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INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Research has demonstrated the positive effects that family engagement can have on math proficiency (Shelton & Epstein, 2000; Sirvani, 2007), reading performance (Powell-Smith, Stone, Shin, & Good, 2000), academic achievement (Fan & Williams, 2010; Jeynes, 2005), and attendance and class preparation (Shinn, 2002). Ecological developmental theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; 1974) and multilevel models (Mapp, 2005) provide a framework for creating a school support system that is more responsive to the needs of families and students. This framework supports the critical work of building and sustaining partnerships between schools and families (Epstein, 2001).

BARRIERS TO FAMILY ENGAGEMENT

• Barriers for families: lack of knowledge about resources; emotional (parental efficacy), language, culture, and physical barriers; previous negative experience with education system; difficulties with scheduling, transportation, childcare, and finances; lack of proficiency in the language of the instruction.
• Barriers for family-school communication: low school performance differences (Clark, 1990). Many schools that struggle with student performance also struggle with parental involvement, often as a result of lower status and fewer resources. One previous study (Clark et al., 1994) found that student performance is negatively affected by parental involvement.
• Barriers for parents: unclear about ways to work with parents as partners; teachers unaware of factors that influence engagement; forming conclusions based on what they believe families need; efforts to involve parents in their children’s education may have unintended negative consequences; few states require training in family involvement for teacher certification; and few teacher training programs emphasize these skills.
• Barriers for schools: inadequate teacher preparation regarding establishing and sustaining relationships with parents; limited time and material resources for engaging parents; pressure from under-resourced national and state accountability measures; many families are involved in the education of their children, albeit in ways that school personnel may not consider because they see no concrete support.

If identified, understood, and thought of as opportunity-focused instead of problem-focused, barriers can lead to positive service delivery changes

FAMILY ENGAGEMENT SUPPORTS

• PREREQUISITES – Five A’s Approach (Attitude, Atmosphere, Activations, Actions, Achievement)
• System of support for families during critical school transitions (Middle, Lines, Fleming, 2014)
• Additional traditional communication systems (i.e. letters, notes, phone, email, website; Maccoby et al., 2008)
• Parent’s role conception, sense of self-efficacy related to involvement, attitudes toward education, and expectations for children’s performance (Hoven-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997)
• Teacher training in family involvement & establishing sustaining relationships with parents (Shartrand, Weiss, Kreider, & Lopes, 1997; Epstein & Sanders, 2006)
• Teachers Involving Parents (TIP) – in-service teacher education program for enhancing parental involvement (Hoven-Dempsey et al., 2002)
• Parents’ awareness of their role in helping children make important contributions to the school;
• Parenting: Basic obligations of families & Type 2 – Communicating: Basic obligations of schools (Epstein, 2001)
• Goal of the implementation of educational programs i.e. concerts, plays, sporting events, science fair (Comer & Haynes, 1991)
• Curriculum of the home – promotion of student learning activities in the home environment i.e. leisure reading, monitoring homework, participating in joint tele-viewing (Rooder, 1992; Waller, 1994)
• One-directional (school-to-home) communication to update on school programs and reports on children’s academic or behavioral functioning (Epstein, 1993)
• Homework program for school-wide social skills intervention (Adams, Womack, Shater, & Caladaira, 2010)
• School newsletters, school handbooks, school-based discipline reports (May et al., 2006)
• Class Dojo
• Parent or mental health screeners (Garbarcz et al., 2016)

FAMILY ENGAGEMENT PRACTICES

• Type 1 – Parenting: Basic obligations of families & Type 2 – Communicating: Basic obligations of schools (Epstein, 2001)
• School Planning and Management Team (Epstein, 2001)
• Wraparound services and Conjunct Behavioral Consultation
• Function Based Interventions implemented at home and school or Family-Based Implementation of PBIS
• Type 3 – Volunteering: Support for the school and for students & Type 4 – Learning at home: involvement in curricular-related activities and decisions (Epstein, 2001)
• Active participation in daily classroom & schoolwide disciplines such as student participation and student in either building or doing work on behalf of the school in their own home (Epstein, 1991)
• Chaperoning, attending parent nights, classroom assistant (Garbarcz et al., 2016)
• Participating in Daily Report Card, Check-In/Check-Out or Behavioral Program interventions
• Networking & Leadership opportunities (Children & Minch, 2012)

