Fall 2022

PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PARENTS REGARDING FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN THE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS™ MODEL

Shena D. Kiper
Southeastern University - Lakeland

PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PARENTS REGARDING FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN THE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS™ MODEL

By

SHENA D. KIPER

A doctoral dissertation submitted to the

College of Education

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree Doctor of Education

in Curriculum and Instruction

Southeastern University

August, 2022

PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PARENTS REGARDING FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN THE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS™ MODEL

by

SHENA D. KIPER

Dissertation Approved:

Sarah J. Yates, EdD, Dissertation Chair

Thomas Gollery, EdD, Committee Member

Jarrad D. Plante, EdD, Committee Member

Lisa A. Coscia, EdD, Dean, College of Education

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my late parents, Sharon Hill-Woods and Daniel Woods Jr., whose love and support inspired me to reach for the stars. I would also like to thank my husband, Josh Kiper and children, Joshua, Jaxon, Jordyn, and Jenna for their patience during my doctoral journey. Deep gratitude goes to my best friend, Emma Barton, for always encouraging me, especially when I felt like giving up.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to acknowledge my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, who makes all things possible. It was only by the grace of God that any of this was attainable. I would also like to recognize my dissertation committee members. To my methodologist, Dr. Gollery, for helping me see the bigger picture in research and in life, to my content expert, Dr. Plante, whose expertise strengthened my understanding of my topic, and to my dissertation chair, Dr. Yates, who is servant leadership personified, I extend my deepest gratitude for your support and guidance Finally, I would like to thank my Cohort for their camaraderie; we did it!

Abstract

This study provides an overview of the literature of Florida's only Community Partnership Schools™ model, as a strategy to enhance family and community engagement in low performing high poverty elementary schools. More specifically, the focus of this study was to determine to what degree parents perceived the effectiveness of family and community engagement strategies within the school. The positive correlation between family and community engagement on student achievement has been well documented. Such partnerships provide additional resources to help students who live in areas where cultural and economic factors erect barriers that adversely impact learning. Although several studies have been published on this topic, school administrators continue to seek effective family and community engagement model that led to school improvement and individual student success (Mapp & Kuttner, 2014).

Keywords: achievement school, Community Partnership Schools ™ Model (CPS), Full-Service Community School (FSCS), School Climate and Perception Survey (SCIP), Socioeconomic Status (SES), University-Assisted Community School (UACS)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Schools are microcosms of the communities they serve. The neighborhood school not only reflects the demographic diversity of the local community, but also the ideas and values of the families it serves. Just as every child is unique, so are the schools the child attends. Schools are multifaceted organizations influenced by several stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, students, parents, policymakers, local businesses, and non-profits.

Similarly, student outcomes are influenced by a series of in-school variables—instructional quality, curriculum design, leadership, and scheduling—and out-of-school variables—budgetary decisions, state policies, community engagement, neighborhood violence, and economic changes. When in-school variables function interdependently, community resources are leveraged to buffer negative out-of-school variables (Elgart, 2015). However, if an imbalance of negative to positive variables exists, students are left vulnerable to factors that can impede learning (Stewart, 2008). To ensure positive student outcomes, the federal government created a series of legislative policies that attempted to meet the needs of students and hold teachers, administrators, schools, and districts accountable for student success (Elgart, 2015).

Since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965 (ESEA), school accountability has worked to hold all stakeholders responsible for student outcomes (Paul, 2018). Over the years, legislative reform policies have fought to expand upon this process. For example, No Child Left Behind (2001), required struggling schools to hold both teachers and administrators accountable for student outcomes. To show improvement, states were given autonomy in goal setting for underachieving schools, such as improving attendance rates,

standardized test scores, or graduation rates. School performance was determined solely on student proficiency in reading and math with a goal to have all students proficient, including students in special education (O'Brien, 2013).

Another way to hold schools accountable was through Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), the accountability measure of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Under the federal NCLB (2001), the U.S. Department of Education rated how public schools performed based on the results from standardized tests. Initially, failure to meet (AYP) within the first five years, held very few consequences for schools (O'Brien, 2013). Schools whose students did not meet proficiency on state assessments for two consecutive years were designated by the state department of education as Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI). A SINI designation meant schools were required to develop an action plan under the oversight of a local governing education district, and schools received additional monies from both state and federal funds. Furthermore, students from low socioeconomic backgrounds could transfer to other non-SINI public schools within the district. SINI Schools that failed to meet AYP for three concurrent years were required to provide supplemental educational services to struggling students. In addition, a fourth year in SINI status required a revamped action plan and often included replacing staff or curriculum (NCLB, 2001; O'Brien, 2013).

A radical overhaul awaited schools stuck in the SINI status after the fourth year. Plans for restructuring could include reopening as a charter school, replacing the staff, takeover by a state or private company, or "other restructuring" (O'Brien, 2013). Often, school districts chose the more favorable "other restructuring" to retain autonomy without closing the school or replacing the staff. Operating under an "other restructuring" option allowed districts the freedom to implement their own ideas, narrow a grade range of a school (K-2 or 3-5), or implement a theme

such as, science, technology, arts, or foreign language immersion, which aimed at improving student academic achievement (O'Brien, 2013).

In 2015, another step toward accountability reduced federal mandates for failing schools and returned the power to individual states. When schools failed to bolster academic achievement, it was up to each state to formulate and implement plans to hold school districts, school administrators, and teachers accountable for student outcomes. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 required states to consider more than academic success during school evaluations. Federal law required states to consider four academic factors: graduation rates, proficiency in reading and math on standardized assessments, growth in reading or math on standardized assessments, progress toward proficiency for English Language Learners (ELL), and a fifth non-academic factor tied to school quality. These factors included competencies to improve family and community engagement as well as student achievement (O'Brien, 2013).

In Florida, schools earn report card grades not unlike student report cards. Academic proficiency is rated on an *A*-*F* scale with high performing schools awarded *As* and *Bs*, average performing schools awarded *Cs*, and low performing schools awarded *Ds* or *Fs*. Schools, who maintain a letter grade of *D* for two consecutive years or receive an *F,* are required to present a turnaround plan to the Florida Department of Education (date) and are referred to as Achievement Schools. Achievement Schools are required to present a specialized action plan to addresses five domains of effective schools: (1) effective leadership, (2) public and collaborative teaching, (3) ambitious instruction, (4) safe and supportive environment, and (5) family and community engagement (Florida's School Improvement Plan, 2018). Multiple data points are collected annually and analyzed to create a score of school performance within each domain.

According to the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Bureau of Accountability and Reporting (2019), data were gathered in the following areas: student achievement, early warning systems, faculty evaluations, observations, and stakeholder the data were analyzed, school and district administrators evaluated the success of the action plans to make recommendations and decisions that affected the future operation of each school site (County Public Schools, 2019). Additionally, achievement schools at the elementary level are divided into Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3. Each tier varies in intensity based on student data and receives additional district support which continues until it earns a grade of *C* or higher for three consecutive years. It is worth noting that in one county as many as 50 schools operate as Achievement Schools (Turnaround Plan Update, n.d.). Further, at the time of this study, school districts have limited options when dealing with failing schools. They are required to convert the existing school into a charter school, turn the school over to the state, or permanently dissolve the school (Elgart, 2015).

Community Partnership Schools™

The Community Partnership Schools ™ (CPS) model is a place-based strategy that combines researched best practices instruction, family support programs, and wellness support. This approach embodies the African proverb, "If you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together," which means the community must take on an active role in educating the youth (McDaniels, 2018).The CPS model has a standard of excellence that follows a specific formula for success, that integrates principles of a university-assisted approach, and that harnesses the synergism of the multiple core partnership approach (Ellis, 2016).

The CPS model meets the ESSA guidelines of a research-based school improvement model, which is designed to facilitate family and community engagement through collaborative processes to promote student and family success. According to Roche (2017), the CPS model

leverages school and community resources to ensure equitable accessibility. By maintaining high academic standards and a culturally relevant curriculum, students are presented with various subjects that extend beyond the core content areas, including civics, environmental, and community-based learning. Furthermore, many programs build social capital by giving educational opportunities to students, families, and neighbors through community partner apprenticeships, technical colleges, and internships.

In 2010, the University of Central Florida (UCF), the Children's Home Society of Florida, and the Orange County Public School board collaborated to transform one of the country's lowest-performing schools, Evans High School (Figlio, 2016). The academic success of the community collaboration project at Evans High school quickly gained recognition. This recognition lead UCF in 2014 to establish the Center for Community Schools. This effort was to replicate the community school model in underachieving schools across the state. Over the last five years, the Center for Community Schools has partnered with more than 15 CPS community schools in various stages of development to improve the overall well-being and academic success of students (UCF Center for Community Schools, n.d.).

Like other community school model, UCF's CPS model offer students and families support services that extend beyond the classroom. Two qualities that make this model standout. First, there are four-core partnerships: (a) healthcare, (b) non-profits, (c) colleges/universities, and (d) school districts. Members from each partnership organization are selected to create a governing body that shares decision-making power and that works interdependently to leverage resources within their area of expertise. Second, these four-core stakeholders work collaboratively to implement the four pillars of success: (a) collaborative leadership, (b)

expanded learning, (c) wellness supports, and (d) family and community engagement (Ellis, 2016; UCF Center for Community Schools, n.d.).

Healthcare Partners

A child's ability and motivation to learn is significantly impacted by his or her health (Health Services in Community Schools, 2015). Also, the American Federation of Teachers (2017) found that about half of student achievement is linked to socioeconomic factors. For some students, bringing wellness facilities onto school campuses reduced health-related barriers to learning. For example, Evans High School, a UCF-Certified Community Partnership Schools™ site in Orlando FL, offers an on-site wellness center that provides physical, dental, and behavioral health services for students, parents, and faculty before, during, and after school (Figlio, 2016). Currently, students can receive health-related services without having to leave campus.

Non-profit Partners

Non-profits are perfectly positioned to facilitate community engagement. With a pulse on the needs of their community, local non-profits are deeply aware of the means required to thrive and the know how to leverage assets for the benefit of the school. For example, The Boys & Girls Clubs of America provides after-school childcare, summer programs, and even in-school programs at little to no cost to local families (Forbs, 2017). These activities are designed to enrich the core content areas of math, reading, science, and social studies by incorporating arts and other skills through fun and engaging lessons. Other non-profits, such as United Way, support community engagement by organizing community events and communicating with stakeholders to help families attain resources that meet their academic and non-academic needs.

University Partners

University partnerships bring a variety of resources to the table. These resources include academic or instructional support through university student volunteers, interns, and program evaluators. The variety of academic specialists within the university or college setting makes this partnership an ideal location to serve as the hub of student support agencies (UCF Center for Community Schools, n.d.).

School District Partners

The school district partnership is considered the most vital element for school improvement success. To establish a CPS community school affiliation, the district and school board must be fully committed to the development and implementation of the model. Without the school district partnership, there is no community school.

Conceptual Framework/Theoretical Foundation

At the time of this study, 55 countries had community schools in various stages of development. According to the Center for American Progress (2018), the United States housed more than 5,000 community schools. Although all community school approaches vary in programming, operating procedures, and budgeting, the four-core pillars of expanded learning opportunities, family and community engagement, collaborative leadership, and wellness support are all cornerstones of each approach (McDaniels, 2018).

The community school model is not a new 21st century educational approach. The concept of schools as the hub of community life harken to the reform era of the early 20th century. John Dewey, founding father and leader of contemporary educational practices, influenced a new era of school reform. Dewey's model re-positioned schools as the center of the community life by connecting families with social services (Blank, Melaville, & Shah, 2003).

Dewey built upon the work of Jane Addams (1910) and the establishment of a famous Chicago Settlement House, Hull House. The Hull House was a revolutionary community model that blended communal living, social services, and education (Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Settlement Houses began to spring up in urban areas at the dawn of the 20th century and became places of refuge for poor immigrant families. One prominent feature of these urban spaces were the multicultural and intergenerational learning opportunities. Often, early childhood education classes were held alongside college and job training classes. Later, health care centers, libraries, social and cultural spaces were added, which transformed the lives of the residents. The Hull House became a place for women to raise themselves out of poverty by providing childcare, job skill training, and college classes at a time when women had few career options and were expected to stay home and raise children (Addams, 1910; Urban & Wagoner, 2000).

After witnessing the success of Hull House, Dewey adopted the belief that schools should function as a "social institution" (Dewey, 1897, p. 77). He summarized his educational philosophy in an 1879 address. Dewey stated, "The school is simply that form of community life in which all those agencies are concentrated that will be most effective in bringing the child to share in the inherited resources of the race, and to use his own powers for **s**ocial ends" (Dewey, 1897, p. 80). Dewey further argued that learning as a social process required the community to take responsibility in educating children. Dewey's educational philosophy left a profound impression on the social sciences and inspired modern pedagogy. His contributions to education can be exemplified through modern educational practices such as problem-based learning, arts education, and community schools. For example, during the 1930s, educational leaders in Michigan developed programs under the name Community Education, which helped parents by

providing high quality evening childcare in vacant school buildings (Urban & Wagoner, 2000). The Community Education programs gained international attention for their innovation.

The Community Education approach continued to gain momentum until the economic downturn of the early 1980s, which reduced federal funding (Blank, Melaville, & Shah, 2003). Despite the loss of funding, the principal logic of the Community Education model of student equity prevailed and community schools adapted and evolved. Now, thousands of community schools have been established worldwide (Coalition for Community Schools, 2017).

Problem Statement

The effect of family and community engagement on student achievement has been well documented. Nevertheless, schools in achievement status are time pressed and are driven by a singular focus, increasing student proficiency. Therefore, turnaround plans invest in programs promising immediate results. Often, these programs are geared at adopting the latest curriculum, strengthening teacher efficacy, and revamping positive behavior support (PBS) programs. When these areas take priority, plans to bolster family and community engagement are neglected. As a result, some schools in Florida look toward the CPS model to fill this gap. However, research is needed to study the perceived effects of the CPS model on family and community engagement.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the perceived effects of the CPS model on family and community engagement for students attending 41 Achievement schools in Central Florida.

Overview of Methodology

This quantitative study was designed to investigate parents' perceptions of family and community engagement in elementary schools using the CPS model. Quantitative researchers

emphasize objective numerical analysis of data sets to make sense of the complexities of the social and emotional nature of problems, subjects, or phenomena (Babbie, 2010). For the purpose of this study, the 2018-2019 School Climate and Perception (SCIP) Survey was utilized to compare the perceived effects of the CPS model on family and community engagement to the perceived effects of non-community schools on family and community engagement in Achievement Schools. To better understand the perceived effect, archival data sets were retrieved from 41 elementary Achievement Schools in a county in central Florida.

Research Design

The proposed study was non-experimental, quantitative, and causal comparative by research design. Study data, archived in nature, were achieved through a survey research approach. Parent perceptions of family and community engagement along eight specific dimensions of school climate represented the basis of data gathered. These dimensions were utilized in the survey process for the 2018-2019 school year and were the most current data available before the Covid 19 pandemic.

