ABSTRACT
This study explored the emergence and implementation of Full Service Schools (FSS) in Western Australia. It utilised a collective case study approach of three established FSS sites from which the experiences of people most involved in their establishment and implementation were sought. Full service schools for the context of this research are defined as “Schools that provide a range of services and activities, often beyond the school day, to help meet the needs of children, their families and the wider community” (Department for Children, Schools and Families 2008) and “Onestop centres where the educational, physical, psychological and social requirements of students and their families are addressed in a rational, holistic fashion” (Dryfoos 1996: 15).

Full service schools have been in existence in various forms internationally, mostly prevalent in US and UK, since the early 1990s (Dryfoos et. Al. 2005). Within Australia their development commenced in late 1990s (Australian Centre for Equity Through Education 1998), in order to develop the school as a central “community hub” for whatever education, health, social/human, and/or employment services have been determined locally to be needed to support a child’s success in school and in the community (Calfee et. al. 1998).

The development of these schools has been in response to the needs of children and their families that exist which conventional schooling systems cannot meet. A significant proportion of children and young people have complex social, health, emotional and cultural needs, often associated with socioeconomic disadvantage which cannot be met in isolation or by institutions acting alone. Schools cannot ensure a quality education for children and young people without specialist service delivery and support.” (Education Foundation Division & Black 2010)

Although each school developed differently according to its resources and circumstances, commonalities across the schools were found to be the importance of systemic change, leadership and partnerships. The research theorises that a theory of change which conceptualises how outcomes may be assessed is a useful tool for schools wishing to implement a FSS.
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CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

‘A significant proportion of children and young people have complex social, health, emotional and cultural needs, often associated with socioeconomic disadvantage which cannot be met in isolation or by institutions acting alone. Schools cannot ensure a quality education for children and young people without specialist service delivery and support.’

(Education Foundation Division & Black, 2010:5)

When I first started as Principal in my current school, children were coming to school hungry and clothed inadequately for the weather. They were falling asleep in the classroom because of the disruption at home. What was happening in this place with these children and their families which led to an eight year old child pull out a knife in the classroom when he was disciplined? Why were parents not coming to talk about their children’s progress and how they could help them? On a daily basis I was confronted with these traumas and social welfare issues which neither I nor my teachers believed we were able to deal with through traditional school methods of discipline or inviting parents to parent-teacher meetings. These situations were preventing the students of my school from achieving academically as well as impacting on the teachers in my school being able to teach their students. There appeared to be more time devoted to disciplining the students, feeding and clothing them, arranging transportation for them, counselling them rather than educating them. How could we turn this around? What did I need to do as a Principal in this school? These questions seven years ago have led to this study where I reflect on what we have done in the school and what other similar schools have done in order to try and address these ‘complex social, health, emotional and cultural needs, [which are] often associated with socioeconomic disadvantage’ (Education Foundation Division & Black 2010:5)

This dissertation sought to answer the question ‘How have FSS schools in WA been initiated and implemented?’ and it recounts both my experiences in my school and those of others in similar but also very different circumstances.

Full Service School (FSS) at Neerigen Brook Primary School

Initially I did not know what the answer was to the myriad issues which myself and my staff were facing. It was through developing a counselling service with the key focus for domestic violence for the students and their parents that I met representatives from Universities and not for profit agencies that introduced myself and my school to the concept of full service. FSS in Western Australia (WA) are relatively new. When I started this process I had one model in WA to consider and that had stopped operating some time previously. Parent engagement and its impact on student learning, partnerships and how the school can work together with these groups to benefit the student and their family were central to the operations of full
service. There developed a shared philosophy in which myself and my school community thought that the issues that the children struggle with stem largely from the low socio economic circumstances, low education levels and inability to access resources faced by the parents. It was believed that home life affects the children’s educational outcomes. It was a belief that the full service school model was an approach which may tackle the resources issues affecting the students and their families at Neerigen Brook PS and thus through this model we could make positive changes to the academic and social progress of students.

This belief is consistent with research:

[The evidence is consistent, positive and convincing: families have a major influence on their children's achievement. When schools, families and community groups work together to support learning, children tend to do better in school, stay in school longer, and like school more (Henderson and Mapp 2002:7).

It was also believed that utilising a strengths-based perspective and approach (Saleeby 1997), which will be described later, would be of value when working together with the Neerigen Brook community. Some of the goals that we initially set out to achieve were to engage more effectively with families to help them achieve a better home environment for the children, and through these strategies achieve better educational outcomes for the children.

The development of the FSS model at my school has not been without a cost including significant workloads and ongoing pressures of funding and sustainability as well as through the development process as issues and questions have arisen we have attempted to solve and meet the identified needs. Some of the issues that were faced were identified needs of the community versus service availability, utilising a strengths based approach in terms of potentials of students and their families rather than simply service provision. However as a researcher I was keen to discover how other schools which had developed this model, went about the implementation process, what their concerns and issues were and what can be learned from these experiences for the future.

This study explores the emergence and implementation of Full Service Schools (FSS) in Western Australia with the fieldwork taking place in 2011-2012. All data relate to that period. It takes an intrinsic case study (Stake 1995) approach of selected FSS sites from the perspectives of people most involved in their establishment and implementation. The research is located within the Interpretivist paradigm, employing case study data collection and thematic analysis.

Defining and Understanding Full Service Schools

What is a Full Service School?
The full service model is complicated by the numerous synonyms, amongst which are Full-Service Schools (Dryfoos 1994), Full Day (Bogenschneider 1996; Ames & Farrell 2005), Beacon (Raffo & Dyson 2007), Lighted School Houses (Dryfoos 1994), Community-School (Ames & Farrell 2005), Wrap-Around Schools (Barlow & Underdown 2005), Extended Schools
Contemporary full service schools have existed in various forms internationally, mostly prevalent in the US and UK, since the early 1990s (Dryfoos et al. 2005:15). Within Australia their development commenced in the late 1990s (Australian Centre for Equity Through Education 1998), in order to develop the school as a central “community hub” for whatever education, health, social/human, and/or employment services have been determined locally to be needed to support a child’s success in school and the community (Calfee et al. 1998).

The development of these schools has been in response to the needs of children and their families that exist which conventional schooling systems cannot meet. The underlying belief is that schools can no longer be treated as isolated from the lived experiences of children and families. Some of the areas FSS aim to address are: educational inequity; the widening achievement gap between high and low socio-economic schools; the impact of changing family patterns on children’s learning and development; changing demographics; inadequate community supports; and insufficient integration of existing social and health services (Children’s Aid Society 2009). The relationship between parents, schools and community is central to education policy and practice. Research (Cummings et. al 2006; Pithouse et. al 2005) has demonstrated that strong parent community links enhance student progress in education and the benefits of children and their families being involved in the planning, delivery and evaluation of services are well documented.

Within Western Australia there are now different forms of full service schools or schools linking with services in varying stages of development. The Innovation Education and Reform Unit and National Partnership of the Education Department of Western Australia is supporting schools in these moves through such events as the Extended Schools (Full Service Schools) Conference, network meetings and sharing of best practices, successes and challenges. The extent to which, if at all, the WA schools illustrate these descriptions will be examined later.

Given the contemporary FSS being relatively recent in conceptualisation and implementation, the available research, predominantly from the UK and US, tends to be descriptive rather than evaluative, although there are exceptions. The majority of research approaches have been qualitative. Even though FSS in the UK and the US have been in operation for a decade or more there is still little outcome or effectiveness evaluation available. Strong research papers which have led the FSS movement include the work of Dryfoos “Full service Schools: A
Revolution in Health and Social Services for children, Youth and Families (1994) and Full Service Schools (1996), Coalition for Community Schools (2000) as well as the Evaluation of the Full Service Extended Schools Initiative, Manchester, UK.

As Dryfoos (1994a) states schools are increasingly being called upon to be those “surrogate parents” that can increase the teachability of children who arrive on their doorstep in poor condition. Leaders in social service provision have observed that fragmented, separately organised and physically scattered services create serious access problems for school aged children (Dryfoos 1994:11). They conclude that the schools as central institutions in the community provide an important, if not critical organising focus for the coordination and integration of services.

For some countries such as the UK, it has been until recently a national agenda through policies such as Every Child Matters (Dfes 2005:4). In the US, agencies such as Children’s Aid Organisation have led the movement (Dryfoos et.al 2005: 13). In Scotland there has been a longstanding commitment to community education. The new community schools initiative, 1999 (Scottish Office 1999: 2) drew upon aspects of the experiences of full-service schooling in the United States. It has had a strong focus on developing new approaches to delivering children’s services through integrated work among education, health, social work and other key partners (HM Inspectorate of Education 2004:1).

“Barriers to learning must be identified at the earliest stage, and intervention must be focused, planned and sustained. A range of services is necessary to assist children overcome the barriers to learning and positive development — family support, family learning and health improvement. New Community Schools will ensure that such expert advice and support is at hand -not at the end of a referral chain to other agencies” (Scottish Office 1999: 2).

Variations on the full service schools concept include school-based services and school-linked services. Key factors common to the models include:

• a clear focus on better outcomes for young people;
• reduced duplication of services;
• better access to external services and resources within the school setting; and
• improved co-operation and collaboration between organisations and individuals in implementing effective interventions.

Globally, there are differing opinions, as well as controversy, on the purpose of FSS. How well schools can attend to social disadvantage and whether they should is one tension. Ability to provide both social and educational services equally is another. Increased workloads, possible disagreements with service providers as to direction and emphasis, the value of integrated services versus school-linked provision, the potential for community resistance,
lack of skills and knowledge of social service provision are all concerns. These all form part of
the discussion from the examination of the three schools in this study.

Within Australia there has been a broad range of extended service schools. There are school
based models where services are located on site and school linked models where services are
not located on site. There are different viewpoints on these models with cost and resource
provision impacting on preferred models.

The FSS literature includes descriptions of specific organisational models (Dryfoos 1994),
addressing themes such as extended hours (McCulloch et. al 2004) addressing students at
educational risk through innovative approaches (Thomson 1999), and innovative parent-
school partnerships (Blank & Berg 2006). The US based Coalition for Community Schools
describes ‘what works’ (Berg et. al 2006), Cummings et al (2006) discuss developments in the
assessments of FSS from Australia.

Although there is a significant amount of international research into full service provision in
schools Australian research has been limited. Kemmis (2000:25) is one of the few to have
studied FSS in Australia and suggested in 2000 that the FSS was an effective model for meeting
social needs of families to support children’s learning and academic progress but without
evaluation of the model. The FSS within Australia still have to meet the challenges of
restricted financial and physical resource provision as well as the barriers of legislation and
agency requirements. Despite an increased interest in FSS in Australia past studies have
overlooked the area of sustainability and the components necessary to maintain an FSS.

This current study intends to provide additional information and understanding through the
in-depth exploration of how three schools in WA have commenced and implemented their
versions of FSS.

Background on the Schools in this Study

All three schools1 are level 5 (student enrolments over 300) public primary schools based in
the metropolitan area of Western Australia. All public schools within Western Australia are
provided with a decile ranking based on the socio economic area through SEIFA data (10
indicating low socio economic area and a decile ranking of 1 being a high socio economic
area). SEIFA is a suite of four summary measures that have been created from 2006 Census
information. The indices can be used to explore different aspects of socio-economic
conditions by geographic areas and provide more general measures of socio-economic status
than is given by measuring, for example, income or unemployment alone. A higher score on

1 Principals of the three schools mentioned in this study have given permission for the names of their school to
be mentioned in this study.
the index means a lower level of disadvantage. A lower score on the index means a higher level of disadvantage. Each of the three schools in this study had a ranking of either 9 or 10.

Challis Cluster

The Challis Cluster encompasses Challis Early Childhood Education Centre (ECEC) and Challis Primary School (CPS) and started in the mid-2000s. Sharing the site with both schools is Challis Parenting and Early Learning Centre (CPELC) which is jointly funded and managed by both schools. Challis Parenting and Early Learning Centre is an integrated and comprehensive multi-agency school and community resource focused on Early Learning and Family Support located on the school premises. It provides programmes for children from 0 - 3 years and support programmes and services for their carers. It is a model of interagency collaboration and is being developed as a hub of service delivery.

The student body is culturally diverse: a high percentage of children are from English/European background; 18% of students are Indigenous, and enrolments from families from African countries are increasing.

Challis Cluster School Background Vision and Reflections

Challis Cluster School staff report that in order to meet their educational purpose they have focussed on developing strong partnerships with parents to meet their child’s needs. This is achieved through their parent engagement programs and strategies together with their numerous partnerships that have been established to work with the school in an integrated approach. The steady and increasing enrolment trend and significant increase in number of Aboriginal children attending school in the early years has led to a focus on early years education. Along with the usual mission statements of teaching and learning strategies, Challis Cluster School recognises the importance of a whole approach to the child’s educational experience through:

- Meaningful engagement with parents and carers
- Provision of extended school services in partnership with relevant agencies from birth to Year 7
- Provision of learning environments that cater for the social, emotional, academic and physical development needs of our students (Challis School Report 2011: 2).

Health and Welfare at Challis Cluster School

Challis Cluster School has a strong partnership with Parkerville, a non-government agency, which includes a Registered Senior Psychologist and a social worker working from the school site. The Psychologist ensures the availability of a specialized service to families and students engaged with the school, in particular the provision of therapeutic intervention. This also included the wider TFS (Therapeutic Family Services) and GJCAC (George Jones Advocacy Centre) team, if required, to provide service, advice, training to staff on how to respond to trauma related behaviours, e.g. sexualised behaviours, affect regulation difficulties, personal
boundaries, behaviour management and anxiety difficulties. Working in collaboration with a Registered Senior Psychologist has allowed the CPELC (Challis Primary Early Learning Centre) to provide 1.5 days of Medicare Health services to family members allowing them to better access mental health interventions. This also further aided the child's prognosis working from a holistic approach. Due to the increased number of days the service is available along with the flexibility of both Challis Schools and CPELC, the service ensured immediate advice, assistance and assessment to any critical cases which arose. Parkerville’s School Based Support Worker is an integral support in the school and CPELC, providing education for teachers and students within the classroom as well as information sessions for parents surrounding protective behaviours and cyber safety. This service also ensured a confidential support for families requiring parenting support.

The Department of Health supports the CPELC through their provision of specialised staff to ensure ease of accessibility to health services while building relationships between health and education. In 2011 an extension of services occurred with the Child Health Nurse’s FTE increasing, as well as the continuation of the Community Health Nurse, Occupational Therapist, and Speech Therapist on site. The Child Health Nurse supports new parents with a Wednesday ‘drop-in’ session along with new initiative, ‘Mother’s Group’, in which new parents were supported throughout the first 12 weeks of their baby’s life, whilst learning valuable parenting advice, information and skills. Parent workshops are also facilitated at the centre by the Child Health Nurse, surrounding child development topics such as toileting, fussy eaters and nutrition. The centre’s Community Health Nurse provides much needed health and socio-emotional advice, support and information to families along with ensuring the support of education and health staff and families throughout the referral process. Cuppa and chat mornings are also provided to further promote the health message whilst providing lifestyle and parenting advice and support.

To ensure the physical health and wellbeing of children the local Canning Division of Health provide Immunisation Clinics ensuring all parents of children aged 0-12 years are able to access vital immunisations on-site. Canning Division of Health also provides an Aboriginal Health Worker each Tuesday morning to conduct health checks with Aboriginal children aged 0-12, with an option for parents to access the service for themselves. Further to these services, Telethon Speech and Hearing funded the Telethon Ear Bus, mobile Children’s Ear Clinic, to service the CPELC along with Challis ECEC and Challis PS. This service provided free hearing screening for all Aboriginal children and referred children four times per year. All parents are notified of results and provided with follow up options as needed with a doctor, nurse and outreach worker from Derbarl Yerrigan Aboriginal Medical Service (AMS).

Research is also a valued activity and to this end, Challis Cluster School has formed partnerships with two WA Universities: Edith Cowan and Curtin.
Challis Cluster School Partnerships
As with most FSS models, Challis has a large number of partnerships that work in an integrated approach with the school. These comprise service provision and research activities. Services are provided on the school site in collaboration with non-government, government and university agencies. The Playgroup is a significant service which includes all these agencies.

Playgroups at Challis Cluster School
Challis runs a number of playgroups including a mainstream playgroup, multicultural playgroup and an Aboriginal playgroup. These playgroups are supported by a range of personnel from Government agencies and including Child Health and Community Nurses, Occupational Therapists and Speech Pathologists and the non-Government agency Save the Children. The Occupational Therapist and Speech Therapist services ensure that children are assessed and as a result are able to access much needed OT and speech services through their in-class therapy, teacher education sessions, parent information sessions, therapy and referral of children. Individual children are also provided with intervention plans for both home and school therapy goals.

Other health and welfare services are provided on site with the collaboration of a non-Government agency which provides therapeutic services from psychologists and social workers.

Challis Cluster School and Edith Cowan University
In 2011 Challis Early Childhood Education Centre (ECEC) worked in partnership with Edith Cowan University (ECU) to provide Primary and Early Childhood university students the opportunity to complete the Residency program as part of their Graduate Diploma of Education, a one year course to become a qualified teacher.

Challis Cluster School and Curtin University
In 2011 a new partnership commenced with Curtin Interprofessional Education Program (IPE). The IPE program supports the education, practice and research of current university students from a variety of different disciplines and scaffolds their learning to ensure they work together to learn with, from and about each other within the education sector. This program ensures an improvement in the collaboration and quality of therapy within the early years between disciplines. To ensure the success of this initiative, an Interprofessional Education Reference Group consisting of Heads of Schools, and the Director of Interprofessional Practice met with Challis ECEC staff to plan the development, implementation and evaluation of the program.

