

Towards Equitable Parent-School Collaboration: Developing Common Parent Engagement Indicators

A Working Paper of the
Equitable Parent-School Collaboration Research Project
<http://education.uw.edu/epsc>

Dr. Ann M. Ishimaru
Dr. Joe Lott
Ismael Fajardo
Jessica Salvador

College of Education
University of Washington
January 30, 2014

For correspondence or more information, contact:
Dr. Ann M. Ishimaru (aishi@uw.edu) or Dr. Joe Lott (jlott1@uw.edu)

Towards Equitable Parent-School Collaboration: Developing Common Parent Engagement Indicators

Executive Summary

Introduction

Educational systems are increasingly expected to partner with parents and families to ensure the success of students, but the field struggles with how to measure parent engagement work and its impacts. The Parent-School Equitable Collaboration Research Project at the University of Washington (UW) seeks to contribute to a collective effort to promote equitable educational outcomes for under-served students, families and communities in South Seattle/South King County. In partnership with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Community Center for Education Results (CCER), and the Road Map Community Network Steering Committee (CNSC), the project seeks to understand and support systemic and place-based parent engagement initiatives and their use of indicators. As part of that work, the UW team collaborated with Road Map partners to develop a common set of indicators of parent engagement. This paper provides the context for that work, describes the iterative process of indicator development, and summarizes ongoing work to develop the indicators as a tool for systemic transformation.

Context

We know from decades of research that strong parent-family-school relations are critical to the success of students (Bryk et al., 2010; Epstein, 1995; Jeynes, 2005, 2007; Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Yet particularly in diverse, low-income communities, traditional involvement approaches – such as Parent-Teacher Associations and open houses - rarely realize their promise. Such efforts are typically implemented with little regard to power, culture, class, and language divides. Despite the best of intentions, traditional school-based parent involvement efforts often limit the participation of non-dominant parents and families in struggling schools (Auerbach, 2012; Olivos, 2006). This project seeks to develop parent engagement indicators that can provide insight into practices that aim to build more equitable collaboration between parents and schools.

Defining Common Indicators of Parent Engagement

This project had three phases. The first was to develop indicators through an iterative process in which the Road Map Community Network Steering Committee (CNSC), comprised of staff from community-based organizations and school districts, worked closely with CCER staff, the Road Map Data Advisory Group, and UW researchers. In this first stage, the following indicators were prioritized for inclusion in the CCER Road Map Framework (each of which represents 4-7 actual questions on a survey):

- *% of parents who feel knowledgeable and confident in their ability to support their child's learning pre-k through college.*
- *% of parents who believe their school provides a welcoming and culturally responsive learning environment.*
- *% of parents who have leadership opportunities and influence on decision-making at their school or district.*

In the second phase, EMC Research used these indicators in the CCER Road Map 2013 Parent Telephone Poll to provide a partial snapshot of the region and a pilot of the indicators. The paper examines the interpretation of the Parent Poll data as well as key methodological limitations. In the third phase, UW researchers are collaborating with Road Map partners to develop a field survey for the region to be piloted at a small scale before region-wide distribution and implementation.

Towards Equitable Parent-School Collaboration: Developing Common Parent Engagement Indicators

Introduction

Educational systems are increasingly expected to partner with parents and families to ensure the success of all students. Yet, the field struggles with how to characterize and measure parent engagement work and its impacts, particularly beyond counting the number of parents at school events. The ability to measure and assess the extent to which parents and families collaborate with educators and schools is critical for multiple reasons. Particularly in the context of collaborative efforts spanning multiple systems, the use of such measures can sustain support for the work, improve professional practice, and align efforts within and across systems (Park, Hironaka, Carver, & Nordstrum, 2013).

Context

We know from decades of research that strong parent-family-school relations are critical to the success of students (Epstein, 1995; Jeynes, 2005; 2007). When parents and staff work together to support student learning, students earn higher grades, score higher on achievement tests, adapt better to school, attend more regularly, earn more credits, have better social skills, and are more likely to graduate and go on to higher education (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Another landmark study found that low-performing elementary schools with strong parent-community ties were "...ten times more likely to improve in math and four times more likely to improve in reading than schools weak on this measure" (Bryk et al., 2010).

Yet particularly in diverse, low-income communities, traditional parent involvement approaches – like parent teacher associations, open houses, and parent-teacher conferences – rarely realize their promise (Schutz, 2006). Such efforts are typically implemented with little regard to power, culture, class, and language divides. A recent report on immigrant families in the Road Map region found that parents wanted to become more informed and engaged in their children's learning, but they rarely participated in traditional models, such as Parent-Teacher Association (PTAs), due to lack of cultural relevance (One America, 2012). Despite the best of intentions, traditional parent involvement efforts often limit the participation of non-dominant parents and families in struggling schools (Auerbach, 2012; Olivos, 2006). These differences exacerbate other inequities in students' access to high-quality opportunities to learn. So where does the problem lie?

