**University of Alberta**

Engaging Parents Through Professional Learning Communities: Supporting Low Socioeconomic Students
by

Matthew Walker

A capping exercise submitted to the Faculty of Education In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education
In
Studies in Educational Leadership

Faculty of Education

Edmonton, Alberta

April 7, 2025

**Abstract**

Educational inequities continue to be an issue in Alberta as students from low socioeconomic backgrounds face systemic barriers such as limited resources, bias, and access issues to quality intervention and extension opportunities. In isolation professional learning communities (PLC's) and parent engagement frameworks independently demonstrate success in supporting student achievement, however, they often leave gaps in providing the necessary comprehensive support. This paper proposes an integrated model combining PLC structures with tiered parent involvement and engagement strategies, creating equity driven school-home partnerships. Utilizing Buffum et al.'s (2016) Response to Intervention (RTI) framework, Goodall and Montgomery's (2014) Continuum of Involvement to Engagement, and Epstein's (2010) Six Types of Involvement, the model presents a collaborative, tiered system focused on actively including parents in instructional decision-making and student support. The model seeks to deconstruct barriers facing low socioeconomic students by aligning educator collaboration with meaningful parent participation built on a foundation of mutual trust between school and home. The integrated approach fosters shared leadership, culturally responsive practices, and continuous professional learning, creating opportunities for schools to learn with and from parents, while easing constraints on teachers. Through a phased implementation process and continuous feedback loops, schools can improve student achievement, engagement, and well-being. This paper argues for combining PLCs with differentiated parent engagement to offer school leaders and their staff a pathway to advance educational equity and ensure lasting support for marginalized students.

*Keywords*: Parental Involvement, Parental Engagement, Professional Learning Communities, Collaboration, Student Achievement

**Table of Contents**

**Introduction**

Equity in education remains a challenge in school systems in Alberta, and around the world. Inequity is particularly prevalent for students from low income families. Research demonstrates students in these communities are consistently facing a disproportionate number of barriers to academic success, including limited access to resources, system bias, and fewer opportunities to extend their learning (Charchuk, 2022; Gutman & McLoyd, 2000; Pollock et al., 2013). Literature has consistently offered avenues to addressing these challenges, be it through teacher collaboration, or parent involvement; however, these structures often lack the wrap-around support required to effectively support students as they progress through the school system. These frameworks have been studied extensively with implementation often being presented as standalone, or isolated from other frameworks. Integration of professional learning community (PLC) practices with parent involvement and engagement strategies remains an underdeveloped area in research and practice. PLCs have been shown to improve student achievement through effective teacher collaboration focused on identifying and refining instructional practices based on data-driven decision-making (Buffum et al., 2016; Gray et al., 2016). While the work of effective PLCs has proven to be impactful on student achievement, its focus remains on intra-school collaboration, neglecting or ignoring the role and value of families in student learning. Epstein's (2010) six types of parent involvement, and Goodall and Montgomery's (2014) continuum of involvement to engagement, emphasize the importance of parent participation in education. Despite consistent evidence indicating family involvement influences student achievement, traditional involvement and engagement efforts remain isolated from school goals, and improvement plans (Pavlakis, 2018). This paper proposes an integrated framework combining PLC structures with tiered parent involvement and engagement strategies.

The proposed framework draws on the response to intervention (RTI) model (Buffum et al., 2016) to establish differentiated levels and forms of parent participation, and the continuum of parent involvement to engagement (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014) to provide a clear pathway between different types of parent school partnerships and participation. By synthesizing literature on PLCs, parent involvement, and community support, this paper seeks to establish a collaborative model focused on enhancing student learning through the building of equitable and sustainable school-home partnerships.

**Research Problem**

Education systems mirror the society they exist in, often resulting in policies and procedures supporting the current power structure. In societies built on neoliberal ideals, such as Alberta, this has resulted in educational inequalities due to the changing roles of parents (Healey, 2024) as schools become more challenging for low-income families to navigate due barriers based on race, gender, and class (Lopes, 2006). Addressing inequity requires a shift in policy and organizational structure, focused on including parents regardless of diversity (Pollock et al., 2013). Literature in the fields of parental engagement and PLCs show they are both impactful alone; however, areas of success for both can support areas of need for the other. Their combined integration remains an underdeveloped area in the research which requires attention in a world where professional development and learning opportunities are often unfocused and ineffective (Akiba & Liang, 2016). To explore the integration of PLC and parent involvement models and frameworks and the impact they can have on students from low-income homes, this paper will examine the following problem:

- What are possible impacts of establishing professional learning communities (PLCs) focused on engaging parents in the improvement of student achievement in low socioeconomic populations?

Additionally, the paper will focus on the following sub-problems:

- What does the literature often identify as barriers to low-income students succeeding in education?

- In what ways does the literature suggest professional learning communities (PLCs) impact the achievement of low socioeconomic students?

- Based on the literature, how does parent engagement impact student achievement of low socioeconomic students?

Exploring these questions and literature triangulation covering each area (barriers, PLC and parent engagement) will be completed through a literature review. This will be followed by an examination of how existing PLC and parent engagement frameworks and models can be integrated into a cohesive model focused on supporting student achievement through data-driven, collaborative school-home partnerships. The integrated model will be unpacked and its connection to the support it can provide low-income students will be analyzed. Finally, this paper will share findings, conclusions and implications for utilizing the integrated model in school's as a way of engaging the power and knowledge of parents and educators together. These final sections will emphasize how the development of this cohesive model emphasizes the importance of establishing effective school-home partnerships focused on improving relationships through trust and communication resulting in aligned support in the school and home.

**Literature Review**

Student achievement and improvement are consistent topics of educational professional learning opportunities provided to teachers and school leaders. Considering the large amount of money poured into these experiences, it raises questions around the success of these programs. While development opportunities vary in success, PLC principles of continuous learning focused on collaboration have consistently been linked to improved student outcomes (Akiba & Liang, 2016). Effectively implementing and improving student achievement can have a lifelong impact, but if students and families are not a part of the process in this journey, it is important to consider if these improvements will continue through the remainder of a child's schooling, and into adulthood, or if they will stop when they experience new schools with different teachers, leaders and values. Student's from low-socioeconomic backgrounds come to school in the face of many challenges, and educators are tasked with removing these barriers to success to help them succeed (Gray et al., 2016). Current practice suggests schools do not remove these barriers, instead they only sidestep them until the child moves on in the educational journey (Harris & Robinson, 2016). Advocates of parent involvement and engagement suggest removal of barriers requires a strong school-home partnership as when families are actively involved in learning processes, successful practices are more likely to continue. Even though literature argues for greater involvement of parents in schools, they continue to be excluded (Pushor, 2017; Pushor & Amendt, 2018; Watson & Bogotch, 2015). This literature review will explore barriers to low socioeconomic student success, the impact of PLC's on student achievement, the impact of parent engagement on student achievement and how they can support each other through an integrated model to improve lifelong student achievement.

