# A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF A PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM IN A K-8 CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

JANET ANN DONOVAN
*St. John the Baptist School*

*This article demonstrates that there is virtual unanimity among America's educational leaders in the belief that when parents become involved in their children's education, the children do better in school. Moreover, the study also reveals that in educational circles serious disagreements exist among leaders as to the degree to which parents should be involved in their children's education. Central to the study is a small Catholic elementary school whose parental involvement program is not only diametrically opposed to contemporary educational thinking but could be interpreted as a refutation of it.*

The recent announcement by Detroit Mayor Dennis Archer that he intended to take advantage of a newly enacted state law to take over the operation of Detroit's failed public school system represents another example of the general public's dissatisfaction with our nation's public schools. The fact that Archer relieved the city's elected school board of its administrative powers and demoted the city's superintendent of schools to a status equal to that of a temporary school employee while a search was initiated for a new superintendent demonstrated the seriousness of the problem.

Parental involvement is not a new concept; it has been part of school districts' policies for many years. Nearly everyone is familiar with parent-teacher associations (PTAs) on the elementary level, and with booster clubs on the secondary level. Traditionally, however, the scope of PTA and booster club involvement, even in the most parentally involved schools, has been limited (Cavarretta, 1998; Stringfellow, 1995). On the elementary school level, parent-teacher associations' activities have been restricted to volunteer school functions such as fundraising, chaperoning school dances and class

*Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, Vol. 3, No. 2, December 1999, 158-172

trips, and monitoring lunch periods. On the secondary school level, the involvement of booster clubs has been commonly restricted to athletic activities and to band parent association projects.

Times are changing, and many nationally known educators and pundits are beginning to realize that there is a direct link between the quality of education in a school and the degree of its parents' involvement. Studies document that higher levels of student achievement are attained in schools where parents are actively involved. For example, in 1981 the National Committee for Citizens in Education published an annotated bibliography entitled *The Evidence Grows.* The research revealed that in 35 studies on the effects of parental involvement on student achievement the findings were identical: "Parents' involvement in almost any form appears to produce measurable gains in student achievement" (Henderson, 1988, p. 149). Moreover, when parents are involved in their children's education, studies on parental involvement further reveal "...that students get better grades, have better attitudes toward school and have higher aspirations..." (Lynn, 1994).

Consequently, as the result of the research studies of Henderson, Lynn, and others, there exists near unanimity among educators and educational leaders concerning the merits of parental involvement (Bauch, 1987, 1990; Canter & Canter, 1991; Hunter, 1989; Sarason, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1990; Sullivan, 1998). Moreover, the general acceptance of parental involvement has resulted in an ever-increasing number of parental involvement paradigms. These paradigms range in scope and depth from Bauch's (1990) caregiving model to Hunter's (1989) partnership model to Sarason's (1995) empowerment model to Frieman's (1997) model that features the need for parental involvement strategies to address family and social problems. Frieman's model addresses such social phenomena as divorce, one-parent families, blended families, and both-parents-working-outside-the-home families (Frieman, 1997).

The differences and the nuances among the various paradigms notwithstanding, if one were pressed to do so, one could categorize the various parental involvement paradigms into three basic models: teacher's helper (Bauch, 1990; Uderos-Blackburn, 1996), teacher's partner (Fleming, 1993; Riley, 1994), and the full empowerment of parents concept that provides parents with both decision-making and policymaking discretion (Cavarretta, 1998; Daniels, 1996; Sarason, 1995).

Further, a review of the literature for this study reveals that despite the fact that most educators favor a greater voice for parents in their children's education, there are some dissenters in the educators' ranks as well. Opposition is not directed at parental involvement per se, but rather at the pervasive nature that the concept has assumed (Bagin, Gallagher, & Kindred, 1994; Black, 1998; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1997). Some teachers feel threatened by parents who are mov-

ing into areas of education that were once exclusively theirs and fear that overly aggressive parents may want "to take over" (Fleming, 1993, p. 77). Moreover, others believe that because parents in general lack the experience and the educational background, most are ill-suited to assume a greater role in their children's education (Black, 1998; Casanova, 1996; Uderos-Blackburn, 1996).

