PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND SOCIO-EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT ORGANIZATIONS AROUND SCHOOL SUPPORT

ALIANZAS ENTRE CENTROS ESCOLARES Y ORGANIZACIONES DE APOYO SOCIOEDUCATIVO EN TORNO AL SOPORTE ESCOLAR

ALIANÇAS ENTRE CENTROS ESCOLARES E ORGANIZAÇÕES DE APOIO EDUCATIVO SOCIAL EM RELAÇÃO AO SUPORTE ESCOLAR

Edgar IGLESIAS VIDAL, Saida LÓPEZ-CRESPO, José Luís MUÑOZ MORENO &
Anna TARRÉS VALLESPÍ
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

ABSTRACT: The creation and consolidation of partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations is considered a success key factor both for learning and for the development of academic support. The present study aims to identify favorable conditions for the configuration of partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations. This work has applied a sequential research design as well as qualitative techniques to analyse the perceptions of 16 socio-educational support organizations in United States and Spain regarding the configuration of solid partnerships with schools. During the first phase of this study, 11 semi-structured interviews have been carried out alongside 3 discussion groups. In a second phase, 4 good practices have been analysed in order to verify the preliminary results obtained. The final results derived from this study show that the development of partnerships between institutions is mediated by the quality of the academic support, the vision of the professional teams, the coordination among institutions and the evaluation of processes and actions. These findings have allowed us to offer an interpretative framework to identify favourable and distorting elements for the construction of partnerships and, consequently, for the success of academic support. Hence, we may highlight that the goal of educational success in contexts of complexity and social and cultural diversity benefits from the collaboration between institutions, which are able to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses, to analyse context's opportunities and threats and to plan collective processes and actions.

CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORS
EDGAR IGLESIAS VIDAL. Profesor Asociado. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. E-Mail: edgar.iglesias@uab.cat

PALABRAS CLAVE:
Alianzas
Escuelas
Éxito educativo
Soporte escolar
Diversidad
   sociocultural

RESUMEN: La creación y consolidación de alianzas entre centros escolares y organizaciones de apoyo socioeducativo se presenta como condición de éxito para los aprendizajes y desarrollo del soporte escolar. El presente estudio pretende identificar condiciones favorables para la configuración de alianzas entre centros escolares y organizaciones de apoyo socioeducativo. Para ello se ha empleado un diseño de investigación secuencial y métodos cualitativos para analizar las percepciones de 16 organizaciones de apoyo socioeducativo, situadas entre Estados Unidos y España y en relación a la configuración de alianzas sólidas con los centros escolares. En la primera fase del estudio se han realizado 11 entrevistas semi-estructuradas y 3 grupos de discusión y en una segunda fase se han analizado 4 buenas prácticas para contrastar los resultados preliminares. Los resultados indican que el desarrollo de alianzas entre instituciones está mediado por la calidad del soporte escolar, las visiones de los equipos profesionales, la coordinación entre instituciones y la evaluación de procesos y actuaciones. Estos hallazgos han permitido ofrecer un marco interpretativo para identificar elementos favorecedores u obstaculizadores para la construcción de alianzas y, por consiguiente, para el éxito del soporte escolar. En este orden se subraya que el logro del éxito educativo, en entornos de complejidad y diversidad sociocultural, necesita de la colaboración entre instituciones, capaces de identificar fortalezas y debilidades institucionales, analizar oportunidades y amenazas de los contextos y establecer procesos y actuaciones colectivas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE:
Alianças
escolas
Sucesso educacional
Apoio escolar
Diversidade
   sociocultural

RESUMO: A criação e consolidação de parcerias entre escolas e organizações de apoio socioeducativo é apresentada como condição de sucesso para o aprendizado e desenvolvimento do apoio escolar. O presente estudo tem como objetivo identificar condições favoráveis para a configuração de parcerias entre escolas e organizações de apoio socioeducativo. Para tanto, um desenho de pesquisa sequencial e métodos qualitativos foram utilizados para analisar as percepções de 16 organizações de apoio socioeducativo localizadas entre os Estados Unidos e a Espanha em relação à configuração de parcerias sólidas com escolas. Na primeira fase do estudo, foram realizadas 11 entrevistas semi-estruturadas e 3 grupos de discussão e, em uma segunda fase, foram analisadas 4 boas práticas para comparar os resultados preliminares. Os resultados indicaram que o desenvolvimento de alianças entre instituições é mediado pela qualidade do apoio escolar, pelas visões das equipes profissionais, pela coordenação entre as instituições e pela avaliação de processos e ações. Esses achados nos permitiram oferecer uma estrutura interpretativa para identificar elementos que favorecem ou dificultam a construção de alianças e, portanto, para o sucesso do apoio escolar. Nessa ordem, ressalta-se que a conquista do sucesso educacional, em ambientes de complexidade e diversidade sociocultural, requer colaboração entre instituições, capaz de identificar pontos fortes e fracos institucionais, analisar oportunidades e ameaças em contextos e estabelecer processos e ações coletivos.

1. Introduction

Academic support includes actions to reduce school failure and contribute to educational success, particularly during compulsory schooling but also in the post-compulsory stage. These actions usually relate to mentoring and individual attention, socio-educational inclusion with school reinforcement and others which combine educational leisure with school reinforcement and core competences. The articulation of an efficient academic support requires solid and sustainable partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations, the latter being considered as those institutions that provide academic support, educational accompaniment beyond educations centers and guidelines and resources for educational success. It is also stated that the strictly academic perspectives of the educational relationship must be overcome on the basis of collaborative work (Chang & Jordan, 2013; Connelly & Young, 2013; Schamper, 2012) and community approach (Mourshed, Chijioke & Barber, 2012), especially when processes of socio-cultural identification must be addressed in situations of cultural inequality and minoritization (Gibson et al., 2013; O'Leary, González & Valdez, 2008).

Recent international researchers have shown, on the one hand, that partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations are a success factor for the learning and development of academic support. On the other hand, such articles demonstrate that these partnerships are conditioned by certain aspects. For this reason, this article presents a study which aims to analyze the partnerships established between schools and socio-educational support organizations for the achievement of school success. We identify and analyze how such factors determine the creation and consolidation of these partnerships among institutions.

