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Introduction & Housekeeping

Thanks for your participation today!

You have a lot of professional experience, and I encourage you to share your expertise with the group and me!

Hopefully,

I will affirm some things that you already know, and give you information and/or ideas about ways to improve the parent-school information pipeline using your school’s existing resources.

Who is here today?

1. Teachers? Administrators? Others?

2. What ages do you work with?

3. What types of students do you serve?

4. What questions do you have about engaging parents, or about the information parents know?
Today

We will discuss findings of a multi-methods study that investigated the informational networks that contributed to parents' possession of more or less accurate information about their EL children's status in school.

Even though the study targeted parents of adolescents classified as Long Term English Language Learners, it did uncover aspects of parent demographics that should be considered when communicating with parents from Spanish speaking countries or communities whose educational experiences are vastly different from those educated in the United States.

Furthermore, these same parents often had younger or older children who attended California's public schools. Therefore, their thoughts, concerns, and understanding are pertinent to parents of children of many different grade levels.

My/Our Story

I am one of six children born to an immigrant mother and a father whose parents both had come from other countries.

My mother spoke little English when she began to attend school. Her mother, my grandmother, could not read or write in any language. Grandma could, however, count the coins collected in their small corner grocery store.

I recall visits with my mother’s family that encircled me in a language and culture I did not really understand. Yet, in observing the trajectories of my grandparents, I realized that individuals of little income or education are intelligent and achieving individuals whose life situations did not afford them the same opportunities that I have since had.

It is with this understanding that I and my team approached parents and asked them what they knew, what they thought, and what they would like to know.
I. The Students

A. LTELL Students:
1. Long Term English Language Learners (LTELLs) remain in EL programs for more than 6 years (AB2193, 2012), form an estimated 50% of the California’s more than 1 million EL students, and are the students most likely to drop out (Becker, Wise, & Watts, 2004; Hakuta, 2011; Olson, 2010).

2. Factors include inappropriate educational programming, and a mismatch of classroom content with high stakes testing (Abedi, 2004; Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Callahan, 2003; Gandara & Rumberger, 2009; Olsen, 2010).

II. Parent Impact, Knowledge, and Help Seeking:

1. Studies suggest that parents of EL students are unaware of their students’ academic and language status: the two basic criteria used to determine EL students’ readiness to participate in regular education programs that prepare them for state mandated tests and qualify them to enroll in college. (Gandara, et al., 2003; Olson, 2010; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Valadez, 2002).

2. Stanton-Salazar’s 2011 student of Mexican origin youth found that: If individuals are unaware of a problem, it is unlikely that they will seek help or support

3. If parents are unaware of a problem, it is unlikely that they that will seek help to promote the success of their children in school (Stanton-Salazar, 2001).
Missing Research

An investigation of parents’ knowledge of their EL students’ language and academic status ..... 

...... and the factors that lead to parents possession of more or less accurate information.

Purpose & Research Questions

Purpose:
1. Identify the relationship between resource-embedded networks and parent perceptions of their high school LTELL students’ status.

2. Identify information resources available to parents and school districts.

Research Questions:
A. Parent Knowledge: Perception and Accuracy
1. What are parents’ perceptions of their students’ performances on the three academic indicators: grades, CELDT score, and classification status?
2. To what extent are these perceptions accurate?
3. Given the information that they do have, what are parents’ evaluations of their students’ abilities?

B. Social Networks
4. What are the social network features of parents with more versus less accurate information?

C. Information Needed (emerged from data):
5. What information did parents need and therefore did not receive from their current informational networks?
**RESEARCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTEL Students/EL Students’ Educational Trajectories</th>
<th>Parent Knowledge &amp; Accuracy</th>
<th>Social Capital = Positive Outcomes</th>
<th>Social Networks = Positive Outcomes</th>
<th>Cultural Capital = Reflected in Parents’ Evaluations of Students’ Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumberger &amp; Tran (2010).</td>
<td>Raty &amp; Kasanen (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methods**

**Data Collection**

**Eligibility:** Parent of high school LTEL student.

**Data Collection:** 2 Groups/Study Conditions

1. **Easier to Access:** 17 Long study participants: responded to flyers, promotions – 2 sessions
   1st: Information card, consent form, and survey.
   2nd: Semi-structured interview, tech sheet, and shared portal data

2. **Difficult to Access:** 14 Short study participants: Recruitment = multiple phone calls, and knocked on doors – 1 session
   1 session: information card, consent form, survey, tech sheet, and shared portal data

**Data Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Construct(s) Measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Information Card</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Extent of Parent Information Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Parent Perceptions: 1. Student Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social Network Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Parent Perceptions: 2. Student Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Network Features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Analysis:**

Data from the interviews were thematically analyzed according to established qualitative methodologies. (Bazeley, 2014; Creswell, 2009) (PPP, p.57)

**Quantitative Analysis:** Descriptive statistics (frequency), measures of central tendency (mean, mode, etc.)
Methods

1. Translator: Spanish speaking, lived in the community, worked at Cambria High School, knew many of the parents’ students, had been ‘moved’ from Mexico to the US in high school

2. Project: Was a study and a service project:
   a. Parents completed data collection materials first.
   b. In return, we helped parents set up their parent portal accounts, show them how to use it, interpret the English data shown in the portal, and recommend resources that would help them help their students.

   a. Examples
      i. What can you tell us about your student’s grades?
         - how did you get that information (who, etc.)
      ii. How did you know that he/she ______?
      iii. Why do you think that he/she was _________?
      iv. How do you handle _________?

