A New Typology: Four Perspectives of School Counselor Involvement with Families

Shannon McCarthy and Dayna Watson
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Abstract

School counselors are called to collaborate with families to support student success and achievement. Although the need for collaboration is apparent in the ASCA National Model as well as research on family-school engagement, an organized view of what this collaboration between school counselors and families may look like and how existing or proposed approaches to collaboration impact school counselor practices is not available. The purpose of this article is to propose a typology for understanding ways school counselors engage families. This typology has specific implications for assessment, service delivery, school counselor training, and future research.

A New Typology: Four Perspectives of School Counselor Involvement with Families

Throughout the past couple of decades, multiple research studies have shown that increased parental involvement in their child's schools and education is related to improved academic performance and social competence for students and increased support and resources for students and their families (Amatea, 2013; Hill & Taylor, 2004; Jeynes, 2011). Research has indicated that caregivers from all ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds care about their children's education and want to support learning; however, the specific behaviors and ways that families engage in education can be heavily influenced by cultural factors (Cheadle & Amato, 2011; Lareau, 2003). In response, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) has adjusted their model for school counselors to call for them to collaborate with families to enhance students' academic performance (ASCA, 2012). In addition, the ASCA model calls for school counselors to develop collaborative family school programs and to work to involve all caregivers in children's learning and development (ASCA, 2012). As a result, school counselors are expected to enact certain roles in working with students' caregivers or family members. Each of these roles is rooted in specific beliefs and assumptions about the preferred roles that should be implemented by adults at school, at home and in the community.

There remains a need, however, for school counselors to find ways to transform this research supporting collaborative family engagement practices into practical application. Several different models, such as Epstein's (1987) model for parental involvement, Bryan and Henry's (2008) model for building school, family, and

community partnerships, or the dual-capacity model for parental involvement presented by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) and the US Department of Education (Mapp & Kuttner, 2013) have provided a framework to guide school counselors and other school personnel in engaging families in more collaborative and egalitarian partnerships. These existing models describe actions to create collaborative partnerships, practices, or interventions, or different ways in which families can be involved in schools and with school personnel. There would seem to be a need, however, for a more specific model or typology that represents the range of school counselors' interventions with families, and allows a school counselor to self-assess his or her current practices with families as well as ideal practices, as a means of informing possible action steps.

A New Typology

In this article, a typology is proposed categorizing these distinctive perspectives on school counselor involvement with students' families. This typology, first presented in the doctoral dissertation by the first author (McCarthy, 2014), is intended to depict the differing goals and assumptions characterizing each perspective of family involvement and the respective roles to be enacted by school counselors and students' families. This typology may also allow one to better understand the various expectations that exist in the field as to how school counselors are expected to interact with families.

Theoretical Foundation

The proposed typology model was developed through an integration of Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory and existing paradigms of family-school relations. Ecological systems theory's focus on the relationship of a student with his or

her surroundings, and the influence of this relationship of other community or social systems, can serve as a way to intercede with and visualize the immediate systems with which an individual student interacts (Green & Keys, 2001). Ecological systems theory has been applied in recent decades as a developmental model for students in school settings, particularly to aid school-based personnel in focusing on students' social, emotional, and mental health needs (Bemak, 2000).

The rows in Table 1 of the model that depict the different targets or focuses of school counselor's work with families were influenced by Bronfenbrenner's systemic model. The individual and family focus category was chosen to represent the individual and microsystem levels. The interventions described in those rows focus on the individual student, or that student's family unit specifically. The second row, which depicts a community focus is influenced by the mesosystem, and the interactions between the systems of the school, the family, and the community, and the influence these interactions can have on an individual student.

The columns representing the different alignments that a school counselor can take in planning and executing interventions with students, families, and communities, were derived from the descriptions of the remediation and collaboration paradigms in which school counselors may operate. Around the 1960's, the separation paradigm of family-school relations, which promoted separate interventions for a child in the school and in the home, began to shift into a remediation paradigm, which is still a dominant paradigm for many models of family-school engagement. As described by Amatea (2013), the remediation paradigm describes the approach by school counselors and other school-based personnel where intervention with students' families focus on

Table 1

Typology of Family Involvement

		School Counselor's Alignment/ Positioning	
		School counselor as primarily responsible for ideas/solutions Addresses perceived challenges and needs Problem-solving/seeking then providing solutions and resources	School counselor seeks caregiver/family resources Addresses perceived strengths and resources Restructuring and creating more engaged roles
School Counselor Target/ Focus	Individual/Family	I. Foundational Approach to Family Involvement • Parent consultation • Parent education/ training • School-based family counseling	II. Family Relationship Building • Epstein's model of family involvement • Family-school problem solving • The use of strength-based family systems approaches by school counselors
	Community	III. Community Needs • Schools providing for communities' needs • Full-service schools • Collaborative climate in schools	IV. Community Development • School-community development • School counselors as leaders • Empowering school, family and community members to participate equally

Note. Adapted from McCarthy (2014).

mitigating student deficits in academic, social, and behavioral areas, particularly for students from lower socioeconomic status backgrounds. Interventions from within this paradigm often focus around parent education, invitations into the school environment, and academic remediation plans that involve the student's family.

As depicted in Table 1, this typology consists of four possible combinations of differing alignments and intervention targets which represent the four perspectives discussed here: (a) foundational approach to family involvement, (b) family relationship building, (c) community needs and (d) community development. Each of these perspectives depicts distinctive counselor role expectations and has implications for practice within the school and community. While school counselors' practices and interventions may not fall cleanly into one specific perspective, these four perspectives are presented here in a simple form to better provoke insight and discussion on how school counselors might choose to structure their role in working with students, their families, other school staff, and/or with community members. It is important to note that the interventions described in these perspectives are described in their traditional forms for the purposes of this typology, though variations in the practice and design of many of these interventions do exist.

