

Appendix A.

**2015-2016 Boston School Committee English Language Learner Task Force
Members**

- **Suzanne Lee**, Task Force Co-Chair
- **Miren Uriarte**, Boston School Committee, Task Force Co-Chair
- **Janet Anderson**, EdVestors
- **Paulo De Barros**, Catholic Charities Teen Center at St. Peter's, CVC-UNIDO
- **Geralde Gabeau**, The Immigrant Family Services Institute (IFSI-USA)
- **Bob Hildreth**, Families United in Educational Leadership (FUEL)
- **Abdul Hussein**, ACEDONE
- **Kim Janey**, Massachusetts Advocates for Children
- **Rev. Cheng Imm Tan**, Parent/Educational Consultant
- **Diana Lam**, Conservatory Lab Charter School
- **John Mudd**
- **Dr. Maria Serpa**, Lesley University
- **Alejandra St. Guillen**, Director, Office of New Bostonians, City of Boston
- [vacant]
- [vacant]

Coordinator: Michael Berardino

| <p align="center">ELL TASK FORCE</p> <p align="center">2015-2016 PRIORITIES IN RELATIONSHIP TO TASK FORCE GOALS</p> <p align="center">Presented to School Committee on May 27 2015 & Updated at September 2015 Task Force Meeting</p> | |
|---|---|
| <p>GOALS</p> <p>MISSION AND VISION</p> <p>1. Recognize and Promote BPS as Multilingual, Multicultural District. <i>BPS should value the multilingual, multicultural culture of District by reinforcing goal of bilingualism for all students in district and directing resources necessary to make it happen</i></p> <p>SYSTEMS AND STRUCTURES</p> <p>2. Improve Data Systems and Use of Technology</p> | <p>TASK FORCE PRIORITIES 15-16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess progress • Monitor the improvement of capacity to produce accurate information about placement and services for ELL students that meets the requirements of USDOJ/USDOE reporting. • Jointly develop and consistently review a set of indicators of appropriate program placement and achievement of ELLs. • Identify a calendar of data requests and reports for the academic year to obtain data in a timely way: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assignment, including families opting out across all grade levels, of students in programs and enrollment patterns by school of ELL students ○ Budget (weighted student formula and OELL budget allocation) ○ Personnel hiring and retention ○ Student achievement for all BPS schools (including in-district charters), by grade level, type of school, etc. |
| <p>WORK AREAS FOR 2015-16</p> <p>3. Improve Student Assessment and Assignment by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improving assessment and assignment of ELL students with greater transparency</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using up to date population data, collaborate with BPS staff in determining if the current distribution of programs responds to the distribution of linguistic minority groups in Boston's neighborhoods. • Assess (or contribute to the general assessment of) the impact of the implementation of the new assignment plan on placement, programs and outcomes of ELLs. Request report about the enrollment change as a result of new student assignment system (Year 2). • Keep informed about the progress of universal enrollment and impact on ELL students and families to ensure equitable access. |

Appendix C. BPS ELL Task Force – Data and Student Assignment Subcommittee

Data Calendar/Data Requests 2016-17 (Draft Template)

| Date | Topics | Data Requests |
|--------------|--|--|
| Sept-15-2016 | Updates from OELL | - Present plan and priorities for the school year. |
| | Updates on ELL Task Force Summer Activities | No data needed |
| | Discussion of ELL Task Force Goals and Priorities | No data needed |
| Oct-20-2016 | DOJ Reports (OELL & ODA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation on OELL's DOJ submission focusing on 4 main categories - Results and findings from longitudinal study of student outcomes by program |
| | ELL Task Force Subcommittee Updates | No data needed |
| Dec-15-2016 | Budget Planning (Finance) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projected Weighted Student Formula - Changes to WSF for ELLs |
| | MCAS/PARCC Report (ODA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PARCC/MCAS Results ELLs vs. FLEP vs. Never ELL - PARCC/MCAS Results by ELD - PARCC/MCAS Results of ELL by Race/Ethnicity |
| | Student Assignment & Enrollment (Engagement, Enrollment, Strategy) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - K1/K2 and 9th grade enrollment for SY2016-17. - Gaps in program availability versus demand. - ELL family participation in rounds of enrollment - ELL families served through Welcome/Newcomers centers |
| | Opportunity & Achievement Gap Task Force Update | No data needed |
| | Mid-Year Report to School Committee | No data needed |
| Feb-9-2017 | Universal Enrollment Updates (Boston/Enroll) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current proposal guidelines - BPS Enrollment |
| | Budget Discussion (Finance) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projected budget for ELL Services - Projected ELL/ESL budget by school and program |
| | Parent Engagement (OE) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Description of current ELL parent engagement activities - ELL Parent participation rates |
| | Evaluation of ELL Task Force Sub-Committee Structure | No data needed |

