

Chapter 4

Building School-Level Capacity Through a Problem-Solving Approach to Parental Engagement in a Large Urban Setting



Angel Rodriguez, Rosalia F. Gallo, Juan Carlos Gonzalez,
and Elizabeth D. Cramer

Abstract Parental engagement continues to be a struggle for parents of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students at risk for academic failure. Throughout legislation such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, P.L. 108–446). And the Every Student Succeeds Act (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015), parental involvement is specifically referenced and supported. Although parental involvement research has suggested that parents who are engaged in school activities significantly impact the achievement and educational benefits of their children, there are still many parents who are marginalized from being engaged in their children’s education, especially those trying to navigate the complexities of special education. Through a collaborative initiative in one large urban school district, a unique, family-focused engagement program was created. This chapter explores the development of this initiative and its effects using the data gathered from the first year of implementation, including the implications and lessons learned.

Keywords Parental engagement · Urban education · Family collaboration · Special education · Disability

Parent engagement continues to be a struggle for disenfranchised groups of families of students with disabilities (SWD), English language learners (ELLs), and students at risk of academic failure (Francis et al. 2016). Throughout legislation such as the

A. Rodriguez (✉) · J. C. Gonzalez
Miami-Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL, USA
e-mail: anglerr@dadeschools.net; juancgonzalez@dadeschools.net

R. F. Gallo
Central Florida Parent Center, Miami, FL, USA

E. D. Cramer
Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA
e-mail: cramere@fiu.edu

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA 2015), parental involvement is specifically referenced and supported. Although research about parent engagement has suggested that involving parents significantly impact the achievement and educational benefits of their children (Fehrman et al. 2015), there are still many parents that are marginalized from being involved in their children's education (e.g., parents of SWD, ELLs, and students at risk). Disenfranchised parents are often described as "Parents are apathetic, unresponsive, and uncaring about their children's education" (Jones 2016). For instance, female-headed households have been linked to such epithets as poverty, decreased supervision, and low achievement. In the case of SWD, parents and professionals need to fully understand the students' abilities to best address their needs (Murray et al. 2009). Furthermore, parent participation, in all aspects of the provision of specially designed instruction through an Individual Educational Plan (IEP), is a basic principle under IDEA 2004 (Schultz et al. 2016; Starr and Foy 2010). However, often parents of SWD feel resentment from school personnel and other parents (Schultz et al. 2016; Starr and Foy 2010). Numerous factors contribute to the marginalization of parents of SWD, particularly those that come from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Cultural mistrust, communication, understanding, and low expectations for participation by low-income families and/or families of color by school professionals, as well as lack of training for both parents and professionals, are some of the barriers that contribute to this ostracism (Francis et al. 2016).

SWD require extensive support not only for the implementation of their IEP and academic achievement but also for their social and emotional development so that they can become contributing members of their society (IDEA 2004). Communication and collaboration between parents and educators is foundational to supporting families, as well as the success of students with disabilities (Francis et al. 2016). In order to achieve this effective level of communication, positive family school outcomes are necessary, and this includes a level of parental engagement (Barton et al. 2004; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2015; Henderson 2007; Mapp and Kutter 2013) that is measured through parental skill development, enhanced satisfaction, understanding their role as participatory members in their child's education, social connections within the school and community, and a contributing member in the life of the school (Francis et al. 2016). Parental engagement ensures that parents are systematically included in their schools and collaborating with professionals at the classroom, school, and district levels; conceptually, it refers to parents being "authors" and "agents" within their schools (Barton et al. 2004).