2. State of the art

The achievement of educational success, particularly in contexts of complexity and socio-cultural diversity, requires the collaboration of an

[Edgar IGLESIAS VIDAL, Saida LÓPEZ-CRESPO, José Luís MUÑOZ MORENO & Anna TARRÉS VALLESPÍ]

institutional framework ready to share educational goals and cooperate in common spaces for intervention. This approach leads to the identification of institutional strengths and weaknesses, the analysis of opportunities and threats of contexts, the establishment of processes and collective actions, and the design and development of partnerships among institutions and their professionals. In this way, the challenge of educational success is ensured. However, the creation and consolidation of partnerships regarding academic support between schools and socio-educational support organizations is a complex task (Leos-Urbel, 2015; Bennett, 2014; Jordan, 2014).

For this reason, the approach of "Full Time Education" frames the position adopted, given its will of integrating instructional and non-instructional time, promoting educational participation and cooperation among different actors, implementing a shared leadership and revitalizing cohesive networks that transfer different learning opportunities (Díaz-Gibson et al., 2017; Sintes, 2016 & 2015). Its philosophy aims to transform educational individuality and fragmentation in a broad and networked education, taking inspiration from a systemic and community action (for instance: "Ganztagsschulen" in German speaking countries, or "Projet Éducatif Territorial" in France).

Many national and international experiences move towards this through solid proposals. Such is the case for "Community Schools" in USA, "Extended Schools" in UK and "Educació 360" in 2018, the latest initiative sponsored by several institutions in Catalonia. All of them seek for cooperation between schools and community educational organizations, from a global and broad perspective of education, which generates learning opportunities throughout life. Moreover, they pursue the connection among learnings, actors and educational organizations; as a consequence, such approaches demand the complicity of the town and the professionals and institutional agents that are involved in education (Muñoz, 2012 & 2009).

Partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations are unique and frequently conditioned by certain factors that can improve them (Rubio & Luchetti, 2016; Albaigés, 2016; Consorci d'Educació de Barcelona, 2015; Jordan, 2014; Gonzales, Gunderson & Wold, 2013; Little, Wimer & Weiss, 2008). Such factors are permeable and meaningful for academic support, and they can be presented as: A) the quality of the academic support, B) the visions of the professional teams, C) the coordination among institutions and D) the evaluation of processes and actions, as discussed below.

The quality of academic support is often conditioned by the generation of personal and academic learnings (Anderson, Sabatelli & Trachtenberg, 2009), in an atmosphere of community relationships where partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations evolve around curricular contexts, being the result of an effective coordination (Bodilly & Beckett, 2005). Therefore, it is advisable to define the goals of academic support (Durlak, Wiessberg & Pachan, 2010) in order to distinguish them in terms of social, educational or psycho-emotional learning. A coherent intervention in this sense increases the impact on the academic performance of students (González, 2016). An active participation of institutional and professional actors involved in academic support is also important, as well as the support provided by volunteers and, of course, families (Dikkers, 2013; Shernoff, 2010; Metz, Goldsmith & Arbreton, 2008). It is a top priority to avoid the mechanizing of an academic support which can lead to a progressive disassociation of students from the educational system (Consorci d'Educació de Barcelona, 2015).

Mutual approaches from the faculties and educational teams (socio-educational support) are instrumental for the creation and socialization of knowledge and for the effective embodiment of inter-institutional partnerships (Afterschool Alliance, 2014; Departament d'Ensenyament, 2013; Gonzales, Gunderson & Wold, 2013). It is appropriate to foster a cooperative culture that arises from mutual recognition and leads to the exchange of experiences as well as to the reciprocal use of resources. The absence of partnerships among professional teams entails a scarce consideration of the benefits of their own academic support. Thus, the acknowledgement of their approaches, moving around the following three stages, needs to be emphasized:

- The goals of professional teams of schools are excessively distanced from the aims of professional teams of socio-educational support organizations. Both institutions disagree, the few initiatives that seek for interconnection are exceptional, academic support does not receive recognition, adverse reactions to demands for collaboration spread and the links that actually take place happen in certain or informal conversations (Huang et al., 2008).
- There is mutual and complementary understanding regarding collaboration agreements between the professional teams of both institutions. Coordination and functional support, as well as relationships, are instrumental and mediated by shared tools aligned with

educational programming. The simultaneous operation involves valid effects for learnings (Afterschool Alliance, 2014 & 2013).

- There is an identification of common and shared goals that, preceded by a mutual recognition, pursues a constant and lasting strategic partnership. Schools and socio-educational support organizations are allies, co-responsible for academic success, and they are based on an educational community project that goes beyond educational perspectives (Jordan, 2014; Gonzales, Gunderson & Wold, 2013; Schamper, 2012). These approaches are coherent with Full-Time Education.

Thus, coordination among institutions must enable partnerships and networking, (Stelow & Martínez, 2013; Harris et al., 2010), as well as a greater awareness and analysis of reality, the chances for the development of educational participation (Muñoz, 2012 & 2019) and the ability for community promotion and transformation. This group of elements have a positive effect in learning processes, being some of the benefits from coordination (FEDAIA, 2016; Stelow & Martínez, 2013; Schamper, 2012; XCO, 2011). For this to happen, trust and support among the members of professional teams are needed, an organizational framework for the planning of actions and role assignment. For this reason, networking is displayed as a useful tool for inter-institutional cooperation, supporting synergies in open and diversified environments (Suárez & Muñoz, 2017), setting specific actions during the school year and embracing critical and reflective pedagogy and self-assessment among their participants (Jordan, 2014; Comellas, 2010). For instance: common working plans, pedagogical agreements, or joint meetings among teachers, families and educators.