FINDINGS: Demographics

Long Study Vs. Short Study Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities:</th>
<th>Short study (N = 14)</th>
<th>Long study (N = 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender: Female, Mothers</td>
<td>11 79%</td>
<td>14 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SES: Lowest Quartile</td>
<td>12 86%</td>
<td>14 82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences: Education Levels

1. Long Study: Slightly higher educational levels: 12 (70%) intermediate or below, 5 (30%) high school and above
2. Short Study: 11 (86%)= intermediate or below, 3 (14%) high school and above.

Implications: Parents have
1. Educational experiences that are different than those of their children
2. Limited financial resources: Restricts opportunities to investigate or obtain student support services outside of the public school system.
3. Less education in combination with FEWER literacy experiences in jobs makes parents at risk for not understanding documents in their own native language.
   a. Observation:
      i. Minimal note taking
      ii. 1/3 of short study parents observed (6) struggled with decoding multi-syllabic words in Spanish documents.
**FINDINGS: RQ# A1: Knowledge – Performance Perceptions**

*The majority of interviewed parents stated that students’ performance on the three indicators were weak, i.e. that they had low grades, did not pass the CELDT, and were not reclassified.*

Perceived Weak Performers: n = 11 (69%)  
(No positive performances)

Perceived Strong Performers: n = 5 (31%)  
(At least one positive performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Cases</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Student's Name/Grade/Gender</th>
<th>Student's Perceived Performance</th>
<th>Student Factor</th>
<th>Parent Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Macias</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Muriel 11th/F</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Older sister’s model</td>
<td>Surprised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Garcia</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Yadira 11th/F</td>
<td>*Strong (CELDT only)</td>
<td>AVID Issue: Older brother’s support</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sandoval</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Andrew 10th/M</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Transnational + Motivated</td>
<td>Information Seeker: Unconcerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINDINGS: RQ A2: Knowledge of Performance –Extent of Accuracy**

Compares parent survey responses with district portal data.

4 Levels:  
0: Insubstantial  
1: Weak  
2: Strong  
3: Maximal

(No accurate info.)  
(Accurate on 1 indicator)  
(Accurate on 2 indicators)  
(Accurate on 3 indicators)

All Conditions: Parents’ Accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy level</th>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of participants</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Cases</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Student's Name/Grade/Gender</th>
<th>Student's Perceived Performance</th>
<th>Parent Descriptor</th>
<th>Extent of Accurate Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Macias</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Muriel 11th/F</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Surprised</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Garcia</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Yadira 11th/F</td>
<td>*Strong (CELDT only)</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sandoval</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Andrew 10th/M</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Information Seeker: Unconcerned</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS: RQ#A3: Capability Perceptions

Data Source & Analysis: Interviews, coding, and qualitative analysis.

Findings:
14 of 15 parents expressed beliefs in their children’s capability, the ability to succeed in school
1. 10 parents’ felt their students had shown improvement in recent performances with motivation, and doing work as the most frequently cited factors.

Most Frequently Cited Reasons for Student Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived performance (n = 10)</th>
<th>Most Frequently Cited Area of Improvement</th>
<th>Most Frequently Cited Reasons For Improvement</th>
<th>Other possible factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Strong Performers (4 of 5)</td>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>Motivation (2 of 4 cases)</td>
<td>Help seeking (3 of 4 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Weak Performers (6 of 11)</td>
<td>Improved Effort</td>
<td>Motivation (2 of 6 cases)</td>
<td>Help seeking (2 of 6 cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Student’s Name/ Grade/Gender</th>
<th>Student’s Perceived Performance</th>
<th>Parent Descriptor</th>
<th>Extent of Accurate Information</th>
<th>Reasons for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Macias</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Muriel -11th/F</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Surprised</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Does homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Garcia</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Yadira -11th/P</td>
<td>*Strong (CELDT only)/</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Does homework. Understands more (math).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sandoval</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Andrew -10th/M</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Information Seeker: Unconcerned</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 5 parents’ general descriptions of students: Included “smart, smart but lazy, just doesn’t care.”

FINDINGS: RQ# B4: SNA Features

Data Source & Analysis: Accuracy: Surveys, quantitative analysis
SNA: Interviews, coding, and qualitative analysis.

Findings:
Extensity and heterogeneity do not fully explain the extent of parent information accuracy.

a. Extensity: The number of contacts in network.