Therefore, in order to limit the degree of parental involvement in our schools, some teachers have been known to draw boundaries around their areas of expertise (Bramlett, 1996). Furthermore, according to Uderos-Blackburn (1996), parents simply don't belong in such professional areas as decision-making, budgeting, and matters pertaining to curriculum development and textbook selection. She believes that the parental involvement concept should be revisited and returned to its original and traditional role of teacher's helper (1996).

On the other hand, proponents of expanding parental involvement are not only increasing in numbers but in resolve as well (Comer & Haynes, 1991; Hunter, 1989; Ost, 1988; Rasmussen, 1998; Sarason, 1995; Stringfellow, 1995; Tarsi, Greenberg, Kennedy, & Gettys, 1994). Moreover, they believe that to fail to take advantage of the talents, skills, and unique life experiences that parents possess is a waste of a valuable resource (McCormack, 1996; O'Neil, 1997).

The degree to which parents should be involved in their children's education is at the heart of the parental involvement controversy. Proponents of parental involvement want the concept expanded in the schools just as critics of the concept want it curtailed. Therefore, in light of these opposing views on parental involvement, this researcher decided to select for this study a K-8 Catholic elementary school that has a parental involvement program in place to try to determine to what degree parents are involved in their children's education. Moreover, to obtain a more definitive view of the extent of parents' involvement, the researcher attempted to answer the following two questions: (1) What roles do parents play at the school in such areas as monitoring of school events, fundraising, textbook selection, budgeting, curriculum revisions, selection of personnel, and policymaking? (2) How do the three participating groups—the parents, the teachers, and the school administration—perceive the level of parental involvement in the school's parental involvement program efforts?

# METHODOLOGY

## PARTICIPANTS

The school selected for this study was a Catholic elementary school in the Diocese of Scranton, Pennsylvania. This school was selected for its facile accessibility to the researcher and the willingness of the principal and her staff to participate in the study. Originally founded and staffed in 1919 by the Order of Bernardine Sisters, the school currently employs a lay staff: nine full-time teachers, one part-time physical education teacher, one part-time computer teacher, and one principal. The student enrollment is 170.

In the study, the participants were the principal, 6 of the 9 full-time teachers, and 18 of the school's parents. The other 3 teachers were in their first year of teaching and had minimum experience with the school's parental involvement program. The 18 parents who participated in the case study were selected at random from the school's attendance roster; 2 parents were selected from each grade level. Therefore, the participants who took part in this study totaled 25: 1 administrator, 6 teachers, and 18 parents.

## INSTRUMENTATION

In this case study, the researcher used a qualitative research design, which focused on a single unit of analysis: a K-8 Catholic elementary school. The researcher employed an inductive approach to observe, collect, and interpret data. Data for the study were gathered through the distribution of a two-part questionnaire; conducting personal interviews with the school principal, the 6 full-time teachers, and 18 of the school's parents; and reviewing various documents and records of the school's parental involvement program.

## DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

The researcher analyzed the participants' interview questions via a process known as data reduction. Data reduction, according to Miles and Huberman (1984) is "the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the 'raw data' that appear in written-up field notes" (p. 21). By following this procedure, the researcher was able to reduce the raw data—rendering them more manageable.

Further, the researcher used tables to assist in identifying common, as well as irregular, patterns and associations in the data. The table graphics aided in identifying common attitudes among the participants. The participants' interview responses were displayed in narrative form on tables. Each participant in the study was assigned a code symbol. For example, the capital letter A was used to identify the school administrator; the 6 teachers were identified as T1 through T6; and the 18 parents were identified as P1 through P18.

The second instrument for data collection used in this case study was the questionnaire. The researcher decided to supplement the interview instrument for collecting data by using a questionnaire that contained two Family/School Involvement Survey Forms. The two-part questionnaire was constructed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education in 1988. The questionnaire is contained in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania publication entitled *Support From the Home Team: Families and School Handbook* (Gilhool, 1988). In the first part of the questionnaire, the three participating groups were asked to respond to the current level of parental involvement at the school and to compare it to what the participants thought it should be. The participants answered this part of the questionnaire by responding to a Likert Scale which had a range in frequency from 1-4. In order to interpret the data obtained from the two-part questionnaire, the researcher clustered and grouped the 17 questions into the following categories: the school's communications and the role parents play in their children's education. Participants' responses were displayed on summary tables in which the researcher reported the number of participants who agreed with each of the four ratings on each of the questions. The data from the summary tables were interpreted in narrative form using percentages to support the findings.