Each of the interventions contained in this typology has been discussed in research, and in some cases, have been traditionally utilized in school counseling practice for some time (e.g., Perera-Diltz, Moe, & Mason, 2011; Amatea & Cholewa, 2013). School counselors, however, have had to select individual interventions and have not had a way to organize these interventions by their target or intention. This typology can allow school counselors to clearly identify the paradigm in which these

interventions may lie, along with the assumptions inherent in each perspective. For school counselors interested in improving some of their family and community engagement practices, this typology can offer a guide to progressing towards a more collaborative paradigm and a wider systemic lens.

Additionally, in their position statement affirming the importance of the school counselor's role in family-school-community partnerships, ASCA (2016) states, "School counselors enhance the collaboration of school-family-community stakeholders by being the catalyst through which these collaborations occur" (p. 53). This position statement also calls for school counselors to inhabit the roles of "advocate, leader, facilitator, initiator, evaluator and collaborator" in these partnerships. While ASCA suggests tasks for school counselors in these roles such as being proactive in seeking out collaborative relationships with families and community members, specific steps or interventions towards accomplishing these tasks are not given. In reviewing this typology, school counselors may be better equipped to adopt perspectives and select interventions that will permit them to successfully inhabit these proactive, collaborative roles with family and community systems that ASCA expects.

Foundational Approach to Family Involvement

According to McCarthy (2014), the foundational approach to family involvement perspective views the home and community environments as strongly influencing the school environment. The responsibility for integrating the home, school and community environments is assumed largely by the school and school personnel such as school counselors. School counselors operating in this perspective are focused on interventions on the individual and microsystem level of Bronfenbrenner's ecological

systems model (Green & Keys, 2001). The school counselor, as a member of the school environment, generally inhabits a problem-solving role in this perspective, responding to a child's reported academic or behavioral difficulties by providing needed solutions or resources to the student/ student's family (Jones, 2013). This stance is consistent with the remediation paradigm (Amatea, 2013). Several of the interventions found in this perspective have been a long-standing part of a school counselor's work. Throughout much of the 20th century, parent training and consultation were the most prominent roles for school counselors with parents or caregivers (Evans & Carter, 1997).

School Counselor Role

As seen in Table 1, a counselor operating in the foundational approach to family involvement perspective typically takes a problem-solving role seeking to resolve a challenge demonstrated by a student through addressing a perceived challenge or difficulty in the student's caregiver or family. To do this, the school counselor assumes an expert knowledgeable role giving the student's caregivers the information and guidance that they need to resolve the problem in their child (Jones, 2013) which is in line with the remediation paradigm's philosophy of supplementing parents and caregivers' missing skills and knowledge (Amatea, 2013). This position typically requires the counselor to: (a) assess and identify parental needs for specific information and skill development through training or consultation, (b) assess children and identify specific caregivers or families concerning their need for consultation, training or therapy, (c) research the selected topic and skills, and (d) collaborate with teachers, administrators, community organizations, etc. to produce the training and track results

(Rickel, Dudley, and Berman, 1980). In line with this perspective, the ASCA National Model states all counselors should be prepared to provide consultation services, defined as sharing strategies with parents, teachers, and other stakeholders to support student achievement (ASCA, 2012). Some common interventions utilized by school counselors in this approach include parent consultation, parent education/training, and school-based family counseling (SBFC).

Parent Consultation. In school counseling, consultation is often a triadic model, where the consultant, or school counselor, works with caregivers to increase their understanding of how to best assist their child academically, socially, and behaviorally. In a study of 998 school counselors across the United States, Perera-Diltz et al. (2011), found that 79% of these school counselors currently use consultation in their practice. Of these counselors who reported using consultation, 69.3% reported that they always or often consult with students' caregivers. Traditionally, parent consultation, as performed by school counselors, has largely been an expert-driven model, wherein the counselor is positioned as an expert who possesses needed information and/or advice for caregivers (Perera-Diltz et al., 2011). More recently, a collaborative model of consultation has emerged that positions the counselor as a team member with caregivers, where the goal of the team is to collaboratively define the problem and produce goals, solutions and plans together (Jones, 2013; Perera-Diltz et al., 2011).

In schools, the overarching goal of parent consultation is to empower caregivers to assist students in their development in academic, personal, social and career development (ASCA, 2009). Common to most of these forms of consultation are the following processes: a) rapport building, b) problem-identification, c) intervention

planning, d) implementation of intervention where strategies are tested and e) evaluation of the intervention and a follow-up process which involves assessing the outcome of the consultation process (Perera-Diltz et al., 2011). Even in collaborative consultation models, the consultant, or school counselor often initiates the consultation process based on a student's behavioral, academic and social functioning as observed in a school setting. As the school counselor traditionally has more knowledge of the basic processes and steps of consultation and problem-solving, the school counselor often is in charge of facilitating the process, including facilitating the definition and assessment of the problem, identification of school-based strategies to influence or resolve a problem and he evaluation of the problem.

A majority of the research involving parent consultation has been focused on group consultation and conjoint behavioral consultation. Multiple studies have been conducted demonstrating the effectiveness of conjoint behavioral consultation in reducing symptoms of childhood emotional and behavioral disorders such as anxiety, aggression, anger outbursts, social skill deficits and attention deficit issues (Auster, Feeney-Kettler & Kratochwill, 2006; Dunson, Hughes & Jackson, 1994).

Parent Education/ Training. Parent educational programs are some of the most traditional and oldest modes of school counselor intervention with families (Gerrard, 2008). Planning and conducting these programs has also been one of the most recognizable and visible roles for school counselors' work with families .These programs have taken various forms and have had multiple definitions throughout the past century. In examining the nature of these types of educational programs, it is important to make a distinction between parent education, parent training and family

therapy. As Lamb and Lamb (1975) explained: “Therapy typically focuses on the affective domain while education and training work with the cognitive” (p. 4).