The research literature clearly shows that parents of all race and class backgrounds care deeply about their children's education (Valencia & Black, 2002; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2003). Many low-income and parents from immigrant communities do work long hours and experience language, cultural, and other barriers to participating in school-based engagement activities. And although some parents' mental, physical or economic challenges do impede their ability to support their children's learning, there is no research evidence to support the idea that all

families who are low-income, immigrants, refugees, or from communities of color are unable or unwilling to support their children's education and are therefore "hard-to-reach." One study found that the most common answer regarding what was missing from parents' involvement in their child's school was "power in decision-making processes and a more equal partnership with the school, one that [does] not center around fault-finding conversations" (Williams & Stallworth, 1984 as cited in Perez Carréon, 2005, p. 467). An immigrant parent from the Road Map region confirmed this finding in noting, "We know how to educate our children but we are never asked" (OneAmerica, 2012). As Warren (2010) concludes, "the main problem may not lie in the individual, passive parent, but rather in the lack of opportunity for participation" (p. 141). Rather than "hard-to-reach" families, then, it is our schools and parent engagement programs and policies that are "hard-to-access" for many non-dominant parents (Mapp & Hong, 2010).

"Next" Practices in Equitable Parent-School Collaboration

What alternatives exist to this narrow, outmoded parent involvement approach? Recent research about collective and community-based approaches to parent and community engagement provides insights into equitable parent-school collaboration. Such collaboration entails a more reciprocal partnership between families and schools, in which they shape the agenda together to foster holistic student learning and success. This relationship is characterized by systemic, equity-focused goals (rather than deficit, "fix the parent" aims), roles for parents as experts on their own children and needs (rather than passive recipients of information and help), and strategies that emphasize capacity and relationship-building. Finally, such collaborations address schools and families as part of their broader communities and understand educational change as a political process (Ishimaru, in press).

Thus, our current "best practices" hold limited promise for moving to a more reciprocal and synergistic relationship between families, communities, and schools. Rather than continuing to do more of the same, we need "next" practices to transform schools to ensure student succeed (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). This project seeks to develop parent engagement indicators that can provide insight into the cultivation of "next" practices in building more equitable collaboration between parents and schools.

The Equitable Parent-School Collaboration Research Project

The Equitable Parent-School Collaboration Research Project at the University of Washington (UW) seeks to contribute to a collective effort to promote equitable educational outcomes for under-served students, families and communities in South Seattle/South King County. The Road Map Project is a regional collaborative initiative aimed at dramatically improving student achievement from "cradle to college and career." In 2012-2013, the Road Map region served 120,890 students, of which 59% were low income, 67% were students of color, and 16% were English Language Learners. Parent and family engagement is a key strategy for reaching the goal

of doubling the number of students on track to graduation or a career credential by 2020 (www.roadmapproject.org).

In partnership with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Community Center for Education Results (CCER), and regional districts and organizations, the UW Equitable Parent-School Collaboration Research Project seeks to understand and support district and place-based parent engagement efforts and their use of indicators to build more equitable parent engagement with schools and communities in the 7-district Road Map region¹. The research includes two components. First, we conducted an in-depth comparative case study to support, document, and learn from the implementation of two school district and two place-based initiatives focused on building parent-school-community collaborations to improve student learning and academic outcomes. Through these case studies, we are gaining a systematic understanding of what promotes and inhibits equitable and authentic parent/family engagement at a systems level within the context of the Road Map collective impact initiative².

The second component of the Equitable Parent-School Collaboration Research Project entails the collaborative development of common parent engagement indicators. An indicator captures data to increase an understanding of a certain problem or issue and can measure progress to achieve a goal. The development of common parent engagement indicators supports the Road Map Project's emphasis on the aligned use of data to encourage strategic action and drive improvement.

Developing Common Indicators of Parent Engagement

The development of common parent engagement indicators began with identifying parent engagement indicators from the literature. Subsequently, members from the Community Network Steering Committee (CNSC) reviewed all of the indicators and began the process of prioritizing top indicators for the Road Map region.³ This work represents first steps in a longer-term process of developing robust indicators that may be used by districts, schools, agencies, and CBOs to inform improvement toward a vision of equitable parent-school collaboration.

Phase 1: Identifying and Defining Parent Engagement Indicators

We organized the parent engagement literature to understand the major domains represented and grouped them into Parent/Family, Parent-School, and Student indicators (e.g., parent knowledge, attitudes, advocacy, etc. See Appendix A for the summary). We created a database of all the

¹ Districts in the Road Map region include Auburn School District, Federal Public Schools, Highline Public Schools, Kent School District, Renton School District, Seattle Public Schools (South Seattle schools only), and Tukwila School District.

² The Road Map Parent Engagement Case Study Final Report is forthcoming in spring 2014.

³ The CNSC is a standing Road Map Project committee established by the Community Center for Education Results (CCER).

parent engagement indicators including sample items, or questions, that related to those indicators.

Prioritizing Parent Engagement Indicators

The UW researchers then presented the parent engagement research indicators to the CNSC Committee members prioritized indicators according to what they observed in their practice would have the most beneficial impact on parent engagement. Next, the UW research team shared the list of highest-ranking indicators with CSNC subcommittee members who then prioritized four:

- Parents know who to go to with concerns/questions and feel able to navigate the education system.
- Respectful, welcoming school climate that values diversity of students and school community.
- Leadership develops and maintains meaningful and ongoing relationships with families and communities through regular two-way, culturally responsive communication.
- Curriculum and instruction reflects values, goals culture of parents/community.