Lastly, we should highlight that the evaluation of processes and actions of academic support reflects the achievement of the pursued results and its impact on the student body (Afterschool Alliance, 2015 & 2014). It has been demonstrated that efficient partnerships consistent with what we have said so far contribute to the enhancement of academic performance of the most vulnerable students: they acquire a greater autonomy regarding learning, they are more persistent in the educational system and they mature socio-emotionally (Vandell, 2014; Chang & Jordan, 2013). Likewise, they intensify their social and cultural engagement in their community (Leos-Urbel, 2015; O'Hare et al., 2015). Nonetheless, the evaluation should not be left unattended, given that the assessment of the effects of academic support is a necessity and a current challenge (Palmer, Anderson & Sabatelli, 2009). As a consequence, it is advisable to perform a deep immersion for the purpose of improving the very quality of coordination and academic support (AIR, 2015; Leos-Urbel, 2015; Vandell, 2013).

3. Objectives and study methodology

The main target of the present study is to identify the favorable conditions for the configuration of partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations through strategies with a positive impact on academic support.

For this reason, a reference framework regarding full-time education has been conducted, as well as an identification of the positive and negative conditioning factors for the configuration of such partnerships. In particular, these factors, considered as dimensions to study which structure the outcome of this research, are: A) the quality of the academic support, B) the vision of the professional teams, C) the coordination among institutions and D) the evaluation of processes.

The tackled methodology, which provides a context for the study, is approached using a qualitative paradigm; the field work has been conducted in Spain, mainly in Catalonia (Ripollet, Cerdanyola del Vallès, Barcelona, Santa Coloma de Gramenet, Zaragoza, Madrid, Sant Boi de Llobregat and Tenerife) and USA (California, San Francisco, San Jose and Palo Alto). Specifically, we have performed two sequential stages: the first happened in USA during 2015 and the second in Spain during the 2017/2018 school year. The former was developed by the investigation "The recognition of cultural diversity in schools in California and Catalonia through collaboration with community education projects", funded by the "Consortium for Advanced Studies Abroad Barcelona. CASB Fellowship". The contexts have been addressed through the inquiry in socio-educational support organizations with relevant experiences regarding academic support and collaborations with schools.

As a triangulation strategy, we analyzed experiences of shared work between schools and academic support organizations, even when they were not necessarily located in the perspective of full-time education.

For that purpose, we conducted a convenience sample (McMillan & Shummacher, 2001) from a non-probability sampling method using criteria of accessibility and representation, paying attention to the following features:

- From the perspective of population, organizations are located in local contexts with a

[Edgar IGLESIAS VIDAL, Saida LÓPEZ-CRESPO, José Luís MUÑOZ MORENO & Anna TARRÉS VALLESPÍ]

significant presence of foreign people (more than 15% of foreign population regarding the total of registered population).

- Regarding the student body, organizations host participants who show high rates of socio-cultural diversity (more than 25% belong to cultural minorities).
- In reference to educational complexities, local contexts where organizations are located present environments where the students require specific academic support needs, as seen in the different accreditation between foreign and native students.
- Regarding social complexities, the sample is located in contexts displaying risk indicators: families with a low level of education; low employment opportunities or high rates of newly-arrived students (AfterSchoolAlliance, 2013; Departamento de Enseñanza, 2014).
- From the point of view of their educational project, the selected organizations incorporate:
  o Experience and sedimentation in the development of educational programs aimed to provide academic support to disadvantaged minorities. These organizations have been operating successfully for more than 8 years.
  o Their target is to encourage community dimension in the educational approaches.
  o Breadth, given that educational projects combine both academic and personal aspects of their participants.
  o Innovation, since they provide updates on the subject of study undertaken.

This way, the organizations compiled in the sample are 16 (Table 1). The tools implemented in the data collection were designed based on methodological considerations by Tójar Hurtado (2006) and Kvale (1996). Particularly, in the first stage, 11 semi-structured interviews were conducted (6 in California and 5 in Catalonia) and 3 discussion groups were organized for the final comparison of the outcome. Subsequently, in a second phase, we use as a triangulation strategy the comparison of the first results with the outcome provided by the analysis of 4 good practices conducted in Spain, having applied telephone interviews. Likewise, we consider good practices as those experiences guided by coherent standards which enable educational partnerships based on the chosen conceptualization (quality, visions, coordination and evaluation). For selection purposes, we applied different criteria: breadth (given the extent of the experience and target population), sedimentation (since they have been conducted for a period of time and have been developed successfully) or innovation (given the updates provided to the subject of study undertaken).

The following table (Table 1) displays the relation between the general profile of the professionals participating in the study and the place where their organizations are located, considering the following code: AP (after-school program), DG (discussion group), I (interview) and GP (good practice). It can be said that the commitment with the study participants will be embodied by socializing this paper once it has been published.

PROFILE	PLACE	CODE
Manager	San Jose	AP1
Director	San Francisco	AP2
Executive director	San Francisco	AP3
Coordinator	San Francisco	AP4
Director	Palo Alto	AP5
Director	Palo Alto	AP6
Coordinator	Palo Alto	AP7
Director	Ripollet	I1
Pedagogue	Ripollet – Cerdanyola del Vallès	I2

Table 1. Organizations participating in the study.

PROFILE	PLACE	CODE
Social Educator	Santa Coloma de Gramenet	I3
Social Educator	Barcelona	I4
Social Educator	Barcelona	I5
Program coordinator	Zaragoza	GP1
Program coordinators	Madrid	GP2
Program coordinator	Sant Boi de Llobregat	GP3
Program coordinator	Tenerife	GP4
Source: Own ellaboration.		

Finally, we stress the following elements as relevant for the description of the good practices that were chosen:

- GP1: it acts upon the principles of academic support for more than 300 participants and 50 schools. This organization considers the promotion of partnerships as a key factor for social projection.
- GP2: for 10 years now it has been fostering academic support and youth participation actions for 300 individuals. The main focus for this organization is the construction of social and community structures.
- GP3: since 1985, it offers support for more than 100 youngsters from 12 different schools, standing out because of its ability for networking and the materialization of partnerships with schools. It focuses on community work and academic support programs with the aim of preventing early school leaving. It is committed to networking and partnerships with schools, social services, families and young individuals, where quality is key for individual accompaniment.
- GP4: this organization promotes a specific project of reduction of scholar absenteeism which supported 150 individuals and offered successful outcome in a short time. It worked with 8 primary and secondary schools in 8 island cities located in isolated areas. The support offered enables a close coordination between homework and school time.

