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It has been recognized for decades that parent and family (PF) involvement is a vital component of students' educational experiences. Moreover, PF involvement is identified as an important protective factor for students. Thus, school administrators and educators understanding and encouraging positive relationships between families and schools may be one way to promote academic, social, and emotional success for youth throughout their lives. The purpose of this paper is to examine the literature on PF involvement and delineate a proposed model of PF involvement to foster resilience in children and youth.
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The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA), successor of the No Child Left Behind Act, and the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965 (ESEA), promotes meaningful involvement between local education agencies (LEAs) and PFs to foster student achievement and increase academic success. LEAs must implement effective policies and programs to support PFs in being actively involved with the school and in sharing and promoting high academic achievement for all students. PF involvement in schools is emphasized in subsequent federal legislation since ESEA. However, a criticism of ESEA’s handling of PF involvement is that the policy was too narrowly defined, focusing primarily on PFs’ right to receive and act on information regarding their children’s school (Kreider & Bouffard, 2009). In the ESSA, the construct of parental involvement was broadened to encompass parental and family engagement. The act specifies that LEAs must involve PFs in school activities and ensure meaningful, two-way communication with PFs in their native language. Also, LEAs must evaluate the effectiveness of their PF engagement policies and use evidence-based strategies to increase PF involvement.

While a multitude of PF involvement policies have emerged, few incentives or sanctions have been established to ensure policies are implemented (Kreider & Bouffard, 2009). In response to the federal mandates, some states have established policies to monitor and evaluate PF involvement programs (Agronick, Clark, O’Donnell, & Steuve,
These policies use a variety of approaches to evaluate programs and hold districts accountable for policy compliance.

Parent and family (PF) involvement in school is identified as a significant protective factor for children and youth, including those with disabilities; families from low socio-economic backgrounds; and families from culturally diverse backgrounds (Campos, 2008; Werner, 1995). Although involving PFs in school presents challenges, when school administrators, educators, and families work together, students’ needs are better met; in turn, narrowing the achievement gap for at-risk populations by fostering resilience (Burke, 2013; Campos, 2008). Children and youth who demonstrate positive outcomes despite adversities in their lives are considered resilient (Zolkoski & Bullock, 2012). Family relationships are an important factor in facilitating resilient outcomes (Benzies & Mychasiuk, 2009; Werner, 1995).

School administrators play a significant role in developing a culture where PF feel valued (Barr & Saltmarsh, 2014; Young, Austin, & Growe, 2013). It is vital for school administrators to lead the way in promoting PF involvement and create a supportive environment where educators are encouraged to foster PF involvement. Strong school administrators create an atmosphere where PFs are viewed as partners rather than outsiders. Understanding and encouraging positive relationships between families and school personnel is one way to promote academic, social, and emotional success for youth throughout their lives (Campos, 2008). Throughout this paper, school personnel will be the term used when collectively discussing school administrators and educators.

Resilience is defined as achieving positive outcomes in the face of adverse circumstances (Zolkoski & Bullock, 2012). Specifically, resilient individuals effectively manage traumatic experiences and avoid negative outcomes associated with risk. Risk and resilience should be perceived through the prism of multiple, iterative influencing interactions with individuals, families, and more extensive social settings. The interaction of risk factors influences whether normal developmental processes result (Richardson, 2008; Werner, 1995). Consequently, resilience is recognized as an ecological phenomenon, because having the capability to overcome adversity does not occur in isolation, rather, through continual interaction.

Resilience may be inhibited by risk factors or enhanced by protective factors (Masten, 2011). Children and youth face a multitude of risk factors on their path towards adulthood including biological (e.g., congenital defects; Brooks, 2006) and environmental influences (e.g., poverty; Masten, 2011). Although risk infers the possibility of negative outcomes, protective factors may buffer these negative outcomes and foster resilience. Protective factors change responses to adverse circumstances so that individuals can avoid potential negative outcomes and include individual characteristics (Buckner, Mezzacappa, & Beardslee, 2003), family conditions (Benzies & Mychasiuk, 2009), and/or community supports.

From Bronfenbrenner’s (1979, 1986) point of view, risk and resilience focus more on introducing protective factors into high-risk ecologies. It has been well established that PFs play an important role in students’ education; however, there is a lack of clarity regarding what that role should be and how to increase PF involvement (LaRocque, Kleiman, & Darling, 2011; Rodriguez, Blatz, & Elbaum, 2014).

