THE PERCEIVED PLAUSIBILITY OF FULL SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Thesis

Submitted to

The School of Education and Health Sciences of the

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree of

Educational Specialist in School Psychology

By

Sara Lovett

Dayton, Ohio

August 2019

University *of* Dayton

THE PERCEIVED PLAUSIBILITY OF FULL SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Name: Lovett, Sara E.

APPROVED BY:

_____
Sawyer Hunley, Ph.D
Advisory Committee Chair
Associate Professor of School Psychology
School of Education and Health Sciences, University of Dayton

_____
Susan Davies, Ed.D
Committee Member
Associate Professor of School Psychology
School of Education and Health Sciences, University of Dayton

_____
Colleen Gallagher, Ph.D.
Committee Member
Assistant Professor in TESOL
School of Education and Health Sciences, University of Dayton

ABSTRACT

THE PERCEIVED PLAUSIBILITY OF FULL SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Name: Lovett, Sara
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Sawyer Hunley

Students from low socioeconomic communities often cannot access health services and do not have their basic physical needs met. Full service community schools (FSCS) aim to remedy this issue by providing resources to meet basic needs on public school grounds. The current study involved qualitative interviews with eight participants. The objective of this study was to examine the roles and views of these stakeholders regarding the FSCS initiative. Seven themes related to the research questions emerged from the research: (1) facilitation and collaboration, (2) hub team cooperation, (3) role satisfaction, (4) school personnel support, (5) positive outcomes, (6) implementation complexity, and (7) personal investment. This research is important in improving the experiences of employees in these schools in order to make the initiative more acceptable to school personnel and raising awareness about FSCS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many schools are limited in the number of services they can provide

disadvantaged students (Machin, McNally, & Meghir, 2010). School officials may still

find low parental involvement, high delinquency occurrences, high dropout rates, and

waning physical and mental health, even though they intend to serve the diverse needs of

students during the school day. Children from low socioeconomic status (SES)

neighborhoods, specifically, are at a disadvantage, as they are more likely to lack access

to services they may need, such as healthcare, mental health services, and homework help

(Cooper & Mulvey, 2015). It is important for a child's basic needs to be met before they

can be expected to excel in school (Noltemeyer, Bush, Patton, & Bergen, 2012; Sanders

& Hembrick-Roberts, 2013; Sanders, 2016). Children must first obtain physical health

and safety before they can begin to meet higher order needs like school performance

(Maslow, 1943; Noltemeyer, Bush, Patton, & Bergen, 2012). Students from low SES

communities begin school without the necessary tools to succeed if these basic needs are

not met in their everyday lives.

Students and parents may also experience emotional distance from the community

and the school due to lack of resources, furthering the disadvantage they may face. Full

service community schools (FSCS), also called wrap around schools, aim to holistically

remedy these disadvantages by forming a partnership between the school, the parents and

students, and the community. In general, FSCS aim to serve and interconnect students with the community that they reside in; FSCS can be flexible and adapt to the specific needs of their students. Most FSCS include learning opportunities, health services, mental health services, social services, family engagement opportunities, and community activities (Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017). FSCS aim to facilitate stronger and more expansive social networks, closer neighborhoods, and work to increase access to resources for students from low SES communities (Chen, Anderson, & Watkins, 2016).

FSCS are associated with increased family engagement and decreased risk taking behavior (Biag & Castrechini, 2016). They are also associated with improved math and language arts scores, attendance, graduation rates, achievement, and family and teacher satisfaction (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Valli, Stefanski & Jacobson, 2016). In addition, communities where FSCS are located see improvements in home ownership, family incomes and property values, and declines in housing vacancies, unemployment, and crime rates (Proscio, 2004; Valli, Stefanski & Jacobson, 2016). Overall, research shows benefits to implementing this type of systems change in community schools (Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Houser 2016).

However, given the vast improvements in outcomes that a full service community school brings, remarkably few schools implement this systems change. In fact, of the almost 100,000 schools in the United States, only 5,000 schools are currently considered FSCS (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). This study investigated how schools have implemented the FSCS initiative in the past and identified the characteristics that make these schools successful.

Multiple articles have mentioned principals, school psychologists, and teachers as key stakeholders in both the implementation and success of FSCS (Dryfoos, 1991; Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017; Min, Anderson & Minge, 2017; Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, & Drouin, 2008). These key stakeholders set the tone for the school and community through their leadership (Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, & Drouin, 2008). However, no literature to date has recorded their views regarding the operation of FSCS. Thus, the present study also examined the roles of current principals, school psychologists, and teachers involved in the FSCS initiative. This work provides an in-depth look at FSCS personnel and a deeper understanding of the workings of a FSCS. It also increases awareness of the FSCS initiative through the perceptions of some key stakeholders in the initiative.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

School and student success is often dependent on the resources available to students. Many schools in the United States experience a disparity between student needs and the services that are available (Ahmadi, 2015). School staff, parents, and the government have attempted to remedy this issue for decades, yet school achievement remains dependent upon the socioeconomic makeup of students who attend.

This chapter describes the reasons for educational inequality between low and high socioeconomic status (SES) students, then provides information on their multifaceted needs. It also addresses a plausible solution to this inequality and the multitude of needs students have through full service community schools. The benefits and limitations of this solution are discussed in further detail.

Educational Inequality among Students from Low SES Families

Children living in low socioeconomic status (SES) neighborhoods are often exposed to more adversity than their counterparts in wealthier neighborhoods. In addition, children in low SES families often experience economic and material deprivation (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012). These adversities may put these students at a disadvantage compared to students from wealthier schools, creating educational inequality (Galindo, Sanders, & Abel, 2017; Min, Anderson & Minge, 2017).

Trauma, maltreatment, and/or abuse are more likely among students from low SES neighborhoods. These experiences can negatively affect learning, which can further disadvantage learners from low SES backgrounds (Hartman, Stotts, Ottley, & Miller, 2017). Without the funding, materials, or healthy childhood experiences, it becomes difficult for these students to be on a level playing field with their peers; they may start school at a disadvantage economically, materially, and emotionally (Galindo, Sanders, & Abel, 2017; Hartman, Stotts, Ottley, & Miller, 2017; Min, Anderson & Minge, 2017). It is often difficult for families to access these resources, even with services that may be available to students in low SES areas. They often lack the time and resources to get to appointments and the insurance to pay for medical or mental health care. In addition, they may lack awareness of available resources.

Basic needs. Students from low SES families often do not have physical or financial access to healthcare, or may have disproportionate health issues stemming from a lack of proper nutrition and well-checks. Health issues have become more prevalent in young children, specifically for children from low SES areas, and can negatively affect their achievement in school (Blank, 2015; Noltemeyer, Bush, Patton & Bergen, 2012). For example, health issues of children from low SES neighborhoods or their parents can result in frequent absences and suspensions, which in turn lead to lower reading scores. The most common issues in low SES students--vision issues, asthma, teen pregnancy, aggression, violence, and physical inactivity--can also contribute to lower achievement in school (Blank, 2015).

It is important for children's basic needs to be met before they can excel in school (Noltemeyer, Bush, Patton & Bergen, 2012; Sanders & Hembrick-Roberts, 2013;

Sanders, 2016). As addressed in Maslow's (1943) theory of the hierarchy of needs, children must first obtain physical health and safety before they can begin to reach their full potential and gain self-esteem and self-actualization. Maslow categorized basic needs as deficiency needs and more advanced needs, such as self-esteem and school achievement, as growth needs. Students from low SES neighborhoods may have less access to services that aid in physical health and may feel unsafe in their neighborhoods or homes. Without this access to fulfill basic needs, students are less able to attend to growth needs, and are less likely to do well in school (Noltemeyer, Bush, Patton & Bergen, 2012).

      Social capital. Family involvement is necessary for a student's learning and cognitive, emotional and physical health (Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016). Family involvement is often referred to as *social capital*. Social capital expands resources for children and their families and benefits students' success in school (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017).

      Parents who experience poverty and adverse situations have more difficulty retaining and maintaining social networks and resources for their children due to lack of physical and cognitive resources (Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Epstein, 2010; Kim et al., 2010). It becomes difficult for them to have access to their children's education without the social networks and resources that would enable them to have the time and confidence to be involved in their children's schools. In addition, Dove, Zorotovich, and Gregg (2018) found that family connectedness to the community and the school is related to their level of participation in their child's education. When families feel a sense of

shared competence and responsibility for their child's educational experience, they are more likely to participate within the school.

Meeting Students' Multifaceted Needs

The number of students who have adverse experiences and academic needs has been increasing in schools (Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017). Although health issues are a concern among children from low SES areas, the multifaceted issues they face are often require more than just access to health services. They often need support for their other basic needs including security, food, healthcare, and shelter.

