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Collaborations are an encouraged practice for agencies to overcome clear challenges. Though championed by scholars and practitioners, there is limited understanding as to how agency differences influence the decision to collaborate and the subsequent consequences of engaging in collaborative practices. Arrangements between education systems and law enforcement as School Resource Officers (SROs), for example, are increasingly discussed and invite thorough investigation given the distinctions between agencies and the clientele served.

This dissertation first evaluates agency incentive to partner following exogenous shocks. Following pivotal events, organizations may perceive weaknesses in operation and look to similar agencies for new practices to adopt. The diffusion of best practices and potential threat may incentivize agencies to express interest in establishing a partnership. Using grant data from the Department of Justice, this study evaluates expressed interest in collaboration from law enforcement agencies following the events at Columbine High School. The findings indicate that increased exposure may limit interest in SRO programs but different measures of potential threats offer diverging interest in federal funding.

The second paper tests alignment to own- and partner-agency mission among executives through an original survey of police chiefs and superintendents. While previous literature evaluates the observable qualities of agency leaders, the value and mission alignment are not tested; if managers can align with and support a partner’s mission and goals, there is a greater likelihood of cooperation among executives, encouraging an effective partnership. The findings
suggest that relating to a partner’s mission will encourage this cooperation, but this is tempered by stronger alignment to one’s own agency.

The final paper evaluates the unintended consequences of collaborations. Tension between individual and collective goals encourages satisficing behavior that can impact agency-specific goals. This may be experienced to a greater degree among marginalized communities. Using data from the Office for Civil Rights and the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, this study investigates the influence SRO programs have on diploma performance among distinct student groups and suggests that while there are slight improvements to overall student achievement, there are negative impacts toward some marginalized communities.
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Introduction

Background and Contribution

Public organizations exist with the purpose of providing services to constituents (Hall and Tolbert, 2015; Kettl, 2016) and vary in mission, culture, and goals (Bozeman and Bretschneider, 1994; Hall and Tolbert, 2015; Pandey and Wright, 2006; Rainey and Bozeman, 2000). To promote accountability of these organizations, and to evaluate efficacy and efficiency of this service delivery, agencies and their political principals establish agency-specific goals (Pandey and Wright, 2006; Rutherford and Meier, 2015). Inevitably in this process, agencies can face problems with undistinguishable solutions (McGuire, 2006). Given the level of difficulty and extent of novelty in many of these challenges, many argue public organizations require creativity and flexibility in decision making.

This flexibility can require building relationships with external organizations; by establishing rapport, compromising decision making powers, and cooperating with another organization, an agency can gain the required resources and skills required while also contributing to the task at hand. Collaborations among public agencies are well documented (see Agranoff and McGuire, 2001; Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; Kettl, 2016; McGuire, 2002, 2006, among others) and cite resource dependence, uncertainty, and leadership initiating as common themes for establishing and maintain these relationships (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015). In short, forgoing some autonomy in decision making and overcoming differences in agency characteristics allows organizations to gain what is necessary for an otherwise overwhelming task (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; Esteve et al., 2013; O’Leary and Vij, 2012; Rainey, 2009). By encouraging cooperation and means for accessing resources, scholars and practitioners alike champion collaborative practices as a cure-all for wicked problems (Warm, 2011). However, the
extent to which agencies are capable of overcoming these differences may be contingent on the influence mission and goals have on decision makers within a partnership and may contribute to unintended consequences experienced by service recipients.

Further, factors such as political preferences or expectations have been shown to change decision making processes by bureaucrats within an organization (Behn, 2003; Carpenter and Krause, 2012; Meier and O’Toole, 2008; Pemberton, 2000; Weber and Khademian, 2008). Past experience in collaborations may be exacerbated by challenges in establishing and maintaining a partnership or may be a shared experience, improving the partnership itself (Ansell and Gash, 2007; Bryson et al., 2006; Esteve et al., 2013; Gulati, 1995). This means that the dynamic relationship between public organizations, and the degree to which they can cooperate in a partnership, can be muted or amplified as a consequence of individual agency responses to the surrounding environment. In this vein, how agencies interact with their environments will reflect how cooperative executives and implementers within the agency will be with a partner. Currently literature is conducted at the agency-level (McGuire, 2002; O’Leary and Vij, 2012; Schermerhorn, 1975; Thomson and Perry, 2006) and does not fully consider how differences across agencies can influence their abilities to cooperate and, to a lesser degree, how the external environment influences this cooperation. If agency differences are too great that it hinders cooperation, then the partnership cannot ensure positive performance outcomes, if it can exist at all. Interagency cooperation not only contributes to potentially achieving a shared goal, but it also has implications beyond the scope of the partnership.

Effective collaborations are grounded in these determinants and require interagency cooperation, where independent agencies are balancing goals and relationships to achieve the task at hand (Aram and Stratton, 1974; Connelly et al., 2008; O’Leary and Vij, 2012; Luo, 2008;
Schermerhorn, 1975). Successful interagency cooperation not only contributes to achieving a shared goal but could influence long-term effects outside of the partnership. Current literature does not entirely account for the degree to which differences in agency missions and values influence the relationships between organizations. Agency leaders have separate goals outside of the partnership that could help or hinder attention and resource allocation to a shared goal. These assumptions, then, are subject to violation given shifts in bureaucratic behavior based on these differences and interactions with other organizations. There is a gap then in addressing the degree to which interagency cooperation is subject to change at different levels of the organization and in relation to agency mission, goals, and the environment. Because bureaucratic behavior and decision making is not insulated from change (Bozeman and Pandey, 2004), establishing partnerships will subject bureaucrats at all levels to changes in actions by virtue of disrupting the status quo. This dissertation aims to investigate what impacts interagency cooperation and the degree to which shifts in this cooperation will influence outcomes for agencies engaged in partnerships. Each paper will address the inputs and outputs of interagency cooperation and collaboration by addressing the following questions:

- To what degree do diffusion and perceived weaknesses influence the decision to establish partnerships?
- How do differences in own- and partner-agency alignment influence executive decision making in public-public partnerships?
- How do public-public partnerships influence agency goals and outcomes beyond the scope of the partnership objectives?
Through empirically testing each question there are opportunities to understand how interagency cooperation will influence establishing and maintaining a partnership while also addressing the potential consequences of this organizational practice.

**Partnerships in Collaboration: School Resource Officer Programs**

Despite the positive attitude toward collaboration as a whole, collaborations do not escape scrutiny or media attention, particularly when partnering organizations have stark contrasts in mission, goals, and procedures. To test these questions, public education and law-enforcement is an appropriate context because these partnerships are not uncommon, though there is little understanding as to how effective these partnerships are. Partnerships between these agencies showcase how the fundamental goals and missions of each organization differ: police departments’ primary values surround public safety (Department of Justice, n.d.) while public school districts aim to provide education and knowledge of civics to all students (Kober, 2007).

These partnerships, known as School Resource Officer (SRO) programs, have become an increasingly salient topic among constituents and policymakers, receiving significant criticism on all fronts because of disproportionate disciplinary actions, the school-to-prison pipeline, and violent acts in school. This attention and the distinctions in agencies offer a venue to test how differences in organizations can influence the structure and outcomes of such collaborations. School Resource Officer programs are specifically partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and school districts, where law enforcement becomes present in one or more schools as a full-time or part-time position. Through an amendment to the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, SROs are federally defined as a law enforcement officers deployed to schools in a community-oriented capacity and are meant to collaborate in schools to establish safe learning environments (Aram and Stratton, 1974; Connelly et al., 2008; Luo, 2008; O’Leary
and Vij, 2012; Schermerhorn, 1975). The presence of law enforcement in education systems has a long history where truancy officers were present as early as the 1840s (Tyack and Berkowitz, 1977), though the first reported SROs were recorded in Flint, Michigan in the 1950s (Connery, 2020).

The federal definition allows for significant state and local government discretion, which are responsible for setting policies for training, certifications, and other collaboration requirements such as structure and expectations (Education Commission of the States, 2019a, 2019b; Finn et al., 2005). The discretion among state and local governments also breeds challenges in determining the number of active SROs. To estimate the number of SROs, the Department of Justice distributed a survey in 2007 through the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Services (LEMAS) survey, finding approximately 17,000 SROs were recorded and deployed in public schools (National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO), n.d.). More recent estimates, made by the National Association of School Resource Officers, are between 14,000 and 20,000 (NASRO, n.d.). It should be noted that SROs, in theory, are different from security officers, where security officers are publicly or privately contracted and have one set of priorities and goals of the partnership. SROs, on the other hand, are in part responsible for establishing a safe environment, to be a positive resource to both students and staff, and are expected to serve as educators, emergency managers, and informal counselors (NASRO, nd). This distinction makes the impact of SRO programs difficult to measure because of the definition of roles and the discretion held by state and local government. The lack of clarity and mandated oversight suggests the true effectiveness of SROs and the partnership between education and public safety is largely speculative and carries some political influence.
The debate of SRO effectiveness is largely encompassed by the increasingly salient discussion of disproportionate disciplinary actions toward minority students (McFadden et al., 1992; Wallace et al., 2008). SRO interactions with students have also been linked to increased trust and positive attitudes toward the program (Theriot, 2016a), where students are more likely to report crimes because of this trust (McDevitt and Panniello, 2005). However, additional research suggests that this disproportionate disciplinary action is also seen among nonwhite students and students with disabilities (Balingit, 2018; U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, 2014). Black and Hispanic students experience higher referral rates and punishment than their white peers regardless of law enforcement presence (McFadden et al., 1992; Merkwae, 2015), though the presence of SROs and the increased use of zero-tolerance policies compound racial biases and result in a disproportionate increase in disciplinary actions, perhaps not improving the safety needs of students and staff (Corley, 2018; Crosse et al., 2021).

Focusing specifically on public education and law enforcement provides an appropriate context to analyze partnerships, in part because there are clear distinctions in both agencies. The increased attention to this partnership also provides opportunities to offer insight into the education policy space to both offer descriptions of the relationships with possible management and policy recommendations. The role of police in education spaces and the increased attention to its necessity and effectiveness suggests that it is imperative to further investigate what influences this partnership and the degree to which these influences have unintended consequences to discipline and education.

**Dissertation Overview**

This dissertation aims to investigate both the influences and outcomes of collaborative structures when considering differences in public organizations. By evaluating the differences in
agencies as they influence establishing partnerships and the subsequent outcomes, the chapters of this dissertation not only contribute to the broader public management literature with these questions, but also provide a useful tool for practitioners to better understand these programs from a previously less transparent perspective.

The first chapter offers insight into organizational interest in collaboration in response to exogenous shocks and contributes to previous management literature investigating drivers of collaboration. Changes to organizations can occur in small, incremental steps to not upset the status quo, but in the wake of exogenous shocks, opportunity for broad sweeping changes can arise as a reaction to the events. Particularly in the wake of seismic events, perceived or actual weaknesses in public organizations can be brought to light, creating an uncertainty that breeds from this newly (re)established threat. In evaluating organizational weaknesses and the surrounding environment, organizations can adopt other practices that are increasingly prevalent in an effort to address gaps in a system and solve the task at hand. The diffusion that occurs as a result of the policy window can encourage new best practices among organizations and create an influx of organizations looking to adopt the policy. Efforts to change agency reputation require quick response to such shocks (see Corbo et al., 2016; Venetoklis, 2021). Because uncertainty is an accepted driver of collaboration (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015), pivotal events can establish a need for organizational change and incentivize organizations to establish partnerships. When a perceived weakness and uncertainty is exposed, do policy windows encourage diffusion of collaborative practices?

When considering diffusion and threat in education, student safety received this type of attention following the tragedy at Columbine High School on April 20, 1999. In the wake of Columbine, school safety was launched into discussion from media outlets and at all levels of
government. The tragedy exposed weaknesses in the education system and posed a threat to schools throughout the country and created opportunity to address this challenge through collaboration with agencies situated in public safety. SRO programs were seen as an opportunity to address this perceived weakness in education, resulting in expressed interest from law enforcement agencies, education systems, and stakeholders outside of both spaces for the collaborative program and facilitated federal grant funding through the Department of Justice COPS in Schools (CIS) grant program. CIS was established following the events at Columbine (Fiddiman et al., 2018; Juvonen, 2001) and had the goal of creating partnerships between law enforcement agencies and local education agencies through funding SRO positions in school systems (Federal Grants, n.d.). Using CIS data from 1999 through 2004, along with measures of crime committed by minors from the Bureau of Justice Statistics and frequency of school shootings from the Naval Postgraduate School, this paper investigates if the prevalence of SRO programs through the state, as a measure of diffusion, and the crimes of minors per capita, as a measure of threat, influence the decision to seek SRO funding. The findings indicate that higher levels of diffusion and school violence per year discouraged individual agency applications from SRO-related funding, though increased crime per capita among minors incentivized application, suggesting an interest in initiating, or expanding partnerships with public education systems is contingent on exogenous shocks and both internal and external influences.

The second chapter focuses on cooperation among executives in public-public partnerships. Agencies rely on executives in the decision making process to overcome initial differences between the organizations when establishing partnerships. While partnerships create opportunities to gain additional expertise and resources, the practice also requires some sacrifice in autonomy (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015) and cooperation across managers (Esteve et al.,
How willing executives will be to lose some decision-making authority, however, is tempered not only by how they align with their partner’s mission and goals, but also the degree to which they align with their home organization. Increasing alignment to one’s own organization can decrease a manager’s willingness to limit autonomy in the partnership as a mechanism to protect agency-specific goals and processes. In contrast, increased alignment to a partner’s mission will increase the willingness to cooperate, creating opportunity for a successful partnership. Previous research focusing on executives in partnerships relied on observable characteristics such as educational attainment, gender, and race (Esteve et al., 2013; McGuire, 2006), but it did not account for these less tangible, observable qualities that are hypothesized to influence the success of a partnership (Ansell and Gash, 2007; Huxham and Vangen, 2004). Observable characteristics create opportunity for executives to find common ground and shared experiences across parties, improving the cooperation and communication in a collaborative arrangement.

In the case of SRO programs, decisions involving the partnership are left primarily to police chiefs and superintendents. How both managers align with their own organizations and with their partners may dictate the degree to which cooperation can take place. By finding common ground in organizational mission and values, much like the observable commonalities tested by previous research, executives are subject to being more agreeable and cooperative in a partnership. This not only sheds light on interagency cooperation among executives, but also offers a potential mechanism to improve communication and effectiveness in a partnership. Using a survey distributed to police chiefs and superintendents in Midwestern states, this paper evaluates the degree to which managers are able to overcome these organizational differences for an effective partnership. The findings indicate that relating to a partner’s mission and goals will
encourage collaboration and a willingness to partner, suggesting that alignment and understanding of outside organizations is a necessary step to overcoming the threshold of differences. However, this willingness to forgo autonomy is tempered by a stronger alignment to a home organization. The results suggest that police chiefs were more likely to forgo autonomy than superintendents despite having a strong alignment to home-agency mission, indicating that previous experience with K-12 education systems fosters a relatability to education that cannot be achieved with organizations that do not offer ubiquitous services.

The final chapter evaluates unintended consequences that arise as a result of collaborative practices. Agency decision making is contingent on how goals are influenced and prioritized (Pandey and Rainey, 2006a; Pandey and Wright, 2006b); by engaging in a partnership, organizations must balance time and resources between the agency-specific goals and the partnership goal. While gaining resources by virtue of partnering, individuals within both agencies still engage in satisficing behavior to appropriately allocate necessary resources (Simon, 1979), which may create tension between organization-specific goals and goals stemming from collaboration (Thomson and Perry, 2006). Partnerships also create challenges of meeting unclear expectations and establishing effective communication and cooperation (Christensen and Knudsen, 2010), hindering how well organizations perform in these agency-specific goals and detract from performance altogether (Adler and Benbunan-Fich, 2012). Further, changes in agency-specific tasks may be experienced differently among communities (see Bullard and Johnson, 2000; Grissom et al., 2009, among others). These differences in experience combined with satisficing behavior within the organization create potential changes in the degree of equity in service allocation and delivery across groups. By understanding the costs of a partnership outside of the collective objectives, there is opportunity to evaluate collaborative performance
from a different perspective, while also offering practical insight to organizations engaged in partnerships.

This paper tests organizational performance beyond the partnership through measuring the rate at which students receive diplomas by racial and ethnic cohorts given the presence of SROs in a given county. Using three waves of data from the Office for Civil Rights, Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, and the National Center of Education Statistics from 2000, 2003, and 2007, the analysis focuses on the relationship between the presence of SROs in public schools and the rate at which Black, Hispanic, and white students received diplomas at the county-level. This analysis moves beyond the existing research and focuses explicitly on differences in outcomes by race and expands the analysis to SRO programs that may not have COPS funding. The results indicate that increasing the presence of SROs results in a slight improvement in students receiving diplomas, but when further disaggregated, Hispanic students experience more negative outcomes than their white peers. This indicates that while overall there are improvements to agency-specific goals (students earning diplomas), there are also negative externalities experienced by some cohorts of students, indicating unequal service experiences.

Collaborative practices have been and will continue to be prescribed as a method to overcome wicked problems faced in public organizations. While collaborations are championed by scholars and practitioners and have normative value, it is important to determine their success and the limitations of this organizational practice. Agency characteristics can dictate group dynamics and help or hinder agency cooperation; it is important to investigate how these differences across organizations influence the decision making and outcomes of partnerships. Previous literature has engaged with differences in public organizations in the context of
partnerships, but this is primarily to the extent of observable characteristics among executives; there is a broad assumption that by virtue of overcoming differences, a partnership will be successful if the collective goal is met. Understanding the influences and outcomes of partnerships will encourage investigation to improve equity and efficacy of current and future partnerships.

In the case of SROs and partnerships in education, this research contributes to a growing body of work evaluating the relationship between law enforcement and school systems, with a goal of improving the education space with respect to safety and equity (Corley, 2018; Johnson, 1999; Johnson, 2015; McFadden et al., 1992; NASRO, 2012). While its effectiveness is debated and there have been discussions and actions to terminate programs (Schwartz et al., 2021; Shannon, 2021), SRO programs are an accepted practice to address school safety. Given its prevalence, there are practical contributions to practitioners to shed light on interagency cooperation and collaborations in a space with limited transparency. Offering this insight encourages a better understanding of the differences between law enforcement and education as they impact collective decision making spaces. Regardless of the future of SRO programs, education and law enforcement agencies will continue to engage in partnerships with each other and other agencies; it is imperative to acknowledge how differences in agencies will influence outcomes to, at worst, minimize challenges, and, at best, foster effective, positive outcomes for service recipients.
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Chapter 1: A mad dash for cash: Changes in School Resource Officer program interest in the wake of the Columbine school shooting

Abstract:

In the wake of large scale, unexpected events, organizations may consider new practices by observing and learning from other organizations. In K-12 education systems, this vulnerability was experienced following the shooting at Columbine High School, which created a search for new tools and protocols for school safety. One practice commonly adopted was School Resource Officer (SRO) programs, partnerships between law enforcement and school systems in which one or more sworn law enforcement officers work closely with schools in an effort to create a safer environment. Using data from the Department of Justice and the Naval Postgraduate School from 1999 to 2004, this study investigates the influences on SRO program interest following the events at Columbine. The findings show that higher levels of diffusion and increased perceived threats discouraged organizations to pursue SRO-related funding, though this is contingent on the severity of the threat measured.
Introduction

Organizational behavior and managerial practices are the result of decision makers responding to the political and external environment (Carpenter and Krause, 2012; Kuipers et al., 2014; O’Toole and Meier, 2003). Individuals within the organization will react to their surrounding environment influencing the managerial practices implemented (see Anagnoston, 1983; Conover, 1988; Dulin, 2007). Though organizational shifts are typically incremental, significant, large-scale events can foster changes in organizational best practices across all organizations in a similar area of service provision (True et al., 2007). Specifically, such events encourage program diffusion through images, stakeholders, a multitude of internal and external influences (see Boushey, 2012; 2013; Graham et al., 2013; Grossback et al., 2004, among others. These pivotal events are also considered potential drivers of collaboration (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015). Because inflection points encourage agencies to act quickly and eventually diffuse new ideas across agencies, organizational interest and subsequent involvement in collaborative structures are subject to an ever changing organizational environment.

Focusing events may also expose potential weaknesses within organizations, creating a threat to the institution itself. By disrupting the environment, and establishing a threat to an organization, these large-scale events may further justify changes in managerial practice. Indeed, the perception of an issue may be compounded by such punctuations and create a window of opportunity from both organizations to find grounds to establish a collaborative arrangement. The threat perceived by decision makers in an organization and the community, along with the environment and substantial changes to the status quo, allow for significant changes in practice and policy to occur with fewer objections.
Public education specifically faces frequent changes imposed by all levels of government (Kirst, 2010). Social movements and increased mistrust in government have influenced best practices and expectations across K-12 education over the last several decades (see Kirst, 2010), though school safety in particular has been debated at length (Gallup, 1977; Hatkoff, 1994; Spearman, 1993; Steinberg et al., 1972). Increased cases of school-related violence and fatalities, and increases in juvenile crime, fostered discussion among governing bodies and stakeholders (Riedman, 2018; Sawchuk, 2021a; Viano et al., 2021), though adoption of policies was primarily to address drugs and violence through zero-tolerance policies (Price, 2009; Sawchuk, 2021).

School safety was launched to the forefront of discussion following the mass shooting of twelve students and one teacher at Columbine High School on April 20, 1999. The unprecedented event created emotive calls for action among policymakers and stakeholders alike because of the exposed weakness in the education environment (Fiddiman et al., 2018; King and Schindler, 2021). The events at Columbine were catastrophic, fostering a wave of change in education circles with respect to school safety. To address the gap in expertise, public school systems engaged a variety of changes including active shooter drills, no backpack policies, and changes to security systems and safety protocols (Fattal, 2019). One notable practice included collaborations with law enforcement agencies through stationing officers in school buildings to engage in community policing efforts. Known as School Resource Officer (SRO) programs, this collaborative approach to school safety was encouraged by federal agencies and quickly adopted by many school systems. From 1999 to 2003, the number of students reporting the presence of a law enforcement officer in their schools increased by 16% (from 54% to 70%) (Lindberg, 2015). Partnerships between law enforcement and education systems have a long history beyond SROs, though the championed practice of collaboration as a means to overcome wicked problems (see
McGuire, 2006; Warm, 2011) offers a solution to school safety by using experts in both fields to achieve a seemingly insurmountable task (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015).

