Section 6: Collaboration to Enhance Resiliency

Why Collaborate?

Since it is clear that neither risk nor protective factors exist only in the school domain, school staff cannot go it alone to provide sufficient protections against risk for the youth they serve. An individual’s environment includes the family, peer group, and community, as well as the school community. It is within this environment that community stakeholders can work together to reduce risk and raise resilient children.

Collaboration that occurs across agencies and within communities is an essential strategy to create the vision described by Robert Linquanti, “children, families and communities that are healthy, empowered, self-sustaining and self-helping” (Linquanti, 1992). Community-wide working alliances can build environments that focus on developing children’s strengths and competencies, rather than fixing what’s wrong with kids. When community members work together to provide children with protective factors in all domains, the outcome of such collaboration is resilient youth.

It has been said that economic, social and technological changes in American life during the past 50 years have fragmented community life, resulting in breaks in the naturally occurring networks and linkages among individuals, families, schools, and other social systems that traditionally have provided protection necessary for healthy human development” (Coleman 1987, Comer 1992, and Wilson 1987). If this is the case, then the time has come for the collaborative efforts of community members to rebuild some of those networks and linkages to work in favor of children. While we recognize that individual protective strategies, such as a single caring relationship with an adult, promote resiliency in youth, communities must work together to lessen harm and ameliorate risk to “stack the deck” in favor of children.

Collaborative school-community approaches produce the following outcomes:

- improved service delivery
- reduced fragmentation of services
- minimum duplication of efforts
- maximum use of resources
- on-going communication and support

Barriers to Collaboration

Those who have been engaged in collaborative relationships within their schools or communities know all too well the challenges involved in building working alliances. Since schools have been historically charged with the mission to educate children, school staff have typically operated independently of other community systems which serve to support youth in other areas. As students needs have increased and schools have been pressured to
“do more with less,” schools are beginning to implement collaborative approaches to complete service delivery. Models such as Full Service Schools and Integrated Service Teams have emerged as methods to deal with the interrelated needs of children.

These models and other collaboratives, such as School Advisory Councils, have taught us that collaboration requires hard work and increased time and commitment. We often think that we can provide a service better ourselves, or that it takes too much time to work with others on a strategy or plan. While this may be true in some cases, there is no replacement for the commitment that results from the ownership of a user-driven process to produce positive outcomes for children.

Some of the specific barriers to interagency collaboration, identified by Linquanti, Cynthia Lugg, and William Boyd, are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turf</th>
<th>The overlapping and sometimes conflicting boundaries of agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Degree of control, decision-making and authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>The sharing of information relevant to the process and outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Independence of individual agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Separate finances and budgets of individual agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these barriers are significant, they are not insurmountable. The success of a collaborative relationship begins with a common goal and commitment to the desired outcome. Once all partners realize that the nature of the problem makes it impossible for any one group to solve alone, they will begin to “buy in” to the collaborative process (Gibbs and Bennett, 1990). Interagency partnerships must focus on establishing trust and respect among the partners early in the process in order to move into any of the stages on the continuum in “interorganizational participation” (Intriligator, 1990), described on the next page.
Levels of Interorganizational Participation

The first step in building a working alliance among organizations is the clarification of the amount or level of interdependence desired by the partners. Typically this level is defined by the nature of the task or the desired outcome. Barbara Intriligator developed a continuum of interorganizational participation with cooperation representing lower levels of participation, coordination representing moderate levels of participation and collaboration representing a high level of participation. As a partnership moves on the continuum, interdependence among partners increases and autonomy decreases. Table 4 outlines each of the levels and includes the defining characteristics of each of the three levels.

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Decision-Making</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaboration can be defined as a “process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible” (Gray, 1989). This definition implies a complex, long-term project which requires a vision shared by partnering agencies. Since cooperation implies a short-term arrangement with a narrow goal, this partnership may not be strong enough to reduce multiple risk factors and enhance resiliency in youth. “Community-wide collaboration based on protective factors is not just the best way to promote resiliency; it may be the only way to create an environment sufficiently rich in protection for kids facing the enormous stresses and risks of growing up in present-day American society” (Linquanti, 1992).
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Project Resilience
Wolin Center
Suite 113, 5410 Connecticut Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20015
202-966-8171
202-966-7587 (FAX)

Emory Cowen
Rochester Child Resiliency Project (RCRP)
University of Rochester
Center for Community Study
575 Mt. Hope Avenue
Rochester, NY 14620

Efficacy Institute
128 Spring Street
Lexington, MA 02173
781-862-4390

Ann Masten
University of Minnesota
Institute of Child Development
51 E. River Rd.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Henry Levin
Stanford University, Graduate School of Education
Stanford, CA 94305
415-723-2300
(Accelerated Schools)

Emmy Werner
Human and Community Development
University of California, Davis
Davis, CA 95616
916-752-1011

J. David Hawkins, Ph.D.
Developmental Research and Programs
130 Nickerson Street, Suite 107
Seattle, WA 98109
National Youth Leadership Council
1910 West County Road B  
St. Paul, MN 55113-1337  
612-631-3672  
612-631-2955 (FAX)  

Center for Civic Education & Service  
930 West Park Avenue  
Tallahassee, FL 32306-2059  
850-644-3342  
850-644-3362 (FAX)  

Florida Peer Helpers Association  
3141 Berridge Lane  
Orlando, FL 32812  
Individual Membership: $10.00 per year  

Web site:  
Resiliency In Action  
http://www.resiliency.com/research.html  

Video:  
“Survivor’s Pride: Building Resilience in Youth at Risk”  
Attainment Company Inc.  
P.O. Box 930160  
Verona, WA 53593-1060  
1-800-327-4269  
1-800-942-3865 (FAX)  

Planning Guide: Achieving Safe, Equitable, Healthy and Drug-Free Schools  
and  
Planning Guide: Supplemental Resources  
Clearinghouse/Information Center  
Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services  
Division of Public Schools and Community Education  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street, Room 622  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400  
850-488-1879  
850-488-2679 (FAX)  

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory  
101 SW Main Street, Suite 500  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-275-9500  

Appendix - Attachments
The following two attachments are the *Florida Performance Measurement System* and a sample *School Climate Profile*.

The *School Climate Profile* is our favorite survey. Multiple protective factors are included. The answers of “what should be” and “what is” provide schools the opportunity to prioritize needs and to make incremental growth in meeting those needs.

The *Florida Performance Measurement System* is a teacher evaluation instrument provided to you because of its support of protective factors in teaching. All items to the left have been shown to be effective teaching strategies/behaviors. The items on the right are viewed as providing more negative outcome.