**Barriers to Low-Socioeconomic Students**

Students from low-income backgrounds in Alberta face significant barriers to educational success, which impacts their future opportunities (Jury et al., 2017). Education is often described as being a place to create equal opportunities for all students, however, systemic inequities, financial hardship, and social challenges disproportionately affect low-income students (Charchuk, 2022; Lareau & Calarco, 2012; Pavlakis, 2018). These barriers present themselves through resource accessibility, school funding disparities, implicit bias, and limited post secondary pathways, all of which influence long term socioeconomic potential of students (Eden, 2016; Mapp & Hong, 2009; Reynolds & Shlafer, 2009; Watson & Bogotch, 2015). This section focuses on the struggles of low-income students in Alberta's K-12 education system, and how an inability to overcome these challenges can extend into post-secondary educational opportunities and future career outlook (Pushor & Amendt, 2018).

*Financial and Resource Barriers*

Inequitable distribution of school funding and educational resources represents a challenging barrier for students from low-income families to overcome (Healey, 2024). Due to a number of factors, schools in low-income communities experience greater restrictions in the use of their per-student resources when compared to schools in wealthier communities (Goss, 2019). This disparity in funding can lead to overcrowding, teacher shortages, and a lack of specialized programs, which creates an uneven playing field where students in low socioeconomic communities struggle to access the same quality of education as their high-income peers (Crowson & Boyd, 2009; Dearing & Tang, 2009). This disparity is most obvious when considering the public school system as compared to the private school system, however, these disparities still exist in low-income areas of a school district as compared to high income areas in

the same district (Lareau & Calarco, 2012). As students come to schools with varying levels of prior learning, students in high income areas have greater access to academic resources and educational opportunities (Moll et al., 1992; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019). This disparity in the learning children have access to, prior to attending the primary school system, requires schools in low-socioeconomic areas to spend a greater amount of financial resources on providing intervention as opposed to offering grade level instruction and extension opportunities (Buffum et al., 2016; Parr & Vander Dussen, 2017). Additionally, schools in wealthier communities are able to access a greater range of educational experiences and services compared to those in low-income areas due to parents' ability to pay beyond regular school fees, and the inability of low-income parents to offer time to volunteer for fundraising (Bower & Griffin, 2011; Pushor, 2017). These compounding factors influence the educational experience of low-income students, and create a barrier to accessing high quality education in the secondary and post secondary levels (Leonard, 2002; Guo, 2012), which later impacts their careers and future earning potential (Jury et al., 2017).

Barriers faced by students from low socioeconomic backgrounds are not restricted to their K-12 education, instead they continue to present challenges and often intensify as these students transition into post-secondary education. While high school, with the inclusion of different course programming levels, advanced academic placements, extracurricular activities, and career planning resources, provides a differentiated experience for students, students from low socioeconomic backgrounds will experience more difficulty in equitably accessing these resources in a meaningful way (Lareau & Calarco, 2012). Without adequate support systems established, students may struggle to graduate, or may disengage from their learning due to compounding effects of academic gaps and external responsibilities, such as part-time work or

other caregiving responsibilities (Pavlakis, 2018). Post-secondary education presents new challenges to low socioeconomic students as they face financial constraints, limited access to mentorship, and a lack of family experience navigating higher education systems (Eden, 2016). First generation students often enter their post-secondary education without the social capital and guidance their peers from affluent backgrounds may receive, negatively impacting their academic experience, and the ability to complete their studies (Jury et al., 2017). These barriers are cyclical and generational, as barriers in early education compound over time, reducing opportunities for long term academic and career success. Addressing these systemic inequities requires a sustained support system focused on bridging a student's K-12 education with future learning opportunities.

### Systemic Barriers

Education systems are set up with the goal of offering accessible learning opportunities to all students. While publicly these messages are shared, in reality this is not always, and is most often not, the case (Pushor & Amendt, 2018; Watson & Bogotch, 2015). Navigating a school system, or individual school, requires an understanding of how the system operates, an understanding of how curriculum influences decisions, and the impact of policies and procedures (Crowson & Boyd, 2009; Guo, 2012). All of these requirements can result in barriers based on the intimidation families and students feel, as well as the impact of cultural differences on comfort with engagement (Charchuk, 2022; Quinton, 2022; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019). While school systems based on eurocentric models developed as places focused on including parents in decision making, with the rise of neoliberal values they have become closed off institutions only seeking to use parents as objects or tools to attain their own goals (Healey, 2024; Mapp & Hong, 2009). With the barriers already present for students and families

navigating the system, having the added challenge of resistant schools, increases the difficulty in providing equitable meaningful access to education (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004; Lareau & Calarco, 2012; Pollock et al., 2013).

**Professional Learning Communities on Improving Achievement**

PLCs have continued to emerge as an important framework for improving student achievement through a focus on collaborative teacher learning, data-driven decision making, and continuous improvement (Buffum et al., 2016; Dufour, 2004; Gray et al., 2016). Research suggests PLCs can enhance teacher efficacy, foster school-wide learning, and lead to improved student outcomes (Admiraal et al., 2021; Gore et al., 2021; Gray et al., 2016). While PLCs have demonstrated potential for improving instructional practices, limitations remain a challenge for leaders and their teams to overcome. Limitations for PLCs exist in their inconsistent implementation, sustainability, and limited stakeholder engagement (Dufour & Dufour, 2012; Lockton & Fargason, 2019). The goal of PLCs is often described as being the bringing together of team knowledge and experience to support students, however, this collaboration is only focused on the knowledge and experience within the walls of the school, which can cause challenges related to time and resources (Dufour & Dufour, 2012; Lockton & Fargason, 2019). This section of the literature review explores the strengths and limitations of PLCs in improving student achievement, and highlights areas for further enhancement.

*Strengths of Professional Learning Communities*

Operating an effective PLC has many benefits for a school, with a key benefit being its ability to foster collaborative professional development among educators. Teachers engaged in PLCs participate in learning focused on instruction, intervention and assessment through the sharing of lesson planning, peer observations, and reflective discussions focused on improving

instructional practices and student achievement (Buffum et al., 2016; Gore, 2021). Completing this work effectively requires teams to focus their time on addressing the four critical questions of a PLC which Dufour and Dufour (2012) outline as, "What is it we want our students to learn? How will we know if they are learning? How will we respond when individual students do not learn? How will we enrich and extend the learning for students who are proficient?" (p. 16). Engaging in professional learning focused on improving the response to these four questions requires educators to actively participate in their learning, as well as their collaborative team's processes if they hope to positively impact student outcomes. Research indicates schools with effective PLC practices in place exhibit higher levels of teacher satisfaction, instructional consistency, and shared accountability for student progress (Dufour & Dufour, 2012).

A foundational component of effective PLCs is the use of data to inform instructional decision-making. This requires staff to analyze student achievement data to identify learning gaps, adapt instructional methods and implement targeted interventions (Buffum et al., 2016). PLCs focused on prioritizing equity and collaboration may create conditions supporting personalized learning for diverse students by drawing on culturally responsive practices and inclusive leadership (Armstead et al., 2016; Heflebower et al., 2017).