The second part of the two-part questionnaire, Effective Partnership Between Home and School, helped to determine to what extent parents are involved in the school. The participants answered the questions on this part of the questionnaire by responding to a Likert Scale which ranged in frequency from 0-3. The researcher categorized the responses to questions from the 25-item questionnaire into the following categories: the school's communications, the school's climate, and the role parents play in their children's education. Participants' responses were displayed on summary tables, which allowed the researcher to identify the various attitudes of the participants. The researcher interpreted the data from the summary tables in narrative form, and the researcher supported the findings through the use of percentages.

In order to obtain a better understanding of the parental involvement program in place at the school, the researcher also reviewed school documents and records. In the absence of both a students' handbook and a teachers' handbook, the school documents and records consisted of a series of memos, directives, and announcements that were sent to parents on a regular basis. The researcher also reviewed *The Scranton Diocesan School Policy Manual.* The *Manual* is used by the school not only to establish school policies and procedures but also to set guidelines and parameters for the principal, teachers, and parents. The document, a comprehensive compendium governing school-related issues, addresses virtually every facet of school life, ranging in scope from philosophy to school finances. The importance of good school climate and good school communications are two of the school issues

addressed in the *Manual,* which is the definitive policy document for the Diocese of Scranton schools.

Moreover, the researcher interpreted the meaning of the school documents and the school records not only in regard to their importance to the study but also in regard to their importance to the theme of each item. In this way, the researcher was able to relate the meanings of the items to those of other items used in the study for collecting data. The documents and the records were then divided into two categories: the school's communications and the role parents play in their children's education. Information gathered from these sources was then interpreted in narrative form.

## THE STUDY'S FINDINGS

The school data both on the participants' personal interviews and on their questionnaires indicate a strong parental presence in monitoring school events and in the school's fundraising activities. The study reveals that parents are involved in school activities such as chaperoning class trips, monitoring lunch periods, helping teachers with their bulletin board displays, and coaching the boys' basketball and girls' cheerleading squads. Commenting on how helpful parents are in these areas, teacher T3 said, "The school's extracurricular events could not take place without the support and cooperation of the parents." A parent responding to the interviewer's question on the role of parents in extracurricular activities said, "Parents are involved with extracurricular activities such as skating parties and ski trips. We are not lacking in that area." In her interview with the principal, the interviewer also noted how much credit the principal gave parents for the success of school events.

On a par with the part parents play in extracurricular and other school activities is the part they play in fundraising. Parents are the very soul of the school's fundraising drives. From the "Pancake Breakfast" to the "Easter Bingo" to the annual "Summer Picnic," parents are irrefutably the driving force. Moreover, the money raised in these events considerably supplement the school's budget. Conversely, however, as active as the parents are in nonprofessional activities at the school, they are equally inactive in areas that could be considered professional in nature. The researcher found little participation by parents in such professional areas as textbook selection, budgeting, curriculum revisions, selection of personnel, and policymaking. Parental participation at the school is restricted to nonprofessional activities—the teacher's helper syndrome.

It should be noted that the three participating groups in the study—the parents, the teachers, and the school administration—perceive the current level of parental involvement in school activities to be essential to the success of the school. A review of the principal's and the teachers' interview

tapes reveals that they regard parents to be the lifeblood of the school. Because she believes that parental participation is essential to the success of the school, the principal uses a number of communication strategies to encourage and stimulate parents' interest in school activities; her personal notes, newsletters, and telephone calls to parents indicate her reliance on them. However, it should be noted that her overtures to parents are designed to get them involved in cocurricular or extracurricular activities. There is no evidence that suggests that the principal wants parents involved in their children's education beyond the caretaker or teacher's-helper level (Bauch, 1990; Uderos-Blackburn, 1996).

Moreover, the teachers' perceptions of the level of parental involvement at the school is similar to that of the principal. They too believe that the parents are indispensable to the success of the school. In the words of T6: "They are a great asset." However, the teachers' questionnaires and personal interview tapes make it abundantly clear that the teachers do not regard the parents as their partners in education (Riley, 1994). They cite the parents' lack of education and proper perspectives as reasons for their refusal to regard parents as their educational equals.