According to Hoard & Shepard (2005), although parent training and parent education are terms that are often used interchangeably in education literature and research, parent training aims to intervene in a student’s or family’s current or existing problem or condition, while parent education programs are largely preventive in nature and seek to prevent the development of behavioral, emotional and academic difficulties in children. While the goals of these programs may differ, both parent education and training programs involve working with a group of caregivers in order to convey information and skills that can aid these caregivers in better supporting their children’s academic, behavioral, social and emotional progress (Hoard & Shepard, 2005). Assisting parents in improving their parenting skills and supporting their children’s academic, behavioral, social and emotional functioning has been a concern for much of the past century, and school-based parent training programs have been suggested as a way through which this can be accomplished (Hoard & Shepard, 2005).

Research on the traditional uses of parent education and training peaked in the 1980’s and early 1990’s. Researchers reported positive changes in children of parents who participated in various parent education programs in schools including improvements in students’ cognitive ability, academic performance and achievement (Slaughter, 1985; Dembo, Sweitzer & Lauritzen, 1985; Pfannenstiel & Seltzer, 1989). For example, Dembo et al. (1985) conducted a review of 48 investigations into three different types of parent education programs: Adlerian, behavioral and Parent Effectiveness Training (PET). Their review found that significant positive changes in

parental attitudes towards child-rearing and in the caregivers' children's behaviors were evident in each of the parent education programs, though Adlerian programs yielded more consistent results in positive caregiver attitude change than the other programs. In a study of Adlerian-based parenting education programs, Mullis (1999) found that 97% of the parents who participated in these programs reported positive changes in their communication and interaction with their children, and 84% reported a positive change in their children's behaviors.

The goals of parent education programs are similar to the goals of any training program that seeks to enhance or improve one's existing skills. According to Lamb and Lamb (1975) the traditional goals of a parent education program are: (a) to assist caregivers in the early identification of children with particular needs, (b) to resolve any identified difficulties or problems for the child and (c) to improve or increase general parenting skills for community members. The majority of these programs have focused on either preventing or resolving children's mental health issues (Hoard & Shepard, 2005).

While different types of parent education and training programs have existed and do currently exist, there are several generalizations that can be made about these programs as they relate to their delivery by school counselors. First, these types of programs are normally short-term and time-limited. They are also often task-oriented and focus on obtaining or improving specific skills (Winton, Sloop & Rodriguez, 1999). Parent education and training progams can be implemented by any educator, but have been traditionally included in the job descriptions and expectations for a school counselor (Lamb & Lamb, 1975).

School-Based Family Counseling. For the purpose of this paper, school-based family counseling (SBFC) is defined as: An integration of school counseling and family counseling models within a broad-based systems meta-model that is used to conceptualize the child's problems in the context of all his or her interpersonal networks: family, per group, classroom, school and community (Gerrard, 2008). As per this definition, the goal of SBFC is to resolve a child's academic or behavioral difficulties by affecting and reinforcing positive change within the child's family. It is implied here that these positive changes will ultimately affect the child in the home and school environments as well (Gerrard, 2008). While SBFC is not necessarily always the role of the school counselor, it can and has been performed by school counselors.

According to Evans and Carter (1997), the nature of SBFC calls for a counselor to be a neutral party who elicits the viewpoints of and advocates for each party's perspective, including the school, the family, and the child. Throughout this process, the ultimate goal is to resolve a child's academic difficulties and improve his or her academic performance. A child's behavioral or academic problems are conceptualized as having their origin in the school environment (Evans & Carter, 1997). A child's difficulties may also be viewed as a result of the child being caught in the middle of dysfunctional or inadequate pattern of communication between adults at home or at school. SBFC may also be used with other counseling methodologies such as consultation with school personnel or individual counseling.

While there are few current empirical studies assessing the effects of specific SBFC programs, the literature shows the effectiveness of SBFC in a range of behavioral and emotional issues in students including depression (Woods, 2005; Stark, Brookman,

& Frazier, 1990), academic difficulties (Stone & Peeks, 1986; Taylor, 1986) and trauma (Kruczek, 2013). In a review of the SBFC literature, which was found to be largely descriptive in nature, Gerrard (2008) identified several benefits of SBFC for schools: decreased misbehavior for students at home, improved academic performance for students, decrease in emotional and behavioral problems in students, cost effectiveness, and improved relationships between schools and caregivers with students experiencing academic and behavioral difficulties at school. While researchers continued to call for increased emphasis on family systems training for school counselors due to these positive results, many studies found that school counselors did not receive adequate training in family systems or family counseling (Goldenburg & Goldenburg, 1991; Hinkle, 1993; Hinkle & Wells, 1995). In a national survey of 189 school counseling programs, Perusse, Goodnough, & Noel (2001), reported that 51.9% of school counseling students in these programs were not required to take a family counseling or family systems theory course in their programs of study.

Family Role

In this perspective caregivers are expected to assume several roles. First, they are expected to recognize a need for and accept assistance in resolving their child's problem (Jones, 2013). They are also expected to recognize and connect the benefits of these types of assistance to their child's improved academic progress. Additionally, caregivers are expected to recognize school counselors' expertise and trust that they can provide them with the needed information, ideas and resources in order to solve the student or family's presenting problem. Finally, caregivers are expected to attend and actively engage in consultation, training or therapy activities and then apply the skills

and information that they have learned in a consistent and appropriate manner in their home (Hoard & Shepard, 2005). The foundational approach to family involvement emphasizes the important role of the family in student success, and school counselors operating in this perspective provide resources and support for families in order to boost student achievement (Jones, 2013).

Building Perspective

Although both the family relationship-building perspective and foundational perspective target families, individual students and their microsystems, in their interventions, the way that roles are structured are quite different (Green & Keys, 2001). In addition to viewing students' families in terms of their strengths and resources, school counselors seek to more actively share the expert role with the student and/or caregiver (Jones, 2013). This approach, consistent with a collaboration paradigm, often requires the school counselor to restructure existing interventions to reflect this concept of seeking solutions to problems alongside the family. Thus, this perspective focuses largely on building relationships between school personnel, particularly school counselors, and families (Jones, 2013). Included here are a variety of approaches and models, including Epstein's model of family involvement, family-school problem solving and other strength-based family systems approaches.