Data Collection

The study's sample was achieved through two non-probability techniques: convenience and purposive. The sample came from one large school district located in the Southeast United States. Parents of students enrolled in schools selected for study purposes represented the focus of the study's sampling process. Relative to the participating schools, parent perceptual data achieved in the study was separated into two categories: schools participating in the CPS model and schools not participating in a CPS model as an achievement school strategy. The parental perceptions of family and community engagement were obtained from 41 elementary

Achievement schools considered to be “failing schools” within the school district foreseen to be used for study purposes.

Instrumentation

The annual SCIP Survey was designed to analyze perceptions of school climate. At the time of this study, six domains captured a variety of aspects within the school that promote a positive school climate. These aspects include communication, family engagement, student learning, school leadership, school environment, community involvement, and volunteering. Together, the domains provide information needed to evaluate the overall school environment. A positive school climate is commonly considered a precursor to family and community engagement. In general, school climate encompasses every domain that facilitates involvement. The National Center for Family and Community Connections found that when resources were allocated toward building an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect among stakeholders, an effective and sustainable family and community partnership was forged (Hanover, 2014).

Research Questions

Four research questions with accompanying hypotheses were stated to address the topic of the proposed study:

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what degree have parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement been affected in schools adopting a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?
2. To what degree did parental perceptions differ on school climate as they pertain to parental engagement in schools that adopted Community Partnership Schools™

model and those schools who did not adopt a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

3. Considering the eight dimensions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement, which reflected the greatest degree of response effect of school for schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model?
4. To what degree did schools who have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model differ along the eight dimensions of school climate from those schools who have not adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

Research Hypotheses

1. To what degree have parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement been affected in schools adopting a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

   H_a 1: There will be a statistically significant effect for parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement for schools adopting a Community Partnership Schools™ model.

2. To what degree do parental perceptions differ on school climate as they pertain to parental engagement in schools that adopted Community Partnership Schools™ model and those schools who did not adopt a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

   H_a 2: The difference in parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement between schools that adopted Community Partnership Schools™ model and those schools who did not adopt a Community Partnership

Schools™ model will favor schools that adopted the Community Partnership Schools™ model to a statistically significant degree.

3. Considering the eight dimensions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement, which reflected the greatest degree of response effect of school for schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model?

   H_a 3: The dimension of "Community" will represent the highest effect of overall parental perceptions of school climate for schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model.

4. To what degree do schools who have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model differ along the eight dimensions of school climate from those schools who have not adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

   H_a 4: Parental perceptions of school climate along the eight dimensions will differ to a statistically significant degree favoring schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model in the comparison.

Overview of Analyses

Study data was analyzed using descriptive, inferential, and associative statistical techniques through the 26th version of IBM's *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)*. Prior to addressing the study's four proposed research questions, evaluations of missing data and internal reliability were conducted. Missing data were analyzed using descriptive techniques (frequencies; percentages). In the event missing data exceeded 5%, the randomness of missing data were assessed using the Little's Missing Completely At Random (MCAR) statistical technique. Internal reliability of study participant response was assessed using the Cronbach's

alpha (*a*) statistical technique. Cronbach's alpha is used to measure internal consistence of test times or set scale.

Preliminary Analysis

Most all analyses included a preliminary analysis of the data.

Data Analysis by Research Questions

Study data were analyzed using descriptive, inferential, and associative statistical techniques through the 28 version of IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Prior to addressing the study's four research questions, evaluations of missing data and internal reliability were conducted. Missing data were addressed using descriptive techniques (frequencies, percentages). In the event missing data exceeded 5%, the randomness of missing data was assessed using the Little's Missing Completely At Random (MCAR) statistical technique. Internal reliability of study participant response was assessed using the Cronbach's alpha statistical technique.

The research questions were addressed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Frequencies (*n*) and percentages (%) were the foundational analyses used for practical significance purposes. The statistical significance of research questions one and three were assessed using the one-sample *t*-test. The statistical significance of research questions two and four were assessed using the *t*-test of Independent Means. The mean scores associated with schools not adopting a CPS model were the statistical model's test value in the comparison process. The magnitude of effect for findings in research questions one, two, and three were assessed using the Cohen's *d* statistical technique. The magnitude of effect for findings in research question four was assessed using Hedge's *g* statistical technique. Sawilowsky's (2009) conventions of effect size interpretations were used to assign numeric effect size values.

Limitations

Limitations were identified during the development of this study. First, the research design utilizes survey responses from parents to enable the researcher to analyze perceptual data. The perceptions of stakeholders outside of the school setting, such as religious institutions, non-profits, and small businesses were not sampled and constitute a gap in literature regarding stakeholder perceptions.

Definition of Key Terms

The following key terms are included in this study.

- **Achievement Schools:** In one county in Central Florida, schools that consistently earn a letter grade of *D* or *F* for two consecutive years are designated as Achievement schools. Achievement schools are provided with additional monetary resources to build equity in high poverty, poor preforming schools.
- **Community School:** The term community schools are broad and has no universal definition, but most share a common philosophy of individual respect and reaffirm the rights of citizens, both young and old, to participate in the education and affairs of the community for the common good. Further, a community school is a public elementary or secondary school that incorporates four components: collaborative leadership, expanded learning, integrated student support, and family and community engagement (Oakes et al., 2017). In other bodies of literature, the community school approach has been referred to as a full-service community school or community school. These terms are often used interchangeably throughout the literature.
- **Community Partnership Schools™ Model:** The University of Central Florida has defined the Community Partnership Schools™ as a school reform model built upon

the four pillars of success, collaborative leadership, expanded learning, wellness supports, and family and community engagement. In addition, four key partnerships, which include a school district, a university or college, a non-profit, and healthcare, work together to develop and govern the Community Partnership Schools. The Community Partnership Schools™ is a trademark and will be narrowed to include only schools working in connection to the University of Central Florida (UCF) Certified Community Partnership Schools program (UCF Center for Community Schools, n.d.).

- **Family and Community Engagement:** The National Association for Family, Schools, and Community Engagement (n.d.) defines family and community engagement as the shared commitment between parents, schools, and community agencies and organizations to support student learning and development.
- **Parent Involvement:** Parent involvement refers to the amount of participation a parent has in their child's education (Epstein et al., 2019).

Significance

Tides of educational reform policies continue to push state and local educational agencies to create action plans to meet rigorous state and national standards. A singular academic focus undermines other important factors, such as family and community engagement. As schools strive to attain academic proficiency, educational leaders, seek methods to connect students with resources that remove barriers to learning (Coalition for Community Schools, 2017). Currently, limited research exits to compare the effectiveness of the CPS model on family and community engagement. Empirical research is needed to determine if implementing the Community Partnership Schools™ model enhances family and community engagement.

Summary

The evolution of the community schools demonstrates that when schools, families, and communities work together to remove both, academic and non-academic barriers to learning students can succeed. Unfortunately, more than half of the student population living at or below the poverty line lack the resources to meet their most basic needs (Oaks et al., 2017). Many of these students face monumental challenges, such as domestic violence, homelessness, food insecurities, and access to basic medical care. Such traumas adversely impact a child's ability to learn, consequently, the burden of education must fall beyond the scoop of the schoolhouse. Universally, the CPS model is designed to address the needs of the neighborhood, giving residents the tools needed to solve these problems (UCF Center for Community Schools, n.d.).

The literature on the topic is consistent, when students and families receive support services to mitigate hardships, students are more likely to graduate from high school and become productive citizens (Oaks et al., 2017). Over the last decade, the number of studies evaluating the effectiveness of the CPS model has increased with favorable results (Coalition for Community

Schools, 2017). However, the variance in programing makes comparing CPS community schools to non-CPS community schools difficult, as some community schools aim to improve academic achievement while others focus on emotional and physical wellness (Blank et al., 2009; Dryfoos et al., 2005). For that reason, there is a lack of empirical research on the topic of CPS model and its perceived effectiveness on family and community engagement. The purpose of this study is to fill the gap in the literature and understand parents' perceptions of the CPS model on family and community engagement.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A literature review was conducted to provide context to parents' perspectives regarding family and community engagement in elementary achievement schools. The interdependence of family and community engagement and school climate is well represented within the body of literature (Children's Aid Society, 2011; Coalition for Community Schools, 2017; Dryfoos et al., 2005; Figlio, 2016). However, few studies captured parental perceptions of family and community engagement within community schools. To that end, a broad, multi-databased review of the literature was conducted using the Southeastern University Steelman Library, ProQuest Central, Google Scholar, and ERIC. This chapter is organized into five sections: (a) family and community engagement policy, (b) family and community engagement, (c) school climate, (d) community school model, and (e) Community Partnership Schools™.

Family and Community Engagement Policy

Legislators have embraced what educational theorists have suggested for years: learning does not exist in a vacuum, and without the involvement of parents, students will be less likely to reach their academic goals (Dryfoos et al., 2005). Federal provisions require family and community engagement practices to be evaluated and included in the overall annual assessment of school performance grades (ESEA, 1965; NCLB, 2001; ESSA, 2015).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA, 1965) increased funding for family engagement initiatives through School Improvement Grants (SIG). These substantial monetary investments obligated public schools to create and monitor programs that bring families and schools together (ESEA, 1965). In addition, the Florida and School Partnership for Student Achievement Act (2016) provided a framework for building relationship capacity among

stakeholders. Bringing schools, families, and communities together is no easy task. In low-SES communities, families face many economic challenges, such as lack of transportation, long work hours, and stress that prevent them from becoming more involved in schools.

Family and Community Engagement

Decades of research recognized parent involvement as a vital component for student success. Epstein's et al. (2019) research on parent involvement influenced educational policies worldwide and is heavily cited throughout the literature. Moreover, Epstein et al.'s framework provided a robust theoretical foundation for gauging parent perceptions on school satisfaction and classified parent involvement into two categories of parent involvement: parent involvement at home and parent involvement at school. Benner et al. (2016) investigated the interaction between home- and school-based involvement and socioeconomic status in four aspects of parent involvement: academic expectations, academic socialization, student academic achievement, and future educational pursuits. Benner et al. (2016) conducted an educational longitudinal study (ELS) to identify the long-term effects of parent involvement on high school students' achievement. The study began in 2002 with a population of 15,240 high-school sophomore students (50% male and 50% female). Demographics were not evenly represented, with a little over half of the participants identifying as White (57 %).

Benner et al. (2016) described home-based involvement as support for student learning through homework help, summer camp, and other enrichment activities. School-based parent involvement occurred at the school site through volunteering, communication with educators, parent-teacher conferences, and help with other school-based activities. Academic expectations were described as beliefs parents held about school achievement and future educational pursuits.

Academic socialization referenced the transmission of parent values about education that shaped students' attitudes toward school.

The quantitative study was part of an ELS and lasted eight years from 2002-2012. Data were collected every two years in four cycles, or "waves," through parent and student surveys and student grade point averages (GPAs). Benner et al. (2016) used bivariate correlations and descriptive statistics to organize and analyze the data from 752 schools with 15,240 parents. Data for parent involvement were gathered through three assessments; for home-based involvement, parents used a 4-point Likert scale to show how often they helped their child with homework or school projects. To measure school-based parent involvement, parents marked attendance at school-based functions. Parents rated academic socialization on a 3-point Likert scale. Student data were gathered through performance indicators, GPAs, educational level, and standardized test scores. Benner et al. (2016) used hierarchical model and simple slope analysis to investigate two-way and three-way interactions.

Benner et al. (2016) noted a link between school-based parent involvement and parental educational expectations of students' cumulative GPA and educational attainment among all student subgroups: high-SES/low-achieving (b = .12, p <.001) low-SES/low-achieving (b = .09, p < .001); high-SES, high-achieving/higher SES and low-achieving subgroups (b = .05, p <.01); and low-SES, low-achieving students (b = .04, p <.05). School-based parent involvement was academically advantageous and beneficial to all subgroups of students despite socioeconomic and achievement status. The results of the Benner et al. study (2016) support family involvement as an effective strategy for school reform.

In addition to classifying parent involvement based on location, at home or at school, Epstein et al. (2019) classified at-home and at-school parent involvement into six different

typologies: communicating, parenting, student learning, volunteering, decision-making and advocacy, and community collaboration. Ihmeideh et al. (2020) highlighted the importance of understanding parent involvement through a multicultural context using Epstein et al.'s parent involvement typology. The study was conducted in Qatar's capital city, Doha, where government leaders have expressed interest in improving nationwide family engagement. Ihmeideh et al. (2020) conducted a mixed-methods study to investigate whether educational stakeholders (parents, teachers, administrators, curriculum coordinators, and school counselors) share similar perspectives of family-school interactions. Only findings related to parent involvement are presented here to add to the body of literature.

Participants were gathered from 25 randomly selected schools throughout the city and were divided into five groups: parents with children ages 4-8 (n = 240); early childhood teachers (n = 170); school administrators (n = 25); subject coordinators (n = 54); and school counselors (n = 25). All participants were female, except in the parent sample, of which seven were male. It is important to note that in two subgroups, school counselors and curriculum coordinators, all selected participants responded and agreed to participate in the study. In contrast, of the 265 teachers invited to join the study, roughly 65% responded. Ihmeideh et al. (2020) also conducted follow-up interviews with participants from each subgroup: parents, (n = 15); teachers, (n = 15); subject coordinators, (n = 10); school administrators (n = 10); and school counselors (n = 10).

Ihmeideh et al. (2020) developed two surveys based on Epstein at al.'s (2019) framework of parent involvement: one for parents and one for school staff. The items on the instruments were similar, however, reflected appropriate differences between subgroups with the first set of items. The survey was divided into demographics and Epstein et al.'s six types of family involvement. Cronbach alpha coefficients measured the reliability of instruments of each domain

(parenting, α= .80; communicating, α = .72; volunteering, α = .76; learning at home, α = .80; decision making, α = .83; and collaboration with the community, α = .70).

The interviews included eight open-ended questions based on Epstein et al.'s (2019) parent involvement framework and were recorded and transcribed for accuracy. A one-way ANOVA was used to compare responses across the six parent involvement domains, and Scheffe's test provided a post hoc test (α = .05). Interview results showed that some parents with higher levels of education were more interested in volunteering at school than their counterparts. In contrast, decision-making (M = 2.88, SD = .93) had the lowest mean value. Also, parents identified student learning at home (M = 3.82, SD = .8) as the parent involvement typology with the greatest impact on student outcomes. However, Ihmeideh et al. (2020) noted that parents consider student learning at home to be a personal reflection of parents' own efforts.

Through interviews, parents stated they felt voiceless in the decision-making process. Finally, parents' perceptions of collaborating with community (M = 3.24, SD = .69) were moderate. Parent interviews demonstrated parents' appreciation for schools' role in connecting families to community resources (Ihmeideh et al., 2020). The results of the study demonstrated parents want to be involved in meaningful ways. Parents understood how their participation impacted student outcomes, and they expressed desires to help create policies that aligned with their ideas and values.

