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The need for increased community involvement (CI) is known and supported by much research. Correlations between CI and positive student outcomes such as improved attendance, reduced dropout rates, reduced misbehavior, and improved grades have been reported. However, barriers to CI exist such as negative perceptions, weak leadership, lack of funding, and lack of time. Many models exist to address barriers and maximize benefits such that educators can find a model to fit the needs of the community they serve. Due to the benefits of increased CI and the needs of students as they near graduation, educators must know of and use the CI programs available to them.

This study attempted to discover the CI programs extant at the target high school campus and measure to what extent the faculty was aware of these programs by use of open-ended questionnaire, informal interviews, and direct observations. A total of 61 CI practices were identified and results were analyzed to discover trends and make recommendations to increase awareness and effectiveness of current CI programs.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Recently, many educators and researchers have noted a strong need for more direct involvement of families and communities in order to support students (Anderson-Butcher, 2004; Agronick, Clark, O’Donnell, & Stueve, 2009; Epstein, 2004; Epstein, Sanders, Sheldon, Simon, Salinas, Jansorn, et al., 2009). Research suggested that, while need may be greater at high school, it was much easier to gain the involvement of families and the greater community when students were in elementary and middle school; in addition to this, several barriers appeared to block family and community involvement at the high school level. The higher academic level of the required work in high school hindered some parents from participating when they might have in earlier grades (Downer & Myers, 2010). Also, social and professional expectations made taking time off of work to help older students difficult. For example, a single parent’s work schedule might have kept him or her from participating in school activities that he or she would otherwise have attended. In addition, parents with multiple children might often have needed childcare for younger children in order to attend activities outside regular school hours. Another possible barrier to community involvement appeared to be that animosity seems to be growing between families and the district administrators and educators (Esquivel, Ryan, & Bonner, 2008).

With these and other barriers to community involvement (CI), educators had a difficult task in facilitating increased CI practices and programs. Despite the challenges, educators should consider the benefits and make the attempt. Community involvement in
education has been linked to increased student attendance rates, reduced dropout rates, reduced misbehavior, and increased academic outcomes for students (Arriaza, 2004; Esquivel et al., 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Given the potential positive outcomes for students at the high school level when greater CI is present, educators must find ways to increase those types of involvement. In order to fully use the resources of current CI programs on campus, educators must know what CI programs exist on campus. Sparse baseline knowledge regarding CI programs at many local high schools hindered the most effective use of the programs that did exist on campus. Starting points for gathering this baseline knowledge included assessing faculty awareness of current programs and compiling a comprehensive list of current programs and practices.

Purpose of the Study

The data collected in this study is intended to explore baseline data mentioned above. Questions to answer include what are the current CI programs and practices in place at the target campus, and to what extent are the faculty aware of these programs? To answer these questions, the data collected can be used as the beginning of a more complete needs-assessment for the target high school. Analysis of the data can also indicate baseline levels of faculty and staff awareness of CI programs. Further, the data collected and the conclusions suggested are intended for presentation to the faculty, administration, and school board to aid in future decision-making regarding funding and faculty awareness training for CI programs.
Theoretical Basis

Bronfenbrenner’s (1992) Ecological Systems Theory (EST) provided a theoretical basis for CI in schools. In this developmental theory, children are seen as growing in a context of changing relationships among the children, their educators, parents, and communities. From this perspective, students can be inhibited or facilitated in their achievement by a multitude of factors. Ecological Systems Theory characterizes students as open systems in which the developmental context—the larger systems within which students interact (i.e. family resources, peers, neighborhood, church organizations, public policy, and others)—had as much connection to student outcomes as did internal characteristics such as intelligence or self-regulation. The systems in close proximity to a student (i.e. classrooms or families) can operate closely with that student and with much impact in his or her daily life. Similarly, systems at a distance have less direct impact (i.e. education policy or cultural importance of education).

Other aspects of EST are that the systems affecting students change over time and that there is multiple causality for student outcomes. Bronfenbrenner (1992) pointed out, and Downer and Myers (2010) clarified, that many studies of child development take a snapshot of student resources and draw conclusions under the assumption that these situations extend into the past and continue into the future. To address this, EST suggested that resources and situations changed with time. For example, the death of a family member or the introduction of welfare-to-work legislation may have great effect on student outcomes for both the short- and long-terms. In addition, EST states that student development and, therefore, outcomes are the result of multiple systems that are
interdependent. This perspective highlights the complexity of the causality of student outcomes.

As it relates to the current study, EST is important in its implication that multiple systems affect student outcomes directly and indirectly. The attitude of, perception of, and involvement of the community is important for positive student outcomes. As educators attempt to address the changing needs of our students, they have a huge resource in the communities and parents of the students they serve. Bronfenbrenner’s (1992) EST suggested that when educators were able to make full use of that resource, positive student outcomes could be maximized.

Limitations of the Study

Due to the current study’s small scope—a single local high school—generalizing the results and analysis may be challenging beyond the school district in the study. In addition, the volunteer sample of faculty respondents to the questionnaire may indicate a bias toward respondents with prior interest in the study topic. Also, the small number of questions on the questionnaire, while potentially serving to maximize the response rate, may limit the amount of useful data gathered.

Definition of Terms

In this study, the community is defined as parents, students, churches, businesses, and other groups involved in students’ lives outside school. Ecological Systems Theory guided this broad definition of community as some of the many systems that effect students.
Community involvement (CI) is defined in this study as activities that support the needs of students including but not limited to academic needs, emotional needs, physical needs, or other needs directly related to activities at the high school. Academic needs may be tutoring and homework help, emotional needs may include mental health and counseling, physical needs may include medical needs and accommodations, and other needs may include transition services such as career shadowing and resume preparation help. These activities may be undertaken or facilitated by any member or members of the community surrounding the high school.

Community involvement does not necessarily need to occur within the geographic boundaries of a neighborhood although it may. Additionally, in this study parent involvement is treated as a category within CI. For the purpose of this study, parent involvement is defined as active participation in a child’s education or educational decision-making by parents or other caregivers. The term community involvement is used throughout to include parent involvement except where referring to specific prior research.

Prior research drew distinctions between CI programs and CI practices as they exist at the high school campus. Agronick, Clark, O’Donnell, and Stueve (2009) defined a CI practice as an activity “supported by state policies and consistent with the No Child Left Behind Act. . . . usually not organized into formal programs . . . that would support rigorous evaluation . . .” (p. 8). Community involvement programs, however, include several practices and involve express goals and personnel. The distinction between the two then, is that a high school campus could have several CI practices in place and if a
staff coordinated those practices in an effort to meet express written goals, one could call it a CI program. To facilitate responses to the questionnaire, both programs and practices were referred to as programs. The two terms are not differentiated in the questionnaire.

Positive academic student outcomes were defined in this study as passing grades, and passing test scores on standardized tests. Other positive, non-academic student outcomes include but are not limited to (a) attendance—as opposed to truancy, (b) behavior—as opposed to misbehavior, and (c) high school completion—as opposed to dropping out.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The remainder of the current study is organized as follows: Chapter Two consists of a review of the most recent literature available regarding CI and its potential benefits and barriers. Effective models for CI programs are explored. Chapter Three explains the setting in which the current study was conducted and the methods used to carry out data collection. Chapter Four presents an analysis of data collected. Results and conclusions are presented in Chapter Five along with the limitations of and suggestions for extension of the current study.

Appendices are included with copies of the data collection tools and a list of CI programs identified. Appendix A includes a list of the CI programs identified separated into four categories of involvement. Appendix B includes a blank copy of the questionnaire used and several representative samples of the completed questionnaires.
Chapter 2

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Much formal and informal debate has covered the topic of who is responsible for student achievement in school and students’ school success. These debates often reduce the argument to a dichotomy that either parents should take responsibility for their students or that educators are not doing enough. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) mandates increases in parental involvement in education, and research suggested greater depth and complexity in both the causes of and responsibilities for student outcomes in our school systems (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002). In addition, many studies suggested multiple potential benefits to community involvement (e.g., Tan & Goldberg, 2009). Despite the many benefits, community involvement (CI) activities happen less in high school and are participated in less frequently at the high school level than at the elementary and middle school levels (Downer & Myers, 2010). Students’ proximity to graduation increases the need for improved academic outcomes at the high school level. The inclusion of community members as well as parents in local educational decision making maximized the effects of CI in one study (Ordonez-Jasis & Jasis, 2004). Indeed, the potential benefits of CI imply that every effort must be made to increase levels of involvement and a first step in this effort would be to maximize educator awareness of the CI programs that exist currently at their campuses.

