24

Achieving Equity in Education Through Full-Service Community Schools

Claudia Galindo[1] and Mavis G. Sanders[2]

[1] *University of Maryland, College Park, USA*
[2] *University of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA*

Educational inequity is a persistent reality in the United States. Racially and ethnically diverse and poor students have experienced significant structural disadvantages in their communities and schools that are reflected in their academic outcomes. Studies on math and reading achievement, for instance, have indicated that Black and Latino students score significantly lower than White students (Aud et al., 2010; Fryer & Levitt, 2004; Reardon & Galindo, 2009). Major achievement gaps have also been observed for students living in poverty (Byrnes & Wasik, 2009; Duncan & Murnane, 2011). Underserved students' educational disadvantages are also visible in other indicators such as high school completion, participation in gifted and special education, and college enrollment (Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010; Roderick, Nagaoka, & Coca, 2009; Wald & Losen, 2003).

Several decades of research suggest that as part of the effort to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for underserved students, we must attend to the complex systems, including families, schools, and communities, in which development and learning are embedded (Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Comer, Haynes, Joyner, & Ben-Avie, 1996; see also Chapter 10 in this volume by Reschly & Christensen). As Epstein (2010) contends, when there is overlap between and among adults in students' families, schools, and communities, students' learning and development are enhanced. We also know that communities' assets and resources can ameliorate the negative consequences of poverty and support students' learning and healthy development (Sanders, 2013; Warren & Mapp, 2011). Reflecting these theoretical principles, full-service community schools seek to increase educational opportunities for underserved students by focusing on different dimensions of student well-being and strategically partnering with individuals, families, and organizations from the community (Dryfoos, 2005).

In this chapter, we review the defining characteristics, professional practices, empirical results, and implementation challenges associated with these schools. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section describes the main

rationale for and characteristics of full-service community schools. The second section discusses how the theory of change of full-service community schools requires different approaches to professional practice in terms of instruction, leadership, and service coordination. The third section presents current, although limited, empirical evidence showing the impact of full-service community schools on students' educational outcomes and other indicators of well-being. In the fourth section, we examine challenges to effectively implementing and sustaining full-service community schools, and provide recommendations for future research and practice. Although we utilize the term full-service community schools throughout this chapter, it is important to note that other educational leaders, practitioners, and researchers use alternative terms such as community schools, community learning centers, and school-based integrated services (see Cummings, Dyson, & Todd, 2011).

Defining Full-Service Community Schools

First conceptualized and practiced in the 19th century (Richardson, 2009), full-service community schools are re-emerging to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for historically underserved students. In the United States, there are about 5,000 of these schools serving about 2 million students in over 150 communities (Blank & Villarreal, 2015). As Frankl (2016) discussed, new provisions in the current reauthorization of ESEA (the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), *Every Student Succeeds*, increase support for school, family, and community partnerships. Thus, it is likely that the number of full-service community schools will significantly increase over the next several years.

The primary underlying assumptions of these schools are that learning is affected by different dimensions of well-being and that students' basic needs must be satisfied before they can excel in schools (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Grossman & Vang, 2009). Following Dewey's (2007) tradition, additional underlying principles of these schools are that learning and knowledge happen through the integration of students' experiences in different contexts, within and outside the school, and that the function of schools goes beyond academics to also serving as community hubs (Rogers, 1998). Thus, full-service community schools seek to remove barriers to students' learning through optimizing and strengthening the resources of their surroundings (Blank, Melaville, & Shah, 2003; Dryfoos, 2000; Sanders, 2016).

Central to the effectiveness of full-service community schools is their capacity to expand the social capital available to students and families (Galindo, Sanders, & Abel, 2017). Social capital refers to the network of connections between people that facilitates mutually advantageous social cooperation (Blank et al., 2003; Halpern, 2005). In school settings, social capital is generated and manifested in different ways. For example, community partners can provide support, information, role models, and the transmission and reinforcement of positive cultural values as sources of school-based social capital (Coleman, 1988; Sampson, 2012). Likewise, parents can be sources of social capital within schools if they develop a sense of community, mutually share information, monitor each other's children,

and respond collectively to resolve school issues (Coleman, 1988; Sheldon, 2002). Teachers, as institutional agents, can also support students and their parents by sharing information, resources, and opportunities to help them navigate the educational system (Sanders & Galindo, 2014; Stanton-Salazar, 2011). In addition, teachers can be sources of professional information and advice, and to the extent that they build trustworthy relations, can also serve as important sources of social capital for each other (Pil & Leana, 2009).

Thus, a complex network of connections, which includes groups from different social and economic backgrounds (and therefore with access to different types of social capital), allows full-service community schools to better support children and families (Smith, 2000). Importantly, a combination of strong (close-knit) *and* weak (extended) ties expand these schools' access to resources and assets that would be unavailable if they relied solely on strong ties in their networks (Granovetter, 1983; Portes, 1998). Capitalizing on diverse networks is particularly important if full-service community schools are to empower underserved students and families to become agents of social and economic change (Noguera, 2005).

Key Features of Full-Service Community Schools

The specific configurations of full-service community schools vary according to the needs of their students and families. However, their theories of change center around improving three areas that influence students' well-being and school success. First, full-service community schools provide extended, coordinated services to students and their families to respond to improper nutrition, health problems, clothing needs, lack of out-of-school supervision, and other factors associated with poverty (Cummings et al., 2011; Eisenhower Foundation, 2005; Sanders & Hembrick-Roberts, 2013). Services can include afterschool activities; summer learning programs; health, mental health, and social services for students; as well as adult education courses, food, and clothing banks, and site-based medical services and referrals for families and community members.