Traditional schools on their own cannot provide the best opportunities for children in low SES neighborhoods due to students' multiple and vast needs (Heers, Van Klaveren, Groot, & Maassen van den Brink, 2016). Families often need a variety of services, which are often dispersed unevenly and difficult to access (Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, & Drouin, 2008). Service fragmentation becomes even more of a barrier to obtaining the needed resources due to the lack of reliable transportation, funds, time, or awareness of these services. The issues and adversity that many children from low SES neighborhoods face are complex and diverse, and therefore require solutions and strategies that are just as complex (Houser, 2016). Schools need to attend to the many needs of students and their families and to empower them to make changes and to improve their educational possibilities (Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017; Valli, Stefanski & Jacobson, 2016). Barriers to learning need to be removed for basic needs to be met and children to excel (Sanders & Hembrick-Roberts, 2013). One way to remove or minimize these barriers is to extend the typical interventions and supports provided during the

school day to allow children to excel. Schools must become a center to deal with psychological, health, and social needs in order to meet these needs (Dryfoos, 1991).

Improving schools. Partnerships between parents and community may be integral in addressing concerns faced by students from low SES homes. The partnerships can address the multiple issues children from low SES neighborhoods experience by sharing resources, expertise, and accountability (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012). As a result, students can experience improved access to resources, support, and social capital (Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017). Schools facilitate the partnerships that will provide care and education to children who have had adverse experiences resulting from poverty (Hartman, Stotts, Ottley, Miller, 2017). Partnerships between schools, communities, and families are increasingly seen as a necessary component of successful education to help students have better behavior, increase student achievement and academic performance, to have access to health care, and benefit from social capital (Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017; Rogers, Salzeider, Holzum, Milbrandt, Zahnd & Puczynski, 2016)

Community agencies can help schools obtain material and social support that these families need, which is increasingly important to students who would not otherwise have these necessary supports (Sibley & Brabeck, 2017). Schools can meet the needs of their students and increase the probability that children will experience positive outcomes by working together with health agencies (Blank, 2015; Hartman, Stotts, Ottley, Miller, 2017). FSCS aim to remove the barriers that children face, address out of school needs, and enable schools to aid in fostering healthy children, families, and communities (Blank, 2015; Sanders & Hembrick-Roberts, 2013; Sibley & Brabeck, 2017). They support

students holistically--with emotional, physical, and academic supports--to increase motivation, engagement, and safety (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2015; Biag & Castrechini, 2016).

Coalition for Community Schools

The Coalition for Community Schools was created in 1998 by the Institute for Educational Leadership to support these efforts, improve the outcomes of students and unite national, state, and local organizations (Coalition for Community Schools, 2018); Dryfoos, 2005) This coalition includes national, state, and local educational organizations which aim to foster FSCS. The coalition aims to help more community schools in the United States to develop and to help improve community schools that are currently functioning (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012).

Full Service Community Schools

FSCS expand the traditional educational mission in order to more fully serve students (Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2016). They aim to address student needs by making changes in the multiple systems in which students exist (i.e. home, school, community) (Houser, 2016). Although FSCSs have become more popular recently, many school personnel, the general public, and even academics studying education are not aware of the term (Min, Anderson & Minge, 2017). Due to this issue, it is important to examine and define what FSCS are.

Definition. FSCS as a term is thought to be a philosophy rather than a specific school initiative because each school begins and develops under different conditions, and cultures (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012). FSCS aim to address the needs of their students, parents, and communities, and therefore will differ

based upon the needs that must be met. However, many of these schools have similar goals. For instance, FSCS aim to increase academic performance, reduce dropout rates, reduce risky behaviors, create family centered environments improve student-centered environments, improve parental involvement and attitudes, and improve parent- teacher communication (Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Heers, Van Klaveren, Groot, Maassen van den Brink, 2016). These schools can effectively use their strengths in addition to community strengths to benefit their student population (Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016).

Collaboration. FSCS must collaborate with students, parents, families, communities, other professionals, and government offices in order to be successful (Sanders, 2018; Trapanier, Pare, Petrakos, Drouin, 2008). They must then coordinate with these stakeholders and integrate services which respond to the needs of individual students, schools, parents, and communities (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). In addition, all policy makers, researchers and practitioners must make a commitment to the school for an extended period of time and share a common vision (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012). FSCS cannot and should not use a one size fits all model (Voyles, 2012).

They also must collaborate with stakeholders and integrate services (Sanders, 2018; Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos & Drouin, 2008; Walsh & Park-Taylor, 2003). By working with other organizations to align resources, FSCS can aid students, families, and communities by providing opportunities for early intervention, basic skills development, parent involvement, life-planning, and social and life skills development by working with other organizations to align resources (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012; Dryfoos,

1991). To continue to be effective, FSCS must build and maintain leadership, use data, achieve and maintain positive results, and provide extensive opportunities for professional development (Blank, 2015; Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, Drouin, 2008). A key to successful FSCS is that they continue to evolve as they go (Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, Drouin, 2008).

Meeting basic needs. Overall, FSCS aim to meet the needs of their students in a holistic way (Voyles, 2012). To do this, they provide more access to comprehensive services that are essential to meeting the student's most basic needs that are often unmet (Biag & Castrechini, 2016). To meet these most basic needs, such schools focus on academics, student development, family involvement, health care, mental health support, social services, material support, and community development (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012; Sibley & Brabeck, 2017). The full service community school can be seen as a "hub" in a neighborhood because it includes all services that families may need to access (Trapanier, Pare, Petrakos, & Douin, 2008). These schools can provide the social capital that parents and students need (Green, 2018; Sanders, 2018).

Models. Terms for FSCS are often used interchangeably to describe individual schools which are organically different in order to meet the individual needs of their students, school, and community. However, Valli, Stefanski and Jacobson (2016 and 2018) identified four main categories of community schools: family and interagency collaboration, full service schools, FSCS, and the community development model. Each model builds upon the previous smaller model. Because most studies use the term FSCS, that term will be used for this project.

The *family and interagency collaboration model* is the most basic of the community schools and requires the least amount of systems change. It extends the traditional school model by including other health and social supports. This model purposely tries to offer more services than a traditional school, and make these services more accessible to students by creating community partnerships, yet does not make a point of ensuring these services are comprehensive. This model may not always offer these services on the school campus, but would at least offer transportation to these services. Research on family and interagency collaboration has shown positive results for student achievement, attendance, graduation rates, educational achievement, homework completion, parent and teacher satisfaction, and community safety and engagement (Blank, Melaville & Shah, 2003). The key to this model is the commitment of partners and leaders to welcome and manage partnerships (Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2018).

Full service schools include a range of academic, health, and social services with an extended school day. This model offers a range of services, expands the school day for additional services, and houses services within the school. Studies have shown that these models yield decreased emotional stress, and positive results in achievement, writing, behavior, attitudes, motivation, self-efficacy, and self-esteem (City Connects, 2010; Cook et. al., 2000). Silos must be eliminated between schools and the agencies that provide services in the school in order for this model to work (Valli, Stefanski and Jacobson, 2016). Leaders in this model are tasked with institutionalizing partnerships (Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2018).

The next model, a *full service community school*, aims to change the culture of the school, allows community agencies to take part in decision making, and offers a full

range of services. This model builds on the previous model with comprehensive services located in the school building; however, it also includes the community in school decision making and works toward school culture change. This model has had positive outcomes in the following areas: math and reading achievement, parental engagement, community partnerships, parent participation in school functions, behavior, attitudes, suspensions, student confidence, and trust between all stakeholders (Castrechini, 2011; Castrechini & London, 2012). There must be a focus on change in the school and the culture of the school in order for this model to succeed (Valli, Stefanski & Jacobson, 2016). Leaders in this model are tasked with introducing a democratic system of running the model, which includes recommended training to carry out these tasks (Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2018).

The fourth and most comprehensive community school model is called the *community development model*. It again builds off of the FSCS model, but also aims to transform entire communities. It attempts to create jobs, develop the economy, and create leadership development opportunities. Research on this model has shown positive outcomes in academic achievement, math and language arts achievement, absenteeism, and parent engagement (Dobbie & Fryer, 2011; Proscio, 2004; Warren, Hong, Rubin & Uy, 2009). It has also shown positive outcomes in surrounding neighborhoods--the community in which community schools take place--including more homeownership, increases in family incomes, increases in property values, declines in vacancy, declining unemployment, and declining crime rates (Proscio, 2004; Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2016). In order for this model to succeed, a so-called 'tipping point' must be reached and a collective vision must be created (Valli, Stefanski and Jacobson, 2016). Leaders in this

model are tasked with joining neighborhood coalitions to improve neighborhoods and schools (Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2018).

Population served. FSCS are most often used to serve urban populations or rural populations with low achievement (Voyles, 2012). Students most often served by these schools are from families who are considered economically disadvantaged, are less likely to have parents who went to college, and are more likely to have free or reduced lunch. Those who utilize the FSCS resources most often have significant challenges to overcome (Biag & Castrechini, 2016).

Desired outcomes. Chen, Anderson, and Watkins (2016) and Green (2018) described ways in which FSCS can have many positive effects on those who participate. First, they help increase parental involvement by creating shared experiences for a parent and child in the "hub" of the community. This allows the parent and child to bring topics from school into their home and also to create a relationship between parents and teachers, who are sharing in the goal of aiding and investing in the children. It also aids parents in increasing social capital by expanding social networks, connecting them to others in the neighborhood, establishing norms of obligation and reciprocity, and allowing parents a part in aiding their children's development. Social capital is improved by promoting coordinated educational, health, and social services. Family engagement through FSCS promotes better attendance, higher scores in math and language arts, increased resilience, more parental involvement, more parent-school connections over time, decreased dropout rate, and a decrease in risk-taking behaviors (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Trepanier, 2008).

