Title:

A toolkit for parental engagement: From Project to Process

Abstract

A Toolkit for Parental Engagement: From Project to Process

This article reports on and analyses a yearlong project supporting school staff to increase parental engagement with children's learning. Working with 34 schools, the project included the provision of a toolkit (information and activities) as well as opportunities for school to school learning.

The project was useful for all schools, but some schools experienced profound changes in outlook, belief and practices. The major influences of change in this project were professional discussion, the use of the tools provided and reflection on both tools and discussion. The article concludes with a discussion of the implications for school leaders.

Author: Dr Janet Goodall, EdD

Lecturer in Educational Leadership and Management

University of Bath

Claverton Down

Bath

BA2 7AY

A Toolkit for Parental Engagement: From Project to Process

Introduction and context

In January of 2016, 30 school leaders came together at the University of Bath for the launch of a project which provided them with a Toolkit to support their work with parents. A year later, many of these same leaders, along with other representatives from the schools, came together again for the final event of the project, having met once more in the interim. This article gives an account of the project, its context and content, and of its impact.

The Toolkit for Parental Engagement was supported by funding from the public engagement unit at the University of Bath. The project worked with over 30 schools and staff from Wiltshire Local Authority. The Toolkit was not promoted as a school improvement project; as was noted to those attending the away days, 'school improvement' is too narrow a concept in relation to parental engagement (Author 2017c); the aim of this project was to support improvements in learning, particularly in the home learning environment. This project concentrated on the engagement of parents, through working with school leaders and the provision of external support, as these elements have been shown to be of value in supporting improvement in learning in schools facing economic challenge (Muijs et al. 2004).

Wiltshire is a relatively large county. The rate of children on free school meals in the Local Authority is relatively low across the county (7%), of whom 30% are identified as having special educational needs. Although overall the standard of living is good, with, for example, a very low rate of crime, there are still areas of concern; significant areas of Wiltshire as in the 5% most deprived in the UK (Wiltshire Community Foundation 2014). It is also worth noting that Wiltshire schools are often rural and many support families with ties to the military, which, among other things, may mean more than 50% mobility among students over an academic year. A range of schools, both primary and secondary, were involved in the project.

Parental engagement with children's learning

The value of parental engagement with children's learning is reasonably well accepted in the literature (Jeynes 2012, Author 2013, Castro et al. 2015, Ma et al. 2015, Punter, Glas, and Meelissen 2016, See and Gorard 2014, Huat See and Gorard 2015). Parental engagement with their children's learning can have beneficial effects on behaviour, attendance, and outcomes. While the literature is not as robust as could be desired (Author and Vorhaus 2011, See and Gorard 2014, Huat See and Gorard 2015), the conclusions are at least sound enough to warrant schools' concentration on parental engagement as an important aspect of their work to raise attainment overall and narrow the achievement gap between children from different backgrounds.

It is important to be clear about what the term, 'parental engagement with children's learning' means. 'Parent' here refers to any adult with a caring responsibility for a given child or young person, so could mean a biological, adoptive, step or foster parent, as well as another relative or other adult who interacts with the child around their learning. As it is used here, parental engagement with children's learning is not solely, or even mainly about parents' interactions with school staff or with schooling; rather, it relates to what has been called the home learning environment (Ho Sui-Chu and Willms 1996, OECD 2012, PISA 2013), typified by discussions around learning in the home. Overall, parental engagement with children's learning may be defined as 'parents' engagement with the broad sphere of their children's learning' (Author 2017b, 139).

Previous research (Harris and Author 2008) has shown that school staff often understand 'parental engagement/involvement' to mean parents' interactions with the school, interactions which are in general initiated and orchestrated by the school. Agency in these

relationships remains for the most part with school staff (Author and Montgomery 2013, Author 2017b). This sort of parental involvement is often understood to be limited to activities such as attending parents' evenings, helping with homework and coming into school for various activities. These actions may be classed as parental involvement school and schooling, and, while these activities may be helpful, they do little to support the home learning environment, yet it is in that environment that the greatest strides toward supporting children's achievement can be made (Desforges and Abouchaar 2003, Sylva et al. 2008).

One of the main aims of the Toolkit project was to support school staff to move their understanding of parental engagement from being centred on the school (parental involvement with school or schooling) thorough to this more effective form of engagement (Author and Montgomery 2013). The aim was to do this through support for schools' work around the home learning environment: to increase the incidence and value of conversations around learning in pupils' homes. Accomplishing this aim would require that both school staff and in particular senior leaders in schools (Author and Vorhaus 2011, Cordingley 2015) and parents come to understand the value of this form of parental engagement. To support this form of learning, schools would devise their own (and thus, appropriate to their contexts) initiatives, changes in practice and changes in emphasis.