Second, full-service community schools seek to strengthen family engagement in education and establish family and school partnerships as key supports for students' success (Galindo & Sheldon, 2012; Sanders, 2013; Warren, 2005). Specifically, full-service community schools focus on creating welcoming environments, building consistency and common expectations between families and schools, and establishing shared channels of communication (Dryfoos, 2005)—important strategies that positively influence student outcomes (Epstein, 2010; Galindo & Pucino, 2012; Henderson & Whipple, 2013). These schools also aim to empower parents to be active partners in their children's learning at school and at home, which are important factors influencing learning outcomes (Ardelt & Eccles, 2001; Crosnoe & Cooper, 2010; Galindo & Sonnenschein, 2015; Grossman & Vang, 2009; Noguera, 2005). Thus, full-service community schools recognize the value and assets of families, and intentionally build partnerships to connect home and school.

The third element of full-service community schools' theories of change centers on strengthening community partnerships and development (Dryfoos,

Quinn, & Barkin, 2005). Full-service community schools not only consider the surrounding community as a potential source of social capital to increase students' academic success, they are committed to supporting community vitality by increasing linking social capital. The function of linking social capital is to intentionally connect individuals or organizations across asymmetrical lines of power (Halpern, 2005). That is, full-service community schools seek to address community concerns and needs by facilitating low-income and racially/ethnically diverse residents' access to political leaders, media representatives, activists, grant-makers, and others with critical resources. As full-service community schools facilitate linking social capital and improve underserved communities' access to power structures and institutions in their surroundings, these schools demonstrate their commitment to social justice and inclusion. Their contributions to a more equitable society, however, largely rely on how key school personnel understand and enact their professional roles.

Professional Practice in Full-Service Community Schools

Although full-service community schools may be configured differently across sites, it is important to consider common elements of professional practice critical to their successful implementation. Accordingly, in this section, we discuss how full-service community schools require expanded conceptions of and approaches to professional practice in terms of instruction, leadership, and service coordination.

Instruction in Full-Service Community Schools

Since their inception, full-service community schools have sought to expand the school curriculum to be more grounded in and responsive to students' cultures and communities. This community-based approach to learning has taken many forms. For example, John Dewey's student, Elsie Clapp, opened the Arthurdale School in 1934. Located in rural West Virginia, the community school offered students an innovative curriculum grounded in Appalachian culture and traditions (Clapp, 1971). Similarly, in the community high school he established in East Harlem, New York in the 1930s, Leonard Covello emphasized the importance of ethnic studies and cross-cultural understanding in students' education (Johanek & Puckett, 2007). Community schools in the 1960s and 1970s also sought to expose students to culturally responsive curricula as well as rigorous academic instruction in safe and nurturing environments (Roderick, 2001). Across historical iterations of community schools, then, the focus has been on constructivist, community-based approaches to learning in which parents, students, and community members are active and visible (Richardson, 2009). This focus has reflected Dewey's philosophy that "There is no such thing as educational value in the abstract," and his desire to create schools that provide experiential learning activities (Dewey, 2007, p. 19).

Thus, the traditional instructional philosophies and goals of full-service community schools require teachers who are able to deliver rigorous academic content in ways that are culturally and community responsive. Empirical studies to date suggest that culturally responsive pedagogy can positively impact the achievement and resilience of racially/ethnically diverse children and youth (Allen, Jackson, & Knight, 2012; Hanley & Noblit, 2009). Culturally responsive teaching is defined as using the cultural characteristics and perspectives of racially/ethnically diverse students to improve instructional quality and effectiveness. It is based on the assumption that when academic knowledge and skills are situated within the lived experiences of students, learning is easier and more personally meaningful (Gay, 2010). Culturally responsive teaching requires that teachers move beyond stereotypes and popular generalizations of culture to substantive understanding of students' backgrounds in order to improve their educational experiences and outcomes (Allen et al., 2012; Sleeter, 2012). Such understanding can be aided through purposeful engagement with students' families and communities.

The broad literature on school, family, and community partnerships also offers insights into effective instruction in full-service community schools. Through a variety of collaborative practices, teachers can create more relevant and engaging learning opportunities by increasing the role, visibility, and presence of parents and community individuals and institutions in students' formal education (Sanders & Galindo, 2014). For example, to develop deeper understandings of and stronger relationships with students' families, teachers can incorporate their "funds of knowledge" (i.e., families' historically-grounded sociocultural and economic understandings, skills, and traditions, Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) into classroom instruction. Service learning projects can also provide students with important learning opportunities that at the same time assist individuals or agencies in addressing community concerns and needs (Morgan & Streb, 2001; Pritchard, 2002; see also Chapter 28 by Reynolds and Horvat in this handbook). Field experiences established through community partnerships, such as working with emotionally or physically challenged children, planting community gardens, or organizing voter registration drives, are examples of service learning activities that can achieve these dual goals.

Our current research suggests that delivering rigorous instruction that is culturally and community responsive is influenced by teachers' academic optimism (Sanders, Galindo, & Allen, 2018). Hoy, Hoy, and Kurz (2008) define teacher academic optimism as a self-referent, positive belief about the capacity to: (a) teach all students (teacher self-efficacy), (b) form trusting relationships with parents and students, and (c) emphasize academic tasks. The interconnected elements of teacher academic optimism are theorized as providing teachers with the resilience required to maintain effectiveness in difficult circumstances (Usher & Pajares, 2008, p. 785). In other words, teachers with high levels of academic optimism as evidenced in their professional beliefs, expectations, and behaviors are likely to be more effective in schools in underserved communities than teachers with lower levels of academic optimism. However, teachers do not enact their professional practice in isolation. Principals also play a role in this process.

