are situated within the intersection of themes and categories.

Table 4.30 Major findings by research question, situated thematically and categorically

		Categories:						
		Aims	Assumptions	Agendas	Agreements	Assets	Staffing	Settings
Themes:	Disclosure	Q2	Q2	Q3		Q2		
	Expectations		Q2; Q4		Q4	Q3		
	Organizational Culture							Q2
	Capacity					Q2; Q3	Q2	
	Continuous Learning		Q3					

This study brings forward thirteen major findings given the research questions addressing practices (Q2), problems (Q3) and prospects (Q4) (see Table 4.29). When considering the findings in relation to the themes, the majority of findings correspond to matters concerning disclosure and expectations. Findings concerning disclosure most generally situate with essential practices, given that three (75%) of the four findings are associated with Q2. Only one finding

concerning disclosure is associated with Q3, problems with public-private partnerships. Findings concerning expectations most generally situate with prospects for cross sector partnerships. Two (50%) of the four findings associated with Q4 are thematically framed by expectations. Additionally, one finding each from Q2 and Q3, practices and problems respectively, align with matters of expectations concerning multi-sectorial relationships. Thematically, capacity related matters present as the third most common set of findings. Two (66%) of the three capacity related findings relate to Q2, essential practices of public-private partnerships, with the third finding associated with Q3. Only one finding addresses organizational culture, which is attributed to Q2. Lastly, one finding is associated with continuous learning as it related to Q3, problems with public-private partnerships.

When considering the findings in relation to grounded categories, the majority of findings correspond to matters concerning assumptions and assets. Findings concerning assumptions most generally situate with essential practices, given that three (50%) of the four findings are associated with Q2. One finding concerning assumptions is associated with Q3, problems with public-private partnerships, with the remaining finding addressing Q4, prospects for multi-sectorial work. Two (50%) of the four findings categorically associated with assets address Q2, essential practices, with the other two findings addressing Q3, problems with public-private partnerships. The following three categories hold one finding each, framed by Q2, essential practices: aims, staffing and settings. One finding specific to agendas relates to Q3, problems or barriers to cross-sector work. Lastly, one categorical finding situates with agreements in relation to Q4, prospects for partnerships.

5.0 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to identify views held by local school board members in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County regarding affiliations with private charitable foundations supporting public education. Four research questions framed the study:

- 1) How do school board members perceive the roles and responsibilities of private charitable foundations in support of public elementary and secondary education?
- 2) What do school board members perceive as practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?
- 3) What do school board members suggest as the most significant barriers to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?
- 4) What do school board members suggest as means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

Chapter One of this work situates the context in which the study was implemented. In addition to positioning this study in the cross roads of political, social and economic dilemmas, Chapter One frames the statement of the problem in relation to the study's four research questions. Specifically, the statement of the problem speaks to the extent to which school board members are able to codify their views concerning affiliations with the philanthropic community when coming from a position of need and subjected to the pressures of internal and external demands. This researcher suggests that without school board members voicing their views with

the same level of focus and clarity as that which is evidenced by the third sector, the shared agenda they embrace may fail to achieve the desired outcomes held by both parties.

Chapter Two of this work addresses the review of literature. This researcher acknowledges that there is a dearth of research that explicitly examines the perspectives of school board members' views on engagement with private charitable foundations. Thus the literature review is framed to address four complementary issues. The first issue unpacks evidence that substantiates historical affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community. The second issue identifies evidence that suggests that affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community are desired presently. The third issue situates how the philanthropic community operates within American society. The fourth and final issue presents relevant findings concerning improvement strategies suggested to bolster affiliations between public education and the philanthropic community.

Chapter Three of this work details the research methodology employed within this study. The methodology consists of semi-structured interviews with a random purposive sampling of nine school board members from Pennsylvania's Allegheny County. Each study subject within the sample represents a school district that is categorized as one that has high, mid or low range per student expenditures based on average daily membership. Collected data is analyzed through a method commonly used by social scientists: content analysis.

Chapter Four of this work presents the findings of this study. The findings are organized by each of the study's four research questions, whereas the questions situate the subjects' thoughts on perspectives, practices, problems and prospects given public-private partnerships (Acar, 2001). While organized by each of the research questions, the findings from questions two, three and four are also framed by themes identified as essential to successful collaborations

between schools and private charitable foundations: disclosure, expectation, organizational culture, capacity and continuous learning (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Given the intersection of the subjects' thoughts in relation to the predetermined themes, analysis of the cases situates all findings in one of seven categories: aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and settings. All findings from each of the research questions are also identified as major or minor. Major findings are those in which five or more of the subjects present cases that are grounded within a category that results from the content analysis. Minor finding are those in which four or less of the subjects present cases that are grounded within a category.

Chapter Five discusses the major and minor findings associated with this study.

5.1 DISCUSSION OF THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVATE CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

The philanthropic community is consistent in evidencing long standing support for America's public schools. Such engagement spans our nation's history, stretching back as far as the establishment of free schools in colonial America (Curti, 1961; Fleishman, 2007; Hess, 2005; Lenkowsky & Spencer, 2001). Today, private charitable foundations continue to seek opportunities to support strong outcomes for public education (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007; Hess, 2005). Accordingly, this study's first research question queries the subjects' views on the responsibility private charitable foundations have to support public elementary and secondary education.

5.1.1 The Responsibilities of Private Charitable Foundations

Major findings from this study suggest that relationships between the third sector's philanthropic community and public schools are an expectation of multi-sector engagements. The subjects in this study speak of foundations as having a responsibility to improve general social outcomes for

communities in which the third sector holds interest. Inherent in the subjects' position is the belief that public education is a subset of general social concerns. Beyond addressing general matters of social welfare, major findings herein suggest that board members believe private charitable foundations have a responsibility to provide both direct and indirect investments in efforts that stand to inform educational agendas, improve student achievement and endorse, or invest in, the institution of public schooling. Such a responsibility is consistent with that which many in the philanthropic community holds for itself. The third sector is acutely interested in emphasizing education, "...as a poorly educated nation is a declining nation" (Ridings, 2000, p. 7). Still, the perceived responsibility of the third sector to support public education resides within an economic context.