As a methodological justification, it should be noted that the designed and implemented instrumentalization has considered interviews and discussions. Both tools were validated by 8 judges who have acted as theoretical experts (4) and practical experts (4), agreeing in the uniqueness, significance and suitability of the raised questions. The selection of good practices for the triangulation of the instrumentalization along with semi-structured interviews and discussion groups has considered the criteria of recognized processes, enhancement, satisfaction and evaluation (Zabalza, 2012). The information gathered for the analysis of the good practices has been collected through telephone interviews as a consequence for the budgetary constraints for face-to-face interviews. Telephone interviews were based on a semi-structured questionnaire focused on the dimensions of the quality of the academic support, the visions of the professional teams, the coordination among institutions and the evaluation of processes and actions.

The analysis of the outcome has been conducted through the compilation of coincidences, divergences, assessments and discussions for the different objects of study.

4. Results

The results are grouped below according to the quality of the academic support, the mutual visions of the professional teams, the coordination among institutions and the evaluation of processes and actions of academic support.

1.1. The good practices

The **quality of the support** for GP1 derived from the weekly and regular work of participants in small groups (primary school, 4 days a week/1h and secondary school, 2 days a week/2h). The intention is to achieve suitable curricular level in every case, starting from personal goals. For this reason, the families are involved in a process of information, and sometimes there are supporting volunteers.

In the GP3 the focus is on academic and personal learnings in a linked way as well as on

[Edgar IGLESIAS VIDAL, Saida LÓPEZ-CRESPO, José Luís MUÑOZ MORENO & Anna TARRÉS VALLESPÍ]

leisure. Regarding organization, it is considered that a greater comprehension and deepening of the educational process leads to a greater impact of students on realms as the development of their study skills and autonomy. The targets are tailored to each specific situation, pursuing proactivity of the participants in the academic work. The reinforcement happens within the group applying methodologies as service-learning.

As seen in the GP3, we find that GP2 specifically tackles contents in the school environment, but considering learning from a global vision: from the social, educational and psycho-emotional dimensions concurrently. The learning basis is established in a very personalized way, enabling participants to a better understanding of the extent of the educational process. A personal bond is created, and it often happens that when the support period is over students remain in the space in order to establish personal relationships or demand emotional support. This way, support is understood as a comprehensive work.

Regarding the **visions of professional teams** (school and support organization), every partnership assessed overcame the excessive distance and maintained a broad, mutual and complementary understanding according to collaborative arrangements. While GP1 generally establishes an occasional coordination and relations are instrumental and mediated by shared tools aligned with educational programming, in GP2, GP3 and GP4 an identification of common and shared goals happens, moving towards a strategic partnership that can last and understand socio-educational support in the framework of an educational and community project beyond schools.

Coordination is key to the quality of partnerships that take place in the context of academic support. The assessment of theoretical elements conforming a good practice regarding coordination shows that the organizations studied are rated an average of 8 points in the global index of quality of this coordination: community dynamization (7), community transformation (6,8), impact of the learning processes (8,8), acquisition of confidence (8,8), help among professional teams (8,8), organization of planning of actions and role assignment (8,3), fixing of specific actions during the school year (8,3), critical reflections (7), explorations of interests (7,5) and self-assessments (7,8). Coordination is a priority for a profitable educational reinforcement, given that it enables a better understanding of actions in educational and non-educational contexts and perform a common work line, even though educational institutions are often the most adapted to the requirements of schools. The common work line typically aims to overcome difficulties of minors in the curricular, behavioral and social spheres, noticing an enhancement of school results, a reduction of disruptive behavior and the promotion of social relations.

Processes of coordination highlight the importance of the involvement of every educational actor, and this is why it is worth focusing on different contexts, visions and support actions on youth. The work with families, for instance, is more intense and has a positive effect on schools. According to the developed project, each partnership deepens in actions of presential/non-presential and regular/occasional coordination, but always in a systematic manner. In the same way, it becomes clear that partnerships demand team work among the professionals, who can then share their knowledge. When partnerships consolidate, there is a predisposition and needs are expressed, and limitations such as the lack of time, the absence of financing or the strain of resources are overcome. However, there are other difficulties for coordination associated with teachers outside school. Another adverse factor is their professional instability or weak relation with some community services. The visions are shared, more or less, in the community dynamization and transformation, given that praxis is isolated and unalike. Undoubtedly, this is a point of interest since coordination demands contextualization and continuity.

Lastly, regarding **evaluation processes**, it is possible to notice the different degree where processes and actions of school support are evaluated. Participants globally rate with 8 points the evaluation processes (Table 2). Specifically: learning autonomy (7,8), persistence in the educational system (7,8), improvement of qualifications (7,8), enhancement of behavior (8,3), socio-emotional growth (9), socio-cultural and community engagement (7,7) and existence of subsequent mechanisms to influence in educational contexts and better the intervention of academic support (6,5). GP1, being consistent with the concept of educational success and shared vision, does not specifically assess socio-cultural participation and underestimates subsequent mechanisms to affect educational contexts and better the intervention of the academic support available. In reference to GP2, the improvement of grades is an element of tension when related to some schools, the reason being that educational organization adds more value to motivation of young people and their achievements regarding autonomy, in contrast to schools, which are mainly concerned about cognitive improvement. Similarly, child and teenager behaviors tend to better outside schools, which offers opportunities for its analysis in relation to the improvement of academic success.