Review of Setren, E. (2015). *Special Education and English Language Learner students in Boston charter schools: Impact and classification*. School Effectiveness and Inequality Initiative Discussion Paper #2015.03.

Michael Berardino, PhD Candidate, Public Policy, University of Massachusetts Boston
michael.berardino@umb.edu

February 11, 2016

The following is a review of the paper "*Special Education and English Language Learner students in Boston charter schools: Impact and classification*" by Elizabeth Setren published by MIT's School Effectiveness and Inequality Initiative (<http://seii.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/SEII-Discussion-Paper-2015.05-Setren.pdf>). This review is written at the request of Miren Uriarte, Co-Chair of the English Language Learner Task Force and a member of the Boston School Committee and addresses the findings in the paper related to English Language Learners (ELLs), setting aside any issues focused on Special Education students. This review highlights a number of concerns regarding the methodology and conceptual design of Setren's research including the generalizability of the findings, the omission of contextual factors, and the validity of the outcome measures, as well as, the validity of the findings relating to reclassification of ELLs.

The Setren paper reports on the academic outcomes of ELLs in Boston charter schools, showing that when looking at the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) performance of ELLs who apply to charter schools, on average, those who enroll in Boston charter schools have higher MCAS scores than those that remain in traditional Boston public schools. The author provides very strong evidence that this is true even for ELLs of all levels of English proficiency and previous MCAS scores. Specifically, the report shows that, "ELL students score over 0.307 standard deviations higher on math in charters relative to traditional public schools ... Charters generate English score gains of 0.200 standard deviations for ELL middle school applicants. While English exam estimates for elementary and high schools are noisier, they are positive and mostly significant (p.8)". Additionally, the author finds that charter attendance also increases the likelihood that ELLs meet high school graduation requirements and earn a state merit scholarship. Based on these findings, the author argues that attending a Boston charter school improves achievement for all ELLs, even those with the lowest levels of English proficiency (p.1).

Generalizability of Findings to Larger ELL Population: The author evaluates the effectiveness of charter schools for ELLs by limiting the analysis to students that apply to charter school lotteries, a common statistical technique amongst educational economists evaluating charter school effectiveness. In this analytical approach, students that are selected at random from the lottery pool and enrolled in charter schools are compared to those that entered the charter lottery but did not receive a charter offer and remained in traditional schools. The argument is that the only difference between the two groups is the random assignment of students to charter schools; therefore, any differences in outcomes between the two groups can be attributed to attending a charter school. Although this is a strong method to assess the effectiveness of the program being evaluated (charter schools) on these specific participants, it is limited in its comparison to the effectiveness of the program to which charters are being compared (district schools). This is because whereas the pool of applicants contains the universe of the potential population of charters, the universe of the population of the district's schools is much broader and diverse (including most notably new immigrant families unaware of the charter school system and late-entry ELLs) than the pool of applicants to the charter schools. *There is no evidence in this paper that charter schools would be successful for non-applicants. Therefore, generalizations about the findings of this research should be limited to students that apply to the charter school lottery.*

traditional public schools using both MCAS scores and English proficiency assessment scores as evidence to support this finding. While the improvements in MCAS ELA scores are clear, the differences in scores on the state's English proficiency assessments are inconclusive. The author finds no statistically significant differences in English proficiency scores for ELLs in elementary and middle school, but marginally significant (at a 10% significance level) differences in English proficiency scores at the high school level. Therefore, the claim of increased English proficiency rests largely on higher MCAS ELA scores, which is not a complete measure of English proficiency.