While there was a slow increase in zero-tolerance policies and efforts to improve security in schools throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the magnitude and severity of the Columbine shooting marked a break in the status quo, requiring immediate attention from multiple government agencies. Importantly, the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) in Schools grant program (CIS) was funded by the Department of Justice from 1999 through 2004 (Federal Grants, n.d.). The program aided an increase in security measures at schools, with both SROs and physical security tools such as cameras and metal detectors being more visible in educational spaces (Addington, 2009). This crisis encouraged partnerships between education systems and law enforcement to address a perceived weakness in student security. This raises the question, was the perceived threat following the events of Columbine a tipping point for diffused changes in safety practices in education?

The following analysis uses data from the COPS grant program from 1999 to 2004 to investigate how the events at Columbine influenced interest in establishing SRO programs as an effort to address the collective concern for safety in education spaces. Using a national dataset to consider factors influencing diffusion of practices in public school systems, the analysis empirically tests whether exposure to SRO programs and increased crime among minors is associated with law enforcement agencies applying to the COPS in Schools (CIS) grant. By focusing on SRO programs following the tragedy at Columbine, there is practical application of this research to understand where programs were expanding and if there is any evidence of diffusion influencing this change. The findings indicate that while increased exposure to SRO programs and increases in school violence seem to decrease the likelihood of a law enforcement
agency applying for the CIS grant, increased crime per capita among minors yields an increase in the likelihood of applying to CIS.

**A Brief History of SROs**

According to an amendment to the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, SROs are federally defined as law enforcement officers deployed to schools in a community-oriented capacity who are meant to collaborate with schools to establish safe learning spaces (Connery, 2020; Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, 1968). Beyond the federal definition, state and local governments have discretion with respect to training, structure and SRO responsibilities (Education Commission of the States, 2019b, 2019a; Finn et al., 2005).

Law enforcement in schools has a long history, beginning with the presence of truancy officers as early as the 1840s (Tyack and Berkowitz, 1977). While the intent of law enforcement began as an effort to encourage school attendance, the role of police in school systems has changed over time to become more focused on safety rather than truancy. SRO-like officers were first reported in the 1950s as a way to build community ties between law enforcement and students (Anderson, 2015), and the use of these officers increased throughout the 1960s and 1970s as desegregation faced challenges in major metropolitan areas including Los Angeles and Boston (American Civil Liberties Union, 2017). The role of school-based law enforcement further changed with the growing concerns of violence and drug use in schools, starting a wave of zero-tolerance policies in the 1980s and culminating in the Guns-Free School Act of 1994 (ALCU, 2017). This further established partnerships between law enforcement and education, where law enforcement officers were seen as experts in safety (Weiler and Cray, 2011). Though this difference is consistent across all governments, the discretion among state and local governments has also contributed to different roles and expectations of SROs. While there is no
definitive training regimen beyond expectations set through receiving federal grant funding, the Department of Justice recommends training through the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) (COPS Office, n.d.). An SRO, as described by NASRO, is the culmination of a law enforcement officer, an informal counselor, and an educator (National Association of School Resource Officers, n.d.). This distinction between a patrol officer and an SRO highlights the emphasis on community-oriented policing and the stated goal of the program.

**Columbine and the CIS Grant**

Though zero-tolerance policies and legislation were in place as efforts for improved school safety with respect to school policies and firearms, the 1999 Columbine High School shooting resulted in a national discussion of ways in which to avoid acts of violence in schools (Mosqueda et al., 2021). On April 20, 1999, two students entered Columbine High School after a failed bomb attempt and began to open fire on students and staff (CNN, 2022). Twelve students and one teacher were killed within the hour. Recorded as the deadliest act of school violence in American history, the collective concern for violence prevention and student safety was raised substantially and resulted in a series of policies and decisions at multiple levels of government.¹

Columbine catapulted school safety to the forefront of media and policy discussion, solidifying an image of violence in schools. The Clinton Administration, through the Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), established a grant program known as COPS in Schools (CIS) with the purpose of providing funding for establishing partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and school entities (Brock et al., 2018).

---

¹Since the events at Columbine High School, 338 school shootings have occurred through May 2022 at U.S. K-12 institutions (Cox et al., 2022). The analysis did not include gunfire at postsecondary institutions (e.g. the events at Virginia Tech in 2007) and classifies a shooting as a firearm being discharged in an education space. This analysis is only investigating changes in SRO programs after the events at Columbine and is not evaluating the effectiveness of the programs.
Funding for the CIS grant continued through the first term of the Bush administration, with an estimated total of between $753 and $823 million granted to applicants (Brock et al., 2018; Na and Gottfredson, 2013). Applications were submitted from local law enforcement agencies on behalf of both the agency and one or more partnering school systems. While only the law enforcement agency applied for the funding, the goal was to “promote collaborative partnerships with the school community” and thus requires communication with a local education agency to apply for funding (Federal Grants, n.d.). The CIS grant was available from 1999 through 2005, though other federally assisted programs, such as support through the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act and the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative (Brock et al., 2018) were created to provide additional opportunities for funding for SROs and other safety measures, including but not limited to metal detectors and cameras (Sawchuk, 2021).

The goal of the CIS funding was to provide financial resources to hire new or additional SROs in a local school system. The DOJ and COPS aimed to build community policing efforts and outlined several requirements for the SROs hired with grant funding (Federal Grants, n.d.; COPS, 2014). Specifically, officers were to spend at least 75% of their time in and around primary and secondary schools and establish a project to build positive relationships within the community and among students (Federal Grants, n.d.). This effort for expanding SRO programs continued despite contrasting evidence of program effectiveness. While there is evidence of perceived and measurable safety improvements (Theriot, 2016; Wood and Hampton, 2021), there is also evidence of unequal treatment among minority students and students with disabilities (McFadden et al., 1992; Wallace et al., 2008). The use of zero-tolerance policies perhaps encouraged partnerships with law enforcement as a way for schools to have in-house intervention for disruptive behavior and crime. In a study using national data and a subset from
Colorado schools, Cray and Weiler (2011) found that hate crimes and gang-related activity encouraged establishing SRO programs between 2000 and 2008, though it was imperative to have a clearly written Memorandum of Understanding to facilitate a safe learning environment.

Following Columbine, survey research determined that 37% of parents reported that their child’s school system had updated security (Fiddiman et al., 2018), while federally collected data calculated that approximately 58% of schools had an officer on site in 2018, compared to the 36% of schools reporting such a status in the 2003-2004 school year (Connery, 2020). It is possible some of this increase could have been supported from grant dollars, though it is unclear when specific school systems engaged in these partnerships with law enforcement agencies to increase SROs in schools. The attention to SROs, then, could be the result of such tragic events being discussed and diffusing the practice across systems as an attempt to strengthen a perceived weakness in education spaces.

**Punctuations, Threat, and Policy Adoption**

Developments in policy and practice occur both in rapid, broad stroke changes (Baumgartner and Jones, 2009) and in incremental steps to maintain consistency in the midst of policy development (Kingdon, 2011; Lindblom, 1959). Through marginal adjustments, policymakers review and update policies systematically, and with fewer political pressures, while maintaining a stable environment in which policies can be adapted and implemented (Lindblom, 1959, 1979). By maintaining a status quo, the incremental changes to a policy can allow for fewer deficiencies and establish an ongoing system of updating as policy makers and constituents are affected by the policy (Atkinson, 2011).

Though efforts are made to not disturb the status quo, exogenous shocks may occur because organizations are not insulated from their environments (Carpenter and Krause, 2012).
In responding to these events, incrementalism is often insufficient; these events often generate policy punctuations (Boushey, 2012; Jones et al., 2003; Jones and Baumgartner, 2005; Kingdon, 2011; True et al., 2007) that create opportunities for discussion and innovation as well as a new equilibrium point in which policies and organizational practices can continue to develop incrementally and are in line with the newly minted environment (Baumgartner and Jones, 2009; Kingdon, 2011). The policy window that emerges following such punctuations provides an appropriate venue to capitalize on previously established policy images, defined as how issues are perceived using emotional appeals and empirical evidence (Baumgartner and Jones, 2009).

When considering values in society that spark controversy (e.g. security and welfare), problems and solutions to policy problems are shared and influenced by the information collected and how it is discussed (Baumgartner and Jones, 2009; Stone, 2012). Stone (2012) identifies the reliance on numbers, empirics, and the media to influence policy images, furthering their importance but also recognizing the paradoxical aspects of this process. Because new images can attract new attention to an issue, particularly strong punctuations can bring about a larger window with more attention and a call to action. The events at Columbine were an exogenous shock that brought new attention to violence in schools, solidifying a policy image surrounding safety in education spaces.

Pivotal events also expose inefficiencies and threats to organizational reputation, encouraging organizational change (Fernandez and Rainey, 2006). Agency reputation, defined by capacity, history and mission (Carpenter and Krause, 2012), is influenced by decision making within an organization and its interaction with external influences (Lange et al., 2011). Because agencies are distinct with respect to mission, goals, and culture (Rainey, 2009; Rainey and Bozeman, 2000), organizational reputation will differ across agencies and will be received
differently by constituent groups (Carpenter and Krause, 2012). If an organization is able to consistently meet goals to the expected level, then that agency is able to improve how policymakers, service recipients, and individuals within other organizations will perceive the agency as a whole. In other words, repeating actions associated with positive outcomes with consistency will solidify a reputation, though missteps can tarnish reputation and trust quickly (Kramer and Cook, 2004; Schoorman et al., 2007).

The conflicts that arise from punctuations can disrupt current processes and create the necessary conditions to introduce new policy and allow for a new wave of practice to emerge (Baumgartner et al., 2017; Boin and Otten, 1996). Changes in the environment can reestablish agency goals and motivate improved efficiency and efficacy of service (Fernandez and Rainey, 2006; Fuentes and Pipkin, 2022), but such events may also hinder an agency’s ability to meet standards and therefore tarnish organizational reputation (Willems et al., 2021). While an opportunity to learn and adapt, this period following a significant event can also create ambiguity and uncertainty for public organizations (March and Olsen, 1975).

Yet, despite the uncertainty, organizations can observe the environment and adopt best practices through diffusion, generally defined as the decision to adopt innovation as influenced by internal and external factors (Graham et al., 2013). Program diffusion is a key aspect of the policy process and dissemination of practices (Gilardi and Wasserfallen, 2019; Nicholson-Crotty, 2009; Shipan and Volden, 2008, 2012) and is applicable to both incrementalism and punctuated equilibrium. Indeed, Boushey (2012), describes the influence punctuated equilibrium has on both slow and fast moving policy responses, arguing that the rapid diffusion of programs can occur as a response to an exogenous shock from internal or external influences. Diffusion can undergo several iterations, where it can be fully immersive or highly superficial (Shipan and
Volden, 2008). As described by Shipan and Volden (2008), governance systems will adopt policies through learning, competition, imitation, and coercion (also see Graham et al., 2013). By focusing on either the policy itself or the system implementing the policy, organizations can adopt new practices by learning from or imitating their peers, driven from competition or manipulation to ensure adoption.

Policy diffusion is conditional on internal and external actors, along with timing and necessity of policy change (Boushey, 2013; Graham et al., 2013). Policy adoption by governing bodies is widely accepted as an S-shaped distribution, though the speed at which policies are adopted is not insulated from the political environment. Evaluating policy characteristics between 1950 to 2001, Nicholson-Crotty (2009) determines that the salience and complexity of issues will influence the likelihood of lawmakers’ acceptance of new policies and willingness to engage in the learning aspect of diffusion when considering the electoral cycle. This supplements the literature surrounding punctuated equilibrium; the policy images used will influence how quickly policies are adopted. Further, Boushey (2013) describes punctuated equilibrium as a framework for both incrementalism and rapid diffusion. Stronger internal stimuli, such as communication and observation, are described as taking on the traditional S-shape function, whereas stronger external stimuli, such as federal mandates, will result in an r-shaped distribution. Because organizations experience both internal and external influences, Boushey asserts there will be some distribution of program uptake between an S- and r-shaped distribution and indicate there is some mimicking of early adopters to late adopters in programs and policies. Berry and Berry (1990; 1992) also emphasize the importance of these determinants; using state lottery programs as a measurement (1990) and later tax policies (1992), Berry and Berry suggest both are present in decision making to adopt specific practices. These influences mirror those of
collaboration (see Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015) and further indicate that collaborative practices are subject to rapid or slow moving adoption in the wake of such events.

Public organizations are subject to this policy window (Baumgartner and Jones, 2009; Karch, 2007), meaning there are instances in which agencies will adopt specific policies, rather than characteristics of an organization, in order to see success or meet some objective (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Rainey, 2009). Observing other actions that seemingly work encourages changes to be made within an organization, and thus policies are adopted in this capacity. The policy window that opens as a result of some seismic event, the perceived weakness as a result of this event, and presence of similar practices cropping up in response, then, could indicate that diffusion plays a substantial role in the decision to adopt the program. In other words:

\[ H_1: \text{The likelihood of an organization adopting a specific practice increases as more organizations adopt a similar practice.} \]

Further, uncertainty and perceived weaknesses in an organization encourage observation and adoption from expertise to alleviate concerns and potential threats to agency success and reputation. The policy window can influence the perception of threat and weakness by giving more attention to outcomes that are related to the policy image. By giving more attention to this adjacent outcome, the perceived threat can be compounded. Political influences will also dictate decision making in program diffusion and decision making in public organizations. Grossback, Nicholson-Crotty, and Peterson (2004), for example, evaluate the influence ideology has on state learning and policy adoption, again indicating the importance of both the observations made by organizations and the degree to which the internal and external factors will manipulate decision making. In the case of crime, for example, increased attention to crime and school shootings from media outlets shifts the perception of crime to establish a larger concern than what is
consistent with actual reported crime (Birkland and Lawrence, 2009; Lowry et al., 2003). If the weaknesses in the organization are seen as substantial by stakeholders, who are inherently political entities, there is a greater likelihood that an organization will look for methods to resolve this challenge. As such, an agency is more likely to adopt specific practices if there is an increased perceived threat or exposed weakness, encouraging diffusion as a result of these challenges. The argument can be hypothesized as:

\[ H_2: \text{The likelihood of an organization adopting a specific practice increases as perceived weaknesses increase.} \]

**Data and Methods**

This study examines the policy diffusion of SRO programs in the wake of Columbine. To accomplish this, variables were collected from several sources. First, the primary dependent and independent variables are collected from the Department of Justice Office of Community Policing Services (COPS), the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Survey (LEMAS), Bureau of Justice Statistics, and the Naval Postgraduate School. Control variables are collected from the National Center of Education Statistics, the MIT Election Lab, the FBI Crime Report, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The unit of analysis is an agency-year; the data span from 1999 to 2004, with approximately 13,900 observations in the dataset.

The dependent variable of interest is a binary measure for submission of a grant application, where 1 indicates an agency applied for a CIS grant and 0 indicates that the agency did not apply. While the variable does not indicate if the agency received funding, the expressed interest in receiving federal funds indicates a commitment to partner with one or more local schools to establish or grow an SRO program. The grant data, of course, do not include organizations that do not apply for this federal funding program. It is possible that some law
enforcement agencies that did not apply for the CIS grant already have SRO programs; perhaps
an agency does not have a need for federal funding to establish or expand an SRO program. This
means the measure of diffusion exhibits some error that is not entirely random and there is some
limitation to the effectiveness of the dependent variable. This variable cannot measure which law
enforcement agencies have SROs, but the grant does provide a substantial amount of funding for
expanding SRO programs. What is measured through this variable is the clear expressed interest
in adopting or expanding an SRO program. The analysis is evaluating the increased interest in
SRO programs and establishing such partnerships with education agencies in light of increased
exposure to the program or exposed weaknesses to school safety. The process to apply for the
grant requires an agreement with at least one school system and a commitment to establish a
partnership fitting the Department of Justice criteria (Federal Grants, n.d.).

There are three primary variables of interest constructed from the LEMAS dataset, the
FBI Crime Report, and the Center of Defense and Homeland Security at the Naval Postgraduate
School. First, to determine the diffusion of SRO programs, the percent of SRO programs in a
given county is calculated by first determining if a law enforcement agency has any law
enforcement officers who are assigned to schools. The LEMAS surveys in 2000, 2003, and 2007
contain questions to evaluate if any law enforcement agencies have SROs. After tallying the
number of agencies in a state and determining which have SRO programs, the fraction of
agencies with programs of the total agencies in each state was converted to a percentage. There
is a limitation to the data as there is potential human error in survey completion and is considered
an ongoing limitation to survey work (Johnston, 2014). The Bureau of Justice Statistics
acknowledges this limitation and creates an additional measure to evaluate if the submission is a
mistake that was corrected or an observation that was verified upon receiving.
Two measures are used to compare the perceived weaknesses observed in public education systems. First, the acts committed at Columbine High School launched significant attention to and concern for school shootings (see Birkland & Lawrence, 2009; Fattal, 2019; among others). The immediate threat for repeat offences primed leadership in both law enforcement and education to be acutely aware such violence in schools and, as a result, would be a viable reason to establish and engage in SRO programs. Particularly because of the federal funding and attention given to the CIS grant, the uncertainty around the potential for shootings to occur in a school system could be a strong incentive to apply for a CIS grant. To determine the threat of school shootings, the total number of school shootings each year following the events at Columbine were included in the dataset. This measure is collected at the national level and is lagged to account for the time between events and possible application. Though the variable is aggregated, this is a viable measure for threat and safety among county-level observations because of the media coverage associated with violence in schools and the subsequent reporting and attention to school shootings among local, state, and federal governing bodies.

A second measure to evaluate risk and weaknesses in public school systems is crimes committed among minors per capita by county (logged) from the FBI Crime Report. Reported misconduct is correlated with increased policing and incarceration (see Brush, 2007; Kent and Jacobs, 2005). Given the grant program was established as a result of the events at Columbine (Fiddiman et al., 2018; Juvonen, 2001), increased crime among school-aged children likely contributes to concerns of safety in schools and incentivizes the presence of law enforcement in school settings to address concerns of school violence and safety.

Additional measures are included to account for county-level characteristics including the political environment, education data, and socioeconomic data. Demographic data from schools
aggregated at the county level are collected from the National Center of Education Statistics. There is evidence suggesting that increasingly impoverished areas and schools with more diverse student populations may have a larger police presence (Theriot, 2009). To control for this possibility, the percentage of Black and Hispanic students in public schools is included in the model. In addition to this measure of student diversity, the student-teacher ratio is included as measures of the size in a county. It should be noted that school-based data were aggregated to be matched with county-level community data. This is the lowest level to which all datasets could be matched, and it is possible that multiple districts may fall within a given county. While the data are matched at the appropriate level for the CIS data and analysis can focus on the law enforcement agency interest in SRO funding, some variance and specificity are lost when aggregating to this level rather than using city or district level data. Socioeconomic measures include the unemployment rate in the county as well as the Urban Rural Continuum collected from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). This measure offers a measure of population size and distance from metropolitan areas on a scale, where 1 indicates a large metropolitan area and 9 indicates a small rural community with a population under 2,500 individuals.

To measure the political environment, models include a variable indicating whether the governor’s office was held by a Democrat (0) or Republican (1). Voting data from the US House of Representatives Elections were collected from the MIT Election Lab. The data are collected at the Congressional district level and provide the total number of votes cast for each district and further break down the vote by candidate. The election years used in the models below are 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004. The political environment in a given county is an important factor to be analyzed because, considering Stone’s (2012) argument, policy images are influenced by the
language and values expressed by interest groups, political parties falling into that category (see also Kingdon, 2011; Mooney, 2001; O’Toole and Meier, 2003).2

Congressional districts are not geographic divisions but are determined by population in each area; in theory, this ensures equal representation across states in the House of Representatives. Thus, there are instances in which county lines will overlap congressional districts and, more frequently, several counties fall within one congressional district. Because these districts are not based on geography, redistricting is a common practice and occurs following the Census. This creates a unique challenge in translating data to the county-level. As a result, several calculations are needed to best capture the percentage of voters in each county for a given year.

Using crosswalk datasets from the Missouri Census Data Center, a measure is created to determine the proportion of each county’s population within the congressional district. A district’s total population is determined by aggregating to the district level based on each county contained within that district; no double counting occurs for counties that overlap several districts as the proportions have been previously determined in the dataset. Then, the percent of the county population in the district can be calculated using the population of a county given its congressional district, and the calculated total population in a congressional district. The total number of voters in each county within a district can then be determined by using the percentage calculated and multiplying this value by the total number of voters in the congressional district.

---

2 An additional measure to evaluate state government preference for SRO programs was included as a binary variable where 1 indicated expressed support for SRO programs. This support ranged from a published statement encouraging the partnership to legislation enacted any time before Columbine through 2004. The findings did not change significantly when the variable was included. Because of the subjectivity in coding the measure, it is left out of analysis.
Finally, the voters per candidate are calculated using this approach, ultimately creating a percentage of total votes per candidate in each county.

For example, there are 74 counties in Alabama and seven congressional districts. In 2000, the second congressional district had a total population of 650,321, and Autauga County had a population of 43,671. This means Autauga County makes up 6.71% of the second congressional district population. Among 189,669 voters in the second congressional district, I assume 6.71%, or 12,737 votes, come from Autauga County. Likewise, the congressional district had 58,136 voters vote Democrat, and of these 3,904 voters (6.71%) are assumed to be from Autauga County.

Following the descriptive analysis, the hypotheses are tested using an event history analysis, specifically a Cox proportional hazard model (see Allison, 2014). Because observations extend over several years and measure the decision to apply for the CIS grant, this model will determine a maximum likelihood estimate that will measure probability of applying for federal funding. Tables report the coefficients of each variable, measuring the expected events of agencies applying for the CIS grant. It should be noted that event history and survival analysis models are designed such that negative coefficients suggest a decrease in the likelihood of the event occurring, whereas a positive coefficient yields a greater likelihood of event occurrence. State fixed effects are used to control for invariant characteristics of the agencies. Descriptive statistics for all variables can be found in Table 1.

**Findings**

Beginning with descriptive statistics and figures allows for a more nuanced consideration of law enforcement agencies applying to the CIS program. Table 2 provides some insight on grant application patterns. Of the 11837 observations in the dataset over five years, 5,334
(29.5%) agencies applied to the program. Each year represented between 22.18% and 32.99% of the overall dataset. A slight surge in applications in 2001 is likely in response to the heightened concern over national security following September 11, 2001, as well as biological warfare following the Anthrax scares (National Public Radio, 2011). Nearly two thirds (60.10%) of agencies are in states with Republican governors, and 47.88% of voters are Democrats (median of 46.50%). Both voting demographics and the proportion of Republican governors are representative of the time period, though preferences regarding SROs as a tool for school safety may vary by political party. This is in part due to the support of law enforcement from more conservative political parties and the response to violence comparisons between Republican and Democrat political entities (see Haider-Markel and Joslyn, 2001; Hoenack, 1990; Luca et al., 2020). Of the agencies that applied for the CIS grant, 22.31% of the applications across all years did not have an existing SRO program and would be establishing the program through the grant.