Benefits of Community Involvement

Beyond a federal mandate and a parental desire, there exists a great need for CI in education. The evidence for this need is in the list of benefits that have been linked to
increased CI in education at all levels. Prior research has linked CI to improved positive student outcomes such as attendance, overall grades, and graduation rates (Downer & Myers, 2010; Sheldon, 2007; Sheldon & Epstein, 2004; Sheppard, 2008; Steinberg & Almeida, 2008; Tan & Goldberg, 2009). Also, decreased negative student outcomes such as misbehavior, truancy, and dropout rates have been connected to CI (Downer & Myers, 2010; Knesting, 2008; Sheldon & Epstein, 2004; Somers, Owens, & Piliawsky, 2009). Each of these benefits has also been linked to parental expectations for their students. Multiple studies suggested that parental expectations are the main determining factor in the student outcomes mentioned above (Clark, 2007; Fan & Chen, 2009; Smith, 2008). These potential changes in student outcomes have been studied in students from kindergarten to high school, and, while a majority of the research focused on CI in elementary school, some evidence suggested that high levels of CI during elementary school could lead to measurable improvements in outcomes in high school (Arnold, Zeljo, Doctoroff, & Ortiz, 2008). Community involvement programs already exist at many high schools, and provide many of the benefits discussed. When educators are not aware of CI programs on campus, access to these potential benefits shrinks; therefore educator awareness is the natural starting point toward garnering these benefits for our students.

**Barriers to Community Involvement**

While the need for increased CI exists at all stages of education, high school education seems to receive less CI. Much prior research has identified multiple barriers that may contribute to this relative lack of CI at the high school level. Table 1 shows a
list of the most commonly identified barriers. These barriers affected some demographic groups more strongly than others, so student and parent demographics interacted with specific barriers in many groups.

Table 1.

Multiple Barriers Among Educators and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Negative Perceptions of CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of Strong Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Perceptions of Students as Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceptions of the Educational Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of Economic Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Models for Community Involvement Programs

To more effectively include community members and to support students, educators must address the barriers mentioned above, and research provided several models for CI programs and practices which began to address these barriers. Agronick, Clark, O'Donnell, and Steuve (2009) suggested four categories for CI programs based on the stated goals of each program. These categories were parent education, assistance with core subjects, outreach to special populations, and family, school, and community partnerships. These categories were used in reviewing the programs in Chapter Two.
Review of Literature

The remainder of Chapter Two elaborates on what we know about contemporary knowledge and salient beliefs by characterizing the benefits of CI, barriers to involvement, and models for CI programs that evidence the beliefs of and efficacy of a shared responsibility among educational stakeholders for student outcomes.

Benefits of Community Involvement

Research has linked many positive academic outcomes for students to increases in CI that occur in all stages of education. The list of benefits includes, but is not limited to the following: increased student attendance; reduced student dropout rates—and subsequent increases in high school completion; reduced misbehavior; and increased academic achievement—such as science grades, math grades, English-language arts grades, and test scores. These benefits had implications beyond their immediate effect as well, such as the potential to increase overall funding.

Attendance

Of the many well-documented benefits to CI, increased attendance had perhaps the widest reaching potential for improved positive student outcomes. There was a well-established link between attendance and academic achievement in school (Sheldon, 2007; Sheldon & Epstein, 2004; Sheppard, 2009;). After all, how is a student to make maximum academic improvement when he or she is not in attendance and missing engaging instruction? Programs that can increase attendance, therefore, have the potential to improve academic achievement. Sheldon (2007) studied the effects of parental involvement on student attendance. The study of 69 Ohio elementary schools,
which used family partnership interventions such as action teams, resulted in a positive small-to-medium effect on daily attendance. This study analyzed elementary school participants, and the parents and care-givers were responsible for students’ attendance or non-attendance; however, the results of the study generalize to high school aged students since the habit of daily attendance and the value of education are learned in elementary school and carried into high school when students begin to take over responsibility for getting themselves to school (Downer & Myers, 2010).

Epstein and Sheldon (2002) reported meaningful negative correlations ($r = -.599$) between educator-initiated CI outreach and truancy, as well as between home-to-school communication regarding attendance and increased school attendance. Educator-initiated practices such as home visits, use of school truant officers, and school based rewards for attendance each had negative correlations to truancy ranging from $r = -.233$ to $r = -.596$ (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002). Home visits had the largest effect on chronic absenteeism with a correlation of $r = -.577$. McNeal (2001) reported a reduced likelihood of dropping out when parent monitoring and Parent Teacher Organization involvement were in place ($r = -.228$). Also, the number of communication practices from school to home regarding attendance was correlated at $r = -.476$ to changes in chronic absenteeism (Sheldon & Epstein, 2004). Sheppard (2009) explored the multiple possible reasons for poor attendance and reported in a comparative, pseudo-experimental study that parental ability and willingness to help with homework was the strongest predictor of absenteeism at 56.3% of the sample ($N = 57$). This study found no statistically significant differences between perceptions of students with high attendance rates (95% or more) and those with
low attendance rates (below 85%) with the exception of parental inability or unwillingness to help with school assignments. Problems of this kind, once identified, could be addressed by CI programs.

Improving student attendance in these ways had the effect of increasing average daily attendance by about 1.1% from year to year (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002). The importance of the findings lie in the expectation that increased attendance rates result in more potential classroom time for learning needed skills, which allows for a greater potential for improved grades and eventual high school completion. Increased attendance, as an important, strong foundation for an equal opportunity to academic success, has the potential of being the most important positive student outcome on which CI programs have an impact.

Reduced Dropout Rates

Improved attendance, by itself, would be a relatively slight victory overall in the face of the many expectations placed on students today. One further benefit of CI is a reduction in the drop out rate. Students frequently cite lack of success as one reason they chose to dropout of school (Knesting, 2008; Somers, Owens, Piliawsky, 2009). Knesting (2008) identified two key factors reducing student dropout rates and one of these was directly related to CI. The students’ perception that they were being listened to was a predictor of high school completion. The venue in which the listening took place was not as important as the fact that it took place. So, a CI program could provide the ideal opportunity for listening since service providers and the students would be present at the same location—on campus.
Knesting (2008) reported that listening to students had the effect of making at-risk students feel like they were valued members of the school community. The act of listening was the important factor, and whether or not their complaints and suggestions were acted upon made no difference in this result. The faculty decided to be available in this way (listening) to support students and keep them from dropping out. Educators took on an emotionally supportive listening role in maintaining student attendance and students had to recognize their own responsibility in maintaining attendance.

The other key factor that reduced dropout rates was the perceptions of students’ role in attendance and educators’ roles in attendance. Effective home-to-school communication played a part in affecting the perception of these roles. When educators kept close contact with home regarding students’ attendance, parents and students were more likely to report that they themselves had a main role in maintaining acceptable attendance (Knesting, 2008). McNeal (1999) supported the finding that school-to-home communications have a negative correlation of $r = -0.122$ to truancy. When educators use CI programs as a resource for addressing high school dropout, students’ and parents’ perceptions of their own roles in high school completion can change and have significant impact on final results in high school.

Steinberg and Almeida (2008) reported that schools with involvement programs have higher graduation rates due to improved completion of gateway courses such as algebra as well as increased promotion from ninth grade. Literacy and numeracy skills in ninth grade were a predictor of high school completion (Steinberg & Almeida, 2008) and schools with CI programs have the opportunity to identify and quickly intervene if
educators are aware of the programs that support academic skill growth. Somers, et al. (2009), reported in their quasi-experimental study of 140 ninth grade public high school students that participation in the CI program studied had an average impact of .5 GPA points after the ninth grade year. This is significant in that success in school is often a reason students continue to attend and complete high school and GPA is a common measure of academic success.

*Reduced Misbehavior Rates*

The possible benefits of increased CI do not stop with better attendance and reduced dropout rates. Another positive effect of CI in high schools is a reduction in misbehavior. This also has the effect of increasing potential classroom learning time and therefore giving the best opportunity for academic success and eventual high school completion. Sheldon (2007) and others (Anderson-Butcher & Ashton, 2004; McNeal, 2001; McNeal, 1999; Smith, Anderson, & Abell, 2008; Van Voorhis, 2003) also reported that when parent monitoring is in place, students have fewer behavioral problems as measured by trips to the office. For example, McNeal (1999, 2001) reported a strong negative correlation between Parent Teacher Organization involvement and high school dropout ($r = -.193, p < .01$). Smith, Anderson, and Abell (2008) reported a reduction in suspensions and expulsions and improvements in school climate when using the Full Purpose Partnership model they evaluated.

Reduced misbehavior allows for two improved outcomes: (a) students were able to spend more time in classrooms learning, and (b) administrative time that was
previously spent on discipline could now be spent elsewhere. Providing more time in the classroom allowed greater opportunity for student learning and practice.

Reducing behavior problems in schools had implications regarding academics and funding. When students spend less time in the office due to behavioral disruptions, they are able to instead spend that time learning. The direct effect of this outcome was that educators had greater opportunity to teach students and address learning goals such as diagnosing learning challenges or extending learning. The indirect effect of this was that students encountered more academic success in the classroom and were less likely to be truant or drop out. Spending more time in the classroom may also strengthen the bond between educator and student. Students who perceive themselves as a valued part of a community are less likely to drop out (Knesting, 2008), so again the potential is that overall attendance would increase for at-risk students and thereby provide funding to the wider school community.

