

Bethel University

Spark

All Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2023

Community School Programming

Timothy D Gilbert

Bethel University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Gilbert, T. (2023). *Community School Programming* [Master's thesis, Bethel University]. Spark Repository. <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/1014>

This Master's thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Spark. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Spark. For more information, please contact lfinifro@bethel.edu.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMMING

A MASTER'S THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BY

Tim Gilbert

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

August 2023

BETHEL UNIVERSITY

COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAMMING

Tim Gilbert

August 2023

APPROVED

Thesis Advisor: Nathan Elliott, Ed.D.

Program Director: Katie Bonawitz, Ed.D.

Acknowledgements

Dedicated to Nathan, for your unwavering encouragement and support.

Dedicated to Diane, for believing in me.

Abstract

Contemporary educational legislation is pushing a resurgence of historic educational program models to meet historic and contemporary barriers to student and school achievement. School districts, especially in urban centers are faced with increased challenges in meeting needs to ensure their achievement. These challenges include meeting the unique needs of students more frequently affected by barriers created by community poverty. School reform programs such as the Community Schools are being popularized to support underperforming schools, especially those serving high-poverty communities. This project reviewed comprehensive research regarding Community Schools including descriptions of their structures, their features and evidence of their effectiveness. The research demonstrated that Community Schools and programming efforts shifted away from the traditional school model. Specifically, the model is supported by a range of local and organizational stakeholders who expand the scope of a program's reach creating equitable and evidence based school reform strategy; one which can effectively address and navigate in and out of school barriers leading to student and school success.

Table of Contents

Signature Page	2
Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
Table of Contents	5
Chapter I: Introduction	6
Chapter II: Literature Review	10
Literature Search Procedures	12
Barriers to Student and School Success	13
The Community School Model	17
Community School Stakeholders and Activities	21
Chapter III: Discussion and Conclusion	46
Summary of Literature	47
Limitations of the Research	48
Implications for Future Research	51
Implications for Professional Application	54
Conclusion	55
References	56

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Context:

This project will review comprehensive research on Community School programming through observance of the Community School Model, a school reform model with unique characteristics of Community School, program-variants and stakeholders. The project seeks to demonstrate how this reform strategy promotes quality and sustainable educational outcomes to students. In the late 19th century, Community Schools sought to increase the capacities of urban schools to meet the needs of their students and communities. When discussing the development of Community Schools, Maier writes that “with increasing industrialization, immigration and urbanization, the socioeconomic shifts of the late 19th century new roles for public institutions to address the needs of the urban poor” (Maier, 2018, p. 18).

In 2023, this is how Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) are responding to achievement gaps with a district of 36,000 students. District-wide student placement and academic/instructional programming is systemic across many elementary and middle schools and is being modified, affecting thousands of individuals including students and families, teachers, staff members, administrators, and the physical school buildings themselves. The Minneapolis Public Schools (2020) state that “the Comprehensive District Design (CDD) is a large-scale, systems-level redesign of the district’s structure and every aspect of our work that has bearing on our ability to deliver on the district’s mission and vision of ensuring that every student receives a well-rounded education and graduates academically, socially, and emotionally prepared for success in college and

career” (p. 1). One component of the new design is a boundary restructuring of many elementary and middle schools, affecting both student and parents’ options for choice or program. Another is the transformation of certain magnet programs that have been in service for decades. Magnet programs (such as Open Schools) are being removed with the CDD and replaced by different school models in response to evidence based practice. Community School programming is among the reform-strategies being implemented district wide.

As stated above, the framework of educational reform is to provide more efficient and effective methods within teaching and learning. Educational reform is also to make the efforts of schools, teachers and stakeholders more productive and meaningful while providing students with more opportunities based on their educational basis, skills and knowledge.

Theoretical Framework:

To objectively frame school reform as a concept, it is necessary to acknowledge that educational institutions are foundationally driven by motives and purposes to provide positive educational outcomes for students. Their success as a school and organization are primarily reflected in how students perform academically and there are historic and contemporary influences and circumstances which specifically create barriers to student and school success. In an era when school districts nationwide demonstrate frequent racial achievement gaps, research on school-reform implementation and student achievement is valuable. Educators and researchers know that collaboration and the sharing of knowledge can come together to nurture educational programming and help

students. Such research can inform the practices of educators and districts, spurring systemic change and distribution of resources to increase student achievement.

Rationale:

Research purpose emphasizes the importance of acknowledging and specifically identifying barriers to student and school success; to better anticipate, generate and provide concrete strategies to guide/support school districts in implementing change. Knaggs (2020) writes that “the majority of urban school reform initiatives over the past two decades have been unwilling and unable to adapt to the changing social and economic conditions of children, families, and communities; and resultantly have produced less than stellar results” (Knagg, 2020, p. 3). This is a time when unique educational models and philosophies are coming together organizationally to help students locally and abroad. It’s imperative to research such models being championed in contemporary education reform.

Definition of Terms:

Community Schools are an educational model originating in the United States in the early 19th century. Pillars of the model include integrated student support, expanded learning time and opportunities, family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership and practice.

High-Poverty schools are schools that serve 75% or more individual students certified as economically disadvantaged (ED).

Low-poverty schools are schools with less than 25% of their students certified as economically disadvantaged.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Federal Education Legislation signed into law in 2015 which focuses on school accountability in regarding academic achievement benchmarks for students across literacy, math and science.

Research Focus:

The corresponding reviews first identify barriers to student and school success, then seek to identify research definitions of the model, followed by its organizational structures that established multiple ways the model can be effectively implemented. Measures of program success will also be discussed and contextualized. Research is being conducted to answer the following questions: What circumstances bring about the need for school reform implementation such as CS programs? What is the Community School Model? What are the model's primary features and standards? How is success measured for these programs? What are the model's primary and unique stakeholders and beneficiaries?

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature Search Procedures

To locate the literature for this thesis, searches of Academic Search Premier, EBSCO, ERIC and Complete Education Journals were conducted between 2016 and 2023. This list of research publications was narrowed by reviewing published empirical studies from peer-reviewed journals, reports or case-studies focused on the Community School Model, as well as Community School program implementation and program effectiveness. Key words used in these services included “community school achievement,” “community school implementation,” “community school programming.” The structure of this chapter reviews three literature sections on Community Schools including: Barriers to Student and School Success; and the Community School Model; Community School Stakeholders and Activities

Barriers to Student and School Success:

Corresponding article reviews will seek to examine research on the Community School model, key-characteristics, variants, implementation, stakeholders and measures of program effectiveness. To contextualize the need for such reform, preliminary article reviews discuss relationships between community poverty and school/student performance, socialization and cognitive development, and measures for evaluating school performance. These preliminary reviews provide context, and circumstances informing student and school outcomes, and illuminate barriers to achievement. Such evidence demonstrates the need for responsive school reform such as Community School

programs. Programs specifically created to formally address barriers created by the effects of community poverty.

Oaks conducted research following the North Carolina Supreme Court's ruling on *Leandro v. State of North Carolina* (NC) (Oaks, 2020). The research purpose was to locate and account for high-poverty schools in the state, and examine corresponding statistics regarding school academic achievement. Research sought to determine the state of N.C. schools, many of which are located in and service communities that experience concentrated poverty (Oaks, 2020)

Research analysis determined that N.C. has many high-poverty schools, and that these sites are disproportionately located in majority minority communities (Oaks, 2020). Furthermore, high-poverty schools and attending students face multiple in-school and out-of-school barriers associated with poverty, and that these adverse conditions impact both student and school achievement negatively (2020). These conditions include parental “economic distress” (p. 66), food insecurity, unemployment, housing instability and overall lack of access to medical and social services. While at school, these students face barriers from inadequate resources, increased operations capacities of their sites, decrease in tenured staff, and decreased transportation capacities (Oak, 2020). Schools facing these challenges have more difficulty providing competitive educational opportunities and are more likely to have lower achievement outcomes, higher dropout rates, lower graduation rates and post-secondary involvement (Oak, 2020). Research established that a unique combination of barriers comes together at these sites. Schools and their local communities are subjectively affected by concentrated poverty,

specifically regarding access to resources. Students with unique needs are being tasked to excel with increasing barriers to their academic success in schools as well as with barriers to their ability to function at full potential or capacity.