The measure for per capita crime committed among minors at the county level was similar among agencies that did and did not apply to the program. Figures 1 and 2 provide histograms of the crime committed by minors per 1000 minors (before the log transformation). On average, agencies applying for the program had slightly fewer crimes per 1000 minors (7.56 crimes per 1000 minors) compared to those not applying (7.75 crimes per 1000 minors). While this may be in part because of overlap in counties, it is possible that the sensitivity to the crimes varies because of proximity. Law enforcement agencies that interact with minors more, both positively and negatively, could have a greater sensitivity to crimes committed by minors than agencies whose officers have fewer interactions with minors. When considering the numbers of school shootings that occurred following Columbine through 2003, a total of 119 school

---

3 Using a t-test to compare means, there is evidence of some statistically significant differences in the means of crime per 1000 minors between agencies that applied for the CIS grant and those who did not (p-value = 0.0489).
shootings occurred where only 18 states did not experience an incident where a firearm was discharged on school property.

Education focused characteristics were similar across applicants and nonapplicants. Among applicants, the average number of schools in a county is 115, with a median of 49 schools. Nonapplicants averaged 153 schools in a county with a median of 59. Both groups also shared similar demographics in enrollment; both are predominantly white (69.60% white students enrolled for applicants, 66.29% white students for nonapplicants). These similarities indicate that both groups are not substantially different in many capacities and that there are perhaps other drivers for seeking out federal funding beyond the size and demographics of the school systems.

The states with the greatest number of applications are California, New Jersey, and Texas; Delaware and Hawaii have the fewest number of applications. When considering California and Texas, this is likely in part due to the number of law enforcement agencies in the given states, particularly when compared to smaller states with fewer counties such as Delaware and Hawaii. In the dataset, New Jersey has twenty one counties listed but averaged just under 60 applications per year, where the peak of these occurred following the attacks on September 11. The proximity to these events could have incentivized the perceived necessity of the partnership, along with the proximity to the Anthrax attacks (National Public Radio, 2011). Indeed, the frequency of large scale events with heavy media attention may have acted as a catalyst of uncertainty for law enforcement and public education agencies alike, fostering a need to fill the gap of public safety among vulnerable populations.

These characteristics support the notion that external stimuli from national events generated discussion and reason for concern among law enforcement officers to fulfill the
generalized mission to protect and serve the public, though this assertion cannot be directly tested here. Such information provides additional context for analysis and testing if and how exposure to SRO programs at the county-level increases the likelihood of applying for funding.

The analysis next focuses on the degree to which the environment influences law enforcement agencies to apply for the CIS grant. First, a base model is used to evaluate whether the presence of SRO programs in a state or prevalence of crimes committed by minors at the local level are influencing the decision to apply for grant funding. Findings reporting odds ratios can be found in Table 3. All three variables of interest yield statistically significant findings, though with some differences in magnitude and direction. A one percent increase in the proportion of agencies using SROs, for example, decreases the likelihood of applying for the CIS funding by 14.6%. As the number of school shootings increases each year, the findings are similar, decreasing the likelihood of application by 15.8%. Such findings challenge the aforementioned hypotheses; neither the increased exposure to organizations engaged in partnerships, nor the increased attention to threats and weaknesses in public school systems encourage individual program adoption. When considering crime committed by minors, a one percent increase in crime per capita increases the likelihood of applying by 4.60%. This is perhaps due to being increasingly surrounded by SRO programs, law enforcement agencies are more likely to request funding to create or expand their own programs as there are other mechanisms to improve safety in surrounding school systems. The correlation could also be identifying that as there are more programs available to schools, there are fewer schools in need of programs, thus it is addressing not a decreased desire for partnering but rather a decreased necessity of the resources (see Knill, 2005; Sharman, 2008).
Some control variables also resulted in statistically significant findings. A one percent increase in Hispanic student enrollment, for example, decreased the likelihood of applying by 0.4%; a one percent increase in Black student enrollment shared these findings, decreasing the likelihood of applying to the CIS grant by 0.7%. Increases in unemployment yielded a positive correlation, where a one percentage point increase in unemployment decreases the likelihood of applying for the CIS grant by 12.8%. Increasing the student teacher ratio also increases the likelihood of applying by 5.8%, suggesting that schools with larger enrollment and fewer staff may require other means of assistance, such as an SRO program. The Urban Rural Continuum and having a Republican governor also result in increases in likelihood of applying to CIS, where becoming an increasingly rural, less populated, area decreases probability of applying by 4.6% and having a Republican Governor is a nearly 22% decrease in probability of applying (21.7%). The later supports previous research in diffusion and collaboration (see Grossback, Nicholson-Crotty, and Peterson, 2004; O’Toole, 2009), where ideology and political principals have an influence on decision making in public organizations with respect to policy and program uptake along with if collaborations are established and continued.

Following the base model, additional models were tested to further consider the influence of county diversity, size, and politics. First, Table 4 investigates the differences between white and nonwhite majorities in schools at the county level. The analysis is consistent with the descriptive findings for white majority schools; a one percent increase in the proportion of agencies using SROs in a state yields a decrease in the likelihood of grant applications by 14%, one additional school shootings in a given year yields a 16% decrease, though changes in crime per capita among minors does not result in statistically significant results. This indicates that, for counties were the majority of students are white, the perception of crime among minors is not
incentivizing institutions to engage in this type of collaborative structure but may influence other decisions made by either law enforcement or public education agencies. The nonwhite minority districts also resulted in statistically significant results, where the proportion of agencies using SROs indicates a 15.8% decrease in likelihood of applying for federal funding, while a decrease in school shootings yields a 14.3% increase in that probability. Crime per capita, however, indicates a 1% increase in crime per capita will increase the probability of application by 13.1%.

The consistency in these findings with the base model offers a number of possible explanations. One possibility is that counties with more diverse student bodies perhaps have fewer resources allocated to these areas to start and exercise more disciplinary action toward their nonwhite students than their white peers (see Owens, 2017; Rocque and Paternoster, 2011). Less attention is given to these areas of safety to use other mechanisms, thus the opportunity to establish a relationship between law enforcement and public education through federal funding may incentivize this decision to apply and engage in partnerships; such results are also consistent with previous studies in education policy (Baker and Corcoran, 2012; Darling-Hammond, 2001). Alternatively, other approaches to school safety that are less reliant on community policing and collaborative structures could be implemented, such as security cameras.

Next, Table 5 provides the model when considering a split in enrollment to determine differences between counties with larger school systems and smaller school systems. While counties often include more than one school district, estimating enrollment at the county level measures the potential responsibility law enforcement agencies would have if establishing partnerships with at least one school system. Enrollment was split at 25,000 total students.

Both models yielded statistically significant findings when considering the increase in proportion of agencies using SROs in the state, where again there is a decrease in likelihood by
17.4% when there are at least 25,000 students enrolled, and a decrease in likelihood of applying by 12.5% when there are fewer than 20,000 students. Perhaps organizations are establishing programs through other means, supporting the contagion or mimicking of other organizations described by Boushey (2012; 2013). The consistencies here, however, also suggest that organizations may be observing outcomes and performance of those quick to adopt SRO programs, or remain to have differences in needs and goals across organizations. Law enforcement with substantial differences from their education system peers may also be unable to overcome the differences to express interest in and engage in a partnership. Increases in school shootings per year also decreased probability of application among both large and small counties to apply by 17.4% and 14.8% respectively. This perceived threat and the attention given to school violence through the media may be encouraging other mechanisms of school safety determined by school systems themselves. It is important to note that because the dependent variable is a measurement of law enforcement agencies applying for CIS, it does not take into account the measures taken by school systems outside of a possible relationship with law enforcement. Schools may be relying on other methods such as security systems (e.g., metal detectors, locked doors, etc.) to address the potential threat to school safety.

Interestingly, crime per capita yields mixed results across large and small counties. While counties with at least 25,000 students have similar results to the base model, where a one percent increase in crime by minors per capita indicate a 26.6% increase in applying for the grant, continuing to suggest that to address this area of concern, other mechanisms may be put in place. With smaller counties, where enrollment is under 25,000, there is a very slight decrease in applying to the CIS grant. A one percent increase in crimes by minors per capita yields a 6.4% increase in likelihood of application. This reinforces the idea that increased crime among minors
may highlight perceived weaknesses in counties, especially in larger areas because of the increased volume of crime experienced in larger communities may be more apparent here than in smaller localities. Following the media coverage of Columbine, increased crime may be understood by constituents and policy makers as exposing weakness in education and in safety, encouraging the partnership’s existence. Again, control variables reflect that of the base model, where unemployment yields a greater likelihood of application.

Finally, Table 6 describes the political environment by evaluating county-level differences among Democrat and Republican majority counties. Much like the previous analyses, there is some consistency to the base model, where increases in proportions of agencies using SROs decreases the likelihood of applying to the CIS grant by 16.5% in Democrat majority counties and 13.4% in Republican majority counties, respectively. An increase in school shootings per year yields similar results, where in Democrat majority counties the decrease in likelihood of apply is 17.7% and in Republican majority counties the decrease in likelihood is by 14.7%. As expected, the Republican majority counties yielded statistically significant results when evaluating the crime by minors per capita variable; a one standard deviation increase in crime by minors yields an increase of 9.5%. Democrat majority counties did not yield statistically significant findings with this variable, supporting previous literature regarding the support and trust in law enforcement differences between parties (Haider-Markel and Joslyn, 2001; Hoenack, 1990; Luca et al., 2020).

Both models demonstrated positive correlations between student-teacher ratios and the likelihood of applying, consistent with the base model. Unemployment and the Urban-Rural Continuum are also consistent with the base model. Both results uphold a possible explanation of the resources for such partnerships among counties with more unemployment may be scarce,
encouraging federal assistance and establishing these relationships for expertise and resources, while increasingly diverse counties may not have policymaker expectations to establish an SRO partnership.

**Implications**

The above analysis investigates the relationship between policy diffusion and environmental threats and the decision to engage in practices addressing those issues. Specifically, the analysis focuses on the expressed interest of law enforcement agencies in establishing partnerships with school systems through the Cops in Schools (CIS) grant following the tragedy at Columbine High School. In applying for assistance to create or extend an SRO program, this signals that both agencies are committed to establishing a formalized relationship as a means to address school safety issues. This study hypothesized that the increased exposure to a given practice will encourage finding the resources to establish similar practices, and that increasing (perceived) environmental threats will follow suit, encouraging applying for federal resources to establish or expand an SRO program.

Across all models, the findings challenge the first hypothesis and support the second hypothesis to some degree. Program diffusion consistently disincentivizes organizations from applying to the CIS program whereas perceived threats were met with mixed results. Increased crime committed among minors slightly encourages the decision for law enforcement to apply to CIS, though the increased number of school shootings in a given year discouraged CIS application. This emphasizes the literature in policy diffusion focusing on the degree to which region and both internal and external factors influence program adoption. As described by Graham, Shipan, and Volden (2013), the policies, rather than ideas, are disseminated among organizations, and both internal and external factors such as preferences, agency capacity, and
the presence of early adopters influence the degree to which policy diffusion takes place. Indeed, in the case of the Cops in Schools program, preferences of stakeholders, organizational capacity, and resource availability are implied as contributors to applying to the CIS, as seen by control variables such as unemployment rate and the diversity of student populations. By observing what other law enforcement agencies adopt, agencies can learn and adopt in efforts to solve problems-if a program appears to be effective, then there is a greater likelihood of diffusion (Graham et al., 2013).

These findings also corroborate contributions by Boushey (2012; 2013); the images and narratives used and shared in the policy window inherently have some bias in support or opposition of a given program. Particularly in the case of SRO programs and the tragedy that launched the discussion of school safety into the forefront of stakeholders and policy makers, the images and discussions that followed the events at Columbine amplified the need for a solution. While the federal government response was swift, offering a strong signal that law enforcement in education is preferred, organizations may have adopted the program without federal assistance. Public school systems were also offered solutions through physical changes such as improved locks and cultural changes such as active shooter drills. These shifts were made exclusively in the public education space and did not inherently require a partnership with law enforcement. This stance and proposed solution from a governing body then encouraged smaller government systems and public organizations to follow this approach, either by establishing a program without government assistance or signaling a preference for SROs and the partnership by applying to CIS.

In evaluating differences in county diversity, school system size, and political environment, the findings proved to be consistent with respect to direction and magnitude,
though some differences were found in statistical significance. Specifically, the evaluation is consistent with descriptive findings, where agencies in white majority counties were more likely to apply to the CIS grant. Further, though school shootings and crimes committed by minors yielded mixed results, what occurred at Columbine High School could have resulted in overzealous reporting in the media and lead to fast acting, reactionary behavior, in response to the potential of school shootings and violence in an education space. Law enforcement agencies experiencing higher levels of crimes committed by minors may seek alternative approaches to addressing the crime itself, but the potential for such events to occur in school may incentivize preferences to engage in partnerships with school systems, signaling interest in both resources and in participating in collaborations. Because of the contrasting evidence in the analysis, additional research in this space is encouraged to further evaluate not just in this context, but the degree to which the environment influences threats to organizations and the subsequent decisions made in those agencies.

There are some data limitations in this analysis. First, there are limits to what is available as the grant ran from 1999 through 2004, and all documentation outside of which organizations applied has since been destroyed. While it is fortunate that the data used in this study still exist, providing a window into the political climate at the time, this is contextually somewhat dated and therefore there are limits to the influence the findings will have. In future iterations of this work, evaluating the current political climate and determining what drove the decision to terminate a partnership will be vital to understanding the influence of politics and policy in the space of collaboration and partnerships. More recent events, such as the social justice movements occurring through 2020 and 2021 and the ongoing tragedies of school related violence, could offer insight into both why school systems and law enforcement agencies express interest in
partnering or why some choose to terminate their partnerships. Understanding the dynamics of the policy process and its relationship with organizational decision making is not only imperative with respect to education policy and student safety, but also in other areas in which public agencies may require interaction with outside agencies to address a given task.

The LEMAS survey system is notably flawed and includes frequent changes to survey language and topics, limiting the degree to which other years of data can be used in the analysis. Additionally, until the 2007 iteration, LEMAS used a sample of law enforcement agencies rather than the population of law enforcement agencies. This limited the available information with respect to agencies that perhaps did not apply to the CIS grant but did have unique partnerships with school systems. Control variables included in the analysis combat some of these challenges, though it is a noted weakness. This also contributed to challenges in cross walking data from agency level to county level as there are several instances in which reports failed to include consistent identifiers. The challenge here was overcome through using several LEMAS sponsored crosswalks, but the specificity of data can be hindered by this challenge.

Because organizations coexist and interact with their environments and constituents, how policy windows unfold, and the decisions made in their wake will continue to be contingent on responses from multiple stakeholders. It is crucial to evaluate the role of the environment on agency perceptions of potential threats, relationships with constituents, and the clients receiving services. Particularly in the context of education, where the service recipient is a protected community spoken for on behalf of others, how school systems and agencies interacting with school systems respond to significant punctuations and changes in the status quo is critical for ensuring effective services. Further, organizations will continue to engage with the policy process and collaborative practices themselves as they remain a viable, encouraged, practice
from scholars, practitioners, and political principals. By evaluating exogenous shocks and their influence on diffusion and threat perception, organizations may be better equipped to engage in collaborative practices to ensure success. Further investigation is encouraged to better understand these influences on organizational behavior and decision making.
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### Tables and Figures

#### Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Agencies with SROs in state</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>48.433</td>
<td>13.967</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of school shootings per year since Columbine</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime by minors per capita (logged)</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>-5.066</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>-10.835</td>
<td>-3.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>15.664</td>
<td>2.754</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Enrollment %</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>12.666</td>
<td>17.762</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Enrollment %</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>15.159</td>
<td>18.169</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Enrollment %</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>67.264</td>
<td>24.272</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Democrat Voter</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>47.881</td>
<td>17.474</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate %</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>5.325</td>
<td>1.799</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Gov</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Rural Continuum</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>2.307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Agencies Applying to CIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Agencies with SROs in state</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>46.54</td>
<td>13.524</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>85.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of school shootings per year since Columbine</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>24.989</td>
<td>6.212</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime by minors per capita (logged)</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>-5.093</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>-10.835</td>
<td>-3.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>15.693</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Enrollment %</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>11.811</td>
<td>17.367</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Enrollment %</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>13.684</td>
<td>16.899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Enrollment %</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>69.595</td>
<td>23.262</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>99.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Democrat Voter</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>47.457</td>
<td>17.679</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate %</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>5.361</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Gov</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Rural Continuum</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Baseline Cox Model Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Agencies with SROs in state</td>
<td>-0.146***</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of school shootings per year since Columbine</td>
<td>-0.158***</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime by minors per capita (logged)</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>0.058***</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Enrollment %</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Enrollment %</td>
<td>-0.007***</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Democrat Voter</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate %</td>
<td>-0.128***</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Gov</td>
<td>0.217***</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Rural Continuum</td>
<td>0.046***</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>11837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo $R^2$</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis
*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$
Table 4: Cox Regression - White Majority vs Nonwhite Majority Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Majority White</th>
<th>Majority Nonwhite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Agencies with SROs in state</td>
<td>-0.140***</td>
<td>-0.158***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of school shootings per year since Columbine</td>
<td>-0.160***</td>
<td>-0.143***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime by minors per capita (logged)</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.131**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>0.085***</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Enrollment %</td>
<td>-0.015***</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Enrollment %</td>
<td>-0.004*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Democrat Voter</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate %</td>
<td>-0.224***</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Gov</td>
<td>0.286***</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td>(0.113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Rural Continuum</td>
<td>0.052***</td>
<td>0.073***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>8942</td>
<td>2895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>≥ 25000 enrolled students</th>
<th>&lt; 25000 enrolled students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Agencies with SROs in state</td>
<td>-0.174*** (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.125*** (0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of school shootings per year since Columbine</td>
<td>-0.174*** (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.148*** (0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime by minors per capita (logged)</td>
<td>0.266*** (0.059)</td>
<td>-0.064** (0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>0.026 (0.025)</td>
<td>0.081*** (0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Enrollment %</td>
<td>0.004* (0.002)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Enrollment %</td>
<td>-0.006** (0.003)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Democrat Voter</td>
<td>0.001 (0.002)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate %</td>
<td>-0.202*** (0.026)</td>
<td>-0.142*** (0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Gov</td>
<td>0.334*** (0.077)</td>
<td>0.036 (0.087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Rural Continuum</td>
<td>0.120*** (0.045)</td>
<td>0.012 (0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>6132</td>
<td>5705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table 6: Cox Regression - Democratic vs. Republican Majority Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic/Outcomes</th>
<th>Democrat Majority</th>
<th>Republican Majority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Agencies with SROs in state</td>
<td>-0.165***</td>
<td>-0.134***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of school shootings per year since Columbine</td>
<td>-0.177***</td>
<td>-0.147***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime by minors per capita (logged)</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.095***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>0.081***</td>
<td>0.052***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Enrollment %</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Enrollment %</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.012***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Democrat Voter</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate %</td>
<td>-0.168***</td>
<td>-0.112***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Gov</td>
<td>0.206**</td>
<td>0.235***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Rural Continuum</td>
<td>0.070***</td>
<td>0.034**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>5259</td>
<td>6578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R^2</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Figure 1: Crime by minors per 1000 minors where agency did apply to CIS

Figure 2: Histograms for crime by minors per 1000 minors where agency did not apply to CIS
Chapter Two: Horizontal legitimacy and executive alignment: Overcoming differences in leadership in School Resource Officer programs

Abstract: Public organizations will engage in collaborative practices to obtain resources and address otherwise unattainable challenges. In doing this, executives must forfeit some autonomy in decision making and overcome differences in mission, values, and culture. While research has investigated how similarities in observable characteristics influence how easily managers overcome organizational differences, there is less understood about how alignment to organizational mission can influence this relationship. The degree to which an executive aligns with their own and partner’s mission offers some insight into one’s willingness to lose autonomy. Higher degrees of shared values with a partner may encourage a greater willingness to cooperate, while more siloed values may hinder cooperation. These challenges are particularly noted in K-12 education with School Resource Officer programs, where police chiefs and school superintendents establish and maintain partnerships. Using original survey data collected from police chiefs and superintendents, this analysis investigates the degree to which alignment with a partnering agency influences individual willingness to cooperate. The findings indicate that relating to a partner’s mission will encourage collaboration but is limited by stronger alignment with a home organization. In this sample, police chiefs were more likely to forgo some autonomy than superintendents, despite having strong alignment with their own agency’s mission.
Introduction

The decision for one public organization to partner with another has been explored at length in public administration and management (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; O’Leary and Bingham, 2009; O’Leary and Vij, 2012; Ostrom, 1990; Schermerhorn, 1975; Thomson and Perry, 2006). For agencies to establish a partnership, there is an underlying assumption that interagency cooperation exists, or there is an accommodating relationship between organizations that would otherwise behave independently. In cases where organizations are working together, managerial characteristics are cited as potential influences on the degree to which interagency cooperation exists and the success of partnership itself (Esteve et al., 2013; O’Leary and Bingham, 2009). Tangentially, organizational identity and culture contribute to decision making, goals and performance of individual agencies (Martinez et al., 2015; Tripathi and Tripathi 2009), further influencing decisions prior to and during a partnership. In other words, how well agencies will get along is, to some degree, contingent on the behavior of organizational executives.

Organization executives also make decisions that are influenced by identity and goal alignment (Andrews et al., 2012; Huxham and Vangen, 2005). In the context of partnerships and collaboration, agency management sacrifices some autonomy to gain some resource or specialized skill to achieve the goal (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015). The decisions made by executives in both agencies are responses to predicted actions (Wenz and Deshmukh, 2012) and are influenced by organizational commitment and identity (Huxham and Vangen, 2005; Simon 1944). The contribution of this study is to determine if and to what degree an executive’s alignment and commitment to a partner organization disrupts their ability to fully commit to a partnership. Further, the study evaluates if commitment to one’s own organization tempers that alignment to a partnering organization’s mission and values. In other words, does commitment to
a home organization affect decision making in partnerships, and is this at all negated by perceived alignment with a partnering agency?