While PLCs are effective in improving teacher collaboration and instruction, they also support the development of a school culture focused on continual improvement. Schools operating as PLCs will offer ongoing, job-embedded learning opportunities as opposed to isolated one off professional development sessions other schools may offer (Gore et al., 2021; Thessin & Starr, 2011). By engaging in ongoing professional learning, teachers are able to refine their practices over time alongside their team (Dufour & Dufour, 2012). Offering learning opportunities in this manner allows educators to bridge the gap between theory and practice,

which leads to sustainable change and long-term student achievement gains (Admiraal et al., 2021; Akiba & Liang, 2016).

### Limitations of Professional Learning Communities

PLCs offer many benefits to school and teacher collaborative learning, however, limitations in their successful implementation remain. Research indicates inconsistent implementation across schools limits their effectiveness as select schools in a district operate as PLCs, and even within individual schools operating as PLCs, teams operate with varying levels of fidelity (Buffum et al., 2016; Dufour & Dufour, 2012; Lockton & Fargason, 2019). As schools attempt to take on the collaborative structure required for an effective PLC, some lack the necessary time, resources, administrative support, or structured frameworks required for PLC implementation (Leonard, 2002; Thessin & Starr, 2011). When school leaders do not prioritize PLC foundations in their implementation, teachers may struggle to find collaborative planning time leading to ineffective teams, and poor levels of professional learning (Buffum et al., 2016).

PLCs act as a practical method for engaging teachers in continuous improvement due to the collaborative learning taking place. PLCs often require additional responsibilities of teachers, which requires thoughtful planning from leaders to ensure they are not demanding too much. Literature suggests poorly structured PLCs contribute to teacher burnout, especially when expected collaboration time exceeds available time and resources (Dufour & Dufour, 2012; Henderson, 2018). Without the establishment of clear guidelines, leader support, and manageable workloads and change, teachers will likely view PLCs as another short term school change rather than a meaningful opportunity for growth (Lockton & Fargason, 2019).

Most PLCs emphasize the importance of collaboration within the school walls often at the expense of outside voices (Lockton & Fargason, 2019). With the rigid structures required for

a PLC and the time commitment needed for effective team meetings and professional learning, key stakeholders, particularly parents and those from the community are left out of decision making processes (Epstein, 2010; Lockton & Fargason, 2019). Research suggests parent involvement in student learning enhances achievement, yet PLC structures rarely incorporate parental perspectives or voice (Bower & Griffin, 2011; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Henderson, 2018). While school leaders and their staff strive for continuous improvement, they often view outside perspectives as a hindrance to their work instead of being a helpful resource (Lockton & Fargason, 2019). Research is yet to offer suggestions for expanding PLC frameworks beyond the school, yet in bringing stakeholders together to support student learning and achievement many of the limitations present in current PLC frameworks could be addressed (Kozak & Schnellert, 2023; Lockton & Fargason, 2019; Pushor, 2017).

### *Relevance to an Integrated Model*

Improving student achievement is a central goal to the PLC framework, and they have continually shown strong potential in successfully meeting this goal with effective implementation (Buffum et al., 2016; Gore et al., 2021). This is limited by the ability of schools to implement the required organizational supports, continually implement these structures with fidelity, and constantly attempt to expand and refine staff engagement (Dufour & Dufour, 2012; Lockton & Fargason, 2019). In doing this work, effective PLC implementation also requires consistent support with time, administrative leadership and professional learning resources (Buffum et al., 2016; Leonard, 2002) putting a strain on the availability of school staff. While current PLC frameworks focus on internal collaboration, research on parent and community partnerships (Kozak & Schnellert, 2023; Pushor, 2017) suggests expanded stakeholder involvement could potentially ease the burden on staff and benefit the learning environment.

Direct models of integrated PLC and parent community partnership are limited in the literature, however, combining these approaches provides a promising pathway to supporting comprehensive student support as suggested by frameworks in both areas (Buffum et al., 2016; Epstein, 2010; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014).

**Parent Engagement on Improving Achievement**

Educational research has long acknowledged the importance of parental involvement and engagement as critical components to influencing student success. It consistently demonstrates students with engaged parents tend to have higher levels of achievement, better attendance, and demonstrate stronger social-emotional skills (Epstein, 2010; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2009; Jeynes, 2023).While involvement and engagement are often used as interchangeable terms, Goodall and Montgomery (2014) offer a clear distinction with involvement being parent participation in school driven activities, and engagement being a parent's active participation in their child's learning. Traditional involvement such as attending school events and assisting with homework continue to show improvements for students, however, growing research emphasizes the importance of parental engagement as a deeper collaborative process between school and home (Bower & Griffin, 2011; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). Schools can deepen connections and foster student growth by acknowledging parent contributions made outside of the school environment, and identifying methods to acquiring and utilizing parent knowledge and expertise (Guo, 2012; Moll et al., 2001). This section explores the strengths and limitations of parent involvement and engagement drawing on Epstein's (2010) Six Types of Involvement and Goodall and Montgomery's (2014) Continuum of Involvement to Engagement as central frameworks to successfully implementing this work. Additionally, with the identification of

limitations in the ability of schools to foster meaningful parent engagement, the potential for PLCs to support this work and remove barriers will be briefly introduced.

***Strengths of Parent Involvement and Engagement***

Parent involvement and engagement have been extensively researched, and it is clear students with engaged parents perform better academically and behaviourally (Epstein, 2010; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2009; Jeynes, 2023). When parents are involved in their child's learning through communication with the school, involvement in school governance, or learning activities at home, the students are more likely to experience increased motivation, stronger literacy and numeracy skills, and better long-term educational outcomes (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019). Epstein (2010) suggests educators move beyond utilizing communication and volunteering in the school, and move towards a model focused on valuing and developing school-home partnerships in the areas of parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making and collaborating with the community. Acknowledging these many forms of involvement and engagement builds a foundation for improving achievement of all students. As schools work with families to improve upon the learning taking place in and out of the school environment, opportunities should be taken to work alongside the community to improve upon the support provided to students. As school, family and community come together to support students, they will experience improvements in engagement, attendance and achievement (Bower & Griffin, 2011; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019).

Western education systems, such as those in Alberta, largely relegate parents to the role of an object or tool to be used to the benefit of the school while they impact decisions through their enrollment which impacts schools in a monetary way, and through parent councils, which

operates in a governance manner (Healey, 2024). Current education systems confine parent involvement to meetings and volunteering, which is beneficial, however, Goodall and Montgomery (2014) argue true engagement involves parents taking an active role in their child's learning. Engagement shifts the focus from school-driven initiatives to parent-school collaboration, where parents feel empowered as co-educators and take part in educational decision making. Meaningful collaboration and inclusion in decision making requires leaders to nurture the development of democratic decision-making environments by re-examining power structures, and evaluating the access to these decision making spaces. With parents in decision-making roles, trust between the school and home improves, further improving relationships and consequently achievement. The establishment of effective relationships built on mutual trust offers opportunities for leaders and teaching staff to learn from outside perspectives and gain a greater understanding of family and community knowledge and expertise (Guo, 2012; Pushor, 2017).