*Improved Student Academic Outcomes*

A fourth positive effect of CI in high schools is an increase in positive student academic outcomes. Tan and Goldberg (2009) found that increased CI resulted in lower school anxiety in students as well as higher school satisfaction. Lower school anxiety was connected to higher grades in the study of 91 families with students in early elementary. Fan and Chen (2001) reported in their meta-analysis of 25 studies that a positive relationship existed between parental expectations and student achievement with a correlation of $r = .30$. While the correlation appears quite modest, it represents a meaningful difference, long-term benefits notwithstanding, for doable practices. Hong
and Ho’s (2005) longitudinal study supported this finding. While that study focused on the effects of racial differences on CI and student achievement, the differences in those effects were mediated by communication of parental expectations. In a more recent meta-analysis of 50 studies, Hill and Tyson (2009) found a positive correlation ($r = .18$) between general parental involvement and achievement in middle school.

Also at the middle school level, Mo and Singh (2008) reported similar results in their longitudinal study across three years of students’ school experiences. Higher student engagement in school was positively correlated to higher academic achievement. Also, parental involvement in homework and school activities was positively correlated ($M = 2.995$, $SD = .734$) to higher achievement (Mo & Singh, 2008). These results implied that if parents establish and maintain strong CI practices, their students have more likelihood of academic success. Fehrmann, Keith, and Reimers (1987) supported the correlation of CI and students’ grades. High school students were found to have higher overall grades when CI was present (Fehrmann, Keith, & Reimers, 1987).

Other studies have tied improved achievement in specific content areas to increased CI. Yan and Lin (2005) reported on the many reasons why CI increased math test scores in 8th grade and 12th grade. Although the strength of this effect varied by race and socio-economic status, CI had measurable positive effects in all cases with effect sizes ranging from medium to large ($ES = .45$ to .96). Sheldon and Epstein (2005) reported similar results effecting math achievement in a nation-wide study of eighteen schools from elementary to high school. When teachers assigned math homework requiring discussing math skills with a family member, this had a meaningful partial
correlation to satisfactory scores on state math tests ($pr = .60$). Van Voorhis (2003) documented a method of interactive homework initiated by educators that resulted in an increase in science report card grades and science test scores in middle school. In spite of a student’s specific academic areas of difficulty, many different CI programs exist that could help address those difficulties in addition to support from classroom teachers. It remains important then, that educators are knowledgeable of all the current programs active on their campus.

Many studies reported increases in reading achievement linked to increased CI (Aikens & Barbarin, 2008; Arnold, Zeljo, Doctoroff, & Ortiz, 2008; Feiler, Andrews, Greenhough, Hughes, Johnson, Scanlan, et al., 2008; Imperato, 2009; Pitcher, 2009). Senechal (2006) reported in a study following 90 children from kindergarten through the end of grade four that the effects of parents’ involvement in early reading experiences had significant effects that carried through to fourth grade. Storybook reading in kindergarten was significantly and directly correlated ($r = .35, p < .05$) to grade four reading for pleasure. This also explained a significant 6% variance in grade four reading comprehension. Higher levels of parental involvement was also positively correlated to children’s pre-literacy ($r = 0.27, p < .001$) in a study of 163 children by Arnold, et al. (2008). MacCleod (2004) pointed out that for parents and students of many cultures, CI practices can support literacy achievement when social power-relationships are recognized and embraced—essentially using the support of the student’s culture and community to remove the obstacle that cultural differences may present in a classroom.
These multiple potential benefits of increased CI at the high school level have broad implications for students. One implication is the monetary impact that increased attendance could have on the entire campus. High quality outreach programs initiated by educators to maximize and facilitate CI on campus have the potential to directly increase daily attendance and to reduce chronic absenteeism, truancy, and dropout rates. These factors combine to increase the average daily attendance measured at a school and therefore increase that school’s potential funding. Community involvement programs provide educators more methods to address attendance issues, dropout rates, misbehavior, academic achievement, and allow educators to make full use of the resources available to them. To take advantage of these benefits, educators must first be aware of the range of CI programs available to them.

Barriers to Involvement

Given the many important potential benefits of increased CI and the governmental mandates to increase involvement, the question remains why educators and communities are not more actively pursuing CI—indeed many are. However, many barriers hinder both educators and parents from full participation in CI programs. Also, demographic factors interact with those barriers for parents. Educators’ negative perceptions of what CI may entail, as well as limited teacher preparation regarding CI, keep many educators from fully participating. The need for strong leadership and funding for CI programs are two more challenging barriers for educators. Parents are also kept from full participation by negative perceptions of CI. The thought that students at the high school level should be more independent is another hindrance to parents’ inclusion in CI. Perhaps the most
A challenging obstacle for parents is lack of economic resources such as time. For parents, these barriers are magnified in some demographic groups such as socio-economically disadvantaged or immigrant parents. These barriers can begin to be addressed as educators become more aware of the CI programs available to them on campus.

**Educators’ Perceptions**

Educators can be prevented from maximum involvement by perceptions of what CI entails. One perception commonly mentioned by educators was that parents would demand unreasonable change to the school system. Another negative perception was that parents would use a CI program as a platform for complaints about specific problems or specific teachers. These perceptions may prevent individual faculty members at the school from participating in a program. Barnyak and McNelly (2009) reported that, while many educators may hold beliefs that strongly support parental and CI programs, the actions that those educators display do not always support involvement. Lack of participation—whether due to misconceptions, apathy, or other reasons—could reduce the effectiveness of a CI program. A loss like this must be prevented due to the potential benefits of CI programs outlined above.

**Teacher Preparation**

One potential cause of these negative perceptions from educators may be teacher preparation programs. Epstein and Sanders (2006) studied teacher preparation programs around the United States and found that few preparation programs offered courses explicitly in CI. Numerous educators reported the slow pace of change in educational institutions as a barrier to any likely changes in teacher preparation programs. Of the
programs studied, several provided one or two optional courses directly related to CI (Epstein & Sanders, 2006). Most of the programs that addressed CI as a required topic had courses that spent one or two class sessions on the topic as part of another class rather than a full course (Epstein & Sanders, 2006). This lack of exposure for teachers in training may greatly contribute to a lack of understanding and misperceptions regarding CI.

To allow teachers-in-training to gain practical experience in CI, the most effective solution presented was to give field training to pre-service teachers. This proved to be difficult and impractical to implement, as many teacher preparation programs had no room for additional credit requirements or time for additional practicum. Some teacher preparation program administrators cited the need to stay competitive with other programs in their states when it came to cost and length of program as reasons for not adding practicum. Community involvement was often a low priority when considering teacher preparation program changes.

*Lack of Strong Leadership*

Lack of strong and effective leadership can also hinder the success of these programs. Programs with strong leadership tended to last longer and have better results for students (Auerbach, 2009; Nkansa & Chapman, 2006). Also, efficient data collection and dissemination was one trait of a strong, effective CI program leader (Sanders, 2008a; Sanders, 2008b). This led to more consistent funding as well as program changes to better serve students based on the data gathered (Sanders, 2008b). Anderson-Butcher and Ashton (2004) supported these results and found that leadership drawn from the local
community works most effectively if it is available. Nkansa and Chapman (2006) found leaders from the community more effective and they stayed longer in the position as well. Barnyak and McNelly (2009) also suggested that administrators and program leaders must take strong and supportive positions to facilitate maximum effect of CI programs.

**Funding**

A fourth barrier to overcome when attempting to increase CI in high school was lack of adequate funding. Community involvement programs were difficult or impossible to implement without funding and just as difficult to sustain without continued funding. Studies revealed that successful programs had access to adequate funding (Sanders, 2008b; Nkansa & Chapman, 2006; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2008). Programs with inadequate funding tended to be less effective at best and more often did not continue beyond the years funded. Even programs with excellent results and effective leadership and stakeholder participation could fail due to inadequate funding (Nkansa & Chapman, 2006). Lack of funding may be the greatest threat to CI programs—programs that have the potential to increase so many positive student outcomes.

Funding may also be difficult to obtain if a CI program is poorly organized. Well-organized CI programs included methods for data collection for accountability (Sanders, 2008a). This data was used to report outcomes and to justify future funding (Sanders, 2008b). In many of the programs previously studied, a person whose job responsibility was analyzing data and reporting findings communicated with administration to acquire funding. This job responsibility can be a useful solution to
address difficulties in attaining adequate funding for the continuity of CI programs. Often, the leader of the CI program took on that job responsibility.

None of these barriers can be effectively addressed if educators are unaware of the CI programs available to them. Community involvement programs could be strongly led, be fully funded, and still be ineffective if educators were unaware of them. Removing or reducing the impact of barriers to educator participation in CI programs, then, seems crucial for maximum benefit to students.