In a similar study, Erdener and Knoeppel (2018) applied Epstein et al.'s (2019) typology to analyze parents' perceptions about involvement in their children's elementary schools in a rural area in Turkey and investigated types of parent involvement across three parent sub-groups: education level, income, marital status, and age. Quantitative data were collected from 742 parent surveys, which modeled Epstein et al.'s framework. The instrument consisted of 23

statements on a 5- point Likert scale, and Cronbach's alpha was used to check reliability (α = .93). The methodology included exploratory factor analysis and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to establish relationships among variable clusters (parent demographic groups and six areas of parent involvement produced). Income significantly affected the domains of parenting (p = .015) and volunteering (p = .034). Education and income had a significant correlation (p = .01). The interaction between education and marital status significantly (p = .04) impacted learning at home. The interaction between education and age significantly (p = .002) affected parent decision making.

According to Erdener and Knoeppel (2018), education level contributed to higher earning potential, meaning both parents with higher levels of education and parents with higher SES could have shared experiences and values of education. One factor was omitted from the study, community collaboration, which was attributed to differences in Turkish school culture or a lack of questions on the topic. The omission of community collaboration represents a limitation of the study as community collaboration is a vital factor in parent involvement. However, Erdener and Knoepple (2018) demonstrated that Epstein et al.'s (2019) framework is generalizable, transcending cultural boundaries and is a relevant when evaluating parent perceptions of schools.

Families often need more support than schools can manage. Knapp et al. (2017) used a quasi-experimental method to examine the impact of community collaboration on students' and parents' participation in a math acquisition program and the programs impact on student math achievement. The Math and Parent Partner (MAPP), a community organization, invited K-8 parents to attend math classes alongside their child(ren). A large portion of participants were low SES, particularly single parents who struggled to help their children with math homework because the parents were unfamiliar with the mathematical content (n = 39). The MAPP

program's goal was to transform parents into co-teachers by building mathematical practices and competencies.

The parents participated in the program from 2008-2011 and later provided positive feedback in post-interviews and on surveys. The results of the study found that students' whose parents were involved in the program scored significantly higher ($p < .001$) on standardized math assessments compared to their peers whose parents did not participate. Further, parents reported feeling closer to their child(ren) because quality time spent in class and doing homework together increased. Another positive outcome of the study showed that parents developed closer connections with teachers and other parents. Initially, many parents reported having little contact or connection with teachers or other parents prior to participating in the program (Knapp et al., 2017). The parent feedback showed that community partners increased social capital by facilitating opportunities for positive social interactions among parents, teachers, and students. Consequently, community collaboration taps into community resources to provide goods and services that improve the lives of students and families.

School Climate

Many factors shape parent perceptions of education and influences their level of involvement. Epstein et al. (2019) developed a theory of overlapping spheres of influence that states that when schools become welcoming places where families, communities, and schools support students, a positive school climate is created. Epstein et al. (2019) stated that a positive school climate makes students feel valued and loved. In a positive school environment, teachers communicate educational expectations, allowing students to grow to their fullest potential and maintain positive attitudes and appropriate school behavior. In contrast, schools that fail to

maintain a positive school climate may alienate families and fail to provide students with resources that promote student success (Epstein et al., 2019).

The National School Climate Center defined school climate as the collective experience of school life that reflect the norms, values, teaching and learning practices of schools (Cohen et al., 2009). For more than 30 years, school climate research has focused on student and teacher outcomes (Schueler et al., 2014). Many researchers have examined school climate from a variety of angles.

Wu et al. (1982) observed that school climate impacted mental health. Epstein et al. (2019) found that school climate affected student academic achievement and student attendance. According to Grayson and Alvarez (2008), teachers' perceptions of school climate were also linked to job satisfaction and attrition. Although much attention has been given to student and teacher perceptions, many scholars argue that parent impressions influence how families engage with schools and shape student attitudes about school (Rodriguez et al., 2014; Kraft & Rogers, 2014; Gilbert et al., 2017)

Rodriguez et al. (2014) captured family perceptions of engagement in student populations with historically low parent involvement: students with disabilities and minority groups. The study participants included 96 parents from 18 different schools across eight districts. The participants were drawn from seven elementary, seven middle, and four high schools to get an even sampling of parents' perspectives from students of varying stages. The demographics of the 96 participants consisted of 55% White, 24% Latino, 17% Black, 3% multiracial, and 9% unknown. In a qualitative study, Rodriguez et al. (2014) used a grounded theory approach to capture parents' perceptions of schools' climate using open-ended survey style questions where

parents had the opportunity to add additional comments to questions. Rodriguez et al. (2014) found eight themes related to parent perceptions of school involvement.

The themes were categorized into two subgroups: positive school practices that increased parent involvement and negative school practices that reduced family involvement. School practices that increased parent involvement were revealed in theme one, which demonstrated that parents were receptive to invitations for parent collaboration. In themes three and four, parents expressed appreciation when schools offered a variety of parent communication methods and when parents had easy access to teachers. Parents reported being more involved when they received more frequent communication about how their child was performing and behaving in school. In theme eight, parents stated knowledge affected their views of the school. For example, parents who understood educational law, including what resources and services were available, reported that their school engagement increased as they learned to navigate the educational landscape.

School practices that decreased parent involvement were revealed in theme six. Parents stated that trust in schools and teachers greatly impacted their decision to become more involved. Also, parents reported that teachers' efforts mattered and shared that some teachers worked harder to involve parents than others and that these efforts varied each year. The warmness of the teacher and the attempt to involve the parents greatly affected parent involvement, and the inconsistency between teachers sent a conflicting message to parents about the school's stance regarding parent involvement. Overall, Rodriguez et al. (2014) found that school engagement efforts play a big role in determining parent engagement decisions. When the school climate was warm and inviting, parents expressed more interest in partnering with schools to improve student outcomes. Creating schoolwide practices that make school staff more accessible, improving and

increasing varied communication methods, and seeking parent collaboration are ways schools can increase parent involvement.

Research also suggests that school-home communication affected school climate and impacted parent involvement. Bergman (2012) found that when parents received texts regarding missing assignments, student GPA improved, and student engagement increased (n = 306). Later, Kraft and Rogers (2014) extended the literature by focusing on weekly written communication from teachers to parents about student behavior and achievement and explored the effects of different types of teacher messages (positive feedback, informative feedback, and no feedback). The participants consisted of 435 students from 30 different high schools. The student population mainly consisted of minority groups (65% African American and 28% Hispanic), 30% of students spoke English as a second language, 25% received special education services, and 80% were eligible for free or reduced lunch (Kraft & Rogers, 2014).

In this study, Kraft and Rogers (2014) conducted a block randomized methodology with multiple treatment groups. The sample population was randomly assigned to one of three conditions: positive feedback (n = 146), improvement feedback (n = 136), or the control group, which provide no feedback at all (n = 153). To start, all the students' families received an initial phone call from the teacher. After the initial teacher contact, parents of students in the positive feedback condition received additional weekly positive communication regarding behavior and academics, while parents of students in the improvement feedback received constructive communication regarding ways their child could improve in behavior and academics. To measure the impact of the teacher communication on students, teachers assessed student effort and behavior by completing a survey consisting of three Likert-scale questions for each individual student who participated in the study (Kraft & Rogers, 2014).

The results of the Kraft and Rogers (2014) study indicated that student outcomes improved when school-to-home communication increased. Additionally, positive communication from teachers produced similar results to informative feedback; specifically, positive and informative feedback was highly associated with reduced student absences ($p = .011$). Any form of communication was associated with increased course completion ($p = .046$). The students whose parents received improvement feedback were more likely to pass the course than students in the control group ($p = .016$). Although not statistically significant, students in the positive feedback condition were more likely to pass the course ($p = .236$). Finally, teacher-parent communication had the most significant effect on absenteeism for students in the informative condition ($p = .003$). Students in the positive feedback condition had greater absences compared to students in the control group, although not significant (-1.7%, $p = .125$). The study confirms a receptive school climate, positive interactions, and communication with educators as highly associated with increased parent involvement in school.

Parents' transmission of values impacts students' attitudes about school and can influence school climate and determine how families interact with school. Gilbert et al. (2017) investigated this phenomenon and noted a significant correlation between parent stress levels, parent involvement, and student achievement within low SES Latino communities. The study sample population consisted of first and second-generation third grade and fourth grade Latino students ($n = 240$) who were interviewed about their academic experiences. The student participants were drawn from 19 elementary schools throughout one school district. The parent participants were determined based on parents who provided working telephone numbers ($n = 86$) and agreed to be interviewed; overall, 80% of parents ($n = 68$) who provided a working phone number also agreed to be interviewed.

Gilbert et al. (2017) used the family economic stress model to analyze the relationship between financial stress and the psychological effects that impact parenting practices. To quantify parents' depressive symptoms, researchers interviewed parents and conducted surveys from the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression scale (CES-D). In the survey, parents answered questions related to three topics: depression symptoms, financial concerns, parent involvement through progress monitoring and values transmission. The questions presented descriptions of depressive symptoms; parents were asked to rate the number of days they experienced the symptoms from the prior week. The frequency of depressive symptoms was combined to create a composite score. According to CES-D, a composite score greater than 22 indicated significant levels of depression ($\alpha = .80$).

Further, parents were asked eight questions to understand the degree to which parents experienced depressive symptoms in relation to financial situations. Gilbert et al. (2017) asked parents to use a 5-point Likert scale to rank their ability to meet financial obligations regarding employment, paying bills, housing, extra-curricular activities, healthcare, groceries, and other family essentials. A mean score was calculated to create a composite score ($\alpha = 0.89$).

Regarding parent involvement through academic monitoring and transmission of values, Gilbert et al. (2017) asked parents to reflect on their parenting practice related to students' academic achievement in three areas: knowledge, communication, and monitoring. A 3-point Likert scale was used to capture the data ($\alpha = 0.90$). Parents also used a 3-point Likert scale to reflect upon their transmission of intrinsic values, such as a physical space dedicated to homework and study, and extrinsic values, like communicated academic rules and achievement expectations. The mean was used as the composite score of academic value transmission ($\alpha = 0.80$).

Gilbert et al. (2017) concluded that most parents reported longer episodes of depressive symptoms when experiencing financial stress, ($B = 4.33$, $p < .05$, $\beta = .30$). Further, longer episodes of depressive symptoms significantly correlated to lower levels of parent monitoring, ($B = -.02$, $p < .05$, $\beta = -.31$), and transmission of values, ($B = -.01$, $p = .05$, $\beta = -.22$). The results of the study are relevant because they illustrate the association between parent attitudes and student outcomes. Children spend a large portion of their day in school and have a host of daily interactions with administrators, teachers, and peers, yet parents explicitly and implicitly transmit values that shape their children's attitudes toward learning. Traditionally, schools have limited resources to provide services that reduce financial burdens or provide mental health programs for parents; therefore, they are unable to address out-of-school variables that impact school climate.

Community School Model

According to the National Center for Community Schools, no uniform definition of community schools exists. Most community school model prescribe the same basic philosophy, optimizing community resources to mitigate barriers that impede student success and addressing four pillars of school success: extended learning, wellness support, family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership (Oaks et al., 2017). At the time of this study, many community school models found in the literature fit into five organizational approaches: (a) community-managed, (b) school-as-lead-agency, (c) multiple core partnerships, (d) community-based-lead-agency, and (e) university-assisted (Maier et al., 2017, 2018; Oaks et al., 2017; UCF Center for Community Schools, n.d.).

According to Oaks et al. (2017), the four pillars of school success are common to most community school model, regardless of governing structure. The pillars work interdependently, comprise the foundation of comprehensive school reform efforts, and outline the purpose and

function of each pillar. The first pillar, expanded learning times, may occur during the traditional school year when students are not required to be in schools, such as summer vacation, school holidays, and before or after school. The extra support provides students with increased time to develop academically and socially. Wellness supports, the second pillar, remove in-and out-of-school barriers to learning. School-based resources often include wellness supports, such as physical, dental, and mental health programs and family counseling services. The community school model is rooted in a holistic approach to learning that recognizes a student's basic need for food, clothing, shelter, and medical needs must be met before learning can occur.

The third pillar of family and community engagement is often described as the collaborative effort to support students' well-being through positive relationships, leadership, and lobbying to adopt educational policies that promote relevant school reform (Roy and Giraldo-García, 2018). The last pillar of collaborative leadership is described as a governing structure that harnesses collective power. The leadership team primarily consists of the school principal, community school director, parents, teachers, and partner representatives. Each member of the collaborative leadership team brings a unique perspective, skillset, and resources to create an environment where teachers, children, and families learn and thrive (Maier et al., 2017, 2018; Oaks et al., 2017; UCF Center for Community Schools, n.d.).

Community-Managed Community School Model

Recognition of educational inequality among the economically disenfranchised and minority students spurred the resurgence of the community school model throughout the United States and abroad during the 20th century. Community schools can be found on every continent and in many countries where compulsory education is non-existent or poorly funded (Ellis, 2019). In community-managed schools, parents and stakeholders take ownership of the school

through taking charge of management, teacher selection, curriculum adoption, and infrastructure maintenance. By 2004, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) oversaw more than 5,000 community-managed schools across Africa in Benin, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Malawi, Mali, South Sudan, and Uganda (Miller-Grandvaux, 2004). The USAID worked with local governments to manage education in rural areas and embraced the community school model as a comprehensive approach to create more equity and access to primary education.

In the early 1990s, USAID's Basic Education and Expansion Project (BEEP) in the district of Kolondieda in southern Mali was regarded as one of the most successful education reforms in Africa (Miller-Grandvaux, 2004). The primary goal was to increase enrollment and school quality by expanding access to students living in rural areas, especially for girls. Strictly enforced gender roles created barriers that inhibited female students from attending school regularly. Social change did not come easily, and great efforts were made to inform parents of the social benefits of educating girls (Miller-Grandvaux, 2004). Over time, community support for educating girls strengthened, and the school schedule and curriculum were adjusted to accommodate female students. As parent and community participation increased so did the demand for school quality.

The Mali educational system was transformed through a collaborative effort with Save the Children, World Education, and local citizens to establish a committee to create an educational system that reflected the cultural needs and values of the community. Teachers were selected from within the community, and the schedule allowed even more flexibility to allow girls to attend to their household obligations; the curriculum was culturally specific and delivered through the area's language and dialect (Miller-Grandvaux, 2004).

School-as-lead-agency Community School Model

Under the school-as-lead-agency approach, districts or schools lead the community school effort. As the lead governing agency, the district or school assumes responsibility for filling leadership positions that oversee the community partnership (Ellis, 2019). Adams (2010) conducted a case study of community schools across two Oklahoma school districts. Both school districts adopted a full-service community school (FSCS) model as a strategy for district reform. A performance evaluation compared the schools' outcomes between FSCS and non-FSCS schools in Tulsa and Union County. To create equal comparisons, FSCSs were classified based on four levels of diffusion or FSCS implementation, (inquiry, emerging, mentoring, and sustaining) because many of the schools operated at various levels of FSCS implementation. The sample schools were selected based on their level of diffusion. Overall, 18 Tulsa Area Community Schools Initiative (TACSI) schools were in the FSCS implementation process; 12 were still in the infancy stages of implementation, so they were excluded from the study. Six schools were categorized as mentoring or sustaining, having fulfilled the basic requirements of the TACSI vision by establishing onsite health services, community-based learning model, and family supports (Adams, 2010).