Throughout 2011, the Curtin IPE students delivered an array of workshops to both staff and students. Promoting the IPE program, along with educating Challis ECEC staff on the roles and responsibilities of the various disciplines including, speech, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, dietetics, nursing, social work and psychology was first and foremost of importance in the success of this program.
Early intervention programs were also developed by the Curtin IPE students to address specific therapy needs of individual and groups of children. After initially screening individual Challis ECEC children, referred by Classroom Teachers, blocks of individual therapy were provided to over 60 students. Students were referred for and received intervention in the areas of speech therapy, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, social work and psychology (Challis School Report 2011: 21).

**Roseworth Primary School**

Roseworth PS started its FSS model in 1998. It has low SEI and Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) indices which reflect the socio-economic disadvantage of the community with approximately 30% Indigenous students, 10% of Vietnamese descent and 40% of non-English speaking backgrounds. There is also a significant degree of transience within the student population with a 25% yearly change in the school enrolment.

Roseworth has several partnerships which exhibited a strength and a strong school community of expertise and include the Smith Family, Mission Australia and the Fogarty Foundation. Each of these partners holds a place on the Board and has a strong presence evidenced in the business plan and other school planning documents. Participants reflect a strong collaborative culture in which partnership knowledge is valued and used not only to service the community but to help shape the school. Participants also reflected a strong resilience, perseverance and commitment to the FSS vision against challenging and complex dynamics.

**Roseworth Primary School Background Vision and Reflections**

Roseworth Primary School’s journey in the development of the FSS has been a long one commencing over 15 years ago. According to school staff their journey has had a strong community development focus with ongoing engagement of all the stakeholders in the development, implementation and evaluation and reviewing of implemented strategies. This school had an interesting journey in that it amalgamated with another school in 2008, (Montrose Primary School amalgamated with Hainsworth Primary School) which then meant the development of a FSS had an additional challenge of the combining of two school cultures and communities together and then developing the shared vision for the school and the FSS development and implementation. Roseworth Primary School shares its school site with Roseworth Education Support Centre and together they cater for the students in the suburb of Girrawheen and the surrounding areas. Roseworth’s mission focuses primarily on their interactions with parents and agencies to ensure students have the support to succeed educationally. The school considers the greatest challenge to be catering for a school community with a socio economic status of 87.4.

*Across all socio economic groups, parents face major challenges when it comes to providing optimal care and education for their children. For families in Roseworth Primary School*
community, these challenges can be formidable (Roseworth Primary School Business Plan 2010-2014).

The mission statements reflect these considerations by including:

- The staff understand that we can’t solve problems in isolation.
- We engage the parents as allies.
- We adopt a whole school approach to all aspects of our operations.
- Our best response to any issue involves helping students and families.
- We use outside help to build the capacity of our school to solve our own problems.
- We put in place good support systems for individual students and families who need it.

**Health and Welfare at Roseworth Primary School**

In addition to the Fogarty Foundation and the Smith Family are other agencies which have connections to and roles within the school, such as the Classroom Strategies Management Team, Next Challenge Consultancy, the Health Department of WA and the Greenwood Uniting Church. Parents are also able to access supports particularly in relation to early intervention strategies. Literacy is a focus, with one-to-one tuition, and measures to address attendance.

The Smith Family also assist in these services and supports through providing a worker. This person administers some of the strategies and programmes such as the Learning for Life suite, including Scholarships, Student to Student, Financial Literacy, Tech Packs, Unlimited Potential, Home to School transition programs, Families and Schools Together (FAST), Learning Clubs, and the Credit Reward Scheme.

Both of these relationships are considered by the school to have resulted in attendance gains and parent engagement as well as educational outcomes for the students.

The universities play a central role in these outcomes through their provision of students on placement, academic consultancy and research.

**Roseworth Primary School Partnerships**

While Roseworth PS does not have the extent of school-agency linkages as Challis, they too have developed a model of educational delivery that embraces an 'Extended Services' philosophy whereby the school shares it premises with partner organisations. The three major partners of the school are Edith Cowan University, The Smith Family and The Fogarty Foundation through which the school is able to access professional growth for staff and to engage wider community support for the school, as well as research and professional learning facilities and administration offices have been added to the school infrastructure to support these partnerships. The 'ECU Fogarty Professional Learning Centre' consisting of a research classroom and observation room, provides the school with opportunities to engage in research and development amongst school staff, Edith Cowan University researchers and Pre-
Service teachers. The 'ECU Residency' program also operates within the school, leading the way in embedding ECU pre-service teachers in the Roseworth Primary School setting. The Classroom Management and Strategies Team providing services to schools in the North Metropolitan Education Region are also co-located on the school site. The CMS Team provides skills-based professional learning in classroom management and instructional skills for the staff of Roseworth Primary School as well as staff across the district. Further examples of extended services include an agreement with the Health Department of WA to provide a School Dental Service for students from K - 11 as well as a Community Health Nurse Service, both located on the Roseworth Primary School site (Roseworth Primary School Business Plan 2010-2014).

Roseworth Primary School and Edith Cowan University Partnership

The Roseworth Primary School partnership is a joint project to develop a facility that can enhance school learning of students, while developing the teaching skills and research of educators, including providing professional practice for pre-service teachers. The partnership has seen the development of a research classroom and observation room facility at Roseworth Primary School, officially opened in December 2010, which enables pre-service and in service teachers to observe and research a wide range of classroom teaching methods and behaviour management techniques without imposing on classrooms. ECU students are also engaged in assisting students at Roseworth Primary School with literacy and numeracy learning.

The benefits of the partnership to the School of Education include that it enables students and staff to gain first-hand knowledge of current educational issues in situ, thus embedding theory in practice.

It has the additional benefits of addressing educational disadvantage among students at the school, while providing expertise that assists in the development of targeted programs to improve outcomes for students. The partnership also supports and develops the teaching capacity of Roseworth staff.

Neerigen Brook Primary School

Neerigen Brook PS also has low SEI and ICSEA indices which reflect the socio economic disadvantage of the community. There is a culturally diverse student population with students from over 15 different backgrounds with 18 % comprising Indigenous students. There is also a significant degree of transience within the student population with a 35% yearly change in the school enrolment. Neerigen Brook Primary School (NBPS) is a Level 5 Independent Public School located in West Armadale and opened at the present site in 1971. 2012 was Neerigen’s third full year as an Independent Public School. The SEI (Socio Economic Index) is 87.96 and
it is a Band One school. The Neerigen Brook student numbers have steadily increased over the last 7 years.

**Neerigen Brook Primary School Background Vision and Reflections**

Neerigen Brook Full Service School (NBPS) FSS model started in 2007 to meet the needs of the school community. NBPS recognizes that children’s education is affected by what is happening outside of the school as well as in the classroom. The FSS is designed to encourage parents and community members to be a central part of children’s education through providing services in the classroom, outside the classroom and outside the school with families. The FSS aim is to meet the needs of all members of the school community not just those in “poor shape”. Importantly, the school takes a strengths-based approach believing that while families do have needs, they also have strengths which can be harnessed to contribute to their children’s educational engagement and development.

Along with the educational aims and vision which promote inclusive and culturally sensitive programmes as well as educational progress, the school’s vision pays attention to parents and the wider community recognising that they are crucial to the success of children’s engagement with education. As an Independent Public School and a full service school the school has a “collaborative mechanism for delivering health and welfare services in addition to education services from or in connection with schools” (Young 2008). Full Service Schooling represents a way of thinking about education which aims to address the social, emotional and physical needs of its students and families, in order to improve educational performance. Working in partnership with parents and the local community to get the best possible education for the students and support for the families is considered by school staff to be fundamental to the aim of the school.

**Health and Welfare at Neerigen Brook Primary School**

A number of government, non-government agencies and universities collaborate to provide services and supports at the school. These include the Community Development Foundation, which is responsible for funding some programmes, the FoodBank provider, Crossways and health and welfare agencies. These Lead Agencies mobilize and integrate community resources and contribute financially to NBPS programs. Psychologists and other counsellors including financial counselling and bill paying services, playgroups and health services including some mental health services are all available.

**Neerigen Brook Primary School and University Partnerships**

There are a number of University partnerships which work on school site to support students and their families. Curtin University offer an interprofessional service where students from Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy, Nursing and Social Work together in an integrated approach to meet identified needs and programs for students and their families. Edith Cowan
University also assist with speech therapy students and University of Western Australia also provide social work students.

At the time of conducting this study in 2011-2012, the following data were available for the three schools.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Student Numbers in 2012</th>
<th>Attendance Rate 2011</th>
<th>State Attendance Rate</th>
<th>Decile Ranking</th>
<th>SEI</th>
<th>SEIFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CECE</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91.63</td>
<td>985.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challis</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91.63</td>
<td>985.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88.32</td>
<td>985.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87.64</td>
<td>879.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the identified schools were in the first intake of Independent Public Schools. Independent Public Schools is a Department of Education initiative that commenced in 2010 initially with 34 schools across the State. Schools apply to become part of this initiative.

“Independent Public Schools have more local authority and freedom from central policies and procedures in the areas of financial management, curriculum, student support, staff recruitment and selection, management of teachers and other staff, payroll, and maintenance of buildings and facilities.” (Department of Education Independent Public Schools Prospectus 2012)

It is also to be noted that all three schools were National Partnership schools. In December 2008 the Western Australian Government signed the three Smarter Schools National Partnerships: Literacy and Numeracy, Low Socio-economic Status (SES) School Communities and Improving Teacher Quality. National Partnership aims to:

improve student engagement, educational attainment and well-being in participating schools and make inroads to entrenched disadvantage (Department for Education 2012).

The Department of Education in Western Australia committed to allocate funds through this partnership to school communities. This is based on the belief that principals and the teachers

---

2 Appendix One provides additional demographic background for the three sites in relation to socio economic advantage and disadvantage for WA local government areas. The index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage Western Australia Local Government Areas lists the top and bottom ten ranked Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Western Australia, and the top and bottom ten ranked Statistical Local Areas (SLAs) in Greater Perth.
working in schools often have innovative ideas for improving educational outcomes for students but are unable to implement their proposals due to financial or policy constraints. Research demonstrates (Epstein 1994; Sanders 2002; Sanders 2006; Sheriden et. al. 2007) that the best results are achieved when principals work with their communities to build shared ownership and responsibility to address local issues and adopt the most effective teaching strategies.

It is intended that participating schools will explore innovative measures aimed at improving student learning outcomes for students from disadvantaged backgrounds over a period of four years (Department of Education 2012).

At each of the schools there is a wide range of services designed to safeguard children’s well-being and remove barriers to learning as well as enhance parent engagement and support students’ families. Services include playgroup, health services, parent support services such as job network links, refugee assistance, fitness classes, food and bills relief, early intervention services, therapy services including occupational therapy, physiotherapy and speech therapy, extended day instruction such as breakfast clubs and homework clubs and ‘active after school’. All three sites have strong University partnerships across one or more Universities. At each of the three sites there exist well developed partnerships with not-for-profit agencies, Government Department and agencies and businesses.

This Study

Not surprisingly, WA lacks a firm evaluation base as the current FSS are relatively new. This study seeks to provide an account of how FSS have emerged and how they are established and developed. It is hoped that this will provide a base line for future studies.

This study looks at the development and implementation of FSS as well as exploring how this model can be used and sustained to meet the needs of all members of the school community - not just those in “poor shape”. This current research seeks to provide a more detailed account of how the FSS have developed in WA and how they have been implemented to meet needs identified by their stakeholders. The research is informed by the literature which emphasises the following:

- Full service schools developed in response to concerns about the effect non-educational issues have on children’s ability to achieve educationally, particularly those related to poverty;
- The way FSS developed is largely shaped by their particular setting: the extent to which they are part of a defined educational and social policy framework (for example in the UK) or as part of a community defined approach (for example the development of community schools in the US). It follows therefore that FSS appear to be designed to fulfil the community premise of ‘local solutions to local issues’; and
FSS by their very nature involve relationships with a number of service and other agencies, but these agencies vary in scope and level of involvement in the determination of how the FSS model is implemented.

Bearing in mind the community intent of providing for local involvement in dealing with local issues it is appropriate to examine the emergence of FSS from those most involved. Hence stakeholders in the identified schools were sought to provide the accounts of how they assessed the need, how they built the strategies and how they put these into effect in their local schools.

There are two major areas that are explored in this study of the implementation process of FSS. The first area focuses on the initiation stage and includes discussion on how and why they commenced and who was involved as well as the underlying philosophy. The second area discusses the development with partnerships; communication with community; challenges and benefits; change process; policies and processes and plans for sustainability.

Chapter Two provides the context for understanding the development of FSS within Australia and overseas. This draws on the literature of full service schools and extended service schools and was completed using web searches and current research and literature from Australia, US, UK and Scotland. Other literature which was used for analysing the findings from this research is to be found when discussing the findings (Chapter Four) and in theorising the findings (Chapters Five and Six). This is consistent with the methodology used for this study which is the subject of Chapter Three. Here is to be found the approach taken to answering the research question which sought to explore how and why the three FSS in metropolitan Perth, WA, commenced and were implemented. A qualitative emergent design was used which allowed for an inductive approach to data collection and analysis using literature to add to the understanding of the research participants’ reports. Additional data and literature were derived from overseas study trips to low socio economic extended service schools in the UK and US, and an interstate study trip to full service schools in Victoria. Chapter Four discusses the initiation and implementation of the FSS in the three study site schools and is presented in three parts: ‘This is not working’ describes why the schools chose to initiate their FSS; ‘How can I make a change?’ details the planning and preliminary implementation phases; and ‘We can’t do it on our own’ presents the processes of engaging others in the implementation as they realised partnerships with other stakeholders were essential. Chapter Five presents three main themes to emerge from the detailed description of the emergence of the FSS in the three study sites: systems change, leadership and partnerships. These are derived from the discussion in the previous chapter which suggested that these three areas were important in how the FSS developed. Literature from other FSS experiences is introduced here to assist in the understanding of these concepts. Chapter Six presents a conceptualisation of FSS and offers three frameworks for other schools interested in starting FSS. Here are to be found discussions of Conditions for Learning, Approaches to FSS, and
Community Development processes which offer the potential for evaluating, formulating structures and processes for FSS respectively.
CHAPTER TWO – FULL SERVICE SCHOOLS OVERSEAS AND WITHIN AUSTRALIA, A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Schools are increasingly being placed at the heart of society with calls for educators to provide tuition and instruction in many of the disciplines and attributes considered necessary for competence in daily as well as academic pursuits. Full service schools (FSS) are a collaborative mechanism for delivering health and welfare services in addition to education services from or in connection with schools. The recognition of the increasing prevalence of health, social and emotional handicaps in some students and disruptions in their families and neighbourhoods which are likely to severely affect their ability to learn and their educational outcomes has been the stimulus for the development of FSS (Dryfoos 1994). Full service schools are promoted as being one strategy to try to overcome these barriers for children and their families through the provision of non-educational supports and facilities on which to build educational engagement. Full service schools or extended service schools seek to build the capacity of schools to deploy multiple interventions across a range of child, family, community contexts in order to improve the lives of children and families, and to enhance the sustainability of the areas where they live (Dyson and Todd 2010 p. 120).

This chapter defines FSS and describes the model of the FSS as they have been developed primarily overseas and then adapted in Australia. It provides the definitions of the model against which the development and implementation of the three WA schools in this study may be understood before describing their emergence and application in the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Australia.

Full Service Schools – towards a definition

As we saw in Chapter One, FSS is only one term used to describe non-education-specific service or resource provision to school children to address a number of non-education-specific needs. The term ‘full service school’ originated in the US (Dryfoos 1996) to address deficits present in a child’s environment leading to poor educational outcome. But deficient environments may be considered as requiring specific remedial services to assist children attend and behave better in the classroom, or through providing support to parents to engage more fully with the school so that they may understand the educational system and how to assist their children in more productive ways. Both of these aspects may be found in the umbrella term of FSS. An early proponent of FSS, Joy Dryfoos, described them as: “One stop centres where the educational, physical, psychological and social requirements of students and their families are addressed in a rational, holistic fashion” (Dryfoos 1996: 18). While in the UK, the Department of Education and Skills noted that extended schools were: “Schools that provide a range of services and activities, often beyond the school day, to help meet the
needs of children, their families and the wider community” (Department of Education and Skills 2008: 7).

The negative effect on children’s educational outcomes of poor social, health and welfare circumstances has been well recognised and researched (Blank & Berg 2006). How schools address these issues varies, but one way is to provide relevant services in these areas to children and their families. These services can constitute what has been termed Full Service Schooling (Dryfoos 1994) and represents a way of thinking about education which aims to address the social, emotional and physical needs of its students and families, in order to improve educational performance.

There are two main models within FSS: those which have a provision of services located on the school site (school based) and those which have a link and clear partnership arrangement with services and agencies (school linked) and Dryfoos (1994: 141-2) groups them under three broad categories:

- School-based clinics that deliver primary health care, psychosocial counselling and health education, operated by health departments, hospitals or community health centres

- School-based youth service or family service centres that offer health, mental health and family counselling, drug and alcohol counselling, recreation, employment services, parenting education and/or child care on site and/or through linkages with other community agencies

- Youth or family service centres that provide coordination with and referral to community agencies.

While these schools may be seen to provide services from the school site (school-based) or through relationships with agencies in the local neighbourhood or surrounds (school-linked or community-based) Dryfoos notes that these are ideal models and to her knowledge no example operates to a ‘pure’ model. Other models noted in the literature have more specific targets and processes and are not strictly connected with schools. For example the Full day model described by Ceglowski (2006) is located at the other end of the age range with pre-primary children and may be co-located with child care centre programmes in larger facilities (such as a technical college), or in community child care centres.