These questions are significant in the context of public education, specifically the partnership between local education and local law enforcement agencies. The partnerships, referred to as School Resource Officer programs, have been studied with respect to the outcomes of the programs and the challenges met by officers and students (Johnson, 1999; Mallet, 2016; Na and Gottfredson, 2013). Less understood, however, is the influence managers in these agencies have on both how the partnership is structured and the expectations of both agencies. Particularly given the differences in mission and goals between law enforcement and public education, the success of a partnership will rely heavily on executive abilities to cooperate, build trust, and interact across agencies and with clientele. However, increased discussion surrounding SRO programs, pushback from community members and clientele, and the subsequent changes in these programs may contribute to potential goal conflict outside of the partnership objective and influence executive perspectives and exacerbate challenges in decision making. Therefore, it is critical to better understand how these perceptions are formed, and to what degree perceptions affect the decision making process.

Using original survey data of superintendents and law enforcement executives across Midwestern states, the following analysis aims to determine if, and how, perceived differences across organizations influence managerial decision making in partnerships. The findings indicate that there is some influence from executive alignment to their own and partnering organization and the degree to which they are comfortable sacrificing some autonomy in the partnership, but this is often tied to which institution the executive belongs and their alignment to their own organization. Implications of this work suggest that in identifying aspects of their partners that
are similar to individual beliefs and values, executives will establish some additional level of
trust to overcome initial hurdles in a partnership and maintain this relationship.

Why organizations partner

A partnership is understood as a remedy for organizations in attaining goals and
improving performance (Agranoff, 2006; Andrews and Entwistle, 2010; Thomson and Perry,
2006). Partnerships may span across sectors (see McGuire 2006; Thomson and Perry 2006;
Gazley 2008) and rely on several assumptions including interdependence, consequential
incentives, and uncertainty (Ansell and Gash, 2007; Biddle and Koontz, 2014; Emerson and
Nabatchi, 2015; O’Leary and Vij, 2012). The uncertainty lies in what may happen to future
performance without collaboration and is driven by resource scarcity, risk minimization and
political pressure, among other factors (see Alter and Hage, 1993; Dyer, 1997; Levine and
White, 1961; Lodgson, 1991; Ostrom, 1990; O’Toole, 2010; Schermerhorn, 1975; Thomson and
Perry, 2006). While the reasons for collaborating may be unique to each organization, there is a
common theme of self-interested, goal-oriented behavior (O’Toole, 2010; Thomson and Perry,
2006). Sharing a common, specific goal incentivizes cooperative behavior across agencies
(Biddle and Koontz, 2014; Mitchell et al., 2015) by building on agency strengths and trust to
achieve a common goal (Bruns, 2013; Thomson and Perry, 2006; Vangen and Huxam, 2012).

By establishing relationships, an organization has a higher degree of dependence on other
agencies. This is furthered by the transaction costs associated with cutting ties (Williamson,
1993) and the inability to predict future partnerships with that organization or others with similar
characteristics (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; Vining and Broadman, 2008). The level of
interagency dependency, as described by Levine and White (1961), is contingent upon the
accessibility of resources and the control over the resources by each agency. While the degree to
which agencies depend on one another is contingent on the problem faced by both organizations, collaborations are driven by some base of dependency on other organizations. Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2006), for example, emphasize the need for organizations to work together by describing institutional and organizational pressure to achieve goals. The consequences of not collaborating, then, encourage agencies to initiate one or more partnerships (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015).

Costs associated with collaborations such as resources and labor are measurable, though the time invested in a collaboration is more opaque and susceptible to manipulation. The counterfactual of what may occur should agencies not partner is largely unknown; this may encourage establishing and maintaining a partnership but can also act as inertia to end the relationship. Further contributing to inertia are the expenses associated with the status quo compared to terminating a partnership, making it difficult to have unanimous agreement on value (Hart, 2003; Thomson and Perry, 2006). The predictable costs of maintaining a collaboration compared to the unclear shifts in concrete and abstract resources used to end the relationship incentivizes agencies to remain stagnant in a partnership. However, continuing the relationship may cause agencies to drift from the collaborative goal and manipulate the status quo toward individual agency needs. Because agency decisions are left to executives, how these individuals perceive organizational goals, collective goals, and the status quo will influence how invested an organization is in collaborative outcomes and therefore signal the strength of cooperation across agencies.

**Management in partnerships**

Public managers play a pivotal role in establishing and maintaining partnerships by finding similarities in goals and processes (Mitchell et al., 2015). Manager participation
empowers and encourages equal representation, and communication across organizations (Ansell and Gash, 2007). Regardless of what drives the collaboration, they are faced with sacrificing some autonomy and interdependence (O’Leary and Vij, 2012). Prior to partnering with other agencies, organizational managers exercise independent decision making with goals focused on individual organizational success. When a partnership is established, however, members at all organizational levels sacrifice autonomy and individual decision making, though this is subject to change across levels and units within both organizations. This could be compounded based on organizational differences in culture and expertise. The decisions and reactions managers exhibit could be in an effort to compensate for the new limitations in decision making and unitary power. As a result, this creates some sort of hierarchy within the partnerships and an imbalance of power between the organizations.

An imbalance of power proves to be a significant challenge among executives in partnerships. In a review of over one hundred collaborative governance cases, Ansell and Gash (2007) state that if managers perceive there to be an imbalance of power, the meaningfulness of the partnership, and ultimately its success, is subject to failure. Influences on the imbalance of power include control of resources, capacity, and the ability to participate; all contribute to distrust and weaker commitments (Ansell and Gash, 2007; Huxham and Vangen, 2013). Further, understanding agency strengths in a competitive advantage may be a threat to the success of a partnership. Mitchell, O’Leary, and Gerard (2015) support this claim; in a survey of managers, loss of power, conflict, and stress from establishing partnerships were found to be common challenges expressed by managers of federal agencies and NGOs. Additional challenges of collaboration include loss of resources and limited control (Mitchell et al., 2015). By overcoming the challenges faced, managers across agencies may establish trust and cooperation, improving
the effectiveness of the partnership and the likelihood of achieving the partnership’s goals.

While the challenges and benefits for managers in collaborations are well documented, whether characteristics relating to organizational commitment help or hinder the partnership are less understood. Other contributions to collaboration and decision making literature suggest demographics such as education, age, and gender, for example, influence managerial styles and decision making (see Hambrick and Mason, 1984, McGuire, 2009, and Meier et al., 2006 respectively). Meier, O’Ttoole, and Goerdel (2006), for example, find neither men nor women dominate specific performance areas, though how men and women respond to performance information differs. Hambrick and Mason (1984) also find that age and other measurable characteristics, including educational attainment, influence the strategic decision making occurring at upper levels of management. This is because the upper echelons of management will reflect these characteristics and influence how managers behave and arrive at different decisions.

McGuire (2009) also contributes to this discussion by demonstrating an empirical relationship between educational attainment and emergency management collaborations. In a study of county level survey data, McGuire (2009) finds a correlation between educational attainment and professionalism with increased collaborative capacity. The survey evaluated local emergency management directors and determined that as the educational training in emergency management (as a measure of assumed professionalism) of an individual increased, they would elect to participate in more collaborative activity. This analysis indicates there are measurable qualities of managers that influence willingness to engage in partnerships; it also implies that these qualities are linked to an individual’s likelihood to overcome differences and establish trust.

Surveying agency executives in local and regional governments, Esteve et al. (2013)
suggest that agency executive characteristics influence collaborations both positively and negatively. More specifically, as educational qualifications increase, managers have an easier time establishing and maintaining collaborations; if a manager is older, there is a negative influence on establishing and maintaining collaborations. This implies that while agencies must overcome hurdles to establish partnerships, the characteristics of managers inevitably influence establishing and continuing partnerships. The analysis also suggests that when there is more overlap between manager demographics, shared qualities facilitate trust between partners and encourage collaboration. While there is evidence of executive demographics, and therefore aspects of identity, influencing one’s ability to partner, less is understood about how values and organizational commitment affect this decision making process. The degree to which an executive aligns with their own organization’s mission, and their openness to aligning with a potential partner, will also influence perceptions of a potential partner and will dictate the structure and success of a partnership. In this way, agency commitment, values, and identity are subject to influencing their partnership.

Commitment and Interagency Cooperation

Values and beliefs drive organizational mission and goals (Campbell and Yeung, 1991); in accepting those goals and having a willingness to act for the agency to reach them, individuals exhibit some level of commitment to the agency (Angle and Perry, 1981). Strongly identifying with values and mission is correlated with a stronger bond to that organization (Abbot, White, and Charles, 2005; Pandey, Wright, and Moynihan, 2008; Tella, Ayeni, Popoola, 2007). Committing to an agency’s mission and values also influences organizational culture (Hofstede, 1998). When establishing a partnership, managers overcome challenges by converging values and priorities (Aram and Stratton, 1974; Devine et al., 2016; Kettl, 2006; Vangen and Huxham,
2012). However, the change may be understood as a threat to agency autonomy in losing some ability to make decisions without additional input. This perceived threat to the status quo may be exacerbated if organizations have fewer goals than their partner or support values in conflict with this outside organization.

It is important to note that while behavior may suggest both agencies are accommodating one another, the sacrifice in autonomy is not inherently avoided by successfully partnering. Commitment and the degree to which managers compromise in a partnership is subject to change, and the original arrangement could prove to expand or minimize control for managers across organizations. Decisions with respect to accountability, performance measures, and reporting, among others, indicate the balance, or possible imbalance, of power in these partnerships.

The extent to which managers in agencies trust one another is influenced by organizational values and norms as well as an individual’s organizational commitment and perceptions of potential collaborators. Considering that managers focus on organizational performance, decisions made with respect to improving performance will be updated based on previous information. Scholars have demonstrated this updating in decision making through Bayesian models (see Boyne et al., 2006, Gil and Witko, 2013, Meier et al., 2015; Zhu et al., 2015). Meier, Favero, and Zhu (2015), for example, explain that as organizations meet or fail to meet performance expectations, managers will update decisions about strategy and actions taken given this new information. Charness, Karni, and Levin (2007) also implement Bayesian updating when researching decision making among groups and individuals, finding that through updating information and discussion, group decision making deviates from individual decision making. The practical applications of updating prior information and beliefs are consistent with
typical human experiences; as individuals receive more information or gain experiences, their decision making processes and preferences are updated accordingly.

This behavior is also true when considering the decision to partner with other agencies, as preconceived notions and prior experience in collaboration will influence decisions in partnerships. Zhu, Robinson, and Torenvlied (2015) highlight changes in behavior based on prior experience using a Bayesian research design to better understand decision making in networks. Because collaboration is derived from a need to achieve an otherwise unattainable goal, the decision to partner can extend from the need to improve performance. Thus, information regarding an outside organization, or previous experience in other partnerships, will update an executive’s priors, thereby influencing the partnership and decisions to follow. Individual perception will influence the decisions and actions taken by that person (Huxham and Vangen, 2013); members of the partnering agency then react to these decisions, influencing their future actions, continuing the cycle of perception and action.

Identity becomes increasingly important when considering members of both agencies and decisions focused on the partnership; executives in an organization must anticipate how actions and decisions are received, and then be prepared for actions taken by their peers. This anticipation and ability to predict partner actions and outcomes indicates that some level of trust is needed across organizational executives to yield a successful partnership. Huxham and Vangen (2013) identify this cycle and outcomes of (mis)trust through qualitative analyses of partnerships. While their work focused on the private sector, the theoretical linkages can apply to public organizations, as human behavior in collaborations will consistently rely on a strong foundation of identity and how to perceive peers.

How managers perceive the partnering organization is also susceptible to external
influence from political stakeholders and clientele. Organizations are disposed to this influence (Carpenter and Krause, 2012) and preferences expressed from these parties may change decision making in the partnership (Meier and O’Toole, 2008). How agencies react to the external environment contributes to how organizational partners perceive one another. These responses can improve trust among managers and organizations or bring about distrust and contempt (Gulati, 1995). This may contribute to perceived threats to identity and therefore compound challenges faced in the partnership.

Trust has been identified in partnerships as an influence on performance. In empirically analyzing US firms with relationships with firms in other countries, Aulkah, Kotabe, and Sahay (1996) suggest that expectations and relational norms will build trust and improve performance for private partnerships. Adjustments made to achieve the collective goal promote cooperation across organizations. This can be extended to public organizations and public-public partnerships. Regardless of sector, agencies establish a partnership to meet a goal (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015), while also trying to mitigate their partner’s self-interested decisions (Aulakh, Kotabe, and Sahay, 1996; Downs, 1965). While there is empirical work demonstrating organizational attempts to make accommodations and establish trust, factors such as culture, reputation, and differences in socialization influence the likelihood of establishing and maintaining trust across organizations, shaping individual agency culture and decision making (Bronstein and Abramson, 2003; Dinger and Enkel, 2016; Carpenter and Krause, 2012; Verhoest, Rommel, and Boon, 2014). Shifts in trust, then, contribute to changes in decision making and organizational performance (Paliszkiewicz et al., 2014).

Because managers often face multiple goals, they are charged with balancing such goals with self-interested behavior. Decisions regarding these goals face a challenge of balancing
priorities and efforts to maximize specific goals (Theobald and Nicholson-Cotty, 2005). In a partnership setting, managers not only balance goals of their own organization, but also the partnership goals. How executives prioritize partnership goals will be shaped by how organizational goals beyond the partnership are met; if the partnership goals affect the ability to meet other agency goals, managers may alter behavior in the partnership to fit organizational priorities.

The degree to which executives establish trust and overcome differences with their peers to partner is contingent on the degree to which they identify with their own organization. In other words, if managers identify more closely with their organization and see less alignment of mission and values to their potential partner, the decisions made by that organization will reflect a limited willingness to sacrifice autonomy in decision making. Instead, executives will make decisions to protect their agency’s autonomy and sense of identity. This will hinder the ability of agencies to overcome differences and establish an effective partnership. In contrast, should agency executives see similar alignment of their beliefs and values with their partnering organization, greater trust can be established across those organizations, improving collaborative effectiveness. This can be formalized by the following hypotheses:

\[ H_1: \text{Increased alignment with one’s own organization will decrease managerial willingness to forgo discretionary power in a public-public partnership.} \]

\[ H_2: \text{Increased alignment with one’s partnering organization will increase managerial willingness to forgo discretionary power in a public-public partnership.} \]

If executives are unable to establish a strong sense of trust with each other, as indicated by decisions made in the partnership structure, then it is likely that the effectiveness of the partnership is limited (Dingler and Enkel, 2016; Vangen and Huxham, 2003; Warm, 2011).
Identifying the challenges, then, becomes imperative to further understanding partnership establishment and outcomes. If there is limited trust between agency executives, this is perhaps due to the perceived and real differences across the organizations. As the magnitude to which individuals, specifically managers, believe there are differences between the organizations increases, those managers will be less likely to sacrifice autonomy in the partnership. This can be demonstrated through taking initiative in making changes in the partnership.

**Partnerships in Public Education: School Resource Officers**

Public-public partnerships are common at all levels of government. Partnerships between law enforcement and public education are a salient and compelling context for understanding how differences in the ways in which executives perceive their partners affect decision making for the partnership itself. These partnerships are best showcased through School Resource Officer (SRO) programs in which a career law enforcement officer is assigned to work in one or more schools as a method of community policing (NASRO, n.d.). SRO programs were introduced into federal law in 1968 with the goal of improving safety in public schools (Omnibus Crime Control and Safety Act, 1968). These programs are also designed for law enforcement officers to build positive relationships with students and staff by being a resource and role model through being an educator and an informal mentor in addition to their role as a law enforcement officer (NASRO, n.d.). SRO programs are largely established through memorandums of understanding (MOUs). It is unclear how many SROs are in the United States, though estimates are between 14,000 and 20,000 (NASRO, n.d.). Partnerships between law enforcement and public schools have also manifested through Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E)
programs\(^5\) and truancy officers; these relationships have been researched in public administration and education policy (see, for example, Monoahan, et al., 2014; Rosenbaum and Hanson, 1998).

There exist differences between law enforcement and public education that make these partnerships theoretically interesting from a collaborative management perspective. Police departments are structurally hierarchical, where the leadership role is held by the chief of police, and have goals primarily related to public safety (Department of Justice, n.d.). Leadership in municipal police departments are appointed to their position from an elected official, whereas sheriffs are elected to their position; while the objectives of both roles are aligned with public safety, there are some differences in goal prioritization and decision making (LaFrance and Placide, 2010; Mughan et al., 2020). School districts share this hierarchical structure but aim to provide federal and state enforced regulatory requirements to children (Center of Education Policy, 2007). Districts are led by superintendents and school boards, where both positions are determined through the political system to varying degrees (Alsbury, 2008; Grissom and Andersen, 2012; Habersham, 2012). While school board members are elected or appointed, superintendents are hired by members of the school board. This distinction is important as superintendents are thus acting in a more bureaucratic capacity but still report and respond to a political principal in the form of a school board.

There exist some overlapping goals between police departments and school districts with respect to child safety. While the goals and tools to achieve safety differ across agencies, there is a shared normative belief that children should attend schools without concern of safety (Connery, 2020; James and McCallion, 2013; Rosiak, 2009). SRO programs bridge the gap between

\(^5\) Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E) is partnership between law enforcement and public education focused on drug use prevention in elementary school students. The program was established in 1983 and differs from SRO programs in that the officers are not in schools in a disciplinary capacity but rather an education program (D.A.R.E, nd.).
education and safety by creating a role in which officers may uphold the law and ensure safety while also educating about safety and law enforcement. In creating SRO programs, administrators (police chiefs and superintendents) in both agencies communicate and establish the SRO position. Given the differences in mission and goals between these agencies, there is a hurdle managers must overcome to accommodate differences in management and priorities. In a series of interviews of school administrators and SROs, Lopez (2019) found the barriers and differences across group expertise to be a common theme, though the shared goal of school safety was sufficient in establishing the partnership. Still, successfully establishing a program does not inherently suggest the presence of shared opinions and priorities among organizational leaders. Differences in understanding roles, the purpose of the program, and general support for the program among executives and implementers are subject to differences, particularly considering the perceptions of student discipline held by educators and law enforcement officers (Curran et al., 2019).

The extent of disciplinary action in education research focuses primarily on disproportionate actions toward minority students (Corley, 2018; GAO-18-258; McFadden et al., 1992; Rocque, 2010; Wallace et al., 2008). The Government Accountability Office, for example, determined that Black students, making up 15.5% of public school enrollment, represented about 39% of suspensions across public schools in the 2013-14 school year (GAO-18-258). Though focused on the psychological impacts of discipline and school climate, Del Toro and Wang (2021) collected original data from a Southern public school system from 2015 through 2018, finding similar disciplinary outcomes occurring at a greater rate among Black students than their white peers. Specifically, the researchers determined that Black students experienced more in and out of school suspension for minor infractions than other students in the school system and
that there appeared to be a correlation to these actions and worse school performance when comparing across groups (Del Toro and Wang, 2021). Additional localized reports from other states find similar outcomes, where minority students experience a disproportionate level of action taken against them than white students (see Goudie et al., 2020; Lacoe and Manley, 2019).

The action taken by school administrators lends itself to the discussion of the school-to-prison pipeline among scholars and practitioners. Specifically, engaging with law enforcement in a school setting can be seen as a contributing factor for students entering the criminal justice system (Owens, 2017). However, there is little focus among scholars on how these partnerships are established and the extent to which managers shape the process (though see Lopez, 2019).

Beyond scholarly work, the purpose of and need for SROs has become an increasingly salient topic among practitioners. While a politically popular choice in response to violence in and around schools, scholarly work primarily focuses on the influence SROs have on students has propelled the need and use of law enforcement in education into the forefront of discussions. In light of increased salience of police violence toward minorities, school boards and city councils across the country have revisited the SRO programs in their school districts. Some jurisdictions have voted to maintain their programs (Nakano, 2020) while others have changed the nature of the SRO program through shifting funding or resources available to the program (see Issa, 2020); select districts have entirely cut their SRO program altogether (CBS, 2020).

The debate regarding SRO programs encourages discussion to understand how executives perceive their partnering agencies and the actions that follow. Though the relationship may change given the program, it is evident that partnerships between law enforcement and public education are prevalent and will continue. If there are perceived differences among agency executives, decision making by these executives will determine the dynamics of the partnership.
and, as a result, its effectiveness. Particularly given its current relevance, understanding the possible differences in decision making between police chiefs and school board chairmen fosters additional discussion for assessing SRO programs.

**Data and Design**

To investigate the connection between alignment to an executive’s own organization and their willingness to partner, two online surveys were fielded to collect original data from police chiefs and school district superintendents in Michigan and Ohio. Both chiefs and superintendents are the highest ranking executive in their respective organizations and, when considering the positions in parallel, are peers with equal rank within their agencies. Because these individuals make organizational decisions and are the public facing figure when decisions are made, how these individuals perceive their home agencies and their potential partner with respect to organizational mission and values will likely influence behavior and decision making.

Both surveys contain questions focused on how executives identified roles and expectations associated with their organization and their partnering organization. These questions asked participants to determine the importance of each role of their home agency and how they perceive their partner agency’s role in society. The survey also included questions regarding the current state and history of a respondent’s SRO partnership, if it existed, as well as normative questions to capture participant beliefs regarding accountability and responsibility. Prior to publishing the surveys, both were tested in a pilot of doctoral students and individuals outside of academia to evaluate question effectiveness and length of the survey. The survey was launched in the early June 2021 and closed in late August 2021; throughout the open period of the survey, individuals who did not opt out of service requests received up to three follow-up reminders requesting participation. It should be noted that the survey was conducted
anonymously, and all data presented are constructed such that there are no identifying markers for a given state or organization. Of the superintendents contacted, 169 of 396 completed the survey (42.68% response). Police chiefs had a 38.19% response rate (110 of 288).

Collecting original data from survey distribution is a powerful tool in that there is current data available to understand individual perspectives and address salient questions. While this is a significant benefit of survey collection, there is also a potential for common source bias, meaning there are potential inaccuracies given that responses from participants were collected from the same method and come from very similar organizations that interact with one another. While this is of concern in survey collection and acknowledged in this analysis, the analysis includes variables from other data sources (e.g., the Census Bureau and the National Center of Education Statistics) to alleviate some of this challenge.

