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Research Questions re the SCALE partnership:

(Partnership: temporary structure that leverage multiple organizations’ human and financial capital to do the work that one organization, alone, cannot do.)

1. Why do particular structures, functions, and people come to work within the SCALE partnership?

2. How do leaders organize people and tools to accomplish partnership goals, as stated in the formal initiating documents? (explored here)
Methods

• Research & evaluation purposes
• Longitudinal design
• Organizational theory
• Tools from organizational research
  -- Organizational charts, network maps
• Interview-based
  Cross-partner sample: 68 “actively engaged” participants
For collaborations with local IHEs, see next page.
Organizational Mapping

Organizational features of SCALE that exceed the capacity of organizational charts:

- Formal and informal interactions
- Embedded relationships
- Individuals with roles in many organizations
- Working groups
  - Hardened/sustained --- Emergent/transitory
  - Embedded in partnering organizations
Findings & implications re “How people and tools are organized to accomplish goals?”

1. Organizational mapping as census-taking

At 16 months:
- 178 active participants
- 80 working groups

Chart A: SCALE Growth by number of engaged working groups and individuals
2. Working groups provide partnership flexibility and constancy - loosely-coupled structures

+ Partnership responds to emerging issues and opportunities
+ Partnership fits into, and amplifies, extant reform initiatives
- Loss of central control functions
- Flexibility could detract from focus on goal attainment
3. Who does the work:
home anchors & outside collaborators wear many hats

+ Inter-organizational collaboration → organizational learning
+ Home anchors keep groups focused on local agenda
+ Multiple hats can create strong contact architecture
- If weak centralized contact architecture → knowledge and power diffused
4. Many mini-partnerships in one partnership

+ Mini-partnerships: different functions, different issues in different member organizations
  
  Aligns with SCALE theory of action (cf. Clune)

- Can one partnership do all this well?
- Structural confusion and possible duplication
Implications for the field

1. Proposition: New understanding of education reform processes can be gleaned by studying the structure and function of organizations within the “instructional change industry” (Rowan, 2001).

   → The SCALE partnership: a slice of the “instructional change industry” with working groups as a key organizational structure

2. Organizational mapping: a valuable tool for organizational researchers and reform practitioners.
Study limitations

- Number of partnerships = 1
- Organizational map iterations thus far = 2
- Thin (thus far) on productivity of relationships