

Partnering With Communities to Promote Student Success: A Review of the Research

Nancy Erbstein, PhD - University of California Davis School of Education, CRESS/Center for Community School Partnerships

*Elizabeth Miller, MD, PhD - University of California Davis School of Medicine
Department of Pediatrics*

Overview

School-community partnerships are a common feature in schools that are striving to close the academic “achievement gap.” These partnerships include families, other community members, community leaders, and a wide variety of local businesses, agencies, institutions, and non-profit organizations.

Research on schools and programs that appear to be closing the “achievement gap” demonstrates that many of these successes benefit from, or even rely upon, partnerships among schools, community members, and institutions to reduce ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic disparities in educational outcomes. These successful schools employ a broad range of school-community partnership strategies. Such strategies focus on 1) strengthening academic learning by fostering student and family engagement, promoting high expectations, and extending meaningful student opportunities to develop strong academic skills; 2) enhancing social support and social/physical well-being at school and beyond by connecting students and their families to needed resources, fostering a climate of care and respect, and helping to strengthen community and

neighborhood contexts; and 3) strengthening school leadership and shifting organizational structures within schools by tapping local knowledge, resources, and constituencies to foster academic and social support as well as facilitate stronger partnerships. Although research on school-community partnerships spans multiple bodies of literature, the integrative concept of “community schools” links these strategies. To further examine the effects of partnership strategies and the conditions required to support them, this paper reviews research on two common categories of partnership strategies: school-linked services and family engagement.

Partnerships Promote Positive Student, School and Community Effects

Research on school-linked services and family and community engagement in schools suggests that high quality school-community partnerships are associated with positive effects on student connectedness, attendance, motivation, conduct, persistence, academic achievement, and pursuit of post-secondary education; students of all ethnic, language and socio-economic backgrounds

appear to experience such effects. Effects on a wide range of school-level outcomes are documented to varying degrees, including improvements in school climate, perceived safety, and parent participation, as well as reductions in family violence and unmet basic needs. Emergent research suggests that some partnerships can foster positive neighborhood and community effects as well. While a causal link between partnership strategies and increased student academic achievement remains unclear, all researchers seem to agree that *not* partnering with families and communities is likely to increase the risk of student failure.

Challenges and Gaps in Current Research

Research on the effectiveness of school-community partnerships in the areas of family engagement and school-linked services is constrained by multiple factors, including the difficulty of maintaining similar interventions across different sites, the tendency to randomize interventions at the level of schools rather than students (limiting the power of a study), large variations in the community institutions involved, and inconsistent definitions of outcomes and measures across studies (e.g., “family involvement” is measured differently across studies). Data collected are inconsistently disaggregated by sub-populations, in particular among English learners (ELs), so the effects of race/ethnicity, language and poverty, as well as outcomes by sub-groups, are not always easily assessed. School and community-level effects are rarely assessed. Studies utilizing matched comparisons and quasi-experimental design tend to infer causality from findings that show associations between programs and outcomes. Few high quality, mixed-method longitudinal studies exist.

In addition, several important gaps in knowledge remain about school-community partnerships. Most significantly, rigorous studies have focused on a relatively narrow range of engagement strategies—typically not those oriented towards building on the strengths of low-income, immigrant, and ethnically diverse communities and shifting the tenor of relationships between these communities and their schools. As a result, studies have not compared the effects of varied strategies. And as most research focuses on individual student outcomes rather than measures of successful partnerships, specific documentation of processes of partnership-building, and the conditions that enable these relationships to flourish are not easily extracted from the literature. Some of the larger scale policy initiatives reviewed (e.g., California’s Healthy Start Initiative) lack rigorous, longitudinal, mixed-methods evaluations that might offer specific and more detailed data on program effects, key program elements and their costs, school structural and policy barriers, and processes of program implementation.

Policy Implications: Enabling School-Community Partnerships

Existing research on school-linked services and family engagement suggests that several conditions are critical precursors of successful partnerships: 1) partnerships are expected, 2) school and district staff are prepared, 3) community partners are prepared to work with schools, 4) a sustainable vision is articulated, 5) space is available, 6) sufficient and sustained funding is available, and 7) partnerships are evaluated. These conditions have important implications for policy development in several areas, including professional development, school finance, school and district planning, school facilities and

transportation, and evaluation and data management.

Partnership strategies appear to be critical, albeit unto themselves insufficient, elements of serious efforts to reduce gaps in K-12 student success based on ethnicity, language, and socio-economic status. California has

many components of an infrastructure to promote and support school-community partnerships, but this support has been piecemeal. Coordinating and building upon these components is an important next step towards fostering stronger, more equitable educational outcomes.

Introduction

Echoing the proverb “it takes a village to raise a child,” the third recommendation in *Closing the Achievement Gap: Report of Superintendent Jack O’Connell’s California P-16 Council* [1] encourages fostering partnerships to close the achievement gap. In particular, the P-16 Council report calls for a “high-quality and inclusive educational program” and a “comprehensive student support system” that will involve nurturing collaborative community partnerships and family involvement. School-community partnerships are a common feature in schools that are beating and shifting the achievement gap odds. These partnerships include families, other community members, community leaders, and a wide variety of local businesses, agencies, institutions, and non-profit organizations.

California faces a number of opportunities and challenges in implementing school-community partnerships to address the academic achievement gap. Opportunities include a dynamic and diverse population, engaged community organizations interested in partnering with schools, policies that encourage and support partnerships, and policy-makers who recognize that healthy, supported students perform better in school. From innovative school-linked services such as the Healthy Start Initiative to home visit programs to afterschool support, California school policies and practices reflect an understanding of the critical role for community partnerships in promoting

student success. Challenges include overall cuts in funding for education and social services, poverty and unemployment and their direct impact on families (especially from communities of color), rural districts that serve large geographic areas, limited multilingual/multicultural capacities within schools, limited training for school staff and leadership to engage in partnerships, and piecemeal programs within schools that are not easily sustained (often reflecting multiple disconnected funding sources). Evident in the review of the research is that such partnerships may be regarded by administrators as peripheral to the primary focus of schools (i.e., academic achievement), and may not be well-integrated into the school’s mission and daily practices.

Descriptive research on schools and programs that appear to be decreasing the “achievement gap” and drop-out rates demonstrates that, while there are no magic bullets, many of these successes benefit from, or even rely upon, partnerships among schools, community members, and institutions to reduce ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic disparities in educational outcomes. These successful schools employ a broad range of school-community partnership strategies. Such strategies focus on 1) strengthening academic programs and learning by fostering student and family engagement, promoting high expectations, and extending meaningful student

opportunities to develop strong academic skills; 2) enhancing social support and social/physical well-being at school and beyond by connecting students and their families to needed resources, fostering a climate of care and respect, and helping to strengthen community and neighborhood contexts; and 3) strengthening school leadership and shifting organizational structures within schools by tapping local knowledge, resources, and constituencies to foster academic and social support, as well as facilitate stronger partnerships. The integrative concept of “community schools” links these multiple strategies.

This paper explores this role of school-community partnerships in addressing the academic achievement gap in three sections.

- Section I, “Partnerships for Student Success,” provides background on the

variety of school-community partnerships and ways that education practitioners in successful schools conceptualize and implement such collaborations.

- Section II, “School Linked Services and Family Engagement,” reviews research on two common examples of school-community partnerships to examine the effects of partnership strategies on academic outcomes, the qualities of promising practices, and barriers schools overcome to engage community individuals (including families) and institutions as partners.
- Section III, “Enabling School Engagement,” identifies key conditions for successful school-community partnerships and briefly outlines their policy implications.

Methods

School-community partnerships, reviewed briefly in the background section below, are highly varied and have multiple outcomes. Because more in-depth review of the many types of partnerships is beyond the scope of this paper, research on school linked services and family engagement—two of the most widespread partnership strategies associated with increased academic achievement—is examined in greater depth. This topic-focused review of current research sought to answer two inter-related questions: 1) What is the evidence of the effects of family and community involvement in schools on reducing disparities in educational outcomes; and 2) What does the research suggest about the specific conditions that support successful school-community partnerships and their policy implications?

Studies were identified utilizing a series of key search terms.ⁱ We attempted to identify

high quality, mixed method studies that used experimental methods, and primarily focused on research conducted since 2002.ⁱⁱ However, few studies fit these characteristics, underscoring a significant chasm in research to adequately measure the specific effects of school-community partnerships. This lack of experimental studies has been a consistent concern with research exploring the links between family involvement, community supports, and student achievement.ⁱⁱⁱ High quality mixed-methods research appears to be underutilized, yet a critically important direction in light of the localized and complex nature of family engagement, support services delivery, and academic outcomes.^{iv}

This review includes studies that employed quantitative methods (quasi-experimental, comparative-population, and correlational

studies, as well as a small number of surveys). Selection focused on a number of methodological criteria: 1) the extent to which assumptions and definitions were described and applied consistently, 2) use of research designs that employed statistical controls, 3) isolation of effects, and 4) use of valid and reliable measures. Some studies that employed qualitative methods, including evaluation reports, were also included, as these reflect much of the available research on this topic and often raise critical theoretical questions. These include case studies and ethnographies. As with the quantitative studies, specific methodological issues were reviewed, including the extent to which assumptions and definitions were described and consistently applied, the studies' grounding in theory, and the use of sound qualitative methods. Finally, several literature reviews and meta-analyses were reviewed that addressed the links among family involvement, school-linked services, and academic outcomes.

