The Family Engagement Partnership
Student Outcome Evaluation

By Steven B. Sheldon & Sol Bee Jung

Johns Hopkins University
School of Education

Center on School, Family, and
Community Partnerships

September 2015

The Family Engagement Partnership
Student Outcome Evaluation
By Steven B. Sheldon and Sol Bee Jung

Johns Hopkins University

School of Education

Center on School, Family, and
Community Partnerships

September 2015

Table of Contents

▶ Executive Summary

Family engagement helps students succeed. Previous research has established consistent and reliable connections between families' involvement in student learning—through practices such as shared reading, homework monitoring, and volunteering at school—with attendance and academic achievement (Hill and Tyson, 2009; Poomeranz, Moorman & Litwach, 2007; Jeynes, 2005; 2012). Studies also show that family engagement matters to the success of the school as an enterprise. Bryk et al.'s (2010) study of school reform efforts across 400 Chicago schools revealed that schools with high trust levels among parents, teachers, and school leadership are more likely to experience improvement in math and reading achievement than schools where trust levels among these groups are lower.

Some family engagement practices may contribute to success more effectively than others, however. Children whose families hold high expectations, set goals, monitor progress, and actively assist with learning at home are most likely to do better in school, with those modes of engagement appearing, in and of themselves, to be the primary driver (Hill and Tyson, 2009). In today's education landscape, research, policy, and practice discussions no longer center on *if* family engagement matters, but, rather, on *what types* of family engagement matter and how families can be supported to play those roles, particularly in an increasingly diverse public school system. With limited time and resources and increasing pressure to demonstrate improved student outcomes, what can and should schools do to engage families?

Although the link between family engagement and student and school success is well established, relatively little research has examined whether family engagement, when initiated by teachers, lead to improved outcomes for students. This evaluation addresses this gap by examining the association between student outcomes at 12 urban public elementary schools and participation by teachers and students' families in the Family Engagement Partnership (FEP), a schoolwide capacity-building effort to support educators in improving how they engage their students' families. In particular, the study examines the association between relationship-building parent-teacher home visits and outcomes including student attendance, school re-enrollment, and grade-level proficiency on literacy skills

assessments. The study also provides preliminary insight into whether educators' participation in the FEP is related to their effectiveness in the classroom, and which aspects of the FEP's implementation may predict student impacts.

The Family Engagement Partnership

The Family Engagement Partnership (FEP) is an intensive, capacity-building intervention designed to support student success by transforming the ways in which teachers and families collaborate with one another. Flamboyan developed the FEP approach in response to input and feedback from D.C. families, teachers, and school leaders who participated in focus groups, fellowships, and learning partnerships, as well as key informant interviews and literature reviews, all occurring over a two-year landscaping process.

To become an FEP school, schools go through a rigorous selection process, which serves two purposes. First, it enables school leaders and teachers to learn about and begin planning how a teacher-focused family engagement initiative would meet their school's needs. Second, it enables Flamboyan to assess the school's readiness to prioritize and manage a change effort and engage families in new and deeper ways. Once selected, FEP teachers participate in 15+ hours of professional development related to family engagement and receive materials and feedback around their family engagement practices. To support their family engagement practice, Flamboyan staff provides bi-weekly coaching and quarterly Professional Learning Community meetings to school leadership teams to build their capacity to lead and manage the initiative. Flamboyan also provides data, finance, and program quality measurement tools and systems to support implementation and continuous improvement. Flamboyan, other local funders, partner schools, charter management organizations, and the District of Columbia Public Schools share in funding the cost of the FEP.

The Family Engagement Partnership supports practices of school leaders and teachers designed to:

- **Build trusting relationships with families:** The FEP's theory of change is that the foundational element of teacher-parent collaboration is trust. As a first step to engaging families, teachers conduct relationship-building home visits, in which they invite families to share students' interests and experiences in school and their hopes and dreams for their child, using the Parent-Teacher Home Visit

Project model. These visits establish the foundation for open communications between parents and teachers throughout the school year.

- **Engage families as partners in their students' academic success:** Once mutually respectful relationships are in place, FEP teachers engage in formal "academic partnering" exchanges with families. These exchanges may occur during traditional parent-teacher conferences or teachers may implement classroom-level parent-teacher conferences called Academic Parent-Teacher Teams (APTT). As part of both options, teachers provide parents with real-time data on their child's academic performance relative to the grade-level standards and their peers. Teachers also share learning activities with families and facilitate goal-setting for their child's progress.

- **Communicate consistently and meaningfully with families:** FEP teachers also communicate with families throughout the year to further strengthen their relationships and to follow up with families about progress in between parent-teacher conferences or APTT meetings.

Flamboyan Foundation first piloted the FEP with five schools in the 2011–2012 school year, and has expanded dramatically since then. In 2014-15, the FEP served 27 public and public charter schools, reaching 98% of their student populations through one or more of the above teacher-initiated family engagement practices. This evaluation assesses the impact of the FEP by rigorously examining student outcomes in 12 partner D.C. Public Schools over the 2013–2014 school year.

Study Overview

In 2013, the Center on School, Family and Community Partnerships at Johns Hopkins University examined outcomes reported on parent and teacher surveys during the early implementation stage of the Family Engagement Partnership (FEP), 2012–2013. This report summarizes results from a phase II follow-up evaluation focusing on the association between home visits and student achievement. Using data from the 2013–2014 school year—the third year of the initiative's implementation—the John Hopkins University team examined the FEP's effectiveness at 12 elementary schools in the District of Columbia. Approximately 4,700 students attended these schools, among whom 23% were classified as English Language Learners, 18% were receiving Special Education Services, 95% were eligible for free

and reduced price lunches, and 96% were persons of color. Using data from these students and their teachers, the study addressed the following questions:

1) Were students whose families received a home visit more likely to have grade-level or better reading comprehension and fluency skills by the end of the school year?

2) Were students whose families received a home visit absent less frequently?

3) Were students whose families received a home visit more likely to re-enroll in their school the following year?

4) What aspects of program implementation (e.g. school support, length of time in the partnership, etc.) were associated with better outcomes for students?

5) Did teachers at schools where the FEP is being implemented receive higher scores on teacher effectiveness measures than teachers at schools with comparable student demographics without the FEP?

The multi-level study design included rigorous controls to ensure to the greatest extent possible that the changes observed were due to effects of the FEP, rather than underlying differences between students who did and did not receive home visits. Johns Hopkins University obtained from D.C. Public Schools (DCPS) information on students' socio-demographic status, as well as students' 2012–2013 rates of daily attendance and fall 2013 literacy test score data. Controlling for previous attendance and test scores allowed the study to hold constant any differences in attendance and reading at the outset of the study. Teacher survey data were collected by the research team in the spring of 2013 to assess differences in the FEP's implementation, and the team identified 13 D.C. elementary schools with similar student populations to allow comparison of teacher effectiveness and other factors in FEP versus non-FEP schools.

Findings

Findings from this evaluation suggest that interventions to build teachers' capacity to engage families can lead to better outcomes for students and teachers. The trusting relationships between teachers and families established at the beginning of the school year, through home visiting, are associated with academic success. In

addition, greater school support and longer participation in the FEP are linked to larger student achievement gains. Preliminary analyses also suggest that teacher effectiveness is associated with teacher participation in the FEP.

Student Outcomes

Students whose families received home visits were more likely to attend school and to achieve or exceed grade-level reading comprehension than students whose families did not receive a home visit, even after controlling for prior differences in attendance and reading comprehension. Students whose families received a home visit were absent, on average, 2.7 fewer days than students whose families did not receive a home visit. This difference represents a 24% reduction in school absences.[1] Students whose families received a home visit had odds of scoring proficient on the TRC that were 1.55 times higher than the odds for similar students who did not receive a home visit. Students whose families received a home visit were not, however, more likely to re-enroll the next year, and their scores on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessment were not significantly higher.