Results from the current court case prioritized responsiveness to student needs by supporting school reform implementation that push districts to restructure their efforts by implementing new programs which are eligible for increased federal funding (Oak, 2020). Responsiveness (in this context) is manufactured to address students' needs by navigating and removing barriers created by adverse conditions outside of school, to allow them to be academically successful inside of school. Recommendations to do so included initiatives for school based expanded programming including early childhood programming, and programs to provide families with access to resources.

Oak's report establishes connections between economic poverty with multiple in-school and out-of-school barriers to student and school success (academically). Other reviews examine barriers created often before school age; Specifically, the "adverse role of poverty in children's cognitive development and school performance" (Sengönül, 2021, p. 1), as well as family poverty, economic distress, and barriers to child rearing.

Sengönül's (2021) research connects to Oak's as it examines the effects of out-of-school barriers affecting families and children's development. Research also examined The Family Stress Model (FSM) and impacts of poverty on the socialization process and cognitive development of children. Research was completed through comprehensive literature review, connecting economic conditions and families' experiences involving child-rearing (or barriers to child-rearing opportunities). Family poverty is defined as "the

condition or the state of not having adequate income level to meet essential needs such as, nutrition, clothing and shelter” (p. 2). Analysis found that parents experiencing poverty have difficulty investing in their children’s essential needs, and educational opportunities (both experientially and materially) (Sengönül, 2021). This incorporates nutritional needs, adequate/safe shelter, clothing, and pediatric medical care. Students experiencing poverty often consumed less food and had fewer toys and “experiences promoting cognitive skills” (p. 6). Families under conditions with “low or limited financial resources offered their children fewer opportunities to benefit from socially enriching and educational activities” (p 5).

Families experiencing economic hardships (debt, job loss) more frequently experience parental stress. Sengönül (2021) cited that the “day-to-day hassles and strains created by unstable economic conditions in families, such as difficulty paying bills or being unable to purchase basic necessities, led to economic pressures. Eventually, these economic pressures generated psychological distress in parents” (p. 4). Associated symptoms reduced parents’ ability for sensitivity and supportive attitudes and behaviors in the processes of socialization and child-rearing. Further analysis finds that these factors negatively inform students' cognitive development and socialization process, creating potential barriers to their academic achievement before becoming school-age. The author's recommendations supported the need for schools to provide supportive attitudes and behaviors that assist in providing for the cognitive and social needs of students. For example, expanded services such as early childhood education to support students with developmental and social deficits prior to entering kindergarten is

essential.. Researchers found that school readiness and success are impacted locationally and economically from school facilities, to barriers to parenting and child development. Students entering school age with such experiences demonstrate unique needs in their general curriculum and to be successful academically.

Hegedus' (2018) research was conducted to examine school accountability measures of low performing Title 1 schools and reflected on relationships between achievement and statistics related to poverty. Research examined stipulations of federal education reform, and testing measures used by states. The sample measure is the MAP Growth Assessment. Data was drawn from a school sample, which assessed achievement using the MAP during the 2015-16 school year (2018). Sample schools were pursued to match nationwide characteristics from public, charters, Title 1/non-Title 1, inner-city, suburban and rural, while MAP growth content and administration was standardized. Approximately 1,500 schools provided reading and math data, and a smaller selection of 95 schools provided demographic data/information a compared against data/school level information provided by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2018). At the time of publishing, MAP was used as a performance measure for approximately 20% of the nation's public schools (Hegedus, 2018).

Their analysis found a “strong negative relationship” (Hegedus, 2018, p. 6) between statistical levels of student poverty and student achievement. Analysis found that “about 50% of a school’s achievement is accounted for by the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch in a school (p. 6).” Due to this negative relationship, using achievement to measure these student/schools’ achievement is biased against

“schools who serve large percentages of students from poverty, and rewards schools with wealthy populations of students” (p. 16). Thus, if an academic assessment tool can effectively measure a school’s level of community poverty, it’s a signifier that this assessment tool, although popularized in educational culture, is an inappropriate measure reflecting on whole school effectiveness, increasing educational disparities within biased standardized testing data.

Reviews also sought to contextualize important barriers to student and school achievement. These include reform strategies that address these unique needs, one of which is the Community Schools as a reform strategy that helps schools overcome the multidimensional barriers which inform student achievement today. Additionally, current/relevant research regarding Community Schools, the model pillars, standards, stakeholders, implementation strategies and effectiveness is polarized, the first of which looks at Community Schools as an effective school improvement strategy.

The Community School Model:

Maier’s research was conducted to examine Community School programming in accordance with high-quality schools and effective school improvement methods for underperforming schools (Maier, 2017). Data was collected through comprehensive literature and research synthesis review. To provide a general context regarding the model in action, Maier states that “community schools vary in the programs they offer and the ways they operate, depending on their local context. However, four features or

pillars appear in most community schools and support the conditions for teaching and learning found in high-quality schools. They are, integrated student supports, expanded learning time and opportunities, family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership and practice” (p. 9).

Maier’s analysis produced 12 findings, providing sufficient evidence to justify the use of Community Schools within school reform methodology. Furthermore, the report provides sufficient evidence to qualify the model as an evidence-based intervention under ESSA (i.e., a program or intervention must have at least one well-designed study that fits into its four-tier definition of evidence). “The evidence base provides a strong warrant for using Community Schools to meet the needs of low-achieving students in high-poverty schools and to help close opportunity and achievement gaps for students from low-income families, students of color, English learners, and students with disabilities” (Maier, 2017, p. 5).

Maier in 2018 expanded on previous findings to further exemplify the Community School model as well as corresponding methods used to address barriers created by poverty and inequality thereby framing the model as an equitable school improvement strategy. Research sought to better understand how Community School programming can support low-income families and racially isolated communities. Expanding on the original findings through a comprehensive literature review. Maier connected previous research regarding the applications of the Community School pillars, which established programming alongside high-quality schools, and as an evidence-based

school reform strategy. Research analysis was completed through comprehensive literature review.

Maier emphasized the observance of all four-pillars as fundamental to program success, self-sustainment and responsiveness to students, family and community needs, and provisions for high-quality education. Maier provided eight additional lessons to understand recommendations to support model effectiveness to combat barriers created by poverty with incorporation of each pillar (2018). Recommendations include objective methods to measure program effectiveness, as well as reliance on data provided by stakeholders to tailor program efforts extend research also connected Community School programming to contemporary educational law.

Oaks' research on Community School programming and equitable school improvement was also published in 2018, reviewed research about each of the four pillars and placed research designs in relation to, and acknowledgment of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (Oaks, 2018). In doing so, credible research connecting Community School programming to adherence to federal educational legislation made the model more accessible, relevant and applicable within school reform legislation opportunities. A comprehensive literature review of the Community School pillars within tiered ESSA criteria and examined the structures and features of the model and rated tiered (1-4) placement by their research/scientific methods. The data analysis found sufficient research base and studies of the pillars and programming, thereby satisfying the ESSA evidence based standard criteria. This applied to all four-pillars of the Community School model as well as provided sufficient evidence to satisfy the Community School

model as an evidence-based school improvement strategy under ESSA criteria (Oaks, 2018).

Overall, the Community School research base provides evidence that these schools “hold promise for closing well-documented racial and economic achievement gaps, in that most of these schools serve students of color and low-income students” (Oaks, 2018, p. 17). This particular article took historic research about the model and placed the methodology alongside contemporary federal educational policy. The following review looks at the model's mission and standards, and shifts from specific research about the model structure, to a standardization of the model and guiding principles.