It is important to note that the traditional indicators of parent involvement (i.e., home-based support, aspirations, and typical school-based activities) did not rise to the top in this process. While well-studied, these indicators were not prioritized by the CNSC and have been critiqued by more recent literature for representing a narrow and limiting vision of how parents and families may be engaged in education. We then suggested previously validity and reliability-tested items from the literature for each indicator.

Refining three Road Map Parent engagement indicators and Items

A sub-committee of the CNSC evaluated the indicators and items based on several criteria, including whether the indicator: a) was actionable; b) reflected the Road Map Project criteria for indicators; c) aligned with existing data collection efforts (if possible); and d) addressed one of the roles of parents as first educators, partners with schools, and advocates.

Preliminary Road Map parent engagement indicators & research

Three parent engagement indicators were selected. We summarize below very briefly the research related to each indicator and provide items for each indicator. See Appendix B for a more detailed summary and notes related to each item and its original source in the literature.

Parent Engagement Indicator 1: Parent Knowledge & Confidence

% of parents who feel knowledgeable and confident in their ability to support their child's learning pre-k through college.

Parents who are *knowledgeable* about the educational system and *confident in their ability* to navigate it are more likely to exhibit a host of parent engagement behaviors, such as support at home, parenting behaviors, and participation in school activities (including traditional parent involvement which improves student achievement). The extent to which parents feel knowledgeable and confident in supporting their child's schooling was "an important factor leading to changes in the parents' activities at home and at school" (Chrispeels & Gonzalez, 2006, p. 27). Knowledge and self-efficacy — a key target of many parent training initiatives — provide a foundation upon which to build other forms of engagement that are tied to student success (Chrispeels & Gonzalez, 2006; Mapp & Gehlbach, 2012).

Items: Questions used a 5-point Likert scale with responses "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree"

- I know special programs available at school or the district to help my child.
- I know what my child will learn this year at school.
- I understand the steps my child needs to take in order to go to college
- I know the community resources to help my child.
- I know who to talk with regarding my concerns or questions about my child's education
- I feel confident in my ability to support my child's learning at home.
- I feel confident in my ability to make sure my child's school meets my child's learning needs.

(Items from Chrispeels & Gonzalez, 2006; Mapp & Gehlbach, 2012; 2010 EMC Parent Poll)

Parent Engagement Indicator 2: Welcoming and Culturally Responsive School Climate

% of parents who believe their school provides a welcoming and culturally responsive learning environment.

This indicator – a high priority from CNSC members – responds to the thoroughly-documented finding from multiple studies that many non-dominant parents (e.g., low-income, immigrant, parents of color) experience schools as hostile and alienating environments (Fine, 1993; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 1998; Olivos, 2006; Perez Carreon et al., 2005; Schutz, 2008; Warren et al., 2009). Rather than assume that parents are independent actors making choices within an even playing field devoid of power dynamics related to race, class, or language divides, attention to the school climate recognizes that schools and educators fundamentally shape how parents experience and engage with their children's formal education.

School climate has a well-established association with academic achievement, though few of these examine how *parents* experience the school culture (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Crow, 1998; Diamond, Randolph & Spillane, 2004; Eilers & Camacho, 2007; Boykin & Noguera, 2011; Riehl, 2000; Ryan, 2006; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Smyth, 1996; Theoharis, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

Items: Questions used a 5-point Likert scale with responses “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” with an addition of “Don’t Know”

- I am greeted warmly when I call or visit the school.
- Teachers work closely with me to meet my child’s needs.
- I am invited to visit classrooms to observe teaching and learning.
- The school encourages feedback from parents and the community.
- My child’s teachers know my child well.
- My home culture and home language are valued by the school.
- At this school, it is difficult to overcome the cultural barriers between staff and parents.
(reverse coded)

(Items adapted from Chicago Consortium on School Research (CCSR - Bryk et al., 2003; Marx & Byrnes, 2012)

Parent Engagement Indicator 3: Parent Leadership Opportunities and Influence

% of parents who have leadership opportunities and influence on decision-making at their school or district.

When families participate as equal partners in the educational process with teachers and other educators and parents, they feel they are able to *influence decisions* made about their own child and about the school and its educational program. Such influence is positively linked to student achievement in standardized test scores (Mediratta, Shah & McAlister, 2009) and more broadly (and qualitatively) to school improvement (Ishimaru, 2014; Gold et al., 2002). This represents the farthest end of the continuum from traditional, passive parent involvement to equitable collaboration between families, schools, and communities.

Items: Questions used a 5-point Likert scale with responses “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” with an addition of “Don’t Know”

- I am involved in making the important decisions in my child’s school.
- I have opportunities to influence what happens at the school.
- My school involves me in meaningful ways in improving the school.
- My school or district helps me develop my leadership skills.

(Items adapted from Mediratta, Shah & McAlister, 2009 (originally CCSR); Epstein, 2009)

Phase 2: Parent poll pilot

CCER incorporated the indicators developed through this process in the 2013 Parent Poll conducted by an external company, EMC Research. EMC conducted a phone poll of randomly selected parents (n=2051) from the seven Road Map districts using de-identified phone numbers (land or cell) from all seven districts. The parent engagement indicators described in this paper

comprised 18 of the 56 questions asked on the phone (please see EMC Research for further information about the polling procedures and the full questionnaire).