Leadership in Full-Service Community Schools

Creating expectations and conditions for effective teaching and learning are key responsibilities of school principals. Principals of full-service community schools, in particular, have an opportunity to promote innovative instructional practices as they seek to transform organizational structures and norms to provide integrated services (Sanders & Hembrick-Roberts, 2013; Smrekar & Mawhinney, 1999). To realize this potential, school leaders must change how they view and enact their professional roles and responsibilities (Dodge, Keenan, & Lattanzi, 2002; Weist, Goldstein, Morris, & Bryant, 2003). School leaders, in particular principals, must establish expectations, structures, and processes that allow for authentic collaboration among service providers, families, community members, and teachers (Abrams & Gibbs, 2000). Blank, Berg, and Melaville (2006) described such individuals as cross boundary leaders.

According to Blank et al. (2006), cross boundary leaders understand that schools prepared to meet the needs of historically underserved students require "networks of responsibility" rather than "traditional models of isolated leadership" (p. 1). Thus, these leaders achieve organizational goals by bringing together individuals from different role groups, including professional educators at the school and district levels; community partners spanning a variety of fields and areas of expertise; and families (Jean-Marie, Ruffin, Burr, & Horsford, 2010). However, each of these groups has belief systems, norms of engagement, as well as social identities that may create conflict rather than consensus around the best ways to advance students' learning and well-being (Lau & Murnighan, 2005). To achieve mutually shared goals, cross boundary leaders, who are also bound by professional and social norms and experiences, must carry out strategies to bridge divisions and manage conflicts that may arise between and among individuals representing different role groups (Ernst & Yip, 2009). Through an in-depth analysis of a variety of international organizations, Ernst and Yip (2009) identified four such practices—suspending, reframing, nesting, and weaving. According to the authors,

> By suspending intergroup differences, reframing a shared and inclusive identity, nesting diverse groups within a larger organizational goal, and through weaving organizational and social identities, boundary spanning leaders can generate effective intergroup contact in service of a larger organizational mission, vision, or goal. (p. 14)

Full-service community schools, in particular, require cross boundary school leaders to implement such practices because the social capital on which these schools rely and seek to generate is only possible through expanded relationships (Galindo et al., 2017; Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2014). Capturing their importance within successful full-service community schools, Adams (2010) observed, "Relationships function as resources when social bonds within role groups and social bridges between role groups are strong" (p. 9).

Several studies have found that while cross boundary leaders are needed throughout the school, principals, in particular, play a unique and essential role

in ensuring schools' success (Abrams & Gibbs, 2000; Valli et al., 2014). For example, using qualitative methods, Jean-Marie et al. (2010) and Sanders (2018) found that principals in effective full-service community schools are critical in creating the structures and norms that make boundary crossing relationships possible; and, in turn, use these relationships to widely implement reform principles. However, principals need support in managing the demands of partnership development, coordination, and maintenance.

Service Coordination in Full-Service Community Schools

No two full-service community schools are exactly alike. They differ by location, services provided, target populations, and level of district and state support (Blank, Jacobson, & Melaville, 2012). Despite such differences, all full-service community schools share common concerns about governing and staffing their extended programs. Who should operate as the governing body of the integrated services program? Should it be the school, a community-based organization, or some other entity? How will the governing body be trained and professionally developed? How will service provision be integrated into the overall school plan? Each of these questions must be considered before a successful full-service community schools model can be implemented.

Special attention should also be given to how community partners will share news and ideas, the roles and responsibilities of each partner, and the impact their individual services will have on participating students and families. These issues are key aspects to be considered during the planning stage of collaboration so stakeholders can avoid many of the complications regarding professional turf, shared vision, and long-term commitment inhered in collaborative initiatives (Fusarelli, 2008; McMahon, Ward, Pruett, Davidson, & Griffith, 2000; Rubin, 2002).

Several approaches have been used to manage service integration at full-service community schools. Dryfoos and Maguire (2002) described a community-based approach where a single community organization is responsible for the coordination and administration of program services. Adelman (1996) described an approach where an external consultant serves as the driver of the integrated services program and then leaves once it becomes stable. Alternatively, Holtzman (1992, 1997) described the importance of an individual coordinator within the school to facilitate program planning, implementation, and maintenance. The effectiveness of one of these approaches over another has not been empirically determined (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002; McMahon et al., 2000), in part due to the contextually specific nature of full-service community schools (Cummings et al., 2011). However, the important role played by individual coordinators, often referred to as community school coordinators, has been highlighted in recent research.

For example, using qualitative case study methods, Ruffin (2013) found that community school coordinators perform an informal leadership role, working closely with the principal to develop and sustain relationships between and among key stakeholders (i.e., teachers, students, families, and community agencies). In a multiple case study, Sanders (2016) found that community school coordinators were also critical in identifying, evaluating, and maintaining

community partnerships. Community school coordinators' responsibilities included vetting partners to ensure their alignment with school goals and needs, terminating partnerships deemed ineffective, and actively pursuing grants and in-kind donations to sustain partnership activities. Given these essential tasks, school and system leaders must safeguard the role of community school coordinators to avoid a dispersion of responsibilities, ensure their appropriate selection and professional development, and facilitate faculty and staff understanding of their role in realizing the school's overall vision and mission. School and system leaders must also prioritize funding for these personnel to achieve desired benefits for students and families (McMahon et al., 2000).

Benefits of Full-Service Community Schools

As full-service community schools have expanded over the past two decades, a number of qualitative and quantitative studies in the United States and internationally have been conducted to examine their effects on students and families. Overall, findings from these studies are encouraging.