Epstein's model of family involvement, particularly the *overlapping spheres* of influence model developed by Epstein and others in the 1980's, embodies the strength-based, relationship building characteristics of this perspective. This model suggests that the three contexts of school, home and the community are overlapping spheres that jointly influence children, their families and relationships (Epstein, 1987). This model

also establishes six types of involvement for schools to promote in working with families and communities: parenting, communicating, learning, volunteering, decision-making, and collaborating with the community (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010).

School Counselor Role

As indicated in Table 1, the school counselor has several explicit roles in this perspective. First, a school counselor is expected to affirm a family's vital role in their child's education and to highlight and utilize a child's and family's strengths in promoting a student's academic, behavioral and social progress in school. The school counselor in this perspective is also expected to co-create and promote new, collaborative roles for involvement for students and families (Jones, 2013). Amatea and West-Olatunji (2007) describe emerging leadership roles that school counselors can enact with families, particularly in high poverty schools. These roles include acting as a *cultural bridge* between teachers and families by blocking blame of families and modeling strength-based perspectives and interventions, assisting teachers in connecting their curriculum to information that is accessible and relatable to students and their families, and joining with teachers and other school personnel to create an overarching school climate that is welcoming to students' caregivers and families (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007). School counselors using this approach may utilize interventions such as family-school problem solving.

Family-School Problem Solving. Collaborative family problem-solving approaches involve the school counselor positioning him or herself as an equal partner with the family. In these interventions, the school counselor approaches problem-solving with the family as utilizing a family's unique strengths and resources to improve a child's

academic, behavioral or social functioning, rather than using specific techniques to remedy deficits in the child or family (Amatea, Smith-Adcock & Villares, 2006). Rather than addressing where a family's or child's problems originate, the school counselor seeks to use the family's strengths to not only remedy a child's current difficulties, but also to initiate growth in the family and prevent future difficulties for the child (Amatea et al., 2006).

A specific application of this strength-based collaborative problem-solving approach can be seen through the implementation of a family-school problem solving meeting, as described by Amatea & Cholewa (2013). A family-school problem-solving meeting presents an alternative to the traditional parent-teacher conferences, wherein the caregivers are called in by a teacher due to a perceived problem with the child. In the traditional form of these meetings, the meetings are initiated by school personnel, they are brief, problem-focused, a solution is normally suggested or discussed by the teacher and the child is normally not included in the meeting (Amatea & Cholewa, 2013). In a collaborative family-school problem-solving meeting, the caregivers and teachers are involved, but the child, school counselor and any other school personnel that the caregivers or child request may be present (Amatea & Cholewa, 2013). From the beginning, the family and student are apprised of the collaborative problem-solving process and structure, and their expected participatory roles. Throughout the meeting, the school personnel position themselves as team members with the student and his or her family as the school personnel seek to highlight and use the family and student's strengths to improve the child's functioning in school (Amatea & Cholewa , 2013). The school counselor and other school personnel are tasked with blocking any blame in the

meeting, focus on family strengths and resources and collaboratively defining the problem and brainstorming solutions with the student and family, and ensuring that each participant, including the student voice their perspective and ideas.

Amatea, Daniels, Bringman, & Vandiver (2004) describe a school staff's implementation of a family school problem-solving meeting format at a K-12 university research school. The researchers found that caregivers who participated in these meetings reported having a more positive perspective of the school personnel involved. These caregivers reported increased beliefs in the school personnel's care and affection for their child and their ability to help their child succeed.

Family Role

Throughout this perspective, caregivers are expected to be open to and accepting of invitations for school involvement and open to these new methods of involvement with school personnel. They should view themselves as having an important role in collaboration with the school in supporting their child's education (Amatea, 2013). Caregivers are expected to accept that the home environment is an important influence on their child's academic performance and that co-creating engagement opportunities are a vital role for them to enact. Finally, caregivers are expected to feel empowered to share their knowledge and viewpoints with school counselors. Thus, parents would enact roles as co-communicators with the school in which they share information that would enhance their children's academic performance and learning (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001). Like in the foundational approach to family involvement, the family relationship-building perspective emphasizes the important contributions families make in their student's success; however, school

counselors operating from the family relationship-building perspective rely more heavily on family expertise and resources than in some other perspectives.

Community Needs Perspective

The third perspective, community needs, reflects the view that interaction between schools, communities and families, known as Bronfenbrenner's mesosystem (Green & Keys, 2001), is a vital function for a child's academic success (McCarthy, 2014). Rather than responding to a specific child or family's needs, this perspective calls for the school to respond to the general needs of families in the community served by the school to improve students' academic performance. In this perspective the school counselor is to initiate contact with families and community services to develop programs for family and community involvement. The school counselor also positions himself or herself as addressing perceived problems or deficits in the families living in the specific community served by the school, as seen in the remediation paradigm (Amatea, 2013). Schools may operate as full-service entities that provide needed resources for families and the community as a whole. In this perspective, schools and school counselors are to address the unique needs of culturally and linguistically diverse families and communities.

School Counselor Role

Bryan and Henry (2008), call for school counselors to be knowledgeable of the needs and resources for marginalized families. In order to help them feel engaged in the school environment and assess their needs, school counselors are encouraged to utilize a family-centered approach when working with these families. As seen in Table 1, school counselors working from this perspective are expected to address family and

student strengths and community needs. School counselors may often be expected to conduct needs assessments with administrators, teachers and staff to ascertain experiences, beliefs and attitudes concerning family and community needs. School counselors working in this perspective also strive to make themselves visible and accessible to students and their families (Walker, Shenker, & Hoover-Dempsey, 2010).

Full-Service Schools. The term, *full-service school*, was first used in legislation in the state of Florida in 1991. Defined by Dryfoos (1996,) full service schools are "One-stop centers where educational, physical, psychological and social requirements of students and their families are addressed in a rational, holistic fashion…" (p. 1). This model was developed in order to serve the academic, physical, emotional and social needs of students and their families (Evans & Carter, 1997). It features school-based service models to assist students and families in receiving comprehensive health, educational and social services. This full-service school model was especially designed to target at-risk students and families in lower SES communities (Evans & Carter, 1997). It is not only designed to ensure that families can access important services, but also to position the school as an important resource for the community and to send the message that the school cares about the members of the community. Community resources such as various social service and medical providers are either embedded in or have access to schools. Many full-service schools offer services such as immigration and employment assistance, and counseling to caregivers and other family members, in addition to providing services to students enrolled in the school. Buildings are often open earlier and stay open later than normal school hours for easier access to families.