### *Limitations of Parental Involvement and Engagement*

Involving and engaging parents in education is heavily researched with results indicating it has a positive impact on student achievement, however, most schools continue to operate in isolation from parents, or with rigid procedures around parent involvement. Research supports the inclusion of parents beyond meetings and events, but parents continue to be exclusively involved in this manner creating a parental belief the school does not want or value them, and a school belief in the lack of caring and knowledge of parents (Lareau & Calarco, 2012; Watson & Bogotch, 2015). These findings are a result of time and work constraints of parents (Mapp & Hong, 2009), cultural and linguistic barriers (Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019), lack of trust, biases of school staff, and a lack of school flexibility in school initiatives and planning

(Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004) which contribute to a lack of meaningful parent-school partnerships,

particularly in low socioeconomic communities (Lesyk, 2021; Moll et al., 2001). While these

factors can also influence parent school relationships in affluent areas, it is important to address

these in low socioeconomic communities due to the existing achievement gap.

Central to challenging relationships with families is the issue with many educators

assuming adversary relationships with parents, or having underlying assumptions about their

knowledge or involvement. Schools often become fixated on what they perceive as effective

involvement or engagement, and will see parents as difficult if their participation does not align

with the school's desired methods (Epstein, 2010; Pushor, 2017). Educator bias often leads to

poorly developed relationships because teachers and leaders assume parents are unwilling, or are

unable to contribute to their child's learning, when in reality they may just engage in the learning

outside of the school, or in different manners (Epstein, 2010). Compounding the issues with bias

is the lack of training in engaging diverse families which can lead to frustration and

miscommunication between school and home (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). Overall, there is a

lack of understanding and clarity between what the school expects of parents, and what the

parents expect of their child's school (Jeynes, 2023).

### *Relevance to Integrated Model*

Improving parent involvement and engagement offers schools an opportunity to enhance

student experience, improve attendance, decrease behaviour challenges, and increase

achievement levels (Epstein, 2010; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2009). Research suggests teachers

are more likely to attempt to engage parents who are similar to themselves (Lareau & Calarco,

2012), however, with the support of a PLC and the opportunity to engage in continuous learning

and improvement, educators may be able to overcome this hurdle (Buffum et al., 2016; Parr &

Vander Dussen, 2017). By establishing PLCs focused on involving parents and transitioning

them to engaged parents, schools are more likely to build the trust and shared understanding

necessary to foster effective partnerships. Parent engagement frameworks are also challenged in

their recognition and planning for disconnected home and school expectations. By engaging

parents in the PLC process, schools can create an inclusive approach acknowledging diverse

family needs and challenges. Overcoming diversity barriers takes driven leaders and teachers

focused on offering flexible parent opportunities, such as virtual meetings, flexible scheduling,

and culturally responsive workshops, which can effectively remove and address current

challenges for families joining the school community (Healey, 2024). Completing this work

requires a school team operating collaboratively with a drive to learn with and from others which

is often seen in effective PLC schools (Buffum et al., 2016). While PLCs offer an avenue to

support the development of school-home partnerships, the full exploration of this relationship

will be discussed later in this paper.

<div align="center">**Methods**</div>

The following section will outline the methods utilized in the development of the paper.

The author's relation to the topic will first be explored, including biases and beliefs. This will be

followed by a description of how the research for this topic was conducted, and how the

literature was selected.

**Author Positionality**

As a teacher and assistant principal in a large Albertan school division, with both rural

and urban experience, in affluent and low socioeconomic areas, I have experienced firsthand the

challenges with improving student achievement in low socioeconomic areas, and the stark

differences in parental involvement and engagement. I have found teachers and leaders tend to

unfairly assume incompetence of parents who are not involved, and label parents as difficult if they challenge instructional practices. In my time as a student in the education system, I experienced a range of teacher personalities, and in primary school, my family was looked at positively, however, as content got more challenging and my parents felt unable to help, they were no longer seen as worth engaging. This created a lack of trust toward the secondary school I attended I had not experienced in primary school. It also developed a lack of understanding and knowledge of my learning needs and overall achievement. In my experience, I do not see this as a shortcoming of my parents, but instead as a shortcoming of the education system in its ability to utilize family and community resources and expertise. Not only did the experience leave my parents feeling devalued, it left me as a student feeling inadequate because I did not feel my parents were important in my educational journey. With my graduation and enrollment into University, I felt alone and underprepared for my transition into post-secondary, as my parents had none of this experience themselves, and had been excluded from my learning for so long.

In my role as an educational leader, I strive to ensure my students do not have this experience. I want to learn with and from the families and communities I work with; however, I acknowledge the challenges to doing this with our current system, as parents are often relegated to the role of parent council, or other governance positions with very little meaningful impact.

**Literature Collection**

In searching for literature exploring the strengths and limitations of PLCs and parent involvement and engagement frameworks, University of Alberta Library Search, Google Scholar, Education Multi-Database Search (Proquest), and previous course reading lists were utilized to identify sources. In these searches, key terms and phrases such as parent engagement, parent involvement, PLC, and collaboration were used to narrow down available literature and

identify reliable and relevant texts. Following the preliminary searches and selection of literature, abstracts were examined to check for appropriateness and applicability to the research problem. Finally, selected literature was read and brief summaries of key connections to research problems were made. At this point if the literature was no longer deemed relevant it was excluded from the reference list, however, if it was still relevant to the research problem, it was included.

Criteria established for the search included the following: relevant to the research problems, applicable to an Alberta context, and focused on impact on primary and secondary schools and students. Priority was given to research conducted in the last 15 years, however, due to the age of central frameworks and models such as Goodall and Montgomery's (2014) and Epstein's (2010) work, earlier sources were considered. The research was broad due to the necessity of bringing parent engagement and PLC literature together to develop an integrated model focused on improving student achievement.

**Findings and Discussion**

This section builds on the existing literature to propose an integrated model combining PLC structures with parent engagement frameworks to support student achievement. The model is designed to support the needs of all students, however, based on its tiered design, effectively implementing the model will greatly enhance the learning experiences of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Buffum et al., 2016; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). Drawing on the literature reviewed, the model addresses existing gaps in current frameworks and offers practical strategies to develop and foster meaningful school-home partnerships (Epstein, 2010; Pushor, 2017). The following discussion explores the model's structure, implementation considerations, and its potential to address systemic barriers with the goal of improving educational outcomes for students (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004).