*Parents’ Perceptions*

Parents and community members face barriers to involvement as well, and these barriers must also be addressed, removed, or reduced to maximize CI and its effects. The literature supported the idea that parent perceptions and expectations can have the largest influence on students’ success in school (Clark, 2007; Hong & Ho, 2005; Smith, 2008; McNeal, Jr., 2001; Yan & Lin, 2003). Just as parent perceptions and expectations communicated to students had a positive effect regarding attendance and high school completion, parent perceptions—when poorly communicated or when negative—could also hinder the effectiveness of CI programs. So parent perceptions could either facilitate or impede students depending on what those perceptions are and how they are communicated to students. For example, parents often reported being uncomfortable at their students’ schools (Esquivel, et al., 2008; Filer, Andrews, Greenhough, Hughes, Johnson, Scanlan, et al., 2008; Imperato, 2009). This was sometimes due to the parents’ previous negative educational experiences or due to previous experiences interacting with their students’ teachers (Downer & Myers, 2010).
Many studies supported that parents’ expectations of their students were the strongest indicator of their students’ academic success (Clark, 2007; Hong & Ho, 2005; Smith, 2008; McNeal, Jr., 2001; Yan & Lin, 2003). Hong and Ho (2005) conducted a meta-analysis of parental involvement and showed that parental expectations for high school completion and college enrollment translated directly into student expectations and correlated to attainment of those goals. Other recent research supported that facilitating the communication of these expectations in the course of CI programs resulted in greater high school completion and college enrollment (McNeal, Jr., 2001; Yan & Lin, 2003).

Hong and Ho (2005) also found demographic differences in the effects of CI. Parental communication was the only involvement that had direct effect on Hispanic students in their study (Hong & Ho, 2005). Additionally, parental educational aspirations (i.e. expectations) was effective in the short term and the long term (four years) for White and Asian students, but only in the short term for African American students (Hong & Ho, 2005).

Perceptions of Students’ Independence

Another obstacle to CI is the perception that students at the high school level should have more autonomy. One common expectation at the high school age can be that educators should be teaching content to state standards and that students should take on increasing amounts of responsibility for their own education (Downer & Myers, 2010; Sheppard, 2009). Often parents thought that education was between the high school student and the teacher and that the parent should step aside and allow that exchange to
take place. This thought continued that the parent was intervening unnecessarily when participating in CI practices at the high school level. This can lead to parents opting out of possible CI programs and activities, especially academic ones that they may have engaged in with their student in elementary and middle school.

**Lack of Economic Resources**

Importantly, Turney and Kao (2009) reported that family socio-economic status was a consistent and negative predictor of all barriers to involvement. Smith (2008) similarly suggested that socio-economic factors had the greatest impact on student success at the college level. This suggested that lack of economic resources is the main barrier to parental involvement.

One of the most difficult barriers to overcome was also the most frequently mentioned—this barrier was time. Work schedules for parents often got in the way of attending potential involvement events (Turney & Kao, 2009). When scheduling school events, educators can never take every parent’s schedule into account; however, this was the largest barrier to parents attending events such as Parent-Teacher Association and Parent-Teacher Organization meetings or back to school nights (Turney & Kao, 2009). If educators are to take full advantage of the potential benefits of CI, every effort must be made to accommodate the work and daily schedules of the local community being served.

The barriers mentioned above showed differences by race and socio-economic status. Turney and Kao (2009) reported substantial race and immigration status differences in the effect size of various barriers to CI. After adjusting for socio-economic status, Hispanic and Asian foreign-born parents perceived more challenges to CI overall.
than did other groups (Turney & Kao, 2009). Also, native-born African American and Hispanic parents reported both transportation and not feeling welcome at school as two major barriers to involvement (Turney & Kao, 2009). Native- and foreign-born African American parents tended to face substantially more barriers than native-born White parents.

Two solutions reported most frequently to address these barriers were the quality of CI programs and that educators should initiate CI programs, rather than waiting for concerned community members to create their own programs. First, Sheldon and Van Voorhis (2004) noted that the quality of the CI program had a direct effect on the amount of involvement as well as results students achieved. High quality programs were more likely to garner more complete participation from the community and educators than were haphazard, poorly organized or poorly coordinated programs. Next, much research supported that programs initiated by educators had greater effect than community run programs or programs run by parent groups (Barnayak & McNelly, 2009; Knesting, 2008; Sanders & Lewis, 2005; Van Voorhis, 2003).

Models for Community Involvement Programs

A review of the literature showed that while many schools had several practices in place to promote increased CI, few had full programs designed with the goal of increasing involvement (Agronick, et al., 2009; Sanders & Lewis, 2005). As noted earlier in Chapter One, Agronick, et al. (2009) defined a program as having “one or more well articulated practices linked to [a] goal, a formal organization, and dedicated personnel or volunteers” (p. 18). Most schools studied had multiple, uncoordinated
practices in place but lacked a goal or action plan and the formal organization and
dedicated staff to coordinate organization. The programs researched fell into four
categories: (a) parent education, (b) parent and family assistance with core subjects, (c)
outreach to special populations, and (d) family, school, and community partnerships and
involvements. These categories were not mutually exclusive as a single CI program
might fit into more than one category depending on its stated goals and practices.
Descriptions of several programs fitting into each category follow.

*Parent Education*

The models for the parent education type of CI programs focus on training parents
to work with students, educators and other parents. Emphasis is placed on supporting
student achievement and collaboration with the school system (Agronick, et al., 2009).
These types of programs, such as the Parent Involvement Education Program, PASSport
to Success, Parent Expectations Support Achievement, Parent Leadership Training
Institute, and the Building Successful Partnerships Program, address issues in grades K-
12 and extend from several days up to 20 weeks or more in time. The programs
mentioned have been used widely and their results varied greatly (Agronick, et al., 2009).

*Parent and Family Assistance with Core Subjects*

Some of the programs identified addressed student achievement—specifically in
core academic subject areas. One of these was Teachers Involve Parents in Schoolwork
(TIPS). This program, used in urban settings, has served large numbers of students with
non-English speaking parents (Agronick, et al., 2009). Students involved in TIPS in a
suburban middle school science program earned higher science grades than comparison
students (Van Voorhis, 2003). The TIPS program has also been successfully employed as a part of a school-wide strategy to increase parental involvement (Sheldon & Epstein, 2005). Other programs in this category included MegaSkills, Equals/Family Math, and Math and Parent Partnerships. These programs focused on family involvement in math by use of workshops.

*Outreach to Special Populations*

The third category of CI program includes those programs supporting outreach to special populations. Ordoñez-Jasis and Jasis (2004) reported on one such community learning center model serving low-performing Hispanic children. Services were provided on campus after school and students were selected for the program based on achievement criteria and grade level. Also, the community learning center had a written foundational goal of serving Chicano-Latino students in the community with the partnership of community members. A non-profit organization was included in the community learning center with the role of maintaining funding and advocating for the center at the district level. Positive academic impacts in math and reading were reported when using this model for CI (Ordoñez-Jasis & Jasis, 2004). An increasing number of communities offer these wraparound services, which may include after school programs that serve working parents and provide safe places for children to engage in activities, and also engage families in the programming (Weiss, Kreider, Lopez, & Chatman, 2005). This meant including parents in the selection process for children’s educational activities.

Another model that fit in this category was the use of parent liaisons (Sanders, 2008a). Parent liaisons are used to increase CI and mitigate the impact of barriers to CI
that might have otherwise kept minority, immigrant, and low socio-economic status parents from participating in CI activities. In some cases, a single parent liaison position at a school site provided services to all these identified groups; however, in other instances, a separate parent liaison worked with each significant sub-group (Sanders, 2008a). Results of this model included documented increases in attendance, behavior, academic achievement, and positive school climate (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Sanders, 2008a; Sanders, 2008b). Sanders (2008a) reported the following four areas of assistance that families using liaisons mentioned: (a) academic support, (b) encouragement and moral support, (c) support in connecting with school and community resources, and (d) material support. Greater levels of involvement in children’s education at home and school also resulted. Additionally, the data gathered by these liaisons were used to acquire additional funding for the programs and to show accountability for the success of the programs.

*Family, School, and Community Partnerships and Involvements*

Mediratta (2007) reported several community organizations taking action for their local schools. In Chicago, the Association of Communities Organized for Reform Now helped community members organize to gain adequate funding for local schools and improved teacher quality programs (Mediratta, 2007). Anderson-Butcher and Ashton (2004) reported on another method of collaboration between community organizations, families, and educators. This collaboration method trained educators to identify at-risk students and refer them to the appropriate service providers that already existed in the district. The result was that students were better supported in handling issues that may
have been external to education and achievement increased when this model was in place (Anderson-Butcher & Ashton, 2004).