Conducting research on full-service schools has been problematic due to the variation in services offered and the relatively small number of these types of schools in existence (Dryfoos, 1996). The research that is available has focused primarily on evaluating the effectiveness of components of these full-service schools such as school-based medical clinics or resource centers for families. In a review of the literature on these full-service components, Dryfoos (1996) reported that schools that contained an on-site health clinic reported increased student attendance, lower student dropout rates and lower rates of substance abuse among students. In a case study of an elementary school in New York that housed various services such as a health clinic, family therapy and casework and parent education, Santiago, Ferrara and Blank (2008) reported higher attendance of students and improvement in reading and math scores. Santiago et al. described increased caregiver involvement in this school, including involvement in classrooms, advisory boards and school cultural events. These researchers also reported positive changes in the school's community including a decrease in neighborhood violence rates and a decrease in community vandalism (Santiago et al., 2008).

One general goal of this perspective is to ensure that individual students' needs are met in school, home and community environments to ensure their optimal academic achievement. This is often accomplished by devising ways for family and community members to feel involved in the school environment. Finally, this perspective places importance on developing parent and community leaders within the school environment.

Family Role

Caregivers' and community members' roles in this perspective often seem to be passive at first until they are invited into an equal engagement with school and community environments. Their role may then shift into a more active one, but one that is still often designed and provided for by the school. Ideally, through this perspective, caregivers recognize and accept the role that the home and community environments play in a child's academic success. An essential aspect of caregivers' roles here is to provide input to schools regarding the needs of their children and families so that schools can make decisions regarding required services (Amatea, 2013). Also inherent in this perspective is the assumption that caregivers and community members are willing and able to engage in multiple roles and involvement in the school environment and that they will respond positively to invitations for involvement. Caregivers must also be willing to access needed community resources through the school environment (Amatea, 2013). In the community needs perspective, the focus, much like in the Foundational perspective, is identifying needs and providing needed resources and programs. In contrast to the Foundational perspective the target is not only individual students and their families, it is also the surrounding community, with the belief that systemic interventions, while broader, may have a farther-reaching effect.

Community Development Perspective

Throughout the past decade, research has increasingly focused on suggesting collaborative roles for school counselors with families and communities and has encouraged school counselors to be leaders in enacting change in schools (Davis & Lambie, 2005; Bryan & Henry, 2008; Walker et al., 2010; Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010).

The final perspective presented here, the community development perspective, suggests major changes in how school staff members view family and community involvement (McCarthy, 2014). It is largely a conceptual perspective, though some of the roles and interventions described in this perspective have begun to be enacted and evaluated. Though it has some similarities with the previous perspective, namely a focus on the mesosystem level, it differs in that, in this perspective, the school does not have full control and responsibility to create the roles that family and community members inhabit. Rather, family and community members are invited and expected to help identify and develop their collaborative roles in the schools. These roles are not only meant to be equal and active roles, but also proactive and preventive, rather than responsive roles as previous perspectives provide for. In this perspective, power and responsibility reside in the school counselors, faculty, students, family members and community members equally. Through this perspective, the school environment is seen as welcoming, open and accessible to students, their family members, and community members.

The main goal for this perspective is for school, family and community members to feel responsible for each other's success and effectiveness. Collaboration is seen as necessary not just for the child's academic success but for the overall systemic health and success of the school, family and community. For this to occur, this perspective aims for school boundaries to become more permeable, allowing for a more welcoming and empowering atmosphere for family and community members (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). A secondary goal is for school counselors to be flexible and take different roles and approaches in working with school staff and in working with family and

community members (Walker et al., 2010). This perspective also strives for new roles and interventions to be developed and suggested by all school, family and community members.

In this perspective, the school is asked to assess the attitudes of families and school personnel towards family involvement in schools, possible barriers in family involvement, differences in beliefs, values and culture between school personnel and families in the community and teachers' perceptions of current and ideal family involvement practices (Walker et al., 2010; Bryan & Henry, 2008). Throughout these various assessments, school personnel are expected to use a strengths-based perspective which allows them to avoid seeing families through a deficit-based lens, particularly culturally and financially diverse families (Bryan & Henry, 2008). Schools and school personnel are also expected to address topics such as, increasing multicultural awareness, promoting awareness of the strengths of and challenges facing nontraditional families, and improving communication skills in order to help foster a school's collaborative climate (Walker et al., 2010).

School Counselor Role

As seen in Table 1, the school counselor has much responsibility in this perspective, but rather than directing programs and interventions as in other perspectives, he or she is tasked with seeking to actively disseminate and share power and control with students, family and community members (Jones, 2013). The school counselor is expected to learn about caregivers' and caregivers' goals for their child, their perspective of their child's strengths and abilities, their culture and values, etc., so as to form a holistic view of a student (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). This information

is then to be shared with school personnel so that they can learn about students' families and communities. In addition to obtaining and sharing information about families, school counselors are expected to take a leadership role in the school environment in promoting new methods of involving and collaborating with families. Walker et al., (2010) suggest that school counselors are uniquely qualified for this role due to their knowledge of counseling theories and interventions, their frequent interaction with a wide variety of school personnel, and their multi-year involvement with students.

School counselors can also assist in creating a more open and welcoming school environment through promoting trainings in interpersonal communication skills and cultivating a strength-based perspective and through promoting open forums in the school for family and community members to share their ideas, concerns and perspectives. School counselors can also assist with anticipating and addressing barriers for family and community involvement in schools by advocating for alternative scheduling for meetings and school activities, arranging for child care during school activities, and advocating for school personnel to arrange home visits with students' families (Walker et al., 2010). Finally, school counselors can advocate for their training and continuing education to include more comprehensive courses on family systems and consultation training and could seek out family-based supervision to increase their competence in collaborating with families (Nejedlo, 1992; Bodenhorn, 2005).