Reclassification Rates: One unexpected finding in the paper is the significantly higher reclassification rate for ELLs at charter schools relative to traditional public schools. The paper shows that in the period between lottery application and enrollment (i.e. before any instruction), charter schools are reclassifying ELLs at a significantly higher rate, largely driven by the reclassification of ELLs with "intermediate" and "advanced" levels of English proficiency. To explain the differences in reclassification rates that occur prior to any instruction, the author offers that charter schools have a "lower preference for classification". However, according to DESE reclassification guidelines, ELLs assessed at ACCESS Levels 1-4 must retain their ELL designation and receive ESL services, while those at Level 5 and higher may be reclassified based on the district's discretion.³ Therefore, it is critical that the author shares more information on the definition of the proficiency categories (the corresponding MEPA or ACCESS Levels for the "Beginning", "Intermediate", or "Advanced" categories) to determine the appropriateness and legality of the reclassification of ELLs at Boston charter schools, specifically the classification of ELLs at ACCESS Level 4 and lower.

Another concerning aspect of the reclassification discussion are the significant differences in reclassification rates amongst Native Speakers of Other Languages [NSOL] that apply for the charter lottery in Pre-K and Kindergarten and therefore have no baseline English proficiency scores. According to the paper, 38% of the NSOL charter lottery applicants that enroll in Boston charter schools in Pre-K and Kindergarten are designated as ELL, a significantly lower rate than the 64% of NSOL lottery applicants that are placed in traditional public schools.⁴ Districts must assess the English proficiency of all NSOL students enrolling in Pre-K or Kindergarten using standardized English proficiency assessments and there are strict thresholds for determining ELL classification. Therefore, either Boston charter schools are selecting NSOL students with higher levels of English proficiency from the lottery or the charter schools are failing to appropriately assess and classify ELLs, thereby failing to provide students with federally and state mandated services.

Conclusion: I commend Elizabeth Setren for beginning the process of analyzing ELL outcomes in charter schools. This paper is an important step in understanding the potential role different forms of instruction have on the education of ELLs. However, it is critical to note that the evidence provided in this paper does not support the conclusions that charter schools universally boost academic performance for all ELLs. Considering the highly political nature of the charter school discussion, it is paramount that the author tempers the use of causal language and bases conclusions on the evidence provided (e.g. this analysis estimates that ELLs in Boston charter schools perform significantly higher on the MCAS Math and ELA tests than comparable ELLs in traditional Boston public schools). I recommend further quantitative analysis that considers both student level and school level factors and uses additional outcomes measures including other measures of academic achievement and engagement. Additionally, I recommend continuing the targeted qualitative research to investigate the experiences of ELLs in Boston charter schools and the pedagogical approach at charter schools where ELLs are thriving.

³ Guidelines can be found at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/Guidance.pdf>.

⁴ According to calculations based on DESE data (<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=00350000&orgtypecode=5&leftNavId=305&>), 63% of all NSOL students in the Boston Public Schools are classified as ELL.

Parental Engagement Among Immigrant Parents: A Review of the Literature.

Iria Dopazo Ruibal

Transnational, Cultural, and Community Studies MS. University of Massachusetts. Boston.

Executive Summary

Research from the last 50 years has demonstrated that the active participation of parents in their children's education has been found to positively influence educational outcomes. All those positive effects impact children of all ages (from early education to high school), and across race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, and parent's educational attainment. However, in spite of this it remains a challenge for the majority of schools across the US. Moreover, parental engagement in schooling continues to differ greatly among the different groups of parents, with immigrant parents showing among the lowest rates of participation (Turney & Kao, 2009).