The Coalition of Community Schools in the US attempted to coordinate services from external agencies which was a criticism in Dryfoos’s (1994:151) work of fragmented service provision. Although agencies may have the motivation and initiative to try to forge partnerships different resourcing, information management, philosophies and legislation systems often affected their efforts.

In the UK the terms Extended, Full Service Extended Services (FSES) or Integrated (Kellett 2011) cover similar ground. These schools were intended to provide a ‘comprehensive range
of services, including access to health services, adult learning and community activities as well as study support and 8am to 6pm childcare’ (Cummings et. al. 2007: 2).

Irrespective of the terminology used in different settings, it appears clear that there are commonalities between the different environments in purpose and perspective. Assessing that circumstances in a child’s life, in family and or environment, serve as barriers to learning, schools form relationships with non-education service providers to address some of these needs. As mentioned in Chapter One, the term Full Service School (FSS) will be used and will refer to services provided either by the school or in association with the school to address student and family needs in a range of non-educational supports to enable the pupil to engage with education.

Rationale for Full Service Schools

Why do we need full service schools?
Schools have a pivotal role in communities and are often the first line of defence against many of the social problems confronting families and children. Research has demonstrated that non-school factors including nutrition, parent participation, time spent watching television and student mobility affect the development of the whole child (Blank & Berg 2006). Blank and Berg also demonstrated that students from minority groups and those living in poverty were far more likely to face academic challenges. Furthermore family involvement in children’s education significantly impact student performance. Full Service Schools have reported improved student achievement, attendance, reduced behavioural problems, increased access to physical and mental health and improvement in family situations (Blank & Berg 2006).

Schools situated in low socio economic communities are regularly confronted with, and challenged by, the effects of poverty and family disruption and as Stafford (2003) notes, the people who may most benefit from assistance are often those who lack the confidence to seek assistance. FSS can build a bridge to the local community leading to strong partnerships which may help to meet both school and community needs for families and children in relation to education.

Proponents of Full Service Schools seek to implement a more integrated care and educational system for children that reconceptualises the relationship between school, family and broader community. This view of the child and family underpins a more holistic service delivery. Having schools already committed to providing a range of services is a necessary first step, for as Berrick & Duerr (1996) note, one of the challenges is merging the interests of service providers with those of school staff. The evaluation for one such programme concluded that remedial services were, while useful, only part of the process of establishing a FSS which could satisfy all stakeholders. LEARN (Local Efforts to Address and Reduce Neglect) operated in nine sites with a focus on voluntary in-home assistance, referrals to
other supports and services and direct intervention. Preparedness by school staff to understand and engage with the programme as well as that of service providers to engage school staff is an essential part of ensuring coordinated and thereby effective services.

The rationale for Full Service Models, of whichever type, is usually recommended for secondary if not tertiary prevention. That is, the focus is on ‘at risk’ children and young people. The assumptions behind providing any or all of the services mentioned above are that populations of children and young people are not receiving adequate levels of services for their growth and development. This may be for several and different reasons, as shall be seen when considering the historical antecedents. Swerdlik et al’s (1999) account of the challenges faced by young people include changes in family work patterns with associated low income; health problems including mental health and poverty related health issues; stressors in the education system resulting in low educational achievement and social pressures; and high risk behaviours. Highlighting the ‘convenience’ (Swerdlik et. al. 1999:72) of providing services to address common issues by co-locating them, the authors clearly consider the risks posed to the healthy development of young people to be of such magnitude that full service schools represent the best option for addressing them. Tertiary prevention, here, is a necessary residual measure.

Other authors concentrate more specifically on one or other of the issues noted above, with a majority of works dealing with health and mental health (Berrick & Duerr 1996; Reeder & Maccow 1997; Adelman & Taylor 1999; Swerdlick et. al. 1999; Wyn et. al. 2000; Ames & Farrell 2005; Kelvin 2005; Hall et. al. 2006). And of course, Dryfoos’ (1994) writing concerned health in both its broad and specific forms being sub-titled ‘a revolution in health...’. Amongst these, however, are those which lean towards a secondary preventive mode, as well as recognising the primary prevention value for whole populations. The secondary prevention approach is less residual, rehabilitative or restorative while at the same time it targets children and young people whose situations render them in need for personal, family, educational, health, financial or social reasons. Those researchers who identify the health and mental health needs of young people may be exemplified in the following description noting the stressors for children and adolescents:

These stresses are associated with high rates of depression and suicide, drug and alcohol abuse and other health problems among children and adolescents (Reeder & Maccow 1997: 604).

The provision of services here is targeted towards those children and young people who have shown some of these symptoms with the intent of providing treatment for these ills. In a review of the provision of these types of services in schools in the United States, however,

---

3 For a more detailed description of the differences and applications of these three forms of prevention see Tomison, A. M. and L. Poole (2000). Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect: Findings from an Australian Audit of Prevention Programmes. Melbourne, National Child Protection Clearing House, Australian Institute of Family Studies, p. 46. where primary prevention is universal (available to all irrespective of identified need), secondary prevention is targeted at identified need, and tertiary prevention identifies specific risk where need has been observed.
Adelman and Taylor (1999) found that while schools sometimes had school counsellors in the form of psychologists or social workers providing treatment services on site, this is by no means widespread. Their recommendation was that the school system needed restructuring to be better able to meet increasing needs.

It is also the case that health promotion forms a large part of the rationale for FSS, for among the stated purposes for the health professionals is evidently educating for good health and avoidance of the risks leading to drug and alcohol abuse for example, and promoting wellbeing. Wyn et al’s (2000) programme MindMatters states clearly that it is a mental health promotional exercise with the intent being that it is adopted as an expected part of the school system; and the Ecological model recommended by Ames and Farrell (2005) suggests implementation of a programme that is broader than health. This latter sets health promotion in a wider context of achieving wellbeing using the school as integrally connected with its surrounding community. The study of a community-school strategy was to ‘reduce the risk of serious illness amongst schoolchildren, their families, and older adults in the school’s community’ (Ames & Farrell 2005: 29), which extends the concept of full service to the local neighbourhood. Indeed, one of the prime strategies was the use of ‘neighbour educator’ to progress health promotion.

**FSS in the United States**

The work most credited with introducing the Full Service School model to a wider public is *Full-service schools: a revolution in health and social services for children, youth, and families* (Dryfoos 1994), even though it is clear that the practice of linking schools (the school linked model) with their neighbourhoods and of providing non-educational services from within the school setting (the full service model) has a lengthy history and practice. According to Dryfoos (1994: 132) Full Service School is an educational reform term which was first used in Florida USA in 1991, even though it is clear that the FSS as a strategy to attempt to alleviate the social contributors to educational performance dates back as far as the Settlement House movement of social worker Jane Addams in the nineteenth century and similar schools called community schools have been reported as being operational in the 1930s (Richardson 2009). Dryfoos (1994: 19) notes these early beginnings from what she calls the Progressive Era as responding to the social changes influenced by the growing industrialisation in the United States and the need to try to curb the negative effects of poverty on children’s learning. Dryfoos (1994) defined the FSS as a concept to guide the organisation of service delivery systems designed to promote the physical, emotional, social and academic growth of children living in high risk environments. Health services were the most common and considered the most desirable and needed services with the synonym of ‘school clinics’ denoting this connection. The modern experiment, encapsulated in what Dryfoos notes as the first modern example from Illinois, was not as successful as hoped largely due to the concerns of both medical and educational professionals who thought schools were not the best place to
practice medicine. The idea of and demand for integrated school-based services has since then waxed and waned with the re-emergence of support in the US in the 90s.

Contrary to their conceptualisation by some policy makers as ‘surrogate parents’ (Dryfoos 1994), the community school movement in the US, otherwise known as the Coalition for Community Schools, considers that a partnership approach to be more valuable. Importantly they considered an integrated approach of coordinating greater numbers of different people and resources could benefit the learning experiences of children (Hatch 1998).

The partners in the Coalition share a broad vision for community schools - not as “add on” programs that operate outside the regular school day - but as community institutions that are capable of improving academic and broader developmental outcomes for youth, as well as their families and communities. Members of the Coalition subscribe to the belief that community, or FSS schools are necessary for the development of the whole child by providing the necessary supports and services. Within the US community schools are now present in 44 states and the District of Columbia. There are national, state and local community school models and each of these models is supported through organisations such as the Children’s Aid Society, Beacon Schools, Schools of the 21st Century, and Communities in Schools Inc. Each organisation has its own aims but still encompasses the overall vision and mission statement which emphasises the importance of the holistic lives of children. According to the Partnership of 21st Century Skills “the education system faces irrelevance unless we bridge the gap between how students live and how they learn” (Melaville et. al 2009: 1). The Coalition’s mission is to mobilize the resources and capacity of multiple sectors and institutions to create a united movement for community schools focusing predominantly on assisting the community to provide supports for the educational progress of the child, rather than merely providing remedial services for children in need.

FSS in the United Kingdom

According to Cummings (2006: 2) the first Extended School in the UK was launched in 2003 by the Department of Education and Skills (DfES). This was part of a general aim to support the development in every local authority area of one or more schools to provide a comprehensive range of services. Here too, synonyms for FSS are integrated or extended schools. The term community schools however appeared early in the twentieth century, with Wilkins et al (2003) noting the village college approach. Smith (2004; 2005), on the other hand, identifies the idea of extended schools in the UK as starting in the late nineteen nineties with policy identification of the connection between disadvantaged communities and low educational attainment of the pupils, and the first of the community schools in the UK to be established in Scotland in 1999. Within the UK the term community education began in 1980 when John Rennie founded an organization called the Community Education Development Centre (CEDC). The goal was to promote, support and develop community education and community schools across the Midlands region and, subsequently, across England and Wales.
It initially secured funding for pilot trials and then developed two other strands of work: parental engagement and links between health and learning.

By 2000, Rennie had persuaded DfES to fund the development of a network of community schools (Community Schools Network CSN) that would share ideas and demonstrate cutting-edge practice through publications, networking events and a new website. DfES also agreed to fund a small-scale pilot entitled ‘Schools Plus Teams,’ which was designed to test the theory that schools could engage with their communities more quickly and effectively with the help of an experienced team of consultants. Six schools were chosen across England representing a variety of communities and each was allocated a specialist consultant (Dyson & Todd 2010:1). Various pilot projects were established to further stimulate schools to adopt the community school approach. The most significant of these was the FSES, Full Service Extended Schools (FSES) project which ran between 2003 and 2006 in which 150 schools participated.

A number of policies have been implemented in recent years to reduce the impact of social disadvantage on educational attainment across the UK. One key reform was the ‘Every Child Matters’ policy (Kellett 2011). This was a system-wide approach designed to ensure that children’s services work together with parents and carers to help give children more opportunities and better support. Within this framework, a range of interventions were developed to integrate different services and align them with the work of schools, and to help schools to reach into their communities. Alongside the extended schools were ‘Early intervention’ programmes which attempted to tackle some of the factors which were considered likely to disadvantage children in school before children started school (Muijs et al. 2010: 26).

Research from 2010 suggested a number of policy directions for ensuring that extended services met the needs of children and their families by designing appropriate in-school supports, and ensuring agency collaboration for those which occur ‘beyond school’ and impact on the educational engagement and attainment of children (Muijs et al. 2010). Concern was expressed that schools should not be expected to solve social problems and that research should seek to provide frameworks to assist in evaluating the links between education and deprivation.

Since its launch in 2006, over £70 million of funding has been provided with additional financial support provided to schools operating in areas of the highest social disadvantage. The varied activities offered through the Extended Schools programme were designed to support learning and promote healthy lifestyles, raise school standards while engaging schools with their local community and connecting people with local services. Although the then Minister for Education committed additional funding to further support the Extended Schools programme up to March 2015 recent policy and funding adjustments have seriously curtailed the programme. Most other schools not participating in the program, however, do
offer some form of extended services through a combination of voluntary effort, parental contributions and alternative sources of external funding.

**FSS Within Australia**

Full service schools are now finding significant support within Australia. One of the strong full service initiatives was through the Australian Centre for Equity through Education (ACEE). In 1997 funding was sought and received through ACEE for research and development of a Full Service Schools Research Circle with the aim of developing a collective community policy and practical response to working together to improve the life opportunities for all students. Schools involved in this research were a range of Primary and High Schools. The outcomes of the research did not produce a defined model of practice but participants were able to reflect on current practice and they recognised the necessity for collaborations within schools, communities and agencies for progress to be made (Australian Centre for Equity through Education 1997).

The relationship between the school and external services, and the nature of services available, varies widely in the concept of ‘full service schools’ within Australia. Variables influencing the concept of full service schools result from different community needs, differences in the availability of local services, the capacity of the school site and location of community agencies, and the definition of ‘services’ that is, ranging from crisis responsive/therapeutic services to broad family related services and supports (Briar-Lawson et. al. 1997).

In 1999 and 2000, 65 clusters of schools (predominantly high schools) through States and Territories were funded from the Federal Department for Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA) to undertake a range of activities of individual support strategies, case management, counselling, curriculum initiatives, school organisational change initiatives, community oriented approaches and system changes (Szirom et. al. 2001). The main focus for this strategy was school retention of seventeen year olds. One of the key findings of this study reiterated the importance of engagement with local community and agencies and coordination of resources and services (Australian Centre for Equity through Education 2001). Although termed FSS, it is to be noted that for these projects and reported research, FSS was defined in a much broader context. Schools and clusters of schools were given flexibility to introduce the most appropriate initiative to meet local need.

The approach adopted within the full service school has also been subjected to differences in interpretation. Specifically, this relates to whether the school should be a site for individual direct services only, or whether the school should be involved in broader community change (Kirner et. al 1998). The Full Service School model promoted by the Australian Centre for Equity through Education (ACCE) recommended a holistic approach incorporating ‘school reform, school linked services, and community development’ (Kirner et. al. 1998: 16). An
Integrated model drawing on Dryfoos’ model is described in Mudaly’s (1999) account of a programme in Port Phillip in Victoria, Australia, which includes case management, early intervention and prevention programmes in collaboration with community health and welfare agencies. Proposed as best requiring a community development approach, this example reiterates the common issues for FSS seeking to embed a collaborative approach: those of competing and little understood sectional interests.

In addition to these structural and process considerations, recent research has demonstrated a reconceptualisation of families to both consider families as part of a wider system and to consider even the most disadvantaged of families having strengths that they can use in contributing to their children’s education (Bowes & Grace 2009: 104). This mirrors recent developments in social service provision to incorporate a ‘strengths’ perspective rather than only rely on problem solving or providing remedial services, an approach with which FSS as a model has yet to fully engage.

Within Western Australia the research available on FSS is very limited. A Masters project studied the implementation of the FSS at one primary school in the Eastern suburbs which started in 2004. This study focussed on the school’s progress in developing and implementing the approach and investigating the community and the school’s understanding and perceptions of the benefits derived (Morrissey 2004).

While the current Western Australia Education Department policy, Classrooms First Strategy (Department of Education 2012) returns to a focus on learning in the classroom the FSS model is one strategy which helps address the above by allowing teachers to focus on ensuring students achieve the expected standards whilst the FSS services provide the necessary support for teachers for this to occur.

Systems and Schools

Education systems in different jurisdictions vary widely and differ on models, policies and processes that are put in place to support schools in the areas of community schools, engagement and development. As Dryfoos (1994) and others have repeated the whole of the education system must pay attention to what is happening beyond the school gate (Dyson 2009). Bronfenbrenner (1986) popularised the use of systems thinking in his conceptualisation of the ecological approach to social issues affecting children, whereby the child and family were surrounded by their communities, social and larger systems. If the links the family had with any of these were weak then the child and family were vulnerable. The task for the systems then was to try to strengthen these links by providing supports and services that would be of benefit. But merely providing services without the necessary engagement so that active interactions and hence stronger links would result was a matter of design.
Global Systems
One global system which provides a systems support to schools is the World Health Organisation. Defining health broadly to encompass social and individual wellbeing, their primary role is to direct and coordinate health within the United Nations system. WHO recognised that schools are important settings for health education. One of their initiatives is a health promoting school. The aim is for the health promoting school to constantly strengthens its capacity as a healthy setting for living, learning and working. The aims of health promoting schools are to:

- Foster health and learning with all the measures at its disposal.
- Engage health and education officials, teachers, teachers' unions, students, parents, health providers and community leaders in efforts to make the school a healthy place.
- Strive to provide a healthy environment, school health education, and school health services along with school/community projects and outreach, health promotion programmes for staff, nutrition and food safety programmes, opportunities for physical education and recreation, and programmes for counselling, social support and mental health promotion.
- Implement policies and practices that respect an individual's well being and dignity, provide multiple opportunities for success, and acknowledge good efforts and intentions as well as personal achievements.
- Strive to improve the health of school personnel, families and community members as well as pupils; and
- Work with community leaders to help them understand how the community contributes to, or undermines, health and education.

Over the last decade many countries have adopted this initiative inclusive of United States of America, England, Norway and Australia. WHO have contributed with significant research, monitoring tools and resources in the areas of student well being and school health which are accessible via their website or through WHO regional offices.

Overall, positive development of health promoting schools was reported in the process evaluations (Mukomu & Fisher 2004). Changes were made to school policies and organizational structures to facilitate the health promoting activities. In some projects, health promotion was successfully integrated into the school curriculum. Parents and local communities were also involved in various capacities in the planning and implementation of the interventions.

Evaluating FSS

How do we evaluate full service schools?
Despite the increasing attention being paid to FSS, evaluations of the programmes vary according to location and application. A variety of authors have examined the operations of FSS: Cummings et al (2006) have evaluated extended schools in the UK, Szirom et al (2001)
(2001) have evaluated FSS in Victoria, Australia, while the Coalition of Community Schools is largely responsible for evaluations in the US.