Parent Poll Analyses

After EMC Research conducted the phone poll, the UW research team conducted standard statistical analyses to understand how the data were distributed and assess how well the questions performed in helping us to understand the underlying constructs, or areas of parent engagement, we had identified. Please see Appendix C for technical information about these analyses.

All items for each of the 3 common parent engagement indicators were measured on a 5-point scale: 1) Strongly Disagree, 2) Disagree, 3) Neither Agree or Disagree, 4) Agree, and 5) Strongly Agree. To translate each indicator into percentages for meaningful interpretations, we calculated the average score for each respondent and each indicator. For example, a hypothetical parent responded to all four questions in the Parent Leadership Opportunities and Influence indicator. Imagine that she selected Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) in response to the first item, Agree (4) to the second item, Agree (4) to the third item, and Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) to the fourth item. Averaging these numbers yields a mean score of 3.5 for that individual ($3+4+4+3=14$ divided by $4=3.5$). In consultation with the Road Map Project's Data Advisory Group, we then used 4.0 as the threshold and calculated the percentage of respondents whose average score for each indicator was *4.0 and above*. In the hypothetical example above, then, that respondent would have been included as part of the percentage that scored below 4.0, on average, for Indicator 3.

Parent Poll Limitations

A number of limitations to the Parent Poll are important to understand in making sense of the percentages for each indicator. In our current context, it is tempting to see numbers as a reflection of objective reality, but which parents were able to participate, the questions asked, and the methods used to collect the data all shape the resulting figures. In light of the following limitations, the percentages for each parent engagement indicator represent only part of the larger picture. Augmenting the Parent Poll with a data collection process that seeks to reach both marginalized and more traditionally involved parents may provide a fuller picture of parent engagement in the region.

- *Sampling bias (or non-response bias)* refers to the possibility that the respondents to a survey are different in key ways from the broader population they are presumed to represent; if this is the case, the responses may not accurately reflect the views or perceptions of the broader population. In the 2013 Parent Poll, 3.3 percent of those who were called responded to the survey. There are several factors that may have contributed to a lower response rate, including the limited availability of the survey in languages

other than English, Spanish, and Vietnamese⁴. Non-response can also occur when there are differences in populations which impacts whether or how they respond (Dillman, et al, 2009). For instance, some parents may have been more likely to answer the phone and complete the survey than others (e.g., parents who are more traditionally-involved in schools may have been more likely to participate). In addition, some parents did not have access to participation in the survey if they did not speak one of the languages in the survey or if they did not have a phone⁵, resulting in coverage error (Dillman, et al, 2009; Groves et al, 2004).

- *Social desirability bias*, the tendency of participants to want to answer favorably to socially approved behaviors, may have also impacted how participants answered the questions (Groves et al, 2004). For instance, the surprisingly high percentage of parents who reported that they were knowledgeable and confident of their ability to support their child's learning may have reflected not only sampling bias, but also the desire to *appear* knowledgeable and confident to the person asking the questions and the unknown audience for the survey, as such behaviors are generally seen as attributes of "good" parents. Warnecke and colleagues (1997) found that respondents from culturally diverse communities tend to over-report socially desirable behaviors, particularly if the person asking them questions is not of the same racial/ethnic group. We also know that the awareness of negative racial or cultural stereotypes can influence individuals' responses and performance⁶.
- Nearly all the items used to comprise the indicators were drawn from reliability and validity-tested research constructs from the research literature, but many were adapted from teacher surveys and nearly all from written (either electronic or paper) surveys. While these items had been tested in those contexts and in English, the items and questionnaire had not been tested in the context of a phone poll or in other languages for interpretation and cultural context reliability and validity.
- Our analyses of interrelationships between the items from the 2013 Parent Poll did not reveal three totally distinct research constructs, suggesting the need for further item refinement and testing. This may also be the result of measuring error from the wording of questions, effects of the survey mode, or other aspects of the respondents' behavior that lead to inaccurate answers to questions.
- The Parent Poll was a random sample of the 7 districts (including only the southern part of Seattle Public Schools) within the region (districts were sampled in proportion to their size). As a result, the data cannot be disaggregated by level of school (i.e., elementary,

⁴ Students in the Road Map districts speak more than 160 languages, and approximately 63% of students speak English as their primary language. The remaining 37% of students speak a primary language other than English. Approximately 16% of Road Map students speak Spanish and 4% speak Vietnamese as their primary languages (2012-2013 OSPI data compiled by CCER). Of the Parent Poll respondents (n=2051), 96.5% (n=1980) participated in English; 2.6% (n=54) participated in Spanish; and 0.8% (n=17) participated in Vietnamese.

⁵ Please refer to EMC Research for details on calling procedures.

⁶ Stereotype threat refers to individuals' risk of confirming a negative, culturally-shared stereotype (Aronson & Steele, 1995).

middle, high) or by a specific school. It is therefore not actionable at the school and/or district-level.

Phase 3: Road Map Parent Engagement Field Survey Development

The next phase of the indicators component of this study is to develop a Road Map Parent Engagement Field Survey instrument that will enable schools, districts, CBOs, and agencies to collect data at a more local level that can be used for improvement and assessment purposes within the context of specific initiatives or interventions. In this phase, we will incorporate the following strategies to strengthen the survey for use with culturally and linguistically diverse populations.

