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What brings you to NCMSH?

What do you hope to get out of our conversation today?

Do you have any specific questions?

Roadmap for Today:
- History & Progress
- Strategies for Supports
- Facilitators & Barriers
- Schoolwide CAYCI-SES
- Barrier Bashing Activity
Objective 1: School Improvement, 30 minutes, All, Verbal/Visual Presentation

Audience will be able to describe current and expanded school improvement models such as the CCMSI and their role in school improvement.

Objective 2: Expanded School-Family-Community Partnerships, 30 minutes, All, Verbal/Visual Presentation

Audience will be able to describe facilitators and barriers to school-family-community partnerships.

Objective 3: Implementation Science, 30 minutes, All, Verbal/Visual Presentation

Audience will be able to identify steps in implementation of the CCMSI and take away next steps for future use of the CCMSI.
Expanded School Improvement Models

**Components Present:**
- Integrate services
- Account for environment of youth
- Acknowledge multiple barriers

**Components Missing:**
- Change how schools operate
- Fail to integrate services into the school improvement process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional School Improvement</th>
<th>Expanded School Improvement</th>
<th>Why look at Facilitators &amp; Barriers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus within the school</td>
<td>Supports for Non-Academic Barriers</td>
<td>Fail to identify root causes of academic distress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for schools to expand</td>
<td>Complexities of Change</td>
<td>Expanded models have attempted to broaden the school’s scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Anderson-Butcher et al., 2008b; Adelman &amp; Taylor, 1997; Fullan, 2006; Fernandez, 2011; Odgers &amp; Adler, 2018; Anderson et al., 2017)</td>
<td>(Anderson-Butcher et al., 2010; Adelman &amp; Taylor, 2007)</td>
<td>Still a gap remains in integrating community and school resources into the school building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 60% of children cannot read and/or compute at grade level (CDF Report, 2014)
• Only 75% of African American Youth compared to 88% of White Youth graduate high school (NCES, 2017)
• 25% of all schools are in urban settings, 41% of these schools considered high poverty (McFarland et al., 2017, p.135)
• 15 million children live below poverty line (Odgers & Adler, 2018)
• 1 in 5 children are in poverty (CDF Report, 2014)
• Of youth attending urban schools 50% have significant learning, behavioral and emotional problems (Taylor & Adelman, 2006)

Need for System-wide Change in Education
Changing the Way Schools Operate

Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement
The CCMSI extends school mental health approaches by focusing on changing the way schools approach their annual school improvement planning process (Anderson-Butcher, Lawson, Bean, Flaspohler, Boone, & Kwiatkowski, 2008).

The CCMSI utilizes five pathways: Academic Learning, Youth Development & School Climate, Parent/Family Engagement & Support, Health & Social Services and Community Partnerships.

Prior research on the CCMSI showcases improved academic success, decreased behavioral incidences, improved school climate, and increased access to mental health services (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2010; Anderson-Butcher, Paluta, Sterling & Anderson, 2018; Anderson-Butcher et al., 2015).
CCMSI Milestones

- Engaging the School & Community
- New and Expanded Partnerships
- Strategies and Programs
- Integration in School Improvement Planning Process
- Infrastructure Development
Canyons School District

CCMSI

- History & Progress
- Strategies for Supports
In 2009, Canyons District was created by a voter referendum to split a large urban/suburban district of over 90,000 students.

Canyons assumed four of the five existing Title I schools – all four were in formal School Improvement status under NCLB.

- Schools were struggling with academics & attendance
- Known risk factors and traumas common within the communities and families
- Chronic staff turnover and burnout
Why School Improvement?

2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress Results:¹

- 36% of fourth graders were proficient in reading.
- 40% were proficient in mathematics.
- Disparities persisted.