Although a minor finding of this study, several subjects speak to current economic shortfalls as a contextual backdrop situating the need for public-private partnerships. Specifically, state and local funding deficits are cited as rationales compelling public schools to seek affiliations with the third sector. Such rationales are not unexpected. In fact, Loveless (2005) finds 75% of foundation program officers acknowledging schools as underfunded. However, there is a secondary implication associated with this finding. The finding also suggests that motivations for affiliations for cross sector partnerships stand to be informed by differencing interests. It is generally recognized that the third sector holds regard for school reform initiatives for the purpose of improving outcomes for public education (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006; Finn & Amis, 2001). Conversely, public schools may approach the philanthropic community for the purpose of closing funding gaps instead of achievement gaps. In the words of Subject #8, "I think that foundations can be used as an alternative funding source." Such as it is,

this researcher believes that further inquiry into the implications of multi-sector relationships, framed by disparate interests, warrants additional study.

5.1.2 The Role of Private Charitable Foundations

This study's subjects squarely situate private charitable foundations as having a responsibility to support public education. However, with respect to such an imperative, the subjects also speak to how they believe foundations should operate given their work within public schools.

Fleishman (2005) asserts that there are three general roles which define how America's philanthropic community operates. The three roles are categorically identified as that of driver, partner, and catalyst. Each role is not necessarily exclusive in terms of the ways in which the philanthropic community affiliates with cross sector partners. However, there are fairly clear distinctions between the various roles. The analysis of subject cases addressing views on the role of the third sector leads to a major finding for purposes of this study. Private charitable foundations should approach public elementary and secondary education as a partner in cross sector work. This study's finding complements Fleishman's (2005) position that most foundations choose to operate as partners when engaging other organizations.

The study's subjects speak of partnerships that have attributes suggestive of shared-decision making and mutual benefit. Although only a minor finding, such attributes correlate with that which Fleishman (2005) describes as practices exhibited by foundations operating as partners in cross sector work.

Typically, the partner foundation share control and accountability with the grant-receiving organization (Fleishman, 2005, p.6).

However, such attributes contrast with those in which foundations operate as drivers when engaging other organizations.

The subjects identify risks where foundations operate as drivers, which is a major finding of this study. In an effort to unpack this role, Fleishman (2005) notes the centralized decision-making position foundations assume when operating as a driver for reform or change. It appears that the centrality of such project control presents as a threat for the subjects. The subjects in this study speak against the potential loss of decision-making in cross sector relationships.

If ... foundation[s were] directing too much in the direction that they would want to go, then that is manipulative. It is a risk. You never want anyone to fully have too much control over what goes on in schools (Subject #5).

In fact, this finding is amplified in cases in which the subjects speak directly of donor/recipient aspects of shared work.

As a district, we want to be able to run this program as funded; but, we don't need [the foundation] looking over our shoulder. This would be an administrative nightmare for us (Subject #6).

Similarly, Subject #2 speaks of foundation investments in programming by qualifying, “give us a little leeway and don’t tie our hands.”

Thus, this study finds that the subjects prefer to have partnerships with the third sector where shared decision-making and mutual benefit is emphasized. However, the subjects also have the tendency to speak of autonomy when it comes to practicalities concerning programming and fund management. Hence a contradiction exists in that the subjects speak of interests in partnering while desiring autonomy given the administration of shared work.

5.2 DISCUSSION OF PRACTICES ESSENTIAL TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

This study’s second research question frames the intersections between that which the subjects suggest as essential practices given the following themes: disclosure, expectations,

organizational culture and capacity. Herein, this sub-section addresses discussion of seven major findings relating to essential practices.

5.2.1 Discussion of Essential Practices Concerning Disclosure

Ehrlich and Bacchetti (2005) surmise that not only do communication problems exist between foundations and education; but, the only means by which to overcome said challenges is through blunt and candid exchanges. Likewise, three of the seven major findings pertaining to essential practices conceptually address issues of disclosures between cross sector partners.

The first of the three findings associated with the practices of disclosure relates to organizational aims. For purposes of this study, aims refer to matters concerning the core missions of partnering agencies. Thus, the subjects speak strongly of the need for partners to understand each other's organizational goals.

[Foundations] need to know what the priorities are for the district (Subject #8).

Likewise:

What are the goals and objectives of the foundation (Subject #1)?

Significance, given the disclosure of aims, resides in the assurance that the cross sector partners have compatible missions. In fact, a finding of the first research question underscores the subjects' position that public-private partners, by definition, need to benefit from cross sector partnerships. Thus, a starting point in ensuring mutual benefit is situated in understanding the organizational intents of multi-sector partners. Without having access to information pertaining to organizational aims, risks present in that incompatible entities may attempt to engage in cross sector work (Subject #1).

The second of three findings pertaining to disclosures relates to matters concerning assets and the funding of cross sector work. Thus, the emphasis on disclosures of assets is framed by

the subjects' interest in the following: origins of third sector funding, amount of private funding being committed to educational initiatives and assurances that private funding will be sufficient to execute the assumptions of shared work. Of note, with respect to this finding, is the general implication that such disclosures appear to be one sided. In other words, the subjects situate disclosure of assets as a practice that needs to be exercised by private charitable foundations partnering with public schools. At no time do the subjects suggest that public schools and districts hold equal responsibility to disclose to their partners information pertaining to school finances and/or the potential funding to sustain or advance outcomes resulting from cross sector work.

It is acknowledged that private charitable foundations continue to seek opportunities to leverage their assets to assist school reform agendas and public schooling (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007; Hess, 2005). Even so, this study's subjects expect to have targeted conversations with foundations concerning the financial aspects of affiliations. Matters concerning the disclosure of assets, as an essential practice of cross sector work, may be informed by the subjects' general concerns over the stability of funding streams. Again, as was previously discussed as a minor finding of this study, the reality of economic shortfalls may situate school board members' interests in affiliations with private charitable foundations. Specifically, state and local funding deficits are each cited as a rationale compelling public schools to seek affiliations with the third sector. However, without additional study, the underlying concerns situating the subjects' interest in the one-sided disclosure of assets, and its effect on the assumptions of public-private partnerships, can only be hypothesized.

The third major finding addressing the practice of disclosures relates to general assumptions of affiliations between private charitable foundations and public education.

Assumptions, for purposes of this study, refer to outcomes associated with cross sector partnerships. As plainly stated by a subject of this study:

Both sides need to be serious about what they are doing and need to be completely open about what they are after (Subject #9).

R. Hall et al. (1963) echo this implication given the attention they provide to occurrences in which the reality of certain grant proposals is other than that which the grant is designed to achieve, espousing that such misrepresentation is “unhealthy for foundations, school administrators and other educators” (p 11). In fact, if the practice of explicit disclosure of general project assumptions fails to take place, the subjects assert that affiliations can result in undesired outcomes that lead to lost opportunities and negative public relations for both partners.