New Survey Questions

There is a need to consider other key indicators for inclusion in the next phase such as: Learning-focused Parent-Teacher Interactions (e.g., Teachers and administrators in my school use information from parents to improve instructional practices and meet student-learning needs, and how often, during this school year, have you talked with a teacher or other adult at your child's school to share with them important information about your child's academic progress?); Teacher Capacity (e.g., related to how teachers communicate with parents and engage them at home and in the classroom); Teacher-Parent Trust (e.g., Staff and parents think of each other as partners in educating children); and Frequency of Contact (e.g., This school year, how often have you met with parents of students in person?). Additionally, we will also explore the inclusion of teacher surveys or organizational assessments to better understand systemic efforts to build educator capacity and collaboration with parents.

Cognitive Interviews and Interpretation

Cognitive interviewing allows us to test the questions by asking participants with similar characteristics as the intended sample to "think-aloud" and "probe" questions to assess various aspects of the questionnaire such as the ordering of the questions, visual presentation, consistency, and the flow (Dillman et al, 2009). In order to reach parents who reflect the cultural and linguistic diversity of the student population of the region, we will be translating the questions into other languages reflective of the Road Map demographics, which will entail further cognitive interviewing, and piloting to ensure that the language is culturally appropriate. This process helps evaluate the quality and reliability of the questionnaire (Beatty & Willis, 2006).

Expanding Data Collection

For the field survey, additional methods will be considered during data collection to reduce sampling bias and obtain data from as many parents as possible, such as face-to-face surveys,

web surveys, written surveys, and internet kiosks. This may provide opportunities for self-administered surveys, which have been found to be more effective for reducing social desirability bias as well as the documented declines in phone survey participation (Dillman et al, 2009; Fowler, 2009; Lavarkas, 2007). Other strategies may include partnering with CBOs who have relationships with marginalized communities to collect data.

Conclusion

Ultimately, to impact meaningful change in educational systems and contexts, indicators must be engaged as part of a broader, integrated strategy of continuous improvement. We hope that the parent engagement indicators can become a tool to support strategic alignment across multiple institutions and to augment the work of practitioners building equitable parent-school collaboration to foster student learning and success in the Road Map region and beyond.

Paper References

- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 69(5), 797.
- Auerbach, S. (2012). *School leadership for authentic family and community partnerships: Research perspectives for transforming practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Beatty, P. C., & Willis, G. B. (2006). Research Synthesis: The Practice of Cognitive Interviewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71(2), 287-311.
- Boykin, A. W., Noguera, P., & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2011). *Creating the opportunity to learn: Moving from research to practice to close the achievement gap*. Alexandria, Va: ASCD.
- Bryk, A. S. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. L. (2002). *Trust in schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. L. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational leadership*, 60(6), 40-45.
- Chrispeels, J. H., & González, M. (2006). *No parent left behind: The role of parent education programs in assisting families to actively engage in their children's education*. University of California, San Diego.
- Community Center for Education Results. (2014). The Road Map Project. Retrieved from <http://www.roadmapproject.org/>
- Crow, G. M. (1998). Implications for leadership in collaborative schools. In D. G. Ponder (Ed.), *Restructuring schools for collaboration: Promises and pitfalls* (pp. 135-153). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Diamond, J. B., Randolph, A., & Spillane, J. P. (2004). Teachers' Expectations and Sense of Responsibility for Student Learning: The Importance of Race, Class, and Organizational Habitus. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 35(1), 75-98.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., Christian, L. M., & Dillman, D. A. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken, N.J: Wiley & Sons.
- Eilers, A. M., & Camacho, A. (2007). School Culture Change in the Making: Leadership Factors that Matter. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 616-637.
- Epstein, J. L. (2009). *School, family, and community partnerships: your handbook for action*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.
- Epstein, J. (1995). *School, family, and community partnerships – caring for the children we share*. in *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview. pp. 401-425.
- Fine, M. (1993). [Ap]parent involvement: Reflections on parents, power, and urban public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 94(4).
- Fowler, F. J. (Ed.). (2009). *Survey research methods* (Vol. 1). Sage Publications.