Facilitating change: Professional learning for school staff

Training and development for school staff is a multimillion pound industry in the UK. Literature in this area, however, suggests that the form of development which is most valued by staff, and one of the most valuable forms, is professional discussion with other teachers (Author et al. 2005, Harris et al. 2006, Cordingley 2015). This paper uses a broad definition of CPD (Chappell 2016), which moves away from a narrow concept of training toward a much broader concept of learning. This is in keeping with Day's definition of continuing professional development as 'all natural learning experiences and those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual, group or school' (Day 1999, 4). Within the Toolkit process, 'group' would include the wider school community, encompassing families as well as students. The aim of the project is thus wider than the usual conception of CPD, which is based in classroom practice (Harris et al. 2006).

This project was structured around Guskey's fivefold levels of evaluation (Guskey 2002). Levels one and two of Guskey's framework, participant experience and learning, were taken into account in planning the away days. Level four, participant use of knowledge, was captured for each day by asking participants what they would do differently as a result of the day, and this as well as levels three and five, organizational change and pupil outcome were catered for by the evaluation process which included the 'Snapshots of the journey so far' analysed below.

This project was intended to facilitate change on a number of levels: in the home learning environment of students, in beliefs and practices of members of school staff, and, importantly, at the level of the organisations involved. The aim of the project was not short-term change but rather to have embedded, systemic change within the schools; the aim was to avoid discontinuous change (By 2005) and instead affect change at a more basic level of belief, and thus, practice (Timperley et al. 2008). All school leaders in Wiltshire were invited to participate in this project, because the impact of leaders on change initiatives is well known (Huber and Muijs 2010, Author and Vorhaus 2011). A fundamental part of the Toolkit project was the need to affect change not just among individual teachers or individual classrooms, but rather across entire organisations and systems (Author 2017b). To that end, those invited to attend the events were senior leaders in their schools. Guskey's evaluative framework (2002) highlights this need for organizational change, and was an important part of the Toolkit process. What was desired as an outcome of this project was not that teachers and leaders did new things or not solely that they did new

things, but that that any new things (and indeed, all of the old) came to be based on a new understanding of the value of parental engagement.

The Toolkit pilot was built around three events which allowed staff to share ideas, issues and progress with each other, as research has shown the value of collective reflection and sense making as a part of teachers' professional development (McArdle and Coutts 2010, Timperley et al. 2008).

All too often changes suggested or introduced by an individual, however enthusiastic or motivated (Harland and Kinder 1997) founder on the seemingly immovable fortress of the organization within which the change is taking place (Guskey 2002). The Toolkit project aimed to affect changes not only in individual cases but within the system of the schools themselves, necessitated by, and founded upon, the new understanding staff had of parental engagement with children's learning, and its importance. This deep seated organizational change holds much greater promise for ongoing support of parental engagement than do one off, classroom based ideas.

A Toolkit for Parental Engagement: Project description

The Toolkit was based on the research about parent's engagement with children's learning. The Toolkit did not offer a 'solution'; rather, it provided schools with tools to design, enact and evaluate their own processes; the use of such tools has been shown to be of value in teachers' professional learning (Cordingley 2015). The Toolkit was not meant to offer 'one best way' or even best practice in relation to parental engagement, but rather to allow schools to find their own solutions to issues arising in their contexts (Bolman and Deal 2010).

The Toolkit process was also created in view of the literature on teachers' professional development. In particular, cognizance was taken of the value of peer to peer conversation and networking for school staff (Byers and Fitzgerald 2002, Day and Hadfield 2004, Hopkins and Jackson 2003, Author et al. 2005); the importance of organizational change and development (Guskey 2000, Guskey 2002) and the components noted by Bayar (2014) as impacting on development. These components include the need to match development to known need (Harris et al. 2006), the necessary involvement of those taking part in the development activity, the ongoing nature of the development and the need for good quality input into the process (Cordingley 2015). The Toolkit also builds on the concept that teachers' development is supported by their active participation in the process and the demonstration of the outcomes of proposed changes (Mor and Mogilevsky 2013, Guskey 2002, Cordingley 2015). As a long-term project, the emphasis was not simply on the participation by school members but on the changes in practice resulting from that participation (Patterson et al. 2013, Timperley et al. 2008).