Implementation and Student Outcomes

Schools where teachers felt more supported by administrators in their family engagement efforts and where teachers reported doing more family engagement practices were more likely to experience improvement in student outcomes.

Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes

Teachers at FEP schools scored higher on their effectiveness in leading well-organized objective-driven lessons; providing students multiple ways to move toward mastery; responding to student understanding; and developing students' higher-level understanding than did teachers at comparable schools. It was not, however, possible to control for other potential differences between the control and treatment schools, such as teachers' years of experience in the classroom.

Conclusion

Findings from this evaluation suggest that teacher-initiated interventions to engage families are associated with better student and teacher outcomes. Specifically, relationship-building home visits implemented as part of the Family Engagement Partnership, which served largely minority students from low-income families, were associated with improved student attendance and grade-level reading proficiency. Attendance in elementary school is an important leading indicator for later student outcomes such as high school graduation (Mac Iver and Messel, 2013). Overall, this work points to the potential of family engagement, especially teacher-initiated efforts that purposefully build trusting relationships with families, for improving student success.

Although this analysis provides important insight into the association between home visits and student success, additional research is needed. This study finds parent-teacher relationship-building activities, such as home visits, are associated with improved student outcomes, but more research is needed into other family engagement practices, such as teachers' communication with families and families' participation in more rigorously focused academic partnering conferences or meetings. In addition, teachers as well as students appear to benefit from participation. If more research confirms this, it suggests that family engagement should become a mainstay in schools' professional development offerings.

---

[1] Calculation uses the FEP-wide average absence rate, 11.39 days for students who did not receive a home visit and subtracts 2.7 days, the slope coefficient for attendance in the HLM in order to calculate the percentage change.

1 Project Background and Existing Literature

Too many students, especially those living in urban areas, are failing to graduate high school or are graduating without the skills necessary to succeed in college or in a career. In 2013, a record 81.4% of students graduated from high school, according to the 2015 *Building a Grad Nation* report (Paoli et al., 2015). This means, however, that almost one in five students still do not earn a high school diploma. The 2015 *Building a Grad Nation* report also concluded that the students most in danger of failing out of school are minority students living in large urban cities, often coming from low-income households. These students represent tremendous diversity in talent and perspective, and the fact that school systems do not prepare them to succeed means their gifts are lost to society.

Deepening schools' engagement with families to support academic success is an under-explored strategy with potential to improve academic achievement, particularly in communities where parents are disconnected from local schools. Studies show that children are more likely to attend school regularly, graduate from high school, take more advanced math courses, and achieve at higher levels when their parents are involved in school activities and engaged in their children's learning (Dearing, Kreider, Simpkins, & Weiss, 2006; Dunlap, & Hevey, 2000; Epstein, 2011; Fan & Chen, 2001; Grolnick, Kurowski, Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2005; 2007; Ma, 1999 McNeal, 1999; Pomeranz, Moorman, & Litwach, 2007; Sheldon, 2007;). Family engagement is also associated with school success. Bryk et al. (2010) identified strong relationships among school staff, families, and community partners as one of five essential ingredients for school improvement. Their longitudinal investigation in Chicago Public Schools showed that schools with stronger support from families and the community were more likely to experience gains in student achievement, and that those schools lacking such support were far less likely to see improvements in student learning and performance (Bryk et al., 2010).

Although the literature has established a strong link between family engagement and student achievement that has inspired policy-makers to advocate for parent engagement initiatives, few of these initiatives have been rigorously evaluated. Jeynes (2012) devoted a secondary section of the meta-analysis he conducted of the parent involvement literature to examining effect sizes for the handful of student achievement-focused evaluations of parental involvement programs that have been implemented. He found the overall scale of effect associated with such programs to be statistically significant but smaller than for parental involvement overall. In particular, his study showed significant impacts on student achievement for programs that promote parent-child shared reading; programs that emphasize parent-teacher collaboration; programs that promote school-family partnerships; and programs that foster increased communication between parents and teachers (Jeynes, 2012).

Family engagement interventions can focus on building parents' capacity or on building teachers' capacity to engage parents. The Grade-Level Reading Campaign (see Smith, 2011) is an example of a school-family-community partnership created to improve student outcomes by building parents' capacity. It brings together community foundations and partners to work with schools and families in an effort to ensure all students can read at grade level by the third grade. Much of this work is focused on directly supporting families, with fewer resources devoted to assisting educators in their efforts to support and engage families in their children's formal education. Increasingly, policy, practice, and research are focusing on how school systems can and should engage families. Recently, the U.S. Department of Education released the *Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships*, recommending the programmatic and system-level conditions that need to be in place for family engagement interventions to create change (Mapp & Kutter, 2013).

The National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) is an example of another family engagement intervention focused on teachers. Schools working with NNPS create teams with teachers, families, and administrators to coordinate and plan the implementation of family engagement practices that are designed to promote student outcomes (Epstein, Sanders, Sheldon, et al., 2009). Research on schools implementing NNPS has

shown that strong implementation of this program is related to greater family engagement at school, improved student attendance, and reduced behavior problems (Sheldon, 2005; 2007; Sheldon & Epstein, 2002). These studies suggest that the coordination and implementation of school practices to engage families in student learning can help improve student engagement as well as academic achievement. The NNPS program provides schools with organizational structures to operationalize family engagement practices. The FEP differs from the NNPS in that it also trains educators to implement specific practices to engage families, and the FEP supports educators' learning and implementation of these practices through training and coaching.

The Family Engagement Partnership

This report presents findings from an evaluation of a new, highly integrative teacher and school capacity-building intervention, the Family Engagement Partnership (FEP). The Family Engagement Partnership (FEP) initiative is an intensive, school-wide intervention designed to support student success by transforming the ways in which teachers and families collaborate with one another. Flamboyan Foundation first piloted the FEP with five schools in 2011–2012, expanding each year to encompass 27 public and public charter schools by the 2014–2015 school year.

The Family Engagement Partnership supports school leaders and teachers to:

- **Build trusting relationships with families:** The FEP's theory of change is that the foundational element of teacher-parent collaboration is trust. As a first step to engaging families, FEP teachers conduct relationship-building home visits, in which they invite families to share students' interests and experiences in school and their hopes and dreams for their child. These visits follow the principles of the Parent-Teacher Home Visit Project, founded in Sacramento, CA[2]: they are voluntary for both teachers and families, they are scheduled in advance, and teachers are compensated for their time. Following the home visit, teachers continue to build their relationships with families through ongoing positive outreach.

- **Engage families as partners in their students' academic success:** Once a foundation of mutually respectful relationships is in place, schools provide the information and support that families need to improve their children's educational outcomes. FEP teachers improve their existing parent-teacher conferences, and/or pilot a new model of classroom-level parent-teacher conferences called Academic Parent-Teacher Teams (APTT), developed by Maria Paredes.[3] APTTs provide parents with real-time data on their child's academic performance relative to the grade-level standard and to their peers. During APTT meetings, families practice learning activities and they receive materials to support their child's learning at home. Families set their own goals for their child's progress, and they have the opportunity to share successful learning-support strategies with other families.

- **Communicate consistently and meaningfully with families:** FEP teachers communicate with families throughout the year to further strengthen their relationships and to follow up with families about progress in between parent-teacher conferences or APTT meetings. Teachers learn strategies to maintain open, trusting lines of communication using a variety of mediums including short text messages, phone calls and send-home folders.

Family Engagement Partner schools go through a rigorous selection process. Chosen principals are deeply committed to family engagement and have the skills to manage a school-change initiative, and their teachers have expressed interest in more family-engagement training. Once selected, schools protect time for teachers to develop their skills in this area and schools invest significant time managing the implementation of the partnership's strategies. The average teacher in a first-year FEP school receives 15+ hours of training and preparation time to conduct these family engagement activities.