A quasi-experimental methodology was used to compare student outcomes in reading and math between TACSI schools and comparison schools. The Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability annual school reports and Oklahoma Center for Education Policy provided student achievement data as well as aggregated teacher, student, parent, and administrator survey response data that captured psychological and social conditions across four domains: home and community, organizational, instructional, and learning (Adams, 2010). The data were organized by relationship type: teacher-student, teacher-parent, and teacher-leadership.

In the area of student achievement, Adams (2010) found that students who attended TACSI schools performed significantly higher in math ($\gamma 02 = 32$, $p \leq .01$) and reading ($\gamma 02 = 19$, $p \leq .05$). In addition, diffusion was a strong indicator of student success in math and reading among students of poverty across all schools ($\gamma 03 = -0.45$; $\gamma 03 = -0.48$). Further, Adams (2010) indicated that collective trust was higher among students, teachers, parents, and administrators who attended TACSI schools.

In a follow-up study, Adams (2019) used a retrospective approach to conduct a longitudinal study that examined the evolution of TACSI from 2010-2018 within two school districts (Tulsa and Union Full-Service Schools) to understand the impact of the community school model on conditions for learning: student achievement and sustainability of trust overtime. Qualitative data were gathered from interviews with school leaders at the six TACSI schools; additionally, researcher observations from 2009-2018 as well as documents including performance reports, progress alerts, and planning tools were examined. Adams (2019) used the Omnibus Trust Scale and Parent Trust Scale to provide measurement for capacity. Through the Omnibus T Scale Interview, participants revealed that Tulsa's FSCS underwent several structural changes as the district stepped away from TACIS founding principles to reflect changes in district priorities. During the initial 2010 study, trust patterns were consistently higher than in non-TACSI schools (Adams, 2010). However, during the 2012-2013 school year, School Capacity Reports released by the Oklahoma Center for Education Policy reported downward shifts in capacity (home, community, organizational, and learning).

Adams (2019) noted that study participants from Union County expressed sustained levels of trust, despite setbacks experienced from implementing FSCS. Participants from Tulsa County Schools reported that collective trust was similar to the pre FSCS implementation as the

Tulsa County school district implemented structural and leadership changes when implementations setbacks occurred. Union County and Tulsa County schools experienced challenges during the implementation process. However, Union's commitment to the FSCS process and Tulsa's shift away from FSCS vision are important and illustrate that trust among stakeholders (parents, teachers, students, staff) can remain despite the challenges, if schools maintain continuity.

Community-based-lead-agency Community School Model

Under the leadership and management of a large community literacy agency, a Rhode Island urban school district implemented a community-based-lead-agency community school as part of a comprehensive school reform strategy. Anderson et al. (2019) conducted a multi-year evaluation of one of the first federally funded full-service community schools in the United States: Providence Full-Service Community Schools (PFSCS). The goal of the evaluation was to understand stakeholders' perceptions of the PFSCS over a four-year period, beginning in 2009 and ending in 2013. Three primary questions drove the focus of the study: How were PFSCS' successes perceived by PFSCS stakeholders; How were PFSCS' implementation challenges perceived by stakeholders; What lessons can be learned by analyzing stakeholders' perceptions from the initial and follow-up study?

The PFSCS opened during the 2008-2009 school year. PFSCS served a cluster of elementary schools and provided a variety of programs, including healthcare, parental involvement, family literacy, and many programs aimed at connecting teachers, students, and families. Anderson et al. (2019) conducted a qualitative study using interviews to compare stakeholders' perceptions of the initiative from the initial study to a four-year follow-up study. The sample population from the initial and follow-up study was derived through non-probability

purposeful sampling based on criteria established by the PFSCS community-based-lead agency governing board. Overall, a diverse sample population was created to represent a variety of educational stakeholders, including parents, teachers, administrators, and representatives of community organizations.

In the initial 2009 study, a grounded theory approach was used to help researchers understand stakeholders' perceptions regarding the breadth, scope, and vision of PFSCS. The baseline data was gathered through semi-structured questions that encouraged participants (n = 18) to describe their experience at PFSCS. Respondents were asked to describe the goals and challenges of the implementation process as well as discuss the potential benefits compared to other school improvement efforts. Analytic induction and constant comparison methodology were used. Themes were categorized into topics and connected to other concepts to contextualize the data. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded; the data were categorized into four topics: (a) reasons for PFSCS implementations, (b) PFSCS goals, (c) PFSCS challenges, and (d) PFSCS' vision for the future. All topics from the baseline study are important considerations for community schools' implementation as a school improvement strategy. PFSCS' vision for the future included expectations for improving family engagement, and information related to this topic was included in the study.

In 2013, Anderson et al. (2019) analyzed how participants viewed the PFSCS four years after implementation. Participants (n = 16) were asked to reflect on their experiences and share how the PFSCS met goals and overcame challenges. The participants were asked semi-structured questions about the successes and challenges faced by the PFSCS. The interview data were categorized into several themes, with one theme related to the family and community engagement at PFSCS.

According to Anderson et al. (2019), stakeholders believed that PFSCS improved in five target areas: community culture, family engagement, student and family literacy, early childhood education, and extended learning programs. Broad cultural change was among the top priorities identified by the stakeholders during the initial study, and it was largely perceived as a success in the follow-up study. One respondent shared, "PFSCS has helped to impact the Providence Public School District in ways that extend how it thinks about partnering and student supports" (Anderson et al., 2019, p. 908). In other words, the community school model changed the culture within the district as schools began to shift from traditional academic-based student and family supports and to begin offering wraparound services that support the whole child. Further, PFSCS' vision became increasingly ingrained in the district as more schools adopted the community school model as a school improvement strategy.

Another respondent noted that school climate had improved, and parent engagement was stronger since the PFSCS implementation; the respondent stated: "I think increasing parent involvement, bringing parents in, having very purposeful activities and supports [is one of the strongest outcomes to date]" (Anderson et al., 2019, p. 913). Cultural changes were seen at the community level as community partners began to understand the socioeconomic and political factors that adversely impact schools. For example, respondents shared that the community support "should focus not just on improving academic achievement, but also in creating and providing opportunities for recreational activities to support the overall well-being of students and families" (Anderson et al., 2019, p. 913).

University-assisted-Community Schools

Partnerships between community schools and institutions of higher education are mutually beneficial; they provide opportunities for research and practical application of skills

and interdisciplinary studies (Harkavy et al., 2013). Therefore, by focusing on problems traditionally found in neighborhoods with few resources (health and human services, education, and financial services), higher educational institutions have the infrastructure in place to strategically leverage resources from outside sources on behalf of the community school.

Luter et al. (2017) conducted a qualitative case study to examine parent and child perspectives of an afterschool program for students who attended a university-assisted community school (UACS) located in a multicultural urban neighborhood. Introduced in 2010, the extended learning program was funded by a local business. A university faculty member worked with one elementary school administrator to expand the program, and the decision was made to incorporate the after-school program into a community school model. The community school served students in grades K-5 in a culturally diverse, high-poverty elementary school. At the time of the study, the community school was open Monday-Friday until 7:00pm during the school year and four hours during the summer.

The sample population was determined based on purposeful sampling. Only students who enrolled in the program for the entire year were included in the study (n = 17). Parent letters were sent with the selected students, which requested permission for the students to participate and informed the parents of the purpose of the study. The parents of student participants also agreed to be in the study (n = 12), and two administrators were interviewed to capture a complete picture of the UACS. Overall, 31 people participated in the study. In addition to interviews, other data sources included site observations and student focus groups (Luter et al., 2017).

The data were analyzed using a thematic analysis of the interview transcriptions. Luter et al. (2017) found three themes captured student and parents' perceptions of the UACS' after-school program. In theme one, many participants shared how they perceived the after-school

program as separate from the typical school day. Parents and students were attracted to the vast number of programs offered and described the program as "enriching" (Luter et al., 2017, p.67). The distinction between the regular school day and after-school program was attributed to the quality of programs sponsored by the UACS. In theme two, parents and students described how they perceived the after-school program as a system for youth development. Many students (n = 11) reported academic improvements while parents (n = 7) shared how the after-school program helped their children overcome behavioral challenges, build positive relationships, and improve decision-making skills.

In the third and final theme, the principal and community school coordinator described the impact made by the university faculty, student volunteers, and resources as "central to the very functioning of the after-school program" (Luter et al., 2017, p.73). The university faculty and students offered tutoring to students and families, and various university departments coordinated more than 70 activities and provided nearly 100 volunteers for the UACS. In this partnership, university students gained experience in their specialty fields of study, and schools obtained additional supports without increased budgetary concerns. The university houses excerpters in a host of different fields and can offer in-kind resources that create a win-win for the university and the UACS. Luter et al. (2017) added to the literature and showed that stakeholders' perspectives support UACS as a school improvement strategy.

Multiple-Core Partnership Community School

The multiple-core partnership community school approach provides additional resources and interventions required to bring sustainable change in areas where large portions of residents live below the poverty line. Several factors contribute to income instability, such as housing instability, higher unemployment rates, and higher transient populations. When students face

such adversities, a school cannot work in isolation to overcome these obstacles. Therefore, a multiple-core partnership community school approach taps into its network of providers to deliver additional resources and interventions required to bring sustainable change (McDaniels, 2018).

Provinzano et al. (2020) conducted a case study of an elementary full-service community school in the Pennsylvania Community School District (PCSD). One focus of the study was to analyze the impact of the collaborative leadership process, especially between the principal and community school director, on school environment and student outcomes. The study participants consisted of all third grade and fifth grade students who had scores in reading and math on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA). The students were split into two cohorts: Cohort 1 students were in third grade during the initial implementation of the community school model, and Cohort 2 students were in kindergarten during the initial year of implementation, thus Cohort 2 students had more exposure to the community school reform strategies than Cohort 1. Quantitative data from standardized test scores in reading and math were used to determine student academic outcomes concerning exposure to community school reform programs.

The quantitative findings of Provinzano et al. (2020) showed that Cohort 1 PSSA scores increased significantly from consecutive third through fifth grade math ($p < .001$, $d = .27$). Math proficiency scores significantly increased in consecutive grades third to fourth ($p < .001$, $d = .23$). Reading proficiency on PSSA increased from grades third through fifth ($p < .001$, $d = .16$). Cohort 2 student scores increased significantly on math PSSA ($p < .01$, $d = .16$) and reading PSSA performance indicators ($p < .01$, $d = .09$); PSSA scores increased significantly for consecutive third through fifth grade math ($p < .01$, $d = .08$) and grades fourth through fifth ($p < .01$, $d = .07$). Overall, Cohort 2 was significantly more proficient on reading and math PSSAs

(except fourth grade math) and had higher score increases ($p < .05$; $p < .001$).

Additionally, Provinzano et al. (2020) gathered qualitative data through interviews with the district superintendent, chief financial officer, director of community partnerships, two classroom teachers, and three community partners ($n = 11$). Participants were asked to answer open-ended questions related to the community school implementation process, services offered by community partners, and perceptions of school leadership. Interviews lasted approximately an hour and were transcribed for accuracy. Once the data were coded, three overarching themes related to collaborative leadership on school environment and student outcomes were identified. Theme one was specific to organizational challenges in building and implementing the community school model, and theme two related to shared governance and developing a leadership team, but only theme three was specific to family and community engagement.

In theme three, participants recognized that students needed academic and non-academic services to address structural inequities and focused on educating the whole child. The leadership team worked alongside community organizations to create an environment where families and students felt welcomed. Developing trust and communication with families and community members was the primary focus from the start. The leadership team recognized that building relationships and providing non-academic services was the first step toward increasing student academics. The study by Provinzano et al. (2020) is important because it highlighted the synergy of a collaborative governing structure to work toward a common goal.

Community Partnership Schools™ Model

Throughout Florida, Community Partnership Schools ™ (CPS) have established long-standing relationships with higher education institutions, local school districts, non-profits, and healthcare providers to support the students' and families' physical, emotional, and social health.

(Ellis, 2016; Figlio, 2016; Lowe, 2021; Maestre, 2015; UCF Center for Community Schools). The CPS model is a multiple-core-partnership approach that organizes multiple community partners to connect children and families to resources and supports that mitigate the harmful effects of poverty on student outcomes. Although each community school within the network differs based on the individual needs of their community, all CPS affiliates have the same foundational elements: a long-standing partnership among four core partnerships, four pillars of success, four designated staff positions, and a certification process to ensure quality and fidelity among member schools (Ellis, 2016; Figlio, 2016; Lowe; 2021, Maestre, 2015; UCF Center for Community Schools, n.d.).

To be recognized as a UCF-Certified CPS model prospective schools must complete a rigorous certification process. The certification process occurs in four phases over a multi-year process. In phase one, schools seeking certification status must complete a Certification Readiness Assessment during the first three years of community school implementation. Then after five years of successfully implementation, schools are eligible to complete the Certification Assessment. Once certified, the CPS model will undergo two additional quality evaluations; the Certification Affirmation Review, which takes three years post evaluation, and Re-Certification, which takes place five years post certification. Finally, potential CPS candidates must provide evidence to show that the school has met 12 implementation standards. These standards include: establish community partnership; implement a collaborative leadership team; develop governance and organizational structures; apply foundational principles; maintain staffing; integrate community partnership school framework, provide expanded learning opportunities; provide wellness supports; promote family and community engagement; recruit volunteers;

establish university partnerships; complete evaluations; and plan for sustainability (UCF-CPS Certification Assessment and Evaluation, n.d.).

Empirical research on the impact of the CPS model is limited in the literature. However, since 2016, studies and program evaluations have been conducted that examine the impact of the CPS model on student achievement, attendance and graduation rates, and student efficacy and civic engagement. Although not peer reviewed, program evaluations and dissertations on CPS affiliated schools represent the whole of the literature regarding CPS model that is publicly available through the UCF Center for Community Schools (Ellis, 2019; Figlio, 2016; Lowe, 2021; Maestre, 2015).

In 2010, the University of Central Florida partnered with the Children's Home Society, Orange County Public Schools, and Central Florida Family Health Center to transform an existing high school into Florida's first community school. Originally, Evans High School had a history of poor academic achievement. However, with the help of community partners, Evans Community School reported a positive turnaround and an increase in student academic outcomes. After two years of community school implementation, Figlio (2016) conducted a case study using matched comparison to evaluate performance indicators and school grades at Evans Community School to performance indicators at 12 similar schools within the district from 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. In addition, the researchers compared student outcomes from before the community school implementation to scores after implementation.

An analysis of student data revealed that Evans High School student outcomes had improved relative to the comparison schools. Evans Florida School's Grade also improved from 2012-2014 after the community school implementation. The preliminary evaluation indicated

Evans Community School improved relative to comparison schools on 10 of 14 categories during the 2013-2014 school year (Figlio, 2016).