The stated aim of the process was to help schools move along the continuum from valuing parental involvement with school, typified by 'getting parents in' through to an emphasis on the home learning environment, to the benefit of students (Author and Montgomery, 2014). Thus the aim of the Toolkit was not merely to change practice, but rather to support practitioners to modify the basis on which practice takes place. Leitch and Day (2000) see this as part of the process of being 'an effective reflective practitioner' which they note is founded on attitudes and understandings of 'self, society and moral purposes', rather than a more narrow understanding of development being focused on 'changed delivery and narrowly conceived achievement targets' (181).

The Toolkit project was announced to schools in 2015 and began with an away day in January of 2016. This was followed by two further full days for participants, in May 2016 and January 2017. Each of the away days included a keynote address, the first examining the concept of parental engagement, the second, the value of relationships and the third, family and particularly paternal

engagement in learning; these addresses provided expert input on which participants could build their own practice (Bayar 2014, Cordingley 2015).

The Toolkit contained general information about parental engagement and links to further resources. The tools for schools consisted first of a tool in which schools could record their current practice in relation to parental engagement (See Appendix One), and then moved on to a 'wishlist' which schools were asked to use to record their vision of parental engagement, and a 'barriers' sheet to list obstacles to attaining these goals and how to overcome these obstacles. (See Appendix Two); school leaders worked on both of these during the first away day. The purposes of these tools was two fold: first to facilitate reflection-on- action, (Leitch and Day 2000), and second, to act as a foundation for future work. At the heart of the Toolkit was an action plan, which allowed schools to translate the 'wishes' into concrete, SMART targets (Patterson et al. 2013), with timelines for their accomplishment, notes of who was responsible and key performance indicators for evaluation of the process (See Appendix Three). These targets allowed schools to 'visualise' what success would look like, in their own contexts (Cordingley 2015, 243). Schools were encouraged to work through these sheets with as many staff as possible.

 This process of taking the Toolkit back into schools affects a bridge between the OECD's concepts of embedded and non-embedded CPD. Although there were three events held away from schools, the main developmental work took place within schools. The project was thus embedded with the school context, sustained over time and required staff to work together on practice based problems, which meets the definition of embedded practice (OECD 2015, Cordingley 2015). All schools agreed to the project protocol, which included a statement of ethics and provided for individual anonymity.

Results

The Toolkit project lies within the constructivist and realist research camps, as it seeks to both understand the participants' words and actions for themselves (constructivist) and to use these words and actions as a window on a wider reality, (realist) even if it bears some of the marks of critical theory research, as understood by Healy and Perry (Healy and Perry 2000), such as a desire to investigate and critique "situated structures" (Healy and Perry 2000, 111). Realist research does not see a participant's report as reality, but rather aggregates data from a range of participants to begin to form a "picture of reality" (Healy and Perry 2000, 123). In this case, the reality was that of the change undergone in schools as they worked through the Toolkit process.

With this conceptualisation of the research in mind, discussions of validity and reliability in qualitative research come to the fore (See, among many others, Lincoln and Guba 1985, Creswell and Miller 2000, Golafshani 2003). The underlying questions in all of these debates are whether or not the data can be trusted, and whether or not they are reliably reported.

The data analysed in this article come from the 'Snapshots', sheets filled in by respondents either at the final away day or immediately before, and the 'Journey so far' sheets, which respondents filled in during the final day (See Appendix Four). These forms were designed to capture impacts, results and comments at a moment in time, rather than as a final evaluation. This is in keeping with the aim of the project not to be a one-off event but rather as a support for long term, embedded change. The analysis of these two forms of data provide the best available, contemporaneous evidence of the impact of this project. Stenbacka suggests that qualitative research may be called valid if "the informant is part of the problem area and if he/she is given the opportunity to speak freely according to his/her own knowledge structures" (Stenbacka 2001, 551). Thus, the data come directly from the participants themselves, immersed in the process of the project.

The data from this project were analysed using a grounded approach (Bryant et al. 2007, Glaser and Strauss 2009, Strauss and Corbin 1990, 1994). Sources were read numerous times. Ideas arising from the data were examined through visual means (MindGenius software), allowing

categorization into themes (Kennedy-Lewis 2014). A priori codes, taken from both the continuum of parental engagement and the concept of the home-school environment, were then applied to this data, resulting in new themes. Data were then coded according to the themes.

The majority of the responses to the Snapshots related to institutional change, as defined by Guskey. Just under half of these responses related to putting on new events for parents. These included many instances of opportunities for family learning or parents working with their children, such as reading with children, shared work in Health Schools Week, and improved arrangements for parent consultations. One school took the opportunity afforded by bringing their catering inhouse to open school lunches to all parents.

