



Integrated Support Strategies

Scaling staff capacity through relational systems
where every student belongs

The Community Partner Integration Rubric

An Operational Diagnostic Tool to Evaluate Shared Service Infrastructure and Partner ROI

Partner Organization: _____ School Site: _____ Audit Date: _____

Operational Guidance: Use this diagnostic matrix to audit how seamlessly an external wraparound or community partner organization is embedded into the school environment. Evaluate each operational indicator to determine whether a partnership is generating a clear capacity return, or experiencing systemic architecture gaps that require district design interventions.

Operational Dimension	Tier 1: Fragmented Integration	Tier 2: Functional Integration	Tier 3: Systemic Integration
Communication & Workflows	[] Communication channels are mutually isolated. The school district lacks a standardized partner onboarding pipeline, leaving building staff unaware of partner programming or presence. Information exchange is entirely unscripted, occurring almost exclusively during an active behavioral or operational crisis.	[] Partner shares basic logistics, rosters, and operational schedules monthly. Standard referral channels exist, but workflows rely heavily on a single liaison (e.g., the Coordinator) to manually bridge communication gaps.	[] Communication pathways are transparent and continuous. Referral loops automatically close via shared documentation. Partner schedules are integrated directly into the building's central master operational calendar.
Relational Infrastructure & Alignment	[] A total deficit of cultural triangulation. Cross-organizational training is not implemented, so partner staff utilize external management models that actively contradict the building's universal tier-1 expectations, causing systemic student behavioral confusion and operational friction for frontline teams.	[] Partner staff understand the school's universal behavior framework. Basic expectations are verbally aligned, though partner staff do not participate in building-level professional development or team planning sessions.	[] Relational standards are universally shared. Partner and building staff cross-train together on trauma-informed practices, escalation thresholds, and restorative protocols, creating a seamless environment for students.

Data Sharing & Privacy Ecosystem	[] Data exchange is entirely blocked or legally unmapped. Neither party has established formal, secure FERPA/HIPAA-compliant release protocols. As a result, building leadership remains blind to real-time student programmatic metrics, and the partner lacks access to critical school baseline indicators.	[] Basic data exchange occurs at scheduled intervals (e.g., end-of-semester reports). Formal FERPA/HIPAA consent pipelines are signed, but student impact data is tracked statically rather than guiding real-time decisions.	[] Secure, bi-directional data pipelines are active. Real-time metrics tracking student engagement, attendance, and programmatic milestones flow dynamically to inform the building's multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) team.
Space & Material Operations	[] Facility usage lacks a formalized operational agreement. The building manages space reactively, causing the partner to frequently shift physical locations. Rules regarding room configuration, shared material boundaries, and custodial support are completely unspecified, creating continuous staff-level tension.	[] Partner is assigned a designated, static physical space within the building. Shared physical boundaries are generally respected, though clean-up, material storage, and room configurations are managed reactively as issues arise.	[] Space usage is governed by an explicit, proactive spatial agreement. Dedicated facility zones are optimized for partner delivery, with clear, co-designed protocols for room transition, material care, and shared space custody.
Leadership Triangulation	[] Executive interactions are strictly transactional, occurring only during annual, high-level board renewals or severe operational breakdowns. The district fails to map partner program outputs to its strategic school improvement goals, resulting in decoupled resource deployment.	[] Building leadership and partner coordinators meet at set intervals (e.g., quarterly) to review general performance metrics. Partner goals are loosely mapped to general school-wide improvement initiatives.	[] Partner leadership is an active, structural voice on the School Coordination Team. Program data is fully triangulated with district performance indices to strategically deploy resources where gaps are identified real-time.

Systemic Audit Indicators for Community School Leadership:

Diagnosing Design Friction: If a partnership scores heavily in Tier 1, it indicates an institutional design gap rather than a partner deficit. Fragmented workflows represent a lack of structural onboarding pipelines, unmapped data agreements, and reactive spatial custody parameters managed by the district.

Targeting the Systemic Shift: Transition from Functional (Tier 2) to Systemic (Tier 3) operations by establishing automated data exchange, cross-organizational PD structures, and formal multi-agency master schedules to remove administrative friction entirely.

Stop Managing Collaboration. Start Architecting Infrastructure.

We partner with districts to turn complex, multi-agency partnerships into streamlined, high-yield operational assets.

Book an ISS Capacity Audit & Consultation today at <https://www.integratedsupportstrategies.com/book-online>