Participation in FSCS has a generally positive influence on student outcomes, and the more programs students participate in, the better their outcomes (Biag & Castrechini, 2016). Participation in the activities offered by these schools also was shown to reduce dropout rates, decrease the amount of risk taking behaviors, and lower family stress (Heers, Van Klaveren, Groot, Maassen van den Brink, 2016; Sanders, 2016). Overall, they have been seen as successful and helpful both in accomplishments and in coordinating services (Houser, 2016; Sanders, 2016).

Programs and services at these schools have experienced high levels of participation. Normally, when schools sponsor programs that do not include community involvement or full service school theory, they only receive 28 percent participation. In FSCS, it has been shown that 75 percent of students participated in one or more full service school activity. This school design successfully provided wraparound services and allowed families to easily access services that they were previously unable to access (Houser, 2016). It can improve the Department of Education's school ratings to the extent that some schools have achieved an outstanding rating (Blank, 2015).

In the surrounding community, FSCS can promote community service, with students supporting charities and engaging in the communities within which they live (Blank, 2015). These benefits include improvements in homeownership, increases in family incomes and property values, and declines in property vacancy, unemployment, and crime rates (Proscio, 2004; Valli, Stefanski and Jacobson, 2016).These community schools flourished even during a recession (Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017).

Limitations and Challenges of FSCS

   Tracking data. Like any systems change endeavor, FSCS can and do experience limitations and challenges. First, because multiple interventions, supports, and programs are present in a community school, it is difficult to tell which programs or supports are effective in improving student and community outcomes and which do not help. Likewise, it is difficult to monitor the effects, outcomes, participation, and financial information of each community and school institution and to coordinate this information into one dataset (Biag & Castrechini, 2016).

   Organization. Maintenance is often difficult, as FSCS keep their doors open beyond the normal school day and facility use increases. This requires extended participation and hours for janitors, supervision after school hours, and increased plumbing and electric costs (Dryfoos, 1991; Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, & Drouin, 2008). These schools also must rely on a myriad of partners in order to support their endeavors, and the services provided must be concerted (Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2016).

   Providing services. FSCS must also acknowledge how school and community culture may create resistance to the changes being made. For example, schools may face interethnic tensions and mistrust of mainstream institutions, including the school (Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017). This can make it difficult to disperse services and gain participation. Furthermore, FSCS are tasked with serving students from different backgrounds, cultures, and with different experiences (Houser, 2016). Students from different cultures and backgrounds will need different services and may be more or less receptive to receiving help. Services must be culturally appropriate and understand the needs of students in order to be the most effective.

An Example of a Full Service Community School

One urban school district in Ohio has been successfully implementing FSCS in the district. With this initiative, they have become the overall highest performing urban school district in Ohio according to the Ohio Department of Education's combined ratings of achievement, gap closing, kindergarten through third grade literacy, progress, graduation rate, and student preparedness for success. They include physical, dental, vision, wellness opportunities, and mental health services for the students and families that they serve on the public school campus. An extended school day is offered for students to access services after school or during school. The initiative started with a rehabilitation program in 2001, but has grown to 35 FSCS (out of 55 schools) in the district (Blank, 2015). Students in this district have shown improvements in academics, attendance, behavior, state benchmark scores in reading, state benchmark scores in math, higher graduation rates, a higher Ohio Performance Index (i.e. student achievement) (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012; Blank, 2015).

The Present Study

The present study examines how the FSCS were created and implemented from the perspectives of key participants in creating and maintaining this initiative. Because principals, school psychologists, and teachers are often mentioned in the literature as key participants but have not been interviewed, their specific opinions and roles on FSCS were sought (Dryfoos, 1991; Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017; Min, Anderson & Minge, 2017; Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, Drouin, 2008). These opinions are important because such stakeholders can aid in determining the success of the full service community school initiative in the district. In addition, an understanding of the needs of these professionals

can aid in improving their experience working in full service community schools.

Understanding the roles of these key stakeholders may also be important for districts

beginning the initiative, both to outline roles and to learn from others' lessons.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The current study examined school psychologists', principals', and teachers' attitudes towards the full service community school initiative. It examined different aspects of the initiative and the school's changes as a result of the implementation. The purpose of this study was to understand what key participants in full service community schools think of the initiative and how they are involved in implementing it. This inquiry is based on previous studies that identified principals, school psychologists, and teachers as key participants or leaders in FSCS, but did not explore their attitudes or specific roles (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Valli, Stefanski & Jacobson, 2016). This information is important in understanding how a full service community school operates, and in improving the experiences of professionals in the initiative. The following research questions were addressed:

What are key stakeholders' roles in full service community schools?

What are stakeholders' attitudes and perceptions of the FSCS initiative?

Research Design

An in-depth qualitative analysis about the full service community school initiative was conducted to examine the attitudes and roles of full service community school participants. The qualitative study design was used because no literature to date has

reported on the perceptions of principals, school psychologists, or teachers in full service community schools. Although they have been described as important, studies do not demonstrate why or how they are important. This study is intended to fill that research gap. The constant comparative method was used to arrive at a grounded theory, meaning that data were consistently compared and coded for themes until a theory emerged from the data (Barney & Glaser, 2008). Interviews were conducted and transcripts were evaluated for emerging themes (Mertens, 2015). This study attempted to find a broad explanation for the roles of stakeholders in FSCS, and did not rely upon previous studies to outline the description of these roles (Miller, Salkind, Creswell & Maietta, 2003). Given that school employees are instrumental in both the implementation of and the outcomes for full service community schools, it was important to hear from these stakeholders in order to expand, continue, and improve FSCS.

Participants and Setting

      Settings. Convenience sampling was used, so only FSCS within Ohio were studied. The researcher found these school districts by searching the Coalition for Community Schools website for registered FSCS or through searching the web for FSCS in Ohio. The researcher obtained school district permission to conduct interviews about full service community schools on school property (see permission form Appendix A). This permission was sought by contacting full service community school coordinators to inquire about who can officially give this permission. School district officials were contacted by email and follow up phone calls were conducted, when needed. Three different FSCS districts were used, including Greenfield Public Schools (GPS;

pseudonym), Sierra Public Schools (SPS; pseudonym), and Pine Valley Public Schools (PPS; pseudonym).

GPS. "GPS" is an urban district with a 100% economic disadvantage level and 13,000 students. This district is made up of 83% African American students, 5% multiracial, 5% Hispanic, and 10% white students. 13.1% of students are identified as students with disabilities. 13% of students in the district stayed for less than a year (mobility rate).

GPS has been implementing the FSCS for eight years and gathered twenty community partners. GPS is currently going through a redistribution of staff and buildings, which impacts the way the strategy is implemented and understood. Their partners and services include the local university, United Way, mental health services, urban services, and various health partnerships. This school implements the full service community school model.

SPS. "SPS" is an urban district that has a 99.9% economic disadvantage level and 6,000 students. The district is made up of 58% white students, 18% African American students, 12% Hispanic, and 12% multiracial. 18.6% of students are identified as students with disabilities. 18% of students in the district stayed for less than a year (mobility rate).

SPS recently began implementing the FSCS initiative, and has been doing so for one year. They currently have twelve community partners and intend to continue growing their partnerships within the community. This school is in the beginning stages of implementation, and they are working to create a sustainable initiative. This school has begun by implementing the full service school model, with the goal of beginning the community outreach portion within the next year.

PPS. **"**PPS" is an urban district that has an economic disadvantage level of 88% and 23,000 students. The district is made up of 45% African American students, 35% white students, 10% Hispanic students, and 9% multiracial students. 21% of students are identified as students with disabilities. 15% of students in the district stayed for less than a year (mobility rate).

PPS has been implementing the FSCS initiative for six years and has nine main community partners that they currently work with. The school has been steadily growing and implementing the full service community school version of this model.

After obtaining district permission and, subsequently, IRB approval, the researcher emailed the principals and school psychologists in several schools in the district asking for voluntary participation. When a principal and school psychologist agreed to participate, the researcher asked them for a referral to a teacher to interview. Interviews were scheduled at the participants' convenience. Participants were interviewed in their school building.

Participants. Participants were recruited after district permission was obtained by the researcher to conduct interviews about full service community schools (See permission form in Appendix A). The plan was to conduct interviews with three people in each district who are currently a part of the FSCS: a principal, school psychologist, and teacher. Potential participants were contacted if they currently work in a FSCS. The researcher emailed or called multiple potential participants in each school district and utilized the first participants to respond. The researcher used a follow-up email to schedule specific times to interview participants, and then obtained individual, voluntary consent by having participants sign a form indicating that they agree to interview prior to

starting the interview (See Appendix B). Participants were compensated with lunch or coffee for their time.

Individual Participants

      Marie. "Marie" is a school psychologist at GPS. She has been at her current building implementing the FSCS initiative for ten years, and has been a school psychologist for thirty years. Marie has known about the initiative from the beginning, but does not always get to be directly involved.