A 2003 study (Blank et. al 2003) brought together findings from the operations of 20 school initiatives in the US, which each cover multiple schools, and concluded from these that where the six conditions of learning are in place (to be discussed in Chapter Three) pupil progress is enhanced, family engagement with the school and their children’s learning is increased, there is greater community vitality and there is a more positive view of the school by outsiders and within the school by its staff (Blank et. al 2003: 33). While the authors of the report do not claim causality they do state they have confidence in the findings, in part because the six conditions for learning themselves were derived from research and corroborating anecdotal evidence is available from participants and observers of the impacts of the programmes. A detailed appendix provides evaluation details of the various studies included in the report. These include studies which gathered test scores, perceptions from pupils, staff and parents and assessed participation by pupils and parents. The authors conclude that in order to advance these results what is needed is ‘a motivating vision, connected learning experiences, community partnerships, and strategic organization and financing’ (Blank et. al. 2003: 57).

The UK evaluation conducted by Cummings and her colleagues (2007) was of the Government initiative of Full Service and Extended Schools (FSES) to have at least one school in every local area provide a range of health and welfare services and community support services and was carried out over three years. The evaluation used a range of methods including case studies, statistical analyses and surveys. The evaluation found that despite improving outcomes for pupils, especially those from less advantaged areas, the challenges for the system were significant and included the sustainability of the programmes, the high cost, the difficulties of partnership working and the reliance on the dynamism of school leaders for the operations of the schools. The initiative has since been considerably scaled back and changes in Government have affected the ethos of extended schooling.

The Victorian evaluation (Szirom et. al. 2001) in Australia was of a Government-funded initiative designed to improve the retention of young people in school to year 12, particularly targeting young people at risk of leaving before then and covered a period of two years of the programme. Mixed methods were used, including surveys, analysis of progress reports and the inclusion of two separate but connected evaluations conducted by the Australian Centre for Equity through Education (ACEE) and the Australian Youth Research Centre. The findings suggested that the programme was successful, representing value for money, in assisting young people either stay at school or transition to employment or other opportunities. The authors concluded the strength of the programme was in forging positive supportive relationships for young people within and outside of the school and engaging a whole of school approach to working with the young people. The authors caution that this initiative should not be confused with other FSS models as it was specifically targeted.
An additional evaluation was conducted (James et. al.2001) using an Action Research methodology which concluded that the initiative was valued by students, teachers and families and that prevention in this area was to be preferred to intervention. Cost of the programme was, however, acknowledged to be high and the Government funding for this initiative did not continue.

The examples from the FSS Program evaluation which provide the most positive demonstrations are almost invariably those schools which have engaged in and with their local community, in a community oriented approach. Such partnerships could be the first step in the creation of new organisational forms, which include schools, local government, community agencies and services and the business sector (Szirom et. al. 2001). This approach is being adopted by a significant minority of schools with more expressing interest.

While other evaluations which have been conducted of specific programmes or projects using a similar model of providing full or extended services in or associated with schools (for example: Briar-Lawson et. al 1997; Holtzman 1997; Barlow & Underdown 2005; Dyson & Todd 2010) suggest that they are beneficial in supporting student educational progress, they also recognise that cost is a major barrier. For those which rely on state funding this reliance on the willingness of the government of the day to provide funding for what is essentially non-education related activities is precarious. Although the evaluations cited above indicate benefits to students and parents one of the major challenges noted by all concerned is how to merge two disparate sets of activities: education and social and health supports. Overcoming the lack of understanding in one sector of the other is necessary and largely dependent on the leadership from within the schools. The strength and quality of the partnerships between schools and their service agencies are of prime importance. In the end it would seem to come down to changing mind sets about the ‘proper’ role of schools, a perspective which is not universally supportive of extending the school reach into the non-education lives of students and families. The extent to which society is able ‘to determine more clearly the relationship between the narrower pupil-focused role of schools and any wider social role they might be held to have’ (Cummings et. al. 2007: 187) is the key on which the future of FSS rests.

Conceptualising FSS
From this review of the literature, it is clear that there are a number of ways of conceptualising FSS. They were born as a reaction to concern expressed by teachers and education policy makers that children’s home circumstances were resulting in children’s poor educational prognoses (Dryfoos 1994). Children from these families were also likely to be among those identified as at-risk and as potentially lacking resilience. Indeed, poverty by itself has been identified as a key indicator of the likelihood of children having little resilience (Yaqub 2002). While some researchers consider this equation to be overly deterministic (Bogenschneider 1996) children from financially disadvantaged households are targeted by
government programmes to improve their life chances in the recognition that they start their lives with significant barriers to success.

Presented here are three different frameworks to assist in the conceptualisation of FSS in WA:

1. Six conditions for learning
2. Approaches to FSS
3. Community development processes

The Coalition of Community Schools in the US provide a useful summary of what they consider to be the six conditions for learning which cover high quality educational, health, welfare, and social provisions, and importantly have a focus on early childhood. Their belief is that the best outcomes for students will be realised when as many of these conditions are in place as possible. Schools agree to abide to the following conditions in joining the Coalition. The conditions are as follows:

Condition 1- the school has a core instructional program with qualified teachers, a challenging curriculum and high standards and expectations for students.
Condition 2- Students are motivated and engaged in learning- both in school and in community settings, during and after school
Condition 3- the basic physical, mental and emotional health needs of young people and their families are recognised and addressed.
Condition 4 – There is mutual respect and effective collaboration among parents, families and school staff.
Condition 5 –Community engagement, together with school efforts, promotes a school climate that is safe, supportive and respectful and connects students to a broader learning community.
Condition 6- Early childhood development is fostered through high quality, comprehensive programs that nurture learning and development (Blank & Berg (2006:9).

These conditions bring school-based educational provisions together with the expectation of effective collaborations between schools and families and the provisions of services to ensure children’s well-being is addressed. From this research perspective these conditions have relevance as a possible structure, evaluation or planning tool for schools considering establishing FSS in Western Australia.

Approaches to FSS

Research suggests (Beckett 1997: 9) that there are three approaches; social justice, economic rationalist, and universal approaches to the full service school model. Two of the three approaches, the economic rationalist and social justice approach could be described as ideological opposites.
**Social Justice Approach**

The social justice approach gives priority to social responsibility and to equity in education (Beckett 1997: 9). One of the key issues in this approach is the devolution to the school of responsibility for the community and for the identified social problems. If these problems are not addressed then this ignores students and their lived experiences and as Beckett (Beckett 1997: 8) points out dealing with social problems claims a lot of teacher’s time. Herein lies the dilemma: if the way forward for schools is to expand to become FSS then there is the assumption that it is the school’s responsibility to source and develop alliances and partnerships to meet the diverse social needs of their community as has been the case in the US with the Coalition of Community Schools. Alternatively, there is the expectation that Government should lead the initiative such as has been found until recently in the UK with the Every Child Matters policy. In both of these cases, a problem based focus is taken.

**Economic Rationalist Approach**

For the economic rationalist approach the primary goals are to rationalise resources and streamline services to ensure efficient and effective use of scarce educational resources (Beckett 1997: 9). Beckett (1997: 3) identified that a market reform agenda impacts on the work of schools. They are expected to be efficient in their service delivery which is subject to auditing and accountability. Criticisms of the market reform agenda are the possibility of causing social stratification which can result in a decline in funding. Funding cuts result in a lack of services and programs which in turn compound educational and social problems for these schools, whereas more affluent schools become stronger and attract more affluent families and can lead to even further unequal distribution of resources. As found by McLeod and Stokes (2000) in their evaluation, increasingly schools are looking to their communities for financial and resource support. These strains of a system following an economic rationalist approach have also been reported in literature (Cummings et. al. 2007; Collins & McCray 2011). The potential for low SES schools to attract sufficient funding to operate FSS as redress against the effects of disadvantage under this approach is seriously limited.

**Universal Approach**

The universal approach occurs when schools themselves take the initiative to provide a social work role by inculcating a philosophy of keeping children engaged with well-resourced programs, adequate student welfare and a good level of parent participation (Beckett 1997: 8). These are usually outside the ambit of the educational purpose and are not necessarily within the skill or knowledge set of teachers and school leaders. A further implication could be the distraction for a school by taking on too many responsibilities.

The Social Justice and Universal approaches take their starting point from the construction of social problems within the local community and families which need to be addressed in order for children to be able to access education adequately. The Economic Rationalist approach has as a consequence generated the need to look to community for support. All approaches, however, locate the school as part of a larger system and as having necessary interactions with and responses to its local community. It is clear from much of the writing on FSS that
the school is considered to be a hub or a ‘community’ school. This raises questions about the nature of community and how FSS do or could interact productively with community.

**Conceptual Approaches to Working In Communities**

Taylor et. al. (2008: 87) have identified four conceptual approaches to working within communities for the areas of health and social care development. As FSS are seeking to provide for better health and social care for the students, a framework for understanding working with community is appropriate. The four conceptual approaches are as follows; the contributions approach, instrumental approach, community empowerment approach and developmental approach.

**The contributions approach**

This approach involves voluntary donations of time, labour, knowledge and skills however there is usually no expectation that contributors would be influential in decision making about how resources are used, or in the project directions. The major criticisms of this approach are communities seen as contributors rather than participants (Midgley 1986: 24 in Taylor et. al. 2008: 89) and that the contribution approach may not be sustainable.

**The instrumental approach**

Taylor et. al. (2008: 94) conceptualise this approach as involvement by individuals, groups and communities according to a strategy designed by professionals to improve health or social well-being. It is also sometimes referred to as a top down approach. Critiques of this approach can be that consultation process can be considered as tokenism, with very little involvement by community members in decision making at impact stage.

**The community empowerment approach**

This approach is seen as a bottom up approach. Empowerment involves encouraging local people to participate in determining priorities and solving problems, and, in the process, increase their knowledge and skill base in addition to achieving a sense of control over their environment. Criticisms of this approach are that the empowerment of one group may result in the disempowerment or expense of another (Labonte 2005: 85 in Taylor et. al. 2008: 99) or that the term empowerment is used loosely with community members not really achieving real power in decision making (Rifkin et. al 2000 in Taylor et. al. 2008: 99).

**The developmental approach**

A developmental approach to working with communities is one in which local people, usually through collective community based processes, are actively involved in a project over which they exert some influence (Oakley & Marsden 1984: 19 in Taylor et. al. 2008: 102). Rifkin (1996: 83 in Taylor et. al 2008: 102) defines the key elements of a developmental approach as: local people being involved in decision making; both the processes of participation and task achievement are valued; and participation results in meeting local participants’ objectives. Taylor et. al. (2008: 105) also identify numerous challenges of this approach including working in an environment with the demands for achievement of highly targeted
objectives, insufficient resources and mismatch between government goals and targets and community goals and targets.

Understanding schools as community sites and possibly as an integral part of the local community from these perspectives offers an additional dimension to that of the approaches mentioned above. A contributions approach may well be that most aligned with the Economic Rationalist approach but not be particularly effective in low socio-economic locations apart from the voluntary contribution of labour. The Instrumental approach can be applied to the social justice approach, although for some professional workers, this may also incorporate an empowerment approach. A developmental approach may commence from concerns about equity and lack of resources, but seeks to work alongside community members to assist them achieve their goals. This may or may not be through a FSS model.

These different modes of operation, the different approaches and community development frameworks can be used to understand the part schools play in their communities. The perspectives of social justice, economical rationalism or universalism to direct the purpose linked with community frameworks highlighting contributions, instrumental, community empowerment, or developmental approaches can be used to both understand the circumstances in which FSS exist and provide strategies for assisting their development and implementation. They can also assist in designing appropriate evaluative mechanisms to contribute to the evaluation literature currently available. As FSS is a relatively new model in WA these analytic and evaluative frameworks may be able to be applied to the operations of FSS in WA. This research hopes to be able to contribute to the understanding of how FSS might operate by in-depth exploration of their occurrence in the selected sites in metropolitan WA.

Along with the six conditions for learning articulated by the Coalition of Community Schools, these merged approaches provide a framework for assessing the school experiences which are the subject of this study and are being used here to analyse the findings which will be presented in Chapter Six. This framework could also provide useful guidance for schools seeking to institute FSS in the future.

**Summary**

This chapter has provided the context for considering FSS in WA by looking at how and why they started in the US and UK, the other two main locations where FSS operate, albeit under different names. The main focus for FSS has been to attend to the results of disadvantage on children’s educational attachment and progress through providing residual and remedial services within a framework of community partnerships. While the social and educational setting and policy environment in the US and the UK differ significantly from Australia, there are similarities in rationale. Concern for providing the necessary supports for children who
are not able to adequately access education because of social and economic circumstances affecting their health and well-being underpin the justification for instituting FSS.

Schools occupy a significant part of children’s lives and FSS emerged in recognition of the fact that schools cannot be separated from the other parts of children’s lives. What occurs outside the school impacts on their ability to make the best use of their school time and for some children, their families and communities these events and conditions mean that children struggle with education. Services have been provided directly to children and in some cases their families and communities with the intention of redressing the negative social conditions which lead to poor educational outcomes and while remedial services on their own will not address social problems they do provide the opportunity for the effect of these social problems to be reduced. Schools have arranged their systems to best meet their local circumstances and so different models have emerged with slightly different emphases.

The FSS implementation differs in location, with some schools accessing services off-site and others inviting services onto the school campus. Crucial to the implementation is the relationship with service providers which operate in quite different policy environments from that of education and so require a willingness on the part of the participants both to understand the policy and practice setting of the other as well as a willingness to collaborate. The overall concern is for the child’s ability to progress through school but these environments are likely to create differing imperatives which will affect how the FSS operates in any given setting.

In Chapter Three, the research design to address the research question, *How have FSS in WA been initiated and implemented* is discussed.
CHAPTER THREE – RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the way this research sought to address the research aim of exploring the ways in which FSS in WA have been established and implemented. This study seeks to identify key elements and factors in the initiation and development of FSS.

As FSS in WA are in their infancy, this study is exploratory. It is founded on the knowledge that at least three schools currently operate versions of FSS and the study seeks to identify what elements contribute to their development. It takes an Interpretivist approach using an intrinsic case study (Stake 1995), seeking to understand FSS in the WA context through their implementation in three metropolitan schools. Stake (1995) defines the term intrinsic in relation to case studies and suggests that researchers who have a genuine interest in a particular circumstance, event, or process should use this approach when the intent is for improvement. It is not undertaken primarily because the case represents other cases or because it illustrates a particular trait or problem, but because in all its particularity and ordinariness, the case itself is of interest. The purpose is not to come to understand some abstract construct or generic phenomenon. The purpose is not to build theory although Stake (1995) notes this as an option. This chapter presents this methodology in four sections. Firstly is a description of the research design and aim, theoretical perspective and justification for choice. Secondly, the methodological approach using an intrinsic case study is presented along with the choice of sites, selection of participants and ethics. Thirdly is described the interview design, interview process, and data handling under the heading Data Collection. Finally there is a description and justification for the thematic analysis process used.

Research Design

The broad research question for this study is ‘how have full service schools in WA been initiated and implemented?’ In order to answer this the researcher developed several sub questions to provide greater focus for the methodology, discussions, findings and conclusions. These sub questions were;

How do systems impact on FSS?
What are the key elements of leadership within FSS?
What are the key elements of partnerships within FSS?
What approaches and frameworks are appropriate for FSS?
This research focused on three primary schools which started FSS models in metropolitan Perth and each have designed their services to respond to the specific needs of their communities.

Research Aim
This research explores how and why FSS started and how they developed in the expectation that this might provide useful information for others facing similar circumstances and particularly schools in low socio-economic settings (SES) with multiple challenges to children’s educational progress. This might be for policy as well as practice purposes as well as to add to the body of literature about FSS. It may also provide a foundation for further research and evaluation.

Theoretical Perspective
A qualitative approach is appropriate to enable an investigation of FSS in “their local contexts from the perspective of those people who were instrumental in establishing them, and through enabling them to reflect on these circumstances” (Flick 2006: 16).

In an interpretive paradigm, the researcher seeks out the views of the participants and their understandings of their circumstances, actions and experiences, and this meaning-making process contributes to the development of knowledge of specific situations. It is a deep understanding rather than one which can be generalised more broadly by considering larger situations across multiple sites as is more generally the case with research from a positivist paradigm.

Qualitative studies are tools used in understanding and describing the world of human experience. Schram (2006: 15) describes qualitative research as “contested work in progress” and the qualitative predisposition as “embracing complexity, uncovering and challenging taken-for-granted assumptions” (Schram 2006: 7) and being “comfortable with uncertainty”. The aim of qualitative research is closer to problem generation (“problematizing”) than problem solution (Schram 2006).

A common criticism of the qualitative approach is the lack of generalisability offered by studying a single unit or a several case studies, rather than the wider viewpoint that quantitative approaches provide. In contrast to this criticism Lincoln and Guba (1985: 110) state that “the trouble with generalizations is that they don’t apply to particulars”. As Seuter (2012: 345) succinctly surmises the quantitative researcher might critically evaluate the qualitative researcher by noting, “What? Your conclusion is based on only one participant?” And the other would respond, “What? Your conclusion is based on only one experiment?”

The ultimate aim of qualitative research is to offer a perspective of a situation and provide well-written research reports that reflect the researcher's ability to illustrate or describe the
corresponding phenomenon. One of the greatest strengths of the qualitative approach is the richness and depth of explorations and descriptions (Myers 2002: 3).

The qualitative research approach permitted the phenomenon of the FSS in WA to be studied through the practises and interactions of involved people in everyday life thereby engaging with the complexities of these situations. Whereas research using quantitative approaches may have reached more people but contained less depth. Importantly for this study in which the researcher is an insider and a subject of the research, “qualitative methods take the researcher’s communication as an explicit part of knowledge instead of deeming it an intervening variable, the subjectivity of the researcher and those being studied becomes part of the research process” (Flick 2006: 17). Thus through this approach the researcher aimed to develop an understanding of the social patterns and social meanings from the context of full service school sites.