Figlio (2016) collected qualitative data from observations and interviews during a site visit. The complexity of the community school model lends itself to a case study methodology that uses narratives, observations, and experiences to capture descriptive data. During the site visit, the researcher met with school administrators, members of the leadership team, teachers, and staff. The site visit produced qualitative data that highlighted six factors of community school success: (a) whole child perspectives; (b) responsiveness to student needs; (c) integrated programs; (d) family and community engagement; (e) shared governing structure, and (f) long-term community partners (Figlio, 2016).

After a daylong site visit, Figlio (2016) reported that Evans Community School was committed to providing a whole child approach to learning. In addition to academic supports, wrap-around services were offered to students and families in the form of physical and mental health. The school also addressed community issues, such as unemployment, housing, and adult education, by establishing a parent engagement center that offered an inclusive tutoring program and comprehensive extracurricular courses that connected students and families to community assets. The school's effort to connect with families was captured during the site visit. One parent shared, "Visiting the parent engagement center was a particular highlight for me, as the community school team are clearly aiming to serve parents where they are, with an emphasis on creating and nurturing relationships" (Figlio, 2016, p. 9).

Figlio (2016) also expressed how the CPS model created a reciprocal relationship with the community by stating, "A successful community school is heavily engaged with families and the community" (p. 9). Finally, Figlio noted that the positive relationship between families, the

community, and the school could not have been facilitated without a strong governing body. According to Figlio, the governing structure consisted of representatives from key community partners, including faith-based organizations, school alumni, health care administrators, university leaders, the principal, parents, and other staff members. To increase transparency, the leadership team met monthly to discuss common goals, operation management, communications, and data.

The preliminary evaluative findings of Figlio (2016) represented an important milestone in the history of UCF's Center for Community Schools as the success of Evans Community School is the golden standard that helped realize the potential of aggressive school improvement model in Florida. A formal external program evaluation is underway through the American Institutes for Research with an estimated completion of April 2022.

In another study, Ellis (2019) examined graduation and attendance rates of students attending a CPS model. To that end, graduation rates from the area's only CPS high school were compared to five comparison non-CPS model schools from the same district between 2003-2017. The five non-CPS comparison schools were selected from a pool of Title I high schools in the same school district. Also the comparison schools shared similar socio-economic, student demographic, and school grade trends as the CPS high school.

An interrupted time series (ITS) method was used to answer two main research questions with three sub questions. First, Ellis (2019) asked, "In what ways and to what extent, if any, is the graduation rate at one CPS high school related to the implementation of a Community Partnership Schools™ model?" (p. 92). To address graduation rates, Ellis (2019) examined graduation trends from 2003-2017. The graduation rates for the CPS school and the five non-CPS schools were analyzed, plotted, and displayed on a line graph. Next, overall trends were

identified and compared by type (CPS model or non-CPS model). Regarding attendance, Ellis (2019) examined attendance trends from 2003-2017. The data from the CPS high school and five non-CPS high schools were analyzed, plotted, and displayed on a line graph. Subsequently, overall trends were identified and compared by type (CPS model or non-CPS model).

The results of the study by Ellis (2019) showed that the CPS high school had higher overall attendance and graduation rates over 14 years compared to non-CPS high schools with some fluctuation in graduation rank. The CPS high school ranked lowest in graduation rates before implementation but showed the second highest graduation rates at the end of 2017. The school also averaged 20.6 percentage points higher in graduation rates after implementation. Although not statistically significant, there was a change in attendance trends between the pre- and post-CPS implementation. Overall, the CPS high school ranked second highest (after implementation) in attendance rate gains when compared to non-CPS high schools.

Ellis (2019) added to the emergent literature on the impact of the CPS model on student outcomes. However, the results were limited to quantitative analysis of complex student outcomes, such as graduation and attendance rates, which omit other influencing factors that hinder or promote student success in these areas. Student attendance and graduation rates are summative results from systemic changes. As Ellis (2019) pointed out:

> It is important to note that the Community Partnership Schools™ model community school is not a dropout prevention program. Goals for the CPS model aim to transform schools, families, and communities over time in meaningful ways (e.g., improved education, health, climate, life success), and whole-school academic gains, behavior, and attendance measures are expected distal expectations of implementing the CPS model. (p. 97)

Ellis' (2019) statement illustrated the cultural shifts toward educating the whole child and suggested that student outcomes, such as higher graduation and attendance rates, are the anticipated outcomes of long-term CPS implementation.

In a separate quantitative study, Maestre (2015) conducted a causal comparative study to examine the association between tutoring and student academic outcomes in a CPS high school. The sample population was determined based on convenience sampling methods. The population of the school was 2,484 students; 1,832 students were scheduled to take an end of year standardized test in one or more subjects. The study's sample consisted of ninth and 10th grade students enrolled in one or more core courses: Reading, Algebra 1, Geometry, Biology, and United States History. Each course required students to complete an end-of-course exam. The course participants were divided into two groups: students who participated in after-school tutoring and students who did not. Attendance in the after-school program was voluntary and open to all students attending core classes, with 561 students choosing to attend at least one tutoring session during the school year. Further, students were subcategorized based on their Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) eligibility. Student academic success was assessed through Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test scores (FCAT), which were provided to the high school by the Florida Department of Education, and end of course grades.

Maestre (2015) conducted a study to understand the relationship between frequency of attendance in an after-school tutoring program and student academic achievement. There were two research questions in the study that addressed attendance and achievement for ESE and ESOL subgroups. However, questions were omitted that pertained to ESE and ESOL subgroups because outside variables, such as additional in school supports, could have impacted the results.

One question compared student achievement data with data from students who did not participate in a tutoring program. The comparison data between non-participants were not presented because the data included ESE and ESOL subgroups.

Maestre (2015) used different methods to analyze data to answer each research question. To establish a correlation between achievement and attendance, a Pearson correlation test wasused to accommodate multiple assessment data points (e.g., state test scores and school grade), which were treated as the dependent variable. Using an independent *t*-test, Mastre (2015) established a link between tutoring and students' achievement across all conditions. To that end, mean scores from each state assessment were used to compare students who participated in the tutoring program to their counterparts.

The results of Maestre's (2015) study offered a comprehensive analysis of student data for each of the nine classes. In Florida, standardized assessment data are used to drive instructional practices and are the largest contributing factor used to determine school grades for Florida public schools (Maestre, 2015). To establish a correlation between attending after-school tutoring and academic achievement, Person Correlation tests were conducted using FCAT 2.0 reading and FCAT 2.0 reading growth. In addition, end-of-course (EOC) data were used as a measure of academic performance in math, biology, and U.S. history.

In reading, the results showed a positive correlation, although not statistically significant ($r = 0.02$, $n = 169$, $p = 0.83$), and suggested that the time spent in tutoring did not have a meaningful impact on student reading outcomes as determined by state level assessments. For reading growth, which measured changes in annual reading proficiency, 157 of 169 tutoring participants showed a statistically significant positive correlation in reading ($r = 0.63$, $n = 157$, $p = 0.00$). The relationship between frequency of attendance and math proficiency, as determined

by EOC, had a positive significant correlation ($r = 0.30$, $n = 146$, $p = 0.00$). The frequency of attendance in tutoring had a positive correlation, but it was not significant ($r = 0.02$, $n = 62$, $p = 0.88$). A significant positive correlation was identified ($r = 0.34$, $n = 143$, $p = 0.00$) for students who attended a minimum of six hours of biology tutoring. For history, the data showed a negative correlation, although not significant ($r = -0.49$, $n = 41$, $p = 0.76$), for frequency of attending a tutoring program and EOC scores for a U.S. history class.

The results from Maestre (2015) affirm extended learning as a method to improve outcomes for students. However, quantitative measures of student achievement did not produce enough information for researchers to understand why some students in the treatment condition responded more favorably than others. Therefore, qualitative data should have been considered to provide context to students' outcomes and experiences.

In another study, Lowe (2021) conducted a casual-comparative study to analyze the relationship between the CPS model on student efficacy and community engagement. Five research questions were posed to determine the relationship between school type (CPS model and non-CPS model) and social, academic, and civic engagement of student self-efficacy among different ethnic and socioeconomic demographics.

The sample population came from one high school that served students from three feeder schools: one CPS high school and two non-CPS high schools. Students who had attended the CPS feeder school served as the treatment group while students who attended the two non-CPS feeder schools served as the control group. All students in the study sample attended the same CPS high school and were enrolled in the same social studies course. Overall, half of the eligible student population agreed to participate in the study ($n = 498$).

To address the research questions, data were gathered through a convenience sampling method. Study participants were asked to complete two surveys: Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) and Civic Engagement Scale (CES). The SEQ-C instrument contained eight questions related to self-efficacy in three domains: social self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, and emotional self-efficacy. A 5-point Likert scale was used to capture student responses. Study participants were asked to complete the CES survey, which contained 14 items and used a 7-point Likert scale to measure student characteristics associated with civic engagement.

Lowe (2021) used an independent *t*-test to analyze students' responses to the items on the student surveys to determine if a relationship existed between student groups and different types of efficacies. The results showed that the CPS model reported a statistically significantly (p = .009) stronger positive correlation between social self-efficacy (n = 94, M = 29.97, SD = 5.421) and the CPS group than the comparison non-CPS group (n = 387, M = 28.84, SD = 4.767). Levene's test for equality of variances was p = .160. Also, the CPS model reported a statistically significant (p = .045) stronger positive correlation (n = 96, M = 30.84, SD = 4.923) between academic self- efficacy and the CPS group than the non-CPS groups (n = 382, M = 29.79, SD = 4.516). Levene's test for equality of variances was p = .223. Further, the CPS model reported a statistically significant higher positive correlation (M = 1.390, 95% CI [-0.063, 2.844], t(479) = 1.879, p = .006.) between emotional self-efficacy and the CPS group (n = 95, M = 28.45, SD = 7.189) than non-CPS groups (n = 386, M = 27.06, SD = 6.269). Levene's test for equality of variances was p = .160. Finally, the CPS model reported a higher statistically significant (M = 2.197, 95% CI [-2.098, 6.492], t(464) = 1.005, p = .032.) difference in civic engagement (n = 92, M = 54.11, 76 SD = 20.433) than non-CPS comparison students (n = 374, M = 51.91, SD = 18.355). Levene's test for equality of variances was p = .242. Lowe's (2021) study added to the

body of literature by suggesting that CPS model improve more than academic outcomes, especially for diverse student populations. At the time of the present study, CPS model serve over 22,000 students and 75% are minorities (46% African American, 26% Hispanic, and 3.75% more than one race), and 86% are of low-SES status (Florida Community Partnership Schools 2020-2021 Fact Sheet, n.d.).

Summary

The effect of family and community engagement on student outcomes has been well documented. Nevertheless, schools in achievement status are time-pressed to increase student proficiency. Therefore, turnaround plans invest in programs promising immediate results. Often, these programs are geared toward adopting the latest curriculum, strengthening teacher efficacy, and revamping positive behavior support programs Unfortunately, they often fail to adopt strategies that bolster family and community engagement. Proponents of community schools have noted that the problems of educational attainment and success often depend on factors beyond the scope of the school and families and are reflective of the social, physical, and emotional needs associated with living in poverty. The benefits of the community school model extend beyond student success. The current literature suggests that school partnerships bring valuable assets to the community in the form of meeting spaces, employment, adult learning opportunities, and the ability to fundraise. However, quantitative studies that examine parents' perceptions of community schools are needed to create a well-rounded body of literature.

III. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to provide context to parents' perceptions of family and community engagement efforts in Achievement elementary schools. The Florida Department of Education requires low-performing schools to develop strategies to increase family and community engagement based on Epstein et al.'s (2019) typology for parent involvement; these strategies are part of the school turnaround improvement plan. Therefore, quantifying parent perceptions of engagement is essential in creating programs that bring families, schools, and communities together to improve schools' performance grades. This chapter describes the methods and procedures utilized in this study. In addition, the research context, sample population, instruments, and research questions are presented. Finally, a preliminary analysis of data is discussed.

Description of Methodology

The present study was non-experimental, quantitative, and causal comparative by research design. A causal-comparative design is a research design that seeks to find relationships between independent and dependent variables after an action or event has already occurred (Mills & Gay, 2019). The survey data were obtained through an archival district database from the 2018-2019 school year. Parent perceptions of family and community engagement were measured along eight specific dimensions of school climate, which represented the basis of data achieved and which represents the most current data available before the COVID -19 pandemic.

The School Climate and Perception Survey (SCIP) was used to compare the perceived effects of the Community Partnership Schools™ model on family and community engagement to the perceived effects of non-community schools on family and community engagement in

Achievement Schools. To better understand the perceived effect, archival data sets were retrieved from 41 Achievement Schools in a county in Central Florida.

Research Context

The research study took place in a large district in Central Florida. The school district is in the top 10 largest in the United States and services nearly 224,000 students; it is the largest employer in the county with around 24,000 employees. The district hosts 274 schools, including 137 elementary schools, 45 middle schools, 28 high schools, 54 charter schools, four career centers, and four community colleges. The overall student demographics consists of 37.1% Hispanic students, 32.9% White students, 21% African American students, 4.6% multi-racial students, 4.1% Asian students, 0.2% American Indian students, and 0.2% Pacific Islander students. The district's student population also consists of 14.4% Exceptional Education students (ESE), 11.1% English Language Learners, and 11.1% Gifted students. In addition, students facing economic challenges consists of 59% low-SES students, 0.9% homeless students, and 0.8% migrant students (HCPS, n.d.).

Achievement schools comprise the 50 lowest performing schools in the district. Schools in Achievement status, serve nearly 30,000 students and employ more than 3,500 teachers. The student demographics are comprised of 89% minority students, 92% students who receive free or reduced lunch, and 18% of students receive ESE services. Schools are divided into zones which operate under the guidance of an area supervisor who is responsible for helping schools improve in five domains: instruction, leadership, collaboration, school climate, and family engagement. In accordance with the district's vision to improve school quality, a vast number of community partners, such as businesses, organizations, and non-profits, collaborated with the district to

provide resources to support students attending low-performing schools (Strategic Acceleration Plan, 2019).

Participants

The participants in this study were a subsample of parents who completed the SCIP Survey and whose children attended elementary Achievement schools. At the time of the study, 41 elementary schools within the district were in Achievement status, and two were Community Partnership Schools™ model affiliates. The demographic composition of the sample were 89% families of color, and more than 90% of the sample received free or reduced lunch. Almost 20% of the sample comprised students with disabilities, which is nearly double the district average (HCPS, n.d.).

Instrument

The school district in this study administers the School Climate and Perception Survey (SCIP) to capture parent perceptions of schools (Title I Parent & Family Engagement Plan, 2020-2021). The SCIP Survey tool evaluates parents' perceptions on school factors that influence student outcomes: parent involvement, communication, student learning, volunteering and relationship building, school decision making and advocating, community collaboration, school environment, and school leadership (Title I Parent & Family Engagement Plan, 2020-2021). Once the results are analyzed, administrators develop a plan to target areas needing improvement as identified by the survey results, which becomes part of the school's School Improvement Plan (Title I Parent & Family Engagement Plan, 2020-2021).