Conceptual Models:

The research presents several conceptual models of parent engagement. The most traditional model is the one defined in the "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001" which defines parental engagement in terms of school-based participation and two-way communication with the school, including: parental assistance in their children's learning, involvement in their education at school, and partnering in their education, including in decision-making and on advisory boards. This model definition presents limitations to the participation of immigrant parents who tend to be less involved in school activities, but their engagement at home is higher (Anderson & Minke, 2007; Delgado-Gaitán, 1991; Klein, 2008; Lowenhaupt, 2014; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996; Turney & Kao, 2009).

Others have proposed more comprehensive models. Epstein's (1995) "Six Partnerships Framework", for example, redefines the relationship between schools, families, and communities as overlapping spheres of influence. The overlapping spheres translate in common interests that can be promoted by policies and actions of the stakeholders through six types of educational involvement that this model recognizes.

Barriers posed by the characteristics or limitations of parents included :

- Language barriers are a discouraging factor for engagement when parents cannot speak fluently English.
- Cultural differences in the understanding of the meaning and requirements of engagement
- Unfamiliarity with the system and their role

Many studies suggest that time, money, safety (depending on the location and time of the activities), childcare, and segmentation of the programs hinder parents' participation (Georgis et al., 2014; Quezada, 2003; Salinas Sosa, 1997; Suarez Orozco, 2009). However, other studies suggest that parents' resources are not related to parental engagement and they participate if they perceive participation is needed, getting engaged despite their constraints (Anderson & Minke, 2007).

Successful Programs for Immigrant Parents

The literature describes numerous projects, programs, initiatives, and strategies that have successfully engaged immigrant parents across the US. The analysis of these programs shows that successful programs resemble the more comprehensive and broader models. The programs reviewed also share two pillars on which they built all their strategies: building and strengthening relationships with parents, and empowering parents. Successful strategies for building relationships and strengthening connections with parents include:

- Increasing the opportunities of interaction among parents, and among parents and teachers.
- Improving the relations parents-parents, parent-teachers, and parents-kids.
- Creating close and meaningful relationships school-families.
- Creating a welcoming environment.

Parental Engagement Among Immigrant Parents: A Review of the Literature

Introduction

Research from the last 50 years has demonstrated that parent engagement¹ in schooling is a key element of academic success. The active participation of parents in their children's education has been found to positively influence educational outcomes: students achieve higher scores in standardized tests, their school attendance improves, their academic aspirations increase, their engagement with schooling increases leading to a decrease in dropout rates. (Eagle, 1989; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Hill et al., 2004; Hong & Ho, 2005; Jeynes, 2003, 2007; Steimberg et al, 1992). All those positive effects impact children of all ages (from early education to high school), and across race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, and parent's educational attainment.

The consistency of these findings prompted the incorporation of parental engagement to federal educational policies beginning with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Since then parental engagement has been increasingly gaining importance as a fundamental piece for students' achievement in the subsequent educational reforms. However, in spite of this incorporation of parental engagement into public policies and the acceptance of its importance in students' outcome, it remains a challenge for the majority of schools across the US.

¹ The different studies use different denominations for parent engagement, such as parent involvement, parental participation, or more recently school-parent- community partnerships. In this report the terms are used in an interchangeably way.

of immigrant parental engagement are for the most part focused on the Latino population. These gaps impede the assessment of the characteristics and barriers faced by different immigrant groups as well as the programs that have been successful in addressing their needs. This literature review, although acknowledging the differences that parents from different countries of origins may have, approaches immigrant parents as a whole group with similar characteristics and barriers.

This review begins with a brief summary of parental engagement in the history of the school reform movement to gain a better understanding of evolution of parental engagement as a policy priority, followed by a description of the definitions and conceptual frameworks of parental engagement used in the literature. The following section describes the findings regarding the barriers that hinder immigrant parents' participation. Then, the focus turns to programs that have been implemented in schools and/or districts in the US that have demonstrated success in engaging immigrant parents. Finally, there is a section dedicated to strategies and recommendations for future initiatives to address immigrant parents' involvement.