**Participants**

Surveys were distributed online through email to school superintendents and police chiefs. The average age of superintendent participants was 51 years old, while police chiefs averaged 54 years; years of experience in the field were 27 years in public education and 30 in law enforcement. Participants in both surveys were contacted via email through the Qualtrics platform; superintendent and police chief contacts were publicly available for the state of Ohio and Michigan through state departments of education and attorney general offices. Across both states, more superintendents responded to the survey than police chiefs; 169 superintendents and 110 police chiefs completed the survey, creating imbalance in the data.

When considering the differences between police chiefs and superintendents in the sample, 25.90% of superintendents are women, whereas 3.25% of police chiefs in the sample are women. All superintendents have at least a Master’s degree, and predominantly identify as
politically moderate (50.26%), though 31.79% identify as conservative. Police chiefs range in education, though 96.84% of those reporting their educational attainment have at least a Bachelor’s degree. Most police chiefs identify as conservative (54.54%). Both survey groups are predominantly white.

**Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable is established using a factor analysis of a series of questions included on both surveys. Factor analysis allows for a more appropriate measure of otherwise latent variables and evaluates the correlation each variable has with each other and the collective measurement (Kline, 1992; Zambrano-Gutierrez et al., 2017). Participants were asked when establishing a partnership, how willing they are to commit to various scenarios. The question and statements are as follows:

When establishing a partnership with public schools [law enforcement agencies], how willing are you to commit to the following?

▪ Losing some authority over SROs
▪ Including leadership from school district [law enforcement agency] in decision making for program expectations
▪ Include leadership from school district [law enforcement agency] in determining SRO contracts
▪ Include leadership from school district [law enforcement agency] in determining SRO training

The statements were presented with a Likert scale with options of “very unwilling”, “somewhat unwilling”, “neutral”, “somewhat willing”, and “very willing.” Each answer was recorded separately in Qualtrics and then assigned a value between one and five where one indicates the
individual answered as “very unwilling” and five indicates the response is “very willing.” Table 1 provides the outcomes of the factor analysis; the factor has an eigenvalue of 2.031 and accounts for 52.7% of the variance. The questions were presented to both superintendents and police chiefs and allow for a measure that captures a willingness (or lack thereof) to limit discretion in the partnership, making this value an effective way to measure a complete willingness to cooperate.⁶

Each of the above questions are also individually used as unique dependent variables if executives are willing to lose discretion of some aspects of a partnership over others. By testing each question individually, there is an opportunity to evaluate if there are aspects of establishing a partnership where executives are more or less hesitant to lose some control in the decision making process. Perhaps there are aspects of the collaboration that prime executives to be more or less willing to dictate control of those activities. Questions regarding training and program expectations implied more involvement from partnering groups.

**Independent Variable**

To measure the perceived difference in organizations, both sets of survey respondents were provided with either a definition of law enforcement or the mission of the Department of Education (for superintendents and chiefs, respectively). The definition was followed by a question asking respondents to indicate to what degree they believe they align with the mission or definition described. The question is a scale from 0 to 100 where 0 indicates there are no similarities and 100 indicates they are identical. By using a larger ordinal scale, the degree to which an individual associates with their partnering organization is a clearer measure than a

---

⁶ Each statement is also tallied to create composite score ranging from 4 to 20, where increasing scores indicate a greater likelihood of forgoing autonomy in decision making. This measure is used as an additional check and can be found in the Appendix.
standard Likert scale (Alwin, 1997; Leung, 2011).

Participants were also provided the mission statement of the general agency to which they belong with a similar question asking how aligned they are to their own organization’s mission and values. The statements are as follows, for law enforcement and education respectively:

- The Bureau of Justice Statistics defines law enforcement as "responsible for enforcing laws and maintaining public order and safety" and "includes the prevention, detection, and investigation of crime, and the apprehension and detention of individuals suspected of law violation." How closely do you identify with this statement? Assume that 0 indicates "not at all" and 100 indicates "fully identify".

- The US Department of Education states their mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access." How closely do you identify with this statement? Assume that 0 indicates "not at all" and 100 indicates "fully identify".

By asking respondents how they identify with their own organization and their potential partnering agency, this allows for direct comparison of executive sentiments toward both agencies. Determining if differences are present across responses provides a simple but effective measure to determine if differences will hinder a partnership; an increasingly large gap in alignment would suggest the differences are perhaps too great to establish an effective collaboration without an external force driving the arrangement.⁷

**Controls**

Control variables are included in the survey and collected from other sources to reduce common source bias and to limit the potential bias in the dependent and independent variables (Bernerth and Aguinis, 2016). In the survey, individuals were asked to identify their political ideology, gender, race, ethnicity, and educational level. All questions included an option to skip

---

⁷ In addition to testing alignment separately, a variable measuring the difference between responses was also tested in the analysis. Findings prove to be consistent with the analysis of separate measures; tables can be found in the Appendix.
or to signal they prefer not to answer the question. Along with questions collecting demographic information, both police chiefs and superintendents were asked how long they have worked in their respective field, agency, and in their current position. Including demographic and experience information provides additional context and is common practice in public administration research. Each are correlated to experiences with government and public administration, suggesting that failing to include such variables would yield endogenous results (see Bernerth and Aguinis, 2016, O’Leary and Vij, 2012, Porter, 1990, among others). To determine location, participants were also asked in which state and county they worked; providing geographic locations allowed for the option to pair and compare individual responses. An additional variable was also introduced following survey completion to indicate whether the survey participant was a superintendent or a police chief and is a dichotomous variable in the analysis where a 1 indicates the individual is a superintendent of schools. All survey questions can be found in the appendix.

Additional measures were collected from the National Center of Education Statistics, the MIT Election Lab, and the United States Census Bureau. The percentages of Black and Hispanic students enrolled in school districts are collected from the National Center of Education Statistics. Including both allow for the analysis to determine the representation of underrepresented communities. Academic and government driven research indicate that nonwhite students experience more disciplinary action in public school systems (Camera, 2020; Krezmien et. al, 2006); an increasingly diverse student body may influence participant decision making or highlight implicit biases in collaborative arrangements.

From the MIT Election lab, the percent of voters who voted for the Democrat presidential nominee in 2020 was calculated to determine the political environment in each county.
Understanding voting behavior will provide some measure of support for policies that are more liberal or conservative and attitudes toward government offices and influence decision making with respect to partnerships. Further, attitudes toward law enforcement among voters and youth vary based on party identification (see Fine et al., 2019); responses to the partnership may be correlated with how individuals vote in larger elections.

Additional measures to determine socioeconomic status are also included in the data. Because resource scarcity is a factor influencing whether agencies partner, socioeconomic factors can allow for some measurement of resource availability for the community and thereby the agencies (Thomson and Perry, 2006). From the Census Bureau, unemployment rates are calculated as the mean over a 24-month period in each county. Using unemployment gauges economic prosperity in a given area, indicating resource scarcity and availability. Summary statistics of all values in analysis can be found in Table 2.

**Methods**

The following analysis uses ordinary least squares (OLS) regression and logistic regression for the willingness factor and individual values respectively. Models first use the entire sample of superintendents and police chiefs and then further investigate the perspective from superintendents. Due to fewer police chiefs completing the survey, there prove to be insufficient observations for an effective analysis. In both OLS and logistic regressions, fixed effects by state are used to limit any influences from individual states. OLS is used to evaluate the relationship between the willingness factor and the alignment toward the partnering agency. When focusing on individual questions, there is insufficient variance in responses to properly use other maximum likelihood estimates, thus the responses are transformed to a willing or unwilling
binary variable and logistic regression are implemented. Odds-ratios are reported for interpretation.

**Findings**

First, the analysis focuses on the factor measuring willingness to forgo discretionary power to executives in the partnering agency. The findings can be found in Table 3; models evaluate the full group of survey respondents followed by individual studies of superintendents and police chiefs. All models use OLS regression. Beginning with the full sample, there is evidence of a positive correlation between aligning with a partnering organization’s mission and the degree to which a decision maker will compromise in a partnership. As a respondent’s alignment to a partnering organization increases by one standard deviation, the willingness factor increases by 0.215 points ($\beta=0.008$). In other words, this sample implies decision makers who closely identify with a partnering organization will be more willing to limit agency autonomy for the sake of a partnership. In the context of SRO programs, the collective sample demonstrates that executives are willing to lose some discretion if decision maker values and mission align with their partner.

When comparing across superintendent and police chief responses groups, there are some differences in findings. The superintendent model does not find a statistically significant correlation between the independent variable of interest and the willingness factor, suggesting that in this sample there is no evidence suggesting greater alignment with partnering organizations influences the degree to which a manager is willing to lose autonomy in decision making. On the other hand, police chiefs did indicate a positive correlation between their alignment with the Department of Education mission and values and the willingness factor score. A one standard deviation increase in alignment results in a 0.455 unit increase in the willingness
factor ($\beta=0.020$). This indicates that for police departments in this sample, partnerships do require some level of alignment to a given organization, though there is no statistical significance with respect to their own organization’s alignment. Further, this suggests that the collective sample findings are driven by the police chief responses in the sample.

When evaluating the control variables, only the combined sample model yields statistically significant findings. As county level unemployment increases by one percent, the degree to which a decision maker is willing to lose autonomy decreases by 0.138. It is important to note that this coefficient is of greater magnitude than the initial variable of interest, meaning there is more practical significance here and perhaps is a result of resource scarcity. Where there are instances of high unemployment, limited resources may be available to both organizations and therefore limit an individual’s willingness to work with other organizations, thereby sharing resources and potentially threatening the success of other goals and objectives of that organization. Political ideology also has a positive correlation with the willingness factor: as a respondent signals that their political ideology leans toward more liberal policies, there is an increase in the willingness factor by 0.179 units. Such findings are consistent with previous research considering political ideology and concerns with collaboration (see Gazley, 2010). The lack of significance among control variables when the models are disaggregated is of note.

Considering the plethora of research focused on police department buy-in and loyalty (Cordner, 2016; Johnson, 2015; Paoline, 2003, Van Maanen, 1975, among others), there is some surprise that the commitment to one’s own organization did not inhibit the ability to commit to and limit autonomy in the partnership setting. This may suggest that self-interested behavior and an innate need to insulate an organization from threat did not negatively impact interest in acting in a more collaborative capacity. Perhaps this is a result of exposure and training; in formative
years of development individuals are exposed to and a part of the education environment and its
mission and values. Law enforcement officers are then immersed in a new set of social norms,
values, and organizational mission that education professionals will not experience to the same
degree. Similar findings are found with the composite score; the table for such findings can be
found in the appendix along with a figure to offer a visualization of the differences across
groups.

Each aspect of the factor value, focused on authority, expectations, contracting, and
training, also offered interesting findings. Table 4 provides the findings of these logistic
regressions; parameters are presented as odds-ratios. Participants were asked their willingness to
lose authority and to include leadership from their partner in decisions including expectations,
contracts, and training. Across all questions with the exception of decisions in regard to
contracts, the independent variable did yield some statistically significant findings. First
considering losing authority to establish a partnership, a one point increase in alignment toward a
partnering organization is associated with a 1.014 increase in the likelihood of limiting authority
over SROs. In other words, individuals are 1.4% more likely to forgo some autonomy in a
partnership.

With respect to decisions surrounding program and officer expectations, respondents
were 1.9% more likely to be willing to forgo autonomy as there the individual’s personal
alignment with their partner increases. Finally, when considering the decisions around SRO
training, increasing one’s alignment with their partnering organization yields a 1.35% increase in
willingness to limit their own autonomy in this decision making process. As decision making
aligns more closely to the partner organization mission, there is perhaps increased understanding
and trust in the decision making by executives in that partnering organization, encouraging some
loss of autonomy across most categories apart from contracting decisions. However, because the magnitude is substantially small, this suggests that practically this alignment is insufficient for encouraging increased cooperation and willingness to lose authority over the program itself. In the context of SRO programs, perhaps there is trust and understanding regarding which organization, and subsequently who, is leading the decision making and acts as the authority over SROs.

These linkages indicate that while there is a positive correlation between identifying with a partnering agency’s mission and a manager’s willingness to forgo autonomy for the sake of the partnership, the degree to which this is true is very limited. Considering the practical meaning of these findings, it is beneficial if partners can relate to organizational mission, though it is not a key driver in encouraging amicable relations across agencies. Perhaps it is simply a goal oriented outcome and decision making remains fairly siloed in the partnership arrangement. Because it is understood that organizations partner for the sake of gaining expertise or specialized resources to overcome a problem, it is perhaps a case of segregated tasks with limited overlap.

All but program expectations demonstrated that home institution influences one’s willingness to cooperate. Considering losing authority over SROs, the degree to which they are involved in contracting arrangements and training, school superintendents are 5.189 times, 6.548 times, and 18.455 times more likely to lose some discretion in these situations than their police chief peers. The magnitudes of the odds ratios indicate that the probability of a superintendent agreeing to lose some autonomy across these decisions is substantially high and much more likely to occur than among police chiefs. This again may be an indication of the expertise and socialization in these areas. For example, while superintendents are comfortable in a space of student education, there may be nuances to officer training that are unfamiliar to superintendents.
but an area of expertise in the policy academy. The need for specialized skills and resources drives this acceptance of losing autonomy in these capacities for the sake of achieving the goal. Further, educators are trained and often encouraged to work collaboratively (see Vangrieken et al., 2015; Villavicenico et al., 2021), perhaps further encouraging a willingness to forgo autonomy and act cooperatively. Figure 1 offers a comparison in responses across police chiefs and superintendents.

Descriptive differences in responses are also investigated between organizations with and without SRO programs as well as between superintendents and police chiefs. Of those in the sample, 30% of respondents did not have an SRO program at the time of completing the survey. When considering the average scores in the independent variables, both own-agency and partner-agency alignment did not demonstrate significant differences in means, suggesting that the sentiment toward one’s own organization and a potential partner is not influenced by being actively involved in an SRO partnership. When evaluating the factor score, the differences in means also did not demonstrate a substantial difference in average responses. Upon investigating the individual questions creating the factor score, only the willingness to forgo decision making with respect to primary authority over SROs yielded a significant difference in means, where superintendents had an average of 0.712 and police chiefs had an average of 0.338, suggesting superintendents were more likely to forgo autonomy in this capacity than their police peers.

When considering differences between superintendents and police chiefs, there are some notable differences in average responses. For alignment to one’s own organization, police chiefs averaged a score of 91.71, whereas superintendents averaged a response of 87.22. The statistically significant difference in these averages could indicate that organizational culture and norms not only recruit individuals who identify strongly with either law enforcement or
education, but also influence the degree to which an individual identifies with their agency, shaping their decision making with respect to a partnership. When testing averages in partner agency alignment, there is no significant difference, further indicating this home organization value is a strong influence on decision making. These differences continue when investigating averages in the factor score and the individual questions contributing to the factor score. Of all tests, only the involvement in program expectations do not exhibit a significant difference of means, where both groups at least somewhat willing to forgo some discretion in decision making over expectations. This again is an indication that to which organization a respondent belongs will adequately influence individual decision making particularly in the context of a partnership. All t-tests can be found in the Appendix.

Discussion

Public-public partnerships occur in instances in which organizations require outside agencies to address seemingly wicked problems. What drives a partnership is the ability for individuals at all organizational levels to successfully overcome differences and cooperate across organizations. To assume this is achieved by virtue of establishing a partnership, however, ignores differences in values and mission that could change individual behavior in the partnership. How executives align with their own and potential partnering organization creates opportunities for improved or limited cooperation across these executives. As executives express more alignment with a partner’s mission and values, the potential for overcoming these differences improves, and allows for a more cooperative relationship. On the other hand, the further removed executives are from a partner may impede the success of a collaborative structure.
The above analysis evaluated such questions through a survey distributed to police chiefs and superintendents in midwestern states. Both the willingness factor and most individual aspects of this were subject to statistically significant change when compared to alignment with a partnering organization’s mission. It can be said that in the given sample, how one identifies themselves and how they perceive their peers is important to successful cooperation among managers. This in turn can contribute to the success of a partnership; if agency leadership can overcome differences and establish a rapport based on their alignment with their partners, this attitude has potential to trickle through both organizations, improving agency culture and attitudes in the partnership setting.

Willingness to be cooperative occurred across both groups but was notably significant when evaluating police chiefs alone and suggests that the organization culture or values differ with respect to being innately open to working in collaborative settings. When evaluating individual decisions are subject to limiting control in the partnership, all but the decisions surrounding contracting appear to have very slight positive correlations with aligning with a partner organization and willingness to cooperate. However, superintendents appear to have the strongest influence on this decision to forgo autonomy for the sake of a partnership, with some influence from the political environment. This is perhaps due to socialization and training educators and executives in education are exposed to regularly, compared to their peers in law enforcement and public safety; there is support for this when investigating the differences in average responses across survey groups. Because of the nature of SRO partnerships, where police officers are placed into a school environment, it is perhaps the result of school administrators being immediately present for SRO oversight as opposed to the police departments having some removal from the program itself. Superintendents may have greater
risk tolerance in sacrificing this autonomy because of the host-guest scenario presented in this unique partnership. In the case of School Resource Officers, this may be attributed to the key differences in approach and goals of the organizations. An agency focused on law enforcement and criminal justice tend to work in different environments than education spaces, requiring specialized training and a culture of support and fast action.

Investigating the correlation between executive alignment with a partner’s mission and the willingness to lose some decision making power is important to understanding the innerworkings of collaborations. There is a prescriptive element to collaborations from researchers and practitioners alike as a method to have additional support and resources from an outside party to achieve a goal. However, there is little understanding outside of the demographics influencing executive decisions to partner. While partnerships are a common practice, true cooperation across parties, especially considering who is sacrificing more discretion, supports that the imbalance of power establishes a hierarchy across agencies. Uncovering some reasons for why some partnerships may experience more cooperative arrangements with potential or current partners can first add to the literature evaluating executives in partnerships, but also encourages additional study at other levels within both organizations.

There are some limitations to the analysis, namely due to limited responses, particularly from police departments. Future iterations of this, or similar surveys, could alleviate this problem by expanding the respondent pool to other states in the region or by establishing relationships with larger, perhaps national, boards for police chiefs and superintendents. Establishing relationships with large scale organizations will both help with distribution to a wider sample but will also provide agency support which would, in theory, encourage participation by both parties.
This survey did not ask questions in regard to previous partnerships or the length of time these partnerships existed, just if their organization is engaged with a partnership at the time of the survey. There is potential for previous partnerships influencing updated perceptions for both police chiefs and superintendents. Future analysis could incorporate Bayesian statistical methods to allow for updating responses accordingly.

In addition to the limited responses, there is a challenge of common source bias. This was alleviated to some degree through incorporating outside variables from federal agencies. However, county level analysis does lose some nuances between agency executives and some potential variables collected indicated strong correlations with variables collected in the survey. To reduce common source bias, additional work applying outcomes of the partnership (e.g., arrests, referrals to law enforcement, prevented violence, etc.) could be collected from an outside data source and used as a way to measures the success of the partnership. Finally, including qualitative analysis may contribute to determining the relationship between executives in this context. While surveys do offer some insight into the innerworkings of specific partnerships, in this case SROs, textboxes and surveys themselves provide fewer opportunities to evaluate relationships between partners and partner executives, while also removing some context that could be essential to understanding the relationship and cooperation across managers.

Interagency cooperation is an important driver for decision making in public-public partnerships. While cooperation is primarily researched at the agency level, it is important to understand the perspectives of individuals within the agencies to capture if cooperation exists and to what extent it is influenced by the environment. Leadership in particular must overcome differences in values and identity in order to cooperate and make decisions to achieve the collective goal. While agency leadership may express a desire to work together to achieve the
partnership objectives, differences in values and culture and how leadership perceives the partnering organization can hinder the likelihood of cooperation. By acknowledging differences and striving to improve communication, as stated by interviewed chiefs and chairmen, leadership can improve cooperation between organizations and therefore improve the partnership.


Tables and Figures

Table 1: Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority over SROs</td>
<td>0.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for SROs</td>
<td>0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting arrangements</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions for training</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue 2.031
Proportion 0.508
N 223

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Willingness Score</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>15.807</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to lose authority</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to lose control of expectations</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to lose control of contract</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to lose control of training</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to partner agency’s mission</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>70.52</td>
<td>29.255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to own agency’s mission</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>89.32</td>
<td>12.829</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience in field</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>27.994</td>
<td>6.969</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female respondent</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White respondent</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County unemployment rates (%)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>5.588</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>10.394</td>
<td>12.316</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>42.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>6.406</td>
<td>5.252</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>37.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in a county who voted Democrat in 2020 (%)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Regression results for Willingness Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both Groups</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Police Chiefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to partner agency’s mission</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.020**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to own agency’s mission</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience in field</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>0.179*</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.102)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County unemployment rate (%)</td>
<td>-0.138*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.074)</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>(0.173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who voted Democrat in 2020 (%)</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.496)</td>
<td>(0.325)</td>
<td>(1.054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table 4: Regression results for Individual Willingness Scores (Full Model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Contracting</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to partner agency’s</td>
<td>1.014***</td>
<td>1.019**</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>1.035**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to own agency’s</td>
<td>0.975**</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience in field</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>4.242*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.148)</td>
<td>(0.498)</td>
<td>(0.582)</td>
<td>(3.487)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.933*</td>
<td>0.911*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County unemployment rate (%)</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>(0.257)</td>
<td>(0.166)</td>
<td>(0.281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who voted Democrat</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>2.501</td>
<td>16.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in 2020 (%)</td>
<td>(0.485)</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(4.813)</td>
<td>(72.719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent is a superintendent</td>
<td>5.189***</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>6.548**</td>
<td>18.455**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.686)</td>
<td>(0.512)</td>
<td>(4.944)</td>
<td>(21.723)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Figure 1: Dispersion of responses to survey answers by group

[Diagram showing the dispersion of responses for Police Chiefs and Superintendents across different categories: Direct Authority, Contracting Decisions, Set Expectations, Influence Training. The y-axis indicates the willingness to cooperate score.]
Chapter Three: Conflict between agency-specific and collective goals: The case of School Resource Officers

Abstract:
Public organizations often engage in collaborative partnerships as a means of addressing otherwise complex challenges. By entering such an arrangement, managers are to balance agency-specific goals with newly formed partnership goals. As a result, limited resources, previously dedicated to agency-specific tasks, are reallocated to the collective goal, forcing managers to balance valuable resources between the two. This decision creates potential for unintended consequences extending beyond the goal of the partnership. Further, these consequences can impact groups receiving services in different capacities, where minority communities are at risk for more negative consequences than their majority counterparts. Using data from the Office for Civil Rights, Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, and the National Center of Education Statistics, this study aims to investigate the influence collaborations have on diploma performance outcomes beyond the scope of the collaboration in the context of School Resource Officer (SRO) programs. Findings indicate that increasing the presence of SROs results in a slight improvement in students receiving diplomas overall, but Hispanic students experience more negative outcomes than their white peers.
Introduction

Literature in public administration supports the claim that individuals within an agency will make decisions regarding resources and processes in order to achieve goals (Lindblom, 1959; Rainey and Jung, 2015; Simon, 1964). Those goals occasionally require establishing and maintaining relationships with other organizations through collaborative partnerships (Schermerhorn, 1975). Collaboration itself is particularly salient among scholars and practitioners and is considered an effective approach for meeting objectives and improving performance, among other positive attributes through sharing expertise and resources (Agranoff, 2006; Agranoff and McGuire, 2001; Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; O’Toole, 2009; Ostrom, 1990; Provan and Milward, 1995; Thomson and Perry, 2006).