The social-ecological theory is an appropriate framework for understanding resilience and PF involvement. This lens assumes that healthy human development
begins through family interactions but is not limited to the home setting (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Utilizing Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) social-ecological theory, the purpose of this paper is to introduce the RESILIENCE Model for involving PFs in school. Since PF involvement is a strong protective factor in the lives of children and youth, school personnel should be aware of resources regarding how to increase PF involvement to promote resilience.

**Findings from the Literature**

To help school personnel student foster resilience, it is essential to gain a thorough understanding of connections between PF involvement, academic achievement, and mental health. Research has continually shown positive outcomes for students who have PFs actively involved in their education. For example, PF involvement (a) positively impacts students’ academic success (e.g., Wang & Sheikh-Khalil, 2014), (b) improves literacy of students (e.g., LaRocque et al., 2011), (c) increases homework completion (e.g., Patall, Cooper, & Robinson, 2008), and (d) supports positive classroom behavior (e.g., Bokhorst-Heng, 2008). According to Tinkler (2002), school attendance, motivation, and reduced dropout rates are associated with PF involvement. In addition to promoting academic success, PF involvement positively impacts adolescent mental health (e.g., Wang & Sheikh-Khalil, 2014). Moreover, improved emotional functioning can positively influence school achievement.

According to LaRocque and colleagues (2011), PF involvement in school may increase awareness of family members’ knowledge of factors related to the child’s education. Specifically, PFs are better informed about teacher expectations and the needs of their child. PF involvement is linked to the development of higher educational ambitions for their child and has even been related to PFs pursuing additional education for themselves (Chen & Gregory, 2010). Involved PFs often have a more positive attitude toward educators, and school administrators can gain an understanding of how to best meet the needs of their students (Sawyer, 2015). It is essential for PFs and school personnel to have a shared understanding. School personnel can effectively plan activities and goals using information provided by PFs. Bi-directional communication between PFs and teachers ensures that all parties have a clear understanding of the child’s educational progress (LaRocque et al., 2011; Rodriguez, Blatz, & Elbaum, 2014).

**Special education.** PF involvement in all children’s education is important in nurturing resilience but is vital for students with disabilities (LaRocque et al., 2011; Sawyer, 2015). Although PFs of students with disabilities face more barriers to involvement than students without disabilities, when PFs become involved, research demonstrates positive student outcomes (Fishman & Nickerson, 2014). For example, Zolkoski, Bullock, and Gable (2016) conducted interviews with former students labeled with emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) who attended alternative education programs to examine factors of resilience. Although research points to many students with EBD facing poor outcomes (e.g., Gable, Tonelson, Sheth, Wilson, & Park, 2012; United States Department of Education, 2012), participants from the study were resilient because they had graduated from their alternative education programs, had a high school diploma, and were currently working or attending post-secondary institutions (Zolkoski
et al., 2016) One of the themes found from the study was PF involvement. Specifically, each participant discussed how his PF helped and supported him throughout school. Moreover, participants believed their PFs were one of the reasons for their success. PF involvement is listed as an evidence-based practice in alternative education programs (Tobin & Sprague, 2000) and can be a protective factor for students with EBD (Zolkoski et al., 2016).

**Levels of involvement.** The nature of PF involvement is wide-ranging and dependent upon several factors (Hoover-Dempsey, Ice, & Whitaker, 2009). Adolescents’ attitudes toward their PFs’ involvement may influence levels of PF involvement. When adolescents view their PFs’ involvement as respectful of their need for autonomy and when the PF participation is nonintrusive, involvement supports learning. As children grow older, PFs and schools experience developmentally appropriate shifts from direct to increasingly indirect PF involvement. Chen and Gregory (2010) investigated the influence of student-perceived PF involvement among a group of ninth-grade students. They found perceived PF involvement through socialization of educational values (i.e., having high expectations for achievement and attainment) was strongly related to student grades and classroom engagement. No relationship was found between students’ perceptions of their PFs’ direct participation in school-related activities and student grades and classroom engagement. School personnel’s awareness of the various levels of PF involvement as youth mature may make a positive contribution as risk factors tend to increase when students get older.

