



Facilitating Collaborative Relationships

Educator deepens their understanding and application of their abilities to facilitate collaborative relationships.

Key Method

The educator deepens their understanding of strategies for facilitating effective collaborative relationships. They examine their own identity and role as a facilitator. The educator develops their skills through practice and reflection on his/her relationship to community stakeholders.

Method Components

The Facilitating Collaborative Relationships micro-credential is one of three in the Instructional Leadership pathway of the Teacher Leadership Institute. Instructional leadership means helping others improve student learning and professional practice. Below are the method components that teacher leaders must complete in the Instructional Leadership stack.

1. Conduct a self-assessment as a member of an identified community. Ask yourself how your own biases, experiences of privilege, and personal values might impact your leadership. As part of the self-assessment, determine what you are trying to accomplish as a leader.
2. Identify the needs and priorities of the identified community and create a plan for meeting those needs. To conduct a needs assessment of a particular community, gather data on one or more of the following: how qualitative/quantitative data are used, current practices, and what the data and/or analysis reveals about most evident needs. Develop a plan to engage colleagues and/or a diverse range of stakeholders to accomplish one or more needs identified in your needs assessment.
3. Implement the plan by engaging members of a community in a meeting or activity in which community members are brought together to address needs and priorities of the community. The evidence for this micro-credential may be collected from any meeting or activity, not necessarily the first action taken to implement the plan.
4. Reflect on the effectiveness of the meeting or activity and your efforts to improve your effectiveness in facilitating collaborative relationships.

Supporting Research

Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100(3), 363–406.

Deliberate practice requires feedback to lead to improvement. Cited by Gladwell in *Outliers*, Ericsson's research has been used to identify the need for feedback from experts or more advanced peers, which has obvious implications for teachers and administrators where feedback is typically limited.

Hattie, J. (2015). *What works best in education: The politics of collaborative expertise* (Open Ideas). Pearson.

Retrieved from https://www.pearson.com/content/dam/corporate/global/pearson-dot-com/files/hattie/150526_ExpertiseWEB_V1.pdf

Hattie makes a strong case for collaborative expertise based on his meta-analyses of effective teaching practices and builds on his visible learning work.

Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.

In this study commissioned by the Wallace Foundation, researchers from the University of Toronto and University of Minnesota concluded that collective leadership has a stronger influence on student achievement than individual leadership—and higher-performing schools award greater influence to teacher teams, parents, and students. Further, the study found that principals and district leaders do not lose influence as others gain influence.

Ronfeldt, M., Farmer, S. O., McQueen, K., & Grissom, J. A. (2015). Teacher collaboration in instructional teams and student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(3), 475–514.

This study occurred in Miami-Dade with over 9,000 teachers. The researchers found that teachers and schools that engaged in better quality collaboration have better achievement gains in math and reading with teachers improving at greater rates.

Resources

- Building Trusting Relationships for School Improvement
<http://educationnorthwest.org/sites/default/files/trust.pdf>
This case study focuses on building trust in teacher-to-teacher and teacher-to-principal relationships and their impact on student performance, but is applicable to any collaborative relationship.
- Collaboration and Collaborative Leadership
<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Other-Resources/Family-and-Community-Engagement/Models-for-Family-and-Community-Engagement/Collaboration-and-Collaborative-Leadership.pdf.aspx>
Framework for establishing new relationships with community organizations to foster school improvement.
- “The Power of Vulnerability”
https://www.ted.com/talks/brene_brown_on_vulnerability
Brene Brown addresses how being vulnerable enhances leadership and builds relationships.

Submission Guidelines & Evaluation Criteria

To earn the micro-credential, you must receive a passing evaluation for Parts 1 and 3 and a score of “Proficient” for each component in Part 2.

Part 1. Overview Questions

350-word limit

Self-Assessment: How might your own biases, experiences of privilege, and personal values impact your ability to effectively communicate? What are you trying to accomplish as a facilitator of this collaborative relationship?

- ❑ **Passing:** The responses clearly and with sufficient detail provide relevant and revealing information about the participant and their role as a facilitator of collaborative relationships.