A third model that fit into this category was the full-purpose partnership (FPP) model. While the FPP model has a high monetary cost, it seems to have the greatest potential benefits both in number and effect size for students. This model can lead to safer classrooms and the positive effects of safer classrooms were clear to parents and educators—increased potential for learning (Smith, Anderson, & Abell, 2008). Students learned more easily and educators focused on student engagement and student learning rather than discipline. Also, discipline problems were reduced to 10-20% of the students at the schools using this model (Smith, Anderson, & Abell, 2008). The assistant principal’s time could then be spent on other supportive tasks.

Contemporary programs such as the Harlem Children’s Zone have models similar to FPP that bring community members and programs as well as social programs to campus to serve students from early morning to dinnertime, at all age levels. The Harlem Children’s Zone has enjoyed success and positive praise; however, new programs such as this and others around the country have yet to be researched in depth. Early reports suggest great potential with these models, but it is too early to draw conclusions.

Conclusions

The need exists for CI programs at the high school level and also for increases in participation in the CI programs that exist already. In an environment of governmental mandates and high community expectations for student achievement, CI is one part of a plan to increase positive student outcomes. The combined effects of increased
attendance, reduced dropout rates, and reduced misbehavior can lead to increased opportunity for academic growth. Research has already suggested positive correlations and strong implications for increased academic outcomes in most academic areas. In service of our students, educators should make every attempt to work together with their communities to mitigate to the extent possible any barriers that prevent access to these multiple benefits. Many CI program models exist, and if educators or the community are unaware of the programs available to them, then a further barrier exists. Educators are often the most frequent contact a student has in the day and so making sure that educators are aware of the full menu of CI programs available to their students is the first step in increasing CI participation.

Much of the literature covers CI at the early elementary level. There appears to be less involvement at the high school level, and also, less research reporting on current levels of involvement at the high school level. The current study would serve as a baseline against which to judge the effectiveness of any future programs implemented or the expansion of any current programs to meet the requirements and mandates of current educational laws. To fill this apparent gap in the literature, the current study attempts to document current programs in place at a local high school. Also, faculty awareness of current programs will be measured by interview and questionnaire. These data will be compiled and analyzed to identify trends and serve as a baseline for future research.

The data gathered in the current study could potentially be used by the target school district as a first step in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of CI programs already in place. The students at the target high school may benefit the most, especially
the students at risk for dropping out. The possibility of greater awareness of available programs and practices at the target high school could lead to more accurate identification of students at risk for dropping out and their subsequent support through those programs.
Chapter 3

METHODS

The research method of the study consisted primarily of participant observation involving 35 high school teachers. This chapter describes the demographic context and participants, instruments, design, and procedures used.

Demographic Context and Participants

The school setting in the study was the only comprehensive high school in its urban district with approximately 1,885 students at the high school campus in grades 9 through 12 during the 2009-2010 school year. Of those students, 38% were Latino, 38% White, 11% Asian, 7% African American, 3% Filipino, and 1% each of American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Multiple or No Response. Additionally, 33% were English learning with 42 different home languages represented on campus. Finally, 55% of the student population received free or reduced lunch.

In the 2007 – 2008 school year (the most recent data available), the high school had a graduation rate of 89% with a graduating class of 297 and 36 dropouts reported from that class. In the same 2007 – 2008 school year, 57 graduates (or 19.6%) completed the A through G class area requirements for admission into the University of California system. The most recent California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) pass rate data for the school is from the 2008 – 2009 school year. 82.5% passed the math section of the test and 78% passed the English Language Arts section. In the 2008 – 2009 school year, the school had an attendance rate of 95.05%. While these statistics were promising and, in general, improved year on year, there remained room for continued improvement. These
areas—math performance, English performance, attendance, and high school completion—were areas that research suggested CI programs had positive correlations for students.

Given such a diverse student population, the need was great for maximum efficiency of CI programs on campus. That efficiency depended on knowledge spread among staff and effective use of current resources. Staff awareness was a natural starting point. Each of the sub-communities that existed within the larger community already benefited from the CI programs in existence at the high school and would continue to benefit from increased organization and coordination among current programs. As observed at the beginning of the study’s timeline, little comprehensive knowledge existed regarding the number of CI programs on campus or to what extent the faculty and staff were aware of those programs.

The participants of this study were a volunteer sample from among the 80 teachers on campus, five counselors, ten office staff, and four administrators during the 2009 – 2010 school year. Ten office staff, five counselors, three administrators, and 41 teachers were distributed questionnaires for a total of 59 distributed. Office staff and counselors were included as they were often primary go-betweens who connected teachers and students with support providers and programs on campus. Respondents included 23 faculty, four counselors, six office staff, and two administrators. Table 2 illustrates the response rates for each group and the total response rate. For this study, there were 35 respondents (N = 35) to the questionnaire and four informal interviewees. Results were intended to suggest starting points, baseline data, and strengths and
weaknesses to faculty, staff, administration, and school board members, as a first step in a more complete needs assessment for CI programs on campus. These data were intended to be used to facilitate decision-making regarding program awareness campaigns and faculty training or professional development days.

Table 2.

*Questionnaire Response Rates by Role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role on Campus</th>
<th>Responses (N/Distributed)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>23/41</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Staff</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-faculty Subtotal</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35/59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments and Design

The researcher used three instruments to collect data: informal interviews were conducted with several faculty and office staff as well as CI program service providers. These interviews occurred between February 2010 and May 2010. Second, a questionnaire was distributed to faculty and office staff in April 2010. The questionnaire consisted of four open-ended questions and can be seen in Appendix B. Third, direct observation was used to gather data during the school’s annual Career Faire and in the daily operation of the career center and counseling office.

Two goals for the current study were to find the current levels of awareness of faculty and staff at the target high school and to compile as complete a list as possible of the current programs available on campus. The review of related literature demonstrated the need for CI programs at the high school level; however, the exact quantity of
programs in place at the target campus and the levels of knowledge among the faculty and staff remained unknown. The need for this baseline information was part of the impetus in creating the questionnaire that was ultimately used for data collection.

Spradley’s (1980) participant observation method presented a convenient starting point for data collection. Since the target population was one local high school, a case study seemed appropriate; however, the time frame did not allow for the level of detail needed when using that method. Participant observation allowed for convenient data collection within the time frame. Part of this method included informal interviews and direct observations.

The informal nature of the interviews facilitated questioning in previously unanticipated topics and aided in the eventual development of questionnaire response items. The participant observation method allowed for field notes describing the current levels of awareness while avoiding, to the fullest extent possible, affecting the results observed. For example, asking an interview question regarding a particular program on campus may yield skewed data as the respondents focus on that single program to the exclusion of others, or remember more information regarding that program versus other programs that were not explicitly mentioned in the question. To address this, questions were open-ended. Interviewees were selected based on potential knowledge of the subject. Administrators, office staff, and programs coordinators were interviewed in an attempt to maximize the amount of useful information gathered in this early stage of study.
For a broader sample of data within the time frame, a questionnaire was developed. Issues identified during interviews were incorporated in its design. The working definition of CI programs was provided at the top of the questionnaire (see also Appendix B). Also a brief verbal summary of that definition was provided to respondents in an attempt to clarify the definition and reduce reporting flaws that may have occurred due to misinterpretation. Additionally, the questionnaire was distributed and collected in person in an attempt to increase the response rate.

The open-ended nature of response item number one was intended to gather from the respondent a more natural representation of the programs one had enough familiarity with that one could name on demand. The assumption here was that if a staff member could not remember the program then he or she was not familiar enough with the program to know how to fully use its services. The expectation was that a majority of respondents would know very few programs on demand.

Response item two was developed in anticipation of that expectation. The intent for response item two was to show that teachers and staff know at least one contact person to go to, regardless of the number of programs they could identify. Another expectation was that item one would show that the counseling staff knew of and utilized the vast majority of CI programs on campus. So, the desired result from response item two was to show that teachers and staff could identify the counseling staff as a potential method of referring students to services. Discussion in Chapter Two suggested that a school site staff could make more effective use of its CI programs when a single person
or a single team was designated in this role of facilitating teachers in linking students in need with the programs that provide services of various types (Sanders, 2008a).

Response items three was included after interview responses indicated the need for exploration into how awareness of CI programs was currently being spread. Interview data suggested that many of the CI programs on campus do not advertise actively. This item yielded valuable anecdotal data regarding how faculty and staff learned of CI programs on campus. Response item four was intended to provide qualitative data identifying possible areas of need at the campus regarding CI programs.

Procedures

The current research began in February of 2010 with informal interviews of selected administrators and program coordinators. The English Learning coordinator was selected due to her knowledge and experience on campus. In addition, an interview with the Principal yielded valuable background information regarding the school in the form of the School Improvement Plan and WASC report. These reports included partial lists of CI programs on campus; however, each list was incomplete. These initial interviews led to development of the first two response items on the questionnaire as well as to further interviews with office staff.