The second largest group of responses were those relating to the conceptual shift noted by respondents. Some of these mention consulting and including all staff in proposed changes, 'so that it is a whole school approach'. Such an approach has been noted as a feature of effective schools (Cordingley 2015). Another respondent highlighted the opportunities for reflection afforded by the creation of the wish list and barriers information, which '…made sure there was a no excuse culture: we had to look for how to overcome the barriers rather than accept them'. Another school leader commented: 'This programme has helped us evaluate what we are doing for parents to ensure their child's learning environment is a two-way process. We want our school to be welcoming to parents and to ensure all staff and parents are working to benefit the children' (School leader's comment).

A number of schools reported instituting extra development for staff, to support their work with parents. These opportunities were meant to help overcome concerns about 'time pressure, and also …a lack of confidence in supporting parents'. Respondents reported changes in attitude, related to 'understanding individual parents' needs more effectively', supporting parents without requiring their presence in school and 'a growing understanding from staff that some parents need more encouragement and support to support their child at home'.

These responses are particularly heartening, as one of the stated aims of the project was to shift not only practice but the basis on which that practice takes place. In some of the schools, at least, this appears to have taken place, with a shift away from emphasis on the school and greater emphasis on the home learning environment. Importantly, a number of respondents reported the fact that this had become embedded within their school.

The analysis of the 'Journey so far' information shows schools' willingness to change their behaviours and structures to attain their stated goals (coded 21 times). These changes included extending the structured conversations which are used as a part of the Achievement for All programme to support students with special educational needs (Humphrey et al. 2013) to all parents, which increased engagement with parents who had previously had little or no contact with the schools. Changes also included new posts, such as a Pupil Premium manager, more release time for staff to work with parents and provision of a creche to allow parents with younger children to attend school based events. These changes, as well as the attendance at the away days by senior leaders in the schools, show a commitment to fundamental, organizational change.

In both forms of data, while there is still an emphasis on activities which take place in schools, it is clear that the focus of these events is now supporting engagement with learning or family learning. Schools also reported encouraging results, 'huge' and 'dramatic' increases in parental attendance at events. There was also a shift in the reasons given for inviting parents into schools, a move away from simply giving information toward partnership working, as expressed by one respondent as a desire to 'Raise the amount of parents attending learning events'.

Schools also reported changes in their own staff and governors as a result of the work in the project, particularly around increased confidence in working with parents (supported by staff

training provided by the school). While feedback from the first away day concentrated around one way flow of communication from the school to parents and telling them what 'they need to know', data from these two forms have moved on to a process of discussion and dialogue with parents (coded 41 times between the two).

 This project did not work directly with parents, but did have their support as one of its ultimate aims. Respondents reported 'huge increases' in parent attendance at workshops, increases in parental confidence in approaching staff for support, and an increase in contact with parents who had previously 'been reluctant' to seek support. The increase in parental confidence in approaching staff is particularly heartening, as the importance of parental confidence is well known in the literature (Jones and Prinz 2005), and increased confidence in approaching staff augurs well for parental engagement for these families in the future (Author 2017b). Schools also reported an increase in parental attendance at events and in responses to questionnaires, from 40% to 80%.

Some of the schools combined work on the Toolkit with that aimed at pupils in receipt of free school meals, and noted, '…the programme has given PP [pupil premium families] … a voice in school and it has raised the profile of PP children and the need for them to have support… we have appointed a PP TA'. Another school worked with families in this group to create profile pages for all their children in school, which led to greater understanding between staff and parents, '[staff] learned lots about the child from the parents and also for the parents to realise what we were doing in school for their child'. Schools changed practices to support communication with parents, providing phone calls to parents unable to attend meetings, for example. This represents a shift in schools' attitudes toward working with parents, away from a concentration on the school itself and toward partnership working around learning.

 One of the main aims of this project was to facilitate a change in both understanding and practice among schools, to move from an emphasis on parental involvement with school toward partnership working with parents to support parental engagement with children's learning. Moving along this continuum requires clear, reflective practice on the part of school staff, as it shifts the emphasis away from the school itself as an institution and toward the concept of learning (Author 2017b). Schools reported increases in family conversations about learning, 'the early feedback is that lots of children are having these discussions with parents at home'. One school reported that, after emphasizing the importance of such conversations, 'One family purchasing their first ever dining room table so that they now eat together and children have somewhere to do their homework'.