Context of the Program

This chapter will focus on how one large urban district created the Parents-Helping-Parents (PHP) initiative, an innovative approach to increasing parental engagement at 37 elementary schools in Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS), the fourth largest school system in the nation serving over 350,000 students. Of the 472 schools in the district, 280 are elementary or K-8 centers, 74 are middle schools, 77

are high schools, and 41 are combined or alternative education sites. There are additional 342 charter schools in the district. The students come from White (7%), Hispanic (71%), and Black (21%) ethnicities. Over 35,700 (10%) students are identified as having a disability under IDEA. Over 67,000 (19%) students participate in programs for ELLs. Over 66% of all students receive free or reduced-price lunch. Of the 18,100 teachers hired during the 2017–2018 school year, 20% were White, 26% Black, and 53% Hispanic. Of the 1210 administrators working during the 2017–2018 school year, 17% were White, 30% were Black, and 52% were Hispanic (M-DCPS Statistical Highlights 2017–2018). The 37 schools participating in PHP were composed of students from White (2%), Hispanic (60%), and Black (38%) ethnicities including ELL (31%), SWD (13%), as well as students identified as gifted (6%). Most students (93%) at the selected schools received free or reduced-price lunch.

Theoretical Framework and Development of Parents-Helping-Parents Initiative

Parents of SWD in M-DCPS have been involved in their children’s education at the school level (e.g., attending IEP meetings), in school associations (e.g., Parent Teacher Association), as well as in district advisory boards (e.g., Superintendent’s District Panel for Students with Disabilities; Parent Involvement Committee). In addition, families are involved at the state level providing input to state and local committees (e.g., Family Care Council; Parent-to-Parent of Miami; The Children’s Trust). Nevertheless, numerous barriers in their attempts to problem-solve and seek information to address the needs of their child with disabilities resulted in the need for a department being established for families to express their grievances. To reduce the number of parental complaints related to special education, the number of due process cases filed, and the litigious environment within M-DCPS, district staff sought guidance from the Florida Department of Education.

The FLDOE suggested Sharing the Commitment (STC) as a successful parent-district partnership implemented in neighboring Collier County Public Schools (CCPS). The Central Florida Parent Center (CFPC; Collier County Public Schools 2018) is a nonprofit agency that collaborates with CCPS in the implementation of the partnership. Since its inception in 2002, STC, founded by a father of a student with multiple disabilities, uses problem-solving and a win-win approach to resolve adversarial situations between parents and the school district (FLDOE, BEESS 2018). STC has become a model of teamwork and collaboration in the district. Since 2009, there have been no due process hearings and only one state complaint filed by a parent in that district.

Based on the positive outcomes of the STC initiative, staff from M-DCPS proposed the PHP initiative. Family-centered projects are designed and based on the posits of cultural-historical activity theory which suggests that, within social practices and their mediating environments, unequal distributions of power can arise from differentiated divisions of labor (Barton et al. 2004). Furthermore, the theory indi-

cates that individuals are not positioned equally within networks of activity and, therefore, do not derive the same kinds of benefits from their mediating environments. To this end, central to the PHP design was the role of the Family Support Specialist (FSS) at each of the 37 selected schools. FSS would not only serve families of SWD but also those of ELLs and students at risk of academic failure, relying on school-based problem-solving strategies and resources to obtain positive outcomes for families of SWD. The FSS empowered families through advocacy training, problem-solving, and providing them with an understanding of the school system.

During the 2016–2017 school year, the School Board of Miami-Dade County approved seed funding for the PHP initiative under Title I Schoolwide Programs. As part of the PHP implementation, a contract was executed with the CFPC. The CFPC served as the fiscal agent that hired a local education expert (LEE) to support the initiative. The LEE selected had over 30 years of experience in the fields of special and bilingual education and a profound understanding of the unique dynamics of the school district. Title I funds were also used to establish a new Department of Family Support Services (DFSS) that supports and addresses family concerns of all 317 Title I schools in the district, including the 37 PHP schools. The DFSS structure includes a family liaison officer, a compliance expert, a licensed family therapist, one clerical support staff, and a community liaison specialist.

The mission and vision of the DFSS includes fostering strong partnerships between families, schools, and community partners. The three main functions of the department are (1) helping families gain greater access to existing services and supports, (2) assisting agencies seeking funding for family services, and (3) providing direct supervision for the FSS. Staff from the DFSS also participate in the Superintendent's District Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to report on the concerns of parents. The department also serves as a liaison between schools and community stakeholders on advisory boards and collaborates with community entities such as Florida International University (FIU), The Children's Trust, and The Advocacy Network on Disabilities. Collaboration with district departments, community-based agencies, and universities is vital in leveraging resources and maximizing outcomes on behalf of the families served.