5.2.2 Discussion of Essential Practices Concerning Expectations

Thoughtful engagement of all cross sector partners in explicating shared work is essential (Acar, 2001; Frumkin, 2005; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). In addition to the practice of disclosing general assumptions of public-private partnerships, this study also finds there to be significance in further clarifying actual expectations of project assumptions. In other words, this study already finds that multi-sector partners need to be frank in sharing their thoughts about cross sector work and project outcomes. However, such frank conversation is not sufficient in and of itself. Additionally, foundations and schools need to exercise targeted efforts to further clarify the implications of cross sector work. In unpacking expectations, the subjects suggest conversations that address planning, implementation, oversight and interpretation of results. When such clarity is established, expectations and ownership of responsibilities for the assumptions of public-private partnership is thus overtly recognized. Such direct recognition is consistent with findings posited by Goren and Wurtzel: ownership of cross sector work needs to be shared and

uncontested (2008). Where ownership of project assumptions is not clarified, R. Hall et al. (1963) caution that the shared work can lead to the eventual advancement of proceedings executed at the expense of education. Herein, and once again, this study's finding not only substantiates this matter but also situates such considerations as those pertaining to planning, implementation, oversight and interpretation of results.

5.2.3 Discussion of Essential Practices Concerning Organizational Culture

Private charitable foundations and public education operate with differing levels of overall accountability and are subject to dissimilar sets of primary stakeholders (Finn & Amis, 2001; Fleishmann, 2007; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Thus, the cultures of such cross sector partners are inherently different. In an effort to successfully position affiliations between public-private partners, this study finds that foundations and public schools need to examine the social, political and/or economic context in which shared work is taking place. The intersection of practices between organizational culture and setting is central to this point. Goren and Wurtzel (2008) suggest that efforts should be taken to diversify the experience and backgrounds of cross sector partners to include understandings of the community in which shared work is situated. Likewise, and framed in more pragmatic terms, Subject #1 speaks to the importance of understanding the setting in which public-private affiliations take place.

A foundation really needs to understand what the district needs are and understand how to meet those needs [instead of] trying to impose their will or their desire (Subject #1).

Hence, general implications hold for practices that are intended to achieve more robust understandings of settings in which private charitable foundations are engaging schools and districts to inform, improve or invest in outcomes of public education. Yet, given the scope of

this study, suggestions by which to inform the practices of cross sector partners in better understanding the needs of their communities of interest are not otherwise defined.

5.2.4 Discussion of Essential Practices Concerning Capacity

The final two major findings of this study, relating to practices essential for public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations, are those that concern capacity. The first of the findings relates to assets and funding necessary to execute shared work. The second finding pertains to capacity of staff to execute and support cross sector work.

Similar to practices relating to disclosures of assets, this study finds practices that address partners' capacity to fund cross sector work are essential to successful cross sector affiliations. However, capacity to fund shared work suggests more than disclosing the origins, amounts and commitments of private funding for public outcomes. Rather, practices need to be in place by which cross sector partners examine their short-term and long-range preparedness for executing and sustaining efforts over time. The implications of this finding are neither subtle nor slight. Rather, such implications are inherently embedded in the paradigms framing multi-sectorial agencies. In fact, Ehrlich and Bacchetti (2005) squarely suggest that school officials are oft lead to seek short-term changes whereas the third sector is generally more interested in addressing long-term problems and solutions through systematic programming. Thus, practices situating public-private partners to examine their fiscal capacities to authentically engage in short-term efforts and support long -term effects are warranted. However, this study does not suggest what variables should be examined, as a matter of practice, in determining public-private partners' capacity to financially engage in and sustain cross sector efforts in support of public education.

Finally, matters pertaining to the capacity of staff to execute and support cross sector work presents as a major finding of this study. Goren and Wurtzel (2008) speak of the capacity

of cross sector agents to effectively implement shared work. As such, this study also suggests considerations specific to practices relating to staff capacity in terms of the expertise of personnel as well as the available human capital poised to execute the assumptions of public-private partnerships. Such considerations are echoed in the extant literature. Ehrlich and Bacchetti (2005) and Finn (2001) discuss implications associated with the time and expertise required of multi-sectorial partners to advance work that results in improved social outcomes. R. Hall et al. (1963) argue that public-private partners need to consider whether their agencies are able to implement shared agendas based on the availability of personnel. Given these understandings, this study suggests that private charitable foundations and public school partners need to examine, assess and address the requisite skills sets of project personnel, the time required of project personnel and the availability of personnel before engaging in cross sector affiliations.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF BARRIERS TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

The third research question within this study frames the intersections between that which the subjects suggest as barriers given the following themes: disclosure, expectations, capacity and continuous learning. Herein, this sub-section addresses discussion of four major findings relating to barriers to partnerships between private charitable foundations and public schools.

5.3.1 Discussion of Barriers Concerning Disclosures

There appears to be a predisposition of doubt given matters concerning the sincerity of cross sector work. Such doubt may be predicated upon the realization that public education and private charitable foundations operate within unlike sectors that express success differently

(Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). However, the inclination of doubt is made manifest in the first of this study's four major findings framing the subjects' views on barriers to public-private partnerships. Herein, the study finds that there could be risks to public schools given the subjects' skepticism that third sector partners will honestly disclose information about ideological agendas underlying and/or motivating their interests in cross sector partnerships. Thus, the study's subjects speak of the disadvantages facing schools and districts when partnering with private charitable foundations that withhold or mask their deeper sociopolitical beliefs.

R. Hall et al. (1963) plainly speak of the damages that results from grant funded projects that are executed for purposes other than that for which they were intended. However, the suggestion that such damage can occur is situated by Hall et al. (1963) in relation to schools' potential misrepresentation of grant proposals as opposed to hidden third sector ideological agendas. In fact, this study's subjects realize the possibility that schools and districts can be duplicitous in leveraging third sector partnerships. In the words of one of the study's own participants, public schools and districts, operating from a point of financial need, may in essence be "making a sales pitch... tell[ing] the [foundations] what ... they want to hear" (Subject #9). Thus, disclosures of ideological agendas are, in actuality, risks for private charitable foundations as well as public schools and districts.

5.3.2 Discussion of Barriers Concerning Expectations

Earlier in this chapter discussion situates the importance of practices framing both the disclosure of assets and the capacity of leveraged assets to effectively support public-private partnerships. Therein, this study suggests that schools need to understand the origins of, amounts committed to, and assurances of third sector funding to execute assumptions of shared work. Moreover,

cross sector partners need to consider their financial capacity to authentically engage in both the short-term and long-range implications associated with outcomes of public-private affiliations. However, with respect to barriers to cross sector relations, a major finding of this study purports that poorly defined expectations concerning the fiscal management of shared work presents as a risk for public entities as well as a conceptual barrier to shared work.