To support FEP teachers, Flamboyan Family Engagement Coaches facilitate family engagement professional development for teachers and offer real-time feedback based on observations of their family engagement practices. They also provide coaching sessions to school leadership teams twice a month, where they review program implementation data, help problem-solve,

[2] See http://www.pthvp.org/ for more information.
[3] See http://www.wested.org/service/academic-parent-teacher-teams-aptt-family-engagement-in-education/ for more information.

and plan next steps. Coaches also facilitate bi-monthly professional learning community meetings among FEP school leadership teams so they learn from each other. In addition, Flamboyan provides curriculum, tools, and data management systems to support FEP implementation.

The District of Columbia is in many ways an ideal context for extensive family engagement interventions. Many of the challenges that school districts around the country are grappling with are magnified in Washington, D.C. Within D.C., 73% of public school students are eligible for free or reduced price lunches—a higher percentage than in any U.S. state (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). In addition, reading and math score gaps between White students and students of color are also larger in Washington, D.C. than in any state in the country (Hemphill & Vanneman, 2011; Vanneman, Hamilton, Baldwin Anderson, & Rahman, 2009). The public education landscape in Washington, D.C. is also undergoing profound transformation. In the past 15 years, rapid population growth and the growth of charter schools have had dramatic effects on enrollment patterns at many local public schools. Politically, the local Public Education Reform Act of 2007 centralized oversight of the education system under the D.C. mayor, eliminating a public school board. This, coupled with reforms to overhaul D.C. Public School's central office functions and teacher evaluation system, as well as school consolidations, contributed to tensions between families and schools. Washington, D.C., like many other urban school districts, needs to forge strong home-school partnerships in order to build trust between schools and parents and to support student success in a transforming education context.

The foundational element of teacher-parent collaboration is trust.

Parents who participated in FEP activities reported greater family engagement at school and at home.

2 Scope and Aim of the Evaluation

This study is the second in a two-stage evaluation of the Family Engagement Partnership. The first stage of the evaluation examined the implementation of the FEP in relation to teacher and parent outcomes. Findings from that study (Sheldon & Hutchins, 2014) found that parents overwhelmingly liked the relationship-building home visits and Academic Parent Teacher Team meetings, and they felt as though the practices strengthened their relationship with their child's school and helped them feel more confident in their ability to support their child's learning. Additionally, parents who participated in FEP activities reported greater family engagement at school and at home than parents who did not. Teachers reported feeling confidence that the FEP practices could benefit students[4] and felt more satisfied in their job if they were at a school that supported FEP implementation more strongly.

In this second stage of the FEP evaluation, implementation of the initiative is examined in relation to student outcomes. Three types of student outcomes are used to estimate the impact of the FEP on students: student attendance, student literacy skill development, and students' re-enrollment in the elementary school. This study also looks at the effects of participation with home visits on student outcomes. As the cornerstone practice of the FEP, it was essential to test for any possible independent effect of home visits on student attendance, literacy skill development, and re-enrollment.

The theory of change underlying the Family Engagement Partnership is that providing technical assistance and training to school staff and teachers committed to family engagement will lead to high quality family engagement outreach that improves student outcomes. By participating in parent-teacher home visits, attending academic partnering meetings or conferences, and engaging in regular communication, teachers and families will develop trusting relationships with one another. These trusting relationships will, in turn, lead to information sharing and to family members feeling more confident in their ability to support their children's learning. Teachers also benefit from participation in the partnership by gaining greater insight into their students and how their parents support their students' learning. Families' greater sense of self-efficacy shall, subsequently, lead to changes in how they engage with their children's education making them more likely to communicate high expectations, hold student accountable, and help support their learning. The knowledge teachers gain from visiting families will also allow them to better target their instruction to students' needs and to partner with parents in holding student accountable.

This report tests the extent to which the family and teacher outcomes associated with the FEP established in the first report might ultimately facilitate family engagement impacts on student attendance, re-enrollment and achievement. These analyses build on the findings from the previous report showing that teachers who participated in more home visits tended to feel more satisfied teaching at their school. That report also showed that teachers at schools more strongly supporting FEP implementation tended to feel more confident in their ability to teach all students; were more satisfied with their job; and tended to rate school-family relationships more positively than did teachers at schools with less support.

In addition, the report examines the FEP implementation in relation to external ratings of teacher quality, and was able to compare teachers in FEP schools to teacher ratings of those in schools where the FEP was not implemented. Lastly, this report provides a preliminary analysis around implementation quality.

The present evaluation pursued the following questions about the potential effects of the Family Engagement Partnership in D.C. Public Schools (DCPS) elementary schools:

1) To what extent was the FEP implemented in DCPS elementary schools?

---

[4] The Phase II evaluation found that teachers' perceptions of FEP impact were statistically significantly correlated with students' actual improvement in attendance. This finding provides important context for interpreting the FEP Phase I evaluation results.

2) To what extent is implementation of the FEP associated with stronger student outcomes?

3) To what extent is the quality and length of implementation of the FEP associated with stronger student outcomes?

4) To what extent is implementation of the FEP associated with teacher effectiveness in the implementing schools?

Method

Sample

In the 2013–14 school year, the FEP was implemented in 12 DCPS elementary and K–8 schools. DCPS provided student background and outcome data for about 4700 students attending schools where the FEP was implemented, or "FEP schools." FEP schools served mostly students of color (see Appendix A, Table A1). Only 4% of the students were White, in contrast to the significantly larger percentages of students who were African-American (61.8%) and Hispanic (30.7%). Almost all of the students come from lower income families, suggested by the fact that about 93% were receiving free or reduced-price meals. Almost a quarter of the students (23.1%) were classified by the school system as English Language Learner, while nearly 1 in 6 students was classified as receiving Special Education services. Most of the students in this study were between kindergarten and 5th grade (see Appendix A, Table A1). Although DCPS offers preschool and pre-kindergarten, it is not compulsory and demand currently exceeds capacity.

School-level demograpics were similar. No school had more than 40% of the student body that was White, and 10 of the 12 schools had fewer than 10% of their students who were White (see Appendix A, Table A2). On average, over 60% of students were African-American or Black, while about 30% of students were Latino or Hispanic. At five schools the student body was more than 95% African American. With respect to family income, in only two schools did fewer than 97% of the student body receive free or reduced-price meals.

Variables

Student Outcomes

Attendance. The school district provided the number of days each student attended school, as well as the number of attendance days possible. From these, the *percent daily attendance* variable was calculated. These data were available for 2012–13 and the 2013–14 school years.

Literacy Skills. Students' literacy skills were measured using two separate benchmark assessments. Both assessments were administered at the school by educators. The first was the *Text Reading Comprehension (TRC)* assessment[5], an individually administered assessment designed to determine students' instructional reading level. Scores on this test were coded "1" if they met their grade-level benchmark standard, and "0" if they failed to meet the benchmark standard. For each student, the 2013–14 beginning-of-year and end-of-year TRC assessments were used throughout the evaluation. Students' *reading fluency* was assessed using the DIBELS assessment. DIBELS is a measure of phonics, word attack, and oral reading fluency[6]. Scores on this test were coded "1" if they met their grade-level benchmark standard, and "0" if they failed to meet the benchmark standard. Data on the 2012–13 and 2013–14 end-of-year DIBELS assessments were used for this evaluation.

Re-enrollment. For each student, the district provided information on whether or not she or he attended the same school the previous year. Calculations using this variable as the outcome did not include students in kindergarten during the 2013–14 school year or students in the fifth grade during the 2012–13 school year. Using these data, a dichotomous variable was created to indicate whether or not the school a student attended in 2013–14 was the same one she or he attended in 2012–13.

Student Implementation Variables

Home Visit. A dichotomous variable indicating whether or not a student and her or his family participated in a relationship-building home visit was used to test the

....