School Reform Movement

The consistency of the research findings regarding the positive impact of parental engagement on student outcomes, has led to its inclusion in educational policies beginning with 1965's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which included in its language the concept of effective parental involvement practices. Since then, every reauthorization of ESEA up to the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act and 2015's Every Student Succeeds Act has included language promoting parental engagement. Federal initiatives and reports have also focused on parent's participation. These include, the report

Turney & Kao, 2009). Thus, researchers suggest that the definition of parental engagement should incorporate a broader perspective that acknowledges all the different types of parental engagement (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Sy et al, 2007). The need to broaden the definition is also supported by the evidence that parental engagement at home has a stronger relationship with academic achievement than engagement in school activities (Hill & Tyson, 2009; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996). For instance, the discussion of expectations, aspirations, goals and learning strategies between parents and their kids has a strong relationship with educational attainment during middle school, while the parent engagement in schooling has a weaker relation with achievement (Hyll & Tyson, 2009).

The need for a broader definition of parent engagement makes it necessary to shift the conversation towards conceptual models that consider parent engagement in a more comprehensive way, as a multifaceted process in which multiple agents need to be involved. Epstein (1995), Mapp & Kuttner (2013), and Warren et al (2009) are examples of scholars that address parental engagement from a broader perspective. They have developed different frameworks of parental engagement that incorporate a more detailed, and practical understanding of parental engagement. These are described below and summarized in Table 1.

Epstein (1995) developed the Six Types of Partnerships Framework, a model that describes six general categories of family - school - community partnerships: 1) parenting: helping families to establish home environments to support children as learners, 2) communicating: effective two-way communication about school programs and children's progress, 3) volunteering: recruitment and organization of parents as school's volunteers, 4) learning at home: helping parents to support their kids with their homework and other learning activities, 5) decision - making: including parents in leadership roles and in the

the parents and their children's. Differently, Warren and Kuttner's framework focuses on building the capacity of schools and parents to enable them to engage in partnerships. Nevertheless, and despite the differences among the three approaches, the three of them highlight the importance of building capacity, strength relations, and empower parents to create meaningful partnerships. The three of them were developed to engage all types of parents without special mention of any particular group.

Barriers

As mentioned before, parents across race/ethnic groups and the different socioeconomic status are interested in their children's education, and want them to succeed (Mapp, 2003). Despite that, parental engagement in schooling differs among different groups of parents. Native - born parents are more involved than foreign- born parents (Delgado-Gaitán, 1991; Lahaie, 2008), while the engagement is lower among immigrant parents (Turney & Kao, 2009), being especially lower among Hispanic, Asian, and Black foreign-born parents than in native-born Whites (Turney & Kao, 2009).

The engagement barriers that parents have may help to explain those differences. The literature reviewed acknowledge the existence of common barriers for all parents that may impact negatively their engagement, such as poor communication school-parents, school-centric understanding of parental engagement by educators, parents' educational background, or the lack of resources that parents have (including time and transportation among others) among others (Anderson & Minke, 2007; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996; Lawson, 2003). But in the case of immigrant parents, they have to overcome a greater number of barriers compared to native-born Whites that may be the cause of their higher levels of disengagement in schooling (Lahaie, 2008; Mapp, 2003; Turney & Kao, 2009). They have a different understanding of what to be engaged means (Crosnoe, 2001; Klein, 2008), their

school expectations. (Carreón, et al., 2005; Delgado Gaitán, 1991; Jasis & Ordoñez-Jasis, 2012). This unbalance in the power relations make parents be less interested in engaging in some of those activities, and ultimately in schooling.

- Personnel attitudes. Some immigrant parents feel negative or condescending attitudes from personnel (Quezada 2003), or that they are being judged of their characteristics (race, ethnicity, social class, etc.) (Salinas Sosa, 1997), other immigrant parents feel that are being marginalized when interacting with schools (Turney & Kao, 2009).
- Communication. The use of sophisticated language by the school personnel hinders engagement (Salinas Sosa, 1997). By using professional terminology that parents may not understand, the communication between parents is ineffective and parents may sense a distance with the educators.
- Lack of personal relationship. The lack of personal relationships among parents and teachers and school administrators ultimately hinder the collaboration of parents with the educators (Carreón, et al., 2005).