Validity of School Climate and Perception Survey

The validity of the School Climate and Perceptions Survey was achieved through content validity. According to Gay et al. (2012), content validity is the degree to which test questions

reflect the topic being assessed. Both sample validity and item validity are judged by experts to determine whether survey items are appropriate for the content being examined (Gay et al., 2012). The SCIP Survey was developed by the Local Education Agency (LEA) and a parent committee. The LEA's office of assessment and accountability is responsible for analyzing and reporting data to school sites and the results are used to develop a parent involvement plan (Parent Improvement Plan, 2017-2018).

Reliability of School Climate and Perception Survey

The reliability of the SCIP Survey instrument was determined by the Cronbach's alpha value. According to George and Mallery (2018), Likert scale instruments are best interpreted using the conventions of alpha value. The Cronbach's alpha value was analyzed by using SPSS version 28. The Cronbach's alpha has a value between 0 and 1. The closer the Cronbach's alpha value to 1, the greater the internal consistency of the item within the scale. According to George and Mallery (2018), Cronbach's alpha value greater than 0.90 suggests high internal consistency, values between 0.80-0.09 reflect moderately high consistency, values between 0.70-0.80 reflect acceptable consistency, and values below 0.70 reflect questionable consistency.

Procedures

First, IRB approval was granted from Southeastern University and the participating school district to conduct research. Archival data were retrieved from the 2018-2019 SCIP Survey from all schools in Achievement status. Next, a one-sample *t*-test and a *t*-test of independent means were used to address statistical significance of the parent perceptions of school. The skew and kurtosis values were analyzed to determine the assumption of normality. It was concluded that the values were within the normal range. According to George and Mallery (2018), data within the ± 2 range show a normal distribution. The power of *G* was used to

address unequal distribution of samples. Finally, the collected data were analyzed through descriptive, inferential, and associated statistics using SPSS 28.0 program.

Data Analysis

Study data were analyzed using descriptive, inferential, and associative statistical techniques through the 28 version of IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Prior to addressing the study's four research questions, evaluations of missing data and internal reliability were conducted. Missing data were addressed using descriptive techniques (frequencies, percentages). In the event missing data exceeded 5%, the randomness of missing data was assessed using the Little's Missing Completely At Random (MCAR) statistical technique. Internal reliability of study participant response was assessed using the Cronbach's alpha and Hedges *g* statistical techniques.

The research questions were addressed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Frequencies (*n*) and percentages (%) were the foundational analyses used for practical significance purposes. The statistical significance of research questions one and three were assessed using the one-sample *t*-test. The statistical significance of research questions two and four were assessed using the *t*-test of Independent Means. The mean scores associated with schools not adopting a CPS model were the statistical model's test value in the comparison process. The magnitude of effect for findings in research questions one, two, and three were assessed using the Cohen's *d* statistical technique. The magnitude of effect for findings in research question four was assessed using Hedge's *g* statistical technique. Sawilowsky's (2009) conventions of effect size interpretations were used to assign numeric effect size values.

Preliminary Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze parents' perceptions of schools using the SCIP Survey by dimensions of school climate and group (CPS and non-CPS). The data were analyzed using frequencies (*n*), measures of typicality (mean scores), variability (minimum/maximum; standard deviations), standard errors of the mean, and data normality.

Research Question 1

To what degree have parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement been affected in schools adopting a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

H_a 1

There will be a statistically significant effect for parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement for schools adopting a Community Partnership Schools™ model.

Research Question 2

To what degree did parental perceptions differ on school climate as they pertain to parental engagement in schools that adopted Community Partnership Schools™ model and those schools who did not adopt a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

H_a 2

The difference in parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement between schools that adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model and those schools who did not adopt a Community Partnership Schools™ model will favor schools that adopted the Community Partnership Schools™ model to a statistically significant degree.

Research Question 3

Considering the eight dimensions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement, which reflected the greatest degree of response effect of school for schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model?

H_a 3

The dimension of community will represent the largest effect in overall parental perceptions of school climate for schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model.

Research Question 4

To what degree did schools who have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model differ along the eight dimensions of school climate from those schools who have not adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

H_a 4

Parental perceptions of school climate along the eight dimensions will differ to a statistically significant degree favoring schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model in the comparison.

Summary

Understanding parents' perceptions is important if educators hope to improve parent involvement in schools. The current literature strongly suggests that parent involvement has the potential to improve student outcomes across many domains. Preliminary research findings illustrated that the CPS model is systematically designed to bring schools, families, and communities together through a variety of parent and student-based programs. A descriptive

statistics-based approach was utilized to analyze data sets that provides context to parent perceptions of schools.

IV. RESULTS

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the perceived effects of the Community Partnership Schools™ model on family and community engagement for students attending 41 Achievement schools in Central Florida. This chapter contains the results of the study, as well as a presentation of the data. Four research questions guided the study.

Methods of Data Collection

A quantitative, non-experimental survey research methodology was used to investigate the topic of this study. IRB approval was requested and granted by the sample population school district and Southeastern University.

The data were obtained through archival survey response records. The data were organized using a descriptive and inferential statistical methodology to answer the four research questions. The study data was analyzed and reported using IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 28).

The following represents the reporting of study findings for analyses conducted in a preliminary manner:

Preliminary Descriptive Statistical Findings

Descriptive statistical techniques were used to assess the study's demographic identifying information. The study's demographic information was specifically addressed using frequencies (n) and percentages (%).

Table 1 contains a summary of finding for the descriptive statistical analysis of the study's demographic identifying information:

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics: Demographic Identifying Information

Variable	*n*	*%*	Cumulative *%*
Group			
Non-Community School	366	97.08	97.08
Community School	11	2.92	100.00
Missing	0	0.00	100.00

Descriptive Statistics: Preliminary Response Set Findings (School Climate Dimensions)

Descriptive statistical techniques were used to assess study participant perceptions of school climate by dimensions of school climate and group (community school; non-community school). The data were addressed using frequencies (n), measures of typicality (mean scores), variability (minimum/maximum; standard deviations), standard errors of the mean (SE_M), and data normality (skew; kurtosis).

Table 2 contains a summary of finding for the descriptive statistical analysis of study participant perceptions of essential school climate elements by group:

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics: Comparison of Essential School Climate Dimensions by Group

School Climate Dimension (Group)	*M*	*SD*	*n*	SE_M	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Non-Community School								
Communication	4.16	0.96	366	0.05	1.33	5.33	-1.00	0.14
Parenting	3.98	1.14	366	0.06	1.00	6.00	-0.92	-0.08
Student	4.08	0.99	366	0.05	1.00	5.22	-1.07	0.58
Volunteer	4.17	0.91	366	0.05	1.00	5.50	-1.08	0.89
Decision	4.09	1.00	366	0.05	1.00	5.50	-0.98	0.26
Community	4.13	0.97	366	0.05	1.00	6.00	-0.86	0.27
Environment	4.09	0.95	366	0.05	1.00	5.30	-0.96	0.32
Leadership	4.14	1.12	366	0.06	1.00	6.00	-1.04	0.53
Community School								
Communication	4.19	1.12	11	0.34	2.11	5.11	-0.99	-0.47
Parenting	4.18	1.01	11	0.30	2.40	5.00	-0.54	-1.33
Student	4.18	1.04	11	0.31	2.22	5.00	-0.80	-0.84
Volunteer	4.30	0.96	11	0.29	2.00	5.00	-1.28	0.87
Decision	4.33	1.00	11	0.30	2.17	5.33	-1.01	-0.17
Community	4.50	0.65	11	0.20	3.50	5.25	-0.35	-1.58
Environment	4.30	0.80	11	0.24	3.10	5.00	-0.37	-1.64
Leadership	4.53	0.83	11	0.25	2.40	5.40	-1.60	2.06

Data Analysis by Research Question

Four research questions and accompanying hypotheses guided the study. Statistical significance was established using the alpha level of $p \leq .05$. The following represents the formal reporting of findings presented in the study. The internal reliability of study participant response to survey items associated with the dimensions of school climate was addressed using the Cronbach's alpha (a) statistical technique (Taber, 2018). The conventions of alpha interpretation proposed by George and Mallery (2018) were used for the interpretation of the internal reliability level achieved in the study. As a result, the internal reliability achieved in the study for

participants associated with Community Partnership Schools™ model was considered excellent (a = .98)

Table 3 contains a summary of finding for the evaluation of internal reliability of study participant response to survey items across the dimensions of school climate for Model Schools:

Table 3

Internal Reliability across Dimensions of School Climate: Model Schools

Scale	No. of Items	α	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Overall Reliability	8	0.98	0.96	0.99

Note. The lower and upper bounds of Cronbach's α were calculated using a 95% confidence interval.

Research Question 1

To what degree have parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement been affected in schools adopting a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

Hypothesis

There will be a statistically significant effect for parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement for schools adopting a Community Partnership Schools™ model.

Analysis

A one sample *t*-test was used to assess the statistical significance of study participant perceptions of overall school climate for schools adopting a CPS approach. The assumption of normality for the one sample *t*-test was addressed through the interpretation of skew and kurtosis values. The skew value (-0.73) and kurtosis value (-1.15) for overall perceptions of school climate for CPS were within -/+2.0 (skew) and -/+7.0 (kurtosis), thus satisfying the assumption of normality using the conventions of skew and kurtosis proposed by George and Mallery (2018).

Findings

The finding for parent perceptions of overall school climate for CPS was statistically significant ($t_{(10)} = 4.74$; $p < .001$). The effect for study participant response in research question one was considered very large ($d = 1.43$).

Table 4 contains a summary of finding for the response effect for overall school climate with schools considered as CPS model.

Table 4

Evaluating the CPS model: Overall Effect

Variable	*M*	*SD*	μ	*t*	*p*	*d*
Overall Perceptions	4.29	0.90	3	4.74	< .001	1.43

Note. Degrees of Freedom for the *t*-statistic = 10. *d* represents Cohen's *d.*

Research Question 2

To what degree do parental perceptions differ on school climate as they pertain to parental engagement in schools that adopted Community Partnership Schools™ model and those schools who did not adopt a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

Hypothesis

The difference in parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement between schools that adopted Community Partnership Schools™ model and those schools who did not adopt a Community Partnership Schools™ model will favor schools that adopted the Community Partnership Schools™ model to a statistically significant degree.

Analysis

The statistical significance of the mean score comparison featured in research question two was addressed using a *t*-test of independent means. The assumption of normality for the *t*-test of independent means was addressed through the interpretation of skew and kurtosis values. The skew value (-0.73) and kurtosis value (-1.15) for overall perceptions of school climate for CPS and the skew value (-0.94) and kurtosis value (0.27) for overall perceptions of school climate for non-CPS were within -/+2.0 (skew) and -/+7.0 (kurtosis), thus satisfying the assumption of normality using the conventions of skew and kurtosis proposed by George and Mallery (2018).

Findings

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was addressed through the interpretation of the Levene *F* value. The Levene *F* value in the comparison was non-statistically significant (Levene $F = 0.10$; $p = .75$). As a result, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was satisfied.

The mean score difference (0.18) favoring the overall perceptions of school climate for study participants associated with CPS was manifested at a non-statistically significant level ($t_{(375)} = 0.66$; $p = .26$). The magnitude of effect in the comparison favoring the overall perceptions of school climate for study participants associated with CPS was considered small. Table 2 contains a summary of findings for the comparison of overall perceptions of school climate between study participants associated with CPS and non-CPS.

Table 5 contains a summary of finding for the comparison of overall perceptions of school climate between study participants associated with the CPS model and non-CPS model:

Table 5

Comparison Finding: Overall Perceptions of School Climate by Model Schools and Non-Model Schools

	Non-Community School		Community School				
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*d*
Overall	4.10	0.90	4.29	0.90	0.66	.26	0.20

Note. N = 377. Degrees of Freedom for the *t*-statistic = 375. *d* represents Cohen's *d.*

Research Question 3

Considering the eight dimensions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement, which reflected the greatest degree of response effect of school climate for schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model?

Hypothesis

The dimension of community will represent the largest effect in overall parental perceptions of school climate for schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model.

Analysis

A one sample *t*-test was used to assess the statistical significance of study participant perceptions in each of the eight dimensions school climate for schools adopting a CPS model. The assumption of normality for the one sample *t*-test was addressed through the interpretation of skew and kurtosis values. The skew values and kurtosis values for each of the eight dimensions of school climate for CPS model were within -/+2.0 (skew) and -/+7.0 (kurtosis), thus satisfying the assumption of normality using the conventions of skew and kurtosis proposed by George and Mallery (2018).

Findings

All eight dimensions of school climate reflected statistically significant response effects. The findings for parental perceptions of school climate in the domain of community for schools in the CPS condition were considered huge ($d = 2.30$). Four of the dimensions of school climate reflected statistically significant, very large response effects.

Table 6 contains a summary of finding for the response effect for each of the eight dimensions of school climate with schools considered as a CPS model:

Table 6

Response Effect Summary: Eight Dimensions of School Climate for CPSs

Dimension	Mean	*SD*	*t*	*d*
Communication	4.19	1.12	3.52***	1.06
Parenting	4.18	1.01	3.90***	1.18
Students	4.18	1.94	3.77***	1.14
Volunteering	4.30	0.96	4.50***	1.36[b]
Decision-Making	4.33	1.00	4.41***	1.33[b]
Community	4.50	0.65	7.63***	2.30[a]
Environment	4.30	0.80	5.41***	1.63[b]
Leadership	4.53	0.83	6.13***	1.85[b]

***$p < .001$ [a] Huge Effect ($d \geq 2.00$) [a] Very Large Effect ($d \geq 1.20$)

Research Question 4

To what degree do schools who have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model differ along the eight dimensions of school climate from those schools who have not adopted a CPS model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

Hypothesis

Parental perceptions of school climate along the eight dimensions will differ to a statistically significant degree favoring schools that have adopted a CPS model in the comparison schools.

Analysis

The statistical significance of the mean score comparisons featured in research question four was addressed using a *t*-test of independent means. The assumption of normality for the *t*-test of independent means was addressed through the interpretation of skew and kurtosis values. The skew values and kurtosis values for all eight comparisons of school climate by dimension were within -/+2.0 (skew) and -/+7.0 (kurtosis), thus satisfying the assumption of normality using the conventions of skew and kurtosis proposed by George and Mallery (2018).

Findings

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was addressed through the interpretation of the Levene *F* value. The Levene *F* values in all eight comparisons were non-statistically significant ($p > .05$). As a result, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was satisfied for all eight comparisons featured in research question four.

All eight comparisons favored the mean score perceptions of study participants associated with CPSs. The greatest single effect favoring the perceptions of study participants associated with CPS was reflected in the dimension of Community ($g = .38$), closely followed by the dimension of Leadership ($g = .35$). Table 4 contains a summary of findings for the comparisons of perceptions by dimension of school climate between study participants associated with CPS and non-CPS.