Function, Role, and Responsibilities of FSS

Schools selected for PHP must meet four criteria: (1) participation in schoolwide Title I programs, (2) low parental engagement data, (3) evidence of an effective Title I Community Involvement Specialist or Community Liaison Specialist, and (4) representation from the schools throughout the nine school board voting districts. Among 472 schools in M-DCPS, 37 schools met these four criteria and participated in the project. Each participating school principal hired a parent from the school or community, who had a SWD, an ELL, or a child at risk of academic failure to serve as the FSS of the school. The selected parent must also have a minimum of a high school diploma or equivalent, in addition to meeting other district employment

eligibility criteria, such as passing background checks and verification of schooling credentials. A total of 24 FSS was hired. Each of the 16 FSS was assigned to support one school, while each of the rest needed to support two schools.

The main function of the FSS was to mentor and advocate on behalf of families through problem-solving, as well as increasing their level of involvement in their children's education. FSS fostered empathic collaboration between the school and the home. They served as role models, helped parents enhance their advocacy skills, and promoted a sense of shared responsibility. This paradigm shift promoted collaboration and helped reduce adversarial situations. Through their use of customer-centered service and active listening skills, they demonstrated the capacity to avoid or minimize combative situations with the school or district. In this role, the FSS provided technical support to the schools, connected families to key school staff (e.g., teachers, counselors, administrators), disseminated valuable information to parents, participated in trainings, and facilitated the simulcast of webinars for families at the school sites.

Building the capacity of the FSS was essential. The initial group of FSS hired received approximately 30 h of training by DFFS during a 3-week period before starting at the assigned schools. The training module topics included ethics, job expectations, customer service, teamwork, problem-solving, the vision and mission of PHP, following the referral system protocols, school-site procedures, IEP/504 and ELL guidelines, and how to access district services and supports. The collaboration with the LEE and other staff from the CFPC was invaluable in providing essential expertise and resources to the FSS. Another vital role of the FSS was to train parents on interpreting and following school procedures and guidelines, helping their children complete schoolwork, and requesting assistance from the school and district offices. This was primarily accomplished through face-to-face meetings and facilitating monthly webinars conducted by the DFSS in collaboration with the CFPC. The FSS were responsible for promoting the webinars, preparing the event at their schools, obtaining feedback from families, and interacting with family members during and after the webinar. In many instances, the interactions with the parents led to additional meetings to address their individual concerns.

The FSS were required to work 10 h per week and report to the DFSS and site administrators. The FSS was supported by the department through ongoing technical assistance and training, collaborating with community agencies, providing access to resources, and following up with families needing assistance navigating the complexities of special education within a large school system. FSS also participated as members of committees that affected student attendance and academics. They helped parents prepare for meetings such as IEP, 504 Plans, behavior intervention plans, and parent-teacher meetings. In addition, the FSS assisted schools in complying with federal, state, and local requirements related to SWD (e.g., completing the annual FLDOE parent special education survey). They helped disseminate relevant school-community information such as newsletters and announcements.

To help the FSS address the concerns of the families, a process was established. Each concern (e.g., implementation of accommodations) brought by a parent to the FSS was classified based on the actions required to resolve the issues, and the case

was documented on a PHP Referral Form. This form was used to document the progress made toward attaining resolution. Issues were classified as either “school level” or “district level” based on the intensity of the action required. School-level concerns were resolved using available school-site resources. Most school-level referrals were related to academic grades, attendance, discipline, homework, and second-language acquisition. These referrals did not require the intervention of the DFSS staff. If the FSS determined the concern required additional help beyond what the school site could offer, they contacted the DFSS, thus escalating the concern to a “district-level” referral (e.g., IEP accommodations, ELL Committee, ESE evaluation). These issues would be managed by the staff at the DFSS. The referral information was then recorded using an online database system created by the DFSS. Many cases were also documented in the district’s student case-management system. Staff from the DFSS monitored cases weekly to determine progress made toward obtaining desired outcomes. Examples of outcomes included changing of a student’s schedule, obtaining transportation for students, completing a psychological evaluation for students, and referring a family to an outside agency for additional services. After 6 months of full implementation, the data gathered from the referral system were compiled, disaggregated, and published on the district’s website.