Barriers posed by the characteristics or limitations of parents. Research suggests that immigrant parents have numerous barriers that hinder their engagement. They may be grouped into four main categories: resources, language, cultural differences, and unfamiliarity with the system.

- Resources. Regarding resources there is controversy about their impact on parental engagement. Many studies suggest that time, money, safety (depending on the location and time of the activities), childcare, and segmentation of the programs hinder parents' participation (Georgis et al., 2014; Quezada, 2003; Salinas Sosa, 1997; Suarez Orozco, 2009). However, other studies suggest that parents' resources are not related to parental engagement and they participate if they perceive

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Posed by the characteristics or limitations of parents. | Resources | Georgis et al., 2014 Quezada, 2003 Salinas Sosa, 1997 Suarez Orozco, 2009 Anderson & Minke, 2007 |
| | Language | Carreón, et al., 2005 Delgado-Gaitán, 1991 Georgis, et al., 2014 Quezada 2003 Vera et al., 2012 |
| | Cultural differences | Delgado-Gaitán, 1991 Georgis, et al., 2014 Quezada 2003 Salinas Sosa 1997 Sy et al, 2007 |
| | Unfamiliarity with the system | Doucet, 2011 Georgis, et al., 2014 Klein, 2008 Salinas Sosa, 1997 Vera, 2012 |

Successful Programs for Engagement of Immigrant Parents

The literature describes numerous projects, programs, initiatives, and strategies that have successfully engaged immigrant parents across the US. In general, these programs are very heterogeneous, not all of them follow a concrete framework, and some of them were even created as a learning opportunity for parents and ended up fostering parental engagement. The programs found in the literature, summarized in table 3., involve mainly small samples of participants and are often focused on one school/community or a few of them, with a strong focus on the needs of the particular community(ies) they are serving. The studies are mostly descriptive, many focused on Latino families, or on immigrant parents without targeting and specific ethnic group.

One focus of the literature is on the entities that initiate the programs. These include examples of programs developed as part of a school initiative (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Georgis et al, 2014; Quezada, 2003; Rivera & Lavan, 2012; Sobel & Kugler, 2007;

teachers, and parents-kids and creating close and meaningful relationships school-families. (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Georgis et al., 2014; Quezada & Sanchez, 2003; Rivera & Lavan, 2012; Sobel & Kugler, 2007; Warren et al., 2009)

- Creating a welcoming environment. (Rivera & Lavan, 2012; Sobel & Kugler, 2007; Warren et al., 2009)

- Empowering parents by

- Raising awareness of the school system and school expectations. (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Bolívar & Chrispeels, 2011; Delgado-Gaitán, 1991; Georgis et al., 2014; Jasis & Ordonez-Jasis, 2012; Kugler & Price, 2009; Quezada, 2010; Rivera & Lavan, 2012)

- Using multiple languages in communications with the families. (Bolívar & Chrispeels, 2011; Delgado-Gaitán, 1991; Georgis et al., 2014; Jasis & Ordonez-Jasis, 2012; Kugler & Price, 2009; Sobel & Kugler, 2007; Warren et al., 2009)

- Increasing parents' confidence and capacity when helping their kids with their assignments. (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Delgado-Gaitán, 1991; Rivera & Lavan, 2012.)