**Model of Collaborative Parent Engagement**

Supporting student achievement is central to the role of educators, however, the challenges and barriers arising with low socioeconomic students require changes to structures, policies, and procedures to adequately meet their needs (Charchuk, 2022; Guo, 2012). Meeting these needs requires willing leaders to relinquish or redistribute their power to support the establishment of democratic decision-making (Healey, 2024). Research has indicated continuous collaborative learning in PLCs and improving parent engagement through school-home partnerships are both effective and meaningful practices for improving student achievement (Buffum et al., 2016; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). These areas have not crossed over in educational research, with different strengths and limitations impacting their relative effectiveness. By establishing a cohesive integrated model, schools can navigate the challenges and barriers these individual frameworks present and further improve programming fidelity and success. When developing and implementing an integrated model it is important to consider, what gaps exist in current PLC and parent engagement frameworks, how the principles of collaboration, parent engagement, and shared leadership support these gaps, and how integrating these models practically serves the field of education (Epstein, 2010; Pushor, 2017). The model presented in this paper will utilize the tiered approach to intervention offered by Buffum et al. (2016) to frame its focus and structure into levels to support the diverse levels of support needed and skills present in the community. It will also tie in Goodall and Montgomery's (2014) Continuum of Involvement to Engagement, as this will acknowledge the different roles school and home play in their interactions. Finally, Epstein's (2010) Six Types of Involvement will be considered in support of the tiered interventions.

**Figure 1**

*Response to Intervention and Parent Engagement Integrated Model*



Involvement ← → Engagement

**Tier 1: Universal strategies to Involve all parents and teachers**
Communication with all families through emails, phone calls and school initiated events
Access to intercultural consultants to support communication
Cultural responsiveness training for school staff
Communication and reaching out to support parent volunteers

**Tier 1: Universal Support to engage all teachers and parents**
All Parents involved in school decision-making processes
Workshops and materials for all families to support home instruction
Alignment of goals and expectations for students, as well as collaborative instruction and assessment plans/models
Community-building events (ex. Cultural nights)

**Tier 2: Targeted parent involvement**
School supports and events offered at flexible times
Parent feedback and support in generation of Individual programming plans
Focus on specific interventions/extensions for school and home (school-led)
Parent volunteers to support school-planned intervention groupings

**Tier 2: Targeted parent engagement**
Neutral sites for parent teacher collaboration or home visits to address student and family-specific challenges
Peer mentoring programs for parents
Alignment of goals and expectations for intervention plans/models to support school and home learning
Progress meetings and interventions co-led by teachers and parents

**Tier 3: Intensive parent involvement support**
Regular parent-teacher individual plan meetings to address student and school needs focused on school identified target activities/resources
Access to internal intensive support services offered by the school
School organized partnerships with external services

**Tier 3: Intensive parent engagement support**
Integration of internal and external intensive services for wraparound support
Individualized family engagement plans tailored to individual barriers or case specific needs
Parent leadership roles in collaborative and intervention teams

Implementation of partnership plans

Collaborative development of school-home partnership plans

Collection of student achievement and parent involvement & engagement data

Collaborative analyzing of data to identify student needs and inform partnership planning

*Parenting – Communicating – Volunteering – Learning at Home – Decision Making*

### Tiered Levels

Buffum et al. (2016) present the response-to-intervention pyramid as an effective model for engaging leaders and educators in student instruction and intervention. As a central piece to organizing effective instruction in a PLC, collaborative teams are meant to collaborate on instruction while considering Dufour and Dufour's (2012) four critical questions. Addressing what we want students to learn requires teams to consider what the essential learning outcomes in the curriculum are, as well as unpacking and understanding the components and requirements (Gray et al., 2016). With a firm understanding of what students need to know, collaborative

teams can work on assessment criteria and establish expected levels of proficiency (Gore et al., 2021). In implementing the integrated model, parents are invited to take part in these processes, as this universal support may offer parents the opportunity to provide insights and expertise in support of this work (Guo, 2012; Pushor, 2017. To enable this collaborative work to take place, school staff must work to address the cultural and language barriers existing in the community to ensure the support offered in tier one is truly universal (Mapp & Hong, 2009; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019). Including parents in the collaborative processes required to respond to the first two critical questions allows educators to establish the strong partnerships and protocols required to enable parent collaboration in answering the final two critical questions.

Tier two of the integrated model offers school and home the opportunity to work together if students require further academic support, or if families require additional support to be meaningfully involved or engaged (Parr & Vander Dussen, 2017). Tier two continues the work of identifying and enacting the response to Dufour and Dufour's (2012) final two critical questions. In this tier, those families with students who need further support to meet their academic goals participate in diverse and targeted collaborative activities with the school to meet their needs (Leonard, 2002). In this tier the school continues to seek out the expertise and experience families and community members can offer, while also identifying methods to overcoming time and resource barriers impacting families (Bower & Griffin, 2011; Lareau & Calarco, 2012). As PLCs already struggle with time constraints, leaders must lean on the knowledge of parents and the community as they address individual student and family needs (Healey, 2024; Pushor, 2017).

Tier three continues on the work of tier two by offering intensive support to both students and families (Buffum et al., 2016). This intensive intervention is effective based on the regular

meetings and collaborative opportunities granted to parents and educators which increases their team learning, and ability to respond to student needs (Thessin & Starr, 2011). Utilizing the integrated model acknowledges the academic literature's assertion that involved and engaged parents improve student outcomes (Epstein, 2010; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014), as well as the understanding that collaborative learning increases practice (Gore et al., 2021; Leonard, 2002). Planning for collaborative parent involvement and engagement demonstrates a willingness to respect and acknowledge the differing perspectives and supports required to meet the needs of diverse student and parent populations (Guo, 2012; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019).

### Involvement to Engagement

In addition to the model's use of tiered support to meet student and family needs, it also emphasizes the multiple methods through which parents can participate in their child's education. The model utilizes Goodall and Montgomery's (2014) continuum to demonstrate the different services and methods to include parents in the PLC process. While involvement is important for improving student outcomes, it is important for schools to attempt to move parents along the continuum to engagement. In transitioning parents from involvement to engagement, leaders and teachers must help families understand how they can engage in student learning, as well as try to understand the ways families already support student learning (Guo, 2012; Moll et al., 2001). By being open to learning from families, schools are more likely to address the biases they come into these collaborative relationships with (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004; Pushor, 2017).

### Utilizing a Feedback Loop

Data plays a vital role in the integrated model due to its ability to offer leaders an effective tool to support decision-making, in an attempt to remove as much bias as possible

(Buffum et al., 2016; Leonard, 2002). It is important to understand that all data comes with its own biases. However, if those biases are explicitly understood by all involved in the decision-making process, it is less likely to impact the outcome (Gore et al., 2021). Utilizing data can be challenging due to the internal and external pressures arising from it if it does not tell the story an individual or team desires (Crowson & Boyd, 2009; Thessin & Starr, 2011). Meeting this challenge openly as a team, and accepting the data allows for collaborative learning to take place, to improve practice (Admiraal et al., 2021).

Operating in a collaborative team, to use data to analyze practices requires the team to feel comfortable and trust those they work with (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004; Pushor, 2017). It is essential the data is not used in an evaluatory manner, instead, it should only inform instructional decision-making to better meet student needs (Buffum et al., 2016). By establishing school-home partnerships grounded in the fundamentals of PLC practice, structures will nurture the establishment of trust through the team's mutually agreed upon goals (Epstein, 2010; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). The initial step to using the integrated models feedback loop is collectively deciding which data will be collected, and then doing so in a timely manner (Leonard, 2002). With this data, the team will analyze to better understand student and team needs, to inform future decisions (Gore et al., 2021). Guiding coalitions and collaborative teams will design and modify plans for improving practice, followed by implementation of these plans (Thessin & Starr, 2011). In a team built on strong relationships grounded in trust, this feedback loop will continuously be in motion as all members attempt to improve (Cranston et al., 2021).