Family Role

Caregivers and students have a very active role in this perspective. Overall, they are expected to actively engage in school and community activities as an equal partner

with school personnel and community members. Walker et al. (2010) propose that this may be demonstrated in several different ways. Caregivers can position themselves as leaders and educators in the schools by sharing their skills, interests and perspectives with school personnel and students; or they can serve as family liaisons for the schools by acting as greeters, interpreters and parent advocates. Caregivers can also seek to share their knowledge of their child's goals, strengths, challenges and learning styles with school personnel in order to optimize their child's learning opportunities (Walker et al., 2010). This perspective is dependent on family and community members feeling empowered to suggest new roles for themselves within the school environment. This can be accomplished through caregivers and family members seeking regular communication with school personnel.

Implications for Practice

While the interventions housed in this typology have been previously researched and/or discussed, there are implications for school counselors concerning both assessment and service delivery. The differing targets and alignments for school counselors, as presented in this typology, can act as a guide for school counselors who wish to integrate more collaborative and systemic practices. These implications highlight the need for and possible uses of this typology in the development and implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program.

Assessment

The existence of such divergent goals and role expectations, such as those characterizing these four perspectives, means that there is a greater possibility of role confusion and role conflict. This underscores the importance of school counselors

identifying the perspective in which their current practices of engaging students' caregivers and families fall. This evaluation may allow school counselors and other school personnel to assess if their current perspective fits with their ultimate goals of family and community involvement for their school program.

There is also a need for school counselors to identify the perspective in which their school has been operating and assess the school's expectations concerning faculty, staff and school counselor involvement with students' families and community. In this way, a school counselor can identify current efforts to interact with families and can find realistic steps for improvement. It could be valuable for the school counselor to assess the expectations of other school personnel concerning their specific roles as well as the school counselor's role in working with students' families. Identifying disparities that may exist between expected practices and current practices of school personnel in engaging family and community members could assist schools in taking steps to present a more unified and comprehensive school climate.

Several different assessments and evaluation tools exist to assess or evaluate current family involvement practices in schools. Many are surveys that evaluate teachers, students, and caregivers' opinions of current school practices, such as Sheldon & Epstein's (2007) surveys on parent and community involvement. Checklists, such as Muscott & Mann's (2004) family engagement checklist, offer schools a way to self-evaluate their family engagement practices. Schools often use proprietary non-validated checklists or assessments with which to evaluate family engagement practices. While these tools may provide some feedback from students, caregivers, and school personnel, they rarely allow school personnel to categorize their practices in a

way that offers a clear view of the types of interventions that are being used, and goals for having more collaborative practices.

McCarthy's (2014) typology may act as a starting point for school counselors to conduct a self-assessment on their family engagement practices, particularly the assessment of whether one is currently working with families in a manner that fits his or her goals for engagement. Based on the typology, the following questions could allow for school counselors to situate their current and ideal practices in a particular perspective:

- Which perspective categorizes my current practices/interventions?
- Who do I wish to target (individual student/family vs. community/system)?
- What am I hoping to accomplish with these interventions?
- Which intervention will best fit the school climate?
- Which intervention will best fit the families' expectations?
- Which perspective allows me to meet my goals for family engagement?
- In which perspective am I most comfortable working?
- If I'm not working in the perspective that meets my goals, how can I alter an intervention to begin shifting my practice to another perspective?

These questions imply a need for a formal assessment based on these four perspectives that could allow a school counselor to situate his or her practices in a particular perspective. Additionally, it is important to note that not all perspectives are compatible with each school counselor's training, theoretical perspective, school setting, and personality. It is important for a school counselor to be able to identify whether their school's current or ideal perspective differs from their own preferred perspective. Due to the variety of interventions available to school counselors in working with families,

professional development opportunities or trainings can be imperative if one is seeking to change the perspective in which one is working with families. Needs assessments of school personnel could allow for school counselors to prepare more comprehensive trainings from which all personnel can benefit.

In addition to assessing the expectations of school personnel for school counselor's practice in engaging families, it may be valuable to assess the expectations of the caregivers and families themselves. How do the families expect to interact with their child's school counselor? What do caregivers think that their role should be in supporting their child's academic, behavioral and social development? A school counselor who can be aware of these four perspectives could also benefit from assessing the acceptance of students' families towards the various perspectives, and particularly the perspectives' inherent roles for these families. It is important for a school counselor to know if families are comfortable with the current working perspective or with a school counselor's preferred perspective. Gauging families' reactions to these perspectives directly can allow for a more efficient working arrangement and more buy-in and participation from students' families and communities.

Service Delivery

Once school counselors have assessed their own perspective, as well as the perspectives of families and other school staff, they may choose to restructure their current direct and indirect service delivery practices in order to create more engaged roles for families. While revamping the entire school climate related to family engagement is likely an unrealistic goal, school counselors can begin immediately

taking smaller steps towards creating a more collaborative school environment to engage families.

When providing direct services to students, school counselors have many opportunities to incorporate more collaboration in their work. School counselors who hope to be more collaborative can communicate with the family more regularly, utilizing families' expertise and incorporating their suggestions into the treatment or behavior plan for the student. Additionally, school counselors can adopt a systems lens for understanding student strengths, student needs, and student achievement.

For example, when scheduling a meeting to address specific student needs, school counselors may choose to use a more collaborative format, such as Amatea & Cholewa's (2013) suggested use of the Family-School Problem Solving Meeting (FSPSM), to establish a more equal partnership with families for decision-making. FSPSMs are designed as an alternative to traditional remediation meetings in which school personnel offer ideas or a plan to address student needs to a student's caregiver. In contrast the FSPSM provide opportunities for school personnel, the student, and the student's family to create a plan collaboratively. This is designed to be a strength-based process in which each participant is expected to contribute their perspective of the problem as well as possible solutions. Through these meetings, family members, as well as the child himself are able to provide input and have their perspective heard by school personnel (Amatea & Cholewa, 2013).