The qualitative research approach provided the opportunity to utilise an exploratory approach and open up new areas of social enquiry. The research explored views, behaviour and experiences of the participants (parents, lead agencies and school community) through the multiple sources of data and resulted in gaining an in-depth description from participants. The exploratory approach allowed complexities and challenges to appear through the conversational interviews which might otherwise be missed through more structured approaches. Such an approach encourages a lengthier and more substantial engagement with the study topic. One of the major strengths of this research was that the qualitative approach allowed a depth and richness to the gathering of data and written records which allows the reader to grasp many elements and idiosyncrasies of the situation and gain a deep understanding of each of the full service school sites.

**Interpretive Paradigm**

This intrinsic case study is set within an interpretive paradigm. The Interpretivist paradigm was developed initially from the work of German theorist Max Weber (1864-1920) which was concerned with the Verstehen, or the understanding, views and opinions of people experienced and expressed in everyday life. As Weber wrote of action, it is “social in so far as, by virtue of the subjective meaning attached to it by the acting individual (or individuals) it takes account of the behaviour of others and is therefore oriented by its course” (May 2001: 40). From here a science of society then seeks: “the interpretive understanding of social action in order thereby to arrive at a causal explanation of its course and effects” (Weber 1964:88). Interpretivism “concentrates on the meanings people bring to situations and behaviour, and which they use to understand their world” (O’Donoghue 2007: 16-17). Interpretivist researchers believe that reality is socially constructed with actors interpreting their own experiences and making meaning of their own realities, whether consciously or not. “Reality is not objective but subjective, reality is what people see it to be” (Sarantakos 1998: 36). This perspective was chosen for the purpose of this study so as to rely as much as possible on the participants’ views of the full service school. As Interpretivist research is
socially constructed, value bound and indeterminate, the only “working hypotheses” that are possible are those which are bound by context and time (Guba 1990:236). Reinforcing the inductive nature of such research in which meanings are understood from the perspectives of those people within the context being studied, Guba reminds us that this is “grounded knowledge” in which the understanding that is communicated “comes not only from its words but also from the broadly shared contexts of natural experiences within which it is embedded” (1990: 235).

The Interpretivist approach recognises that there are multiple realities and viewpoints to be considered and these realities can differ and change according to time and context. It emphasises social interaction as the basis for knowledge and gaining new knowledge. This approach provided opportunities for a deep understanding of the different perspectives formed from each of the study sites. In this approach the research participants helped the researcher to understand their realities.

One of the main benefits in utilising this approach over other approaches such as positivist research, a common approach used for quantitative studies, with its focus on constructing concepts and measuring variables, is that the interpretive paradigm provided the opportunity for a holistic approach to the data collection thus avoiding one of the pitfalls of positivist research which can result in important aspects being missed. Seuter (2012: 345) states “the general understanding favoured by quantitative, positivist researchers comes from empirical verification of observations, not subjective experiences or internal states (emotions, thoughts, etc.) of research participants”. This approach would be detrimental to this research topic as it would miss critical understandings and experiences through the adherence to measuring variables rather than recognising the multiple viewpoints and realities that come from an Interpretivist approach. As Morgan (1983c: 398 in Guba 1990: 237) states “The evidence generated by interpretive research is much more likely to be of an evocative rather than a comprehensive kind, to be sustained, rejected or refined for future studies. The conclusions of one study merely provide a starting point in a continuing cycle of inquiry, which may or may not over time serve to generate persuasive patterns of data from which further conclusions can be drawn”.

In this study the Interpretivist approach was utilised as the sources of qualitative data included interviews, observations, and documents none of which could be analysed easily statistically. The Interpretivist approach provides the researcher with opportunities to gain a “thick” (Denzin 1989) description of people’s lived experiences, events, or situations and from this extract the significance of these experiences. Interpretivism provides the understanding of a whole phenomenon via the perspective of those who actually live it and make sense of it (construct its meaning and interpret it personally) (Seuter 2012: 345).

Interpretivist research has its critics. One of the major criticisms of the use of Interpretivism is that it is not seen as a fool proof approach to reality (Blaikie 1993: 110-112). Other concerns are the adherence to the central elements of the Interpretivist inquiry (intention,
reason, motives) is quite difficult to police and reflective monitoring is not always present. It is not always possible to know whether the researchers gain a true account of the respondent’s meanings. Accounts of researcher and respondents may vary and be competing.

With the increased popularity of Interpretive methodology being utilized in research there have been growing concerns that there is not sufficient understanding of how rigour may be established to ensure confidence in both the findings and the ethical considerations (Laverty, 2003; Maggs-Rapport, 2001). Lincoln & Guba (1985) have provided substantial guidelines to satisfy these concerns and these have been successfully used by qualitative researchers since that time. Attending to credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability have become the hallmarks of the qualitative researcher’s rigorous defences.

Other criticisms have been of an overemphasis on subjectivity, a tendency to report desired outcomes and of the statement that qualitative researcher often is the instrument, relying on his or her skills to receive information in natural contexts and uncover its meaning by descriptive, exploratory, or explanatory procedures. Maxwell 1992 (cited in Cohen et. al. 2011: 181) argues for five kinds of validity in qualitative methods. One of these – interpretive validity – may be impacted by the ability of the researcher to catch the meaning, interpretations and intentions of participants and thereby may result in inaccurate data.

Overemphasis on subjective impressions can be as dangerous and counterproductive as overemphasis on objectivism. As with all institutions schools have divisions of interest and relations of power. It is therefore important to acknowledge the role of the institutional structures in this research. This consideration extends to the number of social and cultural mechanisms in the school community and as Schuets (1971: 5) states “the accuracy and correctness of people’s constructions of their representativeness cannot be tested.”

Patton defines the goal of qualitative data analysis is to uncover emerging themes, patterns, concepts, insights, and understandings (Patton 2002). The interpretivist approach provides a method in which the researcher can use an analytic framework—a network of linked concepts and classifications—to understand an underlying process; that is, a sequence of events or constructs and how they relate.

To counteract the criticisms noted above Patton (2002: 514) identifies the importance of creativity when making sense of the qualitative data. He suggests these criticisms can be lessened by taking on the challenges of being open to multiple possibilities or ways to think about a problem, engaging in “mental excursions” using multiple stimuli, “side-tracking” or “zigzagging,” changing patterns of thinking, making linkages between the “seemingly unconnected,” and “playing at it,” all with the intention of “opening the world to us in some way” (Patton 2002: 544).
In order to counter the criticisms of the Interpretivist approach, particularly in relying so heavily on the researcher’s skills, practices cited by Lincoln & Guba (1985) to ensure trustworthiness include member checking, audit trails to ensure confirmability of the findings. Additionally, the research log, triangulation of methods (described later) fulfilled these.

The type of understanding sought by qualitative Interpretivists demands flexibility in the data analysis process (Seuter 2012: 346), as it does in the design and data collection phase. It has provided the opportunity for participants to construct their own meaning from their experiences and situations and it has allowed the multiple realities that participants experienced from which the researcher has been able to derive meaning by descriptive and exploratory procedures.

**Methodology**

Consistent with an interpretive position is a methodological approach which seeks to understand the meaning given to actions and experiences on the part of the participants and the research then seeks to demonstrate how these can contribute to a wider understanding of social life. Phenomenological and hermeneutic methodologies are often used here to shape the research design. While their application has expanded from their philosophical and theological roots, understanding experience and understanding meanings constitute the main focus for those applications, however they are used, and their uses vary greatly (Patton 2002). The approach used here draws from Denzin’s broad use of these interpretive designs to understand the social world and meaning given to it in relation to the FSS.

This study takes a constructivist interpretive approach to the design of methodology. Crotty (1998:42) defines constructionism as the view that all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context. In a constructivist approach there is a greater need for versatility and or resourcefulness in the use of tools and methods.

As Crotty (1998:64) surmises we should accept that the social constructivist is relativist. What is said to be “the way things are” is really just “the sense we make of them.” Once this standpoint is embraced, we hold our understandings much more lightly and tentatively and far less dogmatically seeing them as historically and culturally effected interpretations rather than eternal truths of some kind.

What does the above mean as implications for this research? It means that the researcher had to remove the preconceived ideas that were held as a result of her own experiences and readings and rather approach the research creatively with an openness and flexibility to all the data as they were presented: to have no answers to the research question rather more a curiosity of what could be revealed.
Within the Interpretivist approach there is a range of theoretical perspectives which guide the research process. Examples include symbolic interactionism, hermeneutics, naturalistic enquiry, realism and phenomenology. Here, although there were some aspects of symbolic interactionism in terms of meanings arising from the process of social interaction the research approach more closely reflects a naturalistic or emergent inquiry (Lincoln & Guba 1985), which seeks to allow experiences and views of participants to provide a thick description of the FSS. According to May (1997:30) a researcher using an inductive approach “might examine a particular aspect of social life and derive our theories from resultant data”. This approach reflects the desire of the researcher to allow the participants’ viewpoints to speak clearly for themselves and not to be surrounded by limiting structural frameworks so that the experiences of the stakeholders of the full service schools can emerge.

Research Methods
This research project uses a case study approach as its main framework to collect data from three primary schools in the metropolitan Perth area of Western Australia. All three schools were already identified as FSS in terms of the previously provided FSS definition.

Case Study Research
In case study research a single case or a small number of cases are studied in detail with the general objective being to develop as full an understanding of the case as possible. Punch (Punch 2009: 119) defines case study research as aiming “to understand the case in depth, and in its natural setting, recognising its complexity and its context. It also has a holistic focus, aiming to preserve and understand the wholeness and unity of the case.”

Patton (1990:99) suggests that Robert Stake (1983) presents an excellent epistemological argument explicated how case studies can contribute both theoretically and pragmatically in educational research, distinguishing three main types of case studies, the intrinsic, instrumental and collective case study. The intrinsic ‘case’ is where little is already known. The ‘case’ here is the Full Service School in WA. This provides the opportunity to deal with the subtleties and intricacies of the FSS as a whole. The knowledge and understanding of FSS in WA is limited and this approach to research is expected to provide in-depth understanding and to enable conceptualising the features of FSS for further study.

This research is of a complex area involving a phenomenon of which not a great deal is known in WA. Case studies are necessarily ‘bounded’, specific to a situation, event, occurrence, entity and in their ‘wholeness’ require multiple data sources and data collection methods (Punch 2009 120). As Yin (1984 in Punch 1998: 153) points out the boundaries between the case and context are not necessarily clearly evident, nonetheless, the researcher needs to identify and describe the boundaries of the case as clearly as possible. The case is FSS in metropolitan Perth and as such are bounded by the schools and their environments. This includes the physical locations and the school catchment areas as well as the connections
these schools have to the agencies providing services, whether they be on or off the school grounds.

Exploring as many of the aspects of the FSS as possible within the confines of the research question enabled, as far as was possible, the maintenance of the unity and integrity of the data (Punch 2009: 120).

The case study approach allowed flexibility in choices of data collection and research methods. This meant that the researcher was able to use three types of data: observation, interviews and documents. The use of multiple sources of data then facilitated the trustworthiness of data through triangulation. Through the use of multiple methods the researcher was provided with the opportunity to capture the complexity of FSS.

Consistent with the qualitative approach, this case study focuses on relationships and processes in a natural setting. In this research each of the three FSS sites were studied as they naturally occurred and no artificial changes or controls were introduced. The case study approach allowed the researcher to view and hear how the people involved are operating within the FSS on a daily basis. One of the major advantages here is that the case study approach allowed the researcher to see how the relationships and processes on each of the sites were interconnected and interrelated. It provided the opportunity to explore the complexities of the models on each site and focus on the relationships and processes rather than restricting attention to outcomes. Thus the researcher was able to explore issues raised by participants, such as leadership, funding, facilities, lead agency partnership communication, time, people and workload and their impacts on the FSS. As Walter (2006: 315) states the real advantage of a case study approach is that it “provides opportunity to find out more than just what the outcomes are; it provides the opportunity to explain why certain outcomes might occur.”

Through the case study approach interconnections and interrelationships can be discovered and it is possible to see how various parts are linked whilst still retaining the strength and virtues of the case study approach (Bryman & Burgess 1994: 142).

One of the common criticisms of the case study approach is its lack of generalisability which therefore questions the credibility of the research findings. As Punch (2010) points out, however, the aim of a case study is to understand a complex situation more fully and so generalisability is not the aim. While the findings may lead to further studies of evaluation or comparison, the exploratory, interpretive aim of this study is to find out what is not known. However it is also recognised that if each case was totally unique this would impact on the transferability of knowledge gained. Punch (1998: 155) takes an opposing view to the popular disapproving and at times condescending view towards case study utilised in research. Rather he states “properly conducted case studies, especially in situations where our knowledge is shallow, fragmentary, incomplete or non-existent, have a valuable contribution to make.” He identifies three main ways. The first of these is the uniqueness of a case study providing an in
depth understanding of a new or persistently problematic research area. In the case of this research FSS within WA as mechanisms to try to address some of the social conditions hindering educational engagement is new and research is limited in this area. Secondly he states that the case study approach allows for “discovering the important features, developing an understanding of them and conceptualising them for further study” and finally that the case study can make an important contribution in combination with other research approaches. It is anticipated that this research will provide a foundation and stepping stone to lead into future research projects.

**Sampling**

FSS are in their infancy in WA with only three currently established, making them the total population. They are therefore information-rich cases and so constitute purposeful samples (Patton 2002). Denzin and Lincoln (in Flick 2006: 202) maintain that: “Many qualitative researchers employ purposive, and not random, sampling methods. They seek out groups, settings and individuals where the processes being studied are most likely to occur”. Of these three sites two are currently identified as FSS and the third school is in its establishment and implementation stage.

The principles of selection involved may be in some respects be seen as the kind of compromise which is common in research, allowing research and evaluation to be conducted rigorously, yet within the parameters of a specified budget (Bryman 1988). Here there was a particular target for the research, which was to understand the FSS as they operated in Perth more fully. As declared in Chapter One, the researcher is a Principal in a FSS, and this is one of the three known to be operating. It was this experience which stimulated interest in how the FSS came into being, and so the criteria for selection of schools in the case study were therefore determined by these considerations: that only primary schools operating their use of services on the school site were to be selected. Overall the strength of this study rests in its intrinsic nature. The research design facilitated the examination of a wide range of full service issues/ knowledge which are not currently apparent in literature available about FSS in WA.

**Research Participants**

The categories of research participants in each site were also purposively selected. These were stakeholders in the operations of the FSS and as they were information-rich (Patton 2002: 230) and be those most likely in each school to have in depth knowledge of the FSS. These stakeholders included the Principal, Deputy, social worker, school chaplain or students-at-educational-risk coordinator and teachers. As it was expected that each school would operate differently, it was hoped that either the Principal or Deputy would participate, one or more teachers and one of the social worker or chaplain positions and students-at-educational-risk coordinator, making a hoped for total of five in each school.

Additionally, stakeholders from partner lead agencies were sought. For the purpose of this research the term lead agencies also incorporates Universities. As already noted these
agencies are those which have had ongoing and in depth involvement in the school from its establishment of the FSS model and have also been involved in its implementation. Three of these agencies were selected to participate for each school from agency identification by the school.

Finally parents who were involved in an ongoing way with the FSS were sought to participate in this study. A total of three parents were sought from each site.

In total there were thirty three participants in the research.

The invitation strategy was sent through an information sheet in the newsletter for the school community and circulated to staff and lead agencies with an invitation to directly contact the researcher. For the other two schools the information letter was sent to the Principals with a request to circulate it amongst the staff, parents and lead agencies.

The choice of Neerigen Brook as one of the sites to be included needs to be mentioned as it is the researcher’s own school. The school site is one over which the researcher has effective control as Principal. It was therefore necessary to be particularly mindful of the ethical issues of vested interest in the findings of the study, subjectivity, informed consent, personal bias and preconceived ideas. There are some disadvantages regarding insider research, including participants being reluctant to express negative opinions for fear of censorship or impact on their relationship with the Principal. Insider research has much in common with ethnography and autoethnography with the declared positioning of the researcher. The task for the researcher is to demonstrate that the findings are able to be assessed as trustworthy and dealing with complications insider research bring in ways that do not result in detachment which, as Sikes and Potts (2008: 7) claim are ‘inimical to doing one’s job in the way in which one has been hired to do’. Trustworthiness can be achieved through the mechanisms common to naturalistic enquiry (Guba & Lincoln 1985). Insider research can also bring greater understanding to the research project. A common concern for insider research is assumed shared knowledge and interpretations leading to possible overlooking of data. Being critically reflective is one action which can assist to overcome this. Undertaking research in one’s own school can bring advantages as well. Being familiar with the local culture and customs and having already established a relationship provides the opportunity for the researcher to gain participants easily and to be privy to ‘insider’ information that would not be trusted to a stranger.

The researcher was also one of the information rich stakeholders who in her own right would contribute information about the formation and implementation of the FSS. This school’s current practice of partaking in a research model with UWA over the last several years may overcome some of the potential difficulties present in ‘insider’ research (Kayrooz & Trevitt 2005). In this case, there was already established process and structure within the school which manages the FSS and from which it was expected the stakeholders would be drawn. This research had already received the approval of this group and there was interest in
providing an in depth description and analysis from the key stakeholders including Principal, Deputy, lead agencies, teachers and student support personnel of the FSS at Neerigen Brook.