Table 2 displays the average of numerical evaluations that interviewees offered to the different theoretical elements considered for analysis. The core theoretical elements are assessed discursively through a battery of semi-structured questions. Moreover, in reference to coordination and evaluation assessment, a battery of key indicators was established, and each organization quantified them between 0 and 10, considering 0 as absence of the indicator in the practice of educational partnership and 10 as the maximum possible presence of the indicator. In order to globally envision the existence of every aspect in the common work of organizations, an average was calculated:

Table 2. Average of numerical evaluations according to theoretical elements considered for analysis		
DIMENSION OF ANALYSIS	**ELEMENTS OF ANALYSIS**	**AVERAGE**
COORDINATION	(1) Community dynamization	7
	(2) Community transformation	6.8
	(3) Impacto n learning processes	8.8
	(4) Acquisition of confidence	8.8
	(5) Help among professional teams	8.8
	(6) Organisational framework for the planning of actions and role assignment	8.3
	(7) Fixing of specific actions during the school year	8.3
	(8) Critical reflections	7
	(9) Explorations of interests	7.5
	(10) Self-assessments	7.8
PROCESS OF EVALUATION	(1) Learning autonomy	7.8
	(2) Persistence in the educational system	7.8
	(3) Improvement of qualifications	7.8
	(4) Enhancement of behavior	8.3
	(5) Socio-emotional growth	9
	(6) Social and cultural engagement in the community	7.7
	(7) Existence of subsequent mechanisms to influence in educational contexts of institutinos in partnerships that enhance the intervention of academic support	6.5
Source: Own ellaboration.		

4.2. The voices of the main figures

The outcome obtained by the interviews and discussion groups are shown below.

The organizations interviewed consider that the **quality of the support** that they offer to participants is a conditioning factor for the success in their actions. According to them, quality is determined by the relations among professionals in the same organization and in other institutions. As a whole, partnerships are associated to the sum of efforts, to a better understanding of the realities of participants, to a greater capacity to attend educational needs and higher rates of educational quality. Likewise, the quality of support consists in a general intervention in every scope of action: school, family, society, emotions, etc.

[Edgar IGLESIAS VIDAL, Saida LÓPEZ-CRESPO, José Luís MUÑOZ MORENO & Anna TARRÉS VALLESPÍ]

Still, schools, along with educational organizations out of formal education, are a significant academic tool for the education of children and young people, developing their learning and generating knowledge, as well as meeting cultural, social and emotional needs (I1)

To achieve success in this general intervention, organizations also need the engagement of families. For that purpose, they are willing to include them as part of their organizational context, setting an open space for voluntary participation.

Extracurricular activities are an opportunity to integrate all the associative network within schools, promoting involvement where families also participate (I4).

We cannot work with young people without working with families (AP2).

Another factor considered relevant by organizations in order to establish partnerships is located in the sphere of visions among professionals. There are cases when they are negative, failing to acknowledge the contributions of the services offered. These visions coexist with others that are biased and attributed to the lack of relation, having as an effect the disregard of the tasks of the respective teams. In turn, the organizations consulted assert that the recognition received by schools regarding the competences of professionals is largely determined by the establishment of inter-institutional partnerships.

Our dream and goal is the recognition of the work that we do, proving to faculties that we can help with our projects and give continuity to the work that is performed in schools (I4).

The vision of schools is that we are merely another service instead of considering us partners, working independently, so this is why we barely interrelate (AP1).

Most of the organizations analyzed explain that **visions**, and the consequent mutual appreciation among institutions, are affected by the absence of coordination. This way, the lack of awareness about the importance of performing good practices for exchange (knowledge, experiences, resources, etc.) leads to biased visions about the respective action areas.

Teachers are still focused on participants during instruction time and think that what happens after school does not affect them (AP4).

Besides, organizations claim that a greater predisposition of schools would ease consensus and coordinated work. In reference to that, they consider and generalize that teachers have an educational vision restricted to school time, which hampers the continuity and integration of actions between both institutions.

Sometimes schools do not understand out contribution (DG2).

Regarding **coordination among institutions**, the organizations consulted agreed on perform three face-to-face meetings within the school, usually with tutors or support staff. These meetings are mainly destined to two measures: exchange of information among professionals and action plan in the short term.

We keep in touch with schools once every three months, and we share experiences and work, and tutors point out the things that we have to encourage, modalities of action and problems that have been raised (I2).

For the meetings, organizations often use mechanisms to promote coordination, such as tools destined to data collection and/or socialization of information or educational knowledge.

We have created a simple rubric with all our academic lessons which are based on collaboration with the school. This is the only information that we share, and it is my job to share this (AP6).

During this course we used a tool for coordination so that both organizations could know what do we want to work with and, consequently, find shared goals (I5).

Some organizations came up with the idea of the "coordinator", a figure of reference in the school, whose aim is to ease joint work among institutions. Likewise, it should be stated that the concept that each organization has about coordination affects its development. For instance, some of the professional consulted assert that, in general, schools consider coordination as a simple exchange of information, claiming that it is not always bidirectional and that the involvement of institutions is uneven. In all cases, organizations claim to be responsible for promoting and ensuring coordination.

One of the main problems relates to coordination. We still do not know how to coordinate, and we end up with a mere transfer of information. These educational projects are fragmented, and this is the reason why the outcome is not what we expected (I3).

In most of cases, the professional who belongs to the socio-educational organization is the one who should initiate the coordination and adapt to the dynamics of the school (DG1).

Other obstacle identified relate to the need of resources for a better action, the lack of communication protocols that can facilitate the contact among institutions and the schedule misalignments that impair coordination. At this point, organizations are resigned to adapt to school time.

In the absence of a moment to meet, the construction of rubrics to share information can be very helpful (DG1).

We had to be flexible regarding schedules and adapt to school realities (I3).

Focusing on professionals, several obstacles for an effective coordination among institutions are identified. On the one hand, recruitment conditions of the professionals of socio-educational organizations, given that they are often hired with a part-time contract and/or for a limited period of time. On the other, the lack of training may be the key for educators to deal with the different challenges that coordination implies.

It is even harder for us when we offer part-time jobs. Many times it is a revolving door for young university students who do not have much experience and spend one or two years learning with us (AP3).

Finally, regarding **evaluation processes**, organizations recognize that the evaluations are performed, but they generally bring a low vision of the outcome that the support provides. In view of this situation, educational teams demand external support to conduct longitudinal assessments geared towards measuring and making visible the impact that is actually generated.