This study finds that when expectations are not clearly defined, the funding of cross sector work can lead to compromising outcomes. Herein, the subjects frame such outcomes as those that can result in the wasting of fiscal resources, loss of fiscal resources and/or risks associated with supplanting core fiduciary obligations with temporal donor funding. The subjects' concerns, given the implications associated with wasted funds and/or loss of funds, are not without cause. Colvin (2005), for example, reports the practice of venture philanthropists delaying project funding, assigning new management to projects, or withdrawing financial support for projects on occasions in which grantees fail to achieve agreed-upon targets. Such realities amplify the financial risks schools take when engaging in cross sector work, situating the risks as a barrier to cross sector affiliations. However, more nuanced is the concern that third sector funding may be used to supplant or replace core district funds. As framed by Subject #3:

I think sometimes if [schools] go after money from a foundation that the school district should be paying for it (Subject #3).

Thus, this study's finding implies that, despite the best of intentions, donor funding used to support public education can create a liability for public schools in terms of compromised funding and a liability for the third sector in terms of achieving desired outcomes.

As the extant literature suggests, thoughtful engagement of all partners in the co-design of shared work bolsters relationships and outcomes (Acar, 2001; Frumkin, 2005; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Thus implied is a general understanding that expectations concerning fiscal

management of shared work needs to be thoughtfully framed and mutually defined. However, as was discussed earlier in this chapter, there is an inherent conflict in bridging such theory and practice. Granted, this study finds that the subjects prefer to have partnerships with the third sector's philanthropic community when shared decision-making and mutual benefit is emphasized. However, the subjects' also have the tendency to speak of autonomy when it comes to practicalities concerning programming and fund management. Such desire for autonomy concerning programming stands to further reinforce the barrier presented by expectations and assets.

5.3.3 Discussion of Barriers Concerning Capacity

The preceding discussion unpacks the problem and associated risks that can result from a lack of clarity given the expectations of shared work and the collateral impact misconstructions can have on funding shared work. In contrast, the third problem defined by this study is situated by the intersection of capacity related matters and assets. Herein, the barrier exists given that public schools may enter in cross sector work only to find themselves unable to sustain projects when donor supports are exited. Clearly, cross sector partners need to consider whether their infrastructures can provision the requisite resources and supports, including financial capital, in order to reasonably implement and sustain cross sector work. However, there appears to be little monies available for schools and districts to access given reform or expansion of programming.

Almost all of the billions spent on schools, however, is already spoken for, claimed by current teachers and the always escalating costs of salaries, health benefits, books, supplies, and maintenance. That leaves precious few public dollars available (Hess, 2005, p.23).

In fact, the subjects themselves speak of this problem.

On an average, 85% of the school's budget is fixed. Whether it be collective-bargaining limits and things pertaining to contracts..., it makes it very difficult. There is a small window for any type of additional work to help support school district work (Subject #7).

Accordingly, there are inherent limitations for schools in advancing school reform and program development. Such limitations present barriers and challenges for public educational entities seeking to authentically commit to short-term and long-range financial implications associated with projects resulting from public-private partnerships.

5.3.4 Discussion of Barriers Concerning Continuous Learning

The final problem identified as a finding of this study addresses learnings resulting from the assumptions of shared work. The barrier resides in the possibility that new understandings resulting from the implementation of shared work may in fact shine a poor light on the public education system. The subjects codify the risks as those that relate to unmasking poor efficiencies and the lack of efficacy associated with public schooling.

In fact, the third sector's philanthropic community questions the outcomes resulting in America's public school system. Foundation leaders overtly question whether the quality of American education has risen over the past three decades (Ferris, Hentschke, & Harmssen, 2007). Not surprisingly, philanthropic foundations assert pessimism over educators' ability to improve student achievement and increase educational capital (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2006). The lack of such confidence in America's public schools leads to the third sector's additional concern for the economic and political status of the United States. Such apprehensions include perceived threats to America's declining position in the global economy (Getty, 2007).

Such critiques deeply situate the barrier addressed herein when recognizing that the third sector, operating as a partner in cross sector work, can purport learnings that expose the failings of public schools. Moreover, such findings can also bring forward greater public scrutiny of public education by dissatisfied, external stakeholders. After all, domestic anti-tax sentiment, coupled with the realization that most demographics indicate that there are more family units with no children in public schools, creates a fiscally contentious relationship between public education and the citizenry who otherwise funds it (Ray, Candoli, & Hack, 2005).

5.4 DISCUSSION OF PROSPECTS FOR SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

The fourth and final research question within this study frames the intersections between that which the subjects suggest as prospects for public-private partnerships given the expectations associated with shared work. Herein, this sub-section addresses discussion of two major findings relating to prospects that stand to bolster the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations.

The first major finding situates prospects for clarifying the assumptions of cross sector work. In essence, the study's subjects suggest that cumulative and sequential steps be exercised as a means to ensure successful partnerships between public schools and private charitable foundations. Such steps include charting the expectations for shared work, including detailing pre-planning, project implementation and project oversight. Similarly, Acar (2001) suggests the same prospect, arguing for "mapping and mutually adjusting" expectation between public-private partners. Likewise, Goren and Wurtzel (2008) contend that both the third sector and public education must fully assume responsibility for being realistic, frank and honest in

establishing agendas, defining responsibilities and reporting outcomes associated with shared work.

Thus, precedence for this study's finding is grounded in the extant literature. However, the contribution of this finding resides in the realization that such prospects are held by school board members. Others who speak to defining expectations frame their arguments from perspectives derived by other stakeholder groups. Goren and Wurtzel (2008) situate their cases given research engaging school superintendents. Acar (2001) situates cases based on work with school personnel and external stakeholders, none of whom are identified as school board directors.

The second major finding situates prospects for clarifying agreements of cross sector work. In essence, this finding suggests the importance of codifying shared work through both verbal and written agreements. Yet, a dearth of detail is acknowledged herein and limitations exist in further unpacking the implication of this prospect.

5.5 IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Goren and Wurtzel (2008) suggest that schools engaging in cross sector work need to have school board members actively engaged in the process.

Boards pose a large and often overlooked challenge. Foundations for the most part pay scant attention to building the capacity, skills and knowledge of elected and appointed board members (Goren & Wurtzel, 2008, p. 5).

Moreover, if school board members hold a sense of ownership of cross sector work, the social outcomes associated with shared work stand a better chance of enduring over time (Acar, 2001; Goren & Wurtzel, 2008). Yet, without school board members voicing their views on cross sector

work with the same level of focus and clarity as that of the third sector, the shared agenda they embrace may fail to achieve the desired outcomes held by both parties.