Initial interviews failed to deliver an adequate list of CI programs on campus and the suggestion was made that the office manager would have such a list. After finding three office staff members who did not have a written list already created, a written list of CI programs on campus was created (Appendix A) with the help of two office staff members and one counselor at the campus. While the list was being developed, informal
interviews with the outreach specialist and counselors were conducted. These took place in March of 2010.

Three direct observations were conducted and field notes recorded following the participant observation method. The first two occurred during normal daily operations of the career center on campus and in the counseling office. These locations were selected due to the high number of CI programs that either occurred or initiated through those locations. Literature regarding various programs, many of them CI programs, was on display in both locations. The third observation took place during the annual Career Fair on campus. The Career Fair filled the career center, quad area, H building commons, and F building commons.

After fully developing the questionnaire, it was distributed to faculty and staff in person with a brief verbal description of the working definition of CI programs as used in this study. This definition was included in writing at the top of the questionnaire page as well. The free response questions were then completed individually and the questionnaire returned to the researcher. Also, the questionnaire was preceded by a request not to research or seek out programs, but only use the prior knowledge the staff member had. The researcher recorded the role of each staff member on campus separately and that information does not appear on the questionnaire itself.

The data from response item one was mainly used in analyzing the number of programs identified. This information was compared to the respondent’s role on campus: a) faculty, b) counselor, c) office staff, and d) administrator. Additionally, after identifying programs on campus that were identified by multiple respondents, response
item three was referred to in order to find potential patterns of why more respondents identified one program over another. Informal interview narrative data was used in this way as well.

A discussion of the data and results discovered follows in Chapter Four. The data collected seemed to reflect the initial expectation of low levels of awareness among staff of CI programs on campus; however, many programs were identified overall. Chapter Four elaborates on this apparent discrepancy between low levels of awareness, while a large number of individual programs were identified. The data collection methods allowed for a quick and relatively accurate measurement of awareness and a cataloging of the CI programs that existed on campus.
Chapter 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to discover the current CI programs in existence at the campus and to explore the extent to which the faculty and staff were aware of these programs. The multiple benefits of these programs are discussed in Chapter Two as is the need for these programs at the high school level given current federal requirements such as the NCLB Act’s requirement for increased parental involvement (NCLB Act of 2001, 2002) and local expectations of the educational institution. A questionnaire of four open ended response items as well as four informal interviews yielded both quantitative and qualitative data regarding the number of CI programs on campus and the extent to which faculty and staff were aware of these programs and the referral techniques used to connect students to these programs. After collecting data, the researcher recorded 61 CI programs on campus—complete list of those discovered was included in Appendix A.

Awareness of CI Programs

Faculty and staff awareness of CI programs was measured by the number of CI programs each respondent could identify on demand and also by the ability to name a method of referring students to each of those programs. The number of programs identified by individuals was, in general, low compared to the total number of programs discovered during the investigation. From response item one, respondents identified a total of 57 different CI programs. Four additional programs were recorded from interviews and observations making a total of 61 programs identified.
When measured in this way, awareness of CI programs was low among individuals and very decentralized. An informal interview with an administrator yielded the suggestion that the office manager may have a complete list of CI programs on campus; however, after searching with three office staff members, no current list could be produced. While several individuals on campus were aware of many programs, no one knew of all the programs discovered. These observations also supported that levels of awareness were low. Data collected from informal interviews supported data from response items three and four and also supported the initial expectation that few faculty and staff members knew of a large number of CI programs on campus. The discovery, after one interview, of the lack of a list of CI programs on campus supported the data from response item one that knowledge of CI programs was not centralized.

Table 3 summarizes frequency data regarding the number of programs identified in response item one. The vast majority of those sampled (74% or 26 out of 35) identified five or fewer programs (8% or less of the total programs identified). Only nine respondents were able to identify more than five programs, and six of those nine were non-faculty. This indicated a slightly higher level of awareness among non-faculty. Figure 1 separates this frequency data by role on campus and illustrates the relative decentralization of CI program knowledge among staff while counselors and other office staff in general identified more programs than faculty. Another indication of the low levels of CI program awareness was that, although most respondents could name around three CI programs, most respondents named different programs. This supported the notion that knowledge and awareness of CI programs was decentralized and accounted
for the relatively large number of programs identified (61) while most individuals could only name three.

Table 3.

Frequency Data from Response Item One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Programs Identified in Item 1</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of Total Respondents</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.

Number of Programs Identified by Role.

![Graph showing the number of programs identified by role.](image-url)
Three faculty members identified zero programs each on response item one; however, of the non-faculty respondents (i.e. counselors, office staff, and administrators), all identified at least two. Counselors, as a group, identified the most programs on average (M = 7.25). This was important because the counseling staff had the opportunity to communicate with the greatest number of students due to their role on campus and the number of contacts they made each day with students. Table 4 illustrates these central tendencies from response item one.

Table 4.

Central Tendencies from Response Item One Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role on Campus</th>
<th>N =</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-faculty Subtotal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-counselor Subtotal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the counseling staff would have higher levels of knowledge regarding CI programs on campus was an initial expectation. Since counselors had a higher level of awareness than other groups on campus, the low levels of awareness discovered from response item one data might not be a large hindrance to CI if the majority of the staff knew how to connect students with CI programs and resources. Response item two was developed to discover if that was the case.

Response item two revealed that nearly all respondents knew how students were referred to the programs they identified. However, five respondents did not answer item two and 20 more respondents did not mention counselors as a referral technique in item
two. Two faculty members identified programs but mentioned no referral techniques in item two. Determining the reason for this would require follow up questioning. Three other faculty members left item two unmarked since they identified no programs in item one. So, five faculty members mentioned no methods of referral in response item two. A total of 86% of those responding to item two mentioned some type of referral technique for the programs they listed in item one. This indicated that if faculty and staff know of an individual program, they generally also know how to refer students to that program. Knowledge of or awareness of CI programs, then, is a prerequisite for connecting students to the services and advantages provided by those programs.

Another expectation for response item two was that respondents would identify the counseling staff as a method of referring students to CI programs. However, this expectation was not supported by the data, although the data showed that non-counseling staff did identify many other appropriate referral methods. Only ten respondents, including only one of the counselors, identified counselors in item two. Office staff identified counselors in item two at the highest rate (67%), however, that was not surprising considering that office staff worked in the same building as the counselors and frequently had to direct students and parents to counselors during the school day. Table 5 shows the numbers of respondents who mentioned counselors in item two split by role on campus. Since 30 of 35 respondents mentioned other appropriate student referral methods in item two, it may not be damaging to the effectiveness of current CI programs on campus that only ten respondents identified counselors as a referral technique.
Table 5.

*Respondents Mentioning Counselors in Response Item Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role on Campus</th>
<th>Mentioned Counselors/Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4/23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Staff</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-faculty Subtotal</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-office Staff Subtotal</td>
<td>6/29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10/35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for the low rate at which counselors were identified in response item two would be difficult to discover without further study. The open-ended nature of response item two, while yielding a more accurate reflection of the respondents’ true extemporaneous knowledge of CI programs, allowed respondents to list many appropriate responses or to list a single response for multiple programs identified. Another reason for this may have been that many CI programs do not require a referral to join and are inclusive of any students.

Observations and interviews identified some CI programs as more visible to faculty and staff than others on campus. Also, data from response item one showed that some programs were identified more frequently than others. It was important to know why some CI programs seemed to be high profile while other programs, with equally important implications for student outcomes, remained less well known. Table 6 summarizes the 15 most frequently identified programs on campus.
Table 6.

*Frequently Identified CI Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Respondents Identifying (N)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIQE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact (Rotary)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEChA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yufa Star</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Aggies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Speech Contest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Boosters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Club (Kiwanis)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response item three provided data regarding how respondents learned of each CI program they identified in item one. From this open-ended item several respondents mentioned learning of CI programs through a personal exchange of some kind. For example, one respondent wrote that the program personnel contacted her to work with the group (case 28, Appendix B). Another respondent indicated that the students in the CI program approached her to help organize the program (case 11, Appendix B). Thirty-one of the 35 respondents answered response item three and of those 31, 14 respondents mentioned announcements or flyers as ways they heard of CI programs. Also, 28 respondents mentioned personal contact or personal knowledge of some kind with the program as the way they learned of the program.
Informal interview data supported data from response item three in suggesting that personal contact from program personnel to faculty greatly improved faculty awareness. For example, respondent 28 indicated that PRO personnel approached her to work with them. The PRO program personnel also made a short presentation at the first faculty meeting of the school year and described the program’s goals. Additionally, respondent 11 indicated that students asked her to work with the MEChA program as a faculty advisor. The Greenhouse Aggies Club had similar levels of awareness due to faculty respondents working on a daily basis with the leader of that Club. Interviews also indicated the use of announcements and to spread awareness and the PIQE program relied primarily on morning announcements, emails, and flyers throughout the school to maintain faculty awareness.