Almost all research that is focused on engaging low-income families and families

of ethnic, cultural, and/or language minority backgrounds reflects some assumptions about causes of the achievement gap. These assumptions tend to reflect one of four broad explanations: 1) deficiencies in the characteristics of students, their families, and/or their communities; 2) differences or mismatches between students' home/cultural group and school cultures and expectations; 3) school practices and policies which disadvantage students and families that do not embody white, middle/upper income, suburban norms; or 4) complex interactions among school, family, peer, and community factors may account for differences in academic performance.^v While we attempted to review research reflecting this range of assumptions, most research appears to reflect a deficit or, to a somewhat lesser extent, mismatch orientation.^{vi} As a result, few large studies have examined the effects on students of initiatives oriented towards building on the complexity and strengths of low-income, immigrant, and ethnically diverse communities and shifting the tenor of relationships between these communities and their schools.

Section I. Background—Partnerships for Student Success

In recent years, multiple studies have identified schools in which students are more academically successful than the demographics would predict, and then sought to define the school qualities that appear to be associated with this success.^{vii} These successful schools have three distinct, but related, foci for partnerships: 1) academic supports, 2) social supports, and 3) school organization that facilitates both academic and social supports. This section provides a brief overview of these three partnership strategies, to illustrate the range of ways in which school-community partnerships have been employed to address the achievement gap.

Academic Supports

School-community partnerships facilitate academic learning by making use of local knowledge and resources to foster student engagement, extend student opportunities to develop strong academic skills, and promote high expectations.

School-community partnerships *foster student engagement* directly by providing opportunities to demonstrate the relevance and applicability of knowledge in local settings. Strategies include place-based curricula, community service, internships, and projects that engage youth in complex research focused on local community

issues.^{viii} In addition to community-based learning opportunities, building on the language and cultural knowledge of students, families, and teachers who are familiar with local communities appears to increase student engagement in curricular material.^{ix}

In addition, schools employ community partnerships to *encourage academic rigor* through collaborations with community colleges and highly skilled community members.^x Local businesses, agencies and organizations also provide settings where students can *develop and reinforce strong academic skills*.

Finally, schools *promote high expectations for academic achievement early and consistently* by working with parents/caregivers in multiple ways, including: 1) explicitly communicating high expectations and academic norms to families,^{xi} 2) engaging parents in constructing school norms,^{xii} 3) communicating with families regarding their children's academic progress through key educational transition points,^{xiii} and 4) partnering with local and state postsecondary institutions and systems to offer parents training on postsecondary requirements and resources.^{xiv} Schools *help families extend children's opportunities to learn* by: 1) working in collaboration with parents to identify and address their needs; 2) providing access to tutoring and other afterschool/summer learning opportunities that are engaging, meaningful, rigorous, and build on funds of knowledge; 3) offering support for parents to extend learning at home, especially in pre-school and the primary grades; and 4) ensuring that parents/family have information they need to support their children's learning and educational decision-making.^{xv}

Social Supports

School-community partnerships foster social supports by *meeting students' basic needs* so they can come to school ready to learn. They address basic needs for nutrition and safe, stable housing by providing school breakfasts, housing and employment support for families. Partnerships are also employed to *address basic healthcare needs of students and families*. Poor health of children and their caretakers predicts lower educational achievement,^{xvi} and school failure is associated with significant health consequences. Health inequities exist largely among socially, economically and linguistically disadvantaged families,^{xvii} and poor health (both physical and mental health) is closely correlated with poor academic achievement.^{xviii} For example, recent research focused on the contribution of childhood mental disorders on educational attainment has highlighted the impact of behaviors such as attention deficit and hyperactivity as well as impulse control on completion of high school education.^{xix} Targeted interventions and treatment of such behavioral disturbances early in the course of a disorder are likely to have an effect on educational attainment. While the mechanisms through which social support-oriented community partnerships promote improved academic outcomes are not well understood,^{xx} connecting students and their families to needed resources and fostering a climate of care and respect appears to improve the health of students, foster a sense of connectedness to school, and facilitate increased access to social capital.

Similarly, school-community partnerships can *foster students' sense of connection to school* by helping families feel comfortable interacting with school.^{xxi} Enlisting the support of families, students, community members and school staff familiar with the community can help foster a climate of

respect among students and between youth and adults of different backgrounds.^{xxii}

Finally, school-community partnerships can contribute to *building the social capital of families and students* by helping them access key knowledge, networks, skills and resources and develop the capacity to identify and act upon local school and community challenges.^{xxiii} Recognizing broader environmental effects on student success and the potential for schools to contribute to positive community change, some partnerships explicitly focus on *strengthening overall neighborhood and community well-being* by supporting community development efforts and assessing their efficacy based on broader community indicators.^{xxiv}

Organizational Structure^{xxv}

Partnerships that affect school organizational structures are in some cases oriented towards creating a setting that facilitates stronger partnerships focused on fostering academic success and social support. *Smaller schools in alternative settings* in some cases involve partnerships with community organizations or businesses.^{xxvi} Reform efforts in the New York City New Century Schools (described in greater detail below) are an example of such partnerships that encourage small learning communities, greater involvement of schools with community organizations, and a more intensive, personal connection with families. *Shared school leadership and constituency-building strategies* (including engagement of parents, community members, and local institutional leaders) are employed in some cases to marshal the assets of non-school staff to strengthen the program and ensure cultural relevance,^{xxvii} to expand services and capacities that cannot be offered by the school alone,^{xxviii} and to build a community-wide constituency of support for school and district reform efforts.^{xxix}

Community Schools as an Integrative Framework

Efforts to study the variety of partnerships noted above are reflected in a disparate set of education literatures, policies and practices. Many are linked under the conceptual umbrella of “community schools,” which the Coalition for Community Schools defines as “both a place and a set of partnerships between the school and other community resources. Its integrated focus on academics, health and social services, youth and community development and community engagement leads to improved student learning, stronger families and healthier communities.”^{xxx} The continuum of community schools extends from superficial addition of support services within schools to highly intertwined institutional and neighborhood/community reform.

In New York City’s New Century Schools, for example, community institutions are lead partners, resulting in innovative school curricula, integrated youth development practices, and increased family involvement. Meeting the needs of youth and families is regarded as integral to the school, and in some cases, schools play an active and integral role in broader community development efforts. Underlying this strategy is the understanding that such partnerships offer knowledge, resources, and opportunities that schools alone are not equipped to provide. While longer-term outcomes are yet to be documented, formative evaluation and descriptive studies show that community integration encourages innovative curricula and pedagogy, school climate change, service provision, family involvement, and healthier neighborhood environments.^{xxxi}

Summary

Successful schools employ community partnerships focused on strengthening academic and social supports, while creating

organizational structures that explicitly promote these partnerships. Research reviewed for two areas of partnerships

below, while primarily descriptive, points to promising practices that merit further rigorous study.

Section II: School-linked Services and Family Engagement

This section draws on two areas of partnership research in particular—school linked services and family engagement—to highlight more specific effects of partnership strategies on academic outcomes, the qualities of promising strategies, and barriers that schools must overcome to engage community individuals (including families) and institutions as partners. The key themes that emerge in this focused research review are:

- Partnerships between schools and communities are necessary, especially to create greater access to high quality resources for students who are disadvantaged based on their family economic, ethnic, and/or language background.
- Most educational reform strategies have focused on schools in isolation, but evidence suggests that family engagement and school-linked services can support student success—ignoring these strengths and assets immediately available to schools through family and community engagement may prevent educators from addressing the achievement gap and disparities in drop-out rates.
- Some evidence exists that family engagement efforts and school-linked services have direct effects on student learning. However, in many cases these strategies may be more likely to affect factors that mediate academic outcomes.
- Successful, sustained partnerships are rooted in respectful relationships that recognize the knowledge and value of

partners, and acknowledge and act upon the challenge of working across different ethnic, language, and cultural backgrounds.

Research Challenges

Research on the effectiveness of school-community partnerships in the areas of family engagement and school-linked services is constrained by multiple factors, including the difficulty of maintaining similar interventions across different sites, the tendency to randomize interventions at the level of schools rather than students (limiting the power of a study), large variations in the community institutions involved, and inconsistent definitions of outcomes and measures across studies (e.g., “family involvement” is measured differently across studies). Data collected are inconsistently disaggregated by sub-populations, in particular among ELs, so the effects of race/ethnicity, language and poverty, as well as outcomes by sub-groups, are not always easily assessed. School and community-level effects are rarely assessed. Studies utilizing matched comparisons and quasi-experimental design tend to infer causality from findings that show associations between programs and outcomes. Few high-quality, mixed-method longitudinal studies exist.

In addition, several important gaps in knowledge remain about school-community partnerships. Most significantly, rigorous studies have focused on a relatively narrow range of engagement strategies—typically not those oriented towards building on the strengths of low-income, immigrant, and ethnically diverse communities and shifting

the tenor of relationships between these communities and their schools. As a result, studies have not compared the effects of varied strategies. And as most research focuses on individual student outcomes rather than measures of successful partnerships, specific documentation of processes of partnership-building, and the conditions that enable these relationships to

flourish are not easily extracted from the literature. Some of the larger scale initiatives reviewed (e.g., California's Healthy Start Initiative) lack rigorous, longitudinal, mixed-methods evaluations that might offer specific and more detailed data on program effects, key program elements and their costs, school structural and policy barriers, and processes of program implementation.

School-linked Services

“School systems are not responsible for meeting every need of their students. But when the need directly affects learning, the school must meet the challenge.” —Carnegie Council Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents [2]

In this review, we focus more narrowly on research that examines the efficacy of partnerships in providing additional services to students that may be beyond the capacity of a school system, with a specific focus on health service provision, as that has been the most well researched.

Data available on the effectiveness of school health centers, school based mental health services, and related school-linked services both on health and educational outcomes underscore several key elements connected to the success of these partnerships in affecting academic outcomes. Findings regarding the effects of specific health interventions on school completion rates (as well as related measures of academic achievement) have some shared general characteristics.