Empirical Evidence on Student Educational Outcomes

When examining the influence of full-service community schools on student educational outcomes, researchers and practitioners refer to academic achievement in key content areas, and other behavioral indicators of student success such as attendance, retention, and suspension. Results from studies analyzing the direct influence of community schools on student achievement are promising but not conclusive (Blank et al., 2003; Dryfoos, 2000). In a recent research brief from *Child Trends,* for instance, Moore and Emig (2014) reviewed 11 evaluations, seven quasi-experimental studies, and four randomized-control trials, of programs conducted in the United States that included integrated student supports (i.e., Beacon Initiative, City Connects, Comer School Development Program, Communities In Schools, School of the Twenty-first Century, university-assisted community schools, and others). The authors found a positive impact of providing coordinated support services, a key dimension of full-service community schools, on math achievement and overall grade point average.

In contrast, evidence from a longitudinal evaluation of full-service community schools with the Tulsa Area Community Schools Initiative did not show overall positive effects on math and reading scores for fifth grade students in these schools when compared to average achievement outcomes for same grade level students in non-full-service community schools (Adams, 2010). Similarly, in an evaluation of full-service community schools in the United Kingdom, Cummings et al. (2011) were unable to demonstrate an overall improvement in achievement for the majority of students attending full-service community schools. In other words, being educated in a full-service community school did not enable "the majority of pupils to attain more highly than they would if they were educated in other schools" (p. 94).

However, it is important to note that subsequent analyses presented in these studies identified positive achievement outcomes under specific circumstances

or for some subgroups (what is known as interaction effects in quantitative research). For example, when examining whether the influence of community schools was relevant for particular groups, Cummings et al. (2011) found that community schools improved academic outcomes for the most economically disadvantaged students, and narrowed the achievement gap between these students and their more affluent peers. Adams (2010) also demonstrated positive effects of community schools when quality of implementation was considered. When examining community schools that were implementing the community school model successfully, Adams found that students, on average, scored 32 and 19 points higher in math and reading, respectively, than the comparison group. He concluded that community schools that have reached the mentoring and sustaining levels of diffusion positively and *directly* impacted students' learning outcomes.

Other research has demonstrated robust, *indirect* effects of community schools on student achievement. For example, Olson (2014) demonstrated the positive influence of community schools on attendance rates and chronic absenteeism when comparing 37 community schools in Baltimore City to their non-community school counterparts. Moore and Emig (2014) also found positive effects of programs offering coordinated services on attendance, which has a positive effect on student achievement, retention, and graduation. The potential indirect effects of full-service community schools on student achievement were also reported by Heers, Van Klaveren, Groot, & van den Brink (2016). In their review of research on full-service community schools, the authors found that key dimensions of these schools (e.g., cooperation with community partners or other institutions, family engagement, and participation in extracurricular activities) were negatively associated with risky behaviors such as substance abuse and criminal involvement, and positively associated with high school graduation.

Empirical Evidence on Other Family Outcomes

Research has also demonstrated that full-service community schools are positively linked to greater access to coordinated services for families, lower family stress, and increased family engagement in children's education. Zetlin, Ramos, and Chee (2001), for instance, conducted two case studies of school-based integrated services programs in two low-income communities. The authors found that through relationships built over time, service providers were able to link parents to essential supports that improved families' overall well-being. Similarly, a qualitative study of an integrated services initiative for refugee families in two primary schools in Australia reported more effective and comprehensive assistance for families (Hancock, Cooper, & Bahn, 2009). In addition, Arimura and Corter (2010) conducted a mixed-methods study with 38 parents. Twelve were from two full-service early childhood programs consisting of kindergarten, childcare, and family support, and 16 were from comparison sites that offered traditional early childhood education programs. The authors found that parents from the full-service school sites reported significantly lower levels of stress and increased interaction with school faculty, staff, and other parents than parents from the traditional programs.

Although limited in number, as a whole, these studies underscore the potential benefits of full-service community schools for improving students' educational outcomes and families' well-being. This body of research also underscores the need for more research on the effects of full-service community schools, as well as best practices that address challenges to their effective implementation. In addition, future research should examine the benefits of these schools taking into account students' developmental stages and grade levels (e.g., early childhood, elementary, and secondary) to better understand the extent to which these factors influence the impact of full-service community schools on students' experiences and outcomes.

Challenges and Future Directions for Full-Service Community Schools

To increase the educational opportunities and outcomes of underserved students, full-service community schools aim to expand their access to needed resources and supports. To achieve this objective, full-service community schools must address key implementation challenges. In this section, three such challenges are discussed: (a) funding, (b) monitoring and evaluation, and (c) equitable community outreach and support. The challenges examined in this section do not represent an exhaustive list. Rather, the first two have been consistently identified in the literature (see for example, Blank et al., 2003; Dryfoos, 2003; McMahon et al., 2000); and the third has emerged from our current work on full-service community schools (see Galindo et al., 2017). While discussing these implementation challenges, we also identify important directions for future research.

Funding

Given the type and amount of services and programs provided by full-service community schools, there is a need to combine diverse sources of funding, both public (e.g., federal, state, district, and city) and private (e.g., local partners and private foundations). On average, a significant proportion of the funding for full-service community schools comes from district, state, and federal sources (Blank, Jacobson, Melaville, & Pearson, 2010). Potential federal funding sources include the Department of Education, primarily through Title I, Twenty-first Century Community Learning Centers, School Improvement Funds, and Promise Neighborhoods. Other important sources of federal funding come from the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Recently, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) included important provisions that support the implementation of full-service community schools: grant programs for full-service community schools (at least 10 grants), and the allocation of funds to support components of full-service community schools, such as coordinating services for students and teacher professional development on parent and community engagement (Coalition for Community Schools, n.d.). While promising, it is still

unclear how much total funding will be made available to full-service community schools through ESSA, and its impact on reform sustainability.