[5] For more information about the TRC assessment, go to: https://www.mclasshome.com/wgenhelp/DN3DR/desktop/Reading_3D/Assessment_Scoring/TRC/Text_Reading_and_Comprehension.htm

[6] For more information about the DIBELS assessment, go to: https://www.mclasshome.com/wgenhelp/DN3DR/desktop/DIBELS_Next/Assessment_and_Scoring/DORF_Details.htm

impact of this practice on student outcomes. Students whose families participated were coded 1 for "yes" and 0 for "no." The Flamboyan Foundation collected this information in order to compensate teachers for conducting home visits during non-contract hours.

Program Implementation and Quality Variables

At the end of the 2013–14 school year, teachers at FEP schools were solicited to complete a survey about their perceptions related to their teaching and family engagement. The survey also asked teachers to report on the degree to which FEP was implemented and supported at their school; and to rate their fidelity in implementing home visits. Teacher scores were aggregated by school, and the school averages were used as predictors of student outcomes.

Teachers' rating of *FEP Implementation* at their school was measured using a scale of eight items (α = .89) asking them to report on the percentage of their students they reached through family engagement practices including: "The percentage of students whose families received a home visit from me this year," "The percentage of families I have communicated with at least FOUR TIMES this year to share something purely positive about their child," and "The percentage of families, on average, who attended an APTT meeting or parent-teacher conference so far this year." Teachers reported on the percentage of families they reached using a 6-item scale where 1 represented "0%", 2 equaled "1–20%," 3 equaled "21–40%," and so on to 6 which represented "81–100%."

Support for FEP Implementation is a scale representing the mean of ten items asking teachers to report the degree to which they felt as though FEP was a priority at their school and how much support they received to implement family engagement practices (α = .91). Teachers indicated on a 5-point Likert scale the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to statements such as, "The FEP was a priority at my school this year;" "I received adequate support to implement FEP strategies from my principal, administrators and/or teacher leads;" and "My principal was adequately involved in leading the FEP at my school." They could "Strongly Disagree," "Disagree," "Neither Agree or Disagree," "Agree," or "Strongly Agree" with each statement. Each item was coded so that higher scores represented higher rating of support for implementing FEP by teachers.

Teachers provided self-report ratings of the *quality of home visits* they conducted with their students' fami-

lies. This was a scale comprised of 6 items that asked teachers to report how reliably they performed home visits according to their training. Teachers were asked if they: talked about the families hopes and dreams for their child, talked about students' backgrounds, asked families what they expected of the teacher this year, talked about the families' backgrounds, discussed how they can communicate with the family during the school year, and whether they entered notes about the family into the home visit database after the home visit. Teachers responded on a four-point scale where 1 was "never", 2 was "for one or a few visits," 3 was "for most visits," and 4 was "for all visits." Like the other teacher survey scales, this scale had good reliability (α = .86).

Finally, teachers were asked to report on their perceptions about the extent to which the FEP program is having an *impact on students and families*. This scale is a set of 11 items that asked teachers to evaluate how much impact the FEP practices have had on students and on their own teaching practice. Teachers indicated on a 5-point scale the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with statements such as, "The FEP strategies have helped me build relationships with families," "The FEP strategies have helped improve student behavior in my class," "The FEP strategies have helped improve student academic performance in my class," "The FEP strategies have helped improve my classroom practice," and "The FEP strategies have helped get families more engaged in their child's education." This scale demonstrated strong reliability as well (α = .93).

Teacher Outcomes

The degree to which teachers' involvement with FEP implementation is related to the effectiveness of their teaching practice in the classroom was explored using DCPS' formal evaluation system, IMPACT. As part of IMPACT, instructional expertise is assessed through up to five observations, four formal and one informal, in an academic year. New teachers or those previously rated less effective are observed more often than teachers rated "Highly Effective." Of these five 30-minute observations, three are conducted by a school leader at teachers' respective schools and two are conducted by master educators, who are independent content experts. In addition to teacher observations, other components, such as a teacher's Commitment to the School Community which includes a measure of dedicated to partnership with families, and teacher goals, called Teacher Assessed Student Achievement Data, are included in overall scores. Overall scores range

from 100 to 400 and translate into one of five ratings: Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Developing, Effective, and Highly Effective.

As part of IMPACT, teachers are evaluated on the extent to which they lead well-organized objective-driven lessons (Teach 1), explain content clearly (Teach 2), engage students at all learning levels (Teach 3), provide students multiple ways to move toward mastery (Teach 4), check for student understanding (Teach 5), respond to student understanding (Teach 6), develop higher-level understanding (Teach 7), maximize instructional time (Teach 8), and build a supportive, learning-focused classroom (Teach 9). For each observation, on each standard, teachers received a score from 1 (ineffective) to 4 (highly effective) from the school leader and from a master educator. We focus on the master educator ratings in this report.

Preliminary analysis indicates teachers in FEP schools earned higher ratings on four IMPACT standards

3 Evaluation Findings

FEP Implementation

Across FEP schools and as shown in Appendix A, Table A1, 2,469 students' families and teacher participated in a relationship-building home visit, compared to 2,235 who did not. No school conducted home visits with less than one-third of its students and at one school teachers and staff conducted home visits with 70% of the students' families. Across all schools, teacher reports of FEP implementation averaged 4.45, meaning that teachers estimated reaching 41-60% of their students' families through their family engagement practices. Finally, on average teachers reported strong support for FEP at their school, high levels of home visit quality, and believed that the family engagement practices were having an impact at their school.

Of the students' whose families received a relationship-building home visit initiated by a teacher (in Table A1) 58% of those students were Black, 32.8% were Hispanic, and 4.7% were White. Across grade levels, 40.1% were in preschool through kindergarten, 31.0% were in 1st or 2nd grade, and 28.9% were in 3rd through 5th grade. In addition to examining how many families received a home visit, statistical analyses revealed that not all students were equally likely to receive a home visit. Regression analyses (not shown) indicated that students in the lower grades were more likely to participate in a home visit. Also, White students were statistically more likely to have a home visit. Given the small percentage of White students in the sample, as shown in Table A1, they are still a very small minority of the families who participated in home visits.

It is important to note that these results are descriptive, and it is not clear why these differences exist. It may be that teachers are more likely to reach out to younger and/or White families, it may be that these families are more likely to accept an invitation to participate in a home visit, or there may be other factors that can explain these trends.

Student Outcomes

Analyses testing for the effect of home visits on student outcomes used multi-level models that included student characteristics and school characteristics as predictors of student attendance, students' grade level proficiency on reading comprehension and reading fluency, and whether a student remained (e.g., re-enrolled) at her or his school throughout the 2013–14 and 2014–15 school years. Testing for a relationship between home visits and student outcomes required using statistical techniques that could account for the fact that students are grouped within schools. Multi-level models (e.g., HLM) allowed us to test for school characteristic (i.e., years in the FEP) while also estimating the role of student characteristics that are well-known predictors of student outcomes (i.e., Special Education status, Free- and Reduced-Price Meal status, grade level, etc.). Multi-level modeling is a statistical approach that allows student and school characteristics to be used simultaneously as predictors of student outcomes.

For each outcome (attendance, grade level reading comprehension, grade level reading fluency, and re-enrollment), six models were tested to determine which elements of the FEP are predictive of student outcomes. Each model includes a baseline measure of the outcomes to account for prior levels of achievement or school attendance and enrollment, as well as student characteristics such as grade level, race, whether the student has an IEP (Special Education), is an English Language Learner (ELL), or comes from a low-income family (FARM). School attendance in 2013–14 was used as a covariate in the models predicting students' grade level proficiency on reading comprehension and fluency, as well as re-enrollment.

Student Attendance

Analyses testing the relationship between FEP implementation and students' daily attendance at school found a statistically significant relationship between home visits and attendance, as well as a positive and significant relationship between student attendance and support for FEP at the school (See Table B1). As shown in Table B1, Models 2–4 and 6, students whose families received a home visit attended school on a more regular basis than those who did not have a home visit. Students whose families received a home visit were absent, on average, 2.7 fewer days than

students whose families did not receive a home visit. This difference represents a 24% reduction in school absences.[7]

Across all models, school attendance the previous year is the strongest predictor of attendance the following year. Also, there was no relationship between race and ethnicity and daily attendance rates; being white, African-American, or Hispanic did not help explain whether a student attended school on a more or less regular basis. Students who were in special education and those who received free- or reduced-price meals, however, tended to miss more school. In contrast, ELL students generally had higher rates of attendance compared to native English speaking students.