600-word limit

What is the context for the activity presented in your recording? Describe the characteristics of the relationship with respect to effective collaboration. (e.g., trust, collegial support, shared vision, norms, protocols, etc.) Who are the stakeholders of this relationship and what unique perspectives and contributions does each stakeholder bring to the group? How will you leverage those assets into your plan? What are the obstacles to leveraging those assets? How do the desired outcomes of this collaborative relationship support the development of all stakeholders?

- ❑ **Passing:** Description is clear, with sufficient detail to know the context and purpose of the meeting, and it provides an insightful description of the other participants and why they were selected for the meeting.

Part 2. Work Examples/Artifacts

Provide evidence of your activity by submitting:

The following must align to the stakeholders described in Part 1:

- An agenda created by the participant for a meeting or activity in which they facilitated collaborative relationships.
 - A rationale explaining why the agenda supports the facilitation of collaborative relationships.
- Evidence from a meeting or event where you implemented part of your plan. You may submit any of the following:
 - An unedited audio or video recording of a meeting or event (10-minute maximum)
 - A written account of the meeting that includes: person(s) in the meeting, your relationship to them, meeting description, and how you demonstrated competence in this skill. (500-word limit)
 - Artifacts, documents, photos, and/or other data which demonstrates evidence of your leadership in a particular meeting/event in your plan. This evidence must be accompanied by a full description of the meeting/event, your relationship to those present, a meeting/event description, and how you demonstrated competence in this skill. (500-word limit)
- Gather feedback from someone attending your meeting or activity. The analysis or feedback should focus on how the submitter effectively organized and led stakeholders. This feedback may be submitted in any of the following formats:
 - a written testimonial (500-word limit)
 - an unedited video or audio (5-minute maximum)
 - a survey of participants

Part 2. Scoring Guide

Your submission(s) will be assessed based on the following rubric. You must earn a score of “Proficient” on all portions of the submission in order to earn the micro-credential.

| | Proficient | Basic | Developing |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Agenda | <p>Agenda clearly demonstrates the purpose and structure of the collaborative activity.</p> <p>Agenda enables genuine collaboration among the stakeholders.</p> <p>Rationale explicitly explains why the purpose, structure, and content of the agenda are conducive to effective collaborative relationships.</p> | <p>Agenda somewhat demonstrates the purpose and structure of the collaborative activity.</p> <p>Agenda enables cooperation among the stakeholders.</p> <p>Rationale somewhat explains why the purpose, structure, and content of the agenda are conducive to effective collaborative relationships.</p> | <p>Agenda fails to demonstrate the purpose and/or structure of the collaborative activity.</p> <p>Agenda enables discussion among the stakeholders.</p> <p>Rationale fails to explain why the purpose, structure, and/or content of the agenda are conducive to effective collaborative relationships.</p> |
| Evidence | <p>Evidence showcases collaboration among stakeholders</p> <p>Facilitator establishes a consistent trusting, professional, and engaging climate.</p> | <p>Evidence showcases cooperation among stakeholders</p> <p>Facilitator establishes a somewhat consistent trusting, professional, and engaging climate.</p> | <p>Evidence showcases discussion among stakeholders</p> <p>Facilitator struggles to establish a consistent trusting, professional, and/or engaging climate.</p> |
| Feedback | <p>Feedback addresses the effectiveness of the activity to achieve the purpose.</p> | <p>Feedback somewhat addresses the effectiveness of the coaching session to achieve the purpose.</p> | <p>Feedback does not address the effectiveness of the coaching session to achieve the purpose or is not submitted.</p> |

Part 3. Reflection

150-word limit per question, for a 900-word limit total.

Reflect on and analyze the impact of the collaborative relationship meeting or activity. Your written reflection should answer the following questions:

1. What characteristics from your answers in Module 1 – Learn were present in your activity? Were any characteristics missing?
2. How effective were you in achieving the intended outcomes of the meeting or activity?
3. Did any obstacles arise and if so how were they handled?
4. If you were to do this activity again, what would you change and why?
5. What did you learn about your role in facilitating collaborative relationships?

- Passing:** Reflection includes a thoughtful self-analysis of strengths, impact, and adaptations of the educator’s role as a facilitator of collaborative relationships.