- Connecting them to resources in the community to address their needs. (Delgado-Gaitán, 1991; Georgis et al., 2014; Quezada & Sanchez, 2003; Rivera & Lavan, 2012; Warren et al., 2009)

- Increasing their leadership skills. (Bolívar & Chrispeels, 2011; Jasis & Ordonez-Jasis, 2012; Quezada, 2010; Sobel & Kugler, 2007; Warren et al., 2009)

- Providing specific trainings to school personnel about how to empower families

Table 3.

| Program | Article's author | Main Characteristics | Model | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| | | | Narrow definition of parental | School-Parents Partnership | School-Parents-Community | Other |
| The Families Promoting Success. California | Auerbach & Collier (2012) | Parent's training in reading skills aimed at improving their kids' scores. | | X | | |
| Parents Leadership Program. California | Bolívar & Chrispeels (2011) | Developed by a community organization. It is a program led in Spanish and aimed at improving the social and intellectual capital of parents. | | | X | |
| Bilingual Preschool Program. California | Delgado-Gaitan (1991) | Not a parent engagement program per se, this program teaches parents how the school operates, how to help their kids at home, and also empowers the parents by including them in the decision-making. Thanks to the commitment of all the personnel who works there parents are engage in their children's education. | X | | | |
| COPLA (committee for Latino parents). California | Delgado-Gaitan (1991) | Committee organized by parents from the bilingual preschool program to help and engage other parents in their children's education. This committee that began in one school and became district-wide, also tried to distribute the power between parents and schools more evenly. | X | | | |
| Migrant Program Carpinteria District. California. | Delgado-Gaitan (1991) | Program that organizes on regular meetings director- parents to get information about school activities, also a guest speaker is scheduled in each meeting to provide information about social needs of the community. | X | | | |
| Transition Support Program. Canada | Georgis et al. (2014) | Program that offers support to refugee students and their parents. For the parents, ESL classes and family support are provided to fulfill all their needs. | X | | | |
| La Familia Initiative. California | Jasis & Ordóñez-Jasis (2012) | Created by parents' initiative in venues independent to the school to ultimately create partnerships with the school. The school personnel go to the meetings by invitation, but they don't have capacity of decision. | X | | | |
| Charter School Parent Initiative. California | Jasis & Ordóñez-Jasis (2012) | Charter school created by Latino parents. This initiative has increased community participation. | | | | X |
| Project Avanzando. California | Jasis & Ordóñez-Jasis (2012) | Community-based adult education program that serves migrant agricultural workers. | X | | | |
| Caring Across Communities Initiative. | Kugler & Price (2009) | Initiative created by a foundation to establish partnerships among schools, mental health services, and immigrant / refugee organizations. It is aimed at addressing mental health issues, and engaging families. | | | | X |
| Parents take PART (parent assisted training program). California. | Quezada et al. (2003) | It is an on-site parent participation pre-school program offered to siblings of ELL students that gives the kids the possibility to go to preschool in their future school. In this way, the kids are more prepared to go to kindergarten, and the parents establish ties with the school, improving the communication between both. | X | | | |
| Family Literacy Workshop. California | Quezada et al. (2003) | 6-week workshop aimed at improving reading ability of the students, the parent support of literacy and English language development, and the communication between parents and school. | X | | | |

Recommendations for Future Programs for Engagement of Immigrant Parents

Many of the authors of the different articles cited provide helpful recommendations and strategies for future programs with immigrant parents. Those recommendations target parents as well as the schools, and their personnel. This is a compendium of all the recommendations provided by the literature reviewed:

1. Education is the key:

- Educate teachers to rise their cultural awareness, enabling them to develop culturally sensitive practices. (Delgado-Gaitán, 1991; Kugler & Price, 2009; Lopez et al., 2001; Sobel & Kugler, 2007)
- Educate parents about the educational system and expectations about parental engagement. (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Delgado-Gaitán, 1991; Sobel & Kugler, 2007)
- Collaborate with the parents' self-improvement and own educational goals (ask for input to implement literacy programs, ESOL programs, and/or other educational programs). (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Lopez et al., 2001; Sobel & Kugler, 2007)

2. Plan engagement opportunities that consider parents constraints:

- Using bilingual /multilingual materials, translation services during meetings, hiring bilingual personnel. (Auerbach & Collier, 2012)
- Meet families' needs by mobilizing community resources. (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Lopez et al., 2001; Warren et al., 2009)

3. Empower parents to engage in schooling:

- Improving relations school-families:
 - o Create relational bonds. (Quezada et al., 2003; Sobel & Kugler, 2007)
 - o Create a welcoming environment. (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Kugler & Price, 2009; Quezada et al., 2003)

provide all the information needed to know in detail the strategies used. Also, the research of those programs is mostly qualitative, and don't offer a rigorous evaluation of their effectiveness through quantitative or mixed methods. In this way, they only offer a description of the program and all the outcomes are related to the satisfaction of the people involved in the programs.