Table 7 contains a summary of finding for the comparisons of parental perceptions by dimension of school climate between study participants associated with the CPS model and non-CPS model:

Table 7

Response Effect Comparison Summary for Dimensions of School Climate

Dimension/Group	*n*	Mean	*SD*	*T*	*g*
Communication (CPS)	11	4.19	1.12	0.13	.04
Communication (non-CPS)	366	4.16	0.96		
Parenting (CPS)	11	4.18	1.01	0.57	.17
Parenting (non-CPS)	366	3.98	1.14		
Student (CPS)	11	4.18	1.04	0.35	.11
Students (non-CPS)	366	4.08	0.99		
Volunteering (CPS)	11	4.30	0.96	0.47	.14
Volunteering (non-CPS)	366	4.17	0.91		
Decision-Making (CPS)	11	4.33	1.00	0.79	.24
Decision-Making (non-CPS)	366	4.09	1.00		
Community (CPS)	11	4.50	0.65	1.26	.38
Community (non-CPS)	366	4.13	0.97		
Environment (CPS)	11	4.30	0.80	0.71	.22
Environment (non-CPS)	366	4.09	0.95		
Leadership (CPS)	11	4.53	0.83	1.14	.35
Leadership (non-CPS)	366	4.15	1.12		

Summary

The survey responses showed a high level of internal reliability in the dimensions of school climate for participants associated with the CPS model. Parental perceptions of school climate for the CPS model was statistically significant, reflecting a very large response effect. The greatest single response effect for parents associated with the CPS model was for the dimension of Community. When comparing the non-CPS to CPS model parental perceptions across all eight dimensions of school climate, parents in the CPS condition rated higher overall for each of the eight dimensions of school climate. A thorough discussion of the findings reported in Chapter IV of the study is presented in Chapter V.

V. DISCUSSION

Parents' perceptions of the Community Partnership Schools™ model on family and community engagement for students attending Achievement elementary schools in Central Florida represented the focus of the study. The first section of Chapter V contains an overview of the research problem and methodology. Next, delineations of the study results and limitations of the study are presented. The remainder of the chapter contains a discussion of the implications on the present study and then provides recommendations for future research.

Review of Methodology

The study's research design was non-experimental, quantitative, and causal comparative by specific research methodology. The study's survey data were obtained through an archival database from the 2018-2019 school year. The study's sample of participants was accessed from the school district's 41 lowest performing elementary schools known as Achievement schools. The Achievement schools were separated into two conditions: CPS community schools and non-CPS community schools. Schools in the CPS condition received support and guidance from the UCF's Center of Community Schools and community partners to improve school quality. Overall, 39 non-CPS and two CPS schools comprised the sample population. A one sample *t*-test and *t*-test of independent means were used to determine statistical significance of parents' perceptions of family and community engagement based on eight dimensions of school climate. The archival data used for study presents the most current data available on the study's topic prior to the Covid-19 pandemic. Study data were analyzed using descriptive, inferential, and associated statistical techniques. The study's data were analyzed and reported using the 28th version of IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Summary of Results

Dewey's (1897) social constructivist theory, the inspiration for the community education model, represented the study's theoretical framework. The community education model relies heavily upon community partners to provide in-place services in the form of wellness services, expanded learning, collaborative leadership, family, and community engagement. The study was designed to focus upon parental perceptions of family and community engagement in schools that have adopted a community education model. Subsequently, four research questions were posed to evaluate parents' perceptions of the Community Partnership Schools™ model on family and community engagement for K-5 students attending Achievement schools in Central Florida. Overall, the results achieved in the study suggested that parents' perceptions of family and community engagement in CPS model schools were favorable across all eight domains as reported on the SCIP survey.

Discussion by Research Question

A discussion of the findings achieved for the four research questions that guided the study is presented as follows.

Research Question 1

To what degree have parental perceptions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement been affected in schools adopting a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP Survey?

Parent perceptions of school climate in CPS model represented the focus of research question one. A one-sample *t*-test was used to determine the statistical significance of archival data and reflected significant positive parent perceptions of overall school climate for schools in the CPS condition. The finding achieved from research question one is practically significant in

that appears to validate the parallel relationship of the four pillars of CPS model (family and community engagement, extended learning, collaborative leadership, and wellness support) and Epstein et al.'s (2019) parent involvement typology, which heavily influenced the construction of the study's survey items (parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decisions making, and community collaboration).

The organic path between the CPS pillar of family and community engagement and Epstein et al.'s (2019) community collaboration typology appears to have influenced and validated the survey responses in the domains of family and community engagement and community. The triangulation of Epstein et al.'s (2019) typology, CPS pillars, and SCIP Survey domains created many opportunities for parents and the community to become involved in schools. The mission statement from one CPS model in the sample of participating schools appears to address the following standard: it is essential to engage "families and partners to provide services that inspire the community to ensure students excel as successful and responsible citizens" (Burns et al., 2019, p. 5).

Next, the relationship between the CPS pillar of collaborative leadership and Epstein et al.'s volunteering and decision-making typology may have exerted a hypothesized influence upon the survey responses in the domains of volunteering, decision-making, community, and leadership. For example, individuals from one CPS model school in the sample worked closely with an advisory committee made up of parents, school administrators, community leaders, and residents. The role of the Advisory Committee was to provide recommendations to the school district on ways to improve the school.

Finally, the statistical relationship between the CPS pillar of extended learning and wellness support correlated with Epstein et al.'s (2019) parent involvement typology in the

domains of student learning at home, communication, parenting, and community and influenced perceptions in the domains of parenting, student learning, and community as captured on the SCIP Survey. In conclusion, the CPS model received support and financial contributions from more than 50 organizations, charities, and businesses to help CPS model create school climates that support students and families (Community Programs, 2018). The results achieved in research question one appears to corroborate the interplay between school climate and stakeholder engagement and, therefore, may be considered as validating of the school district's use of the SCIP Survey to measure perceptions of school quality, specifically, family and community.

Research Question 2

To what degree do parental perceptions differ on school climate as they pertain to parental engagement in schools that adopted Community Partnership Schools™ model and those schools who did not adopt a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP survey?

In research question two, a comparison of parent perceptions of school climate in CPS model and non-CPS model was addressed. The statistical significance of findings in research question two was addressed using the *t*-test of Independent Means for parents' perceptions of CPS model and non-CPS model. The findings for overall perceptions of school climate were non-statistically significant, although the differences in mean scores in the comparison favored the CPS model in overall parent perceptions The magnitude of effect in the comparison of model was considered small. The non-statistically significant difference between comparison groups was likely related to three proposed factors: the lack of maturation of the CPS model that comprised the sample, the impact of community partnerships in non-CPS schools, and the

limitations of quantitative data to understand and provide context to parent perceptions of schools.

One factor that likely contributed to non-significant differences between comparison groups was the length of time operating as a CPS model. Both CPS community schools in the sample had been community schools for less than 4 years. Other studies suggest that stakeholder perceptions often change once the CPS model reach maturation. For example, in Adams' (2010) study, parents' perceptions of community schools changed over time and noted that stakeholder perceptions increased after 10 years of full community school implementation.

In addition, the CPS model is not the only school reform model that embraces Dewey's (1897) educational framework that promotes community involvement in education. Both the CPS model and non-CPS model put forth great effort to create a welcoming school climate that facilitates family and community engagement. Thus, the efforts of both school types were reflected in the survey responses. The present study takes place in one of the largest school districts in the nation. To that end, a vast number of community businesses, organizations, and non-profits partnered with the district to provide resources to support students at school. According to the 2018-2019 School District Impact Report, an education foundation created several innovative empowerment initiatives: empowering students to succeed, empowering through school and classroom enrichment, empowering through mentoring, empowering by providing additional supplies, empowering through teacher support, empowering through scholarships, and empowering through college and career readiness. The goal of the initiative was to provide equity of opportunity by ensuring all students had access to high quality education and educational opportunities, especially within Achievement schools: "We are committed to supporting our district's 50 highest needs schools, Achievement Schools, with

resources and supplies they need to level the playing field for all students" (Impact Report, 2018-2019, p.1).

Finally, the school district's efforts to engage the community on behalf of students and families in non-CPS model were like those of CPS model and were captured in the SCIP Survey, which yielded a non-significant distinction between model. Therefore, more qualitative data is needed to provide context to parents' perspectives in both CPS and non-CPS schools. The survey items did not include open-ended response questions, and parents' perspectives were limited to Likert-scale statements. In conclusion, since both the CPS and non-CPS model had favorable results, comparing school types did not illustrate the strengths or weaknesses of the CPS model. The lack of qualitative data represents a limitation in the study.

Research Question 3

Considering the eight dimensions of school climate as they pertain to parental engagement, research question three asks, "which is most associated with overall parental perceptions of school climate for schools that have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP survey"?

Research question three was designed to address parent perceptions of school climate in CPS model. Five dimensions of school climate reflected statistically significant response effects: (1) volunteering, (2) decision making, (3) community, (4) environment, and (5) leadership. The findings for study participant perceptions of the school climate dimension of "Community" for schools in the CPS condition were noteworthy. The magnitude of the effect for parental responses were considered large.

Parents' perceptions of community were influenced by interactions with multiple community partners. One CPS model was comprised of eight core community partners: The

University of South Florida's College of Education Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships, a local school district, University of Central Florida Center for Community Schools, Children's Home Society of Florida, Tampa Family Health Centers, Florida Hospital, University Area Community Development Center, Tampa Innovation Alliance, Bay Hope Church, and Vistra Communications. The second CPS model featured community partners such as the YMCA, Tampa Family Health Centers, University of South Florida (USF), UCF Center for Community Schools, and the local school board. The abundance of partnerships helped schools meet the needs of students and families without placing additional burdens on the school. Increased financial support and additional personnel are two ways that community partners help schools provide programs that would beyond the traditional role of the school (Ellis, 2019).

Four broad community involvement items were represented on the survey: (1) the school is supported by the community; (2) the school keeps families informed about available resources in the community; (3) students are encouraged to participate in school and community events; and (4) willingness to advocate school needs (Office of Strategy Management, 2019). It would appear logical to conclude that the abundance of community partnerships heavily influenced the parent survey responses in the domain of community collaboration.

Also, the domains of volunteering and decision making are interrelated. Parents often volunteer their time to participate in school committees, such as a Parent Teacher Association (PTA), where parents influence school policies. Similarly, non-profit partnership organizations rely heavily on volunteers to run programs. Since most community organizations are located in the community, parents represent the most readily available pool for volunteers. Thus, the findings related to the domains of volunteering and decision-making align with the research of Ihmeideh et al. (2020), which discovered that parents wanted to be involved in meaningful ways.

Parents expressed wanting to participate in creating policies that impacted their child(ren) and reported being part of the decision-making process increased involvement at school.

The domain of environment was an area measured on the SCIP Survey but not included in Epstein et al.'s (2019) typology. The category was added by the school district to capture parents' perceptions of the school environment. Survey items in this section were designed to elicit parent response to the following school environment conditions: school safety, class sizes, school pride, polite staff, school rules are followed, school cleanliness, condition of school facilities, inclusive of diversity and student differences, and recommend the school to others. The significance of school environment was unlikely related to class size because the number of students in a class is determined by district policy and is impacted by school size. Other factors affecting diversity and student differences could have been impacted by youth development and mentorship from community partnership organizations like the YMCA. The results coincide with Rodriguez et al. (2014), who found that parents' involvement increased when the school environment was warm and welcoming.

Parent perception on survey items associated with school safety, school cleanliness, and condition of facilities could have been greatly impacted by community partners. Student safety may reflect the efforts of after-school tutoring and extended-day programs that provide supervision for students. Keeping the school and facilities clean and in working order could be impacted by services from community partners or by community volunteers beyond the school custodians.

The topic of school leadership was not specifically addressed in Epstein et al.'s typology of parent involvement. However, a Leadership domain was included on the SCIP survey and reflected a statistically significant finding likely due to the shared governing structure in place at

each CPS model in the sample. The findings regarding leadership are consistent with Rodriguez et al. (2014) where parents stated that trust in schools and teachers impacted how they engaged at school. According to Rodriguez et al. (2014), effective school leaders developed schoolwide practices that made staff accessible, sought parent collaboration, and provided clear and frequent communication to create positive family and school relationships.

Finally, the five dimensions of school climate that reflected statistically significant response effects of volunteering, decision making, community, environment, and leadership, are target areas of school improvement aimed to meet the CPS model's objective which is to "meet the social, emotional, mental, physical, nutritional, and sometimes financial needs of students so they are ready and able to fully engage in the rigorous academic opportunities offered by their school" (The Community Partnership Schools™ Model of Community Schools, n.d.). The impact from parents' volunteering and participation in decision making help the CPS model's effectiveness in meeting the needs of the school and families. In conclusion, without community partnerships, the tangible supports needed to address the social, emotional, physical, nutritional, and financial needs of students go unmet. The components of the CPS model work in unison to create an environment that prepares students for academic success. To that end, collaborative leadership establishes an organizational structure that moves the CPS model toward a unified vision.

Research Question 4

To what degree do schools who have adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model differ along the eight dimensions of school climate from those schools who have not adopted a Community Partnership Schools™ model as measured by the SCIP survey?

In research question four, a comparison of parent perceptions of school climate in CPS and non-CPS schools were featured. All eight comparisons featured in research question four favored the mean score perceptions of study participants associated with CPS model, although not to a statistically significant degree. The greatest single effect favoring the perceptions of study participants associated with the CPS model was reflected in the dimension of community, closely followed by the dimension of leadership. The dimension of community was highest among all the domains for the CPS model. The inherent nature and intentional inclusion of community partners may have caused this area to stand out.

The non-statistically significant findings for research question 4 could be attributed to the degree to which the survey was able to capture the width and breadth of the community influence in the CPS model ($p > .05$). The SCIP Survey only included four items in the survey related to community collaboration. Therefore, any great effort to engage the community, which was evident in both CPS and non-CPS model, would only establish a foundation of community involvement. Consequently, a qualitative study could provide context to the SCIP survey and provide a better method to compare CPS and non-CPS model. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the effect for the domain of community was consistent with the professional literature and illustrates the impact of community stakeholders upon schools noting that parents, students, and teachers consider community partnerships essential in youth social and academic development (Luter et al., 2017).

Finally, the results achieved in research question four regarding the domain of leadership was strategically impacted by the inclusion of collaborative leadership practices. The SCIP Survey required parents to rate their response to six statements: principal is an effective leader; assistant principal is an effective leader; principal cares what parents think; assistant principal

cares what parents think; administrators are approachable; and the school runs smoothly. The CPS model promote a collaborative leadership structure and employ a community partnership school director, expanding learning coordinator, wellness coordinator, and family and community engagement coordinator. The shared governing structure helps the school run more efficiently by allowing the principal and assistant principal to attend their responsibilities and respond to parents more effectively.