The Institute for Educational Leadership and Coalition for Community Schools published a report providing a standardization of the Community School model in 2017 (IEL, 2017). The report sought to provide research definitions and discussion of the Community School standards and guiding principles. The article boasts opportunities for the model within federal legislation, directly connecting with Oaks and Maier’s research regarding the validity of Community School programming (IEL, 2017). Research was conducted through a comprehensive literature review. Analysis sought to provide an objective description of Community School structures and functions and common opportunities (specific activities/services/programing) these schools provide to students and stakeholders (IEL, 2017). The authors defined a Community School as a “public school- the hub of its neighborhood, uniting families, education and community partners to provide all students with top quality academics” (p. 2).

The strategy prioritizes that the equitable improvement of academic and developmental outcomes of students is heavily reliant on collaboration between schools and their community partners (including families, local government and public agencies including law enforcement) (IEL, 2017). The standardization of the model is an additional step in making Community School programming favorable and applicable for school districts in need and provides guidance for policy makers to support its expansion where needed. The reviews focused on the identification of the pillars, program standardization, and the acknowledgement of the model being of high-quality, and evidence based. Further reviews provide research that extends beyond the primary Community School pillars and coalition guidance, to exemplify the unique features of who have adopted this model.

Community School Activities & Stakeholders:

Feher's (2016) research examined the implementation strategies of 5 Community Schools in Oakland, California (Oakland Unified School District - OSUD) (Feher 2016). The authors researched programming at sample sites to identify and discuss common or adjacent themes of the schools programming and features (Feher, 2016). Research was completed through qualitative interviews, and student/school data was provided by the district during sample years. Authors sought to generate understanding of successful model characteristics and insight on how key organizational strategies and programming can affect measurable school-based outcomes. School-based outcomes examined in this review center around attendance or chronic absenteeism and suspension rates. Analysis found that sample schools created and provided integrated school supports that focused on health/wellness and expanded learning opportunities on-site.

The five sample schools hosted significantly different student demographics but shared similar cultures and programming approaches (through observance of program pillars). Schools boasted the presence of community partners and staff working together to serve students' needs outside of the classroom. "The Community School approach is grounded in a fundamental conclusion that the traditional school model itself is not sufficient to overcome the role of poverty in equitable access to learning" (p. 2, pg 1, 2016). The commonalities of these schools was their observance of the Community School pillars yet they acknowledged how Community Schools programs and school cultures are influenced by their local community, current staff and leadership. To leverage community resources in an effective way, the schools acknowledge the

importance of every level of stakeholder that leads to the success of each individual school/program. Authors recommended expanding Community School research and discussing how without a comparison school, their research provides more to the features and strategies used by schools aligning with the model, not alternatives (such as magnet schools). Additional reviews begin with an additional focus on the program's effect on leadership roles, especially as programs mature.

Heers' research examined Community School programming effectiveness and major activities (Heers, 2016). Research and analysis sought to identify and draw connections with common programming methods and their influence on student data. This involved expanding on how these programs' effectiveness can be more objectively measured. Data analysis sought to identify types of programming schools can and do offer their communities (as programs mature), and statistical evidence to measure program success. Data was compiled through a comprehensive literature review to characterize Community Schools and connect major programming to student outcomes, specifically how they “inform academic performance, dropout rate, and risky behavior” (p. 1016). Data analysis found three main Community School activities present across their sample. These activities included cooperation between schools and external services, cooperation and parent involvement and extracurricular activities (2016). Analysis found that opportunities and participation in extracurricular activities reduced dropout rates for sample students. Cooperation and parental involvement at/with school also demonstrated a positive association to academic achievement. In this case program success was evaluated beyond academic achievement to acknowledge associations

between participation/exposure to Community School activities and student success. Further research moved beyond the definitions of standards and structures to highlight programming in action, thus providing real metrics and associations on how program success can be observed and manufactured. Finally research involving specific Community School activities and active programs continued through research of Community School program variants titled, Full-service Community Schools (FSCS).

Research conducted by Min examined “Full-service Community Schools (FSCS) operate, what achievements they obtain, and how the model can be implemented more effectively” (Min, 2017, p. 4). Authors completed a review of the existing FSCS literature base. Thematic connections for analysis were supported by NVivo 10, a commercial qualitative analysis software program (2017). Research affirmed that FSCSs are “public schools that integrate educational, medical, social, and/or human services that are conducive to meeting the individual needs of children and families” (p.1, 2017). Historic reviews regarding the research definition of FSCS also looked at different names “including integrated school-based services, school-linked services, coordinated or co-located social and health facilitators, community-centered services, and health services within schools” (p. 4, 2017).

Analysis found many fluid definitions of the FSCS model, yet many sub-themes and shared commonalities in their respective purpose (vision or mission) exist across the data. The model consistently demonstrated a balance of providing fluid human services locationally at the school building (2017). Collaborations with key stakeholders included principals, community school coordinators, external organizations and direct service

providers. Implementation for these schools was evident in the extensions of the schools programming beyond the regular day and classroom.

Scott completed research focused on the implementation of school-reform initiatives for C. A. Weis, an underperforming elementary school in Florida (2020). This resource is unique because it provided an example of a successful Community School program structure and provides clear examples of what school reform implementation looks like at sights. Research was conducted to examine a local Community School's structure, foundational planning process, and use of community capital (community-based assets) to strengthen the school's scope of services. The CPS was a specific variant of the model, with many similarities. Both models benefited from a "local context" (p. 73) and offered programming and services through various organizational partners. Analysis found that the CPS was "run through a long-term partnership between C. A. Weis Community Partnership School (Escambia County, FL.) (via Principal and Superintendent), a Florida based health-care provider, a university partner (UWF) and a community social services organization" (p. 73).

Programming came together in-direct connection with external partnership support. Exemplifying the importance of external partnerships as equally important elements of the program model. With the partnerships working together the school offered holistic services beyond the classroom specifically manufactured to remove barriers to students learning while demonstrating responsiveness to greater community needs.

Within this program, organizational leaders used communicative tools to be more

responsive to the needs of the community, by asking questions and basing programming direction on reported criteria; specifically streamlining what programming would be most responsive to students and families. Simultaneously, the leaders actively sought and utilized resources available in the community. After completion, programming was leveraged around community members' preferences. These preferences included extended day opportunities for kids, parenting classes, health services and greater involvement of the community members in both funding and problem solving (Scott, 2020). Authors identified a sequence of events which led to students performing better on standardized assessments. Specifically, strategic partnerships came together (some at the enterprise level), school leadership assessed programming needs of students, and assets to support programming needs. Programming was implemented, and across the school, students' academic proficiency scores increased systematically. A primary feature of program success and effectiveness was demonstrated through academic gains both ELA and Math assessments (2020). Furthermore, C. A. Weis successes came in response to collaboration with external partnerships, and strategies to provide responsive programming to their community, both supporting short- and long-term success. An additional model discussed below is titled in regard to the schools expanded services in response to the development of partnerships.

Provinzano's study examined Community School program implementation at an urban elementary school that expanded services in response to the development of partnerships. Research sought to analyze various themes impacting student achievement, and how professional roles changed alongside program maturity. Research analyzed both

qualitative interviews from sample stakeholders and quantitative data from students attending Wood Creek Elementary School (WC). WC is a full-service community school (FSCS) in the Pennsylvania Community School District (PSCD) (Provinzano, 2020).

Data analysis found multiple benefits connected to adjustment and expansion of leadership roles at Woodcreek, and expansion of program capacity (Provinzano, 2020). With program expansion, professional roles within the building transformed to meet unique program needs and provided more opportunities for program exposure for students. For example, the role of Principal changed alongside a systematic increase in community member involvement as the school's program matured (Provinzano, 2020). Stakeholders involved at the school prioritized shared leadership and an "organic scaling of community school services" (p. 13) over time as they started small, and added services based on the schools capabilities and community need. Analysis also included school programs such as a school based medical clinic, vision and dental services, mental health services and food distribution (2020).