Of the more than 800 PHP referrals submitted for review to the Department by the FSS, 427 were entered into the district’s student case-management system due to the nature of the parental concern and the intensity of the intervention required. Most district-level referrals were related to the IEP, transition, and Section 504 Plans. Overall, 43% of all PHP referrals made, regardless of the level, were related to special education. The most common action taken at the school level by the FSS included face-to-face meetings with parents, problem-solving over the phone, and accompanying parents at meetings with school staff (PHP Annual Report 2017).

Outcomes

Outcomes of the project were evaluated using both qualitative and quantitative data. Data included stakeholder satisfaction surveys, focus group with FSS, and performance indicators such as school performance (based on state-issued grades), student attendance rates, student reading proficiency on state assessments, and parental engagement in school activities.

Satisfaction Surveys

Satisfaction surveys were developed by the authors to obtain feedback from the participating principals, teachers, family support specialists, and families served by the PHP initiative. The surveys were sent to an expert reviewer (special education professor) for feedback and evaluation of their content validity. The identity of

survey responders was kept anonymous. Principals, teachers, and FSS completed surveys online. Participating families received surveys via the postal service and were asked to return surveys using prepaid self-addressed stamped envelopes provided by DFSS. A four-point Likert-type scale was used to rate statements ranging from 1, “strongly disagree,” to 4, “strongly agree.” Surveys ranged from five to eight Likert statements followed by one to two open-ended questions to gain more detailed information.

Principals A total of 34 out of 37 principals responded to the survey (see Table 4.1). Three of the principals chose not to participate in the survey without providing any reasons. While all responses averaged above “agree,” the highest-ranking response was related to the amount of support provided by DFSS, whereas the lowest response was related to the perceived increase in parental engagement. Nineteen responses were received to the open-ended question, “Please tell us anything you want us to know about the PHP initiative.” Positive comments included, “I appreciated having the program here at the school. I trust it will continue and will provide more opportunities for parents to interact with the school” and “Our FSS is excellent! She is very accessible to parents and helps them a great deal. It is also a great benefit that she is bilingual.” Three principals indicated the need for additional hours of work for the FSS assigned to their school.

Teachers The aim of the teacher survey was to identify teachers’ satisfaction with the PHP program and their self-efficacy in collaborating with parents. A total of 175 teachers responded to the survey (see Table 4.2). Nearly all teachers strongly agreed

Table 4.1 Principal satisfaction survey means

Survey question	Mean	SD
The FSS increased parent engagement at my school	3.15	.78
The FSS addressed family concerns effectively	3.29	.84
The PHP initiative at my school was adequately supported by DFSS	3.35	.88
The FSS collaborated with families and school staff to achieve positive outcomes	3.29	.84
PHP is an essential part of our school improvement initiatives	3.21	.84

Table 4.2 Teacher satisfaction survey means

Survey question	Mean	SD
I am aware that my school is participating in the PHP program	3.48	1.03
I am familiar with the components of the PHP program and what that means for my school	2.83	1.13
I have seen a difference in parental engagement in my school since the implementation of the PHP program beginning the 2016–2017 school year	3.15	1.01
I have had interactions with the PHP FSS assigned to my school	3.02	1.23
I am satisfied with the level of parental engagement in my classroom or school	2.74	1.14
I think parental engagement is an important part of the overall success of my students	3.94	.26

that parental engagement is an important part of student success. When asked about the ways PHP had impacted parental engagement and remaining needs to improve parental engagement, themes of teacher responses included opportunities for parent education, importance of parent-school collaboration, and professional development for staff. Some survey responses also revealed negative views held by many of the teachers about parental roles within the home setting, feeling that parents were not “doing their job at home” and leaving too much parenting in the hands of teachers.