Schools also noted an increase in parents attending family learning sessions, and schools increased the instances of these events. One school added a weekly tip for conversations around learning to their newsletter; 'lots' of students reported having these conversations with family members. That this move along the continuum was successful for some schools is summed up in comments on evaluation forms for the last day, 'Thank you. This programme has made us think in an alternative direction'; 'Thanks for an initiative that has actually had a significant impact on school practice', and, 'For us this is the beginning of an exciting journey. This project has allowed us to really focus and see what we can do for/how to support our parents'.

 It is also clear from the evaluation forms throughout the project, as well as the Snapshots, that while school staff appreciated the input of the speakers throughout the project, it was the chance to work with other schools which was of importance in being able to change their practices. The value of schools working with each other is well known (Muijs, West, and Ainscow 2010). McArdle and Coutts' (2010) work, however goes further, to highlight the interaction of reflection on the one hand and professional discussion on the other. This interaction was particularly fruitful for school staff involved in the Toolkit project. This interaction has included changes in practices, some of which are fairly simple such as changes in timing of parents' evenings, and changes in how parents are able to sign up for such events. Others, however, demonstrate a more

fundamental change in perspective, a move away from a concentration on school as the centre, toward a relationship with parents based around a partnership centred on learning (Author 2017b), shown in the increased level of communication and dialogue, (rather than simply giving parents information (Author 2016).

Limitations

This project does not provide enough evidence for widespread generalisation (Healy and Perry 2000), nor did it set out to do so. One of the basic concepts underlying the Toolkit project is that actions must be suited to context, rather than being generalised to entire populations (eg all schools). Nor does it claim to present causal impacts based on the delicate nature of social phenomena (Healy and Perry 2000). Rather, this research is presented with the purpose of "generating understanding" (Stenbacka 2001, 551).

It is important to note that this research makes no claims to the long term impact of the Toolkit process; it is unable to do so because of the short term (one year) nature of the project. Rather, it aims to produce the understanding of the change process, as mentioned above. The project also took place in only one geographic area, which is not representative of the entire landscape of English education.

Discussion: From Project to Process

In its original concept, the Toolkit was designed as a stand alone project which would provide a scaffold for all a school's work around parental engagement. The aim was to support this work by allowing staff to reflect on current practice, create goals, articulate the barriers to those goals, and the formulate concrete plans to meet the goals. In practice, the project did not work as it was designed to do. No schools reported using the framework as it was intended to be used; schools were expected to send in termly evaluation forms, but few of these were received. The project was successful in attaining its aim of facilitating support for parental engagement with learning, but the means to that end was unforeseen at the start of the project. From the analysis of the data available on the project it would seem that there were three elements which supported positive changes in schools. The first was the opportunity for professional discussion, with speakers but especially with colleagues from similar schools, afforded at the away days. This aligns with previous findings in the literature that teachers themselves most valued development opportunities that were or included professional discussions with other practitioners (Harris et al. 2006). The second was professional reflection on current and future practice. The third, which underpinned the second, was the tools provided in the Toolkit, particularly the wish and barriers lists.

The interplay between these is demonstrated in figure 1, below. All of the elements are linked, as the process is iterative in all facets. As Timperely suggests, effective professional learning is supported through a process that involves setting goals (the wish list and action plan), working on the process itself, monitoring (though the action plan or the school development/improvement plan) and adjusting (which was fostered by the professional discussion at the away days) (Timperley et al. 2008).

INSERT FIGURE ONE HERE

It seems that what was of value was not the structure of the Toolkit itself. Instead, the reflective thinking fostered by the tools provided, the creation of the wish and barriers list, and ongoing discussion with colleagues, led to a change in perception and to changed practices. It is important to note that these changed perceptions were often founded on reports of successful practice, either from speakers or from colleagues from other schools in the project. This extends Guskey's observations that teachers tend to change their beliefs after observing successful practice (Guskey 2000, Guskey 2002), to include practice other than their own in the mix; clearly senior staff were prepared to rely on the success of others as a basis for changed practices within their own schools.

These three elements align well with Bayar's elements for successful professional development (Bayar 2014). Bayar lists six components of quality professional development: a match to teacher needs, and to school needs, involvement of teachers in the process, opportunities for active engagement, engagement over a significant period and high quality input (See also Timperley et al. 2008). The Toolkit project did not separate teacher and school needs, but rather saw these as part of a larger whole, and extended this beyond the confines of the school, to the larger community including students' families. The involvement of all staff (not just teaching staff) was recommended throughout the project, and schools reported involving teaching assistants, parental support workers and outside agencies in the project, showing a more holistic view of families than might have previously been the case.