      Tara. "Tara" is a first grade teacher at GPS. She has been a teacher and in her current building for ten years. Tara has been a part of the initiative for its entirety and sees her main role as being the link between students, parents, and the needed resources that the school offers.

      Kelly. "Kelly" is a principal at SPS. She has been in the district for twelve years, the past two of which she has been the principal. She was previously an assistant principal. When she became principal, the district had already been implementing the initiative for three years. Kelly finds that her role often includes facilitating community involvement and helping the liaison make connections in her building.

      Kylie. "Kylie" is a high school English teacher at SPS. She has been a teacher for nineteen years, and has been at her current school for nine years. Kylie identified her role as referring students to the services and as a middleman between the services offered and the everyday needs of students.

      Rick. "Rick" is a school psychologist at SPS. He has been a school psychologist and in the building for one year. The initiative began when he started working at the

23

school. He identified his role as helping to facilitate events, such as family nights, emphasizing that he had to take an active role himself to be involved.

Megan. "Megan" is a principal at PPS. She has been the principal at this building for three years, and was also the assistant principal prior to her current position. Megan's district had already been implementing the FSCS initiative for three years when she began working there. She identified her role as working with the community hub director to design programming and make sure it addresses the whole child wellness initiative.

Mackenzie. "Mackenzie" is a school psychologist at PPS. She has been a school psychologist for eleven years in the district, but has only been at one of the main buildings implementing the initiative for two years. She identified her role as meeting with a team that includes community hub staff and school faculty to solve student issues or to place students on the community hub caseload.

Taylor. "Taylor" is a middle school English teacher at PPS. She has been a teacher and in the building for seven years. The district started implementing the initiative after her first year of teaching. She identified her role as being part of the hub team to help with decision making and to move the strategy forward.

Materials

Interview Protocol. A semi-structured interview protocol designed by the researcher, based on gaps in previous research, was used to interview the 8 participants (See Appendix C). The protocol included questions regarding participants' views on FSCS and their role in the schools. Follow-up questions were provided as necessary and were included as a prompt for the interviewer.

Due to the small sample of FSCS available in Ohio, these questions were piloted with two school psychologists from schools not currently implementing the full service community school initiative. Questions and the interview protocol were changed according to participant feedback.

Procedures

IRB Approval. District consent was obtained and included as part of the IRB application. The researcher then gained approval from the University of Dayton's Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to contacting individual participants. Upon receiving approval, the researcher contacted potential participants in each district by email to obtain volunteers for the study. Contacts were made by email or phone, and follow-up emails were used to schedule the interviews.

Data collection. To collect data, qualitative semi-structured interviews with each participant were recorded using a digital recorder. This type of interview was selected because the three FSCS have different features, which can only be fully explored with the ability to ask follow-up questions. Interviews examined the views and roles of participants in full service community schools. Each interview lasted between twenty-five and forty minutes. Participants were given a pseudonym in order to keep their personal identity private. All recordings and transcriptions were stored under the pseudonym in a password protected folder in order to ensure that interviewees cannot be identified by files. School districts were also given pseudonyms so that the location of the study cannot be determined.

Transcription. Interviews were transcribed by the researcher (see Appendix F). A transcription convention sheet was used (Appendix D). No identifying information was

used during the interview, in storage, in the transcription, or in the thesis. All participants were given pseudonyms for use in all documents to protect their identity. The accuracy of this transcription was checked by a peer who was also in the school psychology program. For the purposes of this project, transcriptions embedded in the paper have been scrubbed of all vocal fillers to facilitate clarity and understanding.

Data Analyses

Transcriptions were analyzed and coded for underlying themes. As patterns emerged, the researcher looked for themes and edited these themes based on fellow peer feedback. This study followed a grounded theory protocol to develop an understanding of stakeholder roles in FSCS, so these codes were not predetermined and were only identified after an in-depth analysis of the qualitative data. Grounded theory is an inductive qualitative method in which the researcher uses a series of planned strategies in order to develop an understanding of a model (Miller, Salkind, Creswell & Maietta, 2003; Mertens, 2015). All themes emerged from patterns in the interviews.

When considering codes, the researcher looked at multiple coding schemes that evolved from interview data that may fit to code the data. Each coding scheme was examined for clarity and comprehension. A fellow school psychology student peer confirmed codes and themes after independently coding 20% of the data to ensure credibility and consistency of the data with 94% agreement. The researcher kept evidence of coding procedures and transcriptions to address confirmability.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Research Question 1*: What are key stakeholders' roles in full service community schools?*

Three major themes regarding stakeholders' roles in full service community schools emerged from the data: (1) facilitation and collaboration with the 'hub', (2) hub team cooperation, and (3) role satisfaction.

Facilitation and collaboration. Several participants identified their main role as facilitating the FSCS initiative and collaborating with others to facilitate the initiative appropriately.

Mackenzie, a school psychologist from PVS, reflected on her collaboration with the hub team to facilitate better services for students:

Initially the only interaction I would have with the community hub staff was really if it was a student that they were working with and there was an issue with that student or we had a meeting with the parent, um things like that. But now it is a bit different...So weekly meet and talk about students who are having the most behavior and disciplinary issues and how we can help them. So we look for intervention ideas, mentoring ideas, things like that and if it's a student on their caseload, then the community hub partners can be part of those meetings...There are more opportunities now with the weekly meetings for me to be able to collaborate and help with more consultation and more intervention.

27

Mackenzie's meetings with people on the hub team allow her to be more involved with the initiative. This collaboration is an integral part of the school psychology role, and can be easily translated to the initiative to allow for more effective teamwork.

Similarly, Tara, a teacher from GPS, indicated her role in facilitating the strategy and collaborating with parents:

> One of the big things is family night, I've always been a big part of the literacy themed family night...I have kind of a support role like you know I help with the family nights that type of stuff...like I'm kind of a first stop for parents so when they come to me with an issue or I see an issue I'm the one that's then able to like pass their name along or like refer them.

Although Tara sees her role as a support role, her collaboration with families allows them to get connected to the initiative and the resources provided through it. Kelly, a principal at SPS, also indicated that she facilitates the initiative within the school by finding spaces for hub members to work.

> I facilitate a lot through the school with our success liaison who does a lot of our community [outreach]. We do include our community in some events that we have here in the school so some of those things I facilitate and some are teams that I have within my building...I don't have to be involved in their group's work but we do have several ways where we are reaching out to them...So our success liaison will come into our building, I facilitate space for her to meet parents, or meet with anyone in the community that she is working with. we also facilitate things or I facilitate for her.

Kelly's help allows outside providers to feel more welcome in the building, and facilitates positive and collaborative relations between the school and agencies participating in the initiative. Kylie, a teacher at SPS, echoed these thoughts, indicating that she facilitates student connection to the hub team, stating that, "As far as the community initiative, being a teacher, I'm going to be somebody who...um refers them to different aspects of what we have available...I model positivity with them in terms of we have this to offer it's exciting."

By referring students to the initiative, Kylie helps facilitate the connection of individuals to services, and may be the first person to introduce students and families to the services they need. Rick, a school psychologist at SPS, indicated that he volunteers and helps facilitate family events as part of his role, indicating, "So far I've volunteered at those [Pack Nights] walking through those areas and working with families." Marie, a school psychologist at GPS, also indicated that she volunteers as part of her role to help facilitate events called 'Family Nights': "I try to participate at least twice a year [in family nights]." Both Rick and Marie help put on events and facilitate connections of families to the schools and district. This collaboration can both introduce the initiative and facilitate family connection to the initiative.

Hub team cooperation. When considering their roles in the full service community school initiative, several participants identified their role as actively participating in the initiative and working with the hub team directly. The hub team is a team directly created to further the FSCS initiative. This team essentially runs the integration of services to a central location, and also meets to discuss furthering the initiative. These educators found themselves at the forefront of their district's initiative.

Megan, the principal at PVS, indicated that she works closely with the hub director to help create new aspects of the initiative and take ownership of it for her school:

> I work with the community hub director and we work side by side to make sure that programming is natural for the students as far as their whole child wellness their health their academic their...out of school time is all supported as well as supports for the families and that our community as a whole...We talk about it-what kind of things we want to run what kind of event we want to see and then how can the school do something to help them.

Similarly, Taylor, a teacher at PVS, indicated that she was a key part of the initiative as part of the 'hub team' her district created to further the initiative. She also took a leading role in a specific part of the initiative:

> [I am] a member of the hub team and I work very closely with our principal our hub director, our social worker, our counselor, and parents- anybody on the hub team to help to decision making and to move the strategy forward together...I oversee home visits which is a parent intervention where we go to the homes and visit with parents.