Authors' findings suggested that a natural and systematic expansion of leadership roles at school is a positive phenomenon (for programming capacity), and serves the school's and community's needs effectively. The findings looked at the leadership decisions regarding school programming coming singularly from the principal, who generally do not live in the same communities where they work. Changes and expansions in leadership in this context, demonstrates more (not less) individuals serving as leaders and influence on the schools programming. Alongside the observance and acknowledgement of parent, community members' insight and active participation,

traditional leadership roles at the school changed, and the school provided more out of the classroom programming. This research not only provided deeper insight into the available options these schools provide, it reflectively established a basis of how Community School strategies end up supporting children through multiple professionals coming together ultimately providing the foundations these required to be effective.

Caldas' research reported on the effects of Community School programming on (future) student outcomes at the high-school level. Data was gathered from two initial sample schools, Key Elementary FSCS and President Magnet (NY) (located in suburban, Southwestern New York State). Analysis compared (4) cohorts of student outcomes of FSCS and non-FSCS participants years later at the high school level. Informing data included a multitude of high school measures and focused on educational aspirations (post high school). Authors reviewed student data via the NYC regent's examination, cumulative high school GPA, standardized test scores and post-secondary aspirations (as reported through school counselor questionnaires). Kindergarten cohorts, which began in Fall 1998 and 2001, graduated high school (within the district) in Spring 2011 and Spring 2014 (Caldas, 2019).

Data analysis found that once at the higher educational level by age, Key Elementary students demonstrated more post-secondary aspirations; a key feature of program success within the study. Key students outperformed the comparison group on many other measures; differences that did not reach (statistical significance) including higher scores on (NY) Regents Exams, had higher GPAs and higher ACT scores. The authors suggested that if their sample sizes were larger (after the extensive data collection

period), their findings on achievement may have demonstrated more discrepancies between the two samples. Findings demonstrate a need for continued research regarding long term influences of Community School elementary programming.

Anderson's article (2019) also focuses on urban FSCSs. Research was conducted to examine a new reform initiative in Rhode Island. Qualitative data was gathered through baseline and follow up protocol with program stakeholders. The sample district was Providence Full-Service Community Schools (PFSCS) where Community School programming was adapted within 10 school buildings (Anderson, 2019). Data was collected through qualitative interviews of PFSCS stakeholders across multiple schools, organizational partners and parents.

Data analysis identified common themes in participant responses, and provided an overview about perceptions of initiatives, benefits and challenges. Stakeholders across organizational levels shared many common understandings. Objectively, participants demonstrated a general understanding of factors (and needs) leading to school reform, and articulated the multiple benefits that emerged for the communities supported by these schools (by accessing programming provided by the 10 sites). Overall, the stakeholder narrative reflects an overall progression of educational reform in Providence (Anderson, 2019). The program represented systematic change to normalize schools providing comprehensive programming opportunities to attending students and families. These included systems of care for students and families that lead to improved physical/mental health and access to social services. Program success was seen through use and exposure to services, levels of attendance for participants across the program's maturity and

finally, academic achievement. Analysis provided critical insight into challenges that interfered with program success or efficiency, and specifically on funding as it was viewed as being critical to program success and longevity. Perceived challenges included worry about “necessity/longevity for external grants, or frustrations when programs can sustain and prompting connectivity through school-community communication across the various program levels” (Anderson, 2019, p. 94). A connection can be drawn between stakeholders' understanding and support of the program's purpose, as well as active involvement that emphasizes stakeholder perceptions and involvement within the program to inform each other.

Medina's (2019) research evaluated the effectiveness and challenges of two Community School reform programs in Indianapolis. Research followed grant approval within two clusters of Community Schools and examined their implementation practices. Sample data was collected during multiple grant periods extending from “2008–2013, 2010–2015 from the eight focal schools in Near-Westside and Martindale-Brightwood” (p. 277). Data was collected through qualitative interviews from community stakeholders including representatives from partnering healthcare, medical and social service providers, community and business leaders, teachers and parents, and members of the faith community.

Data analysis found recurring themes within interview data. Findings were also discussed with sample members to support authors' recommendations. The data analysis found that stakeholders acknowledged many challenges with community school programs “primarily related to budget constraints and personal turnover and the effects of

student poverty and trauma” (Medina, 2019, p. 4). Program success was noted by sample participants through significant increases of attendance and 4-year graduation rates. This cluster of research highlights the importance and strategic nature of evaluating the successes or failures of these programs, both through stakeholder perceptions and student data. Researchers and stakeholders often reflect on program success differently, however common themes are evident across reviews highlighting ways/tactics of accounting for program success without use of standardized testing measures. These have included measuring program effectiveness through exposure to services (by students/families/community members), attendance rates and graduation rates.

Biag’s research, which examined school programming that informs students language arts and math achievement, was conducted to examine Community School program effectiveness by reviewing student outcomes at six schools in Northern California (The Redwood City School District) (2016). Research examined how Community School programming influenced attendance and achievement for sample students. Quantitative data on school programs and program participation by students was analyzed alongside standardized English-language arts and math examinations. Data analysis found that exposure to (receiving or participating in) school-based services or programming informed student success in multiple ways (Biag, 2016). When compared to their non-participating peers, youth who participated in extended learning programs or whose families were involved in family engagement opportunities showed greater attendance rates and achievement in math and English language arts. “Findings provide promising evidence on the value of a comprehensive and integrated system of school

supports that address the needs of vulnerable student populations' ' (p. 3).

Daniel's report examined the structure of collaborative leadership within Community Schools and identified key stakeholders within the model. Research sought to provide deeper insight and analysis on collaborative leadership framework, in connection to the thematic features and structures of Community Schools (2017). Authors define "collaborative leadership as a form of shared decision-making in which a school leader, such as a principal, creates a structure for sharing decisions and responsibilities with key stakeholders" (p. 5). Data was gathered through a comprehensive literature review.

Authors found that school-based collaboration supported school improvement efforts and had a positive influence on student behavior and learning (2017). Research identified key stakeholders within the model as principals, community school directors (CSD), teachers, family and community members and external organizations. Within the model "principals played an important role in transforming school-climate and programming. Effective "principals historically share leadership in reform efforts and improve conditions and motivations through support of inclusivity and professional development" (Daniel, 2017, p. 7). Principals at Community Schools frequently share leadership decisions alongside Community School Directors (managers or coordinators) who help create new partnerships between the school and community (through members and organizations) (2017).

Recommendations for organizational change and school success for educational policy makers were provided. Through the implementation of collaborative leadership

strategies, schools exercise the highest potential among the community school standards, increase interprofessional culture within the school/community to provide more services/opportunities for students. Such practices include, creating time, prioritizing process, creating structure and roles, and committing to collective leadership development (Daniel 2017).

Provinzano's research examined Community School program benefits and effectiveness on newcomer and immigrant students (2020). "While experiences of refugee and immigrant students differ, both are often classified under the umbrella term newcomers in research and practice. Scholars make reference to newcomers when discussing those students who have immigrated within the last ten years" (p. 1). Quantitative data from 206 middle school students and qualitative data from stakeholder interviews was collected and analyzed. Data was collected through two phases using, both quantitative and qualitative methods and data sets to examine (and understand) measurable outcomes of Community School programming on newcomer students (within the sample). Student outcomes included attendance, behavioral incidents and GPA as well as at-risk benchmarks that used the same criterion including course failures and student academic readiness (Provinzano, 2020). The sample considered Reglan Middle (intervention site) and non-attending newcomer students across the same school district (during the duration of middle school).