Traditional school improvement strategies do not account for the range of nonacademic barriers impeding student learning and development.²

¹ National Center for Education Statistics, 2016; (2) Adelman & Taylor, 2005; Lawson & Anderson-Butcher, 2001
GOALS FOR CSD COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

1. Maximize academic learning
2. Promote school climate and positive youth development;
3. Address non-academic barriers to learning
4. Align resources and services
5. Develop community partnerships to support academic achievement of students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCMSI Pathway</th>
<th>Examples of Strategies Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Learning</strong></td>
<td>AmeriCorps Read Today; Afterschool Program Tutoring; Church Tutoring; Dual Immersion; Junior Achievement; Preschool; Summer School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Development</strong></td>
<td>Big Brother/Big Sisters; Boys &amp; Girls Club; Jump Rope for Heart; Kids Café; PlayWorks!; Theater Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent &amp; Family Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Family Literacy Centers; Mexican Consulate-Tech Online College; Parent Information Resource Center; Parent Teacher/Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Social Services</strong></td>
<td>Dental supports; Hospitals and Health clinics; School-based mental health; University social work interns; School-level wraparound teams (called CARE Teams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Partnerships</strong></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office; Green Fiber Recycling; Police &amp; Fire Departments; Afterschool Network; United Way; Business Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Absenteeism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Students Chronically Absent (>10 days)
Results: Office Discipline Referrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Office Discipline Referrals
Results: School Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitators & Barriers
What are the Facilitators & Barriers schools face?

1. How urban underperforming schools serving socially vulnerable youth adopt, utilize and progress through the CCMSI?

2. Additionally, what facilitators and barriers exist and when progressing through CCMSI milestones?

- **Collection of primary data through qualitative interviews**
  - Principal/Assistant Principal
  - Community School Coordinator
  - District Level Staff

- **Examination of secondary quantitative data CAYCI-SES**
  - Teacher/Staff Perceptions of 5 constructs
  - Multiple Years
Case Study: Canyons School District

Each school has approximately 500 youth.

School A – CCMSI for 6 years
• 47-53% Race/Ethnic Minority, 23-27% ELL, 71-78% Low Socio-Economic Status

School B – CCMSI for 6 years
• 50% Race/Ethnic Minority, 19-25% ELL, 61-67% Low Socio-Economic Status
School Stakeholder Interviews

A total of six interviews were completed as part of a larger evaluation project:

- School A, B and one district personnel interviews lasting on average 65 minutes (41-84 minutes).
- 50% each male (3) and female (3), 100% White/Caucasian (6), and average age 38 (range 38-50 years old).
- Average of 16 years working in schools (13-19 years)
- Average of 4 years in their current role (1-5 years).

CAYCI-SES Teacher/Staff Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of CCMSI Adoption</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Teachers (% of total)</td>
<td>School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>46 (88%)</td>
<td>(11-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year Adoption</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years Adoption</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>(15-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years Adoption</td>
<td>73 (85%)</td>
<td>(17-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 526</strong></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How did we use interviews and CAYCI-SES Results?

• Facilitators and barriers to CCMSI implementation across the CCMSI milestones
• Compared interviews to results from the CAYCI-SES teacher/staff perceptions.
• Changes in overall mean were compared to response themes.
• Thematic analysis using constructivist framework (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).
• Progress towards milestones
Qualitative & Quantitative

Support or Negate Findings
- Triangulation of Results
- Increase Validity of Findings
- Deeper Understanding
- Relation of Time to Facilitators & Barriers

Reliability

Inter-Rater Reliability Test
- Randomize interview transcription
- Rater selected based on prior qualitative experience
- Theme selected portions of transcriptions
- Calculate kappa to determine level of agreement

Member Check
- District Official
- Verify Findings
- Understanding of CCMSI & School Improvement
Understanding Adoption, Progress & Use of the CCMSI

1. Engaging the School & Community
   - School Engagement
   - Community Engagement
   - Parent Engagement

2. Expanded Partnerships, Programs & Strategies
   - Youth Development & School Climate (129 comments)
   - Parent Family Engagement (128 comments)
   - Health & Social Services (108 comments)
   - Academic Learning (96 comments)
   - Community Partnerships (84 comments)

3. Integration into School Improvement
   - Use of Data
   - Deepening the School Improvement Process (SIP)
   - Changes in the School Improvement Priorities
   - Mapping Resources