In the meantime, cities and states remain important sources of funding for many full-service community schools. In cities, such as New York and Baltimore, full-service community schools are increasingly receiving local resources to support their implementation. In Kentucky and Minnesota, state sources of funding are used to cover significant portions of implementation costs. For example, the Kentucky Education Reform Act apportions each school enrolling a specified percent of poor students funding for a community school coordinator (Frankl, 2016). Also, Minnesota has established new funds for planning, implementing, and improving full-service community schools (Coalition for Community Schools, n.d.).

Although public funding sources have increased over the past years, full-service community schools most often need to supplement their budgets with resources from local partners or private foundations to efficiently function. The diverse and fragmented nature of their funding has implications for service coordination, integration, and sustainability, directly impacting the number and quality of services and programs provided (Fusarelli & Lindle, 2011). Therefore, how full-service community schools manage funding challenges remains an important consideration for practice and an area for future research.

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

A critical component of any educational reform is its rigorous and systematic evaluation to guide implementation and sustainability. Within full-service community schools this is a very complex task because of the increased number of models and the different components and activities that these schools implement (Cummings et al., 2011; McMahon et al., 2000). Three evaluation challenges are commonly observed in full-service community schools. One is how to disentangle the unique effectiveness of different activities when programs and services are simultaneously implemented. A second challenge relates to the unit of analysis that is most appropriate when examining the impact of full-service community schools (e.g., school-wide or student/family-level outcomes), and the need to consider multi-level modeling approaches to take into account the nested structure of data utilized in quantitative evaluations (students/families nested within schools). The third is how to separate the true effects of full-service community schools from potential confounders, including selection bias due to participant characteristics. As Dobbie and Fryer (2009) argued, sound methodological approaches are required to deal with these interrelated challenges.

Besides utilizing rigorous quantitative approaches to identify unbiased effects of these schools on potential student and family outcomes, it is important to also utilize qualitative approaches to gather in-depth information about different facets of the reform as well as the perceptions and attitudes of stakeholders involved in the implementation process (Heers et al., 2016). The benefits of mixed-methods approaches, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques, to provide holistic understanding of the implementation of any educational reform has been increasingly recognized among researchers and practitioners (Sondergeld &

Koskey, 2011). Azzam and Szanyi (2011), for example, asked 175 researchers to recommend evaluation strategies for a fictitious program designed to improve achievement outcomes and self-esteem among high school students. The authors found that researchers considered the combination of quantitative and qualitative strategies as optimal for triangulation and cross-validation of research findings.

In addition to diverse methodological approaches to program evaluation, different, yet complementary, conceptual approaches also exist. Owen (2007) describes five of these: (a) Proactive (before a program/reform is implemented), (b) Clarificative (after the program is implemented focusing on internal structure and functioning), (c) Interactive or Participatory (active role of key roles/actors in implementing the reform), (d) Monitoring (examine the progress or evolution of a reform or program), and (e) Impact (effect of the program on key indicators). Any one or a combination of these evaluation approaches could be taken when examining the effectiveness of full-service community schools. Before deciding the conceptual approach(es) to take, however, it is important to identify performance indicators that are measurable, flexible, responsive to the stage of implementation, and consistent with other school goals (Shah, Brink, London, Masur, & Quihuis, 2009).

Because of their specific mission, full-service community schools need to define indicators that are of interest to all schools such as climate, teacher effectiveness, and student achievement and behavioral outcomes; as well as specific indicators related to the quality of services provided to students and families, family engagement, and community outreach and development. Ultimately, learning more about what works, for whom, and under what conditions will lead to more effective full-service community schools for underserved students and families.

Equitable Outreach and Support

Since the 1960s, schools, especially in urban areas, are becoming more racially/ethnically diverse due to changing settlement patterns and different fertility rates among immigrant populations (Sanders & Galindo, 2014). Although the growing multicultural nature of society provides important opportunities for enriching learning experiences, it also brings challenges to schools as microcosms of the larger society. Of significance, increasing distrust and conflict exist among some low-income racial/ethnic groups (Gay, 2006; Oliver & Wong, 2003) due, at least partially, to a competition for resources. These tensions threaten the intergroup connections (social capital) that can generate transformative change in poor communities of color (Galindo et al., 2017).

Full-service community schools can address this threat by creating environments that promote intergroup understanding, collaboration, and exchange. To do so, these schools must take into account racial/ethnic groups' different needs, experiences of discrimination, and feelings of marginalization and invisibility when designing programmatic services and activities. That is, when these schools serve diverse racial/ethnic minority populations, it is important that they engage in practices that convey a message that *all* groups are valued and welcomed.

This can present challenges for full-service community schools as Galindo et al. (2017) found in a case study of an elementary school in a large urban district. Despite the school's success in providing services and supports that were more expansive than those found in traditional schools serving low-income and racially/ethnically diverse students, some non-Latino parents of color believed that its programming was directed mainly toward Latinos. They reported feeling less valued and in unfair competition over the school's expanded, but nonetheless limited, resources. Thus, if full-service community schools fail at equitable outreach, they can contribute to increasing divisions among underserved populations, thereby reducing these schools' capacity to serve as organizations of social change (Galindo et al., 2017). Additional research is therefore needed to document how full-service community schools serving diverse low-income populations ensure equitable outreach and service provision.