Alternately, in lieu of traditional parent-teacher conferences, the school counselor can support faculty in preparing students and families for student-led conferences, which allow students to engage in a meaningful conversation with families about their

learning (Bailey & Guskey, 2000; Amatea & Dolan, 2013). Where traditional parent-teacher conferences are led by the teacher and involve a report of the child's classroom behavior and academic performance, student-led conferences provide an opportunity for a student to take a leadership role in this process by presenting a portfolio of their work to their family. With support from the teacher or school counselor, the student and his or her caregivers identify the student's academic strengths as well as goals for improvement and an action plan for achievement of these goals.

Training

A review of this literature also speaks to a need to further define terms such as collaboration, family involvement, and partnerships and how these terms are defined and used in each perspective (McCarthy, 2014). It could especially be helpful to determine how these terms are used and defined by counselor educators, school counselors, and other school personnel. An analysis of the definition and use of these terms and concepts in existing literature and research in each perspective could also be useful in determining the similarities and differences surrounding them across the various perspectives. Researchers may also want to be more selective in defining and utilizing these terms in the future, especially according to the perspective in which they are working or studying.

The current CACREP accreditation standards do not require school counselors to complete a graduate level course in family-school collaboration; however, the ASCA National Model states that school counselors should provide indirect services for students, including consultation and collaboration with parents (ASCA, 2012). According to ASCA, school counselors should collaborate through teaming and partnering with

parents, staff, businesses, and community organizations to support student achievement and ensure equal access for students (ASCA, 2012). Although The ASCA National Model suggests that school counselors should work in collaboration with parents, little guidance is given on how to team or partner with parents and community members. Additionally, in its position statement on family-school-community partnerships, ASCA (2016) calls for school counselors to work to clear away barriers to successful partnerships with families and community members, such as miscommunication between stakeholders. Adding specific coursework in family-community-school collaboration to school counseling programs would allow counselor educators to provide preservice school counselors with the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively collaborate with students, families, and community stakeholders.

Implications for Research

The categorization of these school counseling perspectives for working with families can especially benefit from and be used to inform future research. School counseling and family school collaboration researchers can utilize these perspectives in future research by first identifying the perspective for which they are advocating and with which they most identify. Not only could this assist consumers of this research to more easily understand the researcher's point of view, but it could allow the researchers themselves to more clearly identify the roles and attitudes inherent to this perspective. Existence of these perspectives also indicates a need for researchers to critically assess the perspectives that are inherent in the literature and references that they use. In particular, they may want to analyze if these resources are consistent with the perspective the researcher is studying or for which they are advocating.

Further research is needed on several aspects of these perspectives. There certainly seems to be a need for research on how the fourth perspective, the community development perspective, is transitioning from conceptual proposals to practical application. It could be important to also conduct more active research on this perspective and how it is currently being applied in schools. Which elements of this perspective are currently being implemented? What are the barriers that exist to the concepts inherent to this perspective and/ or the specific interventions? Are school counselors currently being trained in a way that allows them to be familiar with the concepts and interventions of the community development perspective? Answering these questions could allow for more effective use of this typology as a guide for more effective family and community engagement.

Additionally, further research is needed to evaluate the implications for practice included in this paper. While research supports the use of many of the included assessments and intervention strategies, it is unclear how these assessments and interventions directly impact family engagement and student achievement. Data supporting the use of such assessments and interventions would allow school counselors to advocate for increased attention to family engagement and collaboration in schools.

References

Amatea, E. S. (Ed.) (2013) *Building culturally responsive family-school relationships* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Amatea, E. S., & Cholewa, B. (2013). Engaging in collaborative problem solving with families. In Amatea, E. S. (Ed). *Building culturally responsive family-school relationships* (2nd ed.) (pp. 271-297). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Amatea, E., & Clark, M. (2005). Changing schools, changing counselors: A qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. Professional School Counseling, 9(1), 16-27.

Amatea, E. S., Daniels, H., Bringman, N., & Vandiver, F. M. (2004). Strengthening counselor-teacher-family connections: The family-school collaborative consultation project. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(1), 47-55.

Amatea, E. S., & Dolan, K. (2013). Fostering student and family engagement in learning through student-led parent conferences. In Amatea, E. (Ed). *Building culturally responsive family-school relationships* (2nd ed) (pp. 246-270). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Amatea, E. S., Smith-Adcock, S., & Villares, E. (2006). From family deficit to family strength: Viewing families' contributions to children's learning from a family resilience perspective. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(3), 177-189.

Amatea, E. S., & West-Olatunji, C. S. (2007). Joining the conversation about educating our poorest children: Emerging leadership roles for school counselors in high-poverty schools. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(2), 81-89.

American School Counselor Association. (2012). *ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs.* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCA.

American School Counselor Association (2016). *The school counselor and school-family-community partnerships.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/PositionStatements/PS_Partnerships.pdf

Auster, E. R., Feeney-Kettler, K. A., & Kratochwill, T. R. (2006). Conjoint behavioral consultation: Application to the school-based treatment of anxiety disorders. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *29*(2), 243-256.

Bailey, J. M., & Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Implementing student-led conferences*. Corwin Press.

Bemak, F. (2000). Transforming the role of the counselor to provide leadership in education reform through collaboration. *Professional School Counseling, 3*(5), 323-31.

Bodenhorn, N. (2005). American school counselor association ethical code changes relevant to family work. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 13*(3), 316-320.

Bryan, J. A., & Henry, L. (2008). Strengths-based partnerships: A school-family-community partnership approach to empowering students. *Professional School Counseling*, *12*(2), 149-156.

Cheadle, J. E. & Amato, P. R. (2011). A quantitative assessment of Lareau's qualitative conclusions about class, race, and parenting. *Journal of Family Issues, 32*(5), 679-706.