Role satisfaction. When asked to reflect on their roles, the majority of participants expressed satisfaction with their current role in the initiative. When asked if she liked her role, Mackenzie, the school psychologist at PVS, indicated: "I do! I think it's been really nice this year to be able to be part of the intervention mentorship piece of it." Tara, a teacher at GPS, indicated that she enjoyed having a role that was not a direct part of the initiative, but was supporting the initiative well: "I'm happy with a balance

[between big and small role]. Like I know where to go for the resources about my students that we wouldn't have some of these resources without the neighborhood- without being a neighborhood school center." Rick, a school psychologist at SPS, shared that although he did not have a big role, he was happy with the role he had found for himself: "For right now I'm where I'm at with it I've really enjoyed working with the families." Taylor, a teacher at PVS indicated her excitement in being part of the hub team: "I love my role in that and we were actually talking about ways to include more families, families returning, so I'm looking forward to the future."

Overall, participants classified their roles as one of facilitating and collaborating or as working directly with the hub team. Participants who classified their role as working directly with the hub team described their role as more directly related to the initiative. Those who indicated that they facilitated and collaborated as part of the strategy described themselves more as supporting the initiative as needed without direct and concrete involvement. The majority of participants expressed role satisfaction, regardless of which role they took on.

Research Question 2: *What are stakeholders' attitudes and perceptions of the FSCS initiative?*

Four major themes regarding stakeholders' attitudes and perceptions of FSCS emerged from the data: (1) school personnel support, (2) positive impact on students by meeting basic needs, (3) implementation complexity, and (4) personal investment.

School personnel support. When considering their perceptions on FSCS, several participants emphasized that the initiative helped them in their typical primary roles and gave them resources that they needed for kids. Overall, they expressed that it helped them

solve issues that were outside the scope of their professional role but impacted their classroom. This aid both helped students and staff, essentially solving issues with students that were outside of staff scope of practice.

Megan, a principal at PVS, indicated that she had previously had difficulty finding services for her students before the initiative, but the FSCS initiative resolved this difficulty:

> A lot of times [we would] see that we need things but don't have that person to help plug it in to help it move and go forward. Especially with our teachers are already teaching, they can't help with the mental health piece, they can't help with the physical piece.

Mackenzie, a school psychologist from PVS indicated that the initiative helped relieve some of her duties that she could not fulfill in her typical job:

> Even though we [school psychologists] all like the mental health piece, I don't think we get time to do it so we need more support services to be able to help us...You can never have too much support. You can never have you know enough help with mental health services and behavior and discipline and I mean the more we can collaborate with outside agencies great. The more we can get into our schools to mentor kids that's great because you know not every kid is going to click with one person that's already in the building. Maybe someone coming from an outside agency doing mentoring is going to be more helpful to them so. I really like the mentoring piece that they are doing.

Rick, a school psychologist at SPS spoke about previous difficulties teachers were facing when attempting to educate students who did not have their basic needs met. He indicated: "[We are using the FSCS initiative] to improve the teachers' ability to teach and you know

just to make sure that we're helping the students the best way we can...we are getting more and more parents involved." Kylie, a teacher at SPS, indicated that her ability to teach the curriculum was improved when students' basic needs were met:

> I'm not having as many blowups in my classroom or meltdowns or whatever with students because they're having talk therapy...I can teach them about English I don't have to teach them about life...remove the need to worry about necessities...I've been teaching for almost 20 years and just like in the middle of the situation in my teaching career there was nowhere for these people to...I have a way to help them. So as an educator it actually gives me reassurance and it gives me more gratitude.

Participants showed a greater ability to fulfill their traditional roles as teachers without the added task of helping students deal with unmet physical and emotional basic needs, such as lack of security, safety, and healthcare. These deficiencies often played out in the classroom, causing educators to have to address these needs before doing their job as formally defined (i.e. teaching curriculum and classroom management).

Positive impact on students by meeting basic needs. When considering their perceptions on FSCS, the majority of participants remarked about how the initiative was good for kids and improved their well-being. In general, participants indicated that students benefited from the initiative and that it was important and beneficial to them to have their basic needs met through the school. This included social capital, health, physical, and psychological help through the school.

Taylor, a teacher at PVS indicated that, "we can build community and we can build kids." She also indicated the positive impact it has had on the students in her building:

This year especially we've seen I think 70% drop in suspensions and referrals which

is outstanding for us and they have a place to go when they finish class and

attendance is up this year...We've seen the inclusion of food pantry come in. It's

just been this almost explosion in the last year or two years of this strategy really

coming together...We want our kids to be ready for the world. We want to see this

community built up, we want to see parents and students and everyone empowered

to embrace their community.

Tara, a teacher at GPS, indicated that the initiative benefitted the atmosphere in her school

and community, thus improving social capital: "It brings everyone together like you're a

close knit community, close knit family. You're going to have more parents support."

Kelly, a principal at SPS, indicated: "More students [are] getting their needs met...getting

things they need quicker...students are getting glasses when they need them and not having

to wait." Marie, a school psychologist at GPS indicated that the community hub:

is like an extension of home for lots of kids We have kids that don't want to go

home at the end of the day...Like I said the building never closes...parents are very

comfortable...Parents really, like 90% of the time show up.

This extension of home and the addition of community provide social capital that is both

needed and necessary for students who experience deficiencies in basic needs and lack of

positive social networks. Megan, the principal at PVS indicated that the initiative brought

multiple positive impacts with students and parents:

You know if we have our parents well taken care of then our kids are going to be

served better...We're not losing kids as fast as we used to...I'd like to say we've

seen academic growth, however we've gotten different testing routine...We do see

improvements in math...students who stay after school versus the students who don't stay after school so we just see growth in that piece there.

These benefits come together to improve student experience inside of school and outside of school. The school brings resources and support that were previously unavailable to students, thus addressing educational inequality and allowing positive outcomes.

Implementation complexity. When considering their perceptions on FSCS, many participants mentioned the difficulty getting buy-in on all levels. The vast amount of resources available requires additional funds, resources, and high levels of participation and planning. Combined, these complex needs make the initiative difficult to implement and make it complex to begin and sustain.

Mackenzie, the school psychologist at PVS, indicated the difficulties they have with buy-in on the parent level:

> I mean, parents seem a little bit torn. So sometimes you'll get parents that absolutely love the agency that is in the building and they build a great rapport with them and they wanna have their student meet with them and they want to meet with them and they have great support for them which is wonderful but then other times there could be an issue where the student has already been going to counseling and getting services from a different outside provider so then they come in the building and they don't necessarily want to switch over to the one that's in the building that can sometimes can be an issue or the personalities just don't match.

Mackenzie also mentioned difficulty including hub staff while simultaneously maintaining confidentiality:

From what I've seen, [it is] kind of a balancing act. You wanna be welcoming to the outside community agencies coming in and give them a space and make them feel like they're part of your building. But you also have to be really careful with the confidentiality piece...The confidentiality piece is very big so its sometimes hard because you don't want them to feel like you're kicking them out of the meeting so making them feel welcome but also making sure you can maintain that school confidentiality too.

Mackenzie also spoke about some difficulties she had experienced the previous year serving a hub building that did not operate as cohesively as her current building:

The one that I had last year as a community hub, it didn't seem to work as smoothly as the building I have this year...Last year a lot of the teachers were frustrated with the amount of time that students were out of the classroom or were going down there when they didn't actually know if they needed to and they just were taking advantage of the situation. there were I know...teachers in that building that felt like it was more of a babysitting service for students that weren't doing what they were supposed to be, so it wasn't going very smoothly there but I don't think the communication was as good among everyone that building as much as everyone I have here. I think there is a lot more communication open channels you know, I think that is really important because if everybody is not communicating then it becomes very frustrating. It was very frustrating for the teachers...I know there were some concerns among teachers initially of what background and education those from the community agency have had and that's still somewhat of a concern from what I understand in some buildings that they want to know like their credentials.

Taylor, a teacher at PVS, indicated the difficulty with community buy-in:

> [We] really need a little more community buy-in….We're building that partnership so every little building block we put out there the reception- the views that they have about this and our kids mindset and the discussions that they have about the community are shaped...The biggest thing is you have to have buy-in from all parties. You know not just the district, not just the teachers, not just the parents and the kids but you need that community piece. You need city buy-in. For a hub to work they have to value the education of the kids and I think many schools doing this have to keep that in mind.

Marie, a school psychologist at GPS, also indicated some frustration with the district coming in to make the initiative similar between all buildings, as well as the staff turnover rate still being high:

> The district has taken control...with that comes increased frustration, increased anger in staff, less services...But what happens is a lot of teachers have left and the school has started to morph into more of a district building over 10 years... So pretty soon people are not taking ownership of the kids, they don't want to deal with some of them.

Finally, Taylor, a teacher at PVS, indicated that you should, "Think about how much work they're willing to put in because it is a lot of work...On the front end of it you're required to put in a lot of time."

The multiple demands that this strategy can place on school personnel and parental participation can make it difficult for people to buy in. It can also create a need for more district control and for additional work from staff that is outside the scope of their typical

job description. These requirements make implementing such an initiative difficult, and creates layers of complexity as a strategy.