Extensity From Survey Results: Comparison of Long and Short Study Participants

b. Interview Heterogeneity: The number of contacts unlike the participant that provide support.

Number and Percentage of Specific Types of Ties, by Parent Accuracy Level and Type of Support Provided
**FINDINGS: RQ# B4: SNA – Focused Centrality**

Analysis: Qualitative
Data Source: Interviews
Support Examples: Exact info., explanation, advice, programs, referral - for student academics.

Findings:
1. Almost half obtained most academic support from students.

2. Parents with highest levels of info. accuracy depended more on family than did Level 1 parents. (SN theory does not predict).

3. All but one parent cited grade reports as source of academic information.

Issue: IF SN extensity and heterogeneity does not explain information accuracy levels, what does?

### Table 5.25
Contacts Providing the Most Academic Support to Parents (N = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Accuracy level</th>
<th># of parents (# of supports per parent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Level 1 (n = 5)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order sibling</td>
<td>Level 2 (n=8)</td>
<td>5 (4, 1, 5, 3, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>Level 3 (n = 3)</td>
<td>*1 (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of parents accessing contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% obtaining most support via family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.26
Parents’ Descriptions of Student Communication Exchanges, by Accuracy Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Parent Information Accuracy</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>All levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Exchanges</td>
<td>8 of 16 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Exchanges</td>
<td>8 of 16 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No definitive description</td>
<td>7 of 16 (44%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.27
Inaccurate Student Reporters, by Parent Accuracy Level and Student Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy level</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>All levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 out of 5 (60%)</td>
<td>4 out of 8 (50%)</td>
<td>1 out of 3 (33%)</td>
<td>8 out of 16 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Parent-school communication tools mismatch also appear to contribute. 
Factors: Timing; language; finances (disconnected phones); no school contact; tech divide; for some parents, literacy; portal access; location of information (school). **EX** Mrs.
3. Access explains accuracy also.

### FINDINGS: RQ# B4: SNA – Transmission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy level</th>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long study (N = 16)</td>
<td>Easier to Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants (%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (32%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FINDINGS: RQ# C1 – Information Needed

1. Parents needed information on resources that addressed their concerns: EX Negative peer influences > Boys/Girls Club, ROTC

2. Parents were unaware that parents had more educational rights than do students.

### FINDINGS: 3 Cases: Socio-grams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Student's Name/ Grade/ Gender</th>
<th>Student's Perceived Performance</th>
<th>Parent Descriptor</th>
<th>Extent of Accurate Information</th>
<th>Heritogeneity: Not Family</th>
<th>Inaccurate Student Reports?</th>
<th>Sibling Model?</th>
<th>Institutional Agent?</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Macias</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Muriel - 11th/F</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Surprised</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 - School</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Y – withholds</td>
<td>Negative = Older Sib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Garcia</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Yadira - 11th/F</td>
<td>*Strong (CELT only)</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 - School Tenant - Ed in Mex</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Positive = Older Sib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sandoval</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Andrew - 10th/M</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Information Seeker: Unconcerned</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS

1. Transmission features explained parent information accuracy more than did social network features of extensity or heterogeneity.

2. The current system of getting information to parents forces them to depend on their LTECT students for academic information and school communications that often come too late.

IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

Increase parent access to needed information by
1. improving transmission of information
2. expanding currently narrow parent information networks.
3. providing information on resources that address their concerns in a manner that utilizes all communication modalities.

Information Needed

**Data Source:** SOP for Service Component

**Analysis:** Portal data review; Info. given was based on parents’ expressed concerns & possible student issues.

**Key Points:**
1. This is information that parents did not receive from the school or think of in the manner presented.
2. Parents did not know that they had more educational rights than did their students.
Implications

Objectives:
1. Increase information flow so access and timing are improved.
2. Utilize existing sources to minimize costs and increase effectiveness.

Sources: Community organizations, Parent Engagement Centers - PEC(LCAP), Parent Portals

Options: Adjust for literacy, location (accessible anywhere), timing.

Improve Transmission:
PEC to a. create podcasts, DVDs, or videotaped trainings sent to parents via phone links.
   Contents: Parent rights, student support programs, explanation of different academic skills (literacy, study, etc.)
   b. run workshops teaching email and portal skills

Make Parent Portal available in the dominant language of the parents.

Expand Networks:
PEC to build parent-based communications network from existing parent programs such as Inspire, or train college interns to perform liaison activities.

Join forces with existing community service agencies to create a website for parents that incorporate relevant info/podcasts from organizations such as LEAD, and to promote services such as Big Brothers/Sisters.

Send phone links to parents allowing them access to the above and to a bilingual community liaison at each school site.

Thank you

..........For your participation and interest........

Other Resources:
The video, How to Upload a Video to You-Tube, can be obtained via the website: http://3deducationalsolutions.com

Maria Davis-Perkins, PhD, SP-CCC
Maria.Davis-Perkins@cgu.edu
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