**Practical Implementation of the Model**

Implementing the integrated PLC and parent engagement model requires a systematic approach to ensuring school-home collaboration is embedded into the school structures (Buffum

et al., 2016; Pushor, 2017). Leaders should plan to roll out and implement the model in a phased approach allowing for adjustments based on school and community context and needs (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Healey, 2024). It is essential this process exists within the data-driven feedback loop as teams establish and modify plans and routines (Gore et al., 2021; Leonard, 2002). In the first phase of implementation, school leaders should prioritize establishing a collaborative foundation by introducing the model in staff training and leadership workshops (Admiraal et al., 2021; Akiba & Liang, 2016). Doing this will build an understanding of the value of parent engagement with PLCs, as they are normally excluded from these processes. In this phase, leaders may want to identify a guiding coalition to assist with refining practices and establishing routines early in the process (Buffum et al., 2016). It is essential all staff and parents are clear on what their roles are, and what the expectations for participation are (Pushor, 2017). Ensuring families understand this information will assist with their contribution to the learning process (Mapp & Hong, 2009).

Phase two of implementation should prioritize structuring inclusive PLC meetings (Leonard, 2002; Thessin & Starr, 2011). With expectations and a common understanding established, leaders can now move their attention to developing collaborative meeting routines. Schools should designate specific PLC meeting times to incorporate parent participation, with options for in-person attendance, virtual attendance, or options to provide feedback on minutes (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). Just as a PLC should focus on establishing relationships, common goals, and procedures for problem-solving, these parent participation meetings should engage in the same work (Epstein, 2010; Guo, 2012). Relationships and common understanding will be essential as not all members will come in with the same priorities. By spending focused

time on establishing a strong foundation to build on, teams will be more efficient and effective (Leonard, 2002).

Phase three will involve the implementation of the tiered parent engagement strategies as leaders and their staff align engagement efforts with the tiered model (Buffum et al., 2016). Doing so will ensure parents get the opportunity to receive individualized and meaningful opportunities for participation based on student needs (Epstein, 2010). In this phase, it will also be important for schools to identify effective strategies to move parents along Goodall and Montgomery's (2014) continuum from involvement to engagement. School staff along with their parent teams will need to consider time and resource constraints for both parties (Healey, 2024; Pushor, 2017). Engaging the problem-solving procedures established in phase one may lead to creative solutions benefitting both school and home (Guo, 2012).

The final phase will require evaluation and refinement of the Model based on successes and limitations of the implementation (Gore et al., 2021; Leonard, 2002). In this phase leaders will need to involve all stakeholders in democratic decision making, as without this inclusion, members may not continue their buy-in to the process (Healey, 2024). Phase four will rely heavily on the feedback loop introduced in the integrated model, as data will need to be collected and it will be used to drive decision-making (Buffum et al., 2016; Thessin & Starr, 2011). Potential data to consider in this phase should include educator and parent surveys and student achievement data (Gore et al., 2021). This information should be collected and used to identify strengths and areas for improvement, so the process can engage in continuous refinement (Leonard, 2002). With an effective implementation of the model, school leaders can support their staff, student, and parent populations in improving school-home relationships and student achievement.

**Addressing the Limitations of Existing Frameworks**

PLC and parent engagement models have independently demonstrated effectiveness in improving student achievement, however, they fail to fully address certain challenges when implemented in isolation (Buffum et al., 2016; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). The integrated model explored in this paper seeks to mitigate the impact of time constraints for teachers and parents, reduce educator burnout and resistance, and increase the occurrence and quality of structured parent-school collaboration (Leonard, 2002; Thessin & Starr, 2011).

*Establishing and Improving Trust*

Current educational policies and practices have driven a wedge between many schools and their families. This model seeks to remedy this issue, but for the model to succeed, schools must actively pursue the development of trust between educators and parents (Eptein, 2010; Pushor, 2017). Research suggests mistrust in schools, particularly in low socioeconomic communities, often stems from historical exclusion and negative past experiences (Guo, 2012; Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004). To support the growth and development of trusting partnerships, schools need to ensure communication is transparent by engaging openly and frequently with families, keeping them consistently informed about student progress and school initiatives (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Mapp & Hong, 2009). To support the diverse needs of families, schools should also remove as many barriers to communication as possible by utilizing multiple forms of communication (Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019). These multiple forms of communication can be shared digitally, in print, through phone calls, or home visits, as doing this will increase accessibility (Leonard, 2002). With clear communication in place, schools can continue to improve trust by supporting parents as valued contributors to school decision-making (Epstein, 2010; Healey, 2024). Including parents in decision making processes allows for a

transition from passive involvement to active engagement in student learning (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). Parent input in goal setting, instructional planning and intervention strategies will reinforce the role of parents as partners in education, while also offering external insight and experience into the school to improve practice (Pushor, 2017). Current PLC models emphasize the role of leaders and teachers, and ignore the parents, leading to schools viewing them as an obstacle rather than a resource (Kozak & Schnellert, 2023). Reestablishing the importance of trust beyond the school walls will foster an improved relationship and student outcomes.

***Addressing Cultural and System-Created Barriers***

As school communities in Alberta continue to become increasingly diverse, schools must navigate the challenges of engaging parents who may not understand educational procedures or policy, or their beliefs may not align with educational values of the district or school (Guo, 2012; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019). Cultural and systemic factors continue to restrict meaningful parent engagement, particularly in these diverse communities (Charchuk, 2022; Pushor, 2017). Schools can address this issue by working to remove these barriers. This can be accomplished by providing culturally responsive support, reducing bureaucratic barriers, and training educators to address biases (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Mapp & Hong, 2009).

To effectively provide culturally responsive support schools can offer language support, offer culturally relevant engagement opportunities ensuring all families feel welcome and valued (Healey, 2024). Staff acknowledgement and respect for diverse family structures and traditions is essential for fostering the trust necessary to overcome this barrier (Leonard, 2002). Reducing bureaucratic barriers in the school environment will require leaders and their staff to work alongside parents to identify and change existing policies or structures acting as barriers to

parental engagement (Guo, 2012), this may involve changing meeting times to accommodate working parents and extending decision making opportunities beyond parent council meetings (Pushor, 2017). Additionally, schools should identify alternative participation options for parents, as attending in person may not be possible for some families (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014).

Lastly, schools must address educator biases through ongoing training focused on implicit biases, systemic inequities, and best practices for establishing inclusive family engagement opportunities (Mapp & Hong, 2009; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019). By building leader and teacher knowledge and understanding of how their biases impact parent and student interactions, schools can improve current practice and support students in identifying cultural differences as strengths, leading to improved student outcomes (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004; Lareau & Calarco, 2012).