Personal investment. When considering their perceptions on FSCS, several participants mentioned that you have to take personal initiative to really see results. Marie, a school psychologist at GPS, indicated: "I think you need to see what resources are and contact those resources to see how they can fit into a program. You have to know where your funding is coming from." Megan, a principal at PVS, indicated that you [an educator] need to be 'growing constantly with the strategy.' This requires both research and flexibility within the classroom and in the implementation of the strategy. Mackenzie, a school psychologist at PVS indicated that you need to come together in order for the initiative to work at all: "I think as long as you have people from both sides that are willing to you know come together and collaborate and be welcoming of each others' experience and insight like anything I think you'll do well." This relates to the reasoning behind the majority of educators identifying their role in the initiative as facilitation and collaboration. Tara, at teacher at GPS indicated that you need to find information about the initiative that could benefit your students:

> I think as far as teachers go they need to like seek out the resourcing, need to
> know who to go to, what kind of resources are available, that type of thing you
> know because if you don't know, then you can't figure it out you know. And
> you've gotta ask, you've gotta be open to just like asking and really the kind of
> maybe even a little bit of research because it your school doesn't have it, where
> can we get this?

Kelly, the principal at SPS, indicated that you need to educate yourself about the initiative:

> Advice for a principal would just be getting all of the information that you can and just be as creative as you can to get the information out to your community. that's the biggest thing is educating your community so that way they are comfortable.

Kylie, a teacher at SPS, indicated that you need to know the resources and use them: "You know to utilize the services to use them...but basically just embrace it with positivity because you know your goal is to teach students and this will allow students to be, you know, in a better mental space."

The consistent research, professional development, and seeking new and updated strategies require additional work on the part of educators. This development is in addition to their typical role, making it demanding to keep up with. Educators must buy into the initiative in order to take such initiative, and must translate this buy in to action. Participants found that their efforts have been beneficial to them.

Research questions one and two both provide insight into the role of stakeholders in FSCS initiatives as well as participant feelings on the initiative as a whole. Participants interacted with the initiative either indirectly through facilitation and collaboration or directly as members of the hub team. Regardless of their defined role, the majority of participants classified their feelings on their role as satisfied. In regards to their feelings about the initiative, participants found that it both helped alleviate undefined tasks that were often added to their role and also helped improve student actions. Participants found

the initiative to be complex to implement, but worth doing so. Although many classified

the work as taxing up front, participants indicated that the outcomes were desirable.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Review of Purpose and Major Findings

Principals, school psychologists, and teachers are essential to everyday school function and to how a FSCS functions. Previous studies have identified these positions as key FSCS participants, but have not explored their attitudes or specific roles (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Valli, Stefanski & Jacobson, 2016). This information is necessary in improving the experiences of professionals in the initiative and in the functioning of the FSCS initiative itself.

This present study sought to explore the roles that these key stakeholders take in the initiative as well as to understand how they feel about these roles and the FSCS initiative. This study was conducted using a qualitative approach in order to deeply understand participants' views. Seven themes related to the research questions emerged from the research: (1) facilitation and collaboration, (2) hub team cooperation, (3) role satisfaction, (4) school personnel support, (5) positive outcomes, (6) implementation complexity, and (7) personal investment.

Interpretation of Findings Relative to Predictions

Facilitation and collaboration. The participants in this study described a variety of experiences with the FSCS initiative. The majority of participants indicated that they

worked to further the strategy by collaborating with the FSCS initiative employees, and with facilitating connections to the services available. Members also found it important to participate in activities that promote collaboration with families, with a number of members mentioning participating in family nights to promote collaboration and facilitate parent and FSCS connection.

Participants mentioned that they were often the ones who connected a student or family to FSCS services within their building. Teachers specifically mentioned that they connect students to services, as they are the first to see an issue. Teachers also have the most direct relationship with students, presenting an opportunity for them to see a need and approach it with a student. School psychologists specifically mentioned participating in activities where the parents come into the school to promote parent involvement. One school psychologist also mentioned referring students to FSCS services. A principal specifically mentioned facilitating the use of space in the building and collaborating with FSCS initiative to help families reach them.

This view echoes the research on FSCS, which indicates that it is important to collaborate with families, with the FSCS team, and with fellow educators to further the initiative. Collaboration is an integral part of the success of the initiative and the buy-in that students, parents and educators find in the initiative (Blank, Jacobson & Melaville, 2012; Blank, 2015; Dryfoos, 1991; Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, Drouin, 2008).

Hub team cooperation. Although the majority of participants in the study described their role as supplementary, two participants were members of a 'hub team' that met to further the initiative. These participants, from the same district, both described meeting with the team. This district has been implementing the initiative for multiple

years, and has created the hub team to further promote the initiative. It is the only district that had a hub team specifically designed for this purpose. The principal specifically described working with a community hub director to implement programs that fit with her school. The teacher specifically mentioned aiding in decision making and furthering the FSCS initiative.

This view demonstrates the need that Blank (2015) as well as Trepanier, Pare, Petrakos, and Drouin (2008) brought up, of building and maintaining leadership in FSCS. Without a team to support the initiative, it could not grow. And because growth is necessary to the success of this initiative, it is also necessary to have a team to both monitor and to promote this growth (Trepanier et al., 2008).

Role satisfaction. Overall, participants in this study described being satisfied with how their role with the FSCS initiative was. Participants indicated that they appreciated the position they were in and how the FSCS initiative contributed to and fit with that position. Teachers and school psychologists specifically mentioned being happy with their role in the initiative.

Principals did not indicate explicitly that they were satisfied with their role, with one principal stating that, "We're still feeling our way and learning the process ourselves that I don't think I'm equipped to necessarily have a larger role." Participants in other positions agreed, had a FSCS coordinator in a position to run the initiative, individual schools in the study relied on the principal to facilitate the initiative in their own schools. Previous research suggests that having individual school coordinators in addition to the leadership provided by the school principal is necessary and helpful to the initiative (Galindo, Sanders & Abel, 2017; Min, Anderson & Minge, 2017; Trepanier, Pare,

Petrakos, Drouin, 2008). The lack of this additional team member could contribute to role overload for principals who already have a large role in the school. Schools who had high principal turnover indicated more stress regarding the initiative. Adding an additional role of leading and promoting the FSCS in their individual school could contribute to the lack of positive feelings about their roles or the FSCS initiative in general. In addition, it is important to note that in the FSCS model, Valli, Stefanski, and Jacobson (2018) recommend training for the leadership position of creating a democratic system of running the school- something that the majority of participants in the study were lacking. Principals came into the role simply by their position title.

Role satisfaction is important when considering the plausibility of FSCS. Staff buy-in and willingness to do additional work are important in the initiative. Without the support of staff or their willingness to continue their expanded role, the FSCS initiative would be difficult to operate. Teachers, school psychologists, and principals are an integral part of the initiative.

School personnel support. Participants in this study indicated that the FSCS initiative is helpful to them in their traditional roles. They mentioned that it gives them a place to go to help kids, when they previously had no way to help them. The availability of this support helps make the initiative reasonable. Although it requires additional time and effort for educators, it helps alleviate other issues faced in the classroom.

Multiple members also mentioned that the additional mental health piece was helpful to them. For school psychologists, having additional mental health services for kids and families was helpful because they do not always have time to work with the extensive mental health needs of their building. Teachers mentioned additional mental

health services as helpful because such services prevented difficulties in the classroom and took the burden of worrying about a child's mental health off of them. FSCS have been shown to have positive effects on student outcomes, such as better achievement, less risk-taking behavior, and increased resilience (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Trepanier et al., 2008). These benefits may be evident directly in the classroom, and as a result lessens the load that teachers and school psychologists have in helping their students.

Positive outcomes. Many participants mentioned the positive outcomes that were seen as a result of implementing the initiative. They mentioned better behavior, parent support, a closer community, and less transiency. These benefits have been shown to occur as a result of the initiative in various schools and studies (Heers, Van Klaveren, Groot, Maassen van den Brink, 2016; Houser, 2016; Sanders, 2016). Overall five out of eight participants explicitly mentioned that the strategy was having a positive impact on their schools as a whole.

Participants mentioned the positive benefits of helping students meet their needs quickly. They also mentioned empowering their students' parents and community and creating a supportive environment for students. Participants in the present study described the initiative as meeting students' basic needs. This confirms the major goal of the initiative, as outlined by both Biag and Castrechini, (2016) and Voyles, (2012). Finally, multiple participants mentioned additional parent participation as one benefit of the initiative. A number of previous studies also showed this result. Parent participation has been shown to increase student attendance and resilience (Biag & Castrechini, 2016; Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Trepanier, 2008). This parent participation is also an

indication of increased social capital, which expands resources for families and benefits

school success further (Chen, Anderson & Watkins, 2016; Green, 2018). These positive

outcomes increase the importance and reasonability of FSCS.

Implementation complexity. Four participants indicated that the initiative had

some aspects that were implementation complexity. Participants specifically mentioned

that parent and community buy-in is difficult to obtain, and many felt that there were not

enough effective programs in place to increase this buy-in. In addition, the initiative can

bring about information security and confidentiality concerns, when referring students to

services while maintaining appropriate confidentiality. Addressing these concerns while

simultaneously trying to help FSCS employees can be difficult to manage. The

complexity faced by educators in implementing this can make it difficult to reasonably

continue growing these efforts.