Several measures of program implementation were also positively associated with student attendance. Model 4 shows that students who attended an FEP school where the teachers reported more support for the program tended to come to school more regularly than those at a school where support for FEP implementation was lower. Model 6 provides evidence of similar findings. Students at schools where teachers perceived the impact of FEP higher tended to have higher rates of attendance than those at schools where teacher ratings of impact were lower. Finally, as shown in Model 5, students in schools where teachers rated the quality of their home visits higher tended to have lower rates of daily attendance. In that same model, the effect on students of participating in a home visit was no longer related to attendance. These anomalous findings suggest the home visit quality variable may not be a valid indicator of FEP implementation and that further investigation is needed.

Student Reading Comprehension

The next set of analyses tested the extent to which home visits were associated with students' grade level proficiency on tests of reading comprehension at the end of the 2013–14 school year. These analyses controlled for whether or not the student was proficient on grade level at the beginning-of-year, student attendance, and other student characteristics (See Table B2). Data were available for about 3700 students in kindergarten through fifth grade. As expected, we found that students who were proficient at the beginning of the school were more likely to be proficient at the end of the year. Also, controlling for proficiency at the beginning of the year, students who attended school more frequently were more likely to be proficient in reading

comprehension at the end of the year. Special education students and English language learners were less likely to be proficient on the TRC assessment at the end of the 2013–14 school year.

This evaluation found that, for students participating in a home visit, the odds of scoring proficient on the TRC were 1.55 times higher than the odds for students who did not have a home visit, even after adjusting for student demographic factors and levels of reading comprehension at the beginning of the school year. These findings suggest that direct involvement with the FEP practice of home visits can have benefits for the development of students' reading comprehension skills. None of the school level indicators of FEP implementation predicted whether students were likely to be at grade level in reading comprehension. Because the outcome predicted was a "yes" or "no" variable (e.g., was the student's reading comprehension on grade level or not?) the results were converted into an odds ratio. Here, the odds ratio estimates the likelihood of students scoring on grade level for reading comprehension if they have received a treatment against those students who did not. A coefficient of 1.0 would suggest that there is no effect and that the odds are even (1:1).

Student Reading Fluency

The second set of analyses explored the effect of home visits on student literacy skills and tested models predicting students' grade level proficiency on the DIBELS assessment for reading fluency (Table B3). Participation in home visits was not associated with proficiency on DIBELS, however, students attending schools that implemented the FEP more widely were more likely to be proficient on DIBELS, accounting for prior levels proficiency and other student level factors. In these models, prior levels of proficiency were significantly associated with proficiency in reading fluency in 2013-14, as expected. Similar to the results for reading comprehension, student attendance was associated with greater proficiency on reading fluency; and special education and English language learners tended to score below grade level proficiency on DIBELS.

Re-enrollment

The final set of analyses, shown in Table B4, tested multi-level models predicting whether or not a student was more likely to enroll and attend the same school as the year before. Students whose families received

[7] Calculation uses the FEP-wide average absence rate, 11.39 days, for students who did not receive a home visit and subtracts 2.7 days, the slope coefficient for attendance in the HLM in order to calculate the percentage change.

a home visit were no more likely to re-enroll than students whose families did not. These models were tested because it was hypothesized that, in a district where school choice is a viable and prolific option, families opting to stay at a school from one year to the next is an important outcome for schools and, potentially, a statement about families' perceptions of the school. These analyses showed that very few student level characteristics were associated with returning to a school. Students who attend school more regularly were more likely to stay at the school, whereas students with lower rates of attendance were more likely to be mobile from one year to the next. Grade level, race, special education, ELL, and FARM were not related to whether or not a student returned to the same school. No school level indicators related to the FEP (i.e. years of implementation) predicted re-enrollment. Overall, it appears, families' decision about whether to move their children to a different school may not be easily influenced by school-family relationships, nor do they appear to be related to student/family demographics.

Teacher Effectiveness

To explore the degree to which teachers' involvement with FEP implementation is related to the quality of their teaching, especially in their knowledge of student understanding and ability to engage students at all levels of learning, a preliminary cross-sectional analysis was conducted using de-identified 2013-14 IMPACT data provided by D.C. Public Schools. Specifically, teacher ratings using the Teaching and Learning Framework (TLF) were examined.

TLF ratings on each of the nine teaching standards were compared to those of teachers in a set of thirteen matched DCPS schools. These comparison schools were selected because their student demographics and academic achievement levels were similar to those of the FEP schools. Since teachers were evaluated multiple times throughout the year, average scores of master educator observations were used to conduct cross-sectional comparisons. Using these measures, a series of t-tests were run in order to assess the magnitude of the differences in ratings between the FEP and the comparison schools (See Table 1 below).

Teachers in FEP schools earned higher ratings on four standards: leading well-organized objective-driven lessons, providing students multiple ways to move toward mastery, responding to student understanding, and developing higher-level understanding. On maximizing instructional time and building a supportive, learning-focused classroom, teachers in matched comparison schools earned higher ratings.

Findings from this preliminary analysis must be interpreted with caution, however, as it did not include controls for teacher characteristics or rigorous controls for school context. Future investigations should pay closer attention to various aspects of the school context and changes in teacher effectiveness over time for a more rigorous evaluation of the effects of the FEP intervention. Additionally, future studies should consider the number of observations conducted for each teacher as this is directly related to teachers' previous teacher effectiveness ratings. These investigations should include additional teacher characteristics (i.e., years of teaching experience, grade level taught, etc.) in the models to control for other potential explanations for why teachers at FEP schools might be more likely to earn 'highly effective' ratings from master educators.

Table 1: Master Educator Teacher Ratings across FEP and Comparison Schools

Evaluation Standard	Comparison	FEP	t-values
Standard 1: Lead objective-driven lessons	3.18	3.21	2.49*
Standard 2: Explain content clearly	3.17	3.17	-0.51
Standard 3: Engage students at all learning levels	2.88	2.90	1.24
Standard 4: Provide students multiple ways to move towards mastery	3.12	3.18	4.55***
Standard 5: Check for student understanding	3.34	3.33	-1.04
Standard 6: Respond to student understanding	3.02	3.08	3.94***
Standard 7: Develop higher-level understanding	2.56	2.68	7.02***
Standard 8: Maximize instructional time	3.47	3.36	-7.91***
Standard 9: Build a supportive, learning focused classroom	3.52	3.45	-5. 70***

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Teacher-initiated family engagement practices are associated with stronger student achievement.

4 Conclusions and Next Steps

The findings from this evaluation represent a strong step forward in understanding the potential for improving student academic outcomes through fostering family engagement—particularly via interventions that also focus on building the outreach capabilities of teachers. The evaluation findings also demonstrate the effectiveness of a particular family engagement practice: relationship-building home visits. It analyzes data from 12 elementary and K–8 schools within D.C. Public Schools (DCPS) that participated in the Family Engagement Partnership (FEP) during the 2013–2014 school year. Children attending these schools were primarily students of color from low-income families, many of them from families whose native language is not English. Schools participating in the FEP commit to conducting relationship-building home visits with as many families as possible, to implementing a new model of classroom or individual parent-teacher conferences, and to maintaining ongoing communication with families, all in an effort to develop positive relationships that will support families' own efforts to encourage student achievement. This evaluation focuses on the first, most foundational of these practices: relationship-building home visits.