Thus, this study examines the practices, perspectives, problems and prospects school board members hold in relation to public private partnerships. This study reveals that there is significance in considering the implications of aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and settings in relation to cross sector work. However, not all implications in all cases are found to be significant. Thus, the discussion of results, previously presented within this chapter, only addresses major findings as they relate to each of the following four research questions.

- 1) How do school board members perceive the roles and responsibilities of private charitable foundations in support of public elementary and secondary education?
- 2) What do school board members perceive as practices essential to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?
- 3) What do school board members suggest as the most significant barriers to public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?
- 4) What do school board members suggest as means by which to best ensure the successful development of public-private partnerships with private charitable foundations?

The results of this study also lead to further considerations for additional research and investigation into the views school board members hold for public-private partnerships. Herein, suggestions for additional study are framed.

Replication of this study is warranted in other communities. The limitations of this study situate the research in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County. In total, this study engages nine

subjects representing school districts with high, mid-range and low total student expenditures per average daily student membership. Based on the stratification of districts, no distinct subject response patterns emerge from this study. However, in relation to the limited size of the random purposive sample, this researcher is unable to assert the extent to which district-level, per student funding influences the views of school board members. Moreover, given the limited number of subjects, replication of the study would stand to confirm the extent to which considerations of aims, assumptions, agendas, agreements, assets, staffing and settings are exhaustive and relevant.

This study finds that the subjects prefer partnerships with the third sector's philanthropic community, with an emphasis on shared decision-making and mutual benefit. However, the subjects also have the tendency to speak of autonomy when it comes to practicalities concerning programming and fund management. Hence a contradiction exists in that the subjects speak of interests in partnering while desiring autonomy given the administration of shared work. As such, much remains to be learned from studying the extent to which this duplicitous position may be generalizable and the potential impact that such incongruencies might have on the success of multi-sectorial initiatives.

Given the scope of this study, suggestions by which to inform the practices of cross sector partners in better understanding the needs of their communities are not identified. Yet, as an essential practice, this study finds that foundations and public schools need to examine the social, political and/or economic context in which shared work is taking place. Within this research project, little direction is provided in terms of identifying what variables need to be examined in order for multi-sectorial partners to be assured they have sufficient understanding of the needs-based implications of their shared work.

In relation to the practice of disclosure of assets, the subjects speak of third sector responsibilities. However, there is an absence of recognition provided the study's findings that suggests what schools and districts should consider in relation to disclosures suggesting fiscal readiness for engaging in shared work. Additional study in this area may stand to inform means by which educational entities might determine their financial readiness to undertake short-term and long-range implications often associated with public-private partnerships.

Given the significance of barriers concerning disclosures, this researcher suggests that further investigation into the potential effects ideological agendas may have on cross sector work is warranted. What otherwise distinguishes additional study on this matter is the inherent contradiction in views espoused by this study's subjects. Given the context of this study, the subjects suggest that the third sector's philanthropic community may hold undisclosed ideological agendas that inform their interest and motives for engaging public education. Such undisclosed agendas pose as barriers and present risks to cross sector work. Thus, the subjects place the onus of this barrier squarely on the third sector. However, extant literature otherwise suggests that education, upon occasion, uses opportunities presented by donor/recipient relationships to advance purposes other than those intended of donor funded grants. In fact, within the context of this study, a single subject speaks of the potential for schools and districts to approach private charitable foundations with insincere rhetoric for purposes of securing cross sector funding. Therefore, the extent to which school directors do not recognize underlying motives that may position public schools to engage in cross sector work may prove to be of value in unpacking deeper implications associated with this barrier.

Lastly, a major finding concerning the prospects for clarifying agreements of cross sector work suggests the importance of codifying shared work through both verbal and written

agreements. Yet, the subjects present little additional detail concerning this matter. Thus, additional consideration should be given to that which school directors constitute as sufficient forms of documentation of cross sector agreements.

Moreover, investigation into communication paradigms may be warranted. For example, Chubb (2010) frames communication between multi-sector stakeholders on a continuum that ranges from means-focused to shared means and ends. Chubb labels the levels in the communication paradigm as follows: command, coordinate, cooperate and collaborate. Such a paradigm, when considered in relation to how cross sector agreements are negotiated, may better situate how agreements may be coordinated to best ensure successful outcomes for cross sector partners.

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Date: MM, DD, 2009

<School Board Member's Name>
<Name of Board Member's School District>
<Address #1>
<Address #2>
<City>, PA <Zip Code>

Dear <School Board Member>

My name is James Palmiero. I am currently enrolled as a doctoral student in School Leadership in the Department of Administration and Policy Studies in the University of Pittsburgh's College of Education. Having previously worked as an assistant superintendent of a local school district, I appreciate and recognize school board members' commitment to creating positive learning environments where students can realize their potential and enter the world ready for the challenges ahead. Such outcomes for today's children and youth hold ominous responsibilities that require school directors to oversee both school policies and school finance. Situated in the intersection between policy and finance, the research for my dissertation focuses on the perspectives held by local school board members on the practices, problems and prospects associated with public education's affiliations with private charitable foundations.

As a <school board president>/<school board vice president>/<school board member at-large>, you are being invited to participate in this research study. Please know that aside from serving as a school board member in one of Allegheny County's public school districts, there are

no additional qualifications required for participation in the study. However, your voice in this study is very important.

The following information will provide you with an overview of what you should expect from involvement in this study if you are selected to participate. You will be interviewed face-to-face, in single session at a location on a date and time of your choosing. The interview, which I will conduct, is anticipated to take approximately 60 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded in order to assist with its subsequent transcription. Confidentiality is a high priority and will be maintained by this researcher throughout the study. I will provide you with a written draft of the transcribed interview for review, comment, and/or correction prior to my finalizing the transcript and analyzing the data. Your audio recorded interview will be permanently erased following receipt of the drafted transcript. Both the draft and finalized transcript will have personally identifiable information expunged from the text in order to ensure your anonymity. Moreover, at no time will you and your district be reference by name in the study. For purposes of recording and reporting data, you will be assigned a unique and non-identifiable subject number. As such, there are no foreseeable risks associated with participating in the research project. Nor are there costs or anticipated benefits resulting from your engagement in the study. Finally, it must be acknowledged that you may freely choose to withdraw from the study at any time.

Please recognize that a limited number of participants are being invited to participate in this study, of which you are one. Thus, it is important for you to confirm your interest in participating in this study by filling out and returning the attached form. Please complete the attached form and post it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope or email the application information to <email address> no later than MM, DD, 2009.