Families Served A survey was sent to all 450 families who were served during the 5 months of initial implementation during the 2016–2017 school year. These families were selected based on the cases entered in the student case-management system. Forty-two families returned the surveys via US Postal Service, 9% response rate. Families whose surveys were returned (e.g., wrong address) were contacted and offered an opportunity to complete electronic surveys. An additional 12 families completed the survey electronically. Results of the survey indicated that participated parents’ perception of the FSS was not as positive as the principals and teachers (see Table 4.3). Twenty-four of the participated families included additional comments about the PHP initiative. Only two of the participated families felt that the FSS was not helpful. The rest stated that “Thank you for having the program that helped us a lot especially when you’re a single parent” and “I am so pleased and overjoyed with the family support services. They have an amazing family support specialist, Ms. J, who is an outstanding professional.” Families also indicated that FSS should schedule more training for parents or having face-to-face training was preferred.

Family Support Specialists Twenty-four FSS were hired at the time and all of them responded to the survey (see Table 4.4). The participated FSS commented that they “like meetings where [they] get to share with peers.” When asked “Do you have any suggestions for improving the PHP initiative?” and “Please tell us anything you want us to know about the PHP initiative,” FSS responded that more training should be scheduled in the evenings for families who worked during the day. Additionally, FSS also felt that their workload required them to work more than 10 h per week.

Table 4.3 Families served satisfaction survey means

Survey question	Mean	SD
With the assistance of the FSS, I was able to resolve issues related to my child	2.95	.91
The FSS provided valuable training and information	3.07	.78
The FSS was courteous and demonstrated professionalism	3.19	.86
With the support of the FSS, I am more confident in meeting my child’s educational needs	3.05	.96
Overall, I am satisfied with the services provided by the FSS	3.02	.90

Table 4.4 FSS satisfaction survey means

Survey question	Mean	SD
The DFSS responded to my inquiries in a timely manner	3.91	.28
I received an adequate amount of training in order to perform the duties of an FSS	3.83	.38
The PHP initiative at my school was adequately supported by the Department of FSS	3.79	.41
The school administration was supportive of the PHP initiative and my role as an FSS	3.75	.44
The PHP initiative helped families adequately address individual concerns at my school	3.75	.44

Family Support Specialist Focus Group Results

In addition to satisfaction surveys, two focus groups were held with all the FSS to obtain feedback to determine future PHP programming, as these were the stakeholders who were most directly involved in the day-to-day operation of PHP. One focus group was held in the north section of the district (n = 14), and one in the south (n = 7). Three of the 24 originally hired FSS had been promoted to other positions and did not participate in the focus groups. The focus groups were conducted by FIU faculty and a research assistant who recorded, transcribed, and analyzed for common themes. Examples of questions included: “What has your experience been like as an FSS?” “In what ways has your work as an FSS affected your empowerment as a parent?” “What changes have you seen at your school as a result of this work?” “What types of training would you like to see?” “What has been your biggest obstacle as an FSS?” “What has been your most rewarding experience as an FSS?” and “What else would you like us to know about the project?”

Six overarching themes emerged across both focus groups. These included positive components of PHP, rewarding experience of FSS, personal improvements, personal negative outcomes, challenges/obstacles, and recommended changes. Positive components included external outcomes such as helping improve parent and student performance (e.g., attendance, academics) with rewarding experiences such as feeling appreciated and accomplished. Personal improvement included such comments as noted improvement in themselves as parents, gaining knowledge of school and special education policies, improved parent-child relationships, and helping their own child’s well-being. Personal negative outcomes primarily centered on the time commitment of being a FSS affecting their own family. Negative feelings of stress and helplessness were also noted.

When asking the groups about challenges and obstacles faced by PHP personnel, one subtheme that emerged was the need for more resources and support, including knowledge of available programs, technology, designated work spaces, and administrative support. The lack of definition of the role and responsibilities of a FSS and their perceived lack of belongingness at their schools were seen as contributing to these challenges. Obstacles were also reported in relation to unwelcoming school climates. One underlining subtheme that was ubiquitous across schools was the

duality of being a school member both as a parent and FSS. Conversely, many FSS reported how being in this role has been an “eye opener” as a parent.