However, there exist challenges in first overcoming potential goal conflict across agencies when establishing a collaboration (Thomson and Perry, 2006) and later balancing individual priorities with partnership responsibilities (O’Leary and Vij, 2012; Pandey and Wright, 2006; Weiss and Piderit, 1999). By entering a partnership, collective goals are established and operate alongside agency-specific goals. Agencies must then adjust resource allocation to accommodate both, ultimately satisficing to maintain balancing all goals with limited resources (Christensen and Knudsen, 2010; Simon, 1979). While partnership outcomes are well documented (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; Thomson et al., 2009; Thomson and Perry, 2006), how balancing partnership responsibilities influences outcomes for individual agency objectives is less understood and infrequently tested. Are there unintended consequences that stem from changes in resource allocation and balancing new collaborative priorities? If so, are those consequences experienced to different degrees among cohorts of service recipients?
Such questions can be addressed in the context of public education, where the ramifications of collaborations can be tested against a range of student outcomes. School Resource Officer (SRO) programs, as collaborative partnerships, are a particularly salient context and require further attention following increases in school violence and racially charged events in recent history (Aman and Christian, 2020; Freile, 2020; Hill et al., 2020). While SROs are defined as sworn police officers with arrest powers who work in collaboration with at least one school (National Association of School Resource Officers, n.d.-b), the necessity and effectiveness of SROs is frequently debated (Faircloth, 2020; Federico, 2020; Goldstein, 2020; Pathieu and Gallardo, 2020). Outcomes, such as disparities by race in disciplinary action, are at the forefront of this discussion (Corley, 2018b; Owens, 2017; Pigott et al., 2018), but what is less understood is how SROs affect public education goals beyond school safety, such as student performance and graduation. SRO programs in schools are designed to promote and, in some studies, improve student safety but have also been linked to students feeling less safe at school (Na and Gottfredson, 2013; Theriot and Orme, 2016; Theriot, 2016). Feelings of fear or concern in a school environment, in turn, have been linked to truancy and dropout rates, though there is no clear evidence connecting this fear to the presence of law enforcement in schools (Gase et al. 2016; Henry, 2007; Peguero and Bracy, 2014).

The following analysis uses data from the Office for Civil Rights in the United States Department of Education, the National Center of Education Statistics, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics to focus on the effect SROs have on outcomes beyond school safety from 2000, 2004 and 2006. These outcomes are the overall number of students earning diplomas and graduation by subgroups along racial and ethnic lines. The findings indicate that the increased presence of SROs in public schools has some positive influence on diplomas received per 100 students, but a
narrower effect when further disaggregated by race and ethnicity. Specifically, a statistically significant decrease occurs in the proportion of Hispanic students receiving diplomas among those eligible.

**Establishing Partnerships and Cooperation**

Collaboration is often championed as a tool for improvement and, by some, a cure-all for agency challenges (Agranoff and McGuire, 2001; Dickinson and Sullivan, 2014; O’Toole, 2009). In working together toward a shared goal, it is necessary for agencies to establish some working relationship and encouraged cooperation within and across agencies. Commitment to the partnership, clear communication, and strong leadership have been suggested as common characteristics across successful collaborative arrangements (Johnson et al., 2003; McQuaid, 2015; Schermerhorn, 1975). Tangentially, there must exist an incentive to establish a collaboration; these drivers of collaboration include goal congruence, resource dependence, consequential incentives, and the uncertainty of outcomes (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; Lundin, 2007). These characteristics also influence effective cooperation, which has been linked to collaboration (see Faerman et al., 2001; Lundin, 2007; Tjosvold and Tsao, 1988).

Organizations share some common goal when agreeing to a collaborative arrangement. In this arrangement, decision makers recognize that public value can be increased by working jointly rather than working alone (Schermerhorn, 1975; Thomson and Perry, 2006), though compromise is also often necessary to establish a partnership. To achieve this, agency executives overcome differences in process and mission when engaging in partnerships (Rainey, 2009b) and must relinquish autonomy in decision making (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; O’Leary and Vij, 2012).

---

8 There is some discussion regarding the distinctions between collaborations, networks, and partnerships (see Bovaird and Tizard, 2009, Dickinson and Sullivan, 2014, and McQuaid, 2015, among others). Given the distinction between contract and collaborative partnerships (Bovaird and Tizard, 2009), it should be noted that partnerships described throughout the analysis are collaborative in nature.
Page, 2003). Through limiting discretion, there exists an underlying assumption that organizations can support the needs of the collective goal while continuing to prioritize the goals and objectives outside of the partnership (Connelly et al., 2008). Because mission and goals drive decision making (Campbell and Yeung, 1991; Hofstede, 1998), executives and lower-level members of organizations face the new challenge of continuing to perform tasks outside of the collaboration while also allocating an appropriate amount of time and resources to the collective goals.

Incentives to collaborate include the potential for accessing otherwise unattainable resources and expertise (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015; Levin and White, 1961). In a study of community health and welfare organizations, for example, Levine and White (1961) state partnering agencies rely on having the necessary resources (e.g., skills, physical resources, information) and skills to provide services. By establishing these relationships, there now exists some commonly shared resource that requires management practices to mitigate the waste of resources (Libecap, 2008). Managing shared resources then curbs the discretion of using said resources and suggests that, while there may be a surplus of resources available to the individual agency, there is some sacrifice in what can be done with additional assets. Further, because both agencies must use what is available to them, resource allocation dedicated to partnership objectives may detract from individual agency objectives, suggesting a zero-sum outcome. In other words, it may be difficult to remove and replace a given resource to complete collaborative and individual tasks.

**Balancing Individual and Collective Goals**

In entering a partnership, members of both agencies must balance individual and collective goals, therefore reevaluating how goals are prioritized within their organization.
Restructuring how goals are ranked further influences decisions and, as a result, organizational performance (Chun and Rainey, 2005a, 2005b; Pandey and Rainey, 2006; Pandey and Wright, 2006). Chun and Rainey (2005a) suggest that the complexity of goals contributes to the lack of clarity and emphasizes the importance of clear communication. Pandey and Rainey (2006) corroborate these statements, suggesting that the inconsistent communication of goals is detrimental to individuals’ sense of clarity and aids to the difficulty of achieving organizational objectives. While such findings are consistent in achieving effective goal setting and collaborative partnerships, the balance of goals creates an inevitable competition among individual and collective goals.

Goal conflict between collaborating organizations has been discussed but is an understudied topic in the collaboration literature with respect to agency decision making. Thomson and Perry (2006) describe collaborating agencies to have some tension between self-interest and the collective interest, where some organizational goals remain distinct while others focus on collaborative objectives. When agencies must work with outside organizations to meet specific goals, there is a threat to individual agency identity, contributing to an inability to limit self-interested behavior and enforce accountability (Huxham, 1996; Thomson and Perry, 2006). Because organizations often have multiple goals (Theobald and Nicholson-Crotty, 2005) and will engage in collaborations when goals require external assistance (Thomson and Perry, 2006), there is potential for conflict across the other goals held by the distinct agencies. Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2015) state that identifying goals is critical to a successful partnership, and there are multiple instances in which conflict among goals will hinder the success of the partnership. Described in the context of networks, O’Leary and Bingham (2007) further suggest that conflict
among organizations occurs and is contingent on environmental characteristics and agency qualities.

Partnerships, by nature, involve additional decision makers with different levels and types of expertise, complicating decision making in organizations (see Davis and Reilly, 1998, Groysberg et al., 2011, and Miers and Morgan, 2002, among others). Because partnerships add a layer of complexity due to additional feedback and individuals working together, there is potential for miscommunication or disagreement across decision makers (Emerson and Nabatchi, 2015). Differences in mission and management compound challenges among actors and may contribute to conflict by creating unclear expectations (Schirmer and Cameron, 2012); this lack of clarity can compromise the collective goal by virtue of ineffective communication, where managers incorrectly allocate resources and time to the collaborative arrangement. Chun and Rainey (2005b), for example, suggest that ambiguity and conflict lead to lower managerial effectiveness and, therefore, suggest agencies are not effectively completing tasks. The need to multitask and attain collective goals and tasks beyond the collaboration is linked to decreased performance in public organizations (Adler and Benbunan-Fich, 2012; Ellis, Daniels, and Jauregui, 2010).

Individuals in an agency make decisions with the intent of working toward goals but are constrained by their environment and the resources available to them (Resh and Pitts, 2013). Collaborative structures, while providing additional resources for the organization, contribute to the constraints experienced by decision makers with respect to differences in agency mission and goals outside of the partnership. Even considering the increase in resources available as a result of partnering, there are still finite resources that are to be used for goals and expectations set both within and outside organizations. The limited resources and communication may contribute to
other challenges such as determining to what degree the collaborative goals should be prioritized with respect to agency-specific mission and goals (Thomson and Perry, 2006).

Given there are finite resources available to an organization, including collaborative goals would suggest there are fewer resources available for other tasks and objectives within the organization. This requires some degree of satisficing on the part of each organization participating in a partnership (Christensen and Knudsen, 2010; Simon, 1979). In balancing goals, there is a potential threat to agency identity, where adopting qualities from the partnering agency is seen as shifting agency characteristics. To deflect from a perceived threat, decisions are made to protect agency-focused goals, detracting from the collective objective (Thomson and Perry, 2006). However, in cases where there are enough actors who consider the collective goal to be a higher priority, the shifting in decision making will be such that resources are allocated to provide enough to achieve the goal set by the collective group (Lodgson, 1991; Thomson and Perry, 2006). If partnership goals are prioritized, then the resources organizations have would be adjusted to meet those needs regardless of their current allocation, limiting the resources available to individual tasks. While resource scarcity can contribute to innovation and, in turn, improve performance (Bozeman and Slusher, 1979; Grizzle and Pettijohn, 2002; Walker et al., 2011), there are also links between availability of resources and organizational performance (Lee and Whitford, 2013), where increased availability is believed to contribute to improved performance. Increasing resource availability to the collaborative partnership would suggest the collective goal is of higher priority and would then limit the resources available to complete other agency tasks. The outcomes may not be expected by organizations and will therefore have unintended consequences to those areas of performance. Cumulatively, this would suggest:
**H1:** *Increased resource allocation to collaborative goals will decrease organizational performance towards non-collaborative goals.*

For those receiving services from either organization, the consequences of partnership decisions may result in varying outcomes across groups. By investing resources in collective goals and therefore detracting from attention to individual tasks, the outcomes directly or indirectly influence those receiving the services. Some literature suggests individuals belonging to different groups based on observable characteristics (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) have different experiences with respect to access and quality of service (see Bullard and Johnson, 2000; Grissom et al., 2009; Meier and Bohte, 2001; Theobald and Haider-Markel, 2008, among others). Focusing on cross-sectoral partnerships, Andrews and Entwistle (2010) claim that the strengths of agencies in different sectors will improve partnership efficiency, effectiveness, and equity. While an important contribution to the cross-sectoral, and broader, partnership literature, the focus of this analysis is on the goals outside of the collaboration to assess unintended consequences of partnerships.

While the purpose of a public-public partnership is to meet a collective goal, there is less attention to the potential consequences to tasks beyond the partnership. The following analysis aims to understand if, and how, collaborative partnerships influence individual agency outcomes, specifically considering equity of service. Shifts in actions taken by agencies will influence the trust and satisfaction clients will have of a given organization (Van de Walle, 2017). Because organizations do not exist in isolation, the external environment will influence decision making and outcomes of those decisions (Carpenter and Krause, 2012; Meier and O’Toole, 2008). Including an outside organization and its relationship with its environment will further complicate how individuals within an agency will respond to conditions. How individual and
collective goals are prioritized indicates the degree to which decision makers must respond to new stimuli. Increased focus on the collaborative partnership, indicated by increased resource allocation, suggests the collective goal is prioritized over individual tasks. The outcomes, then, of individual tasks are subject to consequences of reprioritized goals. Because there is evidence suggesting inequity of service provision among minority groups, the consequences of reprioritization will also be experienced differently among groups.

\[ H_2: \text{Increased resource allocation to collective goals will result in lower performance for agency-specific goals such that performance decreases are larger for minority groups.} \]

**Investigating Outcomes Beyond Safety: School Resource Officer Programs**

This study focuses on the partnerships between public education and law enforcement known as School Resource Officer Programs (SROs). Defined as law enforcement officers deployed to schools in a community-oriented policing capacity, SROs are employed by local police departments and are meant to work in collaboration with schools to establish safe learning environments (National Association of School Resource Officers, n.d.). While this is a federally defined term, there are many differences across state and local jurisdictions with respect to how officers are to operate within a school and the structure and processes used by the partnering organizations. These partnerships are largely established through memorandums of understanding between public school districts and local law enforcement agencies, though there are select instances in which a district will create its own police force. These cases, while not requiring explicit partnerships with law enforcement, operate in a similar capacity with respect to the objective of the program and are composed of individuals who previously worked in local law enforcement agencies.
The effectiveness and perceptions of SRO programs vary, particularly with respect to implications of SROs for minority student outcomes. On one hand, there is support for SRO programs given the saliency of school shootings and support for community policing (Cooper, 2020; NASRO, 2012b). In a survey, a majority of SROs have reported to have confiscated weapons from students (Trump, 2004) to promote a safer environment. Community concerns such as drug use and gang violence are also alleviated through having SROs present in schools to implement safety programs such as Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E) and Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T), among other community-based programs (McDaniel, 2001). SRO interactions with students have also been linked to increased trust and positive attitudes toward law enforcement officers (Theriot, 2016) such that students are more likely to report crimes (McDevitt and Panniello, 2005). Additionally, there is evidence indicating that teachers are likely to believe school safety has improved with the presence of law enforcement (Wood and Hampton, 2021).

On the other hand, others argue the programs are ineffective and lead to increasingly disproportionate action toward minority students (McFadden et al., 1992; Rocque, 2010; Wallace et al., 2008). For example, Black students experience higher discipline rates than their white peers regardless of the presence of law enforcement in public schools (McFadden et al., 1992; Merkwae, 2015). Tied to the increased use of zero-tolerance policies, race has been shown to play a significant role in SRO responses to student behavior, where racial bias has been empirically shown to influence law enforcement decision making when determining actions toward youth (see Graham and Lowery, 2004; Merkwae, 2015). In two experiments, Graham and Lowery tested if police and probation officers experience racial priming when given scenarios of adolescents committing property crimes following words related and unrelated to different racial
groups, finding that those exposed to words associated with Black racial categories did endorse harsher punishments than those exposed to neutral words. The analysis is further supported by more recent efforts to study the disciplinary actions taken toward students by race; for example, in a study of Minnesota public schools, Pentek and Eisenberg (2018) found students from underrepresented communities had a statistically significant more negative perception of law enforcement given SRO presence and experience a disproportionate increase in disciplinary actions (Crosse et. al 2021). Media outlets also indicate that the increased use and presence of SROs in public school settings may not improve the safety of students and staff in the buildings (Corley, 2018). While there is a wide array of opinions in support and opposition of SRO programs, the focus of these arguments is on outcomes of the partnership (i.e. crime prevention). There is limited data to support claims made among scholars, media outlets, and other resources that focus on other objectives of public education.

By establishing partnerships with law enforcement, it is possible that attention to other goals in education may be overlooked or experience a reduction in resource allocation. Particularly in cases where there are limited funding opportunities for education, the public school system may be required to allocate money and time the program. The presence of law enforcement may encourage additional safety trainings for educators and administrators, also detracting from time spent achieving education expectations. Further, how students react to the presence of law enforcement is unclear, though it is apparent the interactions are complex and may differ among different populations (Pentek and Eisenberg, 2018; Skiba et al., 2011; Theriot, 2009, 2016).

While there is ample research both with respect to partnerships and the distinct performance measures within public education, there is limited work discussing the potential
influence the partnership between law enforcement and education specifically has on student outcomes. One notable exception is Weisburst (2019), who found that disciplinary actions toward students in middle schools increase when local education agencies have funding through Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grants. Weisburst also concluded that Black students experience increased disciplinary action disproportionately more than their white peers and that there is a decrease in high school graduation rates and college enrollment among students who experience COPS affiliated programs. The following analysis aims to address this question and moves beyond existing research by focusing on differences in outcomes by race and expanding the analysis to SRO programs that may not have COPS funding.

**Data and Methods:**

Data are from the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES), the Office for Civil Rights within the Department of Education, and the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) Series by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The LEMAS Series by the Bureau of Justice Statistics was distributed in 2000, 2003, and 2007. The survey collects data from a nationally representative sample of law enforcement agencies and includes demographic characteristics, job functions, education, and training (Bureau of Justice Statistics, n.d.). For the purpose of this analysis, the number of full-time officers with arrest power and the number of School Resource Officers in the agency are the key variables collected from the surveys.

There is a limitation in the LEMAS data where there are inconsistencies in reporting across organizations. For example, Cochise County, Arizona reports having 107 SROs in 2000, but just one SRO in 2007. Ingham County, Michigan reports 183 SROs in 2003, 819 in 2003, but

---

9 It should be noted the COPS grants include SRO programs among other aspects of school safety such as metal detectors and cameras.
one and eight in 2000 and 2007. Because the number of SROs reported is the key independent variable, the limitation is addressed through calculating the percent change across each year to identify outliers that may represent data errors (i.e., changes that exceed 1000%, 500% or 200%). Each percent change is evaluated based on the magnitude of the SRO count for all three years evaluated. If all counts of SROs are below 50, then the observations remain unchanged, though if there is more than a 200% change in SROs and there is a clear outlier (such as Ingham County, Michigan) the outlier is adjusted to be a missing value. The evaluations were done on a case-by-case basis because there are instances in which a significant percent change could be the result of additional funding or reallocation of resources. Bibb County, for example, added an SRO between 2003 and 2007; while the percent change here is substantial, the smaller size of the agency may indicate receiving grant funding. From this data check, twenty four observations were replaced as missing values. Addressing the most notable changes allows for a better understanding of whether the data have been incorrectly documenting or if it is possible for smaller districts to have had opportunities to expand their departments. This process was followed for the number of full-time officers listed in each county; 334 observations were dropped using this method.

The key independent variable in this analysis is the number of SROs per one thousand students enrolled in a given county, logged. As this measure increases in value, there is a greater likelihood students will encounter and interact with a School Resource Officer. Higher values also suggest that more resources are being invested into the partnership.

The dependent variable is the total number of high school degrees earned and is measured in two different ways. The first hypothesis is tested by measuring the total number of diplomas earned per 100 students; this is used to evaluate the externalities affecting public education given
an increased presence of SROs in districts. To investigate the second hypothesis, the proportion of diploma recipients are analyzed as separate models for Hispanic, Black, and white students. These measures are calculated by evaluating the total number of students receiving diplomas by race/ethnicity as the numerator, and number of grade 12 students, also disaggregated by race, as the denominator and is calculated as a percentage. As the proportion increases, this would suggest that more of the possible number of students receiving diplomas has been met in each cohort of students. It is important to note that it is possible for students to not be registered as grade 12 students but to meet graduate requirements to receive diplomas. However, because there are few instances where this is the case, the dependent variable is an appropriate measure to compare across race with respect to all students graduating.

The dependent variables focus on the diplomas received rather than a graduation rate itself because of how the data are collected: OCR uses diplomas as its primary measure of graduation, though students may be considered graduates if they are receiving a certificate of completion. However, there are distinctions between diplomas and certificates, such as passing state examinations (see Department of Education, 2008a and MDES, 2018). For the purpose of this analysis, diplomas will be the measure to indicate completing graduation requirements and will be used interchangeably. There is discussion of the clarity and applicability of graduation and diploma recipients as performance measures (see Aldeman, 2015; Bailey et al., 2005; Swanson and Chaplin, 2003), though graduation is a common metric used to hold schools and districts accountable (Department of Education, n.d., 2005). Legislation seeking to improve graduation indicates political pressure to prioritize this goal, while balancing and achieving others (O’Toole and Meier, 2004). Further, receiving a high school diploma is a leading indicator across all states to evaluate school district performance (Reform Support Network, 2015). Such
an achievement is also an indicator of completing all state and federal requirements and provides opportunities for higher education, employment opportunities, or entry into the military (Department of Education, 2008b). While using a dependent variable focused on diplomas inherently removes lower grade levels, influences from earlier exposure to law enforcement are carried into higher grade levels (Legewie and Fagan, 2019) and act as measures of student achievement and learning by politically driven standards.

Several control variables are included to account for the characteristics of both school districts and counties. The percent of Hispanic, Black, and white students and percentage of students receiving an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) are collected from NCES and account for diversity of districts within a county. The total expenditures per pupil (logged) is included in the analysis and contribute to the socioeconomic status and size of the districts. While there has been some debate over the influence resources have on student achievement (Greenwald et al., 1996; Hanushek and Woessmann, 2017; Meier and O’Toole, 2001), including such variables allows for a more complete understanding of the environment in which students and SROs are interacting. For example, free and reduced lunch, a program to support student nutrition and provide opportunities for meals, is also indicative of the level of poverty in an area and is therefore connected to students to not completing high school (see Houck and Kurtz, 2010; Murnane, 2013).

County-level control variables include the unemployment rate, the percent of Democrat voters, and the crime per capita reported in each county, which were collected from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the MIT Election Data and Science Lab, and the National Neighborhood Data Archive, respectively. Inclusion of the percentage of Democrat voters from the 2000, 2004, and 2008 presidential elections measures the political landscape in a given county; incorporating the
political environment in analysis allows for a more complete understanding of attitudes toward law enforcement and education. Because attitudes toward law enforcement among voters and youth vary based on voting behavior (see Fine et al., 2019), responses to the partnership may be correlated with how individuals vote in larger elections.