I would suggest you to help us find a support model from a research point of view. We need external support that can provide indicators for impact measurement (I3).

We do not have the tools to offer evidence of the work that we are performing (AP3).

These demands tend to bring a perception of difficulties in the design and implementation of educational evaluation. In this regard, organizations place value on the need of creating space of reflection among professionals in order to decide and define the same evaluation. Moreover, they consider that their actions and procedures must also be assessed in order to identify mutual action areas. However, they acknowledge difficulties to create such spaces due to the pace of work.

I think that first and foremost we should reflect on our responsibility and what we are doing and what we are not. We should identify our goals and be realistic in order to know what we are doing so that we can actually make it. I think that is the first step. We need to look at each other and say what we are doing to finally interrelate (DG2).

Lastly, we present the following table displaying the main coincidences found in the two different backgrounds used in the study.

Table 3. Main coincidences between both contexts	
NORTH AMERICA	**SPAIN**
- The quality of academic support is largely determined by the relationships among professionals. - The quality of academic support implies an intervention from the different action areas (school, family, society, emotions, etc.). - Organizations recognize that they need family engagement. - Organizations feel that schools do not place value on their significance and their contributions. - Organizations consider that teachers have a limited vision that is restricted to school time. - Coordination is established in occasional meetings. - Coordination is based on the exchange of information and the action plan in the short term. - Organizations feel that they are responsible for the promotion of coordination. - There are schedule misalignments impairing coordination. - There is a lack of agreement regarding what should be assessed and how should this evaluation happen.	
Source: Own ellaboration.	

5. Discussion and conclusions

The establishment of partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations demands a shared responsibility for academic success. Partnerships between institutions and professionals require work dynamics and processes built from coordination. Nonetheless, it has been shown that their design and development are conditioned by several interconnected factors: the quality of academic support, the visions of professional teams, the coordination among institutions and the evaluations of processes and actions.

For that matter, it should be noted that we did not find meaningful differences between the two contexts targeted in the study due to the similarities in both environments and their specific features. However, the interest placed in both settings enabled the assertion that the situation of socio-educational organizations, and particularly partnerships with schools, is similar regarding the following elements: the quality of academic support is related to schools through stable bonds, the visions among the respective professional teams are linked to the recognition of professional competences, coordination is promoted by socio-educational organizations, and evaluation is focused on academic results.

The organizations that found difficulties to consolidate partnerships consider that the quality of the support can be measured mostly through the ability to generate stable bonds between their educational team and the educational team of schools. In contrast, the organizations that have already established a more stable partnership framework (GP) place less important elements around quality, giving more importance to pedagogical aspects; for instance, personalization of learning or methodological diversification. What both scenarios have in common is that the bond between organizations and participants ensures quality, and that if the service offered is a mere academic monitoring then it is not considered a quality attention. Additionally, there is consensus in the incorporation of families to the educational relation, given that they have been recognized as key actors for the socialization of educational and personal knowledge (Dikkers, 2013; Shernoff, 2010; Metz, Goldsmith & Arbreton, 2008).

For all that, the quality for organizations implies the full and shared knowledge of the realities of every participant and, consequently, of their social, economic and family needs. Besides, schools and organizations conduct a global and integrated intervention precisely from this approach.

Mutual visions between the professional teams of both institutions are configured as a relevant factor for the establishment of inter-institutional partnerships. A positive vision between teams is related to the recognition of the respective professional competences and, consequently, their intervention areas. When the contributions of the work performed by other institution are acknowledged, a better chance for the posterior development of partnerships takes place. At the same time, the establishment of relations facilitates the awareness of the importance of coordinated work and, as a consequence, of positive visions. However, the absence of relations generates negative visions based on the ignorance and prejudices that lead to professional superiority stances. Conversely, the configuration of solid partnerships, as it is the case of the good practices analyzed, is based on mutual comprehension and community work (Jordan, 2014; Gonzales, Gunderson & Wold, 2013; Schamper, 2012).

The study conducted shows that socio-educational support organizations are proactive in performing and ensuring coordination with schools: they have moments, tools and figures for coordination. However, there are different types of coordination according to the intended functionality criteria. On the one hand, coordination on the basis of compensation seeks to overcome the difficulties of the participants through academic support with no need for agreements or shared strategies. This type of coordination is based on the exchange of information and it takes place in most cases from a pedagogical discontinuity logic: there is no connection between curricular and extra-curricular contents and goals. On the other hand, coordination as the basis for the construction of knowledge is born when needs and targets are shared, based on agreements and shared knowledge, pursuing the creation and systematization of solid partnerships among institutions.

Finally, it should be noted that the evaluation of processes and actions emerges as the dimension which demands more work. All organizations, even those featuring the most stable partnerships established with schools, need help to gather more and better evidence on the different areas of intervention. Specifically, the evaluation tends to focus on academic results of the participants without considering personal and social indicators (Vandell, 2014; Chang & Jordan, 2013). Besides, this evaluation only focuses on participants, and professional performance and collaborative process are left behind. Moreover, both elements are key for the establishment of partnerships. Thus, the priority is to determine and identify the meaning, the type and the evaluation mechanisms

regarding academic support. There is a need for a strong and mutual commitment in order to achieve efficient and successful partnerships to promote and develop them. Working together does not only mean a meeting and formalization of what has been agreed, which is of course a part of the process, but not the most relevant part. Building partnerships implies the consideration of the other, the agreement on the intervention criteria and specifically, concrete action conducted collectively and coordinately, recognizing plurality and diversity.

It is necessary that partnerships between schools and socio-educational support organizations gradually gain more institutional prominence, especially in complex social environments, also from a dimension of educational community and beyond the establishment of concrete relations in particular cases (Gairín & San Fabián, 2005). With the aim of articulating these partnerships and grasping the opportunities, often ignored by schools, it is convenient to place value on experiences as "community schools". This kind of approaches prove the suitability of establishing partnerships and formal/informal relations,

as a tool for the construction of an educational community. For that purpose, professional teams must show wider attitudes based on integration with the environment (Martín, 2000). The actual challenge is to shape a framework of cooperative relations among socio-educational institutions and educational resources of each context.