### *Altering the School-Home Partnership Landscape*

Schools have traditionally operated with hierarchical structures in both their internal and external functioning and interactions (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004; Healey, 2024). By operating in this manner, school leaders are given the freedom to make school based decisions impacting teachers, students, and families (Leonard, 2002). Having school based decision making makes navigating systems more challenging for families, as each school may have slightly different procedures and policies in place (Guo, 2012; Pushor, 2017). A first step to addressing the school-home partnership landscape is to adjust government level or division level policies and procedures to grant parents more access and power in decision-making (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Healey, 2024). This adjustment of the existing hierarchical structures offers an opportunity to redefine parent-school relationships as collaborative partnerships by shifting power dynamics (Epstein, 2010; Pushor, 2017). In moving away from a top-down leadership approach and

entering into a shared leadership approach, parents will experience greater input in their child's learning beyond the current passive actor role (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Mapp & Hong, 2009). This new found parent input should be actively sought and incorporated into decision-making processes to allow schools to benefit from a diverse range of experiences to enhance the educational experience of all students (Guo, 2012; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019).

### *Impact on Barriers and Achievement*

The integrated PLC and parent engagement model addresses gaps in existing models which perpetuate barriers to student improvement by restricting time for collaboration, restricting parent and community access, and creating insufficient levels of accountability to ensure program fidelity (Buffum et al., 2016; Thessin & Starr, 2011). By addressing these barriers in a meaningful manner school leaders and their staff can enhance student support systems, improve the educational experience of students, and as a result, improve their achievement as well (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Pushor, 2017). The tiered approach presented in the model provides targeted interventions to students and parents, ensuring students are able to receive appropriate levels of academic and emotional support (Buffum et al., 2016). With the inclusion of parents in ongoing collaborative learning practices within the school, all involved will be granted the opportunity to learn with and from each other, creating a culture of collaborative and continuing learning for staff, parents and students (Epstein, 2010; Guo, 2012; Healey, 2024).

### Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications

Educational research is robust in the separated areas of parent involvement and engagement and PLCs, however, the model presented in this paper offers a structured approach to involving parents and shifting involvement to engagement (Epstein, 2010; Goodall &

Montgomery, 2014). By engaging parents and families in a collaborative learning process, school communities will develop a collective understanding of both school and home needs to develop an effective system of wrap-around support, ensuring students are able to reach their full academic potential (Pushor, 2017).

**Recommendations**

Based on the research and examinations of the literature in the areas of parent engagement and PLCs, it is evident these frameworks support each other, and their integration allows for a strong foundation to collaborative processes. While educator training will need to be utilized prior to entering into an integrated PLC and parent engagement system, the result of taking on this work has the potential to change and improve the educational experience for students as well as parents and teachers (Guo, 2012; Healey, 2024). In initiating the processes required to utilize the integrated model school leaders must provide educator training on family-school partnerships, and develop flexible and inclusive engagement strategies (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Mapp & Hong, 2009). Data should be used to guide staff and student learning needs, and programming decisions (Buffum et al., 2016), as this will support the effective implementation of collaborative parent engagement. School leaders are granted school-based decision making authority, however, meaningfully implementing the integrated model in a manner supporting its longevity and fidelity requires organizational and institutional engagement in school policies and procedures (Leonard, 2002; Pushor, 2017). It would be beneficial to have continued research into the impact and effects of implementing this model in school communities to analyze its effectiveness and practicality. While the existing literature supports the theoretical effectiveness of the integrated model, more research is needed to identify its practical application.

**Implications**

The research presented in this paper builds on existing models such as Epstein's (2010) Six Types of Involvement, Goodall and Montgomery's (2014) Continuum of Involvement to Engagement, and Buffum et al.'s (2016) Response to Intervention model by demonstrating how these models can be effectively integrated to maximize their impact on student achievement. Expanding PLCs to include parental engagement can redefine the role of school-home partnerships, shifting isolated interventions to a systemic collaborative approach. The integrated model contributes to equity driven educational theory by addressing how barriers impacting low socioeconomic students can be removed or bypassed through structured, multi-stakeholder collaboration (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004; Watson & Bogotch, 2015). In restructuring PLCs to incorporate parent representation, family perspectives will be considered and included in instructional planning and intervention strategies (Epstein, 2010; Leonard, 2002). Providing these opportunities requires teacher certification programs, schools and districts to consider methods to equip teachers with learning in the areas of culturally responsive family engagement to better support their ability to establish trust, communicate effectively, and co-develop student support strategies (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Mapp & Hong, 2009). Meeting the needs of low socioeconomic families requires schools to seek out flexible engagement strategies to accommodate the diverse needs of students and their families, which may require school leaders to establish connections with multilingual resources, and community outreach programs (Lesyk, 2021; Sheldon & Turner-Vorbeck, 2019). To support the work of school leaders, educational policymakers should consider embedding parental engagement frameworks into policies, ensuring institutional support for sustained and meaningful implementation (Healey, 2024; Parr & Vander Dussen, 2017). Changing policy will also require school districts to allocate resources

and funding to support the effective integration of parental engagement and PLC practices, especially in underfunded and marginalized communities (Guo, 2012; Jeynes, 2023).

**Conclusions**

Integration of PLCs and parent engagement models present an equity driven strategy for improving student achievement and addressing systemic educational disparities disproportionately impacting low socioeconomic students (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004; Pushor, 2017). By aligning professional learning opportunities with structured family-school partnerships, the integrated model has the potential to transform how educators and parents collaborate to support student success (Epstein, 2010; Leonard, 2002). The proposed integrated model provides a tiered, collaborative framework focused on systematically embedding family-school partnerships within the decision-making and professional learning process. Future research and real world implementation of this model will be critical in determining its long term effectiveness.

**References**

Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2021). Schools as
professional learning communities: What can schools do to support professional
development of their teachers? *Professional Development in Education, 47*(4), 684–698.
https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1665573

Akiba, M., & Liang, G. (2016). Effects of teacher professional learning activities on
Student Achievement Growth. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *109*(1), 99–110.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.924470

Armstead, C., Bierman, D., Bradshaw, P., Martin, T., & Wright, K. (2016). Groups vs. teams:
Which one are you leading? *Nurse Leader, 14*(3), 179–182.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mnl.2016.03.006

Bower, H. A., & Griffin, D. (2011). Can the Epstein model of parental involvement work in a
high-minority, high-poverty elementary school? *Professional School Counseling, 15*(2),
77-87. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X11015002

Buffum, A., Mattos, M., & Weber, C. (2016). *Taking action: A handbook for RTI at Work™*
[How to implement response to intervention in your school]. Solution Tree Press.

Charchuk, J. (2022). *Parental involvement supporting student success: Overview and synthesis*
[Master's capping exercise, University of Alberta].
https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.7939/r3-96z9-8t93

Cranston, J., Labman, S., & Crook, S. (2021). Reframing parental involvement as social
engagement: A study of recently arrived Arabic-speaking refugee parents'
understandings of involvement in their children's education. *Canadian Journal of
Education, 44*(2), 371–401. https://doi.org/10.53967/cje-rce.v44i2.4439

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (2001). The new role of community development in educational

    reform. *Peabody Journal of Education, 76*(2), 9–29.

    https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930pje7602_2

Dearing, E., & Tang, S. (2009). The home learning environment and achievement during

    childhood. In S. L. Christenson & A. L. Reschly (Eds.), *Handbook of school-family*

    *partnerships* (pp. 131–157). Routledge.