Data analysis found that interventions supported academics through integrated behavioral supports (during instruction) and programming supported external partnerships. It was found that newcomer students attending the same Community School

held more 3.0+ grade point average GPAs (in comparison) and demonstrated significantly less academic risk factors along the 3 year duration. Furthermore, Reglan new-comer students outperformed non-program peers in demonstration of college readiness. The authors warn about the fidelity of measuring student academics as a measure of program success. Overall, the Community School model created measurable results for newcomer students and reflected the overall fidelity of the model in supporting all experiences of students who have unique needs.

Ammar's research was conducted to examine the needs of new-comer and English learners (EL) and analyze literacy achievement as a measure of program effectiveness (2021). Ammar cites that "inequitable learning opportunities are a leading contributor to the persistent literacy achievement gaps evident between historically marginalized students and their more affluent peers. This study investigated the impact of a community school reform effort in an urban middle school, and additional impact on literacy outcomes" (Ammar, 2021, p.1). The Community School intervention of ELs measured objectives for middle schools including end of course grades, course failures (2021) at Reynolds Middle School (in Lancaster City, PN) and the Refugee Center and Community School at Reynolds (RCCSR) (2020).

Wraparound services (for example, before and after school programming) were found to inform sample students' academic achievement positively. Analysis supports that Community School programming reduces a present learning gap between ELL students and their non-ELL peers in the middle grades. Within the sample Community School students significantly outperformed the comparison group in English language

arts (ELA).

The impact of student trauma on school based results within Community Schools was examined by Báez, who followed pillar-programming at two low-income Community Schools in New York City, BKMX (Bronx) and BXMS (Brooklyn). Included were student trauma indicators as they may inform social behavioral and behavioral indicators at school. as well as qualitative and quantitative data including student “social-emotional skill levels, problem behaviors (within one questionnaire) and level of trauma (ACE score)” (Báez, 2019, p. 103).

Data collection also incorporated social emotional learning interventions evaluated and facilitated by Wediko Children’s Services (an external partner of the school). In this case, an external partner directly implements trauma-informed multi-tiered Social Emotional Learning (SEL) services on-site, in classrooms and in response to student target behaviors. Clinicians and their service providers represent the responsive implementation of services via the collaboration with external organizations. The sample surveyed “953 students during non-academic class time across both schools over two years, and 500 students allowed authors to publish” (Báez, 2019, p. 103).

Analysis found that both schools provided a range of services, including wraparound (educational/academic focused) and mental health services, in collaboration with their external partners. Available services for students and families extended from Tier 1 to Tier 3 (ranging from school based academic supports or after school programs to 1:1 or student and family based therapies) and ranged significantly by session and participants. Overall severity of trauma indicators separated samples of students in their

demonstrated outcomes. This included connections between level of ace score, demonstrated need for services (provided at school) and social/behavioral data. Students with increased ACE scores demonstrated more need within the least restrictive environment and across the tiered services. Corresponding reviews have looked at what and how Community Schools provide services and provide insight on and how implementation forms, changes and expands over time. In this case, the school expanded programming in a multitude of ways including individualized programming based on severity of student trauma, and applied tiered interventions/programming that was more individualized based on their ACE.

FitzGerald's research was conducted to examine Community School leadership roles. This included collaborative practices and strategies used by principals to expand programming capacity (such as providing more services). Research focused on leadership at Southside Elementary School, a Community School in eastern Pennsylvania. At the time of the study nearly the entire student body was eligible for free and reduced lunch (2020). Researchers investigated program success through the efforts of school-based leadership methods, and their ability to generate school and community partnerships. They used the partnerships continuum as a metric of the school's programming success. This focused on examining the levels of collaboration demonstrated by staff and modifications to the school principal's role as the program matured (in expanding services options on-site). Case-study research drew on multiple data sources but it predominantly, formal and informal semi-structured interviews collected over a 12-month period (October 2014 - October 2015).

Data analysis found that Southside's principal successfully moved along the leadership continuum (LC). Authors coded the interviews and found evidence of four descriptive themes demonstrating how the principal used collaborative leadership methods. The first looked at collaborative leadership methodology and practice, showing that collaboration between community partners increased. The principal also expanded notions of desirable student outcomes, creations of authentic partnerships and bi-lateral relationships to minimize power differentials' ' (FitzGerald, 2019, p. 520). These findings demonstrate the objectivity of using such leadership strategies that align with the Community School standards and pillars. This research acknowledges the Principal's movement about the LC with program expansion (related to expansive programming), as a natural and positive consequence to a program expanding objective. Through the understanding of the stakeholders' roles, and best practices used, the program expanded with their oversight and through strategic leadership practices, ultimately resulting in efforts that actually informed their own role to change.

Sanders' research further examined the role of Community School Coordinators (CSC) in school programming, and their leadership and collaborative practices. Researchers obtained proper consents and completed interviews of 53 stakeholders/individuals, school observations and various document reviews. Qualitative data was drawn from three separate FSCSs (2019).

Data analysis found that CSCs are a primary stakeholder/position within the model (2019). CSCs worked closely with school principals to personally and administratively develop and maintain external partnerships at the school (directly

expanding program capacity). They created systems which bring the students, families and community members together with opportunities, services, and value provided by external partnerships. CSCs were celebrated for their focus on bringing programming to parents and creating packaged services which the community members benefit from. Additionally, CSCs demonstrated unique professional strategies such as “cross boundary communication” (2019) to collaborate across their multi-dimensional organizations and staff interprofessional capacities to focus efforts back towards the community. Authors noted that these leadership roles and advocates are necessary for schools to provide responsive programming. Often principals and teachers do not live in the communities their schools serve.

Research conducted by Quartz’s (2020) examined individual Community School models as well as roles and perceptions of three program-based teachers at sites across the US. The role of the teacher as a primary stakeholder with the Community School model was also examined.. Sample teachers from San Francisco, New York and Los Angeles and their respective experiences were analyzed including how their practices as teachers promoted learning beyond the classroom. Data was collected through qualitative interviews and site visits. The data looked at each teacher’s site as well as their role as teacher and supporter within the pillars of the Community School model. Analysis found that all three teachers “saw their role as part of a united effort to disturb long-standing educational inequalities” (p. 25).

Overall, teachers at these sites played vital and interprofessional roles within the schools and organizations. Sample teachers were seen expanding their roles beyond the

classroom by directly supporting extended programming and personal observance of the pillars; one such example included teachers working directly with external partners.

Across the sites teachers often worked as leaders and decision makers during vital transformative times and directly supported/enhanced the school environment while also promoting social justice learning and programming (Quartz, 2020). Collaborative leadership strategies were present at all sites and sustained by weekly meetings.

Gherardi (2019) writes that “the Community School model seeks to reform schools to emphasize student, family, and community wellbeing through expanded services and community development” (p. 69). Gherardi’s article sought to examine the experiences of Social Workers and their roles and involvement at their Community Schools. The study tried to better understand their roles within educational settings, their knowledge and perceptions about the model, and their direct roles in Community School reform-implementation (2019). Data collection was completed through qualitative interviews with four New Mexico based school social workers (2019).

The data found that SWs' efforts and roles are essential to Community School reform implementation. Participants demonstrated shared responsibility for student outcomes (just as teachers), and (within their role) found that they can provide direct and related services and support beyond the classroom (Gherardi, 2019). Social workers' direct involvement or underutilization with Community School implementation was linked to multiple factors, and participants shared varied experiences across the sites (with varying levels of involvement with Community School programming). Analysis found that SW roles within the different sites had varying levels of ambivalence about

their job focus or whether it focused on polarizing rigidity. It was also unclear how sample SWs provided or participated in programming, for example, due to funding constraints, or as to whether they were, or were not eligible to assist with certain clusters of students (such as general education students or special education students) (2019).

Additional factors included lack of acknowledgement from leadership regarding interprofessional capacities, varied levels of services and extended programming their sites offered as well as program maturity or presence of external stakeholders (Gherardi, 2019).