Involvement in the away days was open not only to school leaders but to at least one other person per school; these other attendees included teachers, TAs, governors, and parents. School staff in the project clearly understood the whole-school nature of the work of supporting the engagement of parents. The use of these tools in schools, with a wide range of staff, was designed to overcome the well-known (Joyce and Showers 1995) but still prevalent (Harris and Jones 2017) disconnection between training (often offered as stand alone events) and school based practice. As Timperely points out, staff learning and action are conditioned by the contexts in which they take place; in the case of the Toolkit project, the learning was designed to take place primarily within the school communities themselves.

The project itself took place over a full calendar year (Bayar does not give a length of time to be understood as "long term"; Timperley suggests one to two years (Timperley et al. 2008), Cordingley, one to two terms (Cordingley 2015). This extended length of time allowed for the reflective thought, and action upon that thought, which was so important for the outcomes attained. This length of time also allowed schools to try new ideas and report on their success (or otherwise) to colleagues; there were a number of comments from school leaders about the need to 'be brave' and 'try new things'; Crodingley has highlighted the importance of peer support for embarking on new practices which carry an element of risk (Cordingley 2015).

Input on the away days included expert presentations but significantly also included presentations from project schools themselves, reporting on their own work and outcomes. The second day included a highly organized 'speedsharing' designed to allow members from every school to speak at least briefly with every other school. These opportunities for professional discussion were among some of the most valued elements of the project. These days, which afforded ample opportunity for sharing among colleagues from different schools, provided the bridge between embedded and nonembedded CPD (OECD 2015); while embedded CPD was found by the OECD to be the most effective form of development, the away days allowed input by external experts to be aligned to in house developmental activities.

All three of the elements mentioned above, professional discussion, reflection and the use of tools, worked together to support school staff to move from having a particular project around parental engagement to seeing it as an embedded process within their schools.

Implications for school leadership

One of the bases for this project was the finding from previous research (Author and Vorhaus, 2011) that interventions around parental engagement are more likely to be successful if they are supported by school leaders. It is important to understand that "school leadership" in this project was framed to include not only those with leadership responsibility in schools, but also governing bodies and other members of school staff. The success of this project lends weight to this finding, and suggests that further work in schools around parental engagement with children's learning should be supported, if not led, by senior leaders.

The finding that many members of staff had no previous training around the value and nature of parental engagement with learning leads to the suggestion that schools should provide or support such interventions for staff. In view of the value that respondents derived from working with colleagues, it is suggested that such training take place across, rather than merely within schools. This training should provide time for the sharing of, and reflection on, good practice.

One of the other main findings of this project, again known to previous literature (Author and Vorhaus, 2011) is that parental engagement processes work best, and have the most transformative power, when embedded into the culture of a school. Schools which saw the greatest changes in this project found that they were no longer treating it as "a project" but had absorbed it into their everyday working practices.

Appendix One Current Practice in Schools

Parental Engagement Practice	Establishing	Enhancing	Extending	Evidence
The school is welcoming, as soon as parents enter the building or come on the site				
Parents know how to contact the member of staff they need to speak to				
The school web page is parent friendly, and parents can find the information they need				

The school knows enough about its cohort of parents				
The school supports parental engagement in children's learning				
Parents know the targets set for their children, and how the children can achieve those targets				
Parental engagement is mentioned in all appropriate school policies				
The school offers structured activities for family learning				
Induction/transition practices support parental engagement				
The school reiterates to parents the value of their engagement in children's learning				
The school helps parents have high aspirations for their children				
Staff receive training about parental engagement				
There is a feedback loop so parents know how their suggestions/complaints are dealt with				
The school fosters interactive homework that involves parents				
Is there a parent council?				
Are all parent governor posts filled?				
Are parent governors representative of the parental cohort?				

The school engages parents in the inclusivity agenda				

Appendix Two: Wishlist and Barriers

Wish	Barrier	How to overcome
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		

15.		