- Programs are school-centered, with schools serving as the central locus for connection to multiple services (both school-based and in the community): these include coordinated school-health programs, school based health centers, mental health programs, substance abuse treatment, and targeted services for pregnant-parenting teens.

- Successful interventions and integrated services occur in partnership with local community agencies (e.g., community mental health agencies, public health departments, and local businesses) that assist with program development and implementation (including securing funding sources outside of education).
- Some of the health interventions in addition to direct effects on health outcomes, appear to have additional effects on school climate and student connectedness (to school and other caring adults) that may have an indirect effect on academic outcomes.
- Targeted interventions and services that focus on marginalized populations (e.g., youth who are in foster care, homeless, pregnant/parenting, and/or involved with the juvenile justice system) support youth to continue with their education, while providing much needed wrap-around services.

Coordinated School Health Programs (CSH) model

Coordinated School Health was intended to address the nexus of health status, risk behaviors, and academic success. When all

components are incorporated, these programs involve coordination across multiple key stakeholders, including school district staff, school boards, administrators, school nurses and counselors, health assistants, teachers, and food service employees. Parent and community participation are a necessary, but secondary, component to this school-wide effort.^{xxxii} Anecdotal descriptions of successful CSH models include multiple ways in which health has been incorporated into school activities and instruction and enhanced by community partnerships, but the most rigorously evaluated interventions focus only on one or two components of CSH. Despite this limitation, studies demonstrate that CSH approaches do appear to be associated with improvements in academic achievement. Studies, for example, where schools provided asthma education and school-wide efforts to increase awareness of asthma triggers, demonstrate improvements in grades, science performance in particular.^{xxxiii}

School Based Health Centers

School Based Health Centers (SBHCs) use evidence-based strategies to provide comprehensive primary, preventive, and mental health services to children and adolescents, with documented improvements in access to care as well as improved health knowledge.^{xxxiv} SBHCs provide easy access to developmentally and culturally appropriate services by collaborating with parents, educators, and the medical homes (providers of primary care that is accessible, continuous, comprehensive, family-centered, coordinated, compassionate, and culturally effective)^{xxxv} of students to develop an array of services. SBHCs are often located in schools where students are likely to be at greater risk for experiencing both physical and mental healthcare inequalities and often lack access to care due to undocumented status. In rural communities, they are often

the primary source for all students' health services.

While data suggest that improving the overall health of students (including provision of health services on-site at schools) would have some effect on academic achievement, research on the effects of SBHCs on school academic performance is more limited. The primary outcomes that have been assessed in studies looking at the potential effects of SBHCs on academic outcomes are absences and drop-out rates (see Appendix 1 for a summary of these studies).

School-Linked Services

School-linked services offer a single point of program entry, allowing for a coordinated, integrated approach to addressing the complex needs of socially and economically disadvantaged families. Services may be provided on and/or off-site from the school, with the school as the central clearinghouse. With a primary goal of fostering local interagency collaboration and communication, these initiatives attempt to reduce duplication of effort and fragmentation of care. Services may include family support, youth development activities, food and shelter, medical and preventive care, tutoring, and employment training. Implementation of these school-linked services varies widely, which limits rigorous evaluation and the ability to look at specific effects of particular elements. Given the limited published research, we turn to the evaluation reports of two California school-linked initiatives that demonstrate some improvements in academic outcomes; this "practice-based evidence" highlights successful strategies for organizational partnerships and the school conditions that support them.

The Healthy Start Initiative

The State Legislature of California in 1991 passed a bipartisan bill (SB 620 1991) supporting “comprehensive, integrated, supports and services” for California’s most disadvantaged K-12 students and schools. School districts could seek planning and program funds to build partnerships with community members and institutions to address the multitude of barriers to learning—hunger, illness, homelessness, illiteracy, parent unemployment.

Findings from the Stanford Research International (SRI) evaluation IN 1995 [3], and the 1998 statewide evaluation by California Department of Education [4] included: 1) increase in standardized test scores for grades one through three (compared to similar schools without Healthy Start); 2) middle and high school students with the greatest need had nearly 50% increase in grade point average; 3) increased parent participation in all school activities; and 4) reduction in student mobility.

Of note, these improvements were particularly dramatic in the lowest performing schools, and among the children and families with the greatest needs. Additionally, trends in Healthy Start schools have included decreases in school violence, decreases in reports of child abuse and family violence, improvements in self-esteem and self-reported substance use, and cost-effectiveness. ^{xxxvi}

Particular necessary and contributing factors emerged across sites: 1) adequate space that is comfortable and accessible for children and families; 2) a Healthy Start coordinator (one full-time employee) to build and manage community relationships with policy-makers and community-based institutions (and negotiate cross-cultural differences); 3) integration into the school with consistent administrator, faculty, and

staff support; 4) diverse representation on the local Healthy Start collaborative (including youth, families, community members) that shows leadership and allocates funds; 5) resources from multiple other community resources combined and leveraged for the long-term support of children and families; and 6) evaluation results shared regularly with the collaborative partners, including families, to support continuous improvement.

The Beacon Initiative—Youth and Family Centers

Started in 1994, the San Francisco Beacon Initiative (SFBI) is a public-private partnership promoting Youth and Family Centers in public schools. The Initiative offers opportunities, services and activities that foster the healthy development of youth, families, and communities, such as social, athletic, educational, and recreational opportunities before and after school, on weekends and during the summer. Centers receive technical assistance around youth development theory and practice.

Evaluations have demonstrated consistent improvements in academic performance, youth leadership, and youth participation in arts, recreation, and health-related activities. Specifically, compared to youth in schools without Beacon Centers, the Beacon participants demonstrated statistically significant improvements in school attendance. While GPA and suspension rates were slightly worse overall for Beacon participants, those students who attended the Center more than 30 days demonstrated significantly higher GPAs and fewer suspension rates compared with others who participated less and attended the comparison schools. While promising, without adequate controls and sample size to enable more careful modeling, how participation moderates or contributes to improving academic performance remains unclear.

Challenges of Implementing and Sustaining School-Linked and School-Based Services

Despite ample evidence that school-based health centers and school-linked services appear to have some measurable effects on student academic achievement and provide much-needed support services for students in disadvantaged communities, the actual number of school districts that have adopted such school-community partnerships are few in number. Recognizing the potential reasons for limited and unsustainable implementation provides insight into the conditions that enable successful integration. For example, a detailed qualitative review of the New Century Schools, as well as the evaluations of the Healthy Start Initiatives, underscore specific structural and organizational challenges that emerge in building and sustaining community partnerships: 1) institutional cultural

differences (different values, structures, goals, and everyday practices) that require ongoing communication and negotiation; 2) need for clearly articulated policies and procedures, including written information-sharing agreements, (including legal requirements such as HIPAA and FERPA); 3) identification of multiple funding sources (including opportunities for third-party reimbursements for service provision) and successfully braiding those sources of funding; and 4) ensuring that roles and responsibilities are transparent and decision-making processes are understood by all partners.^{xxxvii}

In summary, the research on school-linked and school-based services, while limited in scope, demonstrates some clear effects on improving the health outcomes for children and adolescents as well as attendance and academic performance.

Family Engagement

“Family engagement”^{xxxviii} efforts include a broad range of practices, including efforts to foster specific parenting practices, democratic participation, school choice, and school-community partnerships. This review draws primarily on “School-Community Partnership” research, with some attention to the other areas as they overlap with this body of literature. Studies of “School-Community Partnerships” tend to focus on one or more of six dimensions in which schools can involve parents and other community members: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with the community.^{xxxix} This review draws primarily on research that highlights effects on student achievement/outcomes, effective strategies, and barriers to family engagement.^{xl}

Effects on Student Achievement/Outcomes

Findings specifically addressing the effectiveness of family involvement programs in boosting student academic achievement are inconsistent,^{xli} although mostly positive^{xlii} (see Appendix 2 for further description of the research).

- In preschool, strong home-school relationships are not only associated with stronger preschool performance, but appear to buffer the effects of poverty.
- Outcomes associated with family engagement in primary and secondary grades include lower rates of special education placement, and higher rates of GATE placement, increased math and literacy skills, decreased behavior problems and improved social and

motivational outcomes, increased homework completion and college attendance, decreased drop-out rates, and increased overall school engagement.

The effects of parent involvement, as might be expected developmentally, appear to be larger at the preschool and primary grade levels. Although recent research is encouraging, in many cases the measurable effects are relatively small.^{xliii} In keeping with such findings, parent involvement has a positive correlation with higher performance on standardized tests, but weaker effects than other interventions focused more directly on academic performance in high performing, high poverty schools and schools serving large numbers of ELs.^{xliv}

In general, while family engagement at any grade-level is unlikely to be sufficient to bring about academic success, engaged families may well contribute to the success of schools and students, and their absence may increase the risk of school difficulties.

Effective Family Engagement Strategies

Family engagement efforts associated with measurably stronger academic outcomes emphasize some different, but overlapping, strategies across grade levels.