**Socio-economic status, culture, and linguistic differences.** PFs in low socioeconomic areas and those with low levels of education tend to be perceived by educators as less active in their children’s education (Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey, & Sandler, 2007; Park & Holloway, 2013). Likewise, single parents frequently demonstrate low levels of engagement in school-related activities. Some factors resulting in lower levels of PF involvement include naturally occurring characteristics such as cultural and ethnic differences, but also include pragmatic issues such as limited access to transportation, hours of employment that conflict with school schedules, and lack of access to childcare services. Each of these conjoin to impede participation and communication between homes and schools (Agronick et al., 2009; Gorski, 2013; Kreider & Bouffard, 2009). The expectations of school personnel regarding PF involvement are often congruent with middle-class, White PFs’ capabilities, beliefs, and involvement styles rather than those of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) PFs (Kim, 2009). Educators’ lack of understanding of PFs from CLD backgrounds may be a risk factor for children and youth. PFs who are not able to participate may not identify themselves as valuable to the culture of education. In some cultures, PFs may appear to be uninvolved because their cultural script calls for them to allow school personnel to perform their professional duties without interfering (Gonzalez, Borders, Hines, Villalba, & Henderson, 2013). The aforementioned circumstances may increase the distance PFs from CLD backgrounds feel toward schools.
Barriers to Parent and Family Involvement

It has been well documented that PF involvement increases successful outcomes for children and youth, in turn promoting resilience (e.g., Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2009; Wang, Hill, & Hofkins, 2014), yet a lack of involvement remains (Rodriguez et al., 2014). Often, teachers are not prepared to work with families (Staples & Diliberto, 2010) and fail to recognize that PF abilities to be involved will be different (LaRocque et al., 2011; Sawyer, 2015). Often PFs participate based on the time they have available or their comfort level with being at the school (Staples & Diliberto, 2010). School personnel can do much to encourage participation by providing a variety of opportunities for PFs to be involved varying in time commitment, type, educational comfort, and frequency.

Age and grade level. As stated above, PF school involvement decreases dramatically as students grow older (Hill et al., 2009; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2014), with the decline beginning as early as fourth grade (Elias, Patrikakou, & Weissberg, 2007). Several factors contribute to the decrease. Many times as children age, PF involvement becomes limited to indirect activities (e.g., fundraisers) with fewer PFs participating in substantial ways. With each passing year, PFs often report feeling unable to help their child and having difficulty understanding school policies and procedures (von Otter, 2014) or doubting their ability to assist their children academically (Green et al., 2007). As their children approach adolescence, many PFs report not being as involved in their adolescents’ schooling as they would like; however, research supports that adolescents want their PFs to be involved in their education (Hill et al., 2009).

Socioeconomic status. PFs experiencing economic or social stress may have a difficult time being actively involved in their children’s education due to employment circumstances that do not allow for school-based involvement, caretaking responsibilities for other family members, and limited access to childcare and transportation to school-based involvement (Green et al., 2007). If children are having difficulty at school, educators may perceive elevated difficulty in maintaining relationships with PFs (Hornby & Lafaele, 2011), exacerbating the potential for risk factors. While educators understand the crucial role of involving families in problem solving, PFs may feel a sense of disconnect from the school after repeated negative interactions. PFs may neglect to respond to attempts at communication, be reluctant to attend school meetings, fail to implement recommendations from school personnel, or reply to school personnel with aggravation and frustration (Williams & Sanchez, 2012). The above circumstances often result in educators and school administrators assuming PFs are unwilling to work collaboratively with the school, and unfortunately, attempts at PF involvement may stop.

Proposed Model for Parent and Family Involvement

According to Barr and Saltmarsh (2014), PFs are more likely to be involved when school administrators are perceived as welcoming and supportive of PF involvement. It is key for school administrators to promote comprehensive school-family partnerships. For example, Epstein’s model (2002) suggests a two-way partnership in which PFs support
schools and schools support PFs to improve student learning and success. Sawyer (2015) provides a flexible framework, the BRIDGES Model, for teachers to develop and implement strategies facilitating several types and levels of PF involvement. A primary tenet of the model is creating a collaborative and trusting partnership with PF. Our focus is on promoting resilience through PF involvement; therefore, based on findings from the literature, we propose the RESILIENCE Model (See Table 1). This proposed model gives school personnel strategies to implement in school to promote resilience by involving PFs. Involving PFs can foster resilience in children and youth who potentially face poor outcomes due to various risk factors such as low SES, CLD, and/or special education. The model is designed to provide suggestions for school administrators to foster PF involvement. The suggestions allow school personnel to more adequately involve PFs in activities, which will foster resilience in their children.