The open-ended nature of response item four provided a wealth of anecdotal information regarding real areas of need. Item four was also useful to highlight that some respondents identified areas of need that were currently addressed on campus by programs that the respondent may not have known about. This was useful in that it pointed to the need for better advertisement of programs. A more complete needs assessment would provide more useable information on those points.

Programs Identified

From this research, 61 programs were identified on campus either through interview or questionnaire. Several of those programs most frequently identified are outlined below along with a discussion of the nature of some of the programs’ impacts on positive student outcomes. A more complete list of programs is included in Appendix A.
Agronick, et al. (2009) identified four types of CI programs: parent education, assistance with core subjects, outreach to special populations, and family, school, and community partnerships. A program falling under the parent education category was the Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE) and that was a program identified by twelve respondents. This program targets minority and immigrant parents and provides information on how schools work and how parents can support their students. Also, the parent information night for language and learning was identified. While the fewest number of identified CI programs fit into this category, these CI programs played an important role in improving positive student outcomes given their connection to parent aspirations and expectations and communicating those expectations to students.

Under the category of assistance with core subjects, three respondents identified the Collings Teen Center, which provides afterschool tutoring opportunities and other activities. Two respondents identified after school tutoring provided by the district and three identified Architecture, Construction, and Engineers (ACE) mentoring which also provided tutoring in math and English after school on three days a week. Four respondents identified Friday Night Live (FNL) mentoring which was a tutoring program that met two days a week including Friday, a day when most other programs did not meet on campus. These programs had the potential to significantly affect student academic outcomes, which is especially important in gateway courses such as Algebra 1 other ninth grade courses. Increases in awareness of these programs could have an effect on overall grades and CAHSEE passage rates.
Several programs were identified which fit under the outreach to special population category including the Outreach Specialist position on campus and the two Parent Liaison positions on campus. The Outreach Specialist had the primary role of making phone calls to chronically absent students. In an interview, the Outreach Specialist reported that her contacts each week were to students who had missed three or more days of school and that those phone calls were made primarily to students in their last year of high school or to students receiving special education services. The Parent Liaisons facilitated school services for the Russian and Hispanic student populations including translating phone calls, meetings, and paperwork. They also made checks on students’ attendance and grades and communicated with parents regarding how to support their students. Intervention counselors were another program in this category that targeted ninth and tenth grade students with a 1.9 GPA and below for special intervention and follow up. These programs addressed attendance and academic issues in all significant subgroups on campus; so increased awareness has the potential to affect average daily attendance and academic success as well as school funding and graduation rates indirectly.

The last category under which programs fit was family, school, and community partnerships. The large majority of programs identified on campus fit into this category. For example, the Career Fair fit under this category as local businesses and post-secondary schools were all invited to campus to distribute materials to students. Also, eight respondents identified the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA) group, which fit under this category as it fostered partnerships with the Hispanic and
Chicano communities near the school. Other programs that fit under this category included People Reaching Out (PRO), a free mental health and counseling service that operated on campus from faculty and staff referrals. Ten respondents identified the PRO program. This was the second most frequently identified CI program on campus and data from response item three indicated that the reason for this was that the PRO staff had presented pamphlets and flyers to the faculty at more than one staff meeting through the year. These programs addressed many diverse academic and non-academic needs of students, such as mental health, and supported high school completion.

These programs could have significant impact on positive student outcomes. It is worth noting, however, that the researcher actively sought out these programs and enlisted the help of four additional staff members in that search. This continued from February 2010 through May 2010. Interviews were also used as a way to identify programs on campus. If a program was missed or otherwise not identified, a reasonable conclusion was that a single faculty member who is not searching for resources would not find that program either. A more effective method of disseminating knowledge of CI programs and thereby increasing awareness must be found and implemented.

Discussion

The implications of these findings were that, while it is a great asset to the students that a large number of CI programs exist on campus, knowledge of these programs was limited in scope among the faculty and staff. Additionally, there seems to be a relatively large number of CI programs extant and available on campus and a more immediate barrier to access seems to be low levels of faculty and staff awareness of those
programs. While most respondents were able to identify from two to five CI programs on
campus, five programs is a very small fraction of the programs available on campus. The
need then was for either more complete knowledge across the entire staff or more
centralized knowledge of CI programs and the entire staff knowing whom to contact
regarding CI programs and those resources.

Educators and students would greatly benefit from a comprehensive knowledge of
the CI programs available to them, whether that knowledge was centralized in a single
person or team, or decentralized to each individual teacher through staff trainings. An
ideal goal for awareness of CI programs and dissemination of knowledge concerning CI
programs would be that faculty are able to recall on demand the programs and resources
available to students. A more feasible, and equally effective goal would be that the
faculty knows the contact person or team in charge of connecting students with CI
programs.

For unknown reasons, the response rate among faculty was 56% while that among
non-faculty was much higher (refer to Table 2 for response rates). The disparity may be
due to the much smaller number of office staff and counselors compared to faculty, or
due to the generally more comprehensive knowledge of CI programs among office staff
and counselors. In either case, the purpose of the study was to find the current awareness
of staff and almost half (45%) of the faculty were unable to be polled. These response
rates may have been improved by changing the response items to a format that staff
would perceive as easier—for example, multiple choice—however, other formats may
have led to inaccurate over-reporting.
Of the staff included in the sample for this study, all had other primary job responsibilities besides knowledge and coordination of CI programs. The job role of coordinating knowledge of CI programs could be added on to the job roles of current staff, for example, the current parent liaisons. However, this may be unfeasible due to the realities of their current job responsibilities and time requirements. An ideal solution would include adding a person or a team whose responsibility was to coordinate CI activities and programs. Sanders (2008a), and later Epstein, et al. (2009), described this team as an Action Team for Partnerships (ATP).

The ATP would be a small, six to twelve member team including members from each stakeholder group (students, parents, educators, administrators, community members). The team would create a detailed one-year action plan with activities to encourage and support CI practices and programs. Sources of funding that the ATP would find would support these activities. This may be the most challenging role of the team and is a reason why a team would most likely be more successful than a single person. In addition, the ATP would report progress semi-annually to the school Site Council, publicize CI activities, recognize and celebrate individuals in their support of CI practices and programs, and evaluate their progress yearly. In these ways—which are described in great detail by Epstein, et al. (2009)—the ATP would be able increase awareness of current CI programs on campus and maximize the positive student outcomes from those programs.

The most recent student outcome data presented in Chapter Three including attendance rate, graduation rate, and achievement (such as passing CAHSEE scores and
passing gateway courses like Algebra 1) all have the potential to change for the benefit of the students when awareness of CI programs on campus is increased. The ATP team is one effective model for both supporting CI programs and for increasing awareness of those programs. There are already many CI programs in place on campus that impact student outcomes—the effects of these current CI programs can be magnified with increased awareness.

Limitations

It remains difficult to draw conclusions regarding some important aspects of CI practices at the target campus. The design did not allow for measurement of the quality of programs and practices—an area of importance identified in prior research (Sheldon & Van Voorhis, 2004). Measuring quality was outside the scope of this study and would require more time than allowed for in the design of this study. Also, while practices were identified, each of those practices effects on student outcomes is not addressed. Program coordination was another facet that had impact on how effective CI programs were, and the level of coordination among practices on campus is another area that remains to be documented. Also, the current design failed to address current levels of awareness among other educational stakeholders such as parents and students. That data would give a more complete picture of the current awareness of CI.

Other limitations of the current study included a) sample, b) response rate, c) response item design, and d) the timing of the sample. The volunteer sample created the possibility that those participating cared more about the topic than others—and therefore
would tend to be more familiar with current programs on campus. This did not seem to
be the case as the average number of programs identified was three.

Another possible limitation to analyzing the results was the response rate of 59%.
In anticipation of a potentially poor response rate, the questionnaires were distributed in
person with a brief introduction to the working definitions in question. With a relatively
small potential sample of 99 faculty and staff, a 35% response rate overall may have left
out enough staff members that accuracy of the results is questionable.

The design of the response items as free response questions may have contributed
to a smaller number of programs identified by respondents. Faculty and staff may have
written programs down and stopped when they felt the response area looked full. These
free response questions allowed for more accurate, extemporaneous identification of CI
programs; however, the trade off for this accuracy was a possibility of lower response
rates and fewer programs identified due to the perceived time requirements to complete
the questionnaire. This does not seem to be the case as some staff identified as many as
seventeen programs.

Another possible limitation to the usefulness of the collected data may be the
timing of the sample. The questionnaire was distributed late in the school year in April
of 2010. This may also have contributed to shorter responses as staff felt busy with other
school obligations that accompany the end of the school year (e.g. state testing,
graduating seniors, finals). However, this factor may also apply in the Fall semester due
to holidays and testing that occur in that time period as well. For future research, adding
multiple sampling opportunities throughout the year might address this.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Analysis of the results suggested that knowledge of CI programs on campus was, in general, more centralized in the office staff (including counselors and administrators) as they were able to identify a larger number of programs than the faculty. Knowledge of these programs was a small portion of the office staff and counselors’ job responsibilities, and they each had many other duties each day. As suggested earlier, a person or team whose dedicated role was to have knowledge of all types of CI programs would address the issues of effective communication between CI programs and faculty, faculty and staff awareness, and coordination among CI programs.