MODELS AND THEORIES OF FAMILY ENGAGEMENT

• Family Involvement Positive Supportive Schools (FIPS) (Comer et al., 2004) framework for working with children and families that promotes strengths and capacity building within individuals and systems, and then one focusing on the resolution of problems or remediation of deficiencies
• Family and Community Engagement (FACE) in MTSS (Chils & Minch, 2015)
• Systems-approach & leadership support, outcome-driven and data-based, collaborative problem-solving, positive relationships, empowering, multi-dimensional and multi-tiered approaches
• Protective Model, School-to-Home Transmission Model, Curriculum Enrichment Model, Partnership Model (Swap, 1993)
• Ford’s script analysis of schools that use to resist or encourage effective home-school partnerships
• Ecological Approach (Comer & Haynes, 1991) involve parents at all levels of school life through general support of educational programs, active participation in daily activities, and in school planning and management
• Families and Schools as Partners (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001) student-focused philosophy, shared responsibility for educating and socializing children, creation of a constructive relationship, preventative and solution-oriented focus
• Separate influences (Fried, 1995; Lightfoot, 1978; Waller, 1932) called for the separateness of teachers’ and parents’ roles in schooling
• Embedded Influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) recognized multiple & interdependent influences of various social contexts on children’s development
• Overarching influences (Epstein, 1987; Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1980) the social organizational perspective of overlapping spheres of influence to understand and study connections between school, family, and communities

FAMILY OUTCOMES

• Neg. associated with student behavior problems (Dominick, 2005) and dropout rates (Barond, 2004; Rumberger, 1996)
• Earm higher grades, promotion, improved behavior, and enrollment in postsecondary education programs (Henderson & Mapp, 2002)
• Academic performance and social and behavioral development are strengthened when parents work as a team with teachers (Morrison, Stoney, & Zhang, 2011)
• Home learning resources and opportunities, especially during summer, are a differentiating factor between low and high achievers (Alberoni, Entwisle, & Olsón, 2001)

SCHOOL OUTCOMES

• Teachers stand to gain a valuable support system when they work closely with their students’ parents and parent build support systems with each other (Comer, 2005)
• Out of school learning time explains school performance differences (Clark, 1990)
• Uncertainty between home and school environments in terms of expectations & support for learning can explain low school performance (Comer et al, 1996)
• Schools that include parents in program implementation have more opportunities to improve relationships and are able to obtain more parent support (Epstein, 1986; Townsend, 1994)

• Distributed information in native languages, from a translator, or from personal contact with a familiar school staff member (Maccoby et al., 2008)
• Additional cultural background and institutional practices based on
• Provide information or meetings in a central community location
• Provide child-care opportunities
• Function Based Interventions implemented at home and school or Family-Based Implementation of PBIS

• Type 5 – Decision Making & Type 6 – Collaborating with the community (Epstein, 2001)
• School Planning and Management Team (Epstein, 2001)
• Type 3: Volunteering: Support for the school and for students & Type 4: Learning at home: involvement in curricular-related activities and decisions (Epstein, 2001)
• Active participation in daily classroom & schoolwide disciplines such as student participation and student in either building or doing work on behalf of the school in their own home (Epstein, 1991)
• Chaperoning, attending parent nights, classroom assistant (Garbarcz et al., 2016)
• Participating in Daily Report Card, Check-In/Check-Out or Behavioral Program interventions
• Networking & Leadership opportunities (Children & Minch, 2012)

• Individualized and respectful approach for parents that may have their own unique family experiences, ineffective relationship with their child, personal challenges, or previous compromised relationship (Muscott et al., 2008)
• External consultants to develop better family-school relationships (Dennies & Foster, 2001)
• Parent Education Programs

• Type 1 – Parenting: Basic obligations of families & Type 2 – Communicating: Basic obligations of schools (Epstein, 2001)
• Goal of the implementation of educational programs i.e. concerts, plays, sporting events, science fair (Comer & Haynes, 1991)
• Curriculum of the home – promotion of student learning activities in the home environment i.e. leisure reading, monitoring homework, participating in joint tele-viewing (Rooder, 1992; Waller, 1994)
• One-directional (school-to-home) communication to update on school programs and reports on children’s academic or behavioral functioning (Epstein, 1993)
• Homework program for school-wide social skills intervention (Adams, Womack, Shater, & Caladaira, 2010)
• School newsletters, school handbooks, school-based discipline reports (May et al., 2006)
• Class Dojo
• Parent or mental health screeners (Garbarcz et al., 2016)

• Parents’ role conception, sense of self-efficacy related to involvement, attitudes toward education, and expectations for children’s performance (Hoven-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997)
• Teacher training in family involvement & establishing sustaining relationships with parents (Shartrand, Weiss, Kreider, & Lopes, 1997; Epstein & Sanders, 2006)
• Teachers Involving Parents (TIP) – in-service teacher education program for enhancing parental involvement (Hoven-Dempsey et al., 2002)
• Families’ awareness of their role in helping children make important contributions to the school;
• Parenting: Basic obligations of families & Type 2 – Communicating: Basic obligations of schools (Epstein, 2001)
• Positive approach to school-wide behavior interventions and supports (SWPBS; Sugai et al., 2000) are delivered within a continuum of care that reflects a public health approach (Merrell & Buchanan, 2005)

Conceptualizing family-school collaboration within these kinds of pre-existing structures would allow for greater differentiation and allocation of resources (Edwards, 2011).