In our RESILIENCE Model, “R” stands for recognize. It is essential for school personnel to recognize and respect cultural differences of PFs. Research shows children and youth from CLD backgrounds often are at risk of poor outcomes (e.g., Brooks, 2006; Masten, 2011). According to LaRocque and colleagues (2011), teachers must address emotional, physical, and cultural barriers to increase PF involvement, particularly those from diverse backgrounds. Ward (2014) suggests maintaining a sense of self-awareness to bias and negativity. According to Howard (2010), the foundation for cultural competence starts with an awareness of one’s own culture and racial identity. It is essential for educators to adapt to diverse cultures and welcome all PFs as partners (Wong & Hughes, 2006) to reinforce protective factors. A culturally responsive pedagogy can work to assist teachers build a bridge of resilience to families.

In the RESILIENCE Model, “E” stands for educate; school personnel need to help PFs learn how to effectively work with their children; particularly, PFs who are not typically involved or those who have children in older grades where PFs tend to be less involved (Coleman & McNeese, 2009). Often PFs begin to question their ability to help their child. Furthermore, PFs from CLD backgrounds may not know how to assist their child; therefore, school personnel may help PFs to understand how their participation may be supportive. Additionally, school personnel serving middle and high school students may assist PFs to understand ways to indirectly be involved (e.g., provide examples). Schools serving adolescents may foster resilience by considering programs that emphasize the importance of having high expectations and educational attainment (Chen & Gregory, 2010). Research has shown a strong positive relationship between schools that make an effort to facilitate PF involvement and PFs’ actual involvement (e.g., Rodriguez et al., 2014).

“S” stands for strengthen; it is critical for educators to strengthen relationships with PFs by establishing trust and making concerted efforts to sustain collaborative partnerships. Positive teacher relationships can be a protective factor for children and youth (Olsson, Bond, Burns, Vella-Brodrick, & Sawyer, 2003), which can only be accomplished through effective communication involving sincere engagements rather than superficial encounters (Ward, 2014). Gorski (2013) posited that establishing and strengthening trusting relationships has been the foundation of successful schools. He envisions schools as an integral part of the community hosting a wide array of neighborhood resources. Further, Noguera (2008) reinforces the importance of
strengthening PF partnerships by emphasizing the necessity of responding to the non-academic needs of families.

“I” stands for individualize; it is vital for school personnel to create personal relationships with PFs based on their specific needs. All PFs are unique, making it important for educators to accommodate differences (Sawyer, 2015). Having strong relationships with PFs allows teachers to individualize opportunities for involvement. An individualized relationship allows school personnel to understand various risk factors a family may exhibit. Having knowledge of specific risk factors can help educators promote specific protective factors. A “one size fits all” PF involvement philosophy is not effective, particularly for those who have children with disabilities. Moreover, PF involvement can improve academic achievement, particularly when individualized education programs (IEPs) are developed with PFs as partners in the process. Relationship building must be authentic (Gorski, 2013). Part of building individualized relationships with PFs is consistent communication and treating them as equal collaborators in their child’s education.

“L” stands for listen; educators must understand the hopes and concerns PFs have for their child. When educators listen, and find ways to include PFs, mutual trust and respect is built rather than barriers of fear and mistrust. Teachers’ attitudes towards PF involvement can greatly influence how PFs perceive the school's interest in their involvement (LaRocque et al., 2011). Sawyer (2015) believes it is especially vital for educators to reach out to PFs because they may feel overwhelmed or intimidated. Risk factors may be reduced when school personnel listen, try to understand PFs, and show they care (Ward, 2014). Moreover, teachers should view PFs as a vital resource rather than fear PF involvement. Schools and teachers need to create a foundation for PFs in which they feel they have a voice in their child’s education. Part of this accountability allows for differences of opinion in a respectful manner (Noguera, 2008).