Conclusion

Full-service community schools seek to improve the educational experiences and outcomes of historically underserved students by providing comprehensive services that respond to their multifaceted needs. Furthermore, these schools aim to strengthen families and communities as mutually influential spheres in children's learning and development (Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Comer et al., 1996; Epstein, 2010). Although full-service community schools are not a new reform, they have taken on new appeal as we again recognize that holistic approaches to learning are needed to realize the presently elusive goal of educational equity for all students.

While limited, research on the new wave of full-service community schools is promising. It is clear in these studies that the effectiveness of full-service community schools largely depends on their ability to embody the theoretical principles on which they were founded. This requires that teachers, principals, and other school personnel enact their professional roles differently to build on students' cultural, family, and community assets, and to expand access to needed resources through service coordination and provision. If these enhanced professional roles are to be effectively carried out and sustained, funding, evaluation, and outreach challenges must be addressed. These challenges are thus important areas for practical consideration and continued research. By addressing them, full-service community schools can contribute to more socially just outcomes for the nation's children and youth.

References

Abrams, L. S., & Gibbs, J. T. (2000). Planning for school change: School-community collaboration in a full-service elementary school. *Urban Education*, *35*(1), 79–103 https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085900351005.

Adams, C. M. (2010). *The community school effect: Evidence from an evaluation of the Tulsa Area Community School Initiative*. Tulsa, OK: University of Oklahoma.

The Oklahoma Center for Educational Policy. Retrieved from http://www.
csctulsa.org/files/file/Achievement%20Evidence%20from%20an%20
Evaluation%20of%20TACSI.pdf.

Adelman, H. (1996). Restructuring education support services and integrating
community resources: Beyond the full service school model. *School Psychology
Review*, *25*, 431–445.

Allen, K. M., Jackson, I., & Knight, M. G. (2012). Complicating culturally relevant
pedagogy: Unpacking African immigrants cultural identities. *International
Journal of Multicultural Education*, *14*(2), 1–28 https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.
v14i2.506.

Ardelt, M., & Eccles, J. (2001). Effects of mothers' parental efficacy beliefs and
promotive parenting practices on inner-city youth. *Journal of Family Issues*, *22*(8),
944–972. https://doi.org/10.1177/019251301022008001.

Arimura, T., & Corter, C. (2010). School-based integrated early childhood programs:
Impact on the well-being of children and parents. *Interaction*, *20*(1), 23–32.

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Planty, M., Snyder, T., Bianco, K., Fox, M., … Drake, L. (2010).
The condition of education 2010 (NCES 2010-028). Washington, DC: National
Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department
of Education.

Azzam, T., & Szanyi, M. (2011). Designing evaluations: A study examining preferred
evaluation designs of educational evaluators. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*,
37(2–3), 134–143 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2011.04.006.

Blank, M. J., Berg, A. C., & Melaville, A. (2006). *Growing community schools:
The role of cross-boundary leadership*. Washington, DC: Coalition for
Community Schools. Retrieved from http://www.communityschools.org/
assets/1/AssetManager/Growing_COMM_Schools.pdf.

Blank, M. J., Jacobson, R., & Melaville, A. (2012). *Achieving results through
community school partnerships: How district and community leaders are building
effective, sustainable relationships*. Center for American Progress Retrieved from
https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2012/01/pdf/
community_schools.pdf.

Blank, M. J., Jacobson, R., Melaville, A., & Pearson, S. (2010). *Financing community
schools: Leveraging resources to support student success*. Washington, DC:
Coalition for Community Schools and Institute for Educational Leadership
Retrieved from http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/
finance-paper.pdf.

Blank, M. J., Melaville, A., & Shah, B. P. (2003). *Making a difference: Research and
practice in community schools*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community
Schools. Retrieved from http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/Page/
CCSFullReport.pdf.

Blank, M. J., & Villarreal, L. (2015). Where it all comes together: How partnerships
connect communities and schools. *American Educator*, *39*, 4–9.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development.
In T. Husen, & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of
education* (2nd ed., Vol. *3*) (pp. 1643–1647). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Byrnes, J. P., & Wasik, B. A. (2009). Factors predictive of mathematics achievement
in kindergarten, first and third grades: An opportunity-propensity analysis.

Contemporary Educational Psychology, *34*(2), 167–183 https://doi.org/10.1016/j. cedpsych.2009.01.002.

Clapp, E. (1971). *Community schools in action*. New York: Arno Press & The New York Times.

Coalition for Community Schools (n.d.) ESSA Reauthorization. Retrieved from http://www.communityschools.org/policy_advocacy/esea_reauthorization.aspx

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*(1), 95–120 https://doi.org/10.1086/228943.

Comer, J. P., Haynes, N. M., Joyner, E. T., & Ben-Avie, M. (Eds.) (1996). *Rallying the whole village: The comer process for reforming education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Crosnoe, R., & Cooper, C. E. (2010). Economically disadvantaged children's transitions into elementary school: Linking family processes, school contexts, and educational policy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *47*(2), 258–291 https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209351564.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. (1993). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. *American Journal of Education*, *101*(2), 140–179.

Cummings, C., Dyson, A., & Todd, L. (2011). *Beyond the school gates: Can full service and extended schools overcome disadvantage?*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Dewey, J. (2007). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Dobbie, W., & Fryer, R. G. (2009). *Are high quality schools enough to close the achievement gap? Evidence from a social experiment in Harlem*. Cambridge, MA: The National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER Working Paper No. 15473). Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w15473.pdf.