**Ethical Considerations**

Approval for the current research was sought from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Western Australia and the West Australian Department of Education. The research needed to conform to the requirements of the National Statement of Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. For approval to be given for the research to proceed all requirements of The University of Western Australia ethics review and approval procedures had to be met. All participants were fully informed in writing of what the research concerned and what participation involved, they were informed of their right to participate without any formal or informal coercion, right to withdraw, protection of anonymity and confidentiality.

As the researcher was a Principal of a school it is recognised that this brings expertise and experience and an advanced knowledge of issues in practice as well as a unique perspective of the research. As part of the ethical considerations for this research the insider research potential pitfalls were considered.

Potential issues that the researcher ensured that were planned for in approaching the ethics and methodology of this research were insider bias and validity (Murray and Lawrence, 2000: 18), subjective nature of researching at researcher’s own school, possible conflicts of interest, possible lack of impartiality, sensitivity to participants, misuse of information, changing the focus of the research as information was collated, possible vested interest in certain results being achieved, impact on current relationships with participants, confidentiality, teachers and school staff in particular could have felt expected or pressured to participate with the potential for negative consequences if they did not. To address these issues a research group was established in which the research group met with the stakeholders at the researcher’s school for the interviews and the identity of these stakeholders was not revealed to the researcher. The participants before being interviewed were assured of their anonymity and this was reiterated at the need of the interview and in follow up reviews of the interviews with the participants. The researcher also undertook this research with a strong self awareness and realistic expectations that information from participants will be from a range of perspectives and may be perceived as negative or positive. To guard against bias in work careful attention was given to feedback from participants, initial evaluation of data, and triangulation in the methods of gathering data as well as ensuring a constant focus on the research questions identified in the thesis submission. Data collation and thematic analysis was also discussed with research assistant to ensure these principles were upheld.

The two Ethics committees were satisfied that the prior existence of a research group at the school and its support for the research, as well as the recruitment strategy was appropriate to attend to this perception.

In order to protect the identities of the participants, school staff are described as ‘staff member’ as naming a participant as Chaplain or students-at-educational-risk coordinator may
readily identify him/her. The only time a person is identified in role is in Chapter Five where Principals are key informants.

Data Collection

Data sources comprised interviews with stakeholders, observations, and a research log. These were supplemented by policy documents and other reports directly related to FSS education in WA and in Australia.

Purposeful Conversational Interviews

The interviews were designed and undertaken in accordance with the principles of ethical conduct as described in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (1999).

The un-structured interviews were held on each school site with three parents, three partner lead agencies and five key stakeholders from the staff (covering Principal, Deputy, social worker, school chaplain or students-at-educational-risk coordinator and teachers).

Interview questions were purposefully broad relating to the emergence and implementation of the FSS from the participants’ experience. The approach encouraged the participants to elaborate as they chose.

This technique was chosen as Merton and Kendall (in Flick 2006: 151) suggest specifying questions should be explicit enough to aid the participant in relating to his/her responses to determine aspects of the situation and yet general enough to avoid having the interviewer over structure the interview. This unstructured questioning was guided by the broad areas of:

- how needs were established and the decision made to implement FSS;
- the rationale behind the implemented approaches;
- how the FSS was initiated, by what mechanisms;
- how the FSS was implemented; and
- critical success factors and inhibitors that affected implementation and ongoing development.

Included in these questions were subsidiary questions such as ‘who else was involved and how?’, ‘what particular procedures were needed?’, ‘what particular issues need to be considered as part of the process?’ and ‘how did you overcome challenges and limitations?’ etc.

This approach was intended to allow for a wide variety of views and experiences rather than narrowing meanings into a few categories. Spradley (1979) refers to these questions as Grand Tour, with the next layer focusing in more on some of the specific or ‘mini tour’ questions.
Interviews were tape recorded with the participants’ permission and when permission was not granted, (for example some parents preferred not to be recorded) detailed notes were taken. Interviews lasted approximately one hour.

Interviews were be held on site in rooms which were suitable for the participants and that they were comfortable speaking in as well as being private and free from background noise and interruptions. The tape recording method allowed the interviewer to concentrate on listening to what the participants said, being able to maintain eye contact, a complete record of the interview for analysis including what is said between the interviewer and the interviewee as well as accuracy for future quotations. Note taking also occurred to assist with writing down important issues as well as a safeguard in case equipment failed.

For the interviews the researcher recognised the importance of demonstrating empathic neutrality and took an empathic stance to seek understanding without judgement. The researcher aimed for openness, sensitivity, respect, awareness and responsiveness. In order to gain maximum value from the interview the researcher aimed to establish a rapport was established with each participant by commencing the interview with an introduction and answering questions as well as trying to put the participant at his/her ease. Where deemed appropriate to make the parent participants more comfortable on some sites they were interviewed in pairs. Appearance, body language and firm eye contact were all considered prior to interviewing. Other factors were lighting, space and location of seating. Jargon and double barrelled questions were avoided. If at times the researcher noticed the interviewee being uncomfortable, to respect their feelings the researcher then moved onto a more general topic. Several times I offered to turn off the tape recorder or stop taking notes when a sensitive issue arose. When probing for more information for clarification, elaboration, explanation or understanding the researcher ensured that the probing was in a way that it didn’t influence the interviewee. One strategy that was used was the repetition of the last few words and using them to start the next sentence. At times a short summary was given to see if the researcher had understood them and to determine if they wished to add further information. Prior to the commencement of the interview a length of time was established and was adhered to.

Observations

With the permission of the participating schools, observations were made at the three sites of general activity relating to the various programmes included in their FSS; community and parent participation and their related activities. These included parent child play groups, parenting workshops, community services, university links, child health centres and 3 year old kindys.

The approach that was utilised for these observations was “Simple” observation or “field observation” (Lee 2000) which assumes a non-controlling position over what is observed, even though choices were made about time and particular locations in the schools. Across
the three sites observation times, events and activities were specifically chosen by the stakeholders based on what they considered to be important.

The researcher requested that her presence at the school for the purposes of the research was made known to teachers, staff and parents prior to her visit and seek permission for specific observations. Permission was freely given by those concerned.

An observational protocol was used for recording the observational data. For this protocol three categories were used;
- Demographic information- time, place, date and setting
- Descriptive information – portraits of the participant, reconstruction of dialogue, description of physical setting, accounts of activities
- Reflective information- researcher’s personal thoughts; feelings, ideas, problems, impressions and prejudices (Cresswell 2009: 181).

These were recorded in the research log.

As part of the observation across the three sites, the purpose for the participation was stated clearly to all participants. Dress, behaviour, body language, timing and contextual implications were all considered prior to each observation period to ensure maximum opportunity to gain observations that yielded detailed thick descriptions. Where not deemed appropriate to record at the time of observations then following the participation thoughts and details were recorded to ensure accuracy of recollections. Field notes and observation notes were coded and classified. An example is in Appendix Two.

**Research Log**
A research log was kept by the researcher to ensure that all research methods were open for inspection and to provide an open accountability to demonstrate research reasoning and the chain of evidence on which it is based (Gillham 2000: 23). An example is in Appendix Three.

**Documents**
This research draws on information from a range of sources. Documents publicly available relating to policy were sought and reviewed from areas such as both the state and federal Education Departments, and School site documents. Primarily the Western Australian Department of Education (DET), and the federal Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations DEEWR, and Department for Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA), were surveyed for any material relating to FSS in WA, and more broadly to the role of the school in addressing social concerns through school services. In Western Australia sources included DET extended service web site, Classrooms First, DET Attendance Better Brighter Futures, Education Act Regulations and National Partnership Documents. Additionally the Australian Centre for Equity through Education, Australian Council for Education Research, Youth Research Centre Melbourne, provided commentary and critique on and for the idea of providing supports from the school for social concerns.
The focus on reviewing recent developments in Australia in relation to Australian policies inclusive of Commonwealth Government Communities for Children Initiative and the recent policy directive of the DEEWR focusing on National Partnerships with schools in low socio economic areas provides a timely policy initiative which supports this focus on what is happening in schools to address the effects of their poor socioeconomic status.

At the three school sites a range of documents were collected or accessed through the school website or Schools Online including site specific policy statements, school development plans, communication, passport program quantitative data, parent surveys and events/activity leaflets and vision statements.

**Analysis of the Data**

For this research the qualitative data were collected through observing a naturalistic setting at the three selected school sites allowing a greater depth to the study rather than breadth. It also offered the opportunity to discover how the participants experienced the FSS not just a snapshot of how it happened at a given point in time.

As this was an emergent process, the researcher aimed to be open to what emerged rather than putting predetermined constraints on outcomes. This approach avoided the pitfall of the research process becoming locked into rigid designs. This open approach using several forms of data sources allowed the researcher to focus on complex interdependencies of the context of the full service schools not just a few discrete variables. Each type of data therefore provided a thick, detailed, rich understanding.

Data collection was carried out over 18 weeks. To avoid theorising at too early a stage in the study the researcher made a conscious decision to keep an open mind, to have an ongoing search for data and to defer theorising until the array of data was comprehensive. Inductive data analysis allowed data to be aggregated as they emerged and contributed to decisions about further data to be collected. The key issues of all three schools were brought together using a thematic analysis approach guided by the research topics.

Multiple sources provided data for analysis and the data were initially grouped according to the three different types of interviews, observations and document analysis. Data analysis was conducted simultaneously with data collection and interpretation with initial exploration followed later by confirmation from the participants to their transcripts or notes. In this ongoing cyclical process information was synthesised across sources to look for commonalities and emergent patterns.

The analytical strategy utilised was a thematic analysis as it “yields insightful interpretations that are contextually grounded” (Wiebe et. al. 2009:927). The five purposes of meaning making are described by Boyatzis in Weibe et. al. (2009: 927) “(1) of seeing, (2) of finding relationships, (3) of analysing, (4) of systematically observing a case and (5) of qualifying
qualitative data”. From this emerged a thick description of the FSS in WA. This is supported by the triangulated approach of incorporating the multiple data sources (observations, documents with the interview material as well as the reflective material from the research log). The data themes underwent a number of reflective iterations to produce what Denzin (1989: 247) advocates to consider alternate possible interpretations (theories). This adds breadth and depth to the analysis.

Analysis of data from an intrinsic case study approach is challenging. One of the challenges was trying to derive the essence of the content from the large volumes of data without losing the context.

To ensure reporting back was consistent with the views of the stakeholders from all three sites an ongoing member checking process occurred for all interview transcripts and notes to ensure the record was accurate. A second process occurred in developing the research products in which information recorded was sent to the relevant stakeholders for confirmation, validation and verification (Punch 2009: 316).

To ensure procedural dependability of data collection, data reduction and summaries, reconstruction of data and results of syntheses and findings, process notes and preliminary plans, a clear audit trail was developed (see Appendix Four for an example). This was used to demonstrate how the researcher collated the data and how they were analysed to arrive at the conclusions. Regular peer debriefing (Flick 2006: 376) also occurred as part of this research process with individuals not involved in the research in order to reveal any of the researcher's blind spots and to ensure derived conclusions were credible and dependable.

In summary:

- Collated data were reviewed with the overall aim of integration for findings and conclusions. Collated data consisted of all available material (non structured and structured interviews, empirical data, exploratory data, research log and observations), literature and documents. A triangulated process was used to establish themes and add validity to the data where appropriate;
- Member checking occurred to determine accuracy with participants. Where appropriate follow up interviews occurred;
- Interpretative insights were recorded in research memos;
- As issues became highlighted they were then explored subsequently through data collection and analysis of the other material; and
- Analysis was made to identify converging perspectives (ideas, concepts common to all or a number of groups and diverging perspectives (ideas, concepts found only in one or a few groups).

As is discussed in the following chapters, some of the themes that emerged from the interviews were to be expected, due to prior research from overseas trips and available literature. However, there were a number of factors in the area of initiation and
implementation that have not been so well documented and these were able to emerge due to the conversational interview approach that was utilised which allowed participants’ experiences to emerge without manipulation thus creating greater depth of knowledge gained for this study than otherwise would have occurred.

The themes to emerge, and those to be reported on in the following sections of Chapter Four were grouped broadly under headings ‘This is not working’, ‘How can I make a change?’ and ‘We can’t do this on our own’. This is not working refers to the reflections of predominantly Principals and teachers on what was happening in their schools. Parents and agency personnel also contributed comments here and in the following two sections. This led to them seeking to do something differently in their schools to address lack of parent and children’s engagement in education and provides the rationale for starting the FSS model. How can I make a change refers to the strategies considered by Principals and their staff to address these concerns. And We can’t do it on our own refers to the steps schools took to engage with other services and parents to redress the negative interactions occurring in the schools.
CHAPTER FOUR- THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FULL SERVICE SCHOOLS

Introduction

As identified in Chapter Two, only one study on FSS has been conducted in Western Australia and gaps remain in our knowledge of FSS initiation and implementation. This chapter describes how and why the FSS started in three schools in WA and presents data collected from participants, observation, documents and is interspersed with the literature.

It was inevitable that when asked about the start of FSS several stakeholders talked about why it started: the problems of the complexities of children’s needs not being met through the traditional schooling system; welfare needs impacting on own student’s progress and other student’s progress; the school’s need to enhance children’s learning by attending to the other issues in their lives; and resourcing from the school being drained away from education to meet welfare issues and lack of continuity in services through stand alone services. As conversations progressed with participants there was an energy and a passion in sharing the positives that their approaches have made to individual children and the school as a whole. Participants however did not see their FSS through rosy coloured glasses and there were also stories of heartaches, disappointments with failed partnerships, conflicts with staff or community members of opposing philosophies, frustrations with bureaucracies and Government policies and practices and often overwhelming workloads. Participants still saw their FSS as an ongoing development process as being on a journey of reflection and improvement.

This chapter, which is presented in three sections, discusses the key findings that have emerged from the interviews. The first section ‘This is not working’ discusses the aspects of children and families being disengaged from the positive learning experience and reflects the reasons school staff considered the changes which eventuated. Section two ‘How can I make a change?’ discusses how Principals and other research respondents think about different approaches and strategies to engage children and their families. Section three ‘We can’t do it on our own’ discusses the engagement of others; staff, community and agencies to make a difference to students and their families. While this suggests a chronological and fairly linear process, in fact what schools did and how they did it were represented more as cyclical events, with emerging realisations sending the plans back to be rethought in light of new information. Similarly the recall of the respondents over their experiences is circular and the dynamic between the realisation that This is not working and We can’t do it on our own reflects this. This affects the representation in a linearly written thesis, and here the topics identified by the respondents are shaped into these three sections.
Section One ‘This is not working’

‘This is not working’ was a response to being asked why the school decided to initiate its FSS. The phrase echoes the experiences of the stakeholders in facing insurmountable challenges with limited resources and little progress in standard school processes.

The three case study schools which are currently operating a form of FSS in metropolitan Perth, or providing extended services in and from their schools, started to do so as a result of their Principals and senior staff being faced with increasing demands: from the Education Department to improve education achievement of students; from teachers wanting to know what they should do with children who came to school unfed, poorly clothed, tired from nights disturbed by fighting and so on; inadvertently from parents and community members whose view of the school was negative resulting in vandalism, rejection and non-engagement; and others more specific to the particular issues in their school. The standard approach to providing an education was clearly not reaching many children, nor engaging the parents in assisting their children learn. This section presents the background and rationale from these schools as to why they commenced thinking about providing additional services at or connected with the school to assist in children’s education.

Response to Needs

Interestingly, it was the stakeholders’ response to needs and the stakeholders’ recognition that their current situation was not working that drove the initiation of the FSS rather than a Government driven initiative as in countries like the UK and USA. This study reflected a strong desire for change by the stakeholders to meet the needs of their school community. Three different staff members capture the extent of the experiences at these three schools which led to their schools establishing full or extended services.

It was so frustrating, my workload was already huge, I was running from crisis to crisis constantly putting out fires, leaving work at the end of the day trying to work out if my latest decision in response to a social welfare issue was the right one or was I going to read about the incident in the paper the next day. I constantly thought where was the training to deal with these domestic violence issues, suicide statements and drug addicted households, how can I ensure these students eat regularly and survive their weekends and come back to school intact. Maybe I should be at a “leafy green school” where I can just focus on education and don’t have the constant worry and stress. At times I often felt alone and when I sought out help I was hit with bureaucracy and paperwork. I knew the focus had to be meeting the accountability requirements and improving the NAPLAN4 result scores but how could I when the children aren’t even at school because Dad went to jail last night, or Mum would rather have them at home because she likes the help, company or it is simply too much effort to make their lunch. I thought there had to be a better way but I also thought if I go forward with this FSS it will be harder for me in increasing my already balls in the air to more but worth it if I don’t have to continue to face these issues alone and with limited knowledge (Staff Member).

4 National Assessment Programme- Literacy and Numeracy
I remember when I first came to my school there was the constant threats from parents, safety issues out in the community spilling into the school, no school fence, ongoing vandalism and theft and generally the school looked unloved. Parent complaints were many and at times my staff and I didn’t feel safe. I recall a parent was out the front demanding to see Admin and given that only the previous day he had made serious threats my immediate reaction was not to deal but then I thought no this is not the way we do things here we need to move forward and resolve. The issue did not get resolved that day with this parent nor in the following year but I can say communication with him has improved and he gave me a hug last year, which ultimately means I will be able to educate his kids better as we now have an understanding. We are now working together for his kids not against each other (Staff Member).

I recall there were lock downs and other dangerous incidents including being trapped in a car when I was pregnant with a parent lying underneath the wheels preventing me from driving away as he was not happy that his child was suspended. There were parents sharing with me stories of attempts at suicide, drug addictions, lack of food, no money to pay bills, partners beating them up, physical abuse, partners going to jail and mental health issues. They shared with me as it seemed as if there was no support network for them, nowhere for them to go or a lack of trust in the existing agency support in the area that was available to them. There was an apathetic view of education by some however there were also lots of sparks, parents who were keen to give their all for their kids and wanted the school to be a great place, they generously gave their time and wanted to be involved. I had made a decision that tough schools need good staff and ultimately not to give up on these kids because they deserve the best. I was determined to find a way forward and knew there had to be a change and that I could not do this alone. This is not working and I sought out help from the school community and partnerships to help change things and make it better for the students and our whole community (Staff Member).