Lastly, it is worth noting that the limitations of the study have to do with the size and complexity of the topic of the investigation and the representativeness of the respondents of the sample which limit the generalization of results, as well as difficulties encountered when transferring the outcome obtained to other situations or contexts. All this should enable the adjustment of the meaning of the results, even when we can consider that the outcome is not significantly modified. To this regard, further studies on this topic could be guided towards segregating schooling as a consequence for the lack of cooperation between schools and socio-educational support teams; what's more, towards the overcome of resistance to cooperation between organizations and schools for the achievement of the construction of academic success in contexts of complexity and socio-cultural diversity.

References

Albaigés, B. (2016). *Les polítiques educatives locals en temps de crisi*. Barcelona: Diputació de Barcelona.

Afterschool Alliance. (2015). *Evaluations Backgrounder: A Summary of Formal Evaluations of Afterschool Programs Impact on Academics, Behavior, Safety and Family Life*. Washington, D.C.

Afterschool Alliance. (2014). *Taking a Deeper Dive into Afterschool: Positive Outcomes and Promising Practices*. Washington, D.C.

Afterschool Alliance. (2013). *Afterschools in Action: Innovative Afterschools programs: supporting middle school youth*. Washington, D.C.

Anderson, S. A.; Sabatelli, R. M. y Trachtenberg, J. (2009). Community police and youth programs as a context for positive youth development. *Police Quarterly, 10,* 23-40.

AIR. (2015). Supporting Social and Emotional Development Through Quality Afterschool Programs. *Beyond the Bell,* 1-11.

Bennett, T. (2014). Examining Levels of Alignment between School and Afterschool and Associations with Student Academic. *JELO, 1*(2), 4-22.

Bodilly, S., & Beckett, M. K. (2005). *Making out-ofschool time matter: Evidence for an action agenda*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Chang, H. N., & Jordan, P. W. (2013). Building a Culture of Attendance: Schools and Afterschool Programs Together Can and Should Make a Difference!. En Peterson T. K. (Ed.). *Expanding Minds and Opportunities* (pp. 56-61). Washington, D.C.: Collaborative Communications Group.

Comellas, Mª. J. (2010). El trabajo en red: un modelo de participación para las familias. *Educar, 45,* 117-129.

Connelly G. y Young P. (2013). More than just another "to-do" on the list: The benefits of strong school, principal and afterschool community relationships. En Peterson T. K. (Ed.). *Expanding Minds and Opportunities* (pp. 259-264). Washington, D.C.: Collaborative Communications Group.

Consorci d'Educació de Barcelona. (2015). *Mapa de recursos de suport escolar a Barcelona*. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya - Ajuntament de Barcelona.

Departament d'Ensenyament. (2013). *Ofensiva de país a favor de l'èxit escolar. Pla per a la reducció del fracàs escolar a Cataluya 2012-2018*. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya.

Díaz-Gibson, J., Civís, M., Longás, J.,& Riera, J. (2017). *Projectes d'innovació educativa comunitària: ingredients d'èxit i reptes*. Barcelona: Fundació Jaume Bofill.

Dikkers, A. G. (2013). Family connections: Building connections among home, school, and community. *Childhood Education, 89*(2), 115–116.

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., & Pachan, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 45*, 294–309.

FEDAIA. (2016). *El paper dels Centres Oberts en la cohesió social.* Barcelona: Federació d'Entitats d'Atenció a la Infància i l'Adolescència.

Fundació Jaume Bofill; Diputació de Barcelona i Federació de Moviments de Renovació Pedagògica. (2018). *Educació 360. Educació a temps complet.* Retrieved from https://www.educacio360.cat/ (21 de mayo de 2018).

Gibson, M. A., Carrasco, S., Pàmies, J., Ponferrada, M., & Ríos-Rojas, A. (2013). Different Systems, Similar Results: Immigrant Youth at School in California and Catalonia. In Alba, R. & Holdaway, J. (Eds.). *The Children of Immigrants at School: A Comparative Look at Integration in the United States and Western Europe* (pp. 84-119). New York: NYU Press.

Gairín, J., & San Fabián, J. L. (2005). *La participación social en educación.* En Jiménez, B. (Coord.). Formación profesional (157-188). Barcelona: Praxis.

González, S. (2016). *Quin impacte tenen les activitats extraescolars sobre els aprenentatges dels infants i joves? Què funciona en Educació? Evidències per a la millora educativa.* Barcelona: Fundació Jaume Bofill - Institut Català d'Avaluació de Polítiques Educatives.

Gonzales, L. Gunderson, J., & Wold, M. (2013). Linking common core and expanded learning. *Leadership, 42*(3), 18-22.

Harris, E., Deschenes, S., Westmoreland, H., Bouffard, S., & Coffman, J. (2010). *Partnerships for learning: promising practices in integrating school and out –of- school time program supports.* Cambridge: Harvard Family Research Project.

Huang, D., Cho, J., Mostafavi, S., & Sam, H. (2008). *What works? Common Practices in High Functioning Afterschool Programs. The National Partnership for quality Afterschool Learning final report.* Austin, TX: SEDL.

Jordan, C. (2014). Building Supportive Relationships in Afterschool. *SEDL Insights, 2*(1), 1-8.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research.* Londres: Sage publications.

Leos-Urbel, J. (2015). What Works After School? The Relationship Between After-School. Program Quality, Program Attendance and Academic Outcomes. *Youth and Society, 47*(5) 684-706.

Little, P., Wimer, C., & Weiss, H. B. (2008). After School Programs in the 21st Century. Their potential and what it takes to achieve it. *Harvard Family and Research Project, 10,* 1-12.

Martín, Q. (2000). *Bancos de talento. Participación de la comunidad en los centros docentes.* Madrid: Sanz y Torres.

Mc Millan, J y Shummacher, S. (2001*). Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5 ed). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Metz, R. A., Goldsmith, J., & Arbreton, A. J. A. (2008). *Putting it all together: Guiding principles for quality after-school programs serving preteens.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Mourshed, M., Chijioke, C., & Barber, M. (2012). *How the World's Most-improved School Systems Keep Getting Better.* London, UK: McKinsey & Co.