The focus groups further revealed suggestions for changes to the PHP program. One subtheme that arose was the need to modify trainings/webinars offered to parents. Changes discussed included timeframe for trainings/webinars, languages offered, and greater relevance of trainings to parents. Other suggestions for improvement included the addition of parent support groups, collaboration between FSS at various schools, and expansion of the PHP program to secondary schools where great need was emphasized by participants.

Parent Participation

As part of the Title I school accountability system, parental engagement is monitored by schools implementing Title I programs. The PHP schools implement schoolwide Title I programs and are required to submit monthly parent participation counts to the district Title I office. Parent signatures are obtained as a way of documenting their participation in school activities. These may include student performances, parent-teacher meetings, parent trainings, and open house events.

Over 1000 parents participated in facilitated webinar sessions that were offered in three languages: English, Spanish, and Haitian-Creole. Sessions were interactive and participants submitted questions to the presenters via the Web. This was the first attempt by the district to provide this level of in-school support and training to families. The number of parents attending school functions at the 37 PHP schools during the 2015–2016 school year was 23,076. The number of parents attending school functions at the same schools during 2016–2017 was tripled to 79,517 (M-DCPS Title I Administration, 2017). This drastic increase is attributed to the efforts of the FSS and the school’s participation in PHP activities. This rate of parent participation is holding steady for the 2017–2018 school year (M-DCPS Title I Administration 2018).

Discussion

Overall, FSS were the most satisfied stakeholders in this PHP project, followed by principals, then teachers, and lastly parents. To accomplish the goal of empowering families, the FSS played an essential role as “agents” of change and “authors” of their own stories (Barton et al. 2004) at their schools. FSS encouraged other parents to become engaged through participation in committees and councils (e.g., attendance review committees, school advisory councils). The FSS were extremely satisfied with the training and support provided by the Department of Family Support Services. Through these efforts by the Department, the FSS were able to address the individual needs of parents, particularly those who have children with disabilities as

it related to the provision of free and appropriate public education (Murray et al. 2009; Schultz et al. 2016). Their integration in facilitating PHP activities (e.g., webinars) at their school sites resulted in an overall increase of approximately 300% in the District's parental engagement in Title I schools (M-DCPS Title I, 2018). Although FSS addressed the individual needs at their schools, continuous training is required to update skills sets and remove barriers (Francis et al. 2016). Through the implementation of PHP, schools were perceived as more welcoming toward parents. This helped build the trust necessary to help families at deeper levels.

The principals reported high level of satisfaction with the role of the FSS in addressing individual parental concerns. They also attributed positive school outcomes to the FSS. Similar results were noted in Fehrman et al.'s (2015) work with parental involvement where the impact on student achievement was evident in high school students through school-site involvement of parents. However, principals' responses suggested overall parental engagement was the least impacted by the FSS. This may be a perception that contributes to marginalization of groups of parents (Schultz et al., 2016).

Teachers reported feeling confident in their ability to collaborate with parents and were aware of their school's participation in the PHP project. Awareness of the needs of parents and collaboration with teachers (Francis, et al. 2016), particularly those teaching students with disabilities, is essential in supporting their youngster's educational program (IDEA 2004). Although teachers indicated that they had seen an increase in parental engagement at their school site during the year of PHP implementation, they were not satisfied with the level of parental engagement at their schools. Parental engagement is correlated to an impact on achievement and educational benefit (Fehrman et al. 2015); both are essential to the success of students with disabilities (IDEA 2004; Schultz et al. 2016).

Families felt that in their role, FSS were professional and provided a significant amount of training and information. Lack of training and understanding of the system is reported as a significant barrier by parents in their lack engagement (Francis et al. 2016). This relegation is particularly felt by parents of students with disabilities (Starr and Foy 2010). Resolving issues related to their child was the least satisfied area for families, thus increasing the alienation of these frequently underrepresented stakeholders (Barton et al. 2004).