“I” stands for involve; it is essential for educators to find various ways to include PFs because it has been well established that PFs play an important role in students’ education. Educators need to move away from viewing PFs as a homogeneous group because they do not participate in the same ways and do not have the same needs (LaRocque et al., 2011). Given that PFs involvement in school promotes resilience, educators must recognize PFs can be involved in a variety of ways. Hill and colleagues (2009) identified three types of PF involvement: (a) school (e.g., classroom helpers, field trips, conferences); (b) home (e.g., homework, reading with children, other educational activities); and (c) academic socialization, which refers to supporting teenagers’ autonomy, cognitive skills, and internal motivation. Additionally, Pomerantz, Moorman, and Litwack (2007) found that PFs involvement determines the success of students. Specifically, PF involvement is beneficial when it is “autonomy supportive, process focused, characterized by positive affect, or accompanied by positive beliefs” (p. 388). Conversely, PF involvement may be detrimental if it is controlling and person-focused. A supportive home environment in which learning is encouraged is more significant to student success than income, education level, or cultural background of the family (Bokhorst-Heng, 2008).

In the RESILIENCE Model, “E” stands for empower; school personnel should assist in ensuring PFs have the tools and information to support the needs of their child’s success outside of the classroom. As children move into adolescence, PFs may desire
more guidance and invitations from schools regarding how to stay involved in their children’s education (Robbins & Searby, 2013). Additionally, it is important for educators to be cognizant of the numerous stressors PFs face, especially those with children with disabilities. Educators also need to consider, and plan for, involvement according to the work schedules of their students’ PFs. Outcomes for students with disabilities greatly improve when educators, PFs, and students are all meaningfully involved.

“N” stands for nurture; it is crucial for educators to maintain a diligent schedule of positive communication with PFs. Demonstrating care is a critical aspect of a developing nurturing relationships. School personnel are encouraged need to consistently show PFs and students they are invested in their well-being. Theoharis (2009) outlined a framework for care by school leaders to demonstrate compassion. One of Theoharis’ seven keys for success is creating a climate of belonging, which is fundamental to a caring relationship.

“C” stands for collaborate in which educators recognize the value of PFs and include them in decision-making for their children, the school, and community. According to Rodriguez and colleagues (2014), schools that are successful in encouraging collaboration actively solicited input from PFs, had school personnel who were easily accessible to PFs, and regularly communicated with PFs through a variety of ways. School personnel must make concerted efforts to ensure that their attempts at PF involvement do not establish relationships that may inadvertently marginalize PFs through unequal power structures (Evans & Radina, 2014).

In the RESILIENCE Model, the final letter, “E” stands for engage; school personnel need to connect PFs to valuable community resources. Community resources can serve as a support for those at-risk (Benzies & Mychasiuk, 2009), especially when PFs access community supports such as physical and mental health services. Ward (2014) also recommends teachers become “resource-brokers” (p. 38), helping families navigate complex healthcare and social services systems. Other suggestions include understanding the level of engagement for each unique family situation and selecting appropriate home-based activities. Theoharis (2009) found that some school districts had success with the Tribes Learning Community (TLC, 2016). Additional strategies can be found in Table 1.

Implications for School Administrators

Strong PF relationships begin with school administrators and filters down to teachers and other school personnel. Barr and Saltmarsh (2014) found PFs believe school administrators attitude toward parents plays a significant role in determining PFs’ level of involvement and feelings of being welcomed or too intimidated to be involved. Moreover, having the perspective of PFs is important for school administration preparation programs. It is critical for preparation programs to help future school administrators learn to build relationships with PFs so they feel supported and are willing to become more involved (Theoharis, 2009). Preparation programs should begin helping future administrators understand the importance of their role in fostering and maintaining relationships with PFs as well as the community. Following the RESILIENCE model is a fantastic way for school administrators to begin the relationship building process to benefit all school personnel, PFs, and students.
Conclusion

There is no single “best” way to involve PFs in schools (Sawyer, 2015). However, school administrators must be relationship builders and continue to strive to meet the needs of all families, specifically accommodating families of students who are at-risk for poor academic and social outcomes. School administrators must encourage PF involvement while leading the way in promoting PF involvement (Young et al., 2013). Protective factors are critical to student resilience, particularly in high-risk ecologies (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Collaboration between school personnel and PFs improves outcomes for at-risk children and youth (LaRocque et al., 2011). The RESILIENCE Model for parental involvement is a way for school personnel to enhance protective factors. School administrators can empower PFs by simply showing them that their involvement, at any level, is significant (LaRocque et al., 2011). Implementing strategies provided within the RESILIENCE Model encourages meaningful partnerships, communication, and ultimately promotes resilience in children and youth.
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Table 1

