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Characteristics of Leadership

• ownership/authority
• risk taking, experimentation
• collaboration
• communication
• organization or role clarity
• environment or distraction management
Characteristics of Distributed Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Criteria</th>
<th>Distributed Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ownership/authority</td>
<td>high degree of ownership by non leaders/leader plays down his or her role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk taking, experimentation</td>
<td>sufficient experimentation and risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>high levels of interconnected and voluntary collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>communication is frequent, rich (from both leaders and followers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization or role clarity</td>
<td>clear organization but overlapping roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment or distraction management</td>
<td>distractions are minimized due to strong networks and cooperative participation strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Characteristics of Loosely Coupled Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Criteria</th>
<th>Loosely Coupled Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ownership/authority</td>
<td>not one clear leader or set of leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk taking, experimentation</td>
<td>risk taking is extreme, no oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>collaborations are sporadic and disorganized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>communication is confused and infrequent (from both leaders and followers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization or role clarity</td>
<td>no clear organization, no overlapping of roles, factionalization (egg carton analogy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment or distraction management</td>
<td>high level of unmanaged or unmanageable distractions (e.g., turnover, testing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristics of Centralized Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Criteria</th>
<th>Centralized Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ownership/authority</td>
<td>one/few person making all decisions, initiating action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk taking, experimentation</td>
<td>minimal risk taking or experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>collaboration is minimal and prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>communication is infrequent and mostly top down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization or role clarity</td>
<td>clear organization and leader/follower roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment or distraction management</td>
<td>distractions are minimized by leader/authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Participants

Survey Participant Roles

- Admin: 24%
- Higher Ed Faculty: 10%
- Project Leaders: 31%
- Teachers: 35%
Interview Participants

- Project directors: 44%
- Teachers: 21%
- Higher ed: 21%
- Admin: 14%
Overview of Leadership Characteristics
Leadership Characteristics by Partnership

![Bar Chart]

- Distributed
- Centralized
- Loose
Do you consider yourself one of the leaders in this partnership enhancement project? (a leader is defined broadly here to mean someone who plays an important, extended or committed role)

- yes: 64%
- no: 17%
- sometimes: 17%
- not sure: 2%
- not sure: 2%
Survey question – future leader potential

Would you consider being a project leader in a future partnership enhancement project?

- Yes: 66%
- No: 5%
- Maybe: 24%
- Not sure: 5%
Survey Question on future leaders – continued ("yes")

- 71% from distributed partnerships
- 66% teachers from distributed partnerships
Structural Conditions
Patterns of Developing Partnerships

- Prior partnerships
- Saw notice
- Attended other AMSP events
- Local need
Role Clarity

How clear are partnership roles?

- 25% very clear roles
- 42% mostly clear roles
- 25% some clear-some fuzzy
- 5% mostly fuzzy roles
- 3% very fuzzy roles
Partnership Agreements

How formal are partnership agreements or decisions?

- Very formal: 8%
- Formal: 33%
- Somewhere in between: 50%
- Informal: 10%
- Very informal: 0%
# Goal Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>teacher community</th>
<th>teacher leadership</th>
<th>higher ed partnership</th>
<th>Inter-district partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partnership Outcomes
Additional Expertise Desired

- Curriculum or software specialist: 6
- Administrative support: 4
- Mentorship/oversight from AMSP: 3
- Teacher leaders: 2
- Principal oversight: 1
- None: 0
Partnership Goals

- Stay same: 3
- Fewer participants: 1
- More comprehensive: 1
- More top down: 1
- More time: 7
General Outcomes

- 22% achieved goals
- 15% better student education
- 15% better teacher preparation
- 17% learned how to lead
- 12% higher ed partnership developed
- 17% higher ed partner seeing classrooms
- 17% teachers are collaborating and talking
General Partnership Obstacles

- no time: 24%
- testing/state standards: 5%
- admin not involved: 13%
- not enough money: 17%
- distance issues: 8%
- life issues: 3%
- higher ed involvement: 5%
- resistance to change: 5%
- turnover: 17%
Sustainability

- Pursuing another grant – 83% from distributed partnerships

- Continuation or expansion – 90% from distributed partnerships
Conclusions and Preliminary Observations

Distributed partnerships:
- Improve teacher community
- Develop teacher leadership
- Increase innovation
- Allow for flexible structures and roles
- Increase potential for sustainability

Centralized partnerships:
Facilitate bonds between institutions