The learnings gleaned from this research stands to contribute better understandings of school board members' perspectives on affiliations with private charitable foundations. In advance, I would like to thank you for consideration of this invitation to participate. If you have any questions concerning the study or your potential role as a study participant, please feel free to contact me directly by phone [home] (xxx) xxx-xxxx; [mobile] (xxx) xxx-xxxx; [work] (xxx) xxx-xxx or email <email address>.

Respectfully,

James Palmiero

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE – RESPONSE FORM

<p><School Board Member's Name> <Name of Board Member's School District> <Address #1> <Address #2> <City>, PA <Zip Code></p>		<p>Researcher: James Palmiero Address: <Address #1> <City>, PA <Zip Code> Phone: [h] (xxx) xxx-xxxx [m] (xxx) xxx-xxxx [w] (xxx) xxx-xxxx email: <email address></p>
--	--	--

You have been invited participate in the following research study:

*A Study of School Board Members' Views on Affiliations with Private Charitable Foundations
Supporting Public Education: A Regional Study Situated in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County.*

Please indicate your interest in participating in this study by checking the appropriate box.

- ☐ I am interested in participating in this study.
- ☐ I am not interested in participating in this study.

Name: _____ Date: _____
(Signature)

If interested in participating in this study, please also provide the following information.

Phone Number: _____ Email: _____

Preferred address for written correspondences:

Please return this form in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope or email the application information to jpalmiero@verizon.net no later than MM, DD, 2009.

If volunteering to participate in this research study, you will be contacted in writing with additional information about scheduling your participant interview.

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

Thank you for volunteering your time to participate in this study. This interview focuses on your thoughts about partnerships with foundations. In total there are 25 questions in this interview. The questions are clustered around themes. There is no right or wrong answers. Take as much time as you need to answer each question. Let me know if you do not understand a question. Let me know if you do not have an answer for a question so that we can move onto the next item.

I will be taking notes during this interview and will be audio recording this session. I will be using the recording and notes to help me write a transcript of this interview. I will send you a copy of this transcript for you to review for accuracy. Your responses for purposes of this research project will remain anonymous at all times.

Do you have any questions before we begin? <Address questions, as framed by the subject>

Ok, let's begin. I am wondering....

Roles and Responsibilities of Foundations

- 1) What responsibility do foundations have in supporting public education? (general, situated by perspectives)
- 2) What problems, if any could exist for schools in working with foundations? (general, situated by problems)
- 3) What can schools and foundations do to make sure there are little problems when they work together? (general, situated by prospects)
- 4) Some people use the words driver, catalyst and partner to describe how foundations best work with schools. Using those same words, how do you think foundations should work with schools? Tell me why.

Great, the next set of questions is about information sharing.

Perceptions Concerning Disclosure

- 5) As a board member, what information would you want to see shared between schools and foundation? (disclosure, situated by practices)
- 6) What, if anything, is the incentive for schools and foundations to share such information? (disclosure, situated by perspectives)
- 7) Describe what problems could result from sharing information between schools and foundations? (disclosure, situated by problems)
- 8) What can schools and foundations do to be certain they are sharing important information with one another? (disclosure, situated by prospects)

The next set of questions is about expectations.

Perceptions Concerning Expectations

- 9) What are reasonable expectations for schools and foundations to have of one another? (expectation situated by perspectives)
- 10) How should schools and foundations determine if their expectations are consistent with one another? (expectations situated by practices)
- 11) Describe what problems could exist when schools and foundations talk about their expectations. (expectations situated by problems)
- 12) What could schools and foundations do to reduce problems when they talk about their expectations? (expectations by prospects)

The next set of questions is about how schools and foundations work.

Perceptions Concerning Organizational Culture

- 13) What do schools and foundations need to know about the ways in which they work? (organizational culture situated by perspectives)
- 14) How could the ways in which schools and foundations work affect their relationship? (organizational culture situated by practices)
- 15) Describe what problems could result from the ways in which schools and foundations work. (organizational culture situated by problems)

- 16) What could schools and foundations do to reduce problems that could result from the ways in which work? (organizational culture situated by prospects)

The next set of questions focus on schools' and foundations' ability to work on projects.

Perceptions Concerning Capacity

- 17) What do schools and foundations need to know about their abilities to work together? (capacity situated by perspectives)
- 18) What should schools and foundations do to figure out if they are able to work together? (capacity situated by practices)
- 19) Describe what problems could exist if schools and foundations are not sure they are able to work together. (capacity situated by problems)
- 20) What could schools and foundations do to minimize problems about their ability to work together? (capacity situated by prospects)

This is the last set of questions. They focus on what could be learned from schools and foundations working on grant funded projects.

Perceptions Concerning Continuous Learning

- 21) What types of things can schools and foundations learn from one another? (continuous learning situated by perceptions)
- 22) What could schools and foundations do to learn from one another? (continuous learning situated by practices)
- 23) Describe what problems could exist for schools and foundations in dealing with what they learn. (continuous learning situated by problems)
- 24) What could schools and foundations do to reduce problems linked to what they may learn? (continuous learning situated by prospects)

Thank you. I have one more question.

Closing Items

- 25) I am wondering if your district has received any foundation grants since you have been on the school board.

APPENDIX C

CROSSWALK BETWEEN RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Interview Questions	Research Question #1	Research Question #2	Research Question #3	Research Question #4
1) What responsibility do foundations have in supporting public education?	✓			
2) What problems, if any could exist for schools in working with foundations?			✓	
3) What can schools and foundations do to make sure there are little problems when they work together?				✓
4) Some people use the words driver, catalyst and partner to describe how foundations best work with schools. Using those same words, how do you think foundations should work with schools? Tell me why.	✓			
5) As a board member, what information would you want to see shared between schools and foundation?		✓		
6) What, if anything, is the incentive for schools and foundations to share such information?	✓			
7) Describe what problems could result from sharing information between schools and foundations?			✓	
8) What can schools and foundations do to be certain they are sharing important information with one another?				✓
9) What are reasonable expectations for schools and foundations to have of one another?	✓			
10) How should schools and foundations determine if their expectations are consistent with one another?		✓		
11) Describe what problems could exist when schools and foundations talk about their expectations.			✓	