Furthermore, the parents themselves do not believe that they are the teachers' educational equals, nor do they believe that they should be involved in such professional areas as decision-making and policymaking. To the contrary, parents perceive their current role of involvement at the school as "teacher's helper"—a perception similar to that of the principal and the teachers.

Further, as stated previously in this study, a major concern of teachers nationally is overly aggressive parents. However, at the site of this study overly aggressive parents are not a problem. In fact, the principal and teachers who took part in this study readily admitted that the parents at their school are very respectful of the teachers' turf and that they invariably worked within the parameters established by the principal and teachers.

Research also revealed that the success or failure of any parental involvement program depends upon the rapport between the school and the home. The findings in this study indicated that the school not only made every effort to establish good rapport but also went to great lengths to be cordial and friendly to parents as well. The amount of time teachers set aside for parent-teacher conferences and teachers' profiles reflecting 100% participation in Parent-Teacher Guild's (PTG) activities provided graphic testimony of the teachers' efforts to establish a good working relationship with parents. Moreover, the teachers' willingness to cooperate was not lost on the parents. The parents' personal interview tapes and questionnaires reflected parents' satisfaction with the teachers' availability: 94.4% of parents were pleased with the access they had not only to the teachers but also to the school (61.1%) as well (see Table 1).

**Table 1**
**Present Level of Communications at the School**

| Question | Administrator (N=1) | Teachers (N=6) | Parents (N=18) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Involvement in PTG and school events. | 100% | 100% | 94.4% |
| Teachers available for parent conferences. | 100% | 66.6% | 94.4% |
| Parents can schedule visits during school day. | 100% | 66.6% | 61.1% |

Another finding of the study was the great importance the participants placed on school communications as a rubric for the success of any parental involvement program. Moreover, they all agreed that their school's communications were very good. The study also noted that the participants placed a great deal of importance upon the school's climate. The fact that the principal went to great lengths to keep parents informed and that parent volunteers were willing to give of their time and talents to promote school projects indicate the importance school personnel placed on promoting good school climate. For any parental involvement program to be successful, the participants believed that students, teachers, and parents must have a good feeling about their school. Moreover, the school data revealed that the participants in this study did, indeed, have good feelings about their school.

Although the data indicated that the principal and teachers favored giving the parents input in their children's education, the data also indicated that the input should not go beyond that of teacher's helper (Bauch, 1990; Uderos-Blackburn, 1996). Moreover, the data also reflected the fact that the school examined in the study was a conservative school with traditional values. The school's philosophy included a belief in an educational hierarchy—a hierarchy that had parents at the bottom of the pecking order, subordinate to the principal and teachers. Moreover, despite the plea from United States Secretary of Education Richard Riley (1994) for schools and school districts across the nation to make parents, teachers, and principals partners in education, and despite the fact that *The Scranton Diocesan School Policy Manual* emphatically declared that parents and teachers were partners in the education of children, the school continued to deny parents a voice in their children's education beyond that of teacher's helper.

Ironically, a careful examination of the parents' interviews and questionnaires reveals that the parent participants in the study are not dissatisfied or unhappy with their role in their children's education. To the contrary, their interviews and their questionnaires reveal that they agree with the teachers that they are not the teachers' equals in educational matters. Further, in their interviews and on their questionnaires, they indicate that they regard teachers to be better educated and in a better position to decide what is best for their children and for the school.

The school's parental involvement program has a number of strengths: good rapport between the school and the parents, good communications between the school and the community it serves, and a good supporting cast of parent volunteers who are virtually indispensable to the school's success. The one major inconsistency that the researcher found not only in the school's parental involvement program but in the school itself was the lack of parental input in school matters. Moreover, despite acknowledgment by the principal and teachers of the importance of the parents' role in ancillary school programs, they did not recognize parents as anything more than teachers' helpers.

## CONCLUSION

In some ways the school chosen as the focus of this study is unusual, if not unique. It is unusual because it appears to be desperately trying to hang on to the educational philosophy of the teacher's-helper concept (Bauch, 1990) that has fallen out of favor with most of the era's renowned educators and educational leaders (Bennett, 1996; Daniels, 1996; Erbe, 1991; Hunter, 1989; Riley, 1994; Sarason, 1995; Stocklinski & Miller-Colbert, 1991). Over the years, the school has maintained a top-down administrative approach, where all decision-making and policymaking procedures are imposed from the top. The school continues to do this in an era when public school decisions are being challenged on a regular basis and an angry general public is constantly seeking and sometimes demanding a greater voice in school decision and policymaking matters.