In conclusion, the findings of the present study are consistent with Provinzano et al.'s (2020) work where the impact of the collaborative leadership process between the principal and community school director in school environment and student outcomes was analyzed. The parents and students who participated in the study described the school environment as welcoming and noted that the leadership team worked alongside community partners to develop trust and build relationships with families.

Study Limitations

Relevant information regarding parent perceptions of family and community engagement was presented in the current study. However, several limitations were expected and influenced the methodology as presented in Chapter 3. First, the study was limited to parents' perceptions of family and community engagement. However, including teachers, students, administrators, or community partnerships' perspectives would create a more complete assessment of school engagement practices. Also, the number of parent respondents from the CPS model (n = 11) was low compared to non-CPS schools (n = 366), and all demographics of parents may not be represented.

Another limitation was related to the schools selected for the study. This study was delimited to 41 Achievement elementary schools in one county located in the State of Florida

(two CPS and 39 non-CPS). Limiting the study's sample of participants to one school district limited the generalizability of the results to other CPS schools in other areas of the State of Florida and abroad. In addition, neither CPS model in the sample had reached a mature stage, meaning the CPS model had less than four years of CPS implementation at the time the study was conducted, thus the results of the present study may not be generalizable to more established CPS sites.

A final limitation was related to the research methodology. A quantitative research design was limited in its ability to capture parents' detailed perceptions of school climate. Quantitative research is convenient, especially considering restricted school access due to COVID-19 restrictions. However, qualitative research methods, like interviews, focus groups, and observations provide context to perspectives which cannot be captured through standalone numerical data.

Implications for Future Practice

The abundance of archival data makes evaluating programs and school model convenient for researchers. The School Climate and Perceptions survey is noted to reflect high levels of validity and reliability in evaluating the perceptions of students and parents regarding school climate. Parent perceptions accessed in the current study reflected overall positive perspective of CPS model, especially in the domains of community and school leadership to a significant degree. However, a statistically significant difference in parent perceptions of school climate when comparing CPS affiliates to non-CPS schools was not reflected in the current study. Results achieved in the current study should be considered with other studies that recommend the CPS model as an effective approach to enhancing family and community engagement in schools with low-SES neighborhoods and historically low community involvement.

Epstein et al.'s (2019) research on parent involvement suggested that school climate was linked to parent involvement and student success (Cohen et al., 2009). Educational practices must address a variety of student and family needs, especially in diverse communities. To that end, schools must build more awareness and invest in improving parent involvement by implementing policies and practices that effectively engage families from all socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds as well as business and community organizations. CPS affiliates are recognized for their expertise beyond the scope of the school to reach a wider audience of community members and for their knowledge to engage families in innovative ways (Childs & Grooms, 2018).

Recommendations for Future Research

Understanding the degree to which schools engage families and the community is a complex, multifaceted process. The school climate surveys (SCIP) used in the current study provided data that were closely aligned with Epstein et al.'s (2019) parent involvement, including a domain that specifically addressed community involvement. Future research may focus upon studying perceptions of family and community engagement through the lens of other stakeholders, such as students, teachers, administrators, and community partners, using similar survey instruments. Such findings would help school leaders and policy makers identify engagement barriers and increase parent and community involvement in schools.

Another recommendation for future research on the topic would be to address a limitation in the present study by including qualitative data to provide greater context to parents' perspectives. Therefore, a mixed method or qualitative study is highly recommended to achieve a deeper, more thorough understanding of stakeholder perceptions of family and community engagement. Qualitative methods are well-suited for evaluating numerous sources of data, such

as observations, interviews, focus groups, and surveys, to attribute meaning to a similar phenomenon (Creswell, 2018). A case study design, moreover, could provide important information about stakeholders' perspectives that are specific to the individual school site.

Conclusion

A discussion of the results of Florida's only Community Partnership Schools™ model as a strategy to enhance family and community engagement in Achievement elementary schools in Central Florida was addressed in Chapter V. Overall, parental perceptions of schools were higher in CPS affiliates compared to non-CPS affiliates, and the positive association between community schools and family and community engagement was presented. Further, implications for decision makers who continue to seek effective family and community engagement model and who lobby for school improvement and individual student success were discussed. The present study provided recommendations for future research that includes qualitative data from a variety of educational stakeholders in an effort to better understand the effect of the Community Partnership Schools™ model on family and community engagement.

References

Adams. C. M., (2010). *The community school effect: Evidence from an evaluation of the Tulsa area community school initiative*. The Oklahoma Center for Educational Policy.

Adams. C. M., (2019) *Sustaining Full-Service Community Schools: Lessons from the Tulsa Area Community Schools Initiative*, Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk. (JESPAR), 24:3, 288-313, http://doi: 10.1080/10824669.2019.1615924

Addams, J. (1910). Twenty years at Hull-House. The MacMillan Company. https://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/addams/hullhouse/hullhouse.html

American Federation of Teachers., (2017). Health services in community schools. https://www.aft.org/linking-childrens-health-education/childrens-access-care/health-services-community-schools

Anderson, J. A., Chen, M. E., Min, M., & Watkins, L. L. (2019). Successes, challenges, and future directions for an urban full-service community schools initiative. *Education and Urban Society,* 51(7), 894-921.

Babbie, E.R. (2010) *The practice of social research* (12th ed). [PDF File] Wadsworth Cengage. http://ccftp.scu.edu.cn/Download/e6e50387-38f2-4309-af84-f4ceeefa5baa.pdf

Benner, A., Boyle, A., & Sadler, S. (2016). Parental involvement and adolescents' educational success: *The roles of prior achievement and socioeconomic status*. Springer Science & Business.

Bergman, P. (2012). The More You Know: Evidence from a Field Experiment on Parent-Child Information Frictions and Human Capital Investment. UCLA Working Paper.

Blank, M., Jacobson, R., & Pearson, S. S. (2009). A coordinated effort: Well-conducted partnerships meet students' academic, health, and social service needs. Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 75(3), 42–47

Blank, M. Melaville, A., & Shah, B. (2003). Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools. [PDF File]. Coalition for Community Schools. http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/Page/CCSFullReport.pdf

Bureau of Accountability Reporting, Division of Accountability, Research, and Measurement. (2019). *2018-2019 guide to calculating school grades, district grade, and the federal percent of points index* [PDF File]. http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/18534/urlt/SchoolGradesCalcGuide19.pdf

Cavanagh, S. (2012, April 4). Parental engagement proves no easy goal. *Education Week*, *31*(27), 16-17. https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/04/04/27engagement_ep.h31.html

Children's Aid Society. (2011). Building community schools: A guide for action. The Children's Aid Society.

Coalition for Community Schools (2017) Community schools: A whole child framework for school improvement. http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/CommunitySchools-A-Whole-Child-Approach-to-School-Improvement1.pdf.

Cohen, J., McCabe, E., Michelli, N. & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. Teachers College Record, 111(1), 180–213.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). Sage.

Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. The School Journal, 54, 77-80.

Dryfoos, J., Quinn, J., & Barkin, C. (2005). Community schools in action: Lessons from a decade of practice. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, A. (2016) Center for Community Schools. University of Central Florida. https://ccie.ucf.edu/communityschools/

Ellis, A. (2019). The Impact of the Community Partnership Schools Model on graduation and attendance rates in one Florida high school. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida.] STARS. http://purl.fcla/etd/CFE0007452

Elgart, M. A. (2015). Designing state accountability systems for continuous school improvement: A call to action. [PDF file]. *Advanced Ed*. http://www.advanced.org/sites/default/files/ESSA%20Call%20to%20Action%20Whitepaper.pdf

Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn N. R., Van Voorhis, F. L., Martin, C. S., Thomas, B. G., Greenfield, M. D., Hutchins, D. J., Williams, K. J. (2019). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (4th ed.). Corwin Press.

Erdener, M. A., & Knoeppel, R. C. (2018). Parents' perceptions of their involvement in schooling. International Journal of Research in Education and Science, 4(1), 1–13.

Figlio, D., (2016). A preliminary evaluation of the Evans community school and the extant literature on community schools. Northwestern University. https://www.cohpa.ucf.edu/communityschools/wpcontent/uploads/sites/15/2017/04/evans_community_school_evaluation_with_exec_sum mary_-_jan_2016.pdf

Florida Department of Education, Bureau of School Improvement. (2016). Turnaround plans for repeatedly low-performing schools. http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/16286/urlt/dapres.pdf

Florida Department of Education, Bureau of School Improvement. (2020). Florida school grades: 2018-19 School grades and school improvement ratings. https://www.floridacims.org/downloads

Florida Department of Education, Bureau of School Improvement. (2021). Florida's response and recovery for education: Closing achievement gaps and creating safe spaces for learning. https://s3.amazonaws.com/attachments.siponline/production/downloads/533/2021_22__S111 I__List_Prelim.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAJOJUUKNTH5ILBL7A&Expires=1626610982&Signature=CU5tIcxfSMcMsqxS2QFTTR5IMz4%3D

Florida Department of Education. (2018). Differentiated accountability rule update: 6A1.099811 – differentiated accountability state system of school improvement. https://www.flrules.org/gateway/ruleno.asp?id=6A-1.099811

Florida Department of Education. (2019). Florida School Accountability Reports. http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/accountability-reporting/school-grades/

Forbs Nonprofit. (2017, October 17). Nine ways nonprofits can increase community engagement. https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesnonprofitcouncil/2017/10/17/nine-ways-nonprofits-can-increase-community-engagement/#2b5b48fb7799

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and applications.* 10th ed. Pearson.

George, D. & Mallery, P. (2018). IBM SPSS statistics 25 step by step: A simple guide and reference (15th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351033909

Gilbert, L. R., Spears Brown, C., & Mistry, R. S. (2017). Latino immigrant parents' financial stress, depression, and academic involvement predicting child academic success. Psychology in the Schools, 54(9), 1202–1215.

Grayson, J. & Alvarez, H. (2008). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. Teaching and Teacher Education, 24, 1349-1363. https://doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2007.06.005

Hanover Research. (2014). Best practices in family and community engagement. [PDF file]:https://www.wasaoly.org/WASA/images/WASA/1.0%20Who%20We%20Are/1.4.1.6%20SIRS/Download_Files/LI%202018/Best%20Practices%20in%20Family%20and%20Community%20Engagement%202-1-18.pdf

Harkavy, I., Hartley, M., Hodges, R., & Weeks, J. (2013). The promise of university-assisted community schools to transform American schooling: A report from the field, 1985- 2012. Peabody Journal of Education, 88(5), 525-540, DOI: 10180/0161956X.2012.834789.

Hillsborough County Public Schools. (n.d.). Fact sheet, turnaround plans update. https://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/doc/2081/communications/resources/turnaround/

Ihmeideh, F., AlFlasi, M., Al-Maadadi, F., Coughlin, C., & Al-Thani, T. (2020). Perspectives of family-school relationships in qatar based on epstein's model of six types of parent involvement. *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development*, *40*(2), 188–204.

Knapp, A., Landers, R., Liang, S., & Jefferson, V. (2017). We all as a family are graduating tonight: A case for mathematical knowledge for parental involvement. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 95(1), 79–95.

Kraft, M.A., Rogers, T., & Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness. (2014). Teacher-to-Parent Communication: Experimental Evidence from a Low-Cost Communication Policy. In Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness.

Lowe, B. (2021). The impact of the community partnership school model on student self-efficacy and civic engagement. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020-*. 897. https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd2020/897

Luter, D. G., Lester, J. N., Lochmiller, C. R., & Kronick, R. (2017). Participant perceptions of a UACS afterschool program: extending learning beyond the classroom. *School Community Journal*, 27(1), 55-82.

Maestre, H. (2015). A study on the relationships between participation in tutoring and accountability measures in one urban high school. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1229. https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/1229

Maier, A., Daniel, J., Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2017, December 14). Community schools as an effective school improvement strategy: A review of the evidence. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/community-schools-effective-school-improvement-report

Maier, A., Daniel, J. Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2018). Community schools: A promising foundation for progress. American Educator, 42(2), 17–22. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1182081.pdf

Mapp, K. L., & Kuttner, P. J. (2014). Partners in education: A dual capacity-building framework for family-school partnerships. *Southwest Educational Development Laboratory*. http://www.sedl.org/pubs/framework/

McDaniels, A., (2018) Building community schools system. Center for American Progress. https://americanprogress.org/article/building-community-schools-systems/.

Miller-Grandvaux, Y. (2004). USAID and community schools in Africa: The vision, the strategy, the reality. USAID Office of Education. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadb992.pdf.

Mills, G. E., & Gay, L. R. (2019). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and applications* (Twelfth). Pearson.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 [NCLB], (2002). https://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml

Oakes, J., Maier, A., & Daniel, J. (2017). Community schools: An evidence-based strategy for equitable school improvement. *National Education Policy Center*. https://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/equitable-community-schools

O'Brien, J., (2013). Review of school turnarounds: The essential role of districts. *Journal of School International Research and Reform,* 7(4), 595-597. http://doi:10.1080/15582159.2013.848720

Paul, C. A. (2018). Elementary and secondary act of 1965. https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/programs/education/elementary-and-secondary-education-act-of-1965/

Provinzano, K. T., Sondergeld, T. A., & Knaggs, C. M. (2020). Community schools as a sustainable comprehensive school reform strategy: a transformative mixed methods perspective. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 3-30.

Roche, M. K., Institute for Educational Leadership, & Coalition for Community Schools. (2017).

Community schools: a whole-child framework for school improvement. *Institute for Educational Leadership.*

Rodriguez R. J, Blatz E. T., & Elbaum, B. (2014). *Parents' views of schools' involvement efforts.* Exceptional Children, 81 (1), 79-95.

Roy, M., & Giraldo-García, R. (2018). The role of parental involvement and social/emotional skills in academic achievement: Global perspectives. School Community Journal, 28(2), 29–46.

Sawilowsky, S. (2009). New effect size rules of thumb. Theoretical and Behavioral Foundations, 8,2, 597-599.

Schueler, B., Capotosto, L., Bahena, S., McIntyre., & Gehlbach, H. (2014) *Measuring parent perceptions of family-school engagement: the development of new survey tools.* School Community Journal ,Lincoln Vol 27, Iss. 2. P. 275-301.

The National Association for Family, Schools, and Community Engagement. (n.d.). Family engagement defined. https://nafsce.org/page/definition

U. S. Department of Education (2015). Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). https://www.ed.gov/essa?src=rn

U.S. Department of Education (2018). Title I – Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged. https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg1.html

U.S. Congress. Senate. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: Background Material with Related Presidential Recommendations. January 26, 1965. 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

University of Central Florida Center for Community Schools. (n.d.). The Community Partnership Schools model of community school. https://ccie.ucf.edu/communityschools/partnershipschool/

Urban, W. J., & Wagoner, J. (200). *American education: A history* (2nd ed). McGraw-Hill.

Wu, S.C. Pink, W.T., Crain, R.L., Moles, O. (1982). Student suspension: a critical reappraisal. *The Urban Review.*, 14:245–303.