- Gold, E., Simon, E., Brown, C., Blanc, S., Pickron-Davis, M., Brown, J., et al. (2002). *Strong neighborhoods, strong schools. The indicators project on education organizing*. Chicago, IL: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform Research for Action, Inc.
- Groves, R.M., Fowler, Jr F.J., Couper, M., Lepkowski, J., Singer, E., Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey Methodology*. Wiley Series in Survey Methodology.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: transforming teaching in every school*. New York; London: Teachers College Press.
- Henderson, A. & Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Lab.
- Ishimaru, A.M. (in press). Rewriting the rules of engagement: Building a new model of district-community organizing collaboration. *Harvard Educational Review*.
- Ishimaru, A.M. (2014). When new relationships meet old narratives: The journey towards improving parent-school relations in a district-community organizing collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, 116(2).
- 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.
- Jeynes, W. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and secondary' school student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Urban Education*, 42, 82-112.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2003). *The essential conversation : What parents and teachers can learn from each other* (1st ed ed.). New York: Random House.
- Lavrakas, P. J., & American Association for Public Opinion Research. (2007). *Cell phone numbers and telephone surveying in the U.S*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mapp, K. L. & Gehlbach, H. (2012). Parent survey for K-12 schools. Retrieved from <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/harvard-education-surveys/>
- Mapp, K. L. & Hong, S. (2010). Debunking the myth of the hard to reach parent. *Handbook of School-Family Partnerships*, 345-361.
- Marx, S., & Byrnes, D. (2012). Multicultural school climate inventory. *Current Issues in Education*, 15, 3, 1-15.
- Mediratta, K., Shah, S., & McAlister, S. (2009). *Community organizing for stronger schools : Strategies and successes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Olivos, E. M. (2006). *The power of parents: A critical perspective of bicultural parent involvement in public schools*. New York: Peter Lang.
- One America (2012). *Breaking Down Education Barriers: Lessons from Immigrant Youth and Families in South King County*. Seattle, WA.
- Park, S., Hironaka, S., Carver, P., & Nordstrum, L., (2013). *Continuous Improvement in Education* (White Paper). Carnegie Foundation.
- Perez Carreon, G., Drake, C., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2005). The importance of presence: Immigrant parents' school engagement experiences. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(3), 465-498.

- Riehl, C. J. (2000). The Principal's Role in Creating Inclusive Schools for Diverse Students: A Review of Normative, Empirical, and Critical Literature on the Practice of Educational Administration. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 1, 55-81.
- Ryan, J. (2006). Inclusive leadership and social justice for schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 5, 1, 3-17.
- Scheurich, J. J., & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equity and excellence: Creating high-achievement classrooms, schools, and districts*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Corwin Press.
- 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.
- Smyth, J. (1996). "The socially just alternative to the self-managing school". In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International Handbook of Leadership and Administration* (pp. 1097–1131). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Abstracts*, 42, 4, 221.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering Teacher Professionalism in Schools: The Role of Leadership Orientation and Trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45, 2, 217-247.
- Valencia, R. R., & Black, M. S. (2002). Mexican Americans don't value education! — On the basis of the myth, mythmaking, and debunking. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1, 81--103.
- Warnecke, R. B., Johnson, T. P., Chávez, N., Sudman, S., O'rourke, D. P., Lacey, L., & Horm, J. (1997). Improving question wording in surveys of culturally diverse populations. *Annals of epidemiology*, 7(5), 334-342.
- Warren, M., Hong, S., Rubin, C., & Uy, P. (2009). Beyond the bake sale: A community-based relational approach to parent engagement in schools. *The Teachers College Record*, 111, 9, 2209-2254.
- Warren, M. (2010). Community organizing for education reform. In M. Orr, & J. Rogers (Eds.), *Public engagement for public education*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Appendix A. DRAFT Overview of Parent Engagement Indicators (version 11/21/12)

Parent Outcomes

- *Parent capacity*
 - a. Knowledge
 - Child/Student (e.g., knowing about child’s academic progress, grades, etc.)
 - System (e.g., rights, who to go to w/concerns, understanding of test scores, familiarity with college application process, policy, parents feel knowledgeable about their role in making change, etc.)
 - Resources/CBOs
 - b. Attitudes (e.g., expectations, aspirations, self-efficacy)
 - c. Advocacy/Leadership skills (e.g., Leadership Development, personal empowerment, civic participation, being representatives in public roles, elevating parents as stakeholders with those in power)
- *Parent Engagement Behaviors*
 - a. Home-based engagement
 - Parenting practices/style
 - Homework support
 - Monitoring school activities
 - Informal learning
 - b. School-based engagement
 - Peripheral support
 - Teaching & learning
 - Advocacy
 - Policy/decision-making
 - Parents are involved in instruction & curriculum
 - c. Community engagement
- *Parent Relationships*
 - Parent-child
 - Parent-parent
 - Parent-educators
 - Parent-CBOs (e.g., community power, strong community base of constituents)

Parent-School Outcomes

- *School Capacity*
 - a. Climate (e.g., learning climate, safety, welcome to parents)
 - b. School/district leadership for engagement
 - Public accountability and conversation collection & dissemination of school data
 - Provide the public with multi-use school spaces for adult and child learning classes, recreation, public forums
 - c. Teacher capacity
 - Knowledge (e.g., of student cultures, community, equity opportunities for increased professional development, etc.)
 - Attitudes (re. parents as resources, community as resource, expectations of students/parents, responsiveness, family engagement as core to role, collective responsibility)
 - Behaviors (e.g., outreach, home visits, seeks information for instruction, etc.)
 - d. Curriculum & Instruction (e.g., high quality, reflects values, goals, culture of parents/community)
 - e. School/community connection
 - Relationships/outreach to CBOs/other “nonsystem” actors
 - f. Opportunities for engagement (e.g., traditional school events to decision-making roles)
- *Parent-Educator Interactions*
 - a. Trust (e.g., teacher-parent, parent-school)
 - b. Communication (e.g., frequency, content, directionality)
 - c. Shared vision and accountability (e.g., between teachers & parents)
 - d. Influence on schools (e.g., parent influence on decision-making)
 - e. Parent satisfaction (e.g., with school, leadership, quality of teaching, fit)

Student Outcomes

- *Leading Student Outcomes*
 - a. Behaviors/attitudes
 - Student motivation/engagement
 - Student identification w/school
 - Student expectations/aspirations
 - Positive/negative learning behaviors
 - Socio-emotional outcomes
 - b. Academics
 - Attendance
 - Course selection/enrollment
 - Credits
 - Grades
 - Discipline referrals
 - Local/district formative assessments
 - MAP/WELPA, etc.
 - Equity indicators
 - School-readiness
 - Student leadership
- *Distal Student Outcomes*
 - a. Standardized test scores (e.g., at grade level)
 - On-track to graduate
 - Graduation
 - College acceptance/enrollment

Note: lighter shade text indicates constructs have little or no representation in the literature.