Data collected from the implementation of the FEP suggest that, on average, schools are implementing the initiative well. The percentage of students who received a home visit across the 12 schools ranged from 34% up to 70%, revealing considerable between-school variation in the proportion of students 'touched' by the family engagement practices. We generated measures of overall FEP implementation (including all three FEP practices) and of school support for family engagement (for example, providing teachers with time during the school day to plan and document family engagement work) using data from a survey administered to all FEP teachers. These data indicate that, in general, teachers felt well supported and that a large proportion of students' families had been reached.

Teachers also appeared to benefit from their participation in the FEP. Teachers at FEP schools earned higher ratings from master educators than teachers at comparable D.C. Public Schools without the FEP in the areas of leading well-organized objective-driven lessons, pro-

viding students multiple ways to move toward mastery, responding to student understanding, and developing higher-level understanding.

Results also show that these teacher-initiated family engagement practices in Family Engagement Partner schools do translate into academic improvements for students. Using rigorous multi-level models, controlling for attendance and test scores at earlier points in time as well as individual-student and whole-school predictors, results suggest that students whose families participated in home visits attended school more regularly and were more likely to be proficient in reading comprehension at the end of the school year.

This evaluation also found evidence to support the school-wide, teacher-capacity-building approach to family engagement that is promoted by the Flamboyan Foundation. Regardless of their grade level, race, special education or ELL status, family income, or whether they participated in a home visit, students in schools that supported or implemented FEP more strongly were more likely to be proficient on reading fluency assessments at the end of the school year, and they were more likely to attend school on a regular basis. These associations between school-level measures of FEP implementation quality and student outcomes suggest that a school's commitment to family engagement benefits all students attending the school, even those who do not directly participate in partnership activities like home visits.

It is particularly noteworthy that FEP implementation, and home visits in particular, were positively associated with student attendance. These findings are consistent with other studies of family engagement-initiative effects on student attendance (Sheldon, 2007; Sheldon & Jung, 2015). Importantly, student attendance has been shown to be a leading indicator of other student outcomes such as graduation and later achievement (Balfanz et al., 2007; Mac Iver & Messel, 2013), and in this study it significantly predicted all other outcomes. It is possible that student attendance is a proximal indicator of FEP effects, and that given more time FEP participation would predict more distal outcomes such as test scores two or more years in the future.

Students whose families participated in home visits attended school more regularly and were more likely to be proficient in reading comprehension at the end of the school year.

Future Research

Although this report presents initial evaluation findings suggesting the value of teacher-parent relationship-building on student outcomes, continued research is needed to better determine the effect of providing training and support to teachers for engaging families. Future studies should, for example, examine the impact on student outcomes of the other FEP practices: academic partnering meetings and proactive ongoing communication between teachers and parents.

Additional research is needed focusing on the effects of the home visits for families and taking into account teachers' ratings of the quality of their home visits with families. In the present evaluation, teachers' reports of home visit quality either were not related to outcomes or, in the case of attendance, the results were incongruent with any of the other measures of FEP implementation. Clarifying teachers' perceptions of home visit quality would help illuminate how teachers experience this practice and how these perceptions shape their approach to teaching and learning.

The potential impact of family engagement practices on teachers, a topic that surfaced in the previous year's evaluation, was explored in this phase as well. The findings, although mixed, do suggest the FEP could be a positive influence on teachers and on how their family engagement work may translate to their practice in the classroom. This topic has received a paucity of attention from researchers, and further investigation could provide findings that have important implications for alternative strategies to improve schools and student learning. Using the IMPACT data provided a unique opportunity to examine how content experts (master educators) perceived teaching practice. Teachers at FEP schools earned higher ratings from master educators in several dimensions of strong teaching, although in other aspects they were rated lower. Future studies should explore in greater depth the degree to which establishing relationships with students' families may or may not influence the way teachers organize and deliver their lessons to students.

Finally, future evaluations of FEP should include a comparison group of schools conducting business as usual with regard to family engagement. An evaluation of this type would, ideally, randomly assign schools to implement the FEP and then use remaining schools as comparison sites. In practice, however, random assignment is rarely possible. Finding appropriate comparison schools, then, is critical and requires matching based not only on school characteristics like previous achievement levels, but also on community characteristics such as employment, crime, or family structure. Future evaluations will also require more than 12 schools to implement FEP so that multiple school-level variables can be included concurrently in multi-level models. A larger sample of schools also ensures that results are not unduly influenced by outlier schools (that are implementing the program especially well or poorly) and provides greater power to detect small or moderate effects.

Overall, this study looking at the implementation of the FEP in relation to student outcomes is highly encouraging. Teachers' efforts to strengthen relationships with students' families were consistently associated with better attendance. The evidence also suggests students' literacy skills can improve when school-wide efforts at family engagement are implemented well. These results provide much-needed evidence in support of family engagement as one strategy to improve education outcomes in large urban settings.

Appendix A: Descriptive Tables

Table A1: Characteristics of Students Attending FEP Schools

| | Total FEP Sample | Among students who... | |
		Received home visits	Did not receive home visits
Female	51.6%	51.1%	52.2%
Race/Ethnicity			
White	4.0%	4.7%	3.3%
Black	61.8%	58.2%	65.9%
Hispanic	30.7%	32.8%	28.4%
Other	3.5%	4.3%	2.5%
Grade			
Preschool	8.2%	9.9%	6.4%
Pre-kindergarten	12.8%	13.7%	11.9%
Kindergarten	16.4%	16.5%	16.2%
1st	15.0%	15.6%	14.3%
2nd	13.7%	15.4%	11.7%
3rd	12.0%	11.9%	12.1%
4th	11.8%	10.0%	13.6%
5th	10.2%	7.0%	13.7%
Free and reduced price meals	93.3%	94.0%	92.6%
Special education	17.8%	16.8%	18.9%
English language learner/LEP	23.1%	26.2%	19.8%
% proficient on TRC at start of 2013-14	56.8%	52.2%	61.7%
% proficient on DIBELS in 2012-13	48.3%	47.7%	46.7%
Avg. rate of attendance in 2012-13	92.6%	93.0%	92.0%
N	4704	2469	2235

Table A2: Characteristics of Schools Participating in the FEP

School Name	Grade Range	N	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Female	FARM	LEP/ELL	SPED
School 1	PS-5th	510	1.4%	47.8%	47.5%	3.3%	45.7%	100.0%	32.9%	15.5%
School 2	PS-5th	431	0.5%	96.5%	1.9%	1.2%	49.7%	100.0%	0.7%	18.1%
School 3	PS-5th	274	5.1%	68.2%	23.0%	3.6%	42.3%	100.0%	13.5%	28.5%
School 4	PS-5th	258	1.2%	38.8%	44.6%	15.5%	45.7%	100.0%	43.8%	18.2%
School 5	PS-5th	501	11.2%	8.6%	72.9%	7.4%	52.5%	73.3%	56.9%	12.8%
School 6	PS-8th	383	1.3%	29.5%	67.6%	1.6%	48.8%	100.0%	52.2%	17.8%
School 7	PS-5th	284	0.0%	99.6%	0.4%	0.0%	47.2%	100.0%	0.4%	27.5%
School 8	PS-5th	277	30.3%	56.0%	6.5%	7.2%	51.6%	35.7%	9.7%	11.9%
School 9	PS-5th	419	3.6%	9.1%	83.3%	4.1%	50.1%	99.8%	59.2%	16.2%
School 10	PS-5th	590	0.2%	97.1%	2.4%	0.3%	49.8%	100.0%	0.2%	12.7%
School 11	PS-5th	433	0.0%	98.8%	0.5%	0.7%	45.7%	99.8%	0.2%	25.4%
School 12	PS-8th	344	0.3%	95.3%	2.6%	1.7%	48.3%	100.0%	1.2%	17.2%
Average		392	4.6%	62.1%	29.4%	3.9%	48.1%	92.4%	22.6%	18.5%