These reports of despair on the part of school staff as to what they could possibly do in the way of education when families’ lives were in such turmoil, of distress of parents who could not see a way forward for themselves in their lives, and of the societal demands that schools demonstrate steady improvements in educational progress set the scene for exploring in this chapter how schools considered what they should do in response to these issues and how they went about it.

As to be expected, participants reflected that development of each of the FSS was initially in response to the needs of the students and supportive of their educational success. For all three sites, participants reflected that the primary goal for the development of the FSS was the education of the students and that the extended services were implemented to support their learning. The tone of participants’ reflections was frustration, exhaustion and feelings of failure. Participants felt that the needs were overwhelming and the traditional approach to schooling was not working, they believed that there must be a different way of doing things and it was from these concerns that the pathway to FSS commenced.

As one participant succinctly stated: “The FSS model developed due to the inability of current methods to tackle ever increasing attendance and community issues” (Lead Agency).

Although the participants across the three sites recognised that the primary goal was for the education of the students, at times there seemed to be conflicting philosophies on whether
the FSS should be meeting the need of the wider community as well. From the perspectives of the lead agencies, there was a dual focus for their involvement and their contribution in the development process, rather than a priority focus of one over another. Their focus was to meet the educational needs of the student but also provide services and build capacity within the wider community.

**Viewpoints and Background Prior to Commencement**

Interview participants were asked about the situation of the school prior to commencement of the FSS started and what their perceptions were of the school and its response to school community needs. As expected, responses indicated schools in dire straits, overwhelmed by need and limited by resourcing.

Some participants from some sites reflected that initially the schools were unsafe, volatile, poor student numbers, had a bad reputation and or lacked parent engagement. A thread of commonality across all three sites was the overwhelming difficulties the schools were facing in resourcing, lack of services and resources to meet student and family needs. These issues and the need to overcome them to progress the students’ education was reflected as one of the biggest drivers to commence the FSS. Reflections included the following:

- *It had a bad reputation. It needed something to increase number of students, poor reputation* (Parent).
- *15 years ago the school was in bad shape, lack of parent engagement, siege mentality, poor attendance* (Staff Member).
- *Stolen cars, no fences, no bollards, no gardens, no reticulation, toxic school environment* (Staff Member).

The reputation of the school prior to the commencement of the FSS was commented on by staff, lead agencies and parent participants. This demonstrates that school reputation has significant value for participants regardless of whether it was a perception or a reality. School safety was also raised by many. It was interesting to note that parent participants did not compare on the school’s previous academic results prior to the FSS commencement which may reflect that this is not what they initially judge and rate schools on as well as the parents’ expectations.

It was clear to all three schools that something needed to be done to address the lack of engagement with the education process by parents and children, and to change the perceptions of the schools by parents and community members to make them positive institutions having positive contributions to make.
Section Two ‘How Can I Make a Change?’

From these unarguably despairing beginnings, the staff in these schools determined that not only was there the necessity to approach their work differently, but they were ready to think positively about the changes that were needed. One respondent recalled:

*I had heard about a school North of the river that had agencies co located on site and I had read about the community development schools in the US, Children’s Aid Society and the difference they were making to students’ lives and I thought why can’t we be like them, what is stopping us from following these models and how do we go about it (Staff Member).*

The planning needed to consider the school experience from the point of view of those who were expected to participate with some positive outcomes.

*Our school community was one in crisis. We originally started at making the parents feel comfortable and how we can make the school a point of contact for them. We noticed the parents appreciated this and we also started to look at it from a kids’ perspective and how we can make it better for them (Staff Member).*

Getting the whole system changed, however, took a lot more than just wishing and it was a lengthy process:

*It was all very well wanting things to change for the better but then we had to work out how to do it. I remember lots and lots of conversations. Conversations with staff, conversations with parents and initial conversations with potential partnerships. I wanted for the school to move from the complaints and victim mode with our hands in the air saying it is all too much to the action mode where we could do something about it. The only problem was I wanted it all yesterday. Need I say how much I hate meetings unless I get an immediate action from it. I met with potential partnerships sharing my concerns and how I saw that we might be able to work in partnership and then expected from the meeting something great would begin. I was disappointed I learnt the hard way that developing partnerships take time. I thought a particular partnership would be great but the school community did not and there was backlash and division. A partnership said they were keen to join but then it took 2 more years until they got the approval and funding. A partnership began and was making a difference but then they pulled out with only a week’s notice as they decided that they wanted to use their service and funding on a different project not associated with the school. It was a steep learning curve in partnership development and the community development process and lots of mistakes (Staff Member).*
Deciding that something needed to be done to make changes in the way both children and their families could engage with the educational process in more productive and positive ways was only the first step in establishing a FSS. There was very little in the way of examples in WA to provide guidance, nor was the Educational system constructed to be innovative or to promote what could be thought of as expanding into the social welfare arena. While each school had different ideas as to what could and should be included in an expanded school service domain, this was relatively untried territory and Principals had to imagine possibilities and try out different strategies with no guarantee or indications of what might work. The beginnings of the FSS in each school were at the instigation of the Principals and each of the three Principals tended towards a focus on the early years and family and student support services, whether by training, or intuition, or personal beliefs.

This next section starts with presenting the position put by the three schools that the Principal was the initial driver of the changes, the need to create a shared vision before exploring the experiences of the research participants in the three schools of how their FSS version started.

**Principal as the Initial Driver**

During the interviews, participants shared their views on who was the main driver of this initiative. As might be expected, the Principal has the main responsibility for any new programmes in the school, particularly those initiated from within the school. One Principal says:

> I had to ask the difficult questions, the honest questions, the hard questions where I wasn’t sure if I wanted that answer but knew I had to ask people to be honest and accept their honesty; what is wrong, why do my staff not want to come to work, why are the parents coming into the office shouting, why is my school constantly being vandalised and what is it that can be done differently? Things had to come to a head. The question had to be asked of why it was this way and then what was going to be done about it. This was the start of the 13 year journey (Staff Member).

The services were designed to support children emotionally, socially and physically so that they could focus on learning and develop to their full potential. In each of the cases initially the Principal was the driver for the development together with key staff and lead agencies. For these three schools, a distinct shift in approach and philosophy was necessary. The decision was made to move away from the traditional schooling approach to an integrated model as a strategy for meeting the needs of the school community. The Principals began the process of looking at what is it that they needed to do so that they can make the schools better, better at meeting the needs of the students, better academic results, better social outcomes, better early intervention and a positive school community.
This change in direction similar to what the FSS experienced has also been reflected in research. The situation in schools prior to changing to a FSS model was what Tourse & Sulick (1999) refer to as a “parallel relationship” in which there was very little collaboration between teachers and other social services professionals. Schools have realised that closer interaction and communication are needed among people working in schools (Anderson-Butcher & Ashton 2004: 40).

The emphasis of the FSS was that educational progress was only possible by attending to other concerns. As one staff member stated:

\[ \text{The FSS commenced due to the Principal’s belief that to meet the educational needs of students you need to meet the needs of the whole child.} \]

All three Principals had been working at their schools for a considerable amount of time and all had experience at working on other sites. Their depth of experience and knowledge of working in low SES schools had led them to understand that children’s success in school is also going to be influenced by what happens outside school and in their families. While in all three sites it was the Principal who recognised the need, commenced the FSS and developed and brokered the partnerships and built the shared vision with their community they also recognised they had to include the participation of others.

**Developing the FSS Philosophy and Vision**

One of the early realisations for all three Principals and their senior staff was that the changes envisaged and the needs to be addressed were of such a magnitude that it was going to be beyond the scope of the school to deal with entirely on its own. There were to be many people with a potential interest, school staff, parents, the local community members, social and health service providers and the Education authorities, to say nothing of the children who were to be the main targets and beneficiaries of the changes. Not only was a vision necessary to be developed that could be communicated effectively, but it needed to be a vision that would be understood and embraced by all involved. This meant involvement in the development of the vision by the various groupings.

All three sites demonstrated a clear purpose of what they were aiming to achieve with their school community. But they all realised that without the staff, parents, agencies and the wider community their efforts would be fruitless. Collective ownership of the philosophy and the vision was to be crucial as found in other research (Wong et. al. 2012).

**Communicating the Vision**

The realisation that collective ownership of the purpose of FSS was one matter – how to achieve it was more challenging. One agency representative recalled:

\[ \text{a staff meeting, bringing together interested teachers and other school staff to discuss the FSS. I gave an initial paper of literature – where the FSS idea came from, what it covered, how it was implemented. The aim was information to lead to some discussion about how} \]
could it be implemented here at the school. There were a few comments and a few
questions. But overall, the feeling I was left with was disinterest from the group. This was
a vision which needed to be explained and shared. Significantly it was a vision which
needed to be turned into reality so that the concrete aspects of what it meant and how it was
to be enacted were seen, understood and, importantly, that made sense in the day to day
work of the teachers.

The process of staff engagement here reflected apathy and possibly opposition.
A staff member stated:

All we seemed to do was have meetings and discuss our shared goals and objectives. All I
wanted to know was when were they coming into my class to help with Jack. Every day with
a meeting is another day down that he is not getting help. Couldn’t we just get them into the
class and sort out all the protocols and communication and assessment strategies later?
Why does there always have to be so much paperwork? Isn’t it the kids that matter?

Collins & McCray (2011: 139) also encountered this issue in their research of twenty
practitioners working in multi-agency contexts within the UK. Education practitioners
described what they saw as the slow pace of work in health and social care: “I think in
education the pace is really really fast, you need to see the parent the next day if there has
been a problem with the child, other agencies seem to work, well a lot of them on different
time scales”.

Parents were another group central to the success of the FSS. It can be tricky for schools to
explain the concept of FSS to parents in a manner that avoids confusion as well as showing
sensitivity and not patronising them. Schools are known for their widespread use of jargons
and acronyms which can be confusing. School leaders across the three sites discussed the
importance of demonstrating sensitivity using common-sense language and avoiding big
words which confuse people.

We looked at different ways of communicating with our parents as the traditional
newsletter approach had little success (Staff Member).

One of the participants from the Lead Agencies reflected on the challenge of parent
engagement whilst trying to gain resourcing. She reflected on the development process at
one site in which the meeting with staff, parents and agencies possibly did more damage than
good and possibly resulted in disengaging parents further rather than working in partnership
with them.

We were all gathered in the library at the school, arranged along a long table facing towards
the head of the table. There was a screen for showing some info, most of which was ABS
data about the locality, how many unemployed families, single parent families etc. There
was some data about the school and its low performance rates. In the audience were
agency people who had been invited to participate in some way to the FSS, hopefully to
contribute services or other resources. There were also parents. As I sat listening I couldn’t
help wondering what the parents were making of all of this. How did they feel about their
‘status’ being described as low socio-economic and disadvantaged? Did they care about
this long list of facts and stats? Did they know the other people there, who were very familiar
to each other and talked between themselves easily. The meeting did not produce the
hoped-for resourcing and especially there was considerable tension between the Principal
and a local community development worker who was very critical of the ‘speed’ of the programme development. But what emerged for me was the need to go more slowly in the process, to engage parents and to think about how the project/programme was framed. Interestingly, it was social work students who captured it when they questioned why a strengths-based approach was not being used here – but that’s another story” (Lead Agency).

Agencies were the other major group who had to engage with the vision. In the example above, at that point the agencies which had been invited to that meeting did not engage with the vision as well as the parents.

Subsequently, however, the three schools now believe that there is a common understanding of what is the intent of the FSS and, even if not all people fully agree, there is an acceptance that the FSS is operating. For one senior staff member

It has been about developing our leadership so that I can spread the opportunities around, creating opportunities for other people to step up and learn about how to engage agencies and keep them happy and making sure everybody is buying into the vision.

And another staff member takes it as a given:

The entire staff buy into the one vision so there is no struggle they all buy in and there is a common set of beliefs agreements that we all agree to and stick to. All their performance management is linked to the vision and making sure that they are able to achieve what the beliefs are about.

As far as agencies are concerned:

If any agency or service that comes on board does not buy into that vision and we have had a few who weren’t willing to share the information and wanted to work in isolation then they did not share the vision so they end up leaving as the clash of vision and direction is just too difficult to work with (Staff Member).

**Approaches to Family and Community Involvement**

Uppermost in the consideration of what wasn’t working for school staff was the relationship of the school with the parents. For this staff member, much of this poor relationship could be located in staff attitudes to parents.

We were getting it wrong. The staff believed the parents had their three times to see them to hear about the progress of their child and then the rest should be left to the experts. It was very much a them and us attitude. Our staff were very middle class and the idea that parents had something else to offer other than fundraising had never occurred to them. Parents were always seen in a deficit model rather than a strengths. There was a huge resistance to having them in the staffroom and staff did not want to share their space. Parents had their place and we have ours we do not want to share was the prevalent attitude. What can they possibly offer in partnership with us? Why do we need to do it differently? The majority were not open to a change in approach and it was a long uphill battle which resulted in some staff voting with their feet and leaving the school and others refusing to engage and continuing to create blocks and pockets of opposition. There was
however change as understanding about the philosophy and why started to develop and staff started to see the benefits but it took a lot of time, energy and was stressful and at times extremely frustrating and felt personal. It was the positive beliefs, encouragement and support of the parents, some staff and the partnerships that kept us moving forward (Staff Member).

Although not specifically mentioned as a reason for not involving parents in this response from a staff member, the ‘getting in the way of busy teachers’ activities’ is another potential barrier to parent involvement as noted by the CAS Director of community schools who says: “People pay a lot of lip service to the importance of parent involvement because it is politically correct but most of them don’t really want it because it interferes” (in Dryfoos et. al. 2005: 52).

Variable factors and concerns that have been raised is that FSS works well for some children and their families however these families may not be the most disadvantaged and some schools struggle to engage those who might benefit the most. Other concerns are that sometimes the FSS target the effects or symptoms of disadvantage rather than the bigger issue of inequality. Participants acknowledged this issue and reported seeking help from agencies for both advice and services to engage the disengaged and for help with strategies and services to meet the at times overwhelming areas of need.

We knew there were parents in our school that we weren’t engaging and we certainly had tried the workshop and newsletter approach but nothing was working. We were keen to see things change but didn’t really know what was the best way forward. We sought help and developed partnerships [with agencies] and together we were able to make the changes needed for us to begin the journey of engaging our parents more (Staff Member).

Participants from the partnerships and schools recalled initial discussions in which they wanted to provide a service and meet the needs of students and their families but they did not want to appear as patronising nor did they want to stigmatise the children and their families. Despite there being some staff, as noted above, whose perceptions of parents as having nothing to offer the school business because of their status was linked with their general and lengthy list of deficits: lack of knowledge, interest, ability in helping their children educationally, others sought alternate ways of thinking about parents and how to engage them. For one site this was a strengths approach (Saleebey 2000) introduced by a group of social work students undertaking a project at the school. This approach reverses the deficits-first strengths-later consideration to accepting that parents have skills and knowledge rather than having nothing to offer. This assisted the school staff to revise how they could engage with parents, although as participants in that site stated “there was not a strengths-based approach in place initially and that this approach was not developed until later.”

When moving from a deficit to a strengths based approach it can be difficult for strengths to emerge. FSS research (Henderson et. al. 2002; Munford 2003) recognise the importance for
the school to acknowledge the barriers and difficulties that families face by providing services but to do so with the primary focus being on the strengths and potential of each student and their families. As Munford (2003: 102) notes:

> A strength-based approach is the best way to help parents overcome current challenges [it is a] change in the way we work with families - while not ignoring the difficulties and challenges that families face, work with families should focus on where they want to get to, and their dreams for the future and for their children.“

**Design Considerations**

Research (Wolstenholme et. al. 2008:7; MacDonald & Williamson 2002; Pithouse et. al. 2005) found that parents, carers and children in need of support, value and are more likely to engage with practitioners who are accessible, approachable and responsive. They are also more likely to take up services if they are culturally sensitive.

Research participants identified their need to be ‘accessible, approachable and responsive’ as well as ‘culturally sensitive’ to children and families in their schools, as significant factors that they prioritised in their planning and implementation of strategies in their FSS. Participants discussed how they reflected on what they were doing and began the process of how they could do it differently to best meet the needs of the students and their families. The implementation of these strategies however was not without its challenges.

Cultural sensitivity is a fine line to tread as this participant reflects:

> We wanted our playgroup to be sensitive to the needs of Aboriginal families and welcoming and non-threatening however we also needed to work out a way of doing this so that it didn’t exclude out other ethnic groups (Lead Agency).

And another participant recalls the challenge of trying to meet needs but not neglecting some in favour of others:

> I always wanted to be there for the parents and be helpful and responsive to requests when asked. I didn’t ever want to let them down. But it was difficult sometimes as their requests could be time consuming and in being responsive to their request my own workload was getting behind and this was having an impact on the other programmes I was in charge of coordinating. I often felt I was in a double bind and not quite sure which one was the most important one to prioritise (Staff Member).

Some FSS research (Henderson et. al. 2007: 333) acknowledges that helping staff, parents and other partners really understand the importance of meaningful parent involvement is difficult and that the list of challenges to family involvement is long. Other areas that literature discusses are the impact of negative parent involvement especially when they are
empowered and the damage and difficulties there are in counteracting and derailing the best intentioned initiative.