Moreover, the school's parental involvement philosophy that restricts the parents' role in their children's education to that of teacher's helper is in sharp contrast with the parental involvement philosophy subscribed to by most educators and educational leaders, who assign parents a much larger role in their children's education. The teacher's-helper concept flies in the face of Hunter (1989), who believes that parents have much to offer to their children's education. She cites parents' lifelong experiences and their many talents and skills as being invaluable to their children's education and admonishes schools that do not take advantage of the resources that only parents possess. The parents-as-teacher's-helper paradigm also is at odds with Epstein (1988, 1992, 1995), who urges school districts to structure their programs in conjunction with their districts' demographics. Epstein notes that for a parental involvement strategy to be successful it must contain provisions for such family-unit trends as single-parent, blended, non-English-speaking, and both-parents-working-outside-the-home families. Similarly, Bobango (1994) frowns on any parental involvement strategy that lacks originality. Bobango cautions schools and school districts of the hazards of employing parental involvement strategies that may have been successful in

other schools or other school districts. Further, the school's teacher's-helper strategy appears to be in direct conflict with Riley (1994), who calls for a parents-as-partners approach to parental involvement. Moreover, the school's restricting parents' involvement to that of teacher's helper also appears to clash with *The Scranton Diocesan School Policy Manual,* whose pronouncements also champion the parents-as-partners cause.

The facts that the school's current parental involvement strategy restricts the parents' role to that of teacher's helper, that this strategy appears to be in contrast to strategies embraced by a number of educational leaders, and that the school's management policy uses the top-down approach, lead to the question: Do parents really have a voice in policymaking? To the best of the researcher's knowledge, the answer is a qualified no because parents do have limited input: They can suggest and recommend a particular course of action, but the final decision in all matters rests with the principal, who, in turn, answers to the parish's pastor.

When one reflects on the reality that in public education nearly all educational tenets are being challenged, one might be expected to ask, "How is this school able to maintain such authority over its students, teachers, and parents?" The answer to the question lies in the school's essence—that which makes it what it is. What it is, of course, is a private school, more specifically a private Catholic school. Part of the ambiance of a Catholic school is its respect for authority. Therefore, in the view of the school's parents, teachers, and students there is nothing wrong with the school's authoritative, top-down, administrative approach, i.e., that is the way it should be.

After reviewing this study, one would be wise to resist the temptation to generalize from its findings. The study represents the findings of one, small, Catholic elementary school—nothing more. Therefore, it should not be considered a representation of the other elementary schools.

## FUTURE RESEARCH

This researcher believes that this study was significant and worthwhile because it highlighted a number of educational verities. It revealed that parents have a genuine interest in their schools and that they are willing to give of themselves and their time to improve their children's schools. Moreover, although the participants in this study favored Bauch's (1990) teacher's-helper paradigm of parental involvement over Riley's (1994) parents-as-partners model and over Sarason's (1995) concept of fully empowering parents, one must remember that this study encompassed the data from only one elementary school—thus leaving plenty of room for future research on the parental involvement concept. In fact, in the view of this researcher, this study represents a very limited and narrow attempt to draw some definitive conclusions about the rather amorphous subject of parental involvement.

Consequently, it is this lack of precision in the parental involvement concept that could lead future researchers to some interesting discoveries.

Since the site of this study was one of the diocese's 55 elementary schools, a follow-up study comparing the philosophies, motives, and objectives of this study with those of the other 54 schools would not only be interesting but enlightening as well. Moreover, within close proximity of the site of this study there are a number of public elementary schools that are blessed with very active parents' groups (PTAs/PTOs); a comparison of the amount of parental involvement at those schools with that at the school in this study would be an informative study as well. Some believe that parents who are very involved in parental involvement programs when their children are in elementary school lose interest when the children enter high school. Consequently, a study that would compare the levels of parental involvement at the Diocese of Scranton's high schools with those at the diocese's elementary schools could also be an insightful study.