SW's role in supporting program implementation may not be straightforward or standardized across schools, districts, counties or states. Furthermore, the Community School model brings services into the school across varying or funding sources as well as changes in funding. Schools and school districts can be subjected to outside political influence on funding. This study focused on SW's role in support of school observance of the pillars, and only generated data from four social workers across the entire state where sampled. Additional sampling would allow researchers the ability to better understand and recommend strategies to counteract the "under-utilization" of an important stakeholder within the Community School model.

Bate's further examined the roles and interprofessional features of SWs in community engagement and explored connections of team collaboration with student level outcomes. Data was analyzed from qualitative interviews with 27 different professionals across four different Title 1 elementary schools. Sample participants were chosen based on serving on interdisciplinary consultation, assessment, referral, and

education (CARE) teams in four Title I elementary schools. Researchers examined quantitative data on student-level outcomes for 340 students such as including rates of absenteeism, office discipline referrals and academic assessment by teachers (2019).

Data analysis found interprofessional collaboration among school stakeholder and school-community partnerships positively inform student outcomes (Bates, 2019).

Qualitative findings also indicated that interprofessional team collaboration improved coordination of and access to services, as well as consistent follow-through on plans and interventions. The CARE team processes also were associated with marked improvements in specific academic, behavioral, and mental health outcomes among students. Results point to the important contributions interprofessional teams can make in schools when working together to address student needs.

Another major factor that plays an important role in Community School transition focus is that of hired or salaried stakeholders as compared to volunteers. Vidal de Haymes' research examined the impact of school-based volunteering on Low-Income Mothers in Chicago (2019). Specifically, the investigation looked at the influence programming at Community Schools has on participants' social capital within the community as well as self and collective efficacy. The authors drew from qualitative (pre/post surveys) from more than 400 hundred mothers with preschool and elementary grade students within Chicago Public Schools (CPS).

Results of the study found that school-based volunteering increases social capital and self-efficacy for mothers, and that outcomes were more significant over-time (evident in the post-program survey) (Vidal de Haymes, 2019). Together, through participation in

school engagement programs, participants benefited from factors of social mobility within their communities and schools. Research acknowledges that mothers can access community engagement through school-based volunteering, increasing access to opportunities to interact with other community members. Single mothers who were involved in school-based volunteering demonstrated an increased sense of connection with their child's school, prioritization of the school-parent relationship, connectedness to their community as well as significant increases in their competencies and confidences.

Connecting social capital and CS programming, Galindo's article cites that "Full-service Community Schools aim to reduce education inequality by addressing the multifaceted needs of low-income children and youth. Critical to this task is the ability of these schools to provide sufficient social capital to provide students, families and teachers with essential resources" (p. 1, pg. 140, Galindo 2017). He researched how social capital is manifested in an urban FSCS effort to provide educational opportunities for its racially/ethnically diverse students. Analysis sought to determine the role social capital plays in FSCS in "providing services to underserved students and families" (Galindo, 2017, p.146). Data collection occurred at Hope Academy (HA) (pseudonym) during July 2011 and December 2012. to include semi-structured interviews of primary stakeholders throughout the duration of the study. The sample included the school's principal, the CDC and 14 parents. School observations and document reviews (including the school's mission, policies and communications) were also completed alongside interviews.

The presence of school based social capital was found to support program expansion and the "flow of services, information and resources between school and

external organizations” (Galindo, 2017, p. 149). Social capital, its acquisition and use within the organizational structure of the school benefited program capacity. This acknowledgement that social capital is a valuable entity with CS schools, includes the nurturing and fostering of social capital supports and interprofessional collaboration between stakeholders; both of which are valuable for school programming as all involved parties can benefit.

Hope Academy’s programming expansion included partnerships with more than 20 different local organizations. Collaboration allowed the school to provide services (on-site) ranging from afterschool programming, mental health services, medical/dental services, arts, language classes as well as coordination by the schools CSC and social worker to provide families with nutrition/food access/support (Galindo, 2017). With the program expansion volunteers and community engagement were vital to the program and favored by student families. The school’s principal was charged with both generating momentum of new programming by “bonding, bridging and linking social capital” (p. 4), at Hope Academy. Through their efforts to create and sustain relationships and connectivity with staff and partners (external and internal), social capital at the school increased and bolstered the program's strength overall.

Research continues to reinforce the importance and strategic tendencies of successful administrators within CS programs. As previously discussed, the acknowledgement and leverage of social capital by school leaders benefitted school-based programming on site. The following article review will examine how schools and school programming benefit overall community revitalization.

“At the core of safe cities and vibrant neighborhoods is access to quality education for youth in schools. However, access to quality education is highly dependent on neighborhood and city-level factors” (Britt, 2023, p. 36). Britt found that schools and school programming benefit overall community revitalization. Their research looked at school program effectiveness and community perceptions during and after a major revitalization effort in Columbus Ohio’s Linden neighborhood. The purpose of the study was to provide insights and connection with neighborhood revitalization and educational opportunities, as well as how universities (in this case Ohio State University) as external partners can have an impact with school reform implementation. The authors used a mixed-methods approach to collect and analyze school-based quantitative data and qualitative insight into perceptions of school-based effectiveness, neighborhood safety and school connectedness (2023).

Data analysis found that the revitalization effort sought to turn the neighborhood schools into focal points or “hubs” in the Linden community. The programs followed a similar path as programs discussed previously, including generating a shared vision, assessing community needs, collaborating to make partnerships, aligning resources at and around the school development and review school based and community driven data and narrative. The measured effectiveness of the effort can be seen in significant school-based data. Overall, behavioral incidents reported at school decreased, positive perceptions regarding school climate and learning systems increased and overall measured engagement (even during virtual/e-learning during COVID-19) increased.

Damons’ (2020) article examined effective methods of schooling in South Africa

to assist in making recommendations to benefit schools in poor communities “facing a crisis of inefficiency and inequality” (p. 1). The present deficit definitions of the “community school” in South African education discourses was challenged resulting in a progressive reimagining of community schools to serve internal stakeholders such as learners and staff and external stakeholders such as parents and local community members. “Within the South African context, the notion of a community school has often been framed from the deficit understanding of a school located in what is known as a township or rural contexts which are mostly black” (Damons, 2020, p. 6). These schools face many of the same barriers as schools in the U.S..They struggle with functionality because they are more often under-resourced (2020).

According to community members in Damons’ study, values such as trust, respect and loyalty were core features of successful Community School culture (Damons, 2020). Demonstration of these values, seen through expression of service and community outreach was favored by the community. Analysis found that effective school programs create and sustain “mutually beneficial relationships with the community” (Damen, 2020, p. 12). A primary strategy that worked found that schools can foster stronger relationships with their community through outreach and volunteer programs. Key areas for volunteer areas included the library, the classroom (teacher assistance) as well as caregivers in the community to support foster care. These activities connected with social values within the community, bolstering support, inclusion of beneficiaries, and overall expansion of school programming in positive correlation to community member involvement (2020).

Additional students include Acharaya's (2020) research that examined collaborative instructional practice within CSs in Nepal. The research looked at contemporary instructional practices for science and health learning for boy and girl students. The study introduced the comparison of the "effectiveness of collaborative learning among boys and girls in the basic level community schools in Nepal" (p. 4). Data was collected through a student questionnaire of 250 students who engaged in science and health learning that developed to expand from traditional pedagogical practices. This quantitative study from grades five to seven was undertaken to explore the collaborative strategy by gender in the community school in Nepal.

This study examined classroom collaborations and engagement and compared collaborative learning activities conducted by boys and girls in science and health lessons. An analysis of the data found a weak association was found between collaborative and cooperative learning activities by gender among the students. When students are inexperienced in collaboration, they are unable to contribute fully to the assigned tasks. This may lead to low performance in collaborative learning. Community School outcomes are influenced by the collaborative processes in and outside and inside of the classroom. As seen through the study, authors were able to draw connections between interpersonal collaboration skills applied in the classroom to benefit achievement, which mirror school culture regarding school supports. This was considered between male and female students, who participated within the learning environment evenly. Overall, the reform methods influenced student engagement within academics in the classroom (2020).