- **Preschool:** Family engagement is a component of most successful preschool programs and practices. Positive home-school relationships are fostered through regular and frequent communication. Programs focus on increasing family capacity to support development of academic skills such as literacy at home, both through offering specific strategies and resources, as well as modes of interacting with children. Some programs also offer supports to promote overall family health and well-being.^{xlv}

- **Elementary School:** While some initiatives foster home learning and support parenting more generally through providing information about services and successful parenting strategies,^{xlvi} others note the power of more comprehensive approaches to engaging parents and other community members in multiple ways as part of a broader educational reform strategy.^{xlvii} There is general agreement that ensuring parents have strategies, information, resources, and relationships they need to support their children's learning and well-being, as well as their own, appears to make more of a difference in student success than participation in school-based activities.^{xlviii}

- **Secondary School:** At this level, as at others, communication of high parent aspirations and expectations and positive parent-child relationships appear to be important.^{xlix} At-home involvement such as encouraging homework completion and engaging pursuits that offer opportunities to develop and apply skills are more likely to have effects than participating in school activities.¹ Caretakers are better able to support their children when they have key knowledge and information necessary in a timely manner to ensure their children are attending school and are on-track to meet graduation requirements and pursue post-secondary education opportunities. Family engagement and strengthening appears to be a key element of successful drop-out prevention programs.^{li}

However, as noted earlier, these recommendations are based on research that has focused on a narrow range of conceptual orientations to family engagement (addressing deficits and cultural mismatches). Particularly at the secondary school level, experimentation and evaluation

with a variety of strategies may be worthwhile.^{lii}

Other strategies include ways that family members can foster stronger, more equitable and responsive schools, either through working within school systems in leadership roles,^{liii} building constituencies for reforms,^{liii} or mobilizing to hold schools accountable for improvements.^{liv} Such practices might be best assessed not by individual student outcomes, but rather the extent to which schools develop and implement curricula, programs, policies and practices that address disparities and promote success amongst underperforming populations.

While a wide variety of strategies are employed to support family engagement, promising strategies tend to share the following qualities.

- Efforts are embedded within a framework of formal school- and district-level policies that promote family involvement, including an explicit focus on engaging families who reflect the full diversity of the student population;
- Initiatives receive active and ongoing support from the principal;
- Efforts honor families' hopes and concerns for their children;
- Personal, culturally sensitive outreach is a priority;
- School staff acknowledge commonalities and recognize, respect, and respond to cultural, language, and class differences among students and families;
- Initiatives recognize and build upon the resources (social, cultural, linguistic) of local families;
- Schools and districts strengthen staff capacity to work well with families across ethnic, language, cultural, and class differences;

- Families are supported to understand how schools work, what's expected of both families and students, and how to navigate the system to effectively support and advocate for their children;
- Efforts identify logistical and informational barriers to family engagement and develop solutions to overcome them;
- Participants recognize that it takes time to build trust.

Barriers to Family Engagement

Research has identified multiple barriers to minority, low-income, and immigrant family involvement in their children's schooling—barriers that schools can help overcome. These barriers include logistical/contextual factors (particularly time constraints, child care needs, and transportation problems); English language proficiency/literacy; cultural beliefs about the role of families in their children's schooling; families' limited understanding of U.S. educational processes and systems, parent education levels, and lack of trust.^{lvi} School-based barriers include more limited outreach and communication with parents at schools serving a high percentage of immigrant and low-SES families,^{lvii} limited outreach and relationship building with families,^{lviii} unwelcoming environments (including lack of staff with key language/cultural capacity, lack of comfortable meeting space, intimidating security measures, unfriendly/unhelpful/unavailable staff, and school schedules that make staff unavailable out of regular work hours).^{lix} Secondary schools are even less likely to reach out to families than preschools and elementary schools.^{lx}

School system qualities that contribute to school-based barriers include: 1) deficit perspectives that lead schools to focus on families as problems rather than resources

and to limit attention to ways to improve their own practice^{lxi} 2) emphasis on “traditional” partnership models without attending to families’ linguistic, cultural, and logistical needs;^{lxii} 3) limited efforts to adopt models of parent involvement that include family support, 2-way communication, and parent empowerment;^{lxiii} 4) teachers, principals, and other school staff without key language and cultural capacities and cross-cultural communication skills;^{lxiv} 5) school district capacity, commitment, and comprehensive strategy around engaging families;^{lxv} 6) fear of sharing power;^{lxvi} and 7) resource limitations (time, staff, space, funds)^{lxvii}.

Summary

In summary, research on school-linked services and family and community engagement in schools suggests that high

quality school-community partnerships are associated with positive effects on student connectedness, attendance, motivation, conduct, persistence, academic achievement, and pursuit of post-secondary education; students of all ethnic, language and socio-economic backgrounds appear to experience such effects. Effects on a wide range of school-level outcomes also emerge to varying degrees, including improvements in school climate, perceived safety, and parent participation, as well as reductions in family violence and unmet basic needs. Emergent research suggests that some partnerships can foster positive neighborhood and community effects as well. While a causal link between partnership strategies and increased student academic achievement remains unclear, all researchers seem to agree that *not* partnering with families and communities is likely to increase the risk of student failure.

Section III: Supporting and Sustaining School-Community Partnerships

Schools that succeed in fostering academic success among economically poor students, students of color, and ELs employ a wide variety of approaches to partnering with students’ families and other local individuals and institutions. Research on family engagement and school-linked services highlights conditions that appear to be necessary pre-cursors for effective, sustainable school-community partnerships. These conditions offer an important basis for policy development, and are outlined in this section, along with related policy implications.

Key Conditions

The following seven conditions form a foundation for successful and sustained school-community partnership strategies.

Partnerships are Expected

Education practitioners and leaders in schools with successful community partnerships view them as a core element of what constitutes school, not merely an add-on or peripheral set of activities. Community partnerships are embedded in their school structure, culture, and practice.

School and District Staff are Prepared

Schools are staffed and led by people who have the insight, knowledge and skills needed to effectively collaborate with local individuals and institutions. In particular, addressing the needs of ethnic and linguistic minority students, students from low-income families and neighborhoods, and students whose caretakers are immigrants requires specific capacities that include: 1) cultural capacity/cultural humility^{lxviii} and cross-

cultural communication skills; 2) knowledge of partnership practices and strategies that promote stronger, more equitable outcomes for children, youth and families; 3) knowledge of, and the ability to learn about, potential community and regional resources; and 4) understanding relevant policy arenas and institutional actors in related fields such as public health and community development, and ways of blending funding streams to support partnerships (particularly among school leaders). Offering professional development is an important way of augmenting staff skills, as is designing hiring processes that incorporate these qualifications.

Community Partners are Prepared to Work with Schools

Successful partnerships require that the knowledge, expertise, and wisdom of local collaborators are shared and respected. In addition, community partners need opportunities to expand their knowledge, skills, and networks in ways that strengthen their ability to work with schools.

A Sustainable Vision is Articulated

School districts and schools work with potential partners to articulate comprehensive and sustainable visions of community partnerships that evolve based on

experimentation and reflect local needs, interests, and assets.

Space is Available for Partnership Activities

Schools create space for partnership activities that is accessible to students, families, and community partners. School-linked services research is particularly clear that providing services at school sites is critical to the seamless provision of needed services.

Sufficient, Sustained Funding is Available

Partnership strategies that rely on short-term, inadequate funding and heroic school staff-members are not sustainable; when resources disappear, programs do as well, contributing to the perception and practice of partnerships as peripheral.

Partnerships are Evaluated

Evaluations are a critical source of information for ongoing planning. Evaluations should employ indicators that partnerships are designed to affect. Student outcomes should be broken down by sub-groups such as age/grade, socio-economic status, racial/ethnic background, home language, and English language abilities to ensure that the program is effective for all student populations.

Policy Implications

Fostering the conditions required to promote successful, widespread implementation of school-community partnership strategies will likely demand policy and regulatory attention at the state and local levels. Professional development, school and district planning, school facilities/transportation, school finance, and evaluation and data management are areas in which challenges must be resolved.

Professional Development

California's teacher and administrator credentialing programs must cultivate the knowledge and skills necessary for creating and sustaining strong partnerships between schools, families and communities. Professional development opportunities that foster such capacities must be widely available to in-service teachers and administrators.

State and school-sponsored partnership initiatives should also incorporate mechanisms for fostering family and other community partners' capacities, including basic understandings of how schools and school systems work.

School Finances

Fostering strong partnerships that promote more equitable outcomes for California children might require additional financial resources. However, there is currently limited coordination of resource streams within education that are available to support partnership strategies.^{lxix} increased flexibility coupled with adequate support and accountability mechanisms might yield greater ability to leverage existing resources. Additional resources may also emerge through more strategic braiding of resource streams across areas within the public sector (e.g., education, health, community development, juvenile justice, parks and recreation), and within and across scales (local, state, federal). Requiring reporting to the state on education budgets and expenditures at the school level (rather than only at the district level) would increase capacity to ensure that partnership resources reach all high need neighborhoods and communities.^{lxx}

School and District Planning

Schools and districts should be encouraged and supported to develop comprehensive plans for strategic family and community partnerships by building upon existing planning requirements, such as School Site Plans, Migrant Education plans, and NCLB Section 118 requirements. Comprehensive needs assessment and planning will be

especially critical if funding mechanisms become more flexible.

School Facilities and Transportation

Beyond being creative with existing school facilities, addressing the space needs of various school-community partnerships may require designing and locating new facilities with partnerships in mind, addressing regulatory challenges of using school buildings in off-school hours, and exploring transportation strategies for getting students to other community locations

Evaluation and Data Management

Ensuring that school-community partnership initiatives are well-implemented and address the needs of student populations most affected by the achievement gap will require that high-quality evaluation and student data management strategies are implemented at state and local scales. Evaluations must be adequately funded and based on indicators that programs are designed to effect. Careful mixed-methods designs with attention to the intended and unintended consequences of the effects of partnerships on students, school environments, teachers and families are necessary to develop a greater body of evidence on the role of partnerships in academic success. Given the variation of intervention effects among different student populations, careful data collection and sub-group analyses should be included in evaluations (including sub-groups based on age/grade, socio-economic status, racial/ethnic background, home language, and English language abilities); the ability to track such data will be greatly enhanced by a state-wide system for tracking individual student data.