Although educators and educational leaders across the nation are convinced that when parents get involved in their children's education the children invariably do better in school, future researchers might be interested in determining whether parental involvement is actually the cause of children's doing better in schools.

# REFERENCES

Bagin, D., Gallagher, D. R., & Kindred, L. W. (1994). *The school and community relations.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bauch, P. A. (1987). Parental involvement in Catholic schools. *Momentum, 67,* 67-68.

Bauch, P. A. (1990). Wanted: Parental involvement. *Momentum, 74,* 74-75.

Bennett, D. (1996). Should parents be involved in all school decisions? *NEA Today, 14*(8), 31.

Black, S. (1998). Parent support. *The American School Board Journal, 185*(4), 50-53.

Bobango, J. C. (1994). Promoting parental involvement: Because educators can't do it all. *Schools in the Middle, 3*(4), 26-28.

Bramlett, J. M. (1996, April). *Parental empowerment in context: Collaborative progress and community building in a Los Angeles elementary school.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1991). *Parents on your side.* Santa Monica, CA: Lee Canter & Associates.

Casanova, U. (1996). Parental involvement: A call for prudence. *Educational Research, 25*(8), 30-32, 46.

Cavarretta, J. (1998). Parents are a school's best friend. *Educational Leadership, 55*(8), 12-15.

Comer, J. P., & Haynes, N. M. (1991). Parental involvement in schools: An ecological approach. *The Elementary School Journal, 91*(3), 271-277.

Daniels, H. (1996). The best practice project: Building parent partnerships in Chicago. *Educational Leadership, 53*(7), 38-43.

Epstein, J. L. (1988). How do we improve programs for parental involvement? *Educational Horizons, 66*(2), 58-59.

Epstein, J. L. (1992). School and family partnerships. In M. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research,* Vol. 4 (6th ed., pp. 1139-1151). New York: Macmillan.

Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(9), 701-712.

Erbe, B. (1991). *Parent participation in the Chicago public schools.* Springfield, IL: State Board of Education.

Fleming, B. A. (1993). Parents and schools: From visitors to partners. In R. C. Burns (Ed.), *From visitors to partners: A summary of effective parent-involvement practices* (pp. 77-89). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Frieman, B. B. (1997). Two parents—two homes. *Educational Leadership, 4*(7), 23-25.

Gilhool, T. K. (1988). *Support from the home team: Family and school handbook.* Harrisburg, PA: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Henderson, A. T. (1988). Parents are a school's best friend. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*(2), 148-153.

Hunter, M. (1989). Join the par-aide in education. *Educational Leadership, 47,* 14-17.

Lynn, L. (1994). *Building parental involvement. Brief to principals,* (Vol. 8). Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

McCormack, P. M., (1996). Supporting parents in helping their children. *Today's Catholic Teacher, 30*(1), 46-50.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

O'Neil, J. (1997). Building schools as communities. *Educational Leadership, 54*(8), 6-10.

*Organisation for economic co-operation and development.* (1997). France: OECD Publications.

Ost, D. H. (1988). Teacher-parent interactions: An effective school-community environment. *The Educational Forum, 5*(2), 165-176.

Rasmussen, K. (1998, January). Making parental involvement meaningful. *ASCD Update,* 1,6,7.

Riley, R. W. (1994). Families come first: A renewed emphasis on parent and community involvement is critical to the success of Goals 2000. *Principal, 74*(2), 30-32.

Sarason, S. B. (1995). *Parental involvement and the political principle.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

*The Scranton Diocesan School Policy Manual.* (n/d). Scranton, PA: Diocese of Scranton.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools.* San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Stocklinski, J., & Miller-Colbert, J. (1991). The Comer Process: Moving from "I" to "we." *Principal, 70*(3), 18-19.

Stringfellow, D. (1995). Parent involvement: You can make it work. *Today's Catholic Teacher, 29*(1), 30-35.

Sullivan, P. (1998). The PTA's national standards. *Educational Leadership, 55*(8), 43-44.

Tarsi, N. L., Greenberg, K., Kennedy, R., & Gettys, C. (1994, November). *We want more! Empowered parents speak about their involvement in cognate schools.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Nashville, TN.

Uderos-Blackburn, G. (1996). Should parents be involved in all school decisions? *NEA Today, 14*(8), 31.