Interview Questions

	Research Question #1	Research Question #2	Research Question #3	Research Question #4
12) What could schools and foundations do to reduce problems when they talk about their expectations?				✓
13) What do schools and foundations need to know about the ways in which they work?	✓			
14) How could the ways in which schools and foundations work affect their relationship?		✓		
15) Describe what problems could result from the ways in which schools and foundations work.			✓	
16) What could schools and foundations do to reduce problems that could result from the ways in which work?				✓
17) What do schools and foundations need to know about their abilities to work together?	✓			
18) What should schools and foundations do to figure out if they are able to work together?		✓		
19) Describe what problems could exist if schools and foundations are not sure they are able to work together.			✓	
20) What could schools and foundations do to minimize problems about their ability to work together?				✓
21) What types of things can schools and foundations learn from one another?	✓			
22) What could schools and foundations do to learn from one another?		✓		
23) Describe what problems could exist for schools and foundations in dealing with what they learn.			✓	
24) What could schools and foundations do to reduce problems linked to what they may learn?				✓
25) I am wondering if your district has received any foundation grants since you have been on the school board.	<i>Not Applicable</i>			

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

James Palmiero

From: jpalmiero@verizon.net
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 1:53 PM
To: James Palmiero
Subject: Fwd: PI Notification: IRB determination

Apr 21, 2009 08:38:59 AM, irb@pitt.edu wrote:



University of Pittsburgh
Institutional Review Board

3500 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 363-1480
(412) 363-1508 (fax)
<http://www.irb.pitt.edu>

Memorandum

To: James Palmiero
From: Christopher Ryan, PhD, Vice Chair
Date: 4/21/2009
IRB#: [PRO09040134](#)
Subject: A Study of School Board Members' Views on Affiliations with Private Charitable Foundations Supporting Public Education: A Regional Study Situated in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County

The above-referenced project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board. Based on the information provided to the IRB, this project includes no involvement of human subjects, according to the federal regulations [§46.102(f)]. That is, the investigator conducting research will not obtain data through intervention or interaction with the individual, nor will obtain identifiable private information. Should that situation change, the investigator must notify the IRB immediately.

Please note the following information:

- If any modifications are made to this project, use the " Send Comments to IRB Staff" process from the project workspace to request a review to ensure it continues to meet the no human subjects determination.
- Upon completion of your project, be sure to finalize the project by submitting a "Study Completed" report from the project workspace.

Please be advised that your research study may be audited periodically by the University of Pittsburgh Research Conduct and Compliance Office.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- The 2008 Broad Prize for Urban Education*. (2008). Retrieved November 9, 2008, from <http://www.broadprize.org/asset/1122-tbp2008brochure.pdf>.
- Aarons, D. (2008, October 22). District on Texas boarder wins Broad prize for urban education. *Education Week*, pp. 6-7.
- Acar, M. (2001). *Accountability in public-private partnerships*. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- Allen, J. (1969). Education for the new republic. In *The American public school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bacchetti, R., & Ehrlich, T. (2006). *Turning good intentions into educational capital*. Stanford, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Biebel, C. (1976). Private foundations and public policy: The case of secondary education during the great depression. *History of Education Quarterly*, 19(1), 3-33.
- Bracey, G. W. (2004). The 14th Bracey report on the condition of public education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(2), 149-167.
- The Broad Prize for Urban Education*. (n.d). Retrieved October 17, 2008, from <http://www.broadprize.org/about/overview.html>.
- Burgess, C. (1963). William Maclure and education for a good society. *History of Education Quarterly*, 3(2), 58-76.
- Burton, J. (1997). Philanthropy and the origins of educational cooperation: Harvard College, the Hopkins Trust, and the Cambridge Grammar School. *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 37(2), 141-161.

- Buteau, J., Buchanan, P., Bolanos, C., Block, A., Chang, K., & Ross, J. (2008). *More than money: Making a difference with assistance beyond the grant*. Cambridge: The Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Carnegie, A. (1889). Wealth. *North American Review*, 141, 653-664.
- Christensen, C., Aaron, S., & Clark, W. (2005). Can schools improve? *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 86(No. 7), 545 - 550.
- Chubb, Mark (2010, April 28). *But wait, there's more*. Retrieved February, 26, 2011, from <http://www.hlswatch.com/2010/04/28/but-wait-theres-more/>.
- Cohen D. & Crabtree B. (2006). *Qualitative research guidelines project*. Retrieved December 12, 2009, from <http://www.qualres.org/HomeInte-3516.html>.
- Colvin, R. (2005). A new generation of philanthropists and their great ambition. In F. Hess (Ed.), *With the best of intentions: How philanthropy is reshaping K-12 education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Colvin, R. (2005). The new philanthropists. *Education Next*, 5(4), 34-41.
- Curti, M. (1958). American philanthropy and the national character. *American Quarterly*, 10(4), 420-437.
- Curti, M. (1961). Tradition and innovation in American philanthropy. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 105(2), 146-156.
- Curti, M., Green, J., & Nash, R. (1963). Anatomy of giving: Millionaires in the late 19th century. *American Quarterly*, 15(3), 416-435.
- deMarrais, K. B., & LeCompte, M. D. (1999). *The ways schools work: A sociological analysis of education*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Dotterweich, L., & McNeal, R. (2003). *The No Child Left Behind Act and public preferences*. Paper presented at the 99th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA.
- Duck, L. (1995). *Understanding American education: Its practices, past, and promise*. Burke: VA: Chatelaine Press.

Erhlich, T. & Bacchetti, R. (Ed.). (2005). *Proceedings of the foundation and education Conference*. Stamford, CA: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Eaton, J. (1877). *Report of the commissioner of education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Expenditure Data for All School Entities. (2008). Retrieved September 19, 2008, from http://www.pde.state.pa.us/k12_finances/cwp/view.asp?a=3&Q=50949.

Ferris, J., Hentschke, G., & Harmssen, H. (2007). Philanthropic strategies for school reform: An analysis of foundation choices. *Educational Policy*, 22(705), 705-730.

Finn, C., & Amis, K. (2001). *Making it count: A guide to high impact education philanthropy*. Washington D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Fleishman, J. (2007). *The foundation: A great American secret*. New York: Public Affairs.

The Foundation Center. (2008). *Search grantmakers*. Retrieved from The Foundation Center's Foundation Directory On-Line web site: http://fconline.foundationcenter.org/srch_fdn.php.

Foundation Establishment: From the Turn of the 20th Century to Today. (2005). Retrieved from the Foundation Center web site: http://foundationcenter.org/findfunders/statistics/pdf/13_found_estab/estab_text.pdf.

Freidman, L., & McGarvie, M. (2003). *Charity, philanthropy, and civility in American history*. New York: NY: Cambridge University Press.

Frumkin, P. (2004). *Philanthropy*. Retrieved April 9, 2006, from <http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/965.html>.