Conclusion

Partnership strategies appear to be critical, although unto themselves insufficient, elements of serious efforts to reduce gaps in K-12 student success based on ethnicity, language, and socio-economic status. A variety of financial and technical supports for partnerships are available to California schools and districts via a piecemeal combination of requirements, allocations, and competitive grants. For example, multiple policy mechanisms require schools and districts to involve parents or community members in governance (e.g., through School Site Councils, English Learner Advisory Committees), engage parents (e.g., NCLB Section 118, NCLB tutoring provisions, Title 1, Migrant Education), and develop plans for parent engagement (NCLB Section 118, School Site Plans). Healthy Start, Migrant Education, SAMHSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration), and Homeless Youth and Foster Youth programs support a variety of school-linked and referral services. Nell Soto Parent/Teacher Involvement Grants support teacher home visits. After School Education and Safety, 21st Century Community Learning Center, and Service Learning grants offer opportunities to partner with local youth-serving organizations. A variety of state and federal school improvement resources may be used to foster partnerships that promote more rigorous academic learning and supplemental academic support, but the ways and extent to which such strategies are pursued is unknown.

The fragmented development and implementation of policies that foster the conditions for partnership makes it difficult to assess their overall effects. However, initial assessments of the Healthy Start Initiative, one of the most comprehensive state partnership strategies that directly targets low-income communities, have been

promising in terms of effects on students and families and leveraging of additional resources.

Several potential obstacles to policy development in this area exist, all of which are exacerbated by a climate of scarce resources. First, the current emphasis on standardized assessment may work against investment in partnership-based strategies that foster relevance, rigor, engagement, personalization, and meeting basic needs, despite the apparent importance of these factors in addressing disparities based on ethnicity, language, and socio-economic status. Because it is difficult to produce data that shows clear causal relationship between many partnership strategies and increased standardized test scores, and we lack well-researched intermediate indicators, making the case for sustaining investment in partnerships may be difficult. Based on their vision of the appropriate role of schools, there is significant resistance to school-community partnerships amongst some communities and policy-makers. Finally, the challenges of working across public agencies at the state, county and local levels work against the kind of coordination that is likely to increase resources and streamline processes for school districts, schools, and their community partners.

Nonetheless, California has many components of an infrastructure to promote and support school-community partnerships. Coordinating and building upon these components is an important next step in efforts to foster stronger, more equitable educational outcomes for children and youth.

Appendix 1

Family Engagement and Associated Outcomes

Research on the relationship between family engagement and student achievement reflects some significant conceptual and methodological challenges. Conceptually, the lack of a consistent set of definitions of parent involvement/family engagement, the use of definitions and indicators that do not capture cultural variation in family engagement strategies, and inconsistent use of family engagement constructs make it difficult to assess cumulative knowledge and make comparisons across studies. Most research has been confined to particular orientations to family engagement [6]. Methodological challenges include the lack of studies that employ mixed method, experimental and longitudinal designs, the difficulty of isolating family engagement effects from other program elements [61], and the challenge of accounting for effects of children's achievement on family engagement [5,9,63,91]. While family engagement is noted as an important element of schools that are serving economically poor children, children of color, and ELs well this is only one of multiple critical elements [13,17,20]; efforts to accurately isolate the effects of family engagement at the school or student scale are methodologically challenging. Understandings of family engagement as an ecological process underscore the difficulty of isolating factors that support and/or impede family engagement [92]. Too little high-quality research has been conducted to support a firm conclusion about causal analyses linking specific types and levels of engagement with improved measures of academic learning [6,63]. Another challenge to work in the arena of family engagement is that while school efforts to recognize, promote, and support multiple forms of family engagement appear to be important, schools must also be able to foster student success in the absence of strong family partnerships [18].

The following studies were reviewed for evidence of the effects of family engagement strategies on student outcomes.

	Study*	Research Setting and Design	Key Findings
P R E S C H O O L	Conyers, Reynolds et al. [93]	Examines outcomes for 1,377 low-income, racial minority children in the Chicago Longitudinal Study, comparing students in Chicago Parent Child Centers and other early childhood programs in the Chicago Public Schools	CPC students had significantly lower rate of special education placement (12.5%) than the comparison group (18.4%)
	Fantuzzo, McWayne et al. [94]	Examines relations in urban Head Start between multiple dimensions of family involvement in early childhood education and classroom outcomes. Parental report of family involvement was gathered in late fall, and compared with end of the year outcomes of approaches to learning, conduct problems, and receptive vocabulary. n=144.	Home-based family involvement was strongest predictor of child outcomes, associated significantly with motivation to learn, attention, task persistence, receptive vocabulary skills, and low conduct problems. School-based Involvement significantly related to low conduct problems in the classroom when combined with influence of Home-

E L E M E N T A R Y			Based Involvement
	Marcon [95]	Examines relations in 3 urban public preschool or Head Start cohorts (N=708) between parent involvement and student outcomes using teacher assessment of parent involvement and student scores on the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales and the school district's Early Child Progress Report.	Increased and more active parent involvement were associated with more positive language skills and self-help, social, motor, and adaptive development and academic performance. There were some differences in outcomes based on gender.
	McWayne, Hampton, and Fantuzzo [96]	Uses the Parent Involvement in Children's Education Scale and data on 307 low-income, ethnic minority kindergarteners and their primary caregivers in a large, urban school district in the Northeast to construct a multidimensional analysis of kindergarten parent involvement.	Multivariate relationships were found between kindergarten parent involvement dimensions and children's social and academic competencies. Parents who actively promote learning in the home, have direct and regular contact with school, and experience fewer barriers to involvement have children who demonstrate positive engagement with their peers, adults, and learning.
	Clements, Reynolds, Hickey [97]	Examines the influence of individual and site-level factors from the Chicago Child-Parent Centers (CPC) early educational program on four competence outcomes for 1539 minority youth in the Chicago Longitudinal Study.	Site-level parental involvement predicted both early and later school outcomes.
	Ou [98]	Investigates pathways that might explain observed linkage between participation in early intervention programs and later educational attainment using a sample from the Chicago Longitudinal Study.	Cognitive advantage effects, followed by family support and school support effects, were the best predictors of the relationship between participation in the Chicago Child-Parent Center (CPC) program and subsequent educational attainment.
	Kreider [99]	Examines the relationship between preschool participation and transition to kindergarten using interview data from 200 urban and rural low-income, ethnically diverse parents, approximately half of whom participated in an early childhood program.	In comparison with the control group, parents whose children attended the program read more to their children, were more likely to visit their child's classroom, and knew more parents in their child's class.
Dearing, Krieder et al.	Longitudinal data from N-281	Within families, increased	

[60]	kindergarten to fifth graders on both family involvement in school and children's literacy performance were examined for an ethnically diverse, low-income sample.	school involvement predicted improved child literacy. While there was an achievement gap in average literacy performance between children of more and less educated mothers if family involvement levels were low, this gap was nonexistent if family involvement levels were high.
Dearing, McCartney et al. [100]	Examines associations between family educational involvement during kindergarten, children's feelings about literacy, and children's literacy achievement from kindergarten through fifth grade, using longitudinal data for 167 low-income children.	Family involvement was more positively associated with literacy outcomes for children whose mothers were less educated compared with children whose mothers were more educated.
Izzo, Weisberg, Kaspro, et al. [101]	Examines relationship between parent involvement and student academic outcomes amongst N=1205 urban K-3 students over 3 years. Teachers provided information on parent involvement and school performance. They rated four dimensions of parent involvement: frequency of parent-teacher contact, quality of the parent-teacher interactions, participation in educational activities at home, and participation in school activities.	Parent involvement declined from Year 1 to Year 3. Every parent involvement variable correlated moderately with overall performance in Years 1 and 2, and explained a small amount of variance in Year 3.
Sheldon and Epstein [102]	Examines the connections between specific family and community involvement activities and student achievement in mathematics at the school level, using longitudinal data from elementary and secondary schools.	Effective implementation of practices that encouraged families to support their children's mathematics learning at home was associated with higher percentages of students who scored at or above proficiency on standardized mathematics achievement tests.
Sheldon [103]	In this longitudinal study, data were collected on schools' rates of daily student attendance and chronic absenteeism and on specific partnership practices that were implemented to help increase or sustain student attendance.	Several family-school-community partnership practices predict an increase in daily attendance, a decrease in chronic absenteeism, or both.
Jimerson et al. [104]	Explores multiple predictors of high school dropouts across development using a 19-year	The results of this study demonstrate the association of multiple individual factors

	prospective longitudinal study of “at-risk” children.	in dropping out of high school at age 19, including parent involvement in elementary school.
Moon and Callahan [105]	Investigates the efficacy of specific parental involvement intervention, amongst other interventions, on the academic achievement of 273 elementary students from low socio-economic environments.	While the intervention had no statistically significant effect on student achievement in any grade, by the end of the program, students who received it were on grade level, and had higher rates of placement in GATE.
Domina [106]	Uses data from the children of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 to estimate time-lagged growth models of the effect of several types of parental involvement on scores on elementary school achievement tests and the Behavioral Problems Index.	Parental involvement does not independently improve children’s learning, but some involvement activities do prevent behavioral problems. Interaction analyses suggest that the involvement of parents with low socio-economic status may be more effective than that of parents with high socio-economic status.
Sheldon and Epstein [107]	Reports the results of efforts of school officials to implement family and community involvement activities to reduce disciplinary actions, using longitudinal data from elementary and secondary schools	Regardless of schools’ prior rates of discipline, full implementation of family and community involvement activities was associated with fewer students being sent to principals’ offices or given detention or in-school suspension.
Hawkins et al. [108]	Examines the long-term effects of an intervention combining teacher training, parent education, and social competence training for 598 fifth grade children in a high crime-area of Seattle on adolescent health-risk behaviors at age 18 years.	Fewer students receiving full intervention than control students reported violent delinquent acts (48.3% vs 59.7%; $P=.04$), heavy drinking (15.4% vs 25.6%; $P=.04$), sexual intercourse (72.1% vs 83.0%; $P=.02$), having multiple sex partners (49.7% vs 61.5%; $P=.04$), and pregnancy or causing pregnancy (17.1% vs 26.4%; $P=.06$) by age 18 years. The full intervention student group reported more commitment ($P=.03$) and attachment ($P=.006$) to school, better academic achievement ($P=.01$), and less school misbehavior ($P=.02$) than control