DuFour, R. (2004). What is a professional learning community? *Educational Leadership, 61*(8),

    6–11.

DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. B. (2012). *The school leader's guide to professional learning*

    *communities at work*. Solution Tree Press.

Eden, M. (2016). *Will free tuition increase the number of college graduates?* Manhattan Institute.

Epstein, J. L. (2010). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share.

    *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(3), 81–96. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200326

Goodall, J., & Montgomery, C. (2014). Parental involvement to parental engagement: A

    continuum. *Educational Review, 66*(4), 399–410.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.781576

Gore, J. M., Miller, A., Fray, L., Harris, J., & Prieto, E. (2021). Improving student achievement

    through professional development: Results from a randomised controlled trial of Quality

    Teaching Rounds. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *101*.

    https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103297

Goss, A. C. (2019). Power to engage, power to resist: A structuration analysis of barriers to

    parental involvement. *Education and Urban Society, 51*(5), 595–612.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124517747363

Gray, J., Kruse, S., & Tarter, C. J. (2016). Enabling school structures, collegial trust, and

    academic emphasis: Antecedents of professional learning communities. *Educational*

    *Management Administration & Leadership, 44*(6), 875–891.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143215574505

Guo, Y. (2012). Diversity in public education: Acknowledging immigrant parent knowledge.

    *Canadian Journal of Education, 35*(2), 120–140.

    https://www.jstor.org/stable/canajeducrevucan.35.2.120?seq=1

Gutman, L. M., & McLoyd, V. C. (2000). Parents' management of their children's education

    within the home, at school, and in the community: An examination of African-American

    families living in poverty. *The Urban Review, 32*(1), 1–24.

    https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005112300726

Hargreaves, A., & Lasky, S. (2004). The parent gap: The emotional geographies of

    teacher-parent relationships. In F. Hernández & I. F. Goodson (Eds.), *Social geographies*

    *of educational change* (pp. 103–122). Springer Netherlands.

Harris, A. L., & Robinson, K. (2016). A new framework for understanding parental involvement:

    Setting the stage for academic success. *Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social*

    *Sciences, 2(5).* https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2016.2.5.09

Healey, K. (2024). Mapping the discursive formations of 'effective' school governance and the

    role of parents. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 1-17.*

    https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2024.2338060

Heflebower, T., Hoegh, J., & Warrick, P. (2017). Get it right the first time! *Phi Delta Kappan,*

    *98*(6), 58–62. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26386973

Henderson, D. (2018). Staff collaboration for student success: Implementation challenges of professional learning communities and response to intervention. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education, 10*(2), 39–44.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Whitaker, M. C., & Ice, C. L. (2009). Motivation and commitment to family-school partnerships. In S. L. Christenson & A. L. Reschly (Eds.), *Handbook of school-family partnerships* (pp. 30–47). Routledge.

Jeynes, W. (Ed.). (2023). *Relational aspects of parental involvement to support educational outcomes: Parental communication, expectations, and participation for student success.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003128434

Jury, M., Smeding, A., Stephens, N. M., Nelson, J. E., Aelenei, C., & Darnon, C. (2017). The experience of low-SES students in higher education: Psychological barriers to success and interventions to reduce social-class inequality. *Journal of Social Issues*, 73(1), 23-41. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12202

Kozak, D. L., & Schnellert, L. M. (2023). Parents with teachers re-authoring the home-school interface: A critical participatory action research study. *Canadian Journal of Action Research, 23*(1), 68-92. https://doi.org/10.33524/cjar.v23i1.616

Lareau, A., & Calarco, J. M. (2012). Class, cultural capital, and institutions: The case of families and schools. In S. T. Fiske & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Facing social class: How societal rank influences interaction* (pp. 61–86). Russell Sage Foundation.

Leonard, L. J. (2002). Schools as professional communities: Addressing the collaborative challenge. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning, 6*(17). https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/iejll/index.php/iejll/article/view/447/109

Lesyk, N. (2021). *Enhancing child and youth resilience through school-based wraparound supports* [Master's thesis, University of Alberta]. https://coilink.org/20.500.12592/mdn5jv

Lockton, M., & Fargason, S. (2019). Disrupting the status quo: How teachers grapple with reforms that compete with long-standing educational views. *Journal of Educational Change, 20*(4), 469–494. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-019-09351-5

Lopes, T. (2006). What is racial equity work? In T. Lopes & B. Thomas (Eds.), *Dancing on live embers: Challenging racism in organizations* (pp. 7–24). Between the Lines. https://coilink.org/20.500.12592/snmxsn

Mapp, K. L., & Hong, S. (2009). Debunking the myth of the hard-to-reach parent. In S. L. Christenson & A. L. Reschly (Eds.), *Handbook of school-family partnerships* (pp. 345–361). Routledge.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.

https://education.ucsc.edu/ellisa/pdfs/Moll_Amanti_1992_Funds_of_Knowledge.pdf

Parr, M., & Vander Dussen, M. (2017). Family-school (dis)engagement: Understanding what it is, what it's not, and what to do about it. *Language and Literacy, 19*(1), 48–62. https://doi.org/10.20360/G26G6F

Pavlakis, A. E. (2018). Reaching all families: Family, school, and community partnerships amid homelessness and high mobility in an urban district. *Urban Education, 53*(8), 1043–1073. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915613547

Pollock, K., Lopez, A., & Joshee, R. (2013). Disrupting myths of poverty in the face of

    resistance. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 16*(2), 11-19.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1555458913487031

Pushor, D. (2017). Familycentric schools: Creating a place for all parents. *Education Canada,*

    *57*(4), 16–18.

Pushor, D., & Amendt, T. (2018). Leading an examination of beliefs and assumptions about

    parents. *School Leadership & Management, 38*(2), 202–221.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2018.1439466

Quinton, S. (2022). Teachers' impact on the learning of low-socioeconomic status children.

    *Canadian Journal of Family and Youth, 14*(2), 260-265.

    https://doi.org/10.29173/cjfy29838

Reynolds, A. J., & Shlafer, R. J. (2009). Academic resilience in children of incarcerated parents.

    In S. L. Christenson & A. L. Reschly (Eds.), *Handbook of school-family partnerships*

    (pp. 283–298). Routledge.

Sheldon, S. B., & Turner-Vorbeck, T. A. (2019). Theoretical perspectives on family engagement.

    In S. B. Sheldon & T. A. Turner-Vorbeck (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of family, school,*

    *and community relationships in education* (pp. 9–24). Wiley-Blackwell.

Thessin, R. A., & Starr, J. P. (2011). Supporting the growth of effective professional learning

    communities districtwide. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(6), 48–54.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109200611

Watson, T. N., & Bogotch, I. (2015). Reframing parent involvement: What should urban school

    leaders do differently? *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 14*(3), 257–278.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2015.1024327