*Janet Ann Donovan is assistant principal at St. John the Baptist School. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Janet Ann Donovan, Ed.D., St. John the Baptist School, 12 William St., Pittston, PA 18640.*

# APPENDIX

## FAMILY INVOLVEMENT IN OUR SCHOOL: WHAT IS, WHAT SHOULD BE

Read each statement and respond first to the issue of what the present level of family involvement is in the school. Responses are indicated by circling the appropriate number, 1 to 4, on the scale. Next, respond to the same statements, this time addressing the issue of what the level of family involvement should be in the school. Again, the response is indicated by circling the appropriate number, 1 to 4, on the following scale:

1 = Almost never
2 = Occasionally
3 = Frequently
4 = Almost always

| | What Is | What Should Be |
|---|---|---|
| 1. There are school activities that involve students and teachers such as reading enrichment programs, sports events, and recognition ceremonies to honor student achievement. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 2. Family members are encouraged to work in the school as volunteers. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 3. Parents are able to schedule visits to the school during the day to understand the kinds of experiences their child is having in school. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 4. There are parent education classes run by the PTA in cooperation with resource personnel provided by the school to teach parents how to help their children benefit from school. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 5. Family members can initiate personal conferences with teachers when they feel it is necessary. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 6. The parent-teacher association meetings are well attended by parents or family members. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 7. Family members are asked for their input when written school policies are developed. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. Parents help develop written goals for increasing family involvement. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 9. Parents are part of the team that decides/evaluates how well teachers and the principal do their jobs and how to reward and retain good teachers. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 10. Parents are consulted before a policy determining when students should be held back rather than promoted to the next grade is implemented. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 11. Whenever a school sets up an advisory group to bring suggestions for changes to the principal and parent teacher association, parents are part of this group. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 12. Parents help establish the discipline code in the school. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 13. Parents help select textbooks and other learning materials. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 14. Parents are involved in developing the school budget. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 15. Parents serve on the team that revises report cards. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 16. Parents participate in school events such as parties, field trips, sports events, plays, etc., as needed. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| 17. Parents help establish a policy for recognizing outstanding teacher performance. | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |

**Self-Assessment for Effective Partnerships Between Home and School**

For each statement, circle the degree to which the following positive characteristics are present in the family/community involvement in your school. Read each statement carefully and circle:

0 for conditions which do not apply or are not present in your school.
1 if there is a low level of involvement.
2 if the condition is present but not to a high degree.
3 if there is a high level of involvement.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. There is a staff person responsible for family and community involvement activities. | 0 1 2 3 |
| 2. There are open channels of communication between school and home. | 0 1 2 3 |
| 3. There are regular meetings and conferences with teachers and families. | 0 1 2 3 |

4. School people visit the homes of students. 0 1 2 3
5. Parents and family members feel welcome in school. 0 1 2 3
6. Community members and groups use school building(s). 0 1 2 3
7. Parents and community are involved in policy decisions. 0 1 2 3
8. There is a bilingual person on the school staff. 0 1 2 3
9. Parents or other family members visit or work in the classroom. 0 1 2 3
10. Parents reinforce school goals and discipline practices at home. 0 1 2 3
11. The school provides education in effective parenting. 0 1 2 3
12. Discipline problems have been reduced due to family involvement. 0 1 2 3
13. There is a degree of openness and trust between the school and the community. 0 1 2 3
14. Families are satisfied with the success of students at school. 0 1 2 3
15. There is family-initiated involvement in the school. 0 1 2 3
16. Students are satisfied with their success at school. 0 1 2 3
17. Staff are satisfied with their success at school. 0 1 2 3
18. There is a shared philosophy between school, home, and community. 0 1 2 3
19. There is a high rate of parent attendance at school functions. 0 1 2 3
20. Student attendance has improved because of family involvement. 0 1 2 3
21. Student involvement has improved because of family involvement. 0 1 2 3
22. A speaker bureau was established to address family and school issues. 0 1 2 3
23. Family members have volunteered to tutor students. 0 1 2 3
24. Parents review assigned homework. 0 1 2 3
25. Home-school committees exist to exchange information. 0 1 2 3

Survey provided by Gilhool, T. K. (1988). *Support from the home team: Families and school handbook.* Available from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333.