Although conclusions were restricted by the limitations mentioned above, the data suggested that there were many CI programs on campus, and that a large number of faculty members did not know those practices well enough to identify them on demand. Increased faculty and staff awareness of CI programs on campus has the potential to significantly increase positive student outcomes. The data revealed a number of CI programs already established on campus and increased faculty awareness should be the next step to maximizing the impact of the programs currently available. These potential increases in positive student outcomes would come at relatively little cost in a context where budgets and funding are a large concern at the district and school-site levels.

Further recommendations include adding a CI coordinator or ATP team, as suggested above, with the job responsibility of creating and maintaining several annotated lists of CI programs and practices to distribute to different target groups such as parents, students, and faculty. Also, this coordinator would be responsible for
publicizing events and programs and increasing awareness among stakeholders. The list of current CI practices and programs on campus should be provided in the faculty handbook and the parent handbook and updated each semester by a person or team whose job responsibilities include coordinating community involvement practices.

To extend the results of this research a more rigorous research design should be implemented including a full needs assessment that samples from all educational stakeholders. While parents and educators have a more direct influence on positive student outcomes such as attendance, high school completion, behavior, and grades, community members can indirectly affect these outcomes by their support of and participation in CI programs as Bronfenbrenner (1992) pointed out. All stakeholders (students, parents, educators, and community members) should be included in a needs assessment with response items better designed for ease of measurement. The assessment measuring awareness as well as areas of need should be distributed multiple times throughout the school year both before and after an intervening awareness training or CI awareness fair at the school campus for all stakeholders. Some opportunities at the high school level might include back to school night in the Fall, open house in the Spring, and graduation in the Summer.

Changes of this nature will facilitate the practices that already exist on campus. This will magnify the positive effects these programs and practices are already having on the students at the campus. The potential exists for the attendance rate and graduation rate to continue to improve as well as overall grades while reducing misbehavior and suspensions on campus. With so many expectations on our students, educators must
endeavor to make full use of every resource at our disposal. Community involvement is one of those resources, and periodically through each school year, an assessment is needed regarding how thoroughly CI practices are used.
APPENDIX A

Community Involvement Programs on Campus

Parent Education

Parent Information Night on Language and Learning
Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE)

Assistance with Core Subjects

Adult Education
Architecture, Construction, and Engineering (ACE) mentoring
Collins Teen Center tutoring
District funded after school tutoring
Driver’s Education
Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP)
Friday Night Live (FNL) mentoring
Jazz Band
Music and Drama Classes
Poetry Jam
Science Club
Yearbook

Outreach to Special Populations

Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)
Black Student Union
CalSafe
Child Care Class
Girls Educational & Mentoring Services (GEMS)
Intervention Counseling
Indian Education
Outreach Specialist
Parent Liaisons
Slavic Education Committee
Yufa Star
Family, School, and Community Partnerships

Back to School Night
Beginning Banking Program
Career Center
Career Fair
Cash for College
City Parks and Recreation Joint Use
Communicare
Community Service
Curriculum Council
District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC)
English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC)
EMQ Families First
Future Ballers
Interact Club
Key Club
Mock Trial
Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA)
Partnership with Intel
People Reaching Out (PRO)
Recycling Program
Regional Occupation Programs (ROP)
RCTV
Rotary Partnership
School Newspaper
Site Council
Sports Boosters
Workability
Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Summer Job Program
Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Youth Job Training
Yolo County Mental Health
Youth Health Advocates
Youth and the Law
APPENDIX B

A Sample Questionnaire and Some Representative Responses

Optional:
Name: _____________________________
Years teaching: ______________

For the purpose of this questionnaire, *Community Involvement Programs* will mean programs or practices that

- take place on the high school campus
- whose direct or indirect purpose is to support the academic success of the students
- in pursuit of those goals these programs encourage active involvement from parents or community members, and
- whose activity takes place outside the classroom

Community Involvement Programs may take place during or after school hours.

1. Please list the Community Involvement Programs that you are aware of at this high school.

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

2. In the Programs that you listed, how do students get referred to the program?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

3. How did you learn of the programs you listed?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

4. What areas of need to you see regarding increasing the effectiveness of Community Involvement Programs at this high school?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
Optional:
Name:
Years teaching:

For the purpose of this questionnaire, Community Involvement Programs will mean programs or practices that:
- take place on the high school campus
- whose direct or indirect purpose is to support the academic success of the students
- in pursuit of those goals these programs encourage active involvement from parents or community members, and
- whose activity takes place outside the classroom

Community Involvement Programs may take place during or after school hours.

1. Please list the Community Involvement Programs that you are aware of at this high school.
   - Collins Teen Center
   - Families First
   - Yale County Youth
   - DARE Program
   - Yellow Jacket
   - ROI

2. In the programs that you listed, how do students get referred to the program?
   - School or Parents

3. How did you learn of the programs you listed?
   - Actually, I had to find the info from different sources on my own.

4. What areas of need do you see regarding increasing the effectiveness of Community Involvement Programs at this high school?
   - We need a comprehensive list given to all staff at the beginning of the school year.
Option
Name:
Years:

For the purpose of this questionnaire, Community Involvement Programs will mean programs or practices that:

- take place on the high school campus
- whose direct or indirect purpose is to support the academic success of the students
- in pursuit of those goals these programs encourage active involvement from parents or community members, and
- whose activity takes place outside the classroom

Community Involvement Programs may take place during or after school hours.

1. Please list the Community Involvement Programs that you are aware of at this high school.
   I am only aware of...No idea.

2. In the Programs that you listed, how do students get referred to the program?
   The kids just sign up.

3. How did you learn of the programs you listed?
   The students who are the officers asked me to be their advisor this year.

4. What areas of need do you see regarding increasing the effectiveness of Community Involvement Programs at this high school?
   We need to...Reach out to the community more, we...adopt a family for Christmas and give the gifts, we had a car wash to help pay for an alumni fundraiser, and we participated in the Civil Chavez March.
Optional:
Name: 
Years teac:

For the purpose of this questionnaire, Community Involvement Programs will mean programs or practices that
- take place on the high school campus
- whose direct or indirect purpose is to support the academic success of the students
- in pursuit of those goals these programs encourage active involvement from parents or community members, and
- whose activity takes place outside the classroom
Community Involvement Programs may take place during or after school hours.

1. Please list the Community Involvement Programs that you are aware of at this high school.

   I know there are programs available -

2. In the Programs that you listed, how do students get referred to the program?

   Send to the counselors - referral

3. How did you learn of the programs you listed?

   At the beginning of the year.

4. What areas of need to you see regarding increasing the effectiveness of Community Involvement Programs at this high school?

   I don't know.
For the purpose of this questionnaire, **Community Involvement Programs** will mean programs or practices that:

- take place on the high school campus
- whose direct or indirect purpose is to support the academic success of the students
- in pursuit of those goals these programs encourage active involvement from parents or community members, and
- whose activity takes place outside the classroom

**Community Involvement Programs** may take place during or after school hours.

1. Please list the Community Involvement Programs that you are aware of at this high school.
   - People Reading Out Counseling Program (PRO)
   - YUFEA STAR Club (Anti-tobacco awareness club)

2. In the Programs that you listed, how do students get referred to the program?
   - Students are referred to PRO Counselors by staff advisors, aides, counselors, teachers.
   - Students get involved on their own and join the club.

3. How did you learn of the programs you listed?
   - They contacted me to work with them.
   - They contacted me to work with them.

4. What areas of need do you see regarding increasing the effectiveness of Community Involvement Programs at this high school?
   - Continued funding for the PRO counseling program.
   - Perhaps a peer-mentoring program.

We have a Link Crew but it really only functions to orient new students to school. It could be expanded to a year round program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Referred By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Yufa Star</td>
<td>School Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Interact Club</td>
<td>Duff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) People Reaching Out (PRO)</td>
<td>Counselors/Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Black Student Union (BSU)</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) GEMS</td>
<td>Off Campus Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Greenhouse Aggies</td>
<td>McAllister/Hoffmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) ACE Mentoring</td>
<td>McAllister/Yusufi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Friday Night Live (FNL)</td>
<td>DeLaTorre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) ROP Program</td>
<td>Mojsich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Mecha</td>
<td>Bustamante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Boosters</td>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Workability</td>
<td>Piskun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Mock Trial</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Rotary</td>
<td>Counselors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Youth Health Advocates</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Youth &amp; The Law</td>
<td>Legal Services of Northern Ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Recycling Program</td>
<td>Off Campus Regps/YIPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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