Participants mentioned that it can be frustrating when students are not in class

because they are at a FSCS service. As they are not counted absent, this can present

logistical problems for teachers. Participants also mentioned that the initiative takes a lot

of work and takes logistical thought. School employees are often overwhelmed, and this

can present difficulties by adding things to their work load. These logistical issues are

known issues in FSCS, which are often related to organization and making services work

together effectively (Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2016).

This initiative can also bring about more district control, meaning less staff

autonomy and more regulations. Each school studied treated the initiative as a district

systems change project, and therefore each building did not have a lot of autonomy

regarding the initiative. Although each building has their own services, they all run the

initiative in a similar manner and receive services from FSCS employees that are hired and provide services at the district level.

Personal investment. Finally, participants mentioned that it is important to research the strategy within one's district and understand what is available. They stated that one needs to collaborate and find the resources that are available to them in order to fully utilize the FSCS initiative. One teacher recalled watching a five minute presentation on the initiative before it was implemented, and thinking that they just had some after school classes available. Had she not done her own research, she could not have connected students to the initiative that could meet their basic needs. In addition, many participants had input into what their roles were, with the exception of principals. Participants who worked on the hub team had volunteered to do so, while participants who facilitated events had also volunteered to do so to grow the initiative. Teachers spoke about referring students and parents to services, a task which requires knowledge about the vast array of services available to them. Staff members collaborated and coordinated with other staff members in order to further the initiative and take a role in ensuring its success (Sanders, 2018; Trapanier, Pare, Petrakos, Drouin, 2008). The FSCS initiative is often found to be reliant on individual involvement and time.

Due to this, districts may benefit from spending more time facilitating buy-in from staff, and to help staff combine it with their typical roles. They may also benefit from giving principals additional training on the initiative, as they are often given a leadership role as a result of their title alone. Professional development and careful presentation of the initiative may create an atmosphere that allows the initiative to enter into the typical school mold.

The vast amount of personal investment required for the initiative effectively makes it more difficult to appropriately execute. FSCS rely on individual and district support to function, making it necessary to obtain staff buy-in before attempting to fully implement the initiative.

Plausibility

Most participants in this study indicated positive feelings regarding the FSCS initiative and their role within it. Participants also indicated that the initiative helps them do their jobs more effectively by fulfilling the basic needs of their students. Overall, participants found the initiative to be positive and helpful for their students.

Despite the positive effects and feelings towards the initiative, participants also indicated that there were many hurdles associated with implementing the initiative, including but not limited to increased staff workload, confidentiality concerns, and the need for staff to obtain information on their own.

Participants repeatedly mentioned the need to seek out their own information in order to implement their part of the initiative. Their roles in general were both unclear and came about in a generally informal manner. Participants either educated themselves on the initiative or created their own roles where they saw fit. This made the initiative both more difficult to implement, and created unclear understandings of the initiative among participants.

Overall, participants found the initiative to be difficult to implement, yet worth the additional work. Beginning and sustaining such an initiative required both persistence and consistent participation and buy-in from staff. However, participants classified the initiative as effective for the students and parents, and therefore important to continue.

The positive effects of the FSCS initiative aided in leading participants to role satisfaction and to desiring to continue to participate in it in their schools. Although difficult, the implementation of the initiative is both plausible and effective according to participant views.

Implications for School Districts

FSCS are understood to be an effective way to aide in alleviating student difficulties that stem from poverty and the lack of basic needs being met. Participants mentioned that this initiative decreases suspensions and discipline referrals, increases attendance, increase social family support, increases parental participation in school meetings, improvements in math, and overall improvement in student mental and physical well-being. The initiative improved staff experience with students on a daily basis as a result of the positive effects experienced by the students. Teachers experienced less behavior issues in their classroom. They felt less of a need to take on the task of helping students meet their basic needs and did not need to alleviate the lack of basic needs in the classroom. The initiative allowed students to learn, and for teachers to fulfill their primary role more effectively with less interference from outside issues kids often experience. Participants indicated that it gave them a support system that they did not previously have. It gave them a way to alleviate issues in their classroom and to have more time to teach. School psychologists also indicated that the addition of outside agencies, specifically in the area of mental health, allowed their role to be more focused on their original contract work. Overall, it alleviated the need for school personnel to worry about meeting students basic needs, and created a way for educators to more fully embrace their defined contract roles.

Given the vast array of services that are provided, the initiative takes effort on the part of all staff, including facilitation and collaboration and cooperation with outside businesses. It also requires knowledge of services and how to most effectively connect students to these services. A more formal and detailed introduction to the FSCS initiative upon hiring or upon the start of this initiative may be beneficial in defining staff roles and in connecting staff to knowledge about resources. Many participants in this study indicated that one must do their own research on the initiative and often designed their own role. More thoroughly and thoughtfully outlining how the initiative may affect these roles would be helpful to staff and helpful in expanding the initiative.

Staff may also benefit from continuing professional development regarding the FSCS initiative. As the initiative continues to grow and change, staff roles may evolve. It is important that staff be made aware of changes taking place, and to grow with the initiative. It may also be helpful to include presentations on how this is helpful to staff in alleviating everyday issues within their role. By showing this to staff, buy-in and participation may increase accordingly.

Limitations

Limitations to this study included that the study only explored the in-depth opinions of eight participants in the initiative. Due to the nature of collecting detailed data from a small proportion of full service community schools, participant answers may not represent the attitudes of the group of individuals in their positions. In addition, FSCS differ on many factors by each individual school, thus limiting the generalizability to other FSCS. Furthermore, only full service community schools in Ohio were studied, thus limiting the generalizability to other states. The current study also only included three key

stakeholders in full service community schools (principals, school psychologists, and school nurses) and did not explore the views of other participants.

This study includes self-reported data, which is common among interview-based studies given the subjectivity of the questions being asked. Although participants may have said one thing, their perception may not be an accurate measure. Due to this, not all participant opinions can be considered reliable.

Self-selection and participant bias may also be evident, given that those who chose to participate may be more inclined to have strong opinions on the initiative. In addition, only one school out of each district was examined, meaning that other schools and participants in each district could have different, unexamined opinions.

Finally, all schools studied had been implementing the initiative for less than 10 years. Because systems change initiative time to show results, this amount of time may not be long enough to get a full picture of what the initiative could do. One school had been implementing the initiative for only one year, which also makes it difficult for staff members to know the full extent of their roles in the initiative as it grows.

Implications for Future Research

Future research might examine formal methods of facilitating the connections between parents and students and the FSCS initiative. Knowledge regarding the referral process and everyday practices within the school would be helpful in understanding the full scope of tasks participants may face. Additionally, it may be beneficial to look at how districts can present the initiative to staff members and how they can make them aware of available resources more effectively through professional development

initiatives. Future research may also benefit from looking at a broader sample of participants to include parents and students who are part of the initiative.

Conclusion

This study provides insight into the roles and attitudes of key stakeholders in the FSCS initiative. This research is important in improving the experiences of employees in these schools in order to make the initiative more acceptable to school personnel. This study can also raise awareness about FSCS to help others get an inside look at what the initiative can do for students.

REFERENCES

Ahmadi, P. (2015). Serving the underserved. *Leadership, 44(*4), 20-22.

Barney G. Glaser, P. (2008). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Grounded Theory Review: An International Journal, 7*(3).

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.

Blank, M., Jacobson, R., Melaville, A. (2012). *Achieving results through community school partnerships.* Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools, Institute for Educational Leadership.

Blank, M.J., Melaville, A., & Shah, B.P. (2003). *Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools.* Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools.

Blank, M. J. (2015). Building sustainable health and education partnerships: Stories from local communities. *Journal of School Health, 85*(11), 810-816. doi:10.1111/josh.12311

Castrechini, S. (2011). Service synergy: *Examining the cumulative effects of community school services.* Stanford, CA: John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities, Stanford University.

Castrechini, S., & London, R.A. (2012). Positive student outcomes in community

schools. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from

https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-

12/reports/2012/02/22/11098/positive-student-outcomes-in-community-schools/

Chen, M., Anderson, J. A., & Watkins, L. (2016). Parent perceptions of connectedness in

a full service community school project. *Journal of Child And Family Studies,*

25(7), 2268-2278. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0398-5

City Connects (2010). *The impact of City Connects: Annual report 2010*. Boston, MA:

Boston College Center for Optimized Student Support.

Coalition for Community Schools (2018). *Home.* Retrieved from

http://www.communityschools.org/

Cook, T.D., Murphy, R. F., & Hunt, H. D. (2000). Comer's school development program

in Chicago: A theory-based evaluation*. American Educational Research Journal,*

37, 535-597.

Cooper, B. S., & Mulvey, J. D. (2015). Connecting Education, Welfare, and Health for

American Families. Peabody *Journal of Education, 90*(5), 659-676.

Dobbie, W., & Fryer, R. G., Jr. (2011). Are high quality schools enough to increase

achievement among the poor? Evidence from the Harlem Children's Zone.

American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 3, 158-187.

Dove, M. K., Zorotovich, J., & Gregg, K. (2018). School Community Connectedness and

Family Participation at School. *World Journal of Education, 8*(1), 49–57.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1991). School-based social and health services for at-risk students. *Urban*

Education, 26, 118-137.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1995). Full-service schools: A revolution in health and social-services for

children, youth, and families. *Psychology in the Schools, 32*(1), 62-64.