Christenson, S. L., & Sheridan, S. M. (2001). *Schools and families: Creating essential connections for learning.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Davis, K. M., & Lambie, G. W. (2005). Family Engagement: A collaborative, systemic approach for middle school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(2), 144-151.

Dembo, M. H., Sweitzer, M., & Lauritzen, P. (1985). An evaluation of group parent education: Behavioral, PET, and Adlerian programs. *Review of Educational Research, 55*(2), 155-200.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1996). Full-service schools. *Education Leadership, 53*(7), 18-23.

Dunson, R. M., Hughes, J. N., & Jackson, T. W. (1994). Effect of behavioral consultation on student and teacher behavior. *Journal of School Psychology, 32*(3), 247-266.

Epstein, J. L. (1987). Toward a theory of family-school connections: Teacher practices and parent involvement. In K. Hurrelman, F. Kaufmann, & F. Losel (Eds.), *Social intervention: Potential and constraints* (pp.121-136). New York, NY: DeGruyter.

Epstein, J. L., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2010). School counselors' roles in developing partnerships with families and communities for student success. *Professional School Counseling*, *14*(1), 1-14.

Evans, W. P., & Carter, M. J. (1997). Urban school-based family counseling: Role definition, practice applications, and training implications. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 75*(5), 366-374.

Gerrard, B. (2008). School-based family counseling: Overview, trends, and recommendations for future research. *International Journal for School-Based Family Counseling, 1*(1), 6-24.

Goldenburg, I., & Goldenburg, H. (1991). *Family therapy: Overview* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Books/Cole.

Green, A., & Keys, S. (2001). Expanding the developmental school counseling paradigm: Meeting the needs of the 21st century student. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(2), 84-96.

Hill, N. E., & Taylor, L. C. (2004). Parental school involvement and children's academic achievement: Pragmatics and issues. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13*(4), 161-164.

Hinkle, J. S. (1993). Training school counselors to do family counseling. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 27*, 252-257.

Hinkle, J. S., & Wells, M. E. (1995). Family counseling in the schools: Effective strategies and interventions for counselors, psychologists and therapists. University of North Carolina at Greensboro: ERIC/CASS Publications.

Hoard, D., Shepard, K. N. (2005). Parent education as parent centered prevention: A review of school related outcomes. *School Psychology. Quarterly, 20*(4), 434-454.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Walker, J. M. T., Sandler, H. M., Whetsel, D., Green, C. L., Wilkins, A. S., & Closson, K. (2005). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal, 106*(2), 105-130.

Jeynes, W. (2011). Help families by fostering parental involvement. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(3), 48.

Jones, J. M. (2013) Family, school, and community partnerships. Historical developments in collaboration: A shift in thinking. In D. Shriberg, S. Y. Song, A. H. Miranda, and K. M. Radliff (Eds.). *School psychology and social justice: Conceptual foundations and tools for practice* (pp. 270-293). New York, NY*:* Routledge.

Kruczek, T. (2013). Family involvement in SBFC treatment of childhood trauma. In M. Soriano and B. Gerrard (Eds.), *Handbook of School-Based Family Counseling: Transforming Family-School Relationships.* San Bruno, CA: Institute for School-Based Family Counseling.

Lamb, J., & Lamb, W. A. (1975). *Parent education and elementary counseling*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Mapp, K. L., & Kuttner, P. J. (2013). Partners in education: A dual capacity-building framework for family–school partnerships. *SEDL Advancing Research Improving Education*.

McCarthy, S. N. (2014). *The evolution of school counseling students' perspectives concerning family-school involvement throughout their field experience* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (Order No. 3691351).

Mullis, F. (1999). Active parenting: An evaluation of two Adlerian parent education programs. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 55*, 225-232.

Muscott, H. S., & Mann, E. (2004). *Family engagement checklist*. Bedford, NH: New Hampshire Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports at SERESC.

Nejedlo, B. (1992, September). *Vision and vocation in school counseling.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, San Antonio, TX.

Perera-Diltz, D. M., Moe, J. L., & Mason, K. L. (2011). An exploratory study in school counselor consultation engagement. *Journal of School Counseling, 9*(13). Retrieved from http://www.jsc.montana.edu/articles/v9n13.pdf

Perusse, R., Goodnough, G. E., & Noel, C. J. (2001). A national survey of school counselor preparation programs: Screening methods, faculty experiences, curricular content, and fieldwork requirements. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(1), 49-55.

Pfannenstiel, J. C., & Seltzer, D. A. (1989). New parents as teachers: Evaluation of an early parent education program. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 4*(1), 1-18.

Rickel, A. U., Dudley, G., & Berman, S. (1980). An evaluation of parent training. *Evaluation Review, 4*(3), 389-403.

Santiago, E., Ferrara, J., & Blank, M. (2008). A full-service school. *Educational Leadership, 65*(7), 44-47.

Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein, J. L. (2007). *Parent survey on family and community involvement in the elementary and middle grades*. Baltimore, MD: Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships, Johns Hopkins University.

Slaughter, S. (1985). From serving students to serving the economy: Changing expectations of faculty role performance. *Higher Education*, *14*(1), 41-56.

Stark, K. D., Brookman, C. S., & Frazier, R. (1993). A multicomponent program to reduce depression in the school setting. In J. J. Cohen & M. C. Fish (Eds.) *Handbook of school based interventions* (pp. 253- 255). New York: Jossey Bass.

Stone, G., & Peeks, B. (1986). The use of strategic family therapy in the school setting: A case study. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 65*, 200-203.

Taylor, D. (1986). The child as go between: Consulting with parents and teachers. *Journal of Family Therapy, 8*(1), 79-89.

Walker, J. M., Shenker, S. S. & Hoover-Dempsey, K. V. (2010). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? Implications for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 14*(1), 27-41.

Winton, P. J., Sloop, S., & Rodriguez, P. (1999). Parent education: A term whose time is past. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 19*(3), 157-161.

Woods, B. (2005). *A school-based preventive depression programme trial*. Proceedings of the 2005 Oxford Symposium in SBFC. San Bruno, CA: Institute for School-Based Family Counseling.