Muñoz, J. L. (2012). *Ayuntamientos y desarrollo educativo.* Madrid: Editorial Popular.

Muñoz, J. L. (2009). *La participación de los municipios en la educación.* Madrid: Editorial Popular.

O'Hare, L., Biggart, A., Kerr, K., & Connolly, P. (2015). A Randomized controlled trial evaluation of an after-school prosocial behavior program in an area of socioeconomic. *ESJ, 116*(1), 1-29.

O'Leary, A., González, N., & Valdez, G. (2008). Latinas Practices of Emergence: Between Cultural Narratives and Globalization on the U.S. - Mexico Border. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 7*(3), 206-226.

Palmer, K., Anderson, S. A., & Sabatelli, R. M. (2009). How is the afterschool field defining program quality? A Review of Effective Program Practices and Definitions of Program Quality. *Afterschool Matters*, 1-12.

Rubio, L., & Lucchetti, L. (2016). *APS pau, drets humans i solidaritat. Noves propostes d'educació per a la justícia global.* Aprenentatge Servei. Recuperado de: www.aprenentatgeservei.cat (19 de mayo de 2018).

Schamper, A. (2012). Collaboration between afterschool practitioners and in-school teachers. *Afterschool Matters, 15*, 48-51.

Shernoff, D. J. (2010). Engagement in After-School Programs as a Predictor of Social Competence and Academic Performance. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 45*(3-4), 325-337.

Sintes, E. (2016). 10 elements clau per aconseguir una escola a temps complet. *Diari de l'Educació,* 5 de abril. Retrieved from http://diarieducacio.cat/10-elements-clau-per-aconseguir-una-escola-a-temps-complet/ (17 de abril de 2018)

Sintes, E. (2015). *Escola a temps complet. Cap a un model d'educació compartida.* Barcelona: Fundació Bofill.

Stelow, S., & Martínez, L. (2013). The value of partnerships in afterschool and summer learning: a national case study of 21st century community learning centers. In Peterson, T. K. (Ed.). *Expanding minds and opportunities* (pp.47-53). Washington, D.C.: Collaborative Communications Group.

Suárez, C., & Muñoz, J. L. (2017). El trabajo en red y la cooperación como elementos para la mejora escolar. *Propósitos y Representaciones, 5*(1), 349-402.

Tójar, J. (2006). *La investigación cualitativa: comprender y actuar*. Madrid: La Muralla.

Vandell, D. L. (2013). Afterschool Programs Quality and Student Outcomes: Reflections on Positive Key Findings on Learning and Development From Recent Research. In Peterson T. K. (Ed.). *Expanding Minds and Opportunities* (pp. 180-186). Washington, D.C.: Collaborative Communications Group.

XCO. (2011). *Construint el model de Centres Oberts per a la ciutat de Barcelona*. Barcelona: Ajuntament de Barcelona - Xarxa de Centres Oberts d'Atenció a la Infància de Barcelona. Recuperado de: http://www.bcn.cat/barcelonainclusiva/ca/2011/11/xarxa6_documentmarc.pdf (23 de abril de 2018).

Zabalza, M. A. (2012). El estudio de las "buenas prácticas" docentes en la enseñanza universitaria. REDU. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria,* Vol. 10, Nº 1, 17-42.

HOW TO CITE THE ARTICLE

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

EDGAR IGLESIAS VIDAL. Profesor Asociado. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. E-mail: *edgar.iglesias@uab.cat*

SAIDA LÓPEZ-CRESPO. Personal Investigador en Formación. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. E-mail: *saida.lopez@uab.cat*

JOSÉ LUÍS MUÑOZ MORENO. Profesor Agregado Interino. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. E-mail: *joseluis.muñoz@uab.cat*

ANNA TARRÉS VALLESPÍ. Profesora Asociada. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. E-mail: *anna.tarres@uab.cat*

ACADEMIC PROFILE

EDGAR IGLESIAS VIDAL. Doctor en Pedagogía (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona). Pedagogo, antropólogo y profesor del Departamento de Pedagogía Aplicada de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Es investigador del Equipo de Desarrollo Organizacional EDO y de ERDISC. Sus principales líneas de investigación son la relación escuela y comunidad como estrategia para el éxito educativo y la educación intercultural. Fue becado para realizar una investigación educativa en el contexto de California. ORCID: 0000-0002-0356-0439

SAIDA LÓPEZ-CRESPO. Pedagoga (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona). Personal Investigador en Formación del Equipo de Desarrollo Organizacional EDO y profesora del Departamento de Pedagogía Aplicada de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Becada por el Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competitividad para el desarrollo de su tesis doctoral. Sus líneas de trabajo se centran en el liderazgo para el desarrollo organizativo y los procesos de cambio institucional. ORCID: 0000-0002-1608-2552

JOSÉ LUÍS MUÑOZ MORENO. Doctor en Calidad y Procesos de Innovación Educativa (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona). Pedagogo y profesor del Departamento de Pedagogía Aplicada de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Es investigador del Equipo de Desarrollo Organizacional EDO y las principales líneas de investigación en las que trabaja son: la mejora y el desarrollo organizacional de las instituciones socioeducativas y la inclusión y la participación educativa. ORCID: 0000-0003-2572-4155

ANNA TARRÉS VALLESPÍ. Socióloga y licenciada en Ciencias de la Información (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona). Profesora en la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona y en la Universitat Oberta de Catalunya y colabora con el Grupo de investigación sobre Diversidad y Sociedades Complejas (ERDISC). Actualmente, acaba su tesis doctoral sobre trayectorias de éxito del alumnado de incorporación tardía (NAMS) en el sistema educativo. Ha sido profesora en la Universidad Ramon Llull y trabajado en el Panel de Desigualdades Sociales de la Fundación Jaume Bofill. Beca 2011 de la European *Science* Foundation en el National Educational Panel Study (Bamberg, Alemania). ORCID: 0000-0002-9732-5439