Table A3: Summary of FEP Implementation Measures, by School

School Name	% families w/ a home visit	FEP Implementation	Support for FEP	Quality of home visits	FEP Impact
School 1	0.53	4.55	4.05	3.57	3.76
School 2	0.60	4.70	4.44	3.22	3.89
School 3	0.42	4.60	3.13	3.58	3.91
School 4	0.54	4.72	3.63	3.62	3.73
School 5	0.35	5.15	3.88	3.71	4.04
School 6	0.70	4.73	4.00	3.30	3.88
School 7	0.50	4.66	4.26	3.53	4.14
School 8	0.57	4.44	3.56	3.50	3.77
School 9	0.54	4.09	3.97	3.54	3.58
School 10	0.44	3.81	3.61	3.42	4.07
School 11	0.61	4.93	3.71	3.56	3.72
School 12	0.34	4.16	3.67	3.37	3.90
Average	0.51	4.54	3.83	3.49	3.91

Table A4: Student Samples across Outcomes

	Attendance	Re-enroll	TRC	DIBELS
Female	51.0%	51.1%	50.8%	51.2%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	3.1%	2.9%	3.3%	2.9%
Black	57.9%	62.8%	62.6%	51.4%
Hispanic	35.6%	30.8%	31.0%	41.8%
Other	3.4%	3.5%	3.2%	4.0%
Grade				
Preschool	0.9%	NA	NA	NA
Pre-kindergarten	10.1%	NA	NA	NA
Kindergarten	15.3%	NA	20.7%	NA
1st	17.0%	28.6%	19.0%	0.7%
2nd	16.4%	26.1%	17.3%	30.0%
3rd	14.3%	22.9%	15.2%	25.5%
4th	14.1%	22.4%	14.9%	23.9%
5th	12.0%	NA	12.9%	19.9%
FARM	93.4%	94.1%	93.5%	91.6%
Special education	18.4%	17.0%	16.9%	15.6%
ELL/LEP	26.4%	22.5%	22.9%	25.3%
Baseline	92.6%	78.4%	56.8%	48.3%
N	3167	2461	3709	1362

Appendix B: Analytic Models

Table B1: Multi-Level Models testing FEP Effects on Students' Daily Attendance

	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3		MODEL 4		MODEL 5		MODEL 6	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Attendance baseline	0.592***	0.014	0.588***	0.014	0.586***	0.014	0.577***	0.014	0.596***	0.014	0.585***	0.014
Race/Ethnicity												
Black	-0.017	0.023	-0.013	0.023	-0.013	0.023	-0.019	0.023	-0.015	0.023	-0.009	0.023
Hispanic	0.011	0.024	0.015	0.024	0.015	0.024	0.009	0.024	0.012	0.024	0.016	0.024
Other	0.032	0.029	0.034	0.029	0.032	0.029	0.015	0.028	0.048	0.028	0.032	0.029
Grade												
Pre-kindergarten	0.191***	0.039	0.186***	0.039	0.176***	0.039	0.164***	0.038	0.203***	0.038	0.196***	0.039
Kindergarten	0.205***	0.038	0.199***	0.038	0.189***	0.039	0.178***	0.037	0.220***	0.038	0.210***	0.038
1st	0.234***	0.038	0.229***	0.038	0.219***	0.038	0.208***	0.037	0.251***	0.037	0.242***	0.038
2nd	0.203***	0.038	0.197***	0.038	0.187***	0.038	0.175***	0.037	0.216***	0.037	0.209***	0.038
3rd	0.223***	0.038	0.219***	0.038	0.208***	0.039	0.198***	0.037	0.240***	0.038	0.231***	0.038
4th	0.206***	0.038	0.203***	0.038	0.193***	0.039	0.176***	0.037	0.221***	0.037	0.215***	0.038
5th	0.222***	0.038	0.221***	0.038	0.211***	0.039	0.195***	0.038	0.238***	0.038	0.231***	0.038
FARM	-0.069***	0.016	-0.073***	0.016	-0.066***	0.017	-0.059***	0.016	-0.124***	0.016	-0.067***	0.016
Special education	-0.027**	0.009	-0.027**	0.009	-0.027**	0.009	-0.027**	0.009	-0.028**	0.009	-0.028**	0.009
ELL/LEP	0.030**	0.011	0.030**	0.011	0.031**	0.011	0.024*	0.011	0.028*	0.011	0.027*	0.011
Home visits			0.020**	0.007	0.020**	0.007	0.016*	0.007	0.012	0.007	0.023**	0.007
Implementation qual.					0.019	0.01						
Perception of support							0.125***	0.011				
Quality of home visits									-0.290***	0.027		
Perception of impact											0.087***	0.024
Constant	0.121**	0.044	0.116**	0.044	0.033	0.062	-0.341***	0.059	1.157***	0.105	-0.239*	0.107

N=3167
*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001

Table B2: Multi-Level Models testing FEP Effects on Students' Grade Level Proficiency for Reading   Comprehension

	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3		MODEL 4		MODEL 5		MODEL 6	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
TRC baseline	2.309***	0.106	2.373***	0.108	2.374***	0.108	2.373***	0.108	2.374***	0.108	2.373***	0.108
Race												
Black	-0.435	0.317	-0.353	0.319	-0.354	0.319	-0.354	0.319	-0.354	0.319	-0.353	0.319
Hispanic	-0.151	0.326	-0.082	0.328	-0.084	0.328	-0.082	0.328	-0.084	0.328	-0.082	0.328
Other	-0.032	0.394	-0.03	0.395	-0.029	0.395	-0.028	0.395	-0.029	0.395	-0.03	0.395
Grade												
1st	0.995***	0.144	1.001***	0.144	1.001***	0.144	1.001***	0.144	1.001***	0.144	1.00***	0.144
2nd	0.858***	0.147	0.845***	0.147	0.846***	0.147	0.845***	0.147	0.846***	0.147	0.845***	0.147
3rd	0.816***	0.158	0.843***	0.159	0.843***	0.159	0.842***	0.159	0.843***	0.159	0.843***	0.159
4th	0.784***	0.165	0.836***	0.167	0.837***	0.167	0.837***	0.167	0.837***	0.167	0.836***	0.167
5th	0.820***	0.177	0.903***	0.179	0.903***	0.179	0.904***	0.179	0.903***	0.179	0.903***	0.179
FARM	0.153	0.266	0.156	0.267	0.145	0.267	0.155	0.267	0.149	0.267	0.156	0.267
Special education	-0.834***	0.122	-0.839***	0.122	-0.839***	0.122	-0.839***	0.122	-0.839***	0.122	-0.839***	0.122
ELL/LEP	-0.941***	0.148	-0.947***	0.148	-0.948***	0.148	-0.947***	0.148	-0.947***	0.148	-0.947***	0.148
Attendance	1.093***	0.199	1.005***	0.201	1.008***	0.201	1.008***	0.201	1.004***	0.201	1.005***	0.201
Home visits			0.441***	0.098	0.441***	0.098	0.442***	0.098	0.440***	0.098	0.441***	0.098
Implementation qual.					-1.814	1.456						
Perception of support							-1.276	1.609				
Quality of home visits									-3.249	3.957		
Perception of impact											0.262	3.496
Constant	-0.498	0.655	-0.778	0.663	7.469	6.683	4.11	6.217	10.577		-1.789	

N=3709
*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001

Table B3: Multi-Level Models testing FEP Effects on Students' Grade Level Proficiency for Reading Fluency