Crime rates in a county are reported as the sum of total violent and property crimes (see Osgood, 2000). Violent crimes are considered any crime involving harm to an individual, including murder, sexual assault, aggravated assault, and battery. Property crimes are crimes involving damage or theft of property, including defacing property, vandalism, and arson (National Neighborhood Data Archive, n.d.). Using population data collected from the American Community Survey, the crime rates per capita were calculated and used in the analysis. While there is research suggesting that higher crime areas experience poorer performance in public schools (Bowen and Bowen, 1999), the measure is included to determine possible law enforcement interactions outside of a school setting. The logged value of full-time law enforcement officers per capita is included in analysis; this measures the likelihood of an individual interacting with law enforcement in any capacity outside of a school setting and therefore can influence the interactions students may have with law enforcement in an education space. Finally, the USDA’s Urban-Rural Continuum codes are included in the analysis. Counties are indexed with a ranking from 1 to 9, where 1 indicates the county is an urban area with a population exceeding 250,000 individuals and 9 indicates the county is a rural area not adjacent to a metropolitan area and has a population less than 2500. This variable measures both size and resource accessibility for each county. Summary statistics can be found in Table 1.

For the purpose of this study, school-based data were collected at the district level and aggregated to be matched with county-level data. It is important to note that multiple school
districts may fall within a single county, implying that important variance and nuance is lost. However, county-level averages still provide valuable insight considering the relationship between law enforcement and local education agencies. The following analysis uses ordinary least squares (OLS) regression with fixed effects for both state and year and unbalanced panel data from the 2000-2001, 2003-2004, and 2007-2008 school years. The unit of analysis is a county-year, where years in the dataset indicate the fall semester that is represented in the sample. Fixed effects for years are included to account for factors that may influence all counties over time (e.g., political and economic impacts), while state fixed effects account for factors that are unchanging across states; the standard errors are clustered by FIPS codes.

**Findings**

The analysis first focuses on the relationship between the total diplomas received in a county given the presence of School Resource Officers. Table 2 provides the results of this model. There is a positive association between the number of diplomas per 100 students received and logged value of SROs per one thousand students. Specifically, a one percent increase in SROs per one thousand students is associated with a 0.001 increase in total diplomas granted per 100 students. This would suggest that SRO programs support students completing high school and receiving a diploma, challenging the first hypothesis. The coefficient, while statistically significant, has limited practical meaning as the value is substantially small, suggesting little practical effect on the success of students completing graduation requirements and earning their diploma. Perhaps there are environmental factors that would encourage students to complete their programs, or the increased presence and dedication to the partnership tangentially allows for educators and administrators to dedicate their individual time and resources to other aspects of the learning objectives in public education systems.
Some control variables also indicate statistical significance but again are substantially small, suggesting the practical effect has on diplomas received is negligible. For example, a one percent increase in unemployment rate yields a 0.11 decrease in diplomas earned per 100 students, while a one unit increase in the total expenditure per pupil suggests a decrease of 0.27 diplomas per 100 students. While surprising, the magnitude indicates that this is not of practical significance and could be explained by increased overall spending, though this spending may not address goals and needs of students. Enrollment, specifically Black student enrollment, is associated with a 0.01 decrease in diplomas earned per 100 students. Control variables do demonstrate some correlation with the performance metric, enforcing previously supported claims of the environment contributing to organizational success.

Table 3 further explores the influence of collaborative presence on individual agency priorities, and models are disaggregated by race and acts as a baseline model. This dependent variable is the proportion of diplomas earned by Hispanic, Black, and white students, respectively. When evaluating the Black student model, the presence of SROs per one thousand students does not have a significant influence on Black student achievement. Among control variables, unemployment has a negative correlation, where a one percent increase in unemployment results in a 1.68% decrease in Black students earning diplomas. A one percent increase in Hispanic enrollment also yields a 0.33% decrease in Black student achievement.

The White student model also did not result in a statistically significant relationship between SRO presence and white student achievement. The lack of significant findings for the white student model further emphasizes that this interaction with law enforcement for white students may have no effect on their ability to complete school requirements and see success with respect to earning a diploma. Unemployment and Hispanic student enrollment prove to have
conflicting results where white student achievement decreases by 1.75% with a one percent increase in unemployment and a 0.16% increase with every one percent increase in Hispanic enrollment. Total full-time police officers also has a positive relationship with the proportion of white students earning diplomas, where this increase yields a 1.88% increase in white student diplomas.

When evaluating the base Hispanic student model, there is a statistically significant negative correlation; specifically, a one percent increase in SROs per one thousand students suggests a 0.04% decrease in the proportion of Hispanic students receiving diplomas. While the magnitude of such results is substantially small, the negative relationship suggests that there is some support for both the first and second hypothesis. When considering the positive findings for the collective model, there are several possible drivers for the differences in direction between the full student model and the negative correlation in the Hispanic student model. The presence of law enforcement could, perhaps, influence student decision making that results in an inability to attend school due to disciplinary outcomes (e.g. out-of-school suspension, expulsion), or fosters an environment where students are fearful to attend, increasing truancy or dropout rates. This would reduce the number of eligible students receiving their diplomas through the presence of law enforcement, though to some degree indirectly.

Such an explanation would also be an appropriate possibility for the overall number of students earning diplomas. Several controls resulted in influences on the proportion of students earning diplomas. Specifically, increases in unemployment resulted in a decrease in Hispanic student diplomas by 4.66%, while full-time police officers increased diploma proportions by 3.34%. This is interesting because such results seemingly conflict with the relationship found in the independent variable. The contrast between police per capita and the SROs per one thousand
students coefficients for this model may indicate that while the direct presence of law enforcement in schools negatively impacts Hispanic student achievement. This partially supports the second hypothesis that increased police presence may suggest that the community at large has resources to improve student success in the education space.

While the aggregate data exhibit slight improvements in achievement, suggesting an increased focus on the collaborative goal is benefiting service recipients, the experiences different student groups have with law enforcement can negatively impact specific cohorts of students, thereby negatively impacting equity of service and performance. An alternative explanation would consider that counties that have school systems with at least one SRO may have more readily available resources for students and stakeholders. There is ample research discussing increased resource availability and its effects student achievement (see Burtless, 2011; Gigliotti and Sorenson, 2018; Greenwald et al., 1996; Häkkinen et al., 2003; Hedges et al., 2016, among others) and while there is debate over the relationship due to differences in measurement, there is belief that additional resources at least do not have a negative impact on student achievement.

Considering the above findings, several robustness checks were conducted, evaluating county size, student diversity, and the political environment. These findings can be found in Tables 4-6; the dependent variables are again the proportion of eligible students, by race and ethnicity, earning high school diplomas. First, the evaluation of student diversity was focused on the percent of white students enrolled in each county, considering counties where over 50% of students are white and counties where under 50% of students are white. This allows for a measure to evaluate student, and perhaps county, diversity. This difference may explain differences in student experience in public education; in instances where there is a less diverse
population, for example, the lived experience will differ from minority students in areas where there is great diversity. Considering the size of the schools in a county, total enrollment was split at 15,000 students, where models evaluated counties with at least 15,000 students and counties below this value. Finally, the political environment is measured using the percent of individuals who voted for the Democrat nominee in the 2000, 2004, and 2008 presidential elections. There is an expected correlation between county diversity, size, and aggregate political ideology; while such correlation exists, understanding the degree to which each influences Hispanic, Black, and white student experiences, potential experiences with law enforcement and likelihood of graduating provides additional insight the degree to which agency performance and the partnership are influenced by environmental factors.

In areas where student enrollment is predominantly white, only the Hispanic student model yielded statistically significant findings, where the increase in SROs per one thousand students yields a 0.052% decrease in the proportion of Hispanic students earning diplomas. Smaller counties, where enrollment in the county is below 15,000 students, also yield negative findings, where the decrease is now 0.06% for every one percent increase in the SROs per one thousand students. Finally, considering the voting population in each county, counties that do not have a Democrat majority for the presidential elections also indicate that increasing the independent variable again yields a decrease in the proportion of Hispanic students earning diplomas by 0.05%.

In the case of the Hispanic student model, the lack of student diversity in these environments may contribute to both the interactions students have with law enforcement in public education settings but also to their experience in these school environments with teachers, staff, and their peers. Given the consistencies across models where there are less populated, less
diverse areas, this suggests that there are interactions occurring here were partnerships between law enforcement and public school systems inhibit Hispanic student success in these areas. Potential reasons for this could be implicit biases and lived experiences of students and their community that contribute to decreased performance in such counties. Cultural differences, for example, that may not be absorbed by region, such as relationships with law enforcement and states with explicit legislation at this time to encourage or mandate law enforcement in schools, may explain the relationship described in these models.

This may also be an example of limited resource availability for counties with these characteristics. Further investigation indicated that states that share a greater portion of the samples in each model are geographically located in the southern and midwestern sections of the country, though it should be noted that most states are represented in these samples. These findings further support both the first and second hypothesis.

When evaluating the Black and white student models, there are again no statistically significant findings between the independent and dependent variable with these model specifications. Again, consistent with the baseline models, this indicates that, given the sample, it is unclear if there is a correlation between the presence of law enforcement and the proportion of students earning diplomas. While the relationship cannot be determined, this does suggest that there are other factors at play that can contribute to partnership and individual goals. In the case of SRO programs, the presence of law enforcement in school systems could contribute to differences in student performance, but it is evident there are other factors influencing student performance.

These findings also highlight the need for additional work and suggests analysis is needed to further evaluate this relationship. For example, counties that rely on federal grants and
assistance to fund programs are subject to guidelines and expectations others are exempt from. For example, the passing of the Gun-Free Schools Act in 1994 mandated zero-tolerance policies for schools which use state, and in turn federal, aid (Gun-Free Schools Act, 1994). While data indicating which school districts and counties receiving such aid are unavailable, policy and public responses to policies may further explain the relationship between the presence of law enforcement in schools and the unintended consequences to student outcomes.

Implications

The purpose of the above analysis is to understand to what degree, if at all, shifts in agency resource allocation result in unexpected outcomes to other agency objectives. Further, the analysis dives into potential differences across service recipients, addressing a question of equity in collaborative arrangements. Law enforcement in schools may have negative unintended consequences among students. For instance, the presence of SROs could foster an environment in which some students are concerned about or uncomfortable with the potential encounter with law enforcement, for fear of discrimination (Miller and Jean-Jacques, 2016). Attitudes toward law enforcement may encourage undesirable behavior such as truancy (Bazemore et al., 2004; Monahan et al., 2014), which then results in decreases in student achievement (see Rivers, 2010). For example, Black students experience gaps in graduation rates and math and reading scores compared to their white peers and are also more likely to be suspended or expelled (Hanushek et al., 2019; Pearman et al., 2019; Skiba et al., 2011; Williams, 2011). The increased risk of disciplinary action and lack of trust in law enforcement and decreased student outcomes suggest there is some goal conflict between education outcomes and school safety at large. The influence SROs may have on student achievement, then, can compound education outcomes and issues of equity.
The above analysis finds that increasing the presence of SROs has a slight positive influence on the percentage of students earning a high school diploma but demonstrates some inequity of service among different racial and ethnic groups. Considering the proportions of Black, Hispanic, and white students earning diplomas to their respective grade 12 enrollments, there is some support indicating that there is a negative student outcome among Hispanic students as the presence of law enforcement increases in education. These findings are in ways at odds with one another and with previous education policy literature; where there is no support for the first hypothesis, there is some support for the second. The former indicates that increasing visibility of a collective goal may allow for agency-specific goals to experience newfound attention from within an organization. This would allow for resources dedicated to agency-specific goals to be used with greater effectiveness, improving those outcomes. The latter findings, however, suggest that perhaps there is an increased inequity of services among different groups of clientele; while resources are available to agency-specific goals, this does not eliminate challenges faced by service recipients experiencing inequity. In the case of SRO programs, previously inequitable service delivery in education is exacerbated by the increased presences of law enforcement in schools. This may be explained by resource allocation to the collective goal inhibiting success of the agency-specific goals.

Further investigation indicated that counties in areas with limited diversity and areas with a more politically conservative leaning contribute to the proportion of students earning diplomas by race and ethnicity. Primarily in southern and midwestern states, there is potential that influences such as trust in government, trust in law enforcement, and state and federal policy influences are contributing to the degree to which discrepancies in service are experienced among students. Additional analysis of student demographics is encouraged as these findings
indicate that a relationship is prevalent and consistent with literature suggesting minority student, specifically Hispanic, achievement is lower than that of white students (Becerra, 2012; Corry et al., 2017; Kohler and Lazarín, 2007).

It is important to acknowledge there are some possible explanations for diverging results when evaluating aggregate achievement and achievement by race and ethnicity, particularly when considering the negative relationship depicted in the Hispanic student models. This could in part be due to resource availability among larger school systems in more Democratic leaning counties. While measures for resource availability are disputed, there is evidence across different measures of resources (e.g., teacher quality, effective resource allocation, etc.) that there is potential for all students to improve in these settings (see Barile, n.d.; Goe and Stickler, 2008; Stronge et al., 2007; Wallace Foundation, n.d.). The presence of SROs in this analysis also be measuring an availability for such resources, though further investigation is encouraged to determine the correlation between resource availability and SRO presence. Systems with SROs could be the result of resource availability but could also be the result of federal or state funding to provide the financial resources to have such a collaboration.

The decisions made by service recipients, as a response to decisions made within the organizations, are an important aspect of the relationship between service decisions and outcomes. While there are decisions made within the organization to emphasize the presence of SROs and a decision to invest in this collaboration, there are additional unintended consequences such as changes in educator behavior as a result of such a collaboration. Perhaps educators no longer feel responsible for the lower-level disciplinary responsibilities of their roles and reinvest this time on teaching or administrative responsibilities. Alternatively, educators may now feel an additional presence to adjust behavior and increase disciplinary action taken toward students.
While decisions made within the organization, reactions by students receiving the services may vary and are consistent with previous literature surrounding truancy and student achievement (see Monahan et al., 2014; Servoss, 2017).

This study contributes to theoretical discussions of collaborative arrangements and their influence on organizational behavior. Public organizations are tasked with completing objectives and performance measures often set by organizational mission or outside stakeholders. Because public agencies do not exist in a vacuum, and there are instances in which an agency will face scenarios requiring external resources or specialization. While agencies gain resources when entering a partnership, these are often allocated to the collective goal, limiting what is available with respect to time, knowledge, and other scarce resources for agency-specific goals. There are two possible outcomes for reprioritized goals: either the outside organization alleviates agency bureaucrats from other responsibilities and allows for more attention to agency-specific goals, or the presence of an outside organization and reprioritizing collective goals threatens other agency obligations and autonomy. The latter suggests that agency-specific goals may be secondary to the collaborative effort and subject these goals to poorer performance than prior to the collaborative structure. In the case of public education, decision makers are forced to reconcile public safety and meeting federal, state, and local objectives for students to complete their educations. While the current analysis finds some evidence suggesting the partnership improves agency-specific outcomes as a whole, focused investigation by race and ethnicity indicate these findings are more nuanced, and the magnitude of all models indicates that regardless of whether a partnership helps or hinders outcomes, there is a limited effect of the partnership on outcomes that fall outside of the collaboration. This suggests that there may be other, more significant influences on student outcomes and the equity of those outcomes.
There are some weaknesses in the above analysis. As previously noted, the discrepancies in data reported from the LEMAS surveys challenge the integrity of some observations collected from the survey. While thoroughly cleaned, it is unclear to what degree law enforcement agencies misreported their data. Further, the analysis is limited to three separate school year intervals. The data collected from the National Center of Education Statistics closely matches the data collected from the LEAMS surveys - collected at the end of their respective years - completion data from the Office for Civil Rights is only consistent with these other datasets for the year 2000, where the remaining years were collected in 2004 and 2006. Not only is there potential for differences in what was reported in these years, but the limited number of years collected naturally limits the scope of analysis. More recent and regular surveys from law enforcement agencies and OCR would enable a more current analysis.

The unit of analysis and gaps in data available also proved to be a challenge when collecting county-level control variables. Some variance and power are lost from the school or district level results by aggregating to the county level. While there is benefit to this as this allows for data to be cross walked for a more complete dataset, losing the variance across school and district level experiences removes the nuances of interactions between students and law enforcement. Further, because data were inconsistently collected from federal agencies, potentially useful county-level control variables are missed, such as percentages of individuals in poverty by race, homeowners by race, and access to social services. Such measures are not available through the American Community Survey nor are provided through the Census Bureau or other federal agencies providing services to address these needs (e.g., the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, etc.).
The data are also considerably older than preferred for analysis. This is, again, due to the inconsistencies in when and how datasets have been compiled by individual organizations. The inconsistencies in LEMAS surveys, variables collected by OCR and NCES, and the control variables collected resulted in a completed dataset that is seemingly antiquated. While removed from the current SRO programs, the dataset still provides meaningful evaluations of current programs. Given such partnerships still exist and are a result of ongoing formal and informal arrangements between police departments and school districts and given the lack of data available but increasing attention to such programs, it is necessary to evaluate what is currently published and encourage greater frequency and consistency of collect from the appropriate federal agencies.

Finally, the dependent variables used in the analysis focus on the completion of high school as indicated by a high school diploma. While an effective measure of completion, additional measures such as drop-out rates would perhaps offer a different insight to consequences of partnerships with law enforcement agencies. The current study could not use drop-out rates as it is classified by OCR as restricted data, but there is room for additional analysis give the opportunity to access and use data of this kind. Other potential measures to evaluate would be calculated gaps in achievement based on race or gender, employment following graduation, college readiness, and college or vocational school retention. Because students are future members of the workforce, understanding student outcomes influenced by partnerships in education is important not only for public education systems and law enforcement agencies, but for other aspects of society.

The above analysis also offers implications for practice. Given the increased salience of SRO programs, particularly due to the continued shifts of extending and terminating contracts
between law enforcement agencies and schools, a better understanding of how SROs influence  
the school environment can provide additional context and information for those drafting  
contracts between public schools and law enforcement agencies. While there are decisions being  
made despite limited empirical work understanding the outcomes of such partnerships, findings  
evaluating the consequences of SRO programs is timely with respect to student rights and  
learning outcomes. Future analysis is needed to better capture the current law enforcement and  
education environment, though the trends in the analysis highlight the importance of balancing  
goals and encourage discussion among decision makers, both when establishing a partnership  
and throughout the collaborative arrangement. Information sharing and clarity in goals are  
reinforced in questioning how balancing goals may result in unintended outcomes.  

Collaborative arrangements will likely continue to be discussed in the public sector for  
the foreseeable future. Given the ongoing use of this practice, understanding the limitations  
experienced by organizations outside of the collaboration is essential to improving both  
collaborative performance and performance beyond the partnership. Addressing the  
consequences to autonomous decision making and performance also combats challenges of  
inequity of service and improves organizational capacity to provide equitable and efficient  
service to constituents. Expanding upon this question is encouraged to better understand decision  
making and evaluating how to balance agency and collaborative tasks within an organization.  
Evaluating how managers and implementers at all structural levels of organizations engaged in  
partnerships will further advance questions and research in collaborative management literature.
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### Tables and Figures

#### Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SROs per 1000 students (logged)</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>-1.135</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>-4.922</td>
<td>4.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomas per 100 students</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>4.986</td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of eligible Hispanic students receiving diploma (%)</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>53.403</td>
<td>48.177</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of eligible Black students receiving diploma (%)</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>61.786</td>
<td>47.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of eligible white students receiving diploma (%)</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>77.227</td>
<td>25.796</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-Rural Continuum</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>3.718</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate (%)</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>5.167</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Democrat in presidential election (%)</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>42.539</td>
<td>11.457</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>89.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students receiving free/reduced</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students receiving IEP (%)</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic enrollment (%)</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>9.286</td>
<td>15.689</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black enrollment (%)</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>13.757</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White enrollment (%)</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>72.535</td>
<td>23.545</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime per capita</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROs per 1000 students (logged)</td>
<td>0.138***</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate (%)</td>
<td>-0.110***</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-Rural Continuum</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Democrat in presidential election (%)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students receiving IEP (%)</td>
<td>-1.070</td>
<td>(1.443)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.011***</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime per capita</td>
<td>-0.458</td>
<td>(2.373)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure per pupil (logged)</td>
<td>-0.269***</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table 3: Percent of Student Diplomas Earned by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SROs per 1000 students (logged)</td>
<td>-4.120***</td>
<td>-1.248</td>
<td>-0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.301)</td>
<td>(1.180)</td>
<td>(0.701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate (%)</td>
<td>-4.644***</td>
<td>-1.682**</td>
<td>-1.746***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.735)</td>
<td>(0.795)</td>
<td>(0.512)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-Rural Continuum</td>
<td>-3.935***</td>
<td>-3.787***</td>
<td>-1.476***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.535)</td>
<td>(0.603)</td>
<td>(0.318)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Democrat in presidential election (%)</td>
<td>-0.325***</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students receiving IEP (%)</td>
<td>-37.470</td>
<td>-1.436</td>
<td>0.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.866)</td>
<td>(30.577)</td>
<td>(22.566)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.330***</td>
<td>0.158***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.576***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.676***</td>
<td>-0.442***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime per capita</td>
<td>333.309***</td>
<td>194.523***</td>
<td>60.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(64.729)</td>
<td>(67.521)</td>
<td>(41.166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure per pupil (logged)</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td>3.080**</td>
<td>-3.578***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.474)</td>
<td>(1.436)</td>
<td>(0.904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police per capita</td>
<td>3.336***</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>1.882***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.965)</td>
<td>(0.991)</td>
<td>(0.558)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table 4: Percent of Student Diplomas Earned by Race - Diversity in School Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic Majority</th>
<th>Black Majority</th>
<th>Hispanic White</th>
<th>Black White</th>
<th>Nonwhite Majority</th>
<th>White Nonwhite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SROs per 1000 students (logged)</td>
<td>-5.233***</td>
<td>-2.173</td>
<td>-1.022</td>
<td>-0.571</td>
<td>-0.444</td>
<td>1.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.478)</td>
<td>(1.439)</td>
<td>(0.818)</td>
<td>(2.629)</td>
<td>(1.936)</td>
<td>(1.444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (%)</td>
<td>-6.361***</td>
<td>-3.192***</td>
<td>-2.438***</td>
<td>-1.235</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>-0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.951)</td>
<td>(0.610)</td>
<td>(1.011)</td>
<td>(1.354)</td>
<td>(1.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.563)</td>
<td>(0.651)</td>
<td>(0.341)</td>
<td>(1.606)</td>
<td>(1.392)</td>
<td>(0.999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Democrat in president</td>
<td>-0.245*</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>-0.401</td>
<td>-0.290*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (%)</td>
<td>-6.361***</td>
<td>-3.192***</td>
<td>-2.438***</td>
<td>-1.235</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>-0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.951)</td>
<td>(0.610)</td>
<td>(1.011)</td>
<td>(1.354)</td>
<td>(1.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.563)</td>
<td>(0.651)</td>
<td>(0.341)</td>
<td>(1.606)</td>
<td>(1.392)</td>
<td>(0.999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime per capita</td>
<td>309.552***</td>
<td>239.689***</td>
<td>20.223</td>
<td>281.598*</td>
<td>40.052</td>
<td>88.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(81.188)</td>
<td>(90.395)</td>
<td>(42.871)</td>
<td>(157.952)</td>
<td>(95.558)</td>
<td>(105.494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>-1.418</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>-4.882***</td>
<td>-2.771</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.770)</td>
<td>(1.727)</td>
<td>(1.068)</td>
<td>(2.510)</td>
<td>(2.932)</td>
<td>(1.919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police per capita</td>
<td>3.876***</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>1.941***</td>
<td>-0.523</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.044)</td>
<td>(1.080)</td>
<td>(0.624)</td>
<td>(2.392)</td>
<td>(2.085)</td>
<td>(1.374)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table 5: Percent of Student Diplomas Earned by Race- Enrollment Split at 15000 Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Enrollment ≥ 15000</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Enrollment &lt; 15000</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROs per 1000 students</td>
<td>-0.639</td>
<td>-2.129</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-6.187***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(logged)</td>
<td>(1.600)</td>
<td>(1.442)</td>
<td>(0.955)</td>
<td>(1.864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate (%)</td>
<td>-2.992***</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.865</td>
<td>-3.975***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.962)</td>
<td>(1.002)</td>
<td>(0.723)</td>
<td>(0.995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-Rural Continuum</td>
<td>-3.557**</td>
<td>-4.470***</td>
<td>-4.267***</td>
<td>-2.730***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.545)</td>
<td>(1.441)</td>
<td>(0.924)</td>
<td>(0.632)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Democrat in</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.428**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presidential election (%)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students receiving IEP (%)</td>
<td>-29.344</td>
<td>-23.432</td>
<td>34.742</td>
<td>-55.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39.240)</td>
<td>(36.267)</td>
<td>(28.809)</td>
<td>(46.620)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.270*</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>-0.811***</td>
<td>-0.137*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.541***</td>
<td>-0.394***</td>
<td>-0.736***</td>
<td>-0.342***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime per capita</td>
<td>254.965*</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-14.374</td>
<td>204.936**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(116.952)</td>
<td>(77.280)</td>
<td>(77.280)</td>
<td>(80.908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure per</td>
<td>-2.700</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>-3.056**</td>
<td>-0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupil (logged)</td>
<td>(1.815)</td>
<td>(1.738)</td>
<td>(1.278)</td>
<td>(2.527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police per capita</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>3.936**</td>
<td>2.047*</td>
<td>3.922***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.620)</td>
<td>(1.537)</td>
<td>(1.042)</td>
<td>(1.246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.263</td>
<td>0.230**</td>
<td>-0.383**</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.174)</td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.189)</td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis  
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
### Table 6: Percent of Student Diplomas Earned by Race- Political Environment by Democrat Vote Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrat Majority</th>
<th></th>
<th>Republican Majority</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROs per 1000 students (logged)</td>
<td>-1.964</td>
<td>-0.850</td>
<td>-1.231</td>
<td>-5.296***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.354)</td>
<td>(1.972)</td>
<td>(1.445)</td>
<td>(1.477)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate (%)</td>
<td>-2.563***</td>
<td>-0.926</td>
<td>-2.202**</td>
<td>-5.295***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.080)</td>
<td>(1.315)</td>
<td>(0.901)</td>
<td>(0.942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.502)</td>
<td>(1.647)</td>
<td>(0.779)</td>
<td>(0.570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Democrat in presidential election (%)</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.328*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.255)</td>
<td>(0.307)</td>
<td>(0.197)</td>
<td>(0.189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students receiving IEP (%)</td>
<td>-15.329</td>
<td>-2.132</td>
<td>47.652</td>
<td>-68.876*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46.696)</td>
<td>(49.897)</td>
<td>(36.498)</td>
<td>(39.509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.340**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.400**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.225)</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.820***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>-0.505***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.724***</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.685***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.139)</td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime per capita</td>
<td>353.848***</td>
<td>68.888</td>
<td>140.233</td>
<td>327.871***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(129.862)</td>
<td>(106.592)</td>
<td>(85.062)</td>
<td>(81.104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure per pupil (logged)</td>
<td>6.435***</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>-1.918</td>
<td>-3.445*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.401)</td>
<td>(2.863)</td>
<td>(1.844)</td>
<td>(1.794)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police per capita</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>1.981</td>
<td>2.379**</td>
<td>3.981***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.260)</td>
<td>(2.062)</td>
<td>(1.182)</td>
<td>(1.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
## Appendix
### Chapter 1

### Table A1: Descriptive Statistics of Agencies That Applied to CIS and Did Not Have SROs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Agencies with SROs in state</td>
<td>4144</td>
<td>45.878</td>
<td>12.737</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>85.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime by minors per capita (logged)</td>
<td>3881</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>-3.696</td>
<td>3.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>3809</td>
<td>15.678</td>
<td>2.669</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Enrollment %</td>
<td>3986</td>
<td>9.942</td>
<td>15.526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Enrollment %</td>
<td>3986</td>
<td>12.182</td>
<td>16.441</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Enrollment %</td>
<td>3982</td>
<td>73.303</td>
<td>22.231</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Democrat Voter</td>
<td>3710</td>
<td>47.868</td>
<td>18.054</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate %</td>
<td>4142</td>
<td>5.253</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Gov</td>
<td>4144</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2A: Descriptive Statistics of Law Enforcement Agencies Without SROs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>9148</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime by minors per capita (logged)</td>
<td>8591</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>-3.696</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Agencies with SROs in state</td>
<td>9148</td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>12.328</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>85.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>8534</td>
<td>15.248</td>
<td>2.621</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Enrollment %</td>
<td>8817</td>
<td>10.104</td>
<td>16.007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Enrollment %</td>
<td>8817</td>
<td>13.395</td>
<td>18.068</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Enrollment %</td>
<td>8794</td>
<td>72.245</td>
<td>23.533</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Democrat Voter</td>
<td>8143</td>
<td>47.718</td>
<td>17.717</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate %</td>
<td>9146</td>
<td>5.179</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Gov</td>
<td>9148</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter 2

### Table A1: Regression results for Composite Willingness Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both Groups</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Police Chiefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to partner agency’s mission</td>
<td>0.016***</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to own agency’s mission</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.033**</td>
<td>-0.062**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience in field</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>-0.421*</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.233)</td>
<td>(0.251)</td>
<td>(0.466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County unemployment rate (%)</td>
<td>-0.474***</td>
<td>-0.313*</td>
<td>-0.502*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.167)</td>
<td>(0.175)</td>
<td>(0.289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who voted Democrat in 2020 (%)</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>-1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.094)</td>
<td>(1.301)</td>
<td>(1.701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** \(p<0.01\), ** \(p<0.05\), * \(p<0.1\)

### Table A2: Regression results for Measure of Differences in Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both Groups</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Police Chiefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.019**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience in field</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>0.180*</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.102)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.321)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County unemployment rate (%)</td>
<td>-0.140*</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic student enrollment (%)</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who voted Democrat in 2020 (%)</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>-0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.495)</td>
<td>(0.323)</td>
<td>(1.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parenthesis

*** \(p<0.01\), ** \(p<0.05\), * \(p<0.1\)
Table A3: T-Tests results for Differences of Means across current involvement with SROs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No SRO</th>
<th>SRO</th>
<th>Mean1</th>
<th>Mean2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A4: T-Test results for Difference of Means across Superintendents and Police Chiefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Chiefs</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean1</th>
<th>Mean2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own agency Alignment</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>91.706</td>
<td>87.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness Factor</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-.494</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A1: Box Plot for Composite Willingness Scores Among Chiefs and Superintendents
Figure A2: Superintendent Survey

1. How long, in years, have you been working in public education?
2. How long, in years, have you been working for your current school district?
3. How long, in years have you been in your current role as superintendent?
4. In which state do you work? (Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Other)
   If Indiana, Michigan, or Ohio: In county do you work?
   If Other: What is the zip code for your workplace?
5. How important are the following when considering your role as superintendent?
   Not at all important, Slightly important, Moderately important, Very important, Extremely important
   Oversight of teachers and administrators
   Liaison to the community
   Decision making over contracts with outside organizations (e.g. other districts, nonprofit organizations, local government, etc.)
   Implementing policies determined by state and federal government
   Hiring and firing of officers and staff
   Training new employees
   Setting organizational goals
   Establishing and directing a strategic plan
   Other (Please specify)
6. The US Department of Education states their mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access." How closely do you identify with this statement? Assume that 0 indicates "not at all" and 100 indicates "fully identify".
   Sliding scale from 0 to 100
7. The Bureau of Justice Statistics defines law enforcement as "responsible for enforcing laws and maintaining public order and safety" and "includes the prevention, detection, and investigation of crime, and the apprehension and detention of individuals suspected of law violation". To what degree do you believe your school district's mission aligns with the mission described here? Assume 0 indicates no alignment and 100 indicates the mission fully aligns with the mission stated.
   Sliding scale 0 to 100
8. How would you describe the role of public safety in your community with respect to importance?
   Not at all important, Slightly important, Moderately important, Very important, Extremely important
   To resolve conflict
To act as a liaison between the justice system and the community
Provide social service
To act as first responders to events of crisis

9. When considering decision making in law enforcement, how would you describe the influence each of the following has?

- No influence at all
- Very little influence
- Neutral party
- Substantial influence
- The most influence

- The police chief
- The police union
- The community
- State level government agency
- Other aspects of the justice system
- Other agency, please specify

The follow questions are meant to collect information about your school district's School Resource Officer Programs and your opinions regarding your district's partnership with local law enforcement agencies. As stated by the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO), School Resource Officers (SROs) are defined as "career law enforcement officer with sworn authority who is deployed by an employing police department or agency in a community-oriented policing assignment to work in collaboration with one or more schools."

10. To what degree are the following qualities important when considering a partnership?

- Not at all important
- Slightly important
- Moderately important
- Very important
- Extremely important

- The law enforcement agency has resources that are needed for your school district (e.g. monetary resources, specialized skills, political influence, etc).
- The law enforcement agency appears to be well performing and high achieving
- The law enforcement agency has wide reach to service recipients you may not reach without the partnership
- The law enforcement agency has a mission statement that is similar to your school district's mission
- The law enforcement agency's structure is similar to your school district's structure
- The individuals receiving services from your school district are similar, or the same, as the individuals receiving services from the partnering law enforcement agency
- The culture in the law enforcement agency is similar to the culture in your school district.
- There is an overlap of key values between your school district and the law enforcement agency
- The law enforcement agency initiates the request to partner
- The law enforcement agency is willing to conform to your school district's culture and values.

11. How many School Resource Officers are in your school district?

- Full Time
- Part Time

12. How is your partnership with law enforcement currently defined?

- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
Formal cost sharing
Informal arrangement

13. When establishing a partnership with law enforcement agencies, how willing are you to commit to the following?

**Very unwilling, Somewhat unwilling, Neutral, Somewhat willing, Very willing**
- Losing some authority over SROs
- Including law enforcement in decision making for program expectations
- Including law enforcement leadership in determining SRO contracts
- Including law enforcement leadership in determining SRO training
- Allowing school district leadership (at all levels) to inform and direct SROs on day to day activity

14. How do you believe your SROs should be allotting their time in this position? Please indicate the percentage and ensure it equals 100%.
- Enforcing school rules, Enforcing state/federal law, Teaching public safety to students, Acting as an informal counselor, Other. Please specify

15. Which agency initiated your current SRO program? Please select all that apply.
- The law enforcement agency
- My school district
- An elected official
- A third party

16. How active are each of the following in the SRO selection process?

**Uninvolved in selection process, Not very active, Somewhat active, Very active, The most active (Led selection process)**
- Police Chief, Police Union, School Board, Superintendent, Student Representative(s), Community Representative, Local government leadership (Mayor, City Council, etc.), Other (please specify)

17. How influential are each of the following in the SRO selection process?

**Uninvolved, Very little influence, Moderate influence, Substantial influence, The most influence**
- Police Chief, Police Union, School Board, Superintendent, Student Representative(s), Community Representative, Local government leadership (Mayor, City Council, etc.), Other (please specify)

18. Regarding your current SRO program, to what degree do you agree with the following?

**Strongly disagree, Somewhat disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat agree, Strongly agree**
- Communication by administrators is equal and effective
- There are clearly defined rules and objectives
- There is shared accountability in the partnership
- Officers report equally to administrators in both agencies
19. Are there specific challenges you would like to share in regards to establishing and maintaining your current SRO program?

20. How would you describe your political ideology?
   Very conservative, Conservative, Moderate/middle of the road, Liberal, Very liberal

21. What is your gender?
   Male, Female, Other, Prefer not to answer

22. What is your race?
   Black or African American, Native American or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White or Caucasian, Biracial or Multiracial, Other, Prefer not to answer

23. Do you consider yourself Latino/a/x or Hispanic?
   Yes, No

24. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   Less than a high school diploma, High School diploma or equivalent, Some college, Bachelor's degree or equivalent, Master's degree, Doctorate

25. What is your age?
Figure A3: Police Chief Survey

1. How long, in years, have you been working in law enforcement?
2. How long, in years, have you been working for your current law enforcement agency?
3. How long, in years have you been in your current role as police chief?
4. In which state do you work? (Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Other)
   If Indiana, Michigan, or Ohio: In county do you work?
   If Other: What is the zip code for your workplace?

5. How important are the following when considering your role as superintendent?
   Not at all important, Slightly important, Moderately important, Very important, Extremely important
   Oversight of police force
   Liaison to the community
   Decision making over contracts with outside organizations (e.g. other districts, nonprofit organizations, local government, etc.)
   Implementing policies determined by state and federal government
   Hiring and firing of officers and staff
   Training new employees
   Setting organizational goals
   Establishing and directing a strategic plan
   Other (Please specify)

6. The Bureau of Justice Statistics defines law enforcement as "responsible for enforcing laws and maintaining public order and safety" and "includes the prevention, detection, and investigation of crime, and the apprehension and detention of individuals suspected of law violation." Assume that 0 indicates "not at all" and 100 indicates "fully identify". Sliding scale from 0 to 100

7. The US Department of Education states their mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access." To what degree do you believe your law enforcement agency's mission aligns with the mission described here? Assume 0 indicates no alignment at 100 indicates your agency's mission fully aligns.
   Sliding scale 0 to 100

8. How would you describe the role of public education in your community with respect to importance?
   Not at all important, Slightly important, Moderately important, Very important, Extremely important
   To provide universal access to free education
To guarantee equal opportunity for all children
To teach state/federal education mandates
Provide social service
To prepare people to become economically self-sufficient

9. When considering decision making in law enforcement, how would you describe the influence each of the following has?

- No influence at all
- Very little influence
- Neutral party
- Substantial influence
- The most influence

Superintendent
PTA
School Board
State level government agency
Student representation
Other agency, please specify

The following questions are meant to collect information about your school district's School Resource Officer Programs and your opinions regarding your district's partnership with local law enforcement agencies. As stated by the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO), School Resource Officers (SROs) are defined as "career law enforcement officer with sworn authority who is deployed by an employing police department or agency in a community-oriented policing assignment to work in collaboration with one or more schools."

10. To what degree are the following qualities important when considering a partnership?

- Not at all important
- Slightly important
- Moderately important
- Very important
- Extremely important

The school district has resources that are needed for your law enforcement agency (e.g. monetary resources, specialized skills, political influence, etc.)
The school district appears to be well performing and high achieving
The school district has wide reach to service recipients you may not reach without the partnership
The school district has a mission statement that is similar to your law enforcement agency's mission.
The school district's structure is similar to your law enforcement agency's structure
The individuals receiving services from your law enforcement agency are similar, or the same, as the individuals receiving services from the partnering school district
The culture in the school district is similar to the culture in your law enforcement agency
There is an overlap of key values between your law enforcement agency and the school district
The school district initiates the request to partner
The school district is willing to conform to your law enforcement agency's culture and values

11. How many School Resource Officers are in your school district?

- Full Time
- Part Time

12. How is your partnership with law enforcement currently defined
13. When establishing a partnership with law enforcement agencies, how willing are you to commit to the following?

**Very unwilling, Somewhat unwilling, Neutral, Somewhat willing, Very willing**

- Losing some authority over SROs
- Including law enforcement in decision making for program expectations
- Including law enforcement leadership in determining SRO contracts
- Including law enforcement leadership in determining SRO training
- Allowing school district leadership (at all levels) to inform and direct SROs on day to day activity

14. How do you believe your SROs should be allotting their time in this position? Please indicate the percentage and ensure it equals 100%.

- Enforcing school rules
- Enforcing state/federal law
- Teaching public safety to students
- Acting as an informal counselor
- Other (please specify)

15. Which agency initiated your current SRO program? Please select all that apply.

- My law enforcement agency
- The school district
- An elected official
- A third party

16. How **active** are each of the following in the SRO selection process?

**Uninvolved in selection process, Not very active, Somewhat active, Very active, The most active (Led selection process)**

- Police Chief
- Police Union
- School Board
- Superintendent
- Student Representative(s)
- Community Representative
- Local government leadership (Mayor, City Council, etc.)
- Other (please specify)

17. How **influential** are each of the following in the SRO selection process?

**Uninvolved, Very little influence, Moderate influence, Substantial influence, The most influence**

- Police Chief
- Police Union
- School Board
- Superintendent
- Student Representative(s)
- Community Representative
- Local government leadership (Mayor, City Council, etc.)
- Other (please specify)
18. Regarding your current SRO program, to what degree do you agree with the following?

   Strongly disagree, Somewhat disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat agree, Strongly agree
   Communication by administrators is equal and effective
   There are clearly defined rules and objectives
   There is shared accountability in the partnership
   Officers report equally to administrators in both agencies

19. Are there specific challenges you would like to share in regards to establishing and maintaining your current SRO program?

20. How would you describe your political ideology?
   Very conservative, Conservative, Moderate/middle of the road, Liberal, Very liberal

21. What is your gender?
   Male, Female, Other, Prefer not to answer

22. What is your race?
   Black or African American, Native American or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White or Caucasian, Biracial or Multiracial, Other, Prefer not to answer

23. Do you consider yourself Latino/a/x or Hispanic?
   Yes, No

24. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   Less than a high school diploma, High School diploma or equivalent, Some college, Bachelor's degree or equivalent, Master's degree, Doctorate

25. What is your age?
Megan Eileen Darnley
O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs
Indiana University
1315 E 10th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405

Education
Ph.D. Public Policy, O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs and College of Arts and Sciences
Political Science Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, August 2022
Committee: Amanda Rutherford (chair), Sean Nicholson-Crotty, Thomas Rabovsky, William Bianco
Dissertation: Drivers of Interagency Cooperation and Partnership Outcomes: The Case of School Resource Officers
M.P.A. Public Management, O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, May 2017
B.S. Mathematics and Philosophy, Trinity College, Hartford, CT, May 2015 Advisors: David Mauro, Kari Theurer

Published Work

Works in Progress
Rutherford, Amanda and Megan Darnley, “Can external actors influence internal organizational outcomes? The case of school resource officers and disproportionate student discipline”
Darnley, Megan and Shannon Conley. “Administrative absorption: Improving equity in higher education enrollment and outcomes”

Research & Professional Experience
Research Assistant, Fall 2018-Fall 2020: Amanda Rutherford
Program Analyst, Summer 2016: Government Accountability Office, Natural Resource and Environment Team, “GAO-17-144: Grants Management- EPA partially follows leading practices of strategic workforce planning and could take additional steps” and testimony for Congressional Natural Resources Committee
Sustainability Coordinator, Fall 2015-Spring 2017: Monroe County Commissioners Office

Research Interests
K-12 Education Policy, Higher Education Policy, Collaboration, Interagency Cooperation, Political Control, Public Management
Professional Service

Panel Chair, Nonprofit and Arts Management Panel. O’Neill Honors Research Symposium
Spring 2021
Chair, Association of SPEA Ph.D. Students 2019 Annual Conference. Association of SPEA
Ph.D. Students Executive Board
Contributing Writer, “State Economic Development and Post-Secondary Education: Variance in
the Value of a Degree.” National Science Foundation Grant, May 2017-August 2017.
Principal Investigators: Amanda Rutherford and Kenneth J. Meier Not funded.

Conferences

“Conflict between agency-specific and collective performance goals: The case of School
“Administrative absorption: Improving equity of service in higher education through shifting
burden” with Shannon Conley. April 2022. Midwest Political Science Association Annual
Meeting. Chicago, IL.
“Horizontal legitimacy and executive alignment: Overcoming differences in leadership in
School Resource Officer programs” April 2022. Midwest Political Science Association Annual
Meeting. Chicago, IL.
“Conflict between agency-specific and collective performance goals: The case of School
Chicago, IL. Virtual
Management Research Conference. Honolulu, HI. Canceled due to COVID.
Science Association Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL. Canceled due to COVID.
“Can external actors influence internal organizational outcomes? The case of school resource
officers and disproportionate student discipline” with Amanda Rutherford. April 2019.
Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL
Southern Political Science Association Annual Meeting. Austin, TX.
“Compared to whom? Social and historical reference points and performance appraisals by
students, managers, and the general public.” with Amanda Rutherford and Thomas
TX.
“Tipping the scales: The causes and consequences of administrative spending” with Amanda
Rutherford and Thomas Rabovsky. April 2018. Midwest Political Science Association
Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL.

Teaching Experience

Instructor of Record, O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, K300: Statistical
Techniques Fall 2020, Spring 2021, Fall 2021, Spring 2022
Co-Instructor, O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, K300: Statistical Techniques *Spring 2020*

Assistant Instructor, College of Arts and Sciences, Political Science Department, POLS-Y-103: Introduction to American Politics, *Spring 2018*

**Awards and Honors**
Fellowship to attend the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University Bloomington. *Summer 2018*.

Best Paper: Public Management. Association of SPEA Ph.D. Students 18th Annual Conference. *February 2018*

**Professional Associations**
American Political Science Association, Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Midwest Political Science Association, Public Management Research Association, Southern Political Science Association