S E C O N D A R Y			students.
	Perna and Titus [109]	Examines data from the second (1992) and third (1994) follow-ups to the NELS (National Educational Longitudinal Survey) (N=9810), using HLM (hierarchical linear modeling) to explore the relationship between parent involvement and the likelihood of post-secondary enrollment	Several measures of parent involvement are related to the odds of enrolling in a 2-year or 4-year college in the fall after graduating from high school.
	Sirvani [65]	Considers the effects of an intervention to engage parents in monitoring progress in Algebra 1; of four classes taught by one teacher, 2 classes received treatment, 2 did not.	Students in the experimental group outperformed the students in the control group. Parental involvement did not affect student achievement differently based on gender. Lower- achieving students in the experimental group significantly outperformed such students in the control group.
	Rumberger [110]	Using data from NELS 1988 and HLM, the study explores individual and institutional features that contribute to middle school dropout for white, Black and Latino students.	Parental academic support, supervision, and educational expectations were, amongst other factors, predictors of dropout rates. Effects vary across ethnic groups.
	Dynarski and Gleason [111]	Summarizes implementation findings of evaluations of federally funded drop-out prevention programs.	Parent involvement appears to be a component of successful programs
	Catsambis [112]	Analyzes data from NELS 1988 to investigate relationships between parental involvement practices and the educational outcomes of high school seniors	Relationships depend on the parental practices and educational outcomes considered. Parental involvement indicators are not associated with achievement growth between 8th and 12th grades. High educational expectations, consistent encouragement, and actions that enhance learning opportunities are positively associated with seniors' enrollment in an academic program and coursework in core academic subjects. The relationships exist regardless of students' socioeconomic or race/ethnic background and regardless of whether parental practices are measured in middle or high school.

Hill et al. [113]	A longitudinal model of parent academic involvement, behavioral problems, achievement, and aspirations was examined for 463 adolescents, followed from 7th (approximately 12 years old) through 11th (approximately 16 years old) grades.	Parent academic involvement in 7th grade was negatively related to 8th-grade behavioral problems and positively related to 11th-grade aspirations. There were variations across parental education levels and ethnicity: amongst more highly educated parents, academic involvement was related to fewer behavioral problems, which were related to achievement and then aspirations. For less educated parents, academic involvement was related to aspirations but not to behavior or achievement. Involvement was positively related to achievement for African Americans but not for European Americans.
Simon [114]	Reviews data from more than 11,000 parents of high school seniors and students and 1,000 high school principals	Regardless of students' background and prior achievement, various parenting, volunteering, and home learning activities positively influenced student grades, course credits completed, attendance, behavior, and school preparedness. When educators guided parents and solicited participation, parents responded with increased involvement.
Seidman, et al. [115]	Explores the role of perceived family transactions of daily hassles, social support, and involvement with family in leisure activities in a sample of racially and ethnically diverse urban adolescents living in poverty as they made the transition to junior high school	Adolescents who perceived fewer daily hassles and more involvement with their families prior to junior high school appeared less vulnerable to declines in scores of self-esteem. Those who perceived fewer daily hassles also appeared to have fewer declines in preparedness for class. Social support moderated the effect of daily hassles on class preparation. Under conditions of high hassles and high support, adolescents were most vulnerable to decrements in

			class preparation, whereas adolescents who perceived low hassles and high support were highest in class preparation.
	Sheldon and Epstein [107]	Reports the results of efforts of school officials to implement family and community involvement activities to reduce disciplinary actions, using longitudinal data from elementary and secondary schools	Regardless of schools' prior rates of discipline, full implementation of family and community involvement activities was associated with fewer students being sent to principals' offices or given detention or in-school suspension.
K - 12	Gonzalez-DeHass, et al. [116]	Synthesis of K-12 research on the relationship between parent involvement and student motivation.	Studies show a positive correlation between parental involvement and school engagement, intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, perceived competence, perceived control, self-regulation, mastery goal orientation, and motivation to read.
	Jeynes [53] Jeynes [54]	Meta-analyses of research on the relationship between parent involvement programs at urban elementary (41 studies) and secondary (52 studies) schools and student outcomes.	Elementary studies revealed a considerable and consistent relationship between parental involvement and academic achievement that held for boys and girls and white and minority children. In secondary schools, the impact of parental involvement overall was significant, with positive effects holding for both white and minority students.

*All peer-reviewed

Appendix 2: School Health Center Studies

SCHOOL HEALTH CENTERS (SHC)*	Research Setting and Design**	Key Findings
Gall, et al. [45]	SHC in urban, predominantly Hispanic <u>high school</u> ; 2 months pre and post mental health service referral compared to students not referred (n=383)	Adolescents referred to mental health services had decreased rates of absences and tardiness
Kisker & Brown [44]	Multi-site <u>high schools</u> with adolescent health care program; comparison of students attending schools with SHCs (n = 3050) to urban sample of youth (n=859)	Percentage of students who progressed through school slightly higher for schools with SHCs
McCord et al. [117]	Retrospective comparison of registered SHC users, registered non-users, and non-registrants at an <u>alternative</u> middle and high school (grades 6-12) (n=322)	Clinic users were 3 times more likely to stay in school than non-users, most significant for Black males; no significant difference in numbers of days absent
Webber et al. [118]	<u>Elementary</u> school***; retrospective comparison of students attending 4 schools with SHCs (n = 645) to students in 2 schools without SHCs (n = 304) focused on asthma outcomes	Access to SHCs reduced hospitalization for asthma, increased days in school compared to students at schools without SHC

*All peer-reviewed

**Note all quasi-experimental

***Limited elementary school data

References

1. O'Connell, J. (2008). *Closing the achievement gap*. Report of Superintendent Jack O'Connell's California P-16 Council. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education. Retrieved March 17, 2008, from: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/pc/>
2. Carnegie Council Task Force on the Education of Young Adolescents. (1989). *Turning Points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century. The report of the task force on education of young adolescents*. Waldorf, MD: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.
3. Wechsler, M., & Golan, S. (1995). *A healthy start: Student and family outcomes of four school-linked service models*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
4. California Department of Education. (1999). *Healthy Start works: A statewide profile of Healthy Start sites*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
5. Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family and community connections on student achievement*. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
6. Boethel, M. (2003). *Diversity: School family and community connections*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
7. Boethel, M. (2004). *Readiness: School, family and community connections*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
8. Baker, A. J. L., & Soden, L. M. (1998). *The challenges of parent involvement research*. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.
9. Mattingly, D. J., Prislin, R., McKenzie, T. L., Rodriguez, J. L., & Kayzar, B. (2002). Evaluating evaluations: The case of parent involvement programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(4), 549-576.
10. Sadovnik, A. R., Dworkin, A. G., Gamoran, A., Hallinan, M., & Scott, J. (2008). *Sociological perspectives on NCLB and federal involvement in education*. New York: Routledge.
11. Schutz, A. (2006). Home is a prison in the global city: The tragic failure of school-based community engagement strategies. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 691-743.
12. Arias, M. B., & Morillo-Campbell, M. (2008). *Promoting ELL parental involvement: Challenges in contested times*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
13. Socias, M., Dunn, L., Parrish, T., Muraki, M., & Woods, L. (2007). *California high schools that beat the odds in high school graduation*. Santa Barbara: American Institutes for Research (AIR).
14. Williams, T., Kirst, M., & Haertel, E. (2005). *Similar students, different results: Why do some schools do better? A large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving low-income students*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.
15. Scribner, J. D., Young, M. D., & Pedroza, A. (1999). Building collaborative relationships with parents. In P. Reyes, J. D. Scribner & A. P. Scribner (Eds.), *Lessons from high-performing Hispanic schools: Creating learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

16. Williams, T., Hakuta, K., & Haertel, E. (2007). *Similar English learner students, different results: Why do some schools do better?* A follow-up analysis, based on a large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving low-income and EL students. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.
17. Friedlander, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). *High school for equity: Policy supports for student learning in communities of color*. Palo Alto, CA: School Redesign Network/Stanford University.
18. Allgood, W. C. (2006). *The need for adequate resources for at risk children*. (Working Paper 277). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
19. Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc.
20. Comer, J. P. (2005). *Leave no child behind: Preparing today's youth for tomorrow's world*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
21. Karp, M. M., Jeong, D. W., & Bailey, T. R. (2007). *The postsecondary achievement of participants in dual enrollment: An analysis of student outcomes in two states*. St. Paul, MN: National Research Center for Career and Technical Education.
22. Kirst, M. W., & Venezia, A. (Eds.). (2004). *From high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in postsecondary education*. San Francisco: Wiley and Sons.
23. Chin, T., & Phillips, M. (2004). Social reproduction and child-rearing practices: Social class, children's agency, and the summer activity gap. *Sociology of Education*, 77(3), 185-210.
24. Ingram, M., Wolfe, R. B., & Lieberman, J. M. (2007). The role of parents in high-achieving schools serving low-income, at-risk populations. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(4), 479-497.
25. Ou, S., & Reynolds, A. J. (2006). Early childhood intervention and educational attainment: Age 22 findings from the Chicago longitudinal study. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 11(2), 175-198.
26. Barbarin, O., Bryant, D., McCandles, T., Burchinal, M., Early, D., Clifford, R., et al. (2006). Children enrolled in public pre-k: The relation of family life, neighborhood quality and socio-economic resources to early competence. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 76(2), 265-276.
27. Braverman, P. (2005). Conceptualizing measures of health disparities. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 27, 167-194.
28. Freudenberg, N., & Ruglis, J. (2007). Reframing school dropout as a public health issue. *Preventing of Chronic Disease*, 4(4), 1-11.
29. Deaton, A. (2002). Policy implications of the gradient of health and wealth. *Health Affairs*, 21, 13-30.
30. Ross, C. E., & Wu, C. (1995). The links between education and health. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 719-745.
31. Woolf, S. H. (2007). Potential health and economic consequences of misplaced priorities. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 297(5), 523-526.
32. Breslau, J. (forthcoming). Mental disorders and subsequent educational attainment in a U.S. national sample. *The Journal of Psychiatric Research*.