Lessons Learned and Implications for the Future

Based on the outcomes reported and correlations made, PHP continues to expand within M-DCPS. Since the initial implementation, this evidence-based program has proven to be effective in helping increase parental engagement in schools. The authors agree that the most unique aspect of the initiative is the role of the FSS as a school-level advocate-employee. Their ability to build trust and interact with families has been vital in strengthening the home-school partnership. Nevertheless, the FSS continue to need training and support, especially in the area of working with

families of SWD. Continuing to strengthen partnerships with other area universities and community agencies, the PHP will also help facilitate access to specialized services that would otherwise be out of reach to families of SWD within a large urban school district.

Hiring and retaining eligible FSS was challenging at times given the job requirements and specifications. Six of the initial FSS accepted higher paying positions within months of being hired by the DFSS. Working for 10 h a week was also insufficient to meet the needs of the families or schools. As a result, FSS who possessed the right set of skills (i.e., a second language) accepted a second school assignment as FSS vacancies occurred at the PHP schools. This helped to improve morale, FSS retention rates, and services to families.

Districts considering this model are encouraged to be fiscally creative. Rather than replicating efforts, they should collaborate to create a strong and unified parental engagement initiative building on existing programs. Leveraging resources will ensure the longevity and sustainability. For example, M-DCPS is identifying other sources of funding to increase the number of hours for the FSS at selected schools. The creative and deliberate use of federal and state grant funds such as Title I and IDEA as well as developing university partnerships (e.g., FIU) is also highly recommended.

As with all new initiatives and programs, scheduled monitoring and reporting on the impact of the initiative is vital in ensuring continuity. PHP, and its problem-solving, family-centered approach, is a promising and innovative technique to engage and empower disenfranchised families in any school setting.

References

- Barton AC, Drake C, Perez JG, St Louis K, George M (2004) Ecologies of parental engagement in urban education. *Educ Res* 33(4):3–12
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2015) Parent engagement. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/protective/parent_engagement.htm
- Collier County Public Schools Sharing the Commitment (CCPS STC) (2018) http://www.collier-schools.com/cms/lib/FL01903251/Centricity/Domain/1337/STC_Brochure-English.pdf
- Every Student Succeeds Act (2015) Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/essa>
- Fehrman PG, Keith TZ, Reimers TM (2015) Home influence on school learning: direct and indirect effects of parental involvement on high school grades. *J Educ Res* 80(6):330–337
- Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (FLDOE, BEESS) (2018) Retrieved from student-edu/dispute-resolution/du-process-hearing-orders/2017.stml
- Francis GL, Blue-Banning M, Turnbull AP, Hill C, Haines SJ, Gross JM (2016) Culture in inclusive schools: parental perspectives on trusting family-professional partnerships. *Educ Train Autism Dev Disabil* 51(3):281–293.0901
- Henderson AT (2007) *Beyond the bake sale: the essential guide to family-school partnerships*. New Press: Distributed by W.W. Norton, New York
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of (2004) P.L. 108–446. Retrieved from <http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?path=/prelim@title20/chapter33/subchapter2&edition=prelim>

- Jones, TL (2016) Rethinking parental engagement: perceptions of single African American mothers. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) [Abstract] Michigan State University. Available from ERIC. (1968423766; ED570765)
- Mapp K, Kutter P (2013) Partners in education: a dual capacity-building framework for family-school partnerships. Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/framework/FE-Cap-Building.pdf>
- Miami-Dade County Public Schools Parents-Helping-Parents Annual Report (2017) Retrieved from <http://fss.dadeschools.net/>
- Miami-Dade County Public Schools Statistical Highlights (2018) Retrieved from <http://drs.dadeschools.net/StatisticalHighlights/SH1718.pdf>
- Miami-Dade County Public Schools Title I Administration (2017–2018) Retrieved from <http://title1.dadeschools.net/titleI.asp>
- Murray DS, Ruble LA, Willis H, Molloy CA (2009) Parent and teacher report of social skills in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch* 40:109–115
- Schultz TR, Able H, Sreckovic MA, White T (2016) Parent-teacher collaboration: teacher perceptions of what is needed to support students with ASD in the inclusive classroom. *Educ Train Autism Dev Disabil* 51(4):344–354
- Starr EM, Foy JB (2010) In parents' voices: the education of children with ASD spectrum disorders. *Remedial Spec Educ* 33:207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510383161>