	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3		MODEL 4		MODEL 5		MODEL 6	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
DIBELS baseline	3.038***	0.161	3.038***	0.161	3.047***	0.16	3.040***	0.161	3.037***	0.161	3.044***	0.161
Race												
Black	-0.498	0.621	-0.499	0.622	-0.579	0.616	-0.513	0.621	-0.501	0.622	-0.454	0.626
Hispanic	0.23	0.632	0.23	0.632	0.221	0.629	0.223	0.631	0.23	0.633	0.239	0.636
Other	0.276	0.74	0.276	0.74	0.245	0.734	0.255	0.739	0.27	0.741	0.249	0.741
Grade												
2nd	-1.508*	0.761	-1.508*	0.762	-1.413	0.749	-1.518*	0.762	-1.502*	0.763	-1.598*	0.760
3rd	-2.129**	0.767	-2.129**	0.767	-2.071**	0.755	-2.136**	0.767	-2.123**	0.768	-2.204**	0.765
4th	-1.860*	0.768	-1.860*	0.768	-1.780*	0.753	-1.876*	0.768	-1.853*	0.769	-1.953*	0.767
5th	-2.419**	0.776	-2.419**	0.776	-2.313**	0.761	-2.430**	0.776	-2.412**	0.777	-2.517*	0.774
FARM	-0.638	0.369	-0.638	0.369	-0.426	0.341	-0.637	0.368	-0.623	0.379	-0.603	0.365
Special Education	-1.474***	0.282	-1.474***	0.282	-1.507***	0.284	-1.476***	0.282	-1.474***	0.282	-1.483***	0.282
ELL/LEP	-0.839***	0.236	-0.839***	0.236	-0.858***	0.234	-0.842***	0.236	-0.839***	0.235	-0.843***	0.235
Attendance	0.874*	0.344	0.874*	0.345	0.837*	0.337	0.842*	0.348	0.878*	0.346	0.851*	0.344
Home visits			-0.002	0.162	-0.012	0.16	-0.004	0.162	0.001	0.163	0.021	0.162
Implementation qual.					0.924***	0.226						
Perception of support							0.226	0.366				
Quality of home visits									0.151	0.876		
Perception of impact											1.104	0.700
Constant	0.853	0.981	0.854	0.982	-3.591*	1.454	0.018	1.676	0.302	3.342	-3.38	2.862

N=1362
*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001

Table B4: Multi-Level Models testing FEP Effects on Student Re-enrollment

	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3		MODEL 4		MODEL 5		MODEL 6	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Re-enroll-ment (2012-13)	0.189	0.169	0.180	0.173	0.172	0.173	0.176	0.172	0.180	0.173	0.182	0.173
Race												
Black	-1.638	1.061	-1.631	1.062	-1.621	1.062	-1.620	1.062	-1.629	1.062	-1.633	1.062
Hispanic	-1.115	1.072	-1.109	1.072	-1.101	1.072	-1.112	1.072	-1.104	1.072	-1.109	1.072
Other	-0.197	1.275	-0.195	1.275	-0.198	1.275	-0.223	1.275	-0.200	1.275	-0.192	1.275
Grade												
2nd	0.017	0.195	0.017	0.195	0.019	0.195	0.016	0.195	0.017	0.195	0.017	0.195
3rd	0.107	0.201	0.107	0.201	0.105	0.201	0.104	0.201	0.106	0.201	0.107	0.201
4th	-0.063	0.202	-0.058812	0.203	-0.059	0.202	-0.064	0.202	-0.058	0.203	-0.058	0.203
FARM	-0.081	0.617	-0.081	0.617	-0.007	0.622	-0.100	0.613	-0.038	0.628	-0.093	0.620
Special edu-cation	-0.016	0.186	-0.017	0.187	-0.022	0.187	-0.018	0.186	-0.018	0.187	-0.017	0.187
ELL/LEP	-0.057	0.286	-0.056	0.286	-0.055	0.286	-0.064	0.285	-0.055	0.286	-0.054	0.286
Attendance	1.246***	0.295	1.240***	0.296	1.232***	0.296	1.200***	0.297	1.245***	0.296	1.242***	0.296
Home visits			0.039	0.151	0.037	0.151	0.036	0.151	0.041	0.152	0.037	0.152
Implementa-tion qual.					0.413	0.500						
Perception of support							0.675	0.484				
Quality of home visits									0.503	1.368		
FEP impact											-0.235	1.136
Constant	3.045**	1.111	3.029**	1.113	1.090	2.614	0.491	2.156	1.226	5.030	3.948	4.570

N=2461
*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001

References

■ Balfanz, R., Herzog, L. and Mac Iver, D.J. (2007). Preventing student disengagement and keeping students on the graduation path in urban middle-grades schools: early identification and effective interventions. *Educational Psychologist, 42*, 223-235.

■ Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., and Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

■ Dearing, E., Kreider, H., Simpkins, S., and Weiss, H. B. (2006). Family involvement in school and low-income children's literacy: Longitudinal associations between and within families. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 653–664.

■ Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools, 2nd Edition*. Westview Press.

■ Epstein, J.L., Sanders, M.G., Sheldon, S.B. et al. (2009). *School, Family and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action (3rd edition).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

■ Fan, X., and Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 13*, 1–22.

■ Grolnick, W. S., Kurowski, C. O., Dunlap, and Hevey, (2000). Parental resources and the transition to junior high. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 10*, 465–488.

■ Hemphill, F. C., and Vanneman, A. (2011). *Achievement Gaps: How Hispanic and White Students in Public Schools Perform in Mathematics and Reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress* (NCES 2011-459). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

■ Henderson, A., and Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

■ Hill, Nancy E. and Tyson, D.F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: a meta analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology,* 45, 740-763.

- Jeynes, W. H. (2012). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of different types of parental involvement programs for urban students. *Urban Education, 47*, 706-742.

- Jeynes, W. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: a meta-analysis. *Urban Education, 42*, 82–110.

- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education, 40*, 237–269.

- Mac Iver, M. A., and Messel, M. (2013). The ABCs of keeping on track to graduation: Research findings from Baltimore. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *18*(1), 50–67.

- Ma, X. (1999). Dropping out of advanced mathematics: The effects of parental involvement. *Teachers College Record, 101*, 60–81.

- Mapp, K. L. and Kuttner, P. J. (2013). *Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships*. Southwest Education Development Laboratory. Austin, TX.

- McNeal, R. B. (1999). Parental involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out. *Social Forces, 78*, 117–144.

- Paoli, J. B., Hornig-Fox, J., Ingram, E. S., Maushard, M. Bridgeland, J. M. and R. Balfanz. (2015). *Building a Grad Nation: Progress and Challenge in Ending the High School Dropout Epidemic.* Civic Enterprises and Everyone Graduates Center at the School of Education at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.

- Pomeranz, E. M., Moorman, E. A., and Litwach, S. D. (2007). The how, whom, and why of parents' involvement in children's academic lives: More is not always better. *Review of Education Research, 77*, 373–410.

- Sheldon, S. B. (2007). Improving student attendance with a school-wide approach to school-family-community partnerships. *Journal of Educational Research, 100*, 267–275.

- Sheldon, S. B. (2005). Testing a structural equation model of partnership program implementation and parent involvement. *Elementary School Journal, 106*, 171–187

- Sheldon, S. B., and Epstein, J. L. (2002). Improving student behavior and school discipline with family and community involvement. *Education and Urban Society, 35*, 4–26.

- Sheldon, S.B. and Hutchins, D. (2014). Year 1 Outcomes of the Flamboyan Foundation Initiative. *Center on School, Family and Community Partnerships.*

■ Sheldon, S. B., and Jung, S. B. (2015). *Exploring how school-family partnerships improve attendance: Principals, teachers, and program organization*. Paper presented at the 2015 Annual Conference of the American Educational Researchers Association in Chicago, IL.

■ Smith, R. S. (2011). *An introduction to the campaign for grade-level reading. National Civic Review, 100,* 4.

■ U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey, 2000– 01, 2005–06, 2009–10, and 2010–11*. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC.

■ Vanneman, A., Hamilton, L., Baldwin Anderson, J., and Rahman, T. (2009). *Achievement Gaps: How Black and White Students in Public Schools Perform in Mathematics and Reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress*, (NCES 2009-455). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Edu

The Family Engagement Partnership
Student Outcome Evaluation
By Steven B. Sheldon and Sol Bee Jung

Johns Hopkins University

School of Education
Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships

September 2015