4. Strengthening Infrastructure
   - New and Enhanced Structures
   - Professional Development
   - New Roles in the Schools
   - Role Changes in the Schools
# Understanding Adoption, Progress & Use of the CCMSI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Perceived Teacher/Staff Commitment</th>
<th>Perceived School Climate</th>
<th>Perceived School Connectedness</th>
<th>Perceived Support for Students’ Basic Needs</th>
<th>Perceived Community Supports and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>School A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.22 (46)</td>
<td>4.60 (44)</td>
<td>3.18 (42)</td>
<td>3.45 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.41 (67)</td>
<td>4.76 (64)</td>
<td>3.39 (55)</td>
<td>3.63 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3.69 (72)</td>
<td>3.56 (67)</td>
<td>4.55 (74)</td>
<td>3.18 (50)</td>
<td>3.32 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.29 (48)</td>
<td>3.79 (40)</td>
<td>4.21 (42)</td>
<td>2.79 (42)</td>
<td>3.98 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>School B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.30 (55)</td>
<td>4.77 (55)</td>
<td>3.47 (43)</td>
<td>3.37 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.43 (73)</td>
<td>4.80 (73)</td>
<td>3.77 (53)</td>
<td>3.68 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3.66 (60)</td>
<td>3.76 (56)</td>
<td>4.73 (56)</td>
<td>3.70 (41)</td>
<td>3.66 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.80 (56)</td>
<td>4.40 (43)</td>
<td>4.60 (60)</td>
<td>3.39 (47)</td>
<td>4.62 (52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitators and Barriers to each Milestone of the CCMSI

**Facilitators**
- Community School Facilitator’s Role
- Internal Supports for the Work
- Added Partnerships

**Barriers**
- Lack of Community Support and Alignment
- Changes in Staff and Structures
- Lack of Understanding
- Funding

One of the things that I think has been a barrier for us in terms of engaging schools specifically, not so much the community yet but the school part is that when there’s turnover in our schools when there’s turnover with the administration when there’s turnover with you know teachers it becomes very difficult because sometimes we feel we go back...

And we’ve had less access to be able to do that and I have seen some I’ve seen some difficulty then in some of that that ownership from the school perspective and it depends a lot on the strength of the administrator.
Understanding Adoption, Progress & Use of the CCMSI

1. Progress towards Adoption and Implementation
   • Both schools made progress in all milestones
   • New or enhanced strategies, programs, and infrastructure.

2. Indicators of Progress and Impact
   • Teacher/staff perceptions increased across two of the five constructs analyzed
   • Perceived school climate and Perceived community supports and services

3. Variability in Adoption and Implementation
   • School A: fewer uses of mapping school resources and adjusting school priorities.
   • School B: limited engagement with parents/families or community stakeholders.
   • Schools did not progress through all milestones equally
   • Due to barriers they faced at specific points in the adoption and implementation process.
Think back to our questions…

1. How urban underperforming schools serving socially vulnerable youth adopt, utilize and progress through the CCMSI?
2. Additionally, what facilitators and barriers exists and when progressing through CCMSI milestones?

• Implications for Research
  - More extensive interviews and site observations of schools
  - Include rural, suburban and differing socioeconomic contexts
  - More rigorous study designs such as a randomized control trial

• Implications for Practice
  - Expanded programs and services to support student learning and development
  - Traditional school social workers can prioritize: documentation, early intervention, and communication with administration.
  - Advocate for additional mental and behavioral health supports when needed.
Youth Face Multiple Barriers

CCMSI provides one method to improving schools

Schools the milestones, made significant progress as indicated by the multiple process and product innovations.
Barrier Bashing Activity
Main Barriers to CCMSI Implementation in Case Study:

- Lack of Community Support and Alignment
- Changes in Staff and Structures
- Lack of Understanding
- Funding

1) Choose a Barrier
2) Find a partner or small group
3) Discuss how would you tackle the barrier?
4) Where does the change need to happen within the school, the district, the larger educational system?
Questions?
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Dr. Dawn Anderson-Butcher,
Professor, The Ohio State University
anderson-butcher.1@osu.edu
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