Appendix Three: Action Plan for schools

Wishlist	Barrier	Milestone	When	Who	Evidence	Milestone	When	Who	Evidence	Milestone	When	Who	Evidence
			When	Who	Evidence		When	Who	Evidence		When	Who	Evidence
			When	Who	Evidence		When	Who	Evidence		When	Who	Evidence
			When	Who	Evidence		When	Who	Evidence		When	Who	Evidence

Appendix Three: Reports of Impact on "Our Journey So Far" sheets, January 2017

Parental Engagement Practice	Establishing	Enhancing	Extending	Evidence
The school is welcoming, as soon as parents enter the building or come on the site				
Parents know how to contact the member of staff they need to speak to				
The school web page is parent friendly, and parents can find the information they need				
The school knows enough about its cohort of parents				
The school supports parental engagement in children's learning				
Parents know the targets set for their children, and how the children can achieve those targets				
Parental engagement is mentioned in all appropriate school policies				
The school offers structured activities for family learning				
Induction/transition practices support parental engagement				
The school reiterates to parents the value of their engagement in children's learning				

The school helps parents have high aspirations for their children				
Staff receive training about parental engagement				
There is a feedback loop so parents know how their suggestions/complaints are dealt with				
The school fosters interactive homework that involves parents				
Is there a parent council?				
Are all parent governor posts filled?				
Are parent governors representative of the parental cohort?				
The school engages parents in the inclusivity agenda				

References

Bayar, Adem. 2014. "The Components of Effective Professional Development Activities in Terms of Teachers' Perspective." *Online Submission* 6 (2):319- 327.

Bolman, Lee G., and Terrence E. Deal. 2010. *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryant, A., A. Bryant, A. Bryant, and M. Casper. 2007. The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory. SAGE Publications Ltd.

By, Todnem Rune. 2005. "Organisational change management: A critical review." *Journal of change management* 5 (4):369-380.

Byers, A, and M.A. Fitzgerald. 2002. "Networking for Leadership, Inquiry, and Systemic Thinking: A New Approach to Inquiry-Based Learning." *Journal of Science Education and Technology* 11 (1):81 - 91.

Castro, María, Eva Expósito-Casas, Esther López-Martín, Luis Lizasoain, Enrique Navarro-Asencio, and José Luis Gaviria. 2015. "Parental involvement on student academic achievement: A meta-analysis." *Educational Research Review* 14:33- 46.

Chappell, Anne. 2016. "Thinking differently about continuing professional development: teachers' narratives of professional learning." European Conference on Educational Research (ECER), University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland.

Cordingley, Philippa. 2015. "The contribution of research to teachers' professional learning and development." *Oxford Review of Education* 41 (2):234-252. doi: 10.1080/03054985.2015.1020105.

Creswell, J. W. and D. L. Miller (2000). "Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry." Theory Into Practice **39**(3): 124-130.

Day, Christopher. 1999. *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*: Psychology Press.

Day, Christopher, and Mark Hadfield. 2004. "Learning through Networks: trust, partnerships and the power of action research." *Educational Action Research,* 12 (4):575 - 586.

Desforges, Charles, and Alberto Abouchaar. 2003. The impact of parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment: A literature review. London: Department of Education and Skills.

Glaser, Barney G, and Anselm L Strauss. 2009. *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*: Transaction Publishers.

Golafshani, N. (2003). "Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research." The Qualitative Report **8**(4): 597-606

Guskey, Thomas R. 2002. "Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development." *Educational leadership* 59 (6):45.

Guskey, Thomas R. 2000. *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Corwin Press.

Harland, John, and Kay Kinder. 1997. "Teachers' Continuing Professional Development: framing a model of outcomes." *British Journal of In-service Education* 23 (1):71 - 84.

Harris, A, and Author. 2008. "Do parents know they matter? Engaging all parents in learning." *Educational Research* 50 (3):277 - 289.

Harris, Alma, Christopher Day, Author, Geoff Lindsay, and Daniel Muijs. 2006. "What difference does it make? Continuing Professional Development in Schools." *Scottish Journal of Educational Research* 37:90 - 98.

Harris, Alma, and Michelle Jones. 2017. "Leading professional learning: putting teachers at the centre." *School Leadership & Management* 37 (4):331-333. doi: 10.1080/13632434.2017.1343705.

Healy, M. and C. Perry (2000). "Comprehensive criteria to judge validity and reliability of qualitative research within the realism paradigm." Qualitative market research: An international journal **3**(3): 118-126.

Ho Sui-Chu, Esther, and J. Douglas Willms. 1996. "Effects of parental involvement on eighth-grade achievement." *Sociology of Education* 69 (2):126 - 141.

Hopkins, David, and David Jackson. 2003. Networked learning communities - capacity building, networking and leadership for learning. National College for School Leadership.

Huat See, Beng, and Stephen Gorard. 2015. "The role of parents in young people's education—a critical review of the causal evidence." *Oxford Review of Education* 3 (41):346-366.