Dryfoos, J. G. (2005). Full-service community schools: A strategy—not a program. *New

Directions for Youth Development, 107*, 7-14.

Dyson, A., & Todd., L. (2010). Dealing with complexity: Theory of change evaluation

and the full service extended schools initiative. *International Journal of Research

& Method in Education, 33*, 119–134.

Ferguson, D. (2009). Dayton's neighborhood school centers. *New Directions for Youth

Development, 122,* 81-106.

Galindo, C. g., 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*, 140S-

163S.

Green, T. L. (2018). School as community, community as school: Examining principal

leadership for urban school reform and community development. *Education &

Urban Society, 50*(2), 111–135.

Hartman, S. L., Stotts, J., Ottley, J. R., & Miller, R. (2017). School-community

partnerships in rural settings: Facilitating positive outcomes for young children

who experience maltreatment. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 45*(3), 403-

410.

Heers, M., Van Klaveren, C., Groot, W., & Maassen van den Brink, H. (2016).

Community schools. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 1016-1051.

doi:10.3102/0034654315627365

Houser, J. W. (2016). Community- and school-sponsored program participation and

    academic achievement in a full-service community school. *Education and Urban*

    Society, 48(4), 324-345.

Institute for Educational Leadership, Coalition for Community Schools (2017).

    Community school results. Retrieved from

    http://www.communityschools.org/results/default.aspx

Kim, E. M., Coutts, M. J., Holmes, S. R., Sheridan, S. M., Ransom, K. A., Sjuts, T. M.,

    & Rispoli, K. M. (2012). *Parent involvement and family-school partnerships:*

    Examining the content, processes, and outcomes of structural versus relationship-

    based approaches. CYFS Working Paper No. 2012-6: Nebraska Center for

    Research on Children, Youth, Families and Schools.

Machin, S., McNally S., and Meghir, C. (2010). Resources and standards in urban

    schools. *Journal of Human Capital, 4*(4), 365-393. doi: 10.1086/658634

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50,* 370-

    396.

Mertens, D. M. (2015). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology* (4th

    edition). Sage Publishing: Los Angeles, California.

Miller, D. C., Salkind, N. J., Creswell, J. W., & Maietta, R. C. (2003). *Grounded theory*

    research. In, Handbook of Research Design & Social Measurement (pp. 154-

    158).

Min, M., Anderson, J. A., & Minge, C. (2017). What do we know about full-service

    community schools? Integrative research review with NVivo. *School Community*

    Journal, 27(1), 29-54.

Noltemeyer, A. a., Bush, K., Patton, J., & Bergen, D. (2012). The relationship among deficiency needs and growth needs: An empirical investigation of Maslow's theory. *Children & Youth Services Review, 34*(9), 1862-1867.

Proscio, T. (2004). *Schools, community & development: Erasing the boundaries.* Columbia, MD: The Enterprise Foundation.

Rogers, V., Salzeider, C., Holzum, L., Milbrandt, T., Zahnd, W., & Puczynski, M. (2016). Keep kids in school: A collaborative community effort to increase compliance with state-mandated health requirements. *Journal of School Health, 86*(5), 382-385.

Sanders, M. (2016). Leadership, partnerships, and organizational development: Exploring components of effectiveness in three full-service community schools. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement, 27*(2), 157-177.

Sanders, M. G. (2018.). Crossing boundaries: A qualitative exploration of relational leadership in three full-service community schools. *Teachers College Record,120*(4), 1-36

Sibley, E. E, & Brabeck, K. (2017). Latino immigrant students' school experiences in the United States: The importance of family--school--community collaborations. *School Community Journal, 27*(1), 137-157.

Trepanier, N. S., Pare, M., Petrakos, H., & Drouin, C. (2008). A proposal for involving teachers in school integrated services in the Province of Quebec. *School Community Journal, 18*(1), 105–122.

U. S. Department of Education. (2015). *Frequently asked questions about FSCSs*. Retrieved from: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/communityschools/faq.html

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2015 (NCES 2016-014), Table 105.50.* Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=84

Valli, L. L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2016). Typologizing school–community partnerships. *Urban Education, 51*(7), 719-747.

Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2018). School-community partnership models: implications for leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 21*(1), 31–49.

Voyles, M. M. (2012). Perceived needs of at-risk families in a small town: Implications for full-service community schools. *School Community Journal, 22*(2), 31-63.

Warren, M. R., Hong, S., Rubin, C., & Uy, P. (2009). Beyond the bake sale: A community-based relational approach to parent engagement in schools. *The Teachers College Record, 111*, 2209-2254.

Wonderly, D. M., & McLoughlin, C. S. (1984). Contractual services: A viable alternative? *School Psychology International, 5*(2), 107-113. doi:10.1177/0143034384052009

APPENDIX A

District Consent

Sara Lovett

School of Counselor Education and Health Services

University of Dayton

300 College Park

Dayton, OH 45469-0143

To whom it may concern:

Sara Lovett, will be conducting interviews for a thesis on full service community schools in partial fulfillment of work needed to complete the Education Specialist degree at the University of Dayton. Interviews will be conducted with faculty only, and lunch or coffee will be provided as a thank you for taking the time to participate. These interviews will seek participants' opinions. Identifying information will not be released, and participants will be given a pseudonym for file storage and in the research study. If at any time you have questions, you may contact Sara at trumans1@udayton.edu. You may discontinue participation at any time. If you agree to allow your school district and faculty to participate in this study (should they desire to do so), please review the agreement below.

By signing this document, I agree to allow Sara Lovett, an education specialist student at the University of Dayton, may conduct and digitally record interviews regarding full service community schools with faculty in my school district.

Name: _____   Date: _____

Signature: _____   Position: _____

APPENDIX B

Individual Consent to Participate

Surveys and Interviews

Research Project Title: -- Stakeholder Views on Full Service Community Schools.

You have been asked to participate in a research project conducted by Sara Lovett from the University of Dayton, in the Department of Counselor Education.

The purpose of the project is: To examine the Full Service Community School initiative in depth using information gathered from qualitative interviews from key stakeholders in the implementation process (principals, school psychologists, school nurses).
We will not reveal who you are in any publications or presentations. Other people may need to see your research records (i.e. committee members). This is to confirm requirements of the study are met. They may see your name. These representatives will not reveal who you are to others.
Please read the information below, and ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate.
- Your participation in this research is voluntary. You have the right not to answer any question and to stop participating at any time for any reason. The interview will take about 45 minutes.
- You will be provided lunch or coffee of your choice for your participation.
- All of the identifying information you tell us will be confidential.
- Interviews will be recorded using an audio application.
- Only the researcher and faculty advisor will have access to the interview recording and it will kept in a secure place.
- You are ONLY eligible to participate if you are over the age of 18.

Please contact the following investigators with any questions or concerns:
Sara Lovett, trumans1@udayton.edu, 330-936-7840
Sawyer Hunley, shunley1@udayton.edu
If you feel you have been treated unfairly, or you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact Candise Powell, J.D., Chair of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Dayton, IRB@udayton.edu; Phone: (937) 229-3515

Name: _____   Date: _____

Signature: _____   Position: _____

APPENDIX C

Interview Questions

Question Type	Question
Introductory Comments	"Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is Sara Lovett, and I am conducting a research study on full service community schools. As is evident from the consent form you signed, your participation is voluntary, and you may ask to stop the interview, take a break, or skip a question at any point during this interview. Do you have any questions before we start?" "What is your current position at (school) and how many years have you been at (school)?"
Opening	"Please describe how you are involved in your schools full service community school initiative." Prompt for participants role Prompt for how they feel about this role

Transition	"What makes your school a full service community school?"
	Prompt for school characteristics
Key	"Why did your school begin implementing the Full Service Community School Initiative?"
	Prompt for school characteristics they wanted to change
	Prompt for previous issues they saw within their school.
	Prompt for their role in the beginning of this initiative.
	"How did you and how do you implement the full service community school initiative?"
	Prompt for funding
	Prompt for community buy-in
	Prompt for what they do on a daily basis
	"What kind of change did you see when your school started implementing the full service community school initiative?"
	Prompt for change in students, parents, community
	"Do you feel that making your school a full service community schools was helpful to your students and your district?

	"What advice would you give to schools beginning to implement the FSCS initiative?"
Conclusion	"Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your school?" "Thank you for participating in this interview. I appreciate your input, and I thank you for helping with my thesis and this important initiative."

APPENDIX D

Transcription Conventions

? = rising intonation

. = falling intonation

! = excitement, emphasis

+… = trailing off intonation

xxx = inaudible speech

(...) = noticeable pause

CAPITALS = emphatic stress on a word

= (equals sign) = placed before utterance, means utterance overlaps with one before it;

speakers were talking simultaneously

- =Sudden stop in the middle of a word or sentence

Template:

Date of interaction:

Participants:

Interviewer:

Interviewee:

Created by Dr. Colleen Gallagher, Ph.D, University of Dayton Assistant Professor of

TESOL