**RESILIENCE Model for Parental and Family Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Activities and Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognize</td>
<td>Understand and respect cultural differences of PFs</td>
<td>• Develop cultural self-awareness (Friend &amp; Cook, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn about the values, customs, traditions, and unique attributes of individual families (e.g., cultures’ views of school involvement, child’s role within family system).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Embed home and cultural experiences into learning (e.g. knowledge of family games into classroom learning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Link teaching to the child’s home and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow parents to engage in curriculum choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow students to discuss current political and national events in a safe, welcoming environment (Howard, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>Help PFs learn how to work with their children using best practices</td>
<td>• Offer classes in how to tutor their children or classes for families from language-diverse homes. Assure these are free of charge and offered at various times of the day and week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Have math, science, reading, and/or writing learning opportunities for PFs where food and childcare are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide programs that emphasize ways middle and high school PFs can be involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offer GED classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow parents to lead classes in their native culture, language, and heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Computer lab time for parents to learn technology skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Terms</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Activities and Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Strengthen** | Establish trust and make a concerted effort to sustain a collaborative partnership with PFs. | • Ensure PFs from diverse backgrounds share power with school personnel by actively encouraging PFs to share their questions and concerns in meetings (Olivos, Gallager, & Auilar, 2010).  
• Create opportunities for PFs to have access to the school at convenient times for PFs.  
• Provide PFs with options for service provisions that meet the needs of the family (Friend & Cook, 2012).  
• Establish a community food pantry.  
• Develop partnerships within the community to offer free meals to PFs in need.  
• Establish and maintain community gardens.  
• Flexibility when scheduling school events that includes early morning, late evening, and weekends.  
| **Individualize** | Create personal relationships with PFs based on their specific needs. | • Provide childcare during school events.  
• Provide transportation for the families or have school personnel meet in a community center near the PFs home.  
• Make sure to communicate with PFs in a way that works best for them.  
• Ensure families are treated with respect, as collaborators in their child’s education, through consistent and relevant communication (Gorski, 2013, p. 140-141).  
• Take an active role in asking questions and listening to PFs.  
• Make appropriate changes based on the concerns of PFs.  
• Establish site counsels that are composed of all stakeholders: parents, faculty, administration, and community leaders.  
• Create a judgement free-safe zone for parents to voice their support or concerns to the school.  
• Create formal contracts for the faculty, administration, and parents that assure student engagement from all. |
| **Listen** | Understand hopes and concerns PFs have for their child. |  
(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Activities and Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Involve** | Include PFs at all levels in a variety of ways to meet their needs. | • Distribute weekly newsletters in the PFs native language with information about classroom events, lesson topics, student progress, missing assignments, etc. (Epstein, Sanders, Simon, Salinas, Jansorn, & Van Voorhis, 2009).  
• Teacher and administrators make personal phone calls to invite PFs to attend/participate in school events  
• Develop home learning activities in the PFs native language to actively engage PFs in their child’s academic development (Wong & Hughes, 2006). |
| **Empower** | Give PFs the tools, information, and support they need for their child’s success outside the classroom. | • Provide PFs with needed supports within the community (e.g., counseling, advocacy groups, doctors).  
• Develop advocacy initiatives with parents and community leaders.  
• Understand voting rights and assist families exercise their right to vote. |
| **Nurture** | Maintain a diligent schedule of positive communication with PFs. | • Assure that all campus staff greets parents in a friendly, welcoming tone.  
• Create partnerships with community agencies  
• Invite parents and students to enhance the campus by displaying artwork or other projects.  
• Develop authentic, personal helping relationships with PFs (Friend & Cook, 2012).  
• Develop systems of home-school communication that are convenient for the family (e.g., workshops, texts, email, and home-school folders; Olivos et al., 2010). |

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Activities and Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Collaborate | Recognize the value of PFs and include them in decision-making for their children, school, and community. | • Have meetings over meals, “potluck” dinners, or holiday celebrations.  
• Have a proactive approach to discipline.  
• Provide PFs with information about all options available for their children.  
• Encourage opportunities for PFs to authentically be involved in the decision-making process (Olivos et al., 2010). |
| Engage | Connect PFs to valuable community resources | • Establish health and dental screenings at the school for no cost to the parents  
• Develop a TRIBES learning community assuring all staff have training.  
• Provide PFs information about community services and agencies that may be of use to them (Olivos et al., 2010).  
• Establish support and assistance between community partners and agencies in ways requested by PFs (Friend & Cook, 2012).  
• Establish appropriate home-based activities. |