Dodge, N., Keenan, S., & Lattanzi, T. (2002). Strengthening the capacity of schools and communities to serve students with serious emotional disturbance. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *11*(1), 23–34 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014711426915.

Dryfoos, J. G. (2000). *Evaluation of community schools: Findings to date*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools. Retrieved from www.communityschools.org.

Dryfoos, J. G. (2003). A community school in action. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, *11*(4), 203–206.

Dryfoos, J. G. (2005). Introduction. In J. G. Dryfoos, J. Quinn, & C. Barkin (Eds.), *Community schools in action: Lessons from a decade of practice* (pp. 3–6). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dryfoos, J. G., & Maguire, S. (2002). *Inside full-service community schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Dryfoos, J. G., Quinn, J., & Barkin, C. (Eds.) (2005). *Community schools in action: Lessons from a decade of practice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Duncan, G. J., & Murnane, R. J. (2011). Introduction: The American dream, then and now. In G. J. Duncan, & R. J. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 3–23). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Eisenhower Foundation (2005). Full-service community schools replication handbook. Retrieved from http://www.eisenhowerfoundation.org/docs/FSCS_Handbook_2005.pdf

Epstein, J. L. (2010). *School and family partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Ernst, C., & Yip, J. (2009). Boundary spanning leadership: Tactics for bridging social boundaries in organization. In T. Pittinsky (Ed.), *Crossing the divide: Intergroup leadership in a world of difference* (pp. 161–176). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Frankl, E. (2016). *Community schools: Transforming struggling schools into thriving schools*. Washington, DC: The Center for Popular Democracy Retrieved from https://populardemocracy.org/sites/default/files/Community-Schools-021116.pdf.

Fryer, R. G. Jr., & Levitt, S. D. (2004). Understanding the Black-White test score gap in the first two years of school. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *86*, 447–464 https://doi.org/10.1162/003465304323031049.

Fusarelli, B. C. (2008). The politics of coordinated services for children: Inter-institutional relations and social justice. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 350–373). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fusarelli, B. C., & Lindle, J. C. (2011). The politics, problems, and potential promise of school-linked social services: Insights and new directions from the work of William Lowe Boyd. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *86*(4), 402–415 https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2011.597270.

Galindo, C., & Pucino, A. (2012). Family diversity and school-family relationships. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (pp. 885–889). New York, NY: Sage Publications.

Galindo, C., Sanders, M., & Abel, Y. (2017). Transforming educational experiences in low income communities: A qualitative case study of social capital in a full-service community school. *American Educational Research Journal*, [Centennial Edition], *54*(1S), 140–163.

Galindo, C., & Sheldon, S. (2012). School and home connections and children's kindergarten achievement gains: The mediating role of family involvement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *47*, 90–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2011.05.004.

Galindo, C., & Sonnenschein, S. (2015). Decreasing the SES math achievement gap: Initial math proficiency and home learning environments. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *43*, 25–38 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.08.003.

Gay, C. (2006). Seeing difference: The effect of economic disparity on black attitudes toward Latinos. *American Journal of Political Science*, *50*(4), 982–997 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.15405907.2006.00228.x.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.

Granovetter, M. S. (1983). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revised. *Sociology Theory*, *1*, 201–233.

Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, *39*(1), 59–68 https://doi.org/10.2307/202051.

Grossman, J., & Vang, Z. (2009). *The case for school-based integration of services: Changing the ways students, families and communities engage with their schools.* New York, NY: Public/Private Ventures.

Halpern, D. (2005). *Social capital.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Hancock, P., Cooper, T., & Bahn, S. (2009). Evaluation of the integrated services pilot program from Western Australia. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *32*, 238–246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2008.12.001.

Hanley, M. S., & Noblit, G. W. (2009). *Cultural responsiveness, racial identity and academic success: A review of literature.* Pittsburgh, PA: The Heinz Endowments.

Heers, M., Van Klaveren, C., Groot, W., & van den Brink, H. M. (2016). Community schools: What we know and what we need to know. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*, 1–36 https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315627365.

Henderson, A. T., & Whipple, M. (2013). How to connect with families. *Educational Leadership*, *70*(9), 44–48.

Holtzman, W. H. (1992). Community renewal, family preservation, and child development through the school of the future. In W. H. Holtzman (Ed.), *School of the future* (pp. 45–59). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association & Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.

Holtzman, W. H. (1997). Community psychology and full-service schools in different cultures. *American Psychologist*, *52*(4), 381–389 https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.4.381.

Hoy, A. W., Hoy, W. K., & Kurz, N. M. (2008). Teacher's academic optimism: The development and test of a new construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(4), 821–835. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.08.004.

Jean-Marie, G., Ruffin, V., Burr, K., & Horsford, S. (2010). Leading across boundaries: The role of community schools and cross-boundary leadership in school reform. In S. D. Horsford (Ed.), *New perspectives in educational leadership: Exploring social, political, and community contexts and meaning* (pp. 217–238). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Johanek, M. C., & Puckett, J. L. (2007). *Leonard Covello and the making of Benjamin Franklin High School: Education as if citizenship mattered.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. (2005). Interactions within groups and subgroups: The effects of demographic faultlines. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(4), 645–659 https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.17843943.

McMahon, T. J., Ward, N. L., Pruett, M. K., Davidson, L., & Griffith, E. H. (2000). Building full-service schools: Lessons learned in the development of interagency collaboratives. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, *11*(1), 65–92 https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532768Xjepc1101_05.

Moore, K. A., & Emig, C. (2014). *Integrated student supports: A summary of the evidence base for policymakers.* Washington, DC: Child Trends Retrieved from http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/2014-05ISSWhite Paper1.pdf.