CHAPTER: III: Discussion and Conclusion

Summary of Literature

Initial reviews of the current research sought to briefly identify specific influences affecting student, and school achievement, as presenting context to barriers informing academic success and influences the lives of students. Research establishes that students living in high-poverty communities face more potential barriers to be academically successful at school. “Out of school” barriers include housing and food insecurity as well as limited access to community healthcare and social services. These barriers, among many others, can and do contribute to students' socialization, cognitive development and performance at schools. Furthermore, “in-school” barriers also exist within many schools located in these communities. Schools in high poverty communities are more frequently underfunded, understaffed, and offer less opportunities for advanced learning and transportation. As a result, they have increased difficulty meeting the unique needs of their students academically. These same students may also be subjected to biased standardized assessment methods (Caldas et al., 2019; Hegedus et al., 2018; Provinzano et al., 2018; Sengönül, 2020).

Within this context, traditional school models and measures can be expanded through objective school reform to meet diverse needs of students. The Community School model is a promising contender. This methodology suggests that by implementing

programming to specifically address in and out of school barriers affecting students and schools can be effective (Anderson et al., 2019; Biag et al., 2016; Min et al., 2017; Oaks et al., 2020).

The expansion needed is evident within school-based programming that extends beyond classroom instruction and normal school hours. Expanding programming scope to better meet student needs, the Community School model (in practice) demonstrates four common pillars. Implementation as seen through additional services; school-based activities available locationally; professional strategies and organizational strategies supporting program fidelity. Reviewed research establishes that the Community School model, and corresponding programming is an evidence-based school improvement strategy. When implemented effectively, these programs parallel high-quality schools and demonstrate actual responsiveness to address barriers associated with poverty and inequality. Furthermore, Community School programming aligns with contemporary educational law such as ESSA' extended research on the pillars as well as corresponding programming/activities that establish acknowledgement and complacency with educational law, making the model more objective in the eyes of policy makers and school district leadership. This demonstrates program value to individual students and at the enterprise level of districts (Heers et al. 2016; Maier 2017 et al.; Maier 2018 et al; Min et al 2017; Oaks 2017 et al).

When established, these schools may be identified as full-service or community partnership schools, acknowledging their expansive purpose and mission by title. The pillars and standards guide school programming efforts outward to the communities they serve. Programs expand by generating, nurturing and sustaining external partnerships with outside organizations and individuals in the community. Established schools are supported by shared leadership and collaboration with the local community and seek to match programming with the criteria of community needs. Responsiveness and quality of programming are connected with a school's ability to effectively utilize and direct external partnerships, leverage community resources and assets and influence social capital (Anderson 2019 et al; Britt 2023 et al; Medina 2019 et al. Galindo 2017, Vidal de Haymes 2019 et al).

Primary external partnerships varied significantly by location, need and program maturity. Partners included local universities, social service organizations, health-care providers, mental health clinicians, food-banks, faith-based organizations, and members of the schools local community. Primary stakeholders within the program included school principals, community directors, representatives and practitioners from the schools external partners, teachers/staff, social workers, parents and volunteers and members of the community (Bates 2019 et al; Daniel 2017 et al; FitzGerald 2020; Gherardi 2019 et al; Haynes 2019 et al; Quartz et al 2020; Sandars 2019 et al).

Types of community school activities ranged from school to school, but often included early childhood programs, before and afters-school programming, on-site counseling, food distribution/assistance, medical services including dental, access to social workers/social services, mental health counseling, on-site childcare, job training, mentoring, adult education classes and arts programming (Anderson 2019 et al; Biag 2016 et al; Scott et al. 2020).

Effectiveness of sample Community School programs was based on a multitude of measurable outcomes. Outcomes included school based measures such as language arts or math achievement, GPA, ACT scores and graduation rates, attendance, suspensions, exposure to school based services, and post-secondary aspirations. At many individual sites program success was measured against its student's measures year to year, demonstrating an additional expansion from standardized achievement exams to determine sample student success. Others were matched against other school programs. Program success could also be determined by students, families or community members exposure to services provided at the school. Through the research measures, the model was also found to reduce barriers for newcomer students or English language learners, and students who experienced childhood trauma (Ammar 2020 et al; Báez 2019 et al; Provinzano 2020 et al, Feher 2016 et al).

Being that the model focuses on the local context, and needs of the community,

these programs can work effectively alongside large scale community revitalization efforts, and can demonstrate value in supporting schools abroad in building their own collaborative systems with the communities or strengthening school based engagement (Achaya 2020 et. al; Britt et. al 2023; Damons 2020 et. al).

Limitations of the Research

Limitations of the research were significantly affected by the age of the research, and low continuity of research purpose, design, scope, samples and measures of program success. Different research designs regarding the pillars, structures and features of the model varied significantly, with those which examined program effectiveness statistically. It was difficult to draw comparisons and connections among findings across the different clusters of published works. This opens the door to questioning the objectivity of comparing qualitative narratives, against achievement data to measure program effectiveness. This doesn't denote the importance of both, yet it highlights how differences in the selected research forced an expansion of the research study's purpose as well as questions and methods of prioritizing published works against others. Research comparing historic Community School programs against newly formed programs could not be incorporated

The variety of research design, methods and measurable outcomes influenced the scope of the project and presented significant gaps within the literature. The original

scope of the project was to compare various Community School programs and its direct influence on academic achievement. It originally appeared that extensive research existed on Community Schools academics on a national scale. However, a macro side by side comparison was severely limited. Additionally, research regarding Community School programming on students with special needs was limited.

Implications for Future Research

Community School research demonstrates a wide-variety of applicable research designs, methods, and metrics of evaluating program success. Contemporary research extends across elementary, middle and high schools aged students and geographic locations in the US and abroad. There are so many unique demographics of students and such a wide variety of school programs to access, and even more local/environmental factors which impact data. Furthermore, limits of the research identified specific student groups which may not be considered within implementation policy. What members of the community are not eligible for support under the CS model? The field would benefit from additional research investigating programming effectiveness for LGBTQ+, newcomers, EL students, students in foster care and students receiving special education services.

What factors may be interfering with the expansion of such an applicable school program model? As there are in and out of school barriers which affect student and school success, what barriers are currently influencing Community School program

reform and popularity? What barriers impact Community School programming expansion? Furthermore, what types of research approaches and/or designs can assist in investigating the possible collaboration of different research designs together to more appropriately assess the quality and effectiveness? How can Community School implementation reform affect schools that are already performing for their students?

Professional Application

This project initially and briefly identified factors which influence students and school success and provided guidance to meet these influences in real time. The process has positively informed my practices and perceptions as an educator in multiple ways. Specifically, one such practice is the ability to explain how schools and stakeholders can provide responsive and holistic school programming. Analysis allowed me to better understand the organizational capacities of the Community School where I work; allowing me to increase my involvement as an objective stakeholder.

I am more informed, capable and enthusiastic about supporting students in and outside the classroom, because I better understand the model and its value. For example, I can support student success by participating in afterschool programs and informing parents and guardians on programs and services offered at school. As a school collaborator, I can provide informed suggestions and guidance on how leadership can be more responsive in future program expansion. This may also include when expansion

needs to be scaled back or re-tailored. I can make this pool of research available to my peers to support their practices as well.

As a teacher and direct service provider, I can tailor my own instruction and direct service efforts to meet the needs of students affected by barriers to their educational success. I can identify these barriers and tailor instructional approaches to their needs. Professionally, I better understand the value of interprofessional growth in these educational settings, which mirrors the expansion of what schools are providing to their students and communities. I see program success not only in student measures but in my own professional development. As I grow interprofessionally and directly participate/contribute, my school's capacity to not only provide more programming opportunities yet also to grow thereby benefiting more students, families and members of the community.