With regard to the programs per se, many of them weren't created following any theoretical framework, although through the characteristics shared they may be associated to one of them. In most cases, their creation and strategies are the response to a gap that the school, the parents, or the community needed to fulfill. The vagueness of the term, along with the imprecision in the definition in the reforms in the educational policies over time, has not contributed to the creation of more structured and theoretical-grounded programs. Moreover, the limited scientific publication of rigorous evaluation of current successful programs hinders the development of new programs based on evidence-based practices.

Given the positive impact of parental engagement on educational outcomes, along with the public recognition that is currently given to parental engagement, and the efforts that are being made to implement new strategies and programs, it is advisable to take into account all the barriers, and successful strategies that other studies have previously found. However, it is recommended to perform rigorous evaluations of the new programs and the existing ones, and to include in those evaluations larger populations, and qualitative methods, in order to enable comparison and generalization. Considering the specific characteristics of migrant parents, as a vulnerable population due to all the barriers they face, this recommendation is especially important to offer quality programs that help them become more involved in the education of their child, and ultimately improve the academic performance of their children.

- Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2002). Family, school, and community partnerships. *Handbook of Parenting Volume 5 Practical Issues in Parenting*, 406.
- Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2006). Prospects for change: Preparing educators for school, family, and community partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 81(2), 81-120.
- Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/Family/Community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(9), 701-12.
- Georgis, R., Gokiart, R. J., Ford, D. M., & Ali, M. (2014). Creating inclusive parent engagement practices: Lessons learned from a school community collaborative supporting newcomer refugee families. *Multicultural Education*, 21(3-4), 23-27.
- Henderson, A.T., Mapp K. (2002). A new wave for evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student learning. Austin, TX: Southwest Education Development Laboratory.
- Hill, N. E., & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(3), 740.
- Hill, N. E., Castellino, D. R., Lansford, J. E., Nowlin, P., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (2004). Parent academic involvement as related to school behavior, achievement, and aspirations: Demographic variations across adolescence. *Child Development*, 75(5), 1491-1509.
- Hong, S., & Ho, H. (2005). Direct and indirect longitudinal effects of parental involvement on student achievement: Second-order latent growth modeling across ethnic groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(1), 32.
- Jasis, P. M., & Ordonez-Jasis, R. (2012). Latino parent involvement: Examining

- Quezada, M. S., & CEO, C. (2010). When parents are engaged, the schools get better! *The Multilingual Educator*, 8-13.
- Quezada, R. L., Diaz, D. M., & Sanchez, M. (2003). Involving Latino Parents. *Leadership*, 33(1), 32.
- Rivera, L., & Lavan, N. (2012). Family literacy practices and parental involvement of Latin American immigrant mothers. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 11(4), 247-259.
- Sobel, A., & Kugler, E. G. (2007). Building partnerships with immigrant parents. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 62-66.
- Sosa, A. S. (1997). Involving hispanic parents in educational activities through collaborative relationships. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(2-3), 285-293.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development*, 63(5), 1266-1281.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Onaga, M., & Lardemelle, C. d. (2010). Promoting academic engagement among immigrant adolescents through school-family-community collaboration. *Professional School Counseling*, 14(1, Special issue: Collaboration and Partnerships with Families and Communities: The School Counselor's Role)15-26.
- Sui-Chu, E. H., & Willms, J. D. (1996). Effects of parental involvement on eighth-grade achievement. *Sociology of Education*, 126-141.
- Sy, S. R., Rowley, S. J., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2007). Predictors of parent involvement across contexts in Asian American and European American families. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 38(1), 1-29.
- Terriquez, V. (2012). Civic inequalities? immigrant incorporation and Latina mothers'