Huber, Stephan Gerhard, and Daniel Muijs. 2010. "School leadership effectiveness: The growing insight in the importance of school leadership for the quality and development of schools and their pupils." In *School leadership-international perspectives*, 57-77. Springer.

Humphrey, Neil, Ann Lendrum, Alexandra Barlow, Michael Wigelsworth, and Garry Squires. 2013. "Achievement for All: Improving psychosocial outcomes for students with special educational needs and disabilities." *Research in developmental disabilities* 34 (4):1210-1225.

Jeynes, W. 2012. "A Meta-Analysis of the Efficacy of Different Types of Parental Involvement Programs for Urban Students." *Urban Education* 47 (4):706-742. doi: 10.1177/0042085912445643.

Jones, Tracy L, and Ronald J Prinz. 2005. "Potential roles of parental self-efficacy in parent and child adjustment: A review." *Clinical psychology review* 25 (3):341- 363.

Joyce, B , and B Showers. 1995. *Student Achievement Through Staff Development*. White Plains, NY: . Longman.

Kennedy-Lewis, Brianna L. 2014. "Using Diagrams to Make Meaning in Grounded Theory Data Collection and Analysis." In. London. http://methods.sagepub.com/case/diagrams-meaning-grounded-theory-datacollection- and-analysis (accessed 2017/08/27).

Leitch, Ruth, and Christopher Day. 2000. "Action research and reflective practice: towards a holistic view." *Educational Action Research* 8 (1):179-193. doi: 10.1080/09650790000200108.

Lincoln, Y. S. and E. G. Guba (1985). Naturalistic inquiry, Sage.

Ma, Xin, Jianping Shen, Huilan Y Krenn, Shanshan Hu, and Jing Yuan. 2015. "A Meta- Analysis of the Relationship Between Learning Outcomes and Parental Involvement During Early Childhood Education and Early Elementary Education." *Educational Psychology Review* 28 (4):1-31.

McArdle, Karen, and Norman Coutts. 2010. "Taking teachers' continuous professional development (CPD) beyond reflection: Adding shared sense-making and collaborative engagement for professional renewal." *Studies in continuing education* 32 (3):201-215.

Mor, Yishay, and Orit Mogilevsky. 2013. "The learning design studio: collaborative design inquiry as teachers' professional development." *Research in Learning Technology* 21 (1):22054. doi: 10.3402/rlt.v21i0.22054.

Muijs, Daniel, Alma Harris, Christopher Chapman, Louise Stoll, and Jennifer Russ. 2004. "Improving schools in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas–A review of research evidence." *School effectiveness and school improvement* 15 (2):149- 175.

Muijs, Daniel, Mel West, and Mel Ainscow. 2010. "Why network? Theoretical perspectives on networking." *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 21 (1):5-26.

OECD. 2012. Let's Read Them a Story! The Parent Factor in Education. edited by PISA. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2015. Teaching in Focus: Embedding professional development in schools for teacher success. Paris.

Patterson, Brandon J, Elizabeth H Chang, Matthew J Witry, Oscar W Garza, and CoraLynn B Trewet. 2013. "Pilot evaluation of a continuing professional development tool for developing leadership skills." *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy* 9 (2):222-229.

PISA, OECD. 2013. Results: Ready to Learn-Students' Engagement, Drive and Self- Beliefs (Volume III). PISA. OECD Publishing.

Punter, R Annemiek, Cees AW Glas, and Martina RM Meelissen. 2016. "Relation Between Parental Involvement and Student Achievement in PIRLS-2011." In *Psychometric Framework for Modeling Parental Involvement and Reading Literacy*, 77-87. Springer.

See, Beng Huat, and Stephen Gorard. 2014. What do rigorous evaluations tell us about the most promising parental involvement interventions? A critical review of what works for disadvantaged children in different age groups. Nuffield Foundation.

Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications. Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. 1994. "Grounded theory methodology." *Handbook of qualitative research*:273-285.

Stenbacka, C. (2001). "Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own." Management decision **39**(7): 551-556.

Sylva, Kathy, Edward C. Melhuish, Pamela Sammons, Blatchford Iram Siraj, and Brenda Taggart. 2008. "Final report from the primary phase: pre-school, school and family influences on children-s development during Key Stage 2 (Age 7- 11)."165.

Timperley, Helen, Aaron Wilson, Heather Barrar, and Irene Fung. 2008. "Teacher professional learning and development."

Wiltshire Community Foundation. 2014. Wiltshire Unovered Report. Devizes: Wiltshire Community Foundation.