This research emphasizes the vitality of organizational collaboration. With personal aspirations to move into educational leadership, this research is valuable in exemplifying professional responsibilities and successful strategies used by school administrators. Leadership at these sites were key influences in their program's expansion as evidence in their ability to grow interprofessionally in their own roles and promote such with other stakeholders. Their methods to navigate growing pains, trials and tribulations and resource scarcity are applicable to more than just school-based initiatives.

The stories of these schools and experiences of these stakeholders are inspiring.

Community School research is an increasingly valuable frontier, one which can provide assistance/guidance to schools struggling to provide foundations for students' success. Interpersonally, I have grown an appetite to consume more educational research on the topic and have more enthusiasm for information which can better inform my practice as a professional, an educator, a student, or as a stakeholder in my community.

Conclusion

School programming, anchored in the acknowledgement of barriers to student success needs to be a priority for all school districts and educational policy makers. Community School programming is, and will continue to be a contender in contemporary educational reform. More specifically, beneficiaries of these programs exceed the scope of traditional school models. As research continues, its value as evidence based, equitable and effective will continue to expand as well. Maier (2018) writes that “community schools cannot overcome all problems facing poor neighborhoods—that would require substantial investments in job training, housing and social safety net infrastructures, and other poverty alleviation measures. However, they have a long history of connecting children and families to resources, opportunities, and supports that foster healthy development and help offset the harms of poverty” (p. 18).

References:

- Anderson, J. A., Chen, M.-E., Min, M., & Watkins, L. L. (2019). Successes, Challenges, and Future Directions for an Urban Full Service Community Schools Initiative. *Education and Urban Society, 51*(7), 894–921.
- Acharya, K. P., Acharya, M., & Shrestha, M. K. (2020). Collaborative Learning Practices by Gender: A Case of a Community School in Nepal. *International Education Studies, 13*(4), 75–83.
- Ammar, A. A., Sondergeld, T. A., Provinzano, K., & Delaney, B. (2021). Exploring the Impact a Community School Reform Initiative on the Literacy Achievement of Middle Level English Language Learners. *Research in Middle Level Education Online, 44*(4), 1–16. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1080/19404476.2021.1893909>
- Bates, S. M., Mellin, E., Paluta, L. M., Anderson-Butcher, D., Vogeler, M., & Sterling, K. (2019). Examining the influence of interprofessional team collaboration on student-level outcomes through school–community partnerships. *Children & Schools, 41*(2), 111–122. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1093/cs/cdz001>
- Báez, J. C., Renshaw, K. J., Bachman, L. E. M., Kim, D., Smith, V. D., & Stafford, R. E. (2019). Understanding the Necessity of Trauma-Informed Care in Community Schools: A Mixed-Methods Program Evaluation. *Children & Schools, 41*(2), 101–110. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1093/cs/cdz007>
- Biag, M., & Castrechini, S. (2016). Coordinated strategies to help the whole child: Examining the contributions of full-service community schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 21*(3), 157–173. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1080/10824669.2016.1172231>
- Britt, N., Bates, S., Anderson-Butcher, D., Edwards, R., Noteman, N., Brady, C., DuMond, L., & Childs, T. M. (2023). University-Assisted Community Schools as Partners in Neighborhood Revitalization Efforts. *Children & Schools, 45*(1), 35–45. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1093/cs/cdac024>

- Caldas, S. J., Gómez, D. W., & Ferrara, J. (2019). A Comparative Analysis of the Impact of a Full-Service Community School on Student Achievement. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 24(3), 197–217.
- Daniel, J., & University of Colorado at Boulder, N. E. P. C. (2017). Strong Collaborative Relationships for Strong Community Schools. In *National Education Policy Center*. National Education Policy Center.
- Damons, B., & Cherrington, A. (2020). Reimagining Community Schools as Beacons of Hope and Possibility in the South African Context. *Education as Change*, 24.
- Fehrer, K., & Leos-Urbel, J. (2016). “We’re One Team”: Examining Community School Implementation Strategies in Oakland. *Education Sciences*, 6.
- FitzGerald, A. M., & Quiñones, S. (2019). Working in and with Community: Leading for Partnerships in a Community School. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 18(4), 511–532.
- Galindo, C., Sanders, M., & Abel, Y. (2017). Transforming educational experiences in low income communities: A qualitative case study of social capital in a full-service community school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1, Suppl), 140S–163S. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.3102/0002831216676571>
- Gherardi, S. A., & Whittlesey-Jerome, W. K. (2019). Exploring School Social Worker Involvement in Community School Implementation. *Children & Schools*, 41(2), 69–78.
- Heers, M., Van Klaveren, C., Groot, W., & Maassen van den Brink, H. (2016). Community Schools: What We Know and What We Need to Know. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1016–1051. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315627365>
- Hegedus, A., & NWEA. (2018). Evaluating the Relationships between Poverty and School Performance. NWEA Research. In *NWEA*. NWEA.
- Community School Standards. Updated. (2018). *Institute for Educational Leadership*.
- Maier, A., Daniel, J., Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2017). Community Schools as an Effective School Improvement Strategy: A Review of the Evidence. In *Learning Policy Institute*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Maier, A., Daniel, J., Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2018). Community Schools: A Promising

Foundation for Progress. *American Educator*, 42(2), 17–22.

- Min, M., Anderson, J. A., & Chen, M. (2017). What do we know about full-service community schools? Integrative research review with NVivo. *The School Community Journal*, 27(1), 29–54.
- Medina, M. A., Cosby, G., & Grim, J. (2019). Community Engagement through Partnerships: Lessons Learned from a Decade of Full-Service Community School Implementation. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 24(3), 272–287.
- Oakes, J., Cookson, P., George, J., Levin, S., Carver-Thomas, D., & Learning Policy Institute. (2021). Adequate and Equitable Education in High-Poverty Schools: Barriers and Opportunities in North Carolina. Research Brief. In *Learning Policy Institute*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Oakes, J., Maier, A., & Daniel, J. (2017). *Community Schools: An Evidence-Based Strategy for Equitable School Improvement*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved [date] from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/equitable-community-schools>
- Provinzano, K., Sondergeld, T. A., & Knaggs, C. M. (2020). Community Schools as a Sustainable Comprehensive School Reform Strategy: A Transformative Mixed Methods Perspective. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 3–30.
- Provinzano, K., Sondergeld, T. A., Ammar, A. A., & Meloche, A. (2020). A Community School Reform Initiative for Middle Grades Urban and Newcomer Students: Using Mixed Methods to Examine Student Academic and Nonacademic Outcomes over Time and Compared to a Matched Sample. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 25(4), 293–318.
- Quartz, K. H., Daniel, J., & Maier, A. (2020). Classroom Teachers in the Community Schools Movement: A Social Justice Perspective. *American Educator*, 44(1), 35–38.
- Sanders, M., Galindo, C., & DeTablan, D. (2019). Leadership for Collaboration: Exploring How Community School Coordinators Advance the Goals of Full-Service Community Schools. *Children & Schools*, 41(2), 89–100.
- Scott, D. L., Sharma, R., Godwyll, F. E., Johnson, J. D., & Putman, T. (2020). Building on Strengths to Address Challenges: An Asset-Based Approach to Planning and Implementing a Community Partnership School. *Journal of Higher Education*

Outreach and Engagement, 24(2), 69–83.

Sengönül, T. (2021). The Adverse Role of Poverty in the Socialization Processes in the Family and in the Cognitive Development of Children and School Performance. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 11(2), 1–13.

Vidal de Vidal de Haymes, M., O'Donoghue, S., & Nguyen, H. (2019). The impact of school based volunteering on social capital and self- and collective efficacy among low-income mothers. *Children & Schools*, 41(2), 79–88. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1093/cs/cdz005>