Morgan, W., & Streb, M. (2001). Building citizenship: How student voice in service-learning develops civic values. *Social Science Quarterly*, *82*(1), 154–169 https://doi.org/10.1111/0038-4941.00014.

Noguera, P. A. (2005). Transforming urban schools through investments in the social capital of parents. In S. Saegert, J. P. Thompson, & M. R. Warren (Eds.), *Social capital and poor communities* (pp. 189–212). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Oliver, E. J., & Wong, J. (2003). Intergroup prejudice in multiethnic settings. *American Journal of Political Science*, *47*(4), 567–582 https://doi.org/10.2307/3186119.

Olson, L. (2014). *A first look at community schools in Baltimore*. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore Education Research Consortium. Retrieved from http://baltimore-berc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/CommunitySchoolsReportDec2014.pdf.

Owen, J. M. (2007). *Program evaluation: Forms and approaches* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.

Pil, F. K., & Leana, C. R. (2009). Applying organizational research to public school reform: The effect of teacher human capital and social capital on student performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*(6), 1101–1124.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *1*, 1–24.

Pritchard, I. (2002). Community service and service-learning in America: The state of the art. In A. Furco, & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 3–22). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Reardon, S. F., & Galindo, C. (2009). The Hispanic-White achievement gap in math and reading in the elementary grades. *American Educational Research Journal*, *46*(3), 853–891 https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209333184.

Richardson, J. (2009). *The full-service community school movement: Lessons from the James Adams community school*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roderick, M., Nagaoka, J., & Coca, V. (2009). College readiness for all: The challenge for urban high school. *The Future of the Children*, *19*(1), 185–210.

Roderick, T. (2001). *A school of our own: Parents, power, and community at the East Harlem Block Schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rogers, J. S. (1998). Community schools: Lessons for the past and present. Retrieved from http://sedn.senate.ca.gov/sites/sedn.senate.ca.gov/files/rogers_community_schools_lessons_1998.pdf

Rubin, H. (2002). *Collaborative leadership: Developing effective partnerships in communities and schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Ruffin, V. D. (2013). *Exploratory case studies of the role of the community school coordinator: Developing the school social network in urban elementary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (Publication number: 3561094).

Sampson, R. (2012). *Great American city: Chicago and the enduring neighborhood effect*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sanders, M. G. (2013). Poverty, families, and schools. In C. Yeakey, V. Thompson, & A. Wells (Eds.), *Urban ills: Confronting twenty first century dilemmas of urban living in global contexts* (pp. 329–350). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Sanders, M. G. (2016). Leadership, partnerships, and organizational development: Exploring components of effectiveness in three full-service community schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *27*(2), 1–21 https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2015.1030432.

Sanders, M. G. (2018). Crossing boundaries: A qualitative exploration of relational leaderhsip in Three Full-Service Communities. *Teachers College Record*, *120*(4), 1–36.

Sanders, M., & Galindo, C. (2014). Communities, schools, and teachers. In K. Bauserman, L. Martin, S. Kragler, & D. Quatroche (Eds.), *The handbook of professional development, PK-12: Successful models and practices* (pp. 103–124). New York, NY: Guilford Publishing.

Sanders, M., Galindo, C., & Allen, K. M. (2018). Professional capital and culturally relevant education in full-service community schools. A qualitative exploration of the role of teachers. *Urban Education*. Advanced online publication.https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918770719.

Sanders, M. G., & Hembrick-Roberts, J. (2013). Leadership for service integration in schools. In L. Tillman, & J. Scheurich (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational leadership for diversity and equity* (pp. 476–493). London: Routledge.

Shah, S. C., Brink, K., London, R., Masur, S., & Quihuis, G. (2009). *Community school evaluation toolkit.* Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools Retrieved from http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/Evaluation_Toolkit_March2010.pdf.

Sheldon, S. B. (2002). Parents' social networks and beliefs as predictors of parental involvement. *The Elementary School Journal*, *102*(4), 301–316.

Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education*, *47*(3), 562–584 https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085911431472.

Smith, S. S. (2000). Mobilizing social resources: Race, ethnic, and gender differences in social capital and persisting wages inequalities. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *41*(4), 509–537 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2000.tb00071.x.

Smrekar, C., & Mawhinney, H. (1999). Integrated services: Challenges in linking schools, families, and communities. In J. Murphy, & K. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed.) (pp. 443–461). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Sondergeld, T. A., & Koskey, K. L. K. (2011). Evaluating the impact of an urban comprehensive school reform: An illustration of the need for mixed methods. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *37*(2), 94–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2011.08.001.

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2011). A social capital framework for the study of institutional agents and their role in the empowerment of low-status youth. *Youth and Society*, *43*(3), 1066–1109 https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X10382877.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*, 751–796 https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308321456.

Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2014). Leadership in school-community partnerships. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *141*, 110–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.020.

Wald, J., & Losen, D. J. (2003). Defining and redirecting a school to prison pipeline. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *99*, 9–15 https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.51.

Warren, M. R. (2005). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, *75*(2), 133–173 https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.75.2.m718151032167438.

Warren, M. R., & Mapp, K. L. (2011). *A match on dry grass: Community organizing as a catalyst for school reform*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Weist, M., Goldstein, A., Morris, L., & Bryant, T. (2003). Integrating expanded school mental health programs and school-based health centers. *Psychology in the Schools*, *40*(3), 297–308 https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10089.

Zetlin, A. G., Ramos, C., & Chee, A. (2001). Two case studies of community schools serving Latino and Southeast Asian children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *10*(1), 23–38 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016640327789.