33. Hill, N. E., & Craft, S. A. (2003). Parent-school involvement and school performance: Mediated pathways among socioeconomically comparable African American and Euro-American families. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(1), 74-83.
34. Joyner, A. (2007). The healthy approach: Coordinated school programs show that proper nutrition, exercise, and learning go hand-in-hand. *American School Board Journal, 194*(6), 42-45.
35. Sanders, M. G., & Campbell, T. F. (2007). Securing the ties that bind: Community involvement and the educational success of African-American children and youth. In J. F. Jackson (Ed.), *Strengthening the African American educational pipeline* (pp. 141-165). New York: SUNY Press.
36. Harlem Children's Zone. (2008). Harlem Children's Zone 2007 annual report. Retrieved February 1, 2008, from <http://www.hcz.org/index.html>
37. Goldschmidt, P., Huang, D. (2007). *The long-term effects of after-school programming on educational adjustment and juvenile crime: A study of LA's BEST after-school program*. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, UCLA.
38. Calkins, A., Guenther, W., Belfiore, G., & Lash, D. (2007). *The turnaround challenge: Why America's best opportunity to dramatically improve student achievement lies in our worst-performing schools*. Boston, MA: Mass Insight Education and Research Institute.
39. Hirota, J. (2005). *Reframing education: The partnership strategy and public schools*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
40. Stone, C. N., Henig, J. R., Jones, B. D., & Pierannuzi, C. (2001). *Building civic capacity: The politics of reforming urban schools*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
41. Dryfoos, J., Quinn, J., & Barkin, C. (2005). *Community schools in action: Lessons from a decade of practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
42. Evans, D., Clark, N. M., Feldman, C. H., Rips, J., Kaplan, D., Levison, M. J., et al. (1987). A school health education program for children with asthma aged 8-11 years. *Health Education Quarterly, 14*(3), 267-279.
43. Clark, N. M., Brown, R., Joseph, C. L., Anderson, E. W., Liu, M., & Valerio, M. A. (2004). Effects of a comprehensive school-based asthma program on symptoms, parent management, grades, and absenteeism. *Chest, 125*(5), 1674-1679.
44. Kisker, E. E., & Brown, R. S. (1996). Do school-based health centers improve adolescents' access to health care, health status, and risk-taking behavior? *Journal of Adolescent Health, 18*, 335- 343.
45. Gall, G., Pagano, M. E., Desmond, M. S., Perrin, J. M., & Murphy, J. M. (2000). Utility of psychosocial screening at a school-based health center. *Journal of School Health, 70*(7), 292-298.
46. UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities. (2001). *Sustainability of California's Healthy Start Initiative*. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from <http://www.healthychild.ucla.edu/sustainabilitycaliforniashealthystart.asp>.
47. Villarreal, L. (2005). California's healthy start: A solid platform for promoting youth

- development. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 107, 89-97.
48. Wagner, M., & Golan, S. (1996). *A healthy start for California's children and families: Early findings from a statewide evaluation of school-linked services*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
 49. Hirota, J., & Jacobs, L. E. (2003). *Vital voices: Building constituencies for public school reform*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children/University of Chicago.
 50. Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2000). Connecting home, school and community: New directions for social research. In M. T. Hallinan (Ed.), *Handbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 285-306). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
 51. Desimone, L. (1999). Linking parent involvement with student achievement: Do race and income matter? *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93(1), 11-30.
 52. McNeal, R. B. (1999). Parental involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out. *Social Forces*, 78(1), 117-144.
 53. Jeynes, W. H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 40(3), 237-269.
 54. Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Urban Education*, 42(1), 82-110.
 55. Manz, P. H., Fantuzzo, J. W., & Power, T. J. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of family involvement among urban elementary students. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42(6), 461-475.
 56. Stewart, E. B. (2008). School structural characteristics, student effort, peer associations, and parental involvement: The influence of school-school and individual-level factors on academic achievement. *Education and Urban Society*, 40(2), 179-204.
 57. Hong, S., & Ho, H. (2005). Direct and indirect longitudinal effects of parental involvement on student achievement: Second-order latent growth modeling across ethnic groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(1), 32-42.
 58. Spera, C. (2005). A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17(2), 125-146.
 59. Yan, W., & Lin, Q. (2005). Parent involvement and mathematics achievement: Contrast across racial and ethnic groups. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(2), 116-127.
 60. Dearing, E., Krieder, H., Simpkins, S., & Weiss, H. B. (2006). Family involvement in school and low-income children's literacy: Longitudinal associations between and within families. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(4), 653-664.
 61. Reynolds, A. J., Magnuson, K., Ou, S. (2006). *PK-3 education: Programs and practices that work in children's first decade*. Minneapolis, MN: Early Childhood Research Collaborative/University of Minnesota.
 62. Jackson, J. F. L. (2007). *Strengthening the African American educational pipeline*. New York: SUNY Press.
 63. Juvonen, J., Le, V., Kaganoff, T., Augustine, C., & Constant, L. (2004). *Focus on the*

- wonder years: Challenges facing the American middle school*. Santa Monica: RAND.
64. Moore, K. A., Guzman, L., Hair, E., Lippman, L., & Garrett, S. (2004). *Parent-teen relationships and interactions: Far more positive than not*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
 65. Sirvani, H. (2007). The effect of teacher communication with parents on students' mathematics achievement. *American Secondary Education*, 36(1), 31-46.
 66. Hammond, C., Linton, D., Smink, J., & Drew, S. (2007). *Dropout risk factors and exemplary programs*. (A technical report). Clemson, SC: Clemson University/National Dropout Prevention Center.
 67. Oakes, J., & Rogers, J. (2006). *Learning power: Organizing for education and justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
 68. Anyon, J. (2006). *Radical possibilities*. New York: Routledge.
 69. Mediratta, K., & Fruchter, N. (2001). *Mapping the field of organizing for school improvement: A report on education organizing in Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, the Mississippi Delta, New York City, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Washington D.C*. New York: New York University.
 70. Cooper, C. W., & Christie, C. A. (2005). Evaluating parent empowerment: A look at the potential of social justice evaluation in education. *Teachers College Record*, 107(10), 2248-2274.
 71. Halsey, P. A. (2005). Parent involvement in junior high schools: A failure to communicate. *American Secondary Education*, 34(1), 57-69.
 72. Quirocho, A. M. L., & Daoud, A. M. (2006). Dispelling myths about Latino parent participation in schools. *The Educational Forum*, 70(3), 255-267.
 73. Lawson, M. A. (2003). School-family relations in context: Parent and teacher perceptions of parent involvement. *Urban Education*, 38(1), 77-133.
 74. Zarate, M. E. (2007). *Understanding Latino parental involvement in education: Perceptions, expectations and recommendations*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
 75. Ramirez, A. Y. F. (2003). Dismay and disappointment: Parental involvement of Latino immigrant parents. *The Urban Review*, 35(2), 93-110.
 76. Lightfoot, D. (2004). Some parents just don't care: Decoding the meanings of parental involvement in urban schools. *Urban Education*, 39(1), 91-107.
 77. Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, 60(6), 40-44.
 78. Chen, X. (2001). *Efforts by public K-8 schools to involve parents in children's education: Do school and parent reports agree?* (No. NCES 2001-076). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
 79. Lewis, A. E., & Forman, T. A. (2002). Contestation or collaboration? A comparative study of home-school relations. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 33(1), 60-89.
 80. Garcia Coll, C., Akiba, D., Palacios, N., Bailey, B., Silver, R., DiMartino, L., et al. (2002). Parental involvement in children's education: Lessons from three immigrant groups. *Parenting: Science & Practice*, 2, 303-324.

81. Enyeart, C., Diehl, J., Hampden-Thompson, G., & Scotchmer, M. (2006). *School and parent interaction by household language and poverty status: 2002-2003*. Washington DC: IES/U.S. Department of Education.
82. Overstreet, S., Devine, J., & Bevans, K. (2005). Predicting parental involvement in children's schooling within an economically disadvantaged African American sample. *Psychology in the Schools, 42*(1), 101-111.
83. Green, C. L., Walker, J. M. T., Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (2007). Parents' motivations for involvement in children's education: An empirical test of a theoretical model of parental involvement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 532-544.
84. Anderson, K. J. & Minke, K. M. (2007). Parent involvement in education: Toward an understanding of parents' decision making. *The Journal of Educational Research, 100*(5), 311-323.
85. Gibson, M. A., & Bejinez, L. F. (2002). Dropout prevention: How migrant education supports Mexican youth. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 1*(3), 155-175.
86. Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools: An ethnographic portrait*. New York: Teachers College Press.
87. Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English learners*. Santa Cruz, CA: UC LMRI / CFTL / PACE.
88. Epstein, J. L., & Sheldon, S. B. (2006). Moving forward: Ideas for research on school, family, and community partnerships. In C. F. Conrad & R. Serlin (Eds.), *SAGE handbook for research in education: Engaging ideas and enriching inquiry* (pp. 117-138). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
89. Sheldon, S. B. (2008). Getting families involved with NCLB: Factors affecting schools' enactment of federal policy. In A. R. Sadovnik, J. A. O'Day, G. W. Bohrnstedt & K. M. Borman (Eds.), *No Child Left Behind and the reduction of the achievement gap: Sociological perspectives on federal educational policy* (pp. 281-294). New York: Routledge.
90. Tervalon, M., & Murray-García, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competency: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 9*(2), 117-125.
91. Baker, A. J. L., & Soden, L. M. (March 1997). *Parent involvement in children's education: A critical assessment of the knowledge base*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA, Chicago.
92. Barton, A. C., Drake, C., & Perez, J. G. (2004). Ecologies of parental engagement in urban education. *Educational Researcher, 33*(4), 3-12.
93. Fantuzzo, J., McWayne, C., & Perry, M. A. (2004). Multiple dimensions of family involvement and their relations to behavioral and learning competencies for urban, low-income children. *The School Psychology Review, 33*(4), 467-480.
94. Conyers, L. M., Reynolds, A. J., & Ou, S. (2003). The effect of early childhood intervention and subsequent special education services: Findings from the Chicago Child-Parent Centers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25*(1), 75-95.