Frumkin, P. (2005). Strategic giving and public school reform. In F. Hess (Ed.), *With the best of intentions: How philanthropy is reshaping K-12 education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Gay, L.R., (1987). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. New York, Merrill MacMillan.

- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Education research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Columbus: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Ginsburg, M. (1998). *On being critical in reading, writing, thinking and enacting: Think piece by Mark Ginsburg*: University of Pittsburgh.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Goren, P., Wurtzel, J. (2008). *Urban districts and national foundations: Making the marriage work*. Aspen, The Aspen Institute.
- Greene, J. (2005). Buckets into the sea: Why philanthropy isn't changing schools, and how it could. In F. Hess (Ed.), *With the best of intentions: How philanthropy is reshaping K-12 education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Grossman, J. (2000). Philanthropy is revolutionizing education. *USA Today Magazine*, 128(=2658), 54, 52p, 51bw.
- Guthrie, J. (2008). Next needed steps in the evolution of American education, finance and policy: Attenuating a judicially imposed policy distraction, activating a balanced portfolio of K-12 school reforms, advancing rationality as a goal in pursuing productivity, advocating change in a responsible and effective manner. *Peabody Journal of Education* (83)2, 259-284.
- Hall, P. (1994). Business, philanthropy and education in the United States. *Theory into Practice*, 33(4), 211-217.
- Hall, P. (2003a, June 26,). *A History of nonprofit boards in the United States*, 2006, from http://www.boardsource.org/dl.asp?document_id=11.
- Hall, P. (2003b). *The welfare state and the careers of public and private institutions since 1945*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, R., Carmichael, B., Eibling, H., Ellena, W., Masiko, P., Miller, P., et al. (1963). *Private philanthropy and public purposes: An inquiry into the relationships between foundations and public education*. Washington D.C.: American Association of School Administrators.
- Hammack, D. (1989). Private organizations, public purposes: Nonprofits and their archives. *The Journal of American History*, 76(1), 181-191.

- Havinghurst, R. (1981). Philanthropic foundations as interest groups. *Education and Urban Society*, 12(193), 193-218.
- Hess, F. (2005). *With the best of intentions: How philanthropy is reshaping K-12 education*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- Heyrman, C. (1982). The fashion among more superior people: Charity and social change in provincial New England, 1700-1740. *American Quarterly*, 34(2), 107-124.
- Jones, R. (2003). *The Enlightenment*. Retrieved March 18, 2006, from <http://www.philosopher.org.uk/enl.htm>.
- Kaestle, C. (1972). Commons schools before the "Common School Revival": New York schooling in the 1790's. *History of Education Quarterly*, 12(4), 465-500.
- Kaestle, C. (2001). School: The story of American public education. In S. Mondale (Ed.), *School: The story of American public education*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An Introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Lagemann, E. C. (1992). Philanthropy, education, and the politics of knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 93(3), 361-369.
- Lenkowsky, L. (2005). The 'best uses' of philanthropy for reform. In F. Hess (Ed.), *With the best of intentions: How philanthropy is reshaping K-12 education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Lenkowsky, L., & Spencer, E. (2001). *The History of Philanthropy for Education Reform*. Retrieved April 9, 2006, from http://www.edexcellence.net/detail/news.cfm?news_id=318&pubsubid=845#845.
- Leonard, M. (1992). The Response of the private sector: Foundations and entrepreneurs. *Teachers College Record*, 93(3), 377-381.
- Loveless, T. (2005). How program officers at education philanthropies view education. In F. Hess (Ed.), *With the best of intentions: How philanthropy is reshaping K-12 education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

- McCarthy, K. (2003). *American creed: Philanthropy and the rise of civil society, 1700-1865*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McGuinn, P. (2004). *Educating politics: The transformation of federal education policy 1965-2002*. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Meade, Edward. (1992). Recalling and updating "philanthropy and public schools: One foundation's evolving perspectives." *Teachers College Record*, 93(3), 426-462.
- Nagai, A., Lerner, R., & Rothman, S. (1994). *Giving for social change*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- National public education financial survey, 1989-90 through 2004-05*. (2007). Retrieved September 19, 2008 from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_175.asp.
- New finance plans for school urged. (1936). *Teachers College Record*, 37, 339-339.
- Number of larger foundations by decade of establishment and asset range*. (2005). Retrieved May 4, 2008, from http://foundationcenter.org/findfunders/statistics/found_estab.html.
- Projections of education statistics to 2013*. (2003). Retrieved Jan. 16, 2006 from Section 1. Elementary and Secondary Enrollment Web site: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/projections/ch_1.asp.
- Ray, J., Candoli, I., & Hack, W. (2005). *School business administration: A planning approach*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Ridings, D. S. (2000). Philanthropy: Family education's next-best friend, *International Conference of the Parents as Teachers*. St. Louis, MO: EDRS.
- Riley, R. (1996). Education: The gateway to America's future, *Annual Address of the US Secretary of Education on the State of American Education*. U.S. District of Columbia: Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Office of the Secretary.
- Sealand, J. (1997). *Private wealth and public life: Foundation philanthropy and the reshaping of American social policy from the progressive era to the new deal*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- School Districts*. (2007). Retrieved Oct. 25, 2008, from Pennsylvania Department of Education Web site:

<http://www.pde.state.pa.us/k12/cwp/view.asp?a=165&Q=47176&k12Nav=|3453|&k12Nav=|1141|810|>.

- Shaker, P. & Heilman, E. E. (2004). The new common sense of education: Advocacy research versus academic authority. *Teachers College Record*, 106(7), 1444-1470.
- Shulman, L. (1998). Disciplines of inquiry in education: An overview. In R. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education*. Washington D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Smith, M. L., Fey, P., Heinecke, W., & Kahn, L. (2004). *Political spectacle and the fate of American schools: Symbiotic politics and educational policies*. New York: NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Spring, J. (2005). *Conflict of interests*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in Social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Tyack, D. (1966). Education as artifact: Benjamin Franklin and instruction of "A Rising People." *History of Education Quarterly*, 6(1), 3-15.
- Tyack, D. (1976). Ways of seeing. An essay on the history of compulsory schooling. *Harvard Education Review*, 46(3), 355-389.
- Urban, W., & Wagoner, J. (2000). *American education: A history*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Waldo, D. (1974). Reflections on public morality. *Administration and Society*, 6(3), 267-282.
- Wallace, R. (1996). *From Vision to practice: The art of educational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Wollcott, H. (1998). Ethnographic research in education. In R. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education*. Washington D.C.: American Educational Research Association.