Appendix B: Item Sources and Research.

Parent Engagement Indicator 1	Indicator	Items	Research Notes
<i>Parent Knowledge and Efficacy</i>	<i>% of parents who feel confident in their knowledge and ability to partner within the education system pre-K through college</i>	<p><u>Knowledge</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I know special programs available at school or the district to help my child. 2. I know what my child will learn this year at school. 3. I understand the steps my child needs to take in order to go to college. 4. I know the community resources to help my child. 5. I know who to talk with regarding my concerns or questions about my child's education. 	<i>Parent Knowledge:</i> Parents' knowledge and awareness of the school system and socio-emotional development (Chrispeels & Gonzalez, 2006).
		<p><u>Efficacy</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. I feel confident in my ability to support my child's learning at home. 7. I feel confident in my ability to make sure my child's school meets my child's learning needs 	<i>Parental efficacy</i> is one of Mapp & Gehlbach's new constructs for Survey Monkey, so it is in the process of being tested but it has not been used in studies yet. However, parental efficacy (and parent knowledge, as above) have been studied elsewhere as key leading indicators of parent behaviors at home and school that support student learning and success (Chrispeels & Gonzalez, 2006).

Parent Engagement Indicator 2	Indicator	Items	Research Notes
Welcoming school climate	<i>% of parents who feel their school provides a welcoming and culturally responsive learning environment for students and families</i>	<u>School Climate</u> 1. My home culture and home language are valued by the school. 2. My child's teachers know my child well.	<p><i>School climate</i> has a well established association with academic achievement, though few of these examine how <i>parents</i> experience the school culture (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Crow, 1998; Diamond, Randolph & Spillane, 2004; Eilers & Camacho, 2007; Boykin & Noguera, 2011; Riehl, 2000; Ryan, 2006; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Smyth, 1996; Theoharis, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2009)</p> <p>(Items adapted from Marx & Byrnes, 2012)</p>
		<u>Teacher Outreach</u> 3. Teachers work closely with me to meet my child's needs 4. I am invited to visit classrooms to observe teaching and learning 5. The school encourages feedback from parents and the community 6. I am greeted warmly when I call or visit the school 7. At this school, it is difficult to overcome the cultural barriers between staff and parents. <i>(reverse coded)</i>	<p><i>Teacher outreach to parents</i> (CCSR). Greater teacher cultural & community awareness was associated with 10% points higher reading and 24% point higher math scores (Marschall, 2006). Elementary schools with strong parent-school ties “were ten times more likely to improve in math and four times more likely to improve in reading than schools weak on this measure.” (Bryk et al., 2010).</p> <p>(Items adapted from Chicago Consortium on School Research (CCSR - Bryk et al., 2003))</p>

Parent Engagement Indicator 3	Indicator	Items	Research Notes
<p>Parent Opportunities for Leadership and Influence on Decision-making</p>	<p><i>% of parents who have leadership opportunities and influence on decision-making at their school or district</i></p>	<p><u>Parental influence in decision-making</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am involved in making the important decisions in my child's school. 2. My school or district helps me develop my leadership skills 3. I have opportunities to influence what happens at the school 4. My school involves me in meaningful ways in improving the school 	<p>A fairly robust qualitative research literature supports the relationship between leadership that collaborates with parents/families/community and student academic success (Anderson, 2009; Auerbach, 2007, 2010; Cooper, 2009; Delgado-Gaitan, 2001; Ishimaru, 2013; Khalifa, 2012; Mediratta, Shah & McAlister, 2009; Moll et al., 1992; Olivos, 2006; Ross & Berger, 2009; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Warren, 2005; Warren et al., 2011). Parent participation in school or district-level <i>decision-making</i> is associated with higher academic achievement (Epstein, 1995; Sanders, et al, 1999; Sheldon & Epstein, 2005; Epstein, 2009).</p> <p>(Items are adapted from Mediratta, Shah, McAlister & , 2009, which were adapted from CCSR)</p>