95. Marcon, R. A. (1999). Positive relationships between parent school involvement and public school inner-city preschoolers' development and academic performance. *School Psychology Review*, 28(3), 395-412.
96. McWayne, C., Hampton, V., & Fantuzzo, J. (2004). A multivariate examination of parent involvement and the social and academic competencies of urban kindergarten children. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41(3), 363-377.
97. Clements, M. A., Reynolds, A. J., & Hickey, E. (2004). Site-level predictors of children's school and social competence in the Chicago Child-Parent Centers. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 19 (2), 273-296.
98. Ou, S. (2005). Pathways of long-term effects of an early intervention program on educational attainment: Findings from the Chicago longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26(5), 578-611.
99. Kreider, H. (2002). *Getting parents "ready" for kindergarten: The role of early childhood education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.
100. Dearing, E., McCartney, K., & Weiss, H. B. (2004). The promotive effects of family educational involvement for low-income children's literacy. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42(6), 445-460.
101. Izzo, C. V., Weissber, R. P., Kasprow, W. J., Fendrich, M. (1999). A longitudinal assessment of teacher perceptions of parent involvement in children's education and school performance. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 27(6), 817-839.
102. Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein, J. L. (2005). Involvement counts: Family and community partnerships and mathematics achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98(4), 196-206.
103. Sheldon, S. B. (2007). Improving attendance with school, family and community partnerships. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100(5), 267-277.
104. Jimerson, S., Egeland, B., Sroufe, L. A., & Carlson, B. (2000). A prospective longitudinal study of high school dropouts examining multiple predictors across development. *Journal of School Psychology*, 38(6), 525-549.
105. Moon, T. R., & Callahan, C. M. (2001). Curricular modifications, family outreach, and a mentoring program: Impacts on achievement and gifted identification in high-risk primary students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 24(4), 305-321.
106. Domina, T. (2005). Leveling the home advantage: Assessing the effectiveness of parental involvement in elementary school. *Sociology of Education*, 78(3), 233-249.
107. Sheldon, B. and Epstein, J. L. (2002). Improving student behavior and discipline with family and community involvement. *Education in Urban Society*, 35(1), 4-26.
108. Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Kosterman, R., Abbott, R., & Hill, K. G. (1999). Preventing adolescent health-risk behaviors by strengthening protection during childhood. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 153(3), 226-234.
109. Perna, L. W., & Titus, M. A. (2005). The relationship between parental involvement as social capital and college enrollment: An examination of racial/ethnic group differences. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(5), 485-518.
110. Rumberger, R. W. (1995). Dropping out of middle school: A multilevel analysis of students and schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 583-625.

111. Dynarski, M., & Gleason, P. (2002). How can we help? What we have learned from recent federal dropout prevention evaluations. *Journal of Education of Students Placed at Risk*, 7(1), 43-69.
112. Catsambis, S. (2001). Expanding knowledge of parental involvement in children's secondary education: Connections with high school seniors' academic success. *Social Psychology of Education*, 5(2), 149-177.
113. Hill, N. E., Castellino, D. R., Lansford, J. E., Nowlin, P., Dodge, K. A., & Bates, J. E. (2004). Parent academic involvement as related to school behavior, achievement, and aspirations: Demographic variations across adolescence. *Child Development*, 75(5), 1491-1509.
114. Simon, B. S. (2004). High school outreach and family involvement. *Social Psychology of Education*, 7, 185-209
115. Seidman, E., Lambert, L. E., Allen, L., & Aber, J. L. (2003). Urban adolescents' transition to junior high school and protective family transactions. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 23(2), 166-193.
116. Gonzalez-DeHass, et al. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17(2), June 2005, 99-122.
117. McCord, M. T., Klein, J. D., Foy, J. M., & Fothergill, K. (1993). School-based clinic use and school performance. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 14(2), 91-98.
118. Webber, M. P., Carpiniello, K. E., Oruwariye, T., Lo, Y., Burton, W. B., & Appel, D. K. (2003). Burden of asthma in inner-city elementary schoolchildren. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 157, 125-129.

Notes

ⁱ Search terms for the review of family engagement research included parent involvement, parent participation, parent engagement, parent empowerment, community involvement, community engagement, family involvement, family participation, family engagement, Latino parent involvement, Hispanic parent involvement, African American parent involvement, Asian American parent involvement, immigrant. Terms for the review of school-linked services research included community partnerships, school based health, school health, academic achievement; coordinated school health; student support, and community schools.

ⁱⁱ Extensive reviews of research on family engagement were released at that time [5,6,7]. Some school health related studies from as early as 1993 were also reviewed.

ⁱⁱⁱ [8,9]

^{iv} [10]

^v [6, p. 13-18]

^{vi} [6,5,11,12]

^{vii} This research defines “success” in a variety of ways: relatively low dropout rates/high graduation rates [13], relatively high standardized test scores [14,15,16], and combinations of criteria [17]. Primary research and related literature reviews also employ a variety of conceptual frameworks, focusing alternately on schools that mitigate the effects of poverty [14,18], schools that serve racially/ethnically diverse populations well [17], and schools that serve English learners well [15,16]. This research generates many overlapping conclusions about key qualities of these schools, although distinct emphases and elements emerge as well.

^{viii} [13,17]

^{ix} [15,16,19,20,]

^x [17,21]

^{xi} [15,20]

^{xii} [15,20]

^{xiii} e.g. [13]

^{xiv} e.g. [13,22]

^{xv} [13,15,17,23,24,25]

^{xvi} [26]

^{xvii} [27]

^{xviii} [28,29,30,31]

^{xix} [32]

^{xx} See [33] for emergent work in this area with respect to parent involvement

^{xxi} [13,15]

^{xxii} Coordinated School Health Programs, <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/CSHP/>; [34]

^{xxiii} [15,17,18]

^{xxiv} [26,35,36,37]

^{xxv} A separate body of research has also explored the effects of parent choice models (e.g., vouchers, charter schools, intra-district choice strategies, and NCLB transfer options) on strengthening educational outcomes. To date, these studies have suggested modest positive effects, but as a body of work are not conclusively positive. No clear evidence exists that choice models bring into existence adequate numbers of schools that serve ELs, children and youth of color, and economically poor families well. For these reasons, this literature is not reviewed here.

^{xxvi} [17,38]

^{xxvii} [15,17,20]

^{xxviii} [38,39]

^{xxix} [13,40]

^{xxx} Retrieved 1/24/08, from

<http://www.communityschools.org/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=6&Itemid=27#WhatCS>,

^{xxxi} [41]

^{xxxii} [34]

^{xxxiii} [42,43]

^{xxxiv} [44,45]

^{xxxv} Retrieved March 26, 2008, from <http://www.medicalhomeinfo.org/>

^{xxxvi} [46,47,48]

^{xxxvii} [49]

^{xxxviii} We use the term “family engagement” in recognition of the multiplicity of family structures and networks that support our young people’s growth and development [6], but researchers tend to use parent involvement, parent engagement, and parent participation interchangeably.

^{xxxix} [50]

^{xl} [5, p. 21]

^{xli} [6,9,51,52]

^{xlii} [5,6]

^{xliii} [53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60]

^{xliv} [14,16]

^{xlv} [7,61]

^{xlvi} [24]

^{xlvii} [15,20,62]

^{xlviii} [6]

^{xlix} [54,63,64]

^l [63, p. 87-88, 65]

^{li} [66]

^{lii} [63, p. 121]

^{liii} e.g. [15,20]

^{liv} e.g. [40,49]

^{lv} e.g. [11,40,67,68,69]

^{lvi} [6,12,15,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80]

^{lvii} [81]

^{lviii} [82,83,84]

^{lix} [6,12]

^{lx} [63,71]

^{lxi} [12,85,86]

^{lxii} [12,15]

^{lxiii} [12,35]

^{lxiv} [19,87]

^{lxv} [88,89]

^{lxvi} [70,72]

^{lxvii} [6]

^{lxviii} Tervalon and Murray-García [90] coined the term “cultural humility” to describe a set of understandings and practices that enable effective engagement across cultures, as genuine cultural capacity is not always possible

^{lxix} For example, Title 1 funds, SIP funds, NCLB tutoring provisions, ASES/ASSET, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Healthy Start, Migrant Education, Homeless Youth program, Foster Youth program, Home Visit program, etc.

^{lxx} Currently it is impossible to assess the statewide distribution of partnership resources at the school level. Many partnership resources are distributed through competitive grants, raising questions about whether and how this affects allocation of resources. A benefit of this system is that resources are received by schools and districts that are most organized to access them; the potential downside is that schools and districts with great need but more limited grant-writing capacity may have more limited access to these resources.