Appendix B. References

- Anderson, G. L. (2009). *Advocacy leadership toward a post-reform agenda in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Auerbach, S. (2007). From Moral Supporters to Struggling Advocates: Reconceptualizing Parent Roles in Education through the Experience of Working-Class Families of Color. *Urban Education*, 42(3), 250–283.
- Auerbach, S. (2010). Beyond coffee with the principal: Toward leadership for authentic school-family partnerships. *Journal of School Leadership*, 20, 728-57.
- Boykin, A. W., Noguera, P., & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2011). *Creating the opportunity to learn moving from research to practice to close the achievement gap*. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. L. (2002). *Trust in schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. L. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational leadership*, 60(6), 40-45.
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement : Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chrispeels, J. H., & González, M. (2006). *No parent left behind: The role of parent education programs in assisting families to actively engage in their children's education*. University of California, San Diego.
- Cooper, C.W. (2009). Educational leaders as cultural workers: Engaging families and school communities through transformative leadership. In S. D. Horsford (Ed.), *New perspectives in educational leadership: Exploring social, political, and community contexts and meaning*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Crow, G. M. (1998). Implications for leadership in collaborative schools. In D. G. Ponder (Ed.), *Restructuring schools for collaboration: Promises and pitfalls* (pp. 135-153). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (2001). *The power of community: Mobilizing for family and schooling*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Diamond, J. B., Randolph, A., & Spillane, J. P. (2004). Teachers' expectations and sense of responsibility for student learning: The importance of race, class, and organizational habitus. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 35, 75-98.
- Eilers, A. M., & Camacho, A. (2007). School Culture Change in the Making: Leadership Factors That Matter. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 616–637.
- Epstein, J. (1995). *School, family, and community partnerships – caring for the children we share*. in *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview. pp. 401-425.
- Epstein, J. L. (2009). *School, family, and community partnerships: your handbook for action*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.
- Ishimaru, A. (2013). From heroes to organizers: Principals and education organizing in urban school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 49(1): 3-51.
- Khalifa, M. (2012). A “Re”-new-“ed” paradigm in successful urban school leadership: Principal as community leader. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3),424-467.
- Mapp, K. L. & Gehlbach, H. (2012). Parent survey for K-12 schools. Retrieved from <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/harvard-education-surveys/>
- Marschall, M. (2006). Parent involvement and educational outcomes for Latino students. *Review of Policy Research*, 23(5), 1053–1076.

- Marx, S., & Byrnes, D. (2012). Multicultural school climate inventory. *Current Issues in Education*, 15, 3, 1-15.
- Mediratta, K., Shah, S., & McAlister, S. (2009). *Community organizing for stronger schools: Strategies and successes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31, 132.
- Olivos, E. M. (2006). *The power of parents: A critical perspective of bicultural parent involvement in public schools*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Riehl, C. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), 55–82.
- Ross, J. A., & Berger, M. (2009). Equity and leadership: Research-based strategies for school leaders. *School Leadership & Management*, 29
- Ryan, J. (2006). Inclusive leadership and social justice for schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 5, 1, 3-17.
- Sanders, M. G., Epstein, J. L., & Connors-Tadros, L. (1999). Family partnerships with high schools: The parents' perspective (CRESPAR Report 32): Johns Hopkins University. ED428148.
<http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/Reports/report32entire.htm>
- Scheurich, J. J., & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equity and excellence: Creating high-achievement classrooms, schools, and districts*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Corwin Press.
- Smyth, J. (1996). "The socially just alternative to the self-managing school". In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International Handbook of Leadership and Administration* (pp. 1097–1131). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein, J. L. (2005). Involvement counts: Family and community partners and mathematics achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 98(4), 196–209.
- Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2001). *Manufacturing hope and despair: The school and kin support networks of U.S.-Mexican youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Abstracts*, 42, 4, 221.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools the role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 217-247.
- Warren, M. (2005). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(2), 133-173.
- Warren, M., Mapp, K., & The Community Organizing and School Reform Project. (2011). *A match on dry grass: Community organizing as a catalyst for school reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX C. Parent Poll Data Technical Analyses

1. Parent Poll Pilot Reliability and Factor Analyses

We first assessed item frequency distributions and histograms to understand how the data were distributed within the sample (see EMC Research report for descriptive statistics for each item). To assess the reliability of the research constructs, we used Cronbach's alpha (α) and all research constructs indicated good reliabilities (Parent Knowledge $\alpha = .804$; Welcoming School Climate $\alpha = .781$; and Parent Leadership & Influence $\alpha = .835$). We then conducted factor analyses to understand how parent engagement items correlated with one another and with the three indicators and, with input of CCER, EMC, and the Data Advisory Group, made slight adjustments to the composite research constructs. We then created mean scores for each of the 3 indicators using the items (see table 1 for results). The parent knowledge indicator (7 questions) had the highest mean at 4.11, followed by welcoming school climate at 3.99, and parent leadership and influence at 3.52.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics	Parent Knowledge	Welcoming School Climate	Parent Leadership & Influence
N -- Valid Responses	2046	2027	2015
Missing Responses	5	24	36
Mean	4.1179	3.9985	3.5295
Std. Deviation	0.75149	0.80392	1.0801
Minimum	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5
25 th Percentiles	3.7143	3.5	2.75
50 th Percentiles	4.2857	4.1429	3.75
75 th Percentiles	4.7143	4.5714	4.50

2. Interpreting the Indicators in Percentages

Using 4.0 as the threshold (mean scores of 4.0 and above), we interpreted the indicators as percentages: 66% of parent respondents report feeling knowledgeable and confident in their ability to support their child's learning pre-k through college; 60% of respondents report that their school provides a welcoming and culturally responsive learning environment; and 43% of respondents report having leadership opportunities and influence on decision-making at their