**Early Intervention Focus**

Of prime concern for all the schools was school readiness for the children so that they had the best start to their educational engagement possible. This sentiment reflects the interest by several research respondents:

*There was a big gap between our kids when they started Pre-primary and the rest of the State and this was backed up by the Performance Indicators in Primary Schools (PIPS) data. In response to identified needs and social impact of children coming through we initially developed a playgroup and then from that developed into the integrated model. We initially looked at changing our pedagogy and our curriculum in Kindy and Pre-primary and try and better meet the needs of the kids but really what we had to try and do was to look at what was happening from 0-to-3 (Staff Member).*

Another respondent outlined some of the problems:

*Some of my students were coming to Kindy still in their nappies. The parents had simply not got round to toilet training them. They thought we could do it as we were the experts. This made me cross as didn’t I already have enough to do with getting the children to know how to read and write. I thought they are not working surely the least that they could do is to get their kids toilet trained instead of plonking them in front of the TV. Yet other parents who did seem to care when I spoke to them about their kid’s speech problems said they had been on the waitlist for 2 years and were still waiting. Others said, when asked about issues at home and what they were doing to get these things changed they said they had tried everywhere for help and were tired of telling the same story and no one seemed to care, they had even tried as a last resort Family and Children Services (as they called it welfare) but even they didn’t want to help. They had simply given up. They were fed up and frustrated and so was I. It simply didn’t seem fair to any of us and my heart went out to the child who seemed to be the innocent one in this foray of mess (Staff Member).*

For all three sites it began with the focus in the area of early intervention. All three schools aimed to involve the parents and community as early as possible, “One of the first things was to get some sort of positive relationship in the community- started down the bottom 0-to-3” (Staff Member). For one site it was the initial service that was provided and it was through this that later services then began to be introduced in response to community need. The approach required that the services needed to link and work together towards a common agreed goal in an integrated approach, as referred to below in the term integrated model. All
school-based participants identified the pressing need to put preventative strategies in place and increase opportunities for early identification of needs and linking to services. This was achieved through a range of services being provided on site inclusive of playgroups, child health, 3 year old programs, home visits and occupational, physio and speech therapy services. This approach and philosophy is also widely accepted with evidence of the importance of effective coordination of these early identification and preventative strategies for children and their families. (Hine 2005; Department for Education and Skills UK 2003)

The importance of early intervention and the positive impact that implemented strategies have on brain development is recognised globally (McCain & Mustard 1999) and informed Federal government initiatives in the early 2000s (Katz 2007). There are numerous bodies of research which have studied the impact of early intervention strategies on brain development and have concluded that the 0-to-3 is a crucial stage of learning for children. Growing evidence has emerged from a wide research base in health, developmental psychology, neuroscience, education and criminology, of the importance of promoting positive family and community experiences for young children during the earliest years of childhood (for example, McCain & Mustard 1999). The importance of early childhood prevention and early intervention programs is based on the premise that the first few years of life of a child's development are crucial in setting the foundation for lifelong learning, behaviour and health outcomes (McCain & Mustard 1999; Gauntlett et. al. 2000).

Wolstenholme et. al. (2008: 2) define early intervention as “where ‘early’ is taken to reference the point in time at which a child or young person becomes vulnerable to poor developmental outcomes. Effective early intervention approaches are those that prevent or arrest problems early in a child's life, or at early stages in the development of problem situations”. As Oberklaid (cited in Szego & Nader 2002: 4) notes: 'Social ills such as crime, unemployment and illiteracy could be countered by early intervention therapies designed to root out problems before they flourished'.

Early intervention activities may be carried out at the individual, family, and/or community levels, and can be tailored to meet the needs of different cultural groups. Early intervention services that may have a positive impact on children and families include: home visiting services for pregnant women and families with new babies; parenting skills training; family relationship education; family counselling; and support services for families with very young children, such as play groups, all of which help stimulate brain development (Fish 2002).

However, engaging parents who had not previously been engaged or seen the value in early intervention strategies was a challenge. One of the sites discussed how they went about meeting these challenges.

*We didn’t seem to be targeting the right parents those who were struggling with their language we then began to seek funding through a variety of sources to look at how we can employ someone who can go out and reach out to parents who*
typically would not be engaged in school so that year we employed a fulltime family support worker and to try to engage with the families who are difficult to engage in. Also made a connection with the local librarian who would come down and read stories to the children at playgroup time (Staff Member).

As important as providing services directly to and for children was also the recognition that parent involvement was crucial.

**Parent Engagement Approaches and Strategies**

The success of the FSS was always going to rest on the extent to which parents were directly involved in the schools. The idea of parents as partners rather than service recipients gained currency. As one respondent noted:

*The main purpose of FSS is about bettering the education of the children through establishing partnerships. A lot of the parents are disengaged with education through their own experiences and through lack of education and lack of literacy skills. It is about reengaging parents in the education system in a way that is approachable for them and by assisting them to become involved we can see the improvement in the student’s education (Staff Member).*

Through engaging parents in the “Start point in a particular school vision [there] is more whole wide community approach, coordinated within the school, parents are more likely to go for things” (Lead Agency).

Participants noted that parents were becoming actively involved in the school and an integral part of service delivery also mentioning parent involvement in developing the vision and the focus for the school, such as taking a strength-based approach. Some participants reported parent involvement and communication of services has been a challenge and for some it was still the same core group of parents being involved initially but some participants reported this changed over time.

One of the significant benefits identified across the three sites was the increased strengthening of relationships between parents and the school together with a change of attitude from parents whose historic view of schools was previously negative. Participants also identified significant positives for students with attendance issues who may not have viewed the school in a positive light.

One representative from a Lead Agency reflected that:

*One of the things that it really has helped with is if school has not been a positive experience for some people and then they have their own children it is not necessarily at the forefront of their minds to keep their children regularly attending school. If they can come in through the child health nurse so that they*
can get used to regularly visiting the school nice things so that then they think maybe the school is not so bad, get used to being on the school site and then possibly get used to positive feelings for being there rather than negative feelings (Lead Agency).

Another member of a Lead Agency commented:

The successful integration of the families into the school through the availability of the services is reflected by the staff and parents whose attitudes toward the schooling environment changes from one where the parents are only spasmodically involved with the teachers to one where the parent can discuss and be involved in the child’s schooling through both increased correspondence and physical participation (Lead Agency).

Clearly reaching out to parents in a spirit of reciprocity and inclusion has been something to which these parents have responded.

On one site there was a distinct change from a deficit model to a strengths-based approach where students and their families were participants not recipients in a range of projects where there is a stronger concept of reciprocity. This site had a dual focus of both inclusivity to meet the needs of all members of the school community, as well as a targeted approach to meet specific needs. One of its key premises is engagement and capacity building of parents. “We wanted to develop the parents’ and families’ strengths rather than worrying about the weaknesses all the deficiencies that they have” (Staff Member).

This change in perception had a significant effect on both how the school staff approached the introduction of the FSS and in responses from parents. One staff member recalled the:

Push from the Principal and her passion and also because a strengths-based approach has been a huge benefit. If it is going from what people do not have it automatically puts their back up straight away but if it is going from what they can do (looks at what they can do) not what they can’t do (Staff Member).

However, focusing on the competence of parents requires some patience for strengths to emerge, given people’s circumstances. Some suggestions that came from agencies and partnerships in overcoming the difficulty in a strengths-based approach was to take a more ‘values-based’ approach – engaging them in discussions about where they want to get to, and their dreams for the future and their children. The three schools actively used variations of these approaches.
To assist in this strengths-based approach at the three schools there is employed a school based community liaison officer, parent support worker or parent coordinator. These workers have strong ties to the local community and are able to establish links between the school and the parents. The roles and responsibilities of these workers across the three sites varied and included organising workshops and other learning experiences, creating volunteer and leadership opportunities, linking parents and their children to agencies and advocating for assistance for parents who need it, facilitating community outreach, home visits and staffing the parent room.

The strengths-based approach which was evident across these sites reflects the basic principle of the FSS as described by Dryfoos et al (2005: 42)

We see parents as assets and key allies not as burdens, we aim not only to increase the number of parents involved in their children’s education but also to deepen the intensity of their involvement and to encourage greater participation in their children’s future. Parent involvement is challenging. Although historically we have done a good job I prefer to see it as a continuing challenge so that we can always be at the cutting edge.

Within Australian research Kemmis (2000: 19) identifies the “importance of being positive and realistic; building on strengths without denying vulnerabilities, difficulties and resistance.”

Having a vision of possibilities was common to these schools and conceptualising the relationships differently between schools and parents, in addition to the practical provision of services which would start to meet the needs of the families. But there are other benefits from merely having services available to parents.

Parents are now happier for the one stop shop as many don’t have cars. Parents are meeting other parents. There is bridging between parents, teachers and services. School feels happier, not scary, kids and teachers smiling. Felt supported and not a closed group. Kids like parents being at school and they get to know other parents (Parents).

And school staff can see the flow-on effects.

The services have had an overwhelmingly positive effect on the school. Having formed the relationship between the school and the parents the school is better equipped to discuss pending issues regarding the child. This is also true with the students as is clearly visible when present at the school. The students have a relationship with the school that extends past just the educational aspects and tends towards a well-being/holistic approach that includes health both physical and mental and home situations that may be encroaching on the child’s ability to learn at school. This is clearly recognised by the child/student who duly holds the
school in a different opinion than before, which duly corresponds to increased attendance (Staff Member).

While services are evidently important and valued, it appears that the intrinsic benefits are those which research respondents have noticed more: more positive attitudes to the school and education and relationships developing which can be supportive.

Despite these positive signs from the beginnings of changed approaches to engaging parents, there were still some considerations in the process of implementing the FSS. Some parents noted that there was “still the same core group of parents that has always been involved,” and “But it is initially overwhelming and takes time to adjust.”

There are only a few teachers who see beyond that to engaging parents in different ways to eventually lead to changed behaviour and circumstances for children, and that teachers really want to be left alone to get on with the job of teaching and in certain circumstances they will use a service if it helps them in the classroom – such as sending a ‘disruptive’ child for ‘counselling’ (Staff member).

But this is offset by the development of increased parent interest, and in some cases, as shown by this next narrative, formal engagement with the school. A Lead Agency representative tells the following story:

I have been part of the regular FSS meetings at the school in 2012. They have happened weekly, then fortnightly, sometimes opportunistically, sometimes missing for some time. They have been resisted, avoided and questioned. There have been times when there has been a sense of relief to be at the meeting. One day, when there was a scheduled fortnightly meeting, I knew I was going to be very late if I were to go. I rang Lisa (pseudonym) who coordinates them and told her I would be very late. She said that was OK, there were other things she had to do. So I asked if she would have the meeting anyway and she replied probably not. I found out later she had the meeting. Lisa was a parent, who then became involved in the FSS and then was employed in FSS and now coordinates FSS parent engagement. I have watched her develop confidence, skills in relation to the FSS (she already had considerable skills). I was not needed to be at the meeting because Lisa is the important person at that meeting. FSS will rely on the Lisas of this world – albeit with support from others (Lead Agency).

For these three schools, the implementation of changes, while still needing careful and ongoing consideration, has resulted in some shared decision making including representatives of school, parents, and lead agencies in aspects of school programs and changes in the schools’ attitudes and practices to parent involvement. Of particular note is the change in attitude of parents towards the school. Parents from low SES areas may previously had negative experiences of education and schools which therefore impact on
their own involvement in the school, the attendance of their children at school and the priority and value that they place on the importance of education. Research participants could see that parents were engaging with other parents and parents who tended to be isolated were now forming connections with staff and parents on the school site. But attempting to undertake the necessary changes on their own was recognised by senior school staff as not being possible, or, according to the literature on FSS, desirable. The point of FSS is that they garner available supports and strategies which are extending the preventive ability of communities to address some of the social circumstances that lead to the need for remedial action in schools.

**Section Three ‘We can’t do it on our own’**

This section details the recognition of the need for help from agencies, through parent and community engagement and how the school sites went about engaging them to make a difference to students and their families and redress the negative situations and challenges that were being faced. Interview participants shared strong views on the importance of consultation and collaboration, involvement of stakeholders in the development process, engagement and developing strong sustainable partnerships with agencies.

Developing a shared vision and purpose to address the issues which had been identified by school staff, as mentioned in the previous section, was crucial to the implementation of the FSS approach. In that section school staff and some lead agencies recalled the discussions and preparatory work of communicating the ideas in ways that were likely to be understood and accepted. But this was still regarded as being a school-initiated action where the school had ultimate responsibility and authority. The idea of genuine partnership with agencies, in particular, as their services were necessary to address some of the issues, and parents as equal contributors to change was not something that was initially considered. The mechanisms for forming working relationships with agencies and parents were not those within the current skill set of school leaders and staff. It was the activities of collaboration, consultation and communication that were identified as being necessary for engaging agency personnel and parents to realise the vision.

**Communication, Consultation and Collaboration**

The purpose of the FSS has already been discussed as being to bring services onto the school site for the benefit of the children and families of the schools. Following this articulation of purpose came the realisation that not only was the school community, however conceptualised, to be extended but also that the services would need to be integrated. For one of the schools at least this was conceptualised deliberately through a community development focus. While the other schools did not conceptualise what they were doing through this perspective, all three discussed the necessary components of extending their school communities to include others – agencies, parents and community members in an integrated way. This involved communication, consultation and collaboration.
The challenges involved in communication have already been discussed. Engaging people in the purpose required different strategies. The consultative processes needed to be directed towards the particular groups involved.

A staff member recalls that “It was a huge consultation process”, although for some there wasn’t enough consultation. And while consultation was important, finding that parents in particular weren’t using the services provided was another form of feedback to add to the implementation of the FSS. One parent states that “The service was provided but parents didn’t use it because it didn’t have the service that parents wanted.”

Some of the early consultative attempts have already been mentioned, at the beginnings of the process of deciding that something had to be done to change what was happening, and not happening in the school. However small these measures might have been, they all added to a growing awareness of what could be done. Learning how to collaborate effectively was more by trial and error as collaborative working is not a skill that is necessarily taught to school staff.

This next example illustrates the negotiation that was employed to engage in a collaborative process of establishing a new service.

I remember we were expanding rapidly and we have always had the philosophy if it is free and it benefits the children let’s grab the opportunity. We were asked if we wanted a free service to join into our existing playgroup which we shared and ran in partnership with one of our Lead Agencies. We said yes definitely when approached however the agency said no. It was a distinct difference of opinions and approaches and we were not sure of how we were going to progress this further. We had a meeting and discussed the pros and cons of adding this additional service. There were definitely compromises made on both sides but over a few weeks and lots of emails and phone calls we were able to come up with an agreement that allowed this new service to join without causing detriment to the philosophy and approach of the existing Lead Agency (Staff member).

However, consulting and taking a collaborative approach have their disadvantages, not least of which is the time necessary to consult fully and to enter into a collaborative process as presented above. The example presented earlier about the meeting at which a Principal outlined her/his vision for the FSS at which a community development worker from a community agency expressed disapproval at the speed the Principal wanted to go is just one illustration of misconceptions about how long the process can take. Representatives from all the schools noted their surprise at how long the collaborative process took.

Added to these different time scales and expectations is also the realisation that to hurry or pass these processes may later result in the lack of long term sustainability of particular programs. As one staff member says: “You can’t expect it to happen overnight... it has been a 15 year journey.” These realisations are supported in the literature.
Changing schools is a slow process and changing working relationships between schools, communities and other agencies is also slow. Confronting and overcoming these habitual relationships of functional separation from the community and other agencies turns out to be very challenging for all concerned—students, school, staff, community members and staff of other agencies (Kemmis 2000: 24).

The general response from the majority of participants involved is that working collaboratively, although hard work and challenging, is definitely worth it, with the benefits far outweighing the disadvantages. The disadvantages of significant amounts of time spent in coordinating and facilitating meetings, meeting time spent, follow up from meetings, as well as listening and having to respond to oppositional viewpoints were sizeable, but in the end participants agreed that it was both necessary and productive.

The amount of time needed to establish relationships and embed services was not the only challenge. A representative from a Lead Agency refers to the different viewpoints as to what is needed and what can be provided.

> We are not pressured for time in regards to funding in our other work at our Agency and there can be a tendency to have your work compromised at a school site. This is an issue for us. We are really used to the integrated model within our Agency and we do really well and practice this approach so that has not been an issue working in this style with the school. For us it is mainly about the different systems and the motivators behind which can cause some issues and tension as what the school site puts as a priority is not what we would put as a priority with the cases at hand (Lead Agency).

And another states:

> As an agency working with the school we are trying to work with an education system where there are old rules and we have had to adjust to that. There has been a lot of teething issues (Lead Agency).

These competing situations of the need to collaborate as well as the benefits and disadvantages of having extra resources are reflected in the literature. Donaldson (1993) identifies two standpoints in monitoring the efficiency of the model: how productive it was in reaching desired outcomes and how much it depleted important resources, including the human ones.

With increased participation by a wide range of stakeholders in FSS so increases the opportunity for conflict. Already mentioned from agencies’ perspectives were the issues of opposing identified priorities from the school as well as having to work under pressure due to funding limiting their time allocated to the school and its needs. Parents also reported some hesitation and opposition: “Some parents think too much time spent on FSS and not enough on education.”

Although, as Hargreaves (1998: 90) notes “It is much harder to work through complex problems with diverse personalities and competing groups”, he also says “Yet altering relationships for the better is absolutely necessary for successful reform.”
Rather than seeing conflict in opposition to a collaborative approach, schools took the opportunities offered by disagreements to shape the services productively. Participants believed that disagreement assisted in the development of the FSS at their schools. At one site it assisted in identifying the appropriateness or validity of a service on the site; at another it was used as a starting point for the development of the FSS. The schools were open to differing opinions and the willingness to explore these within the context as long as there remained a clear purpose and direction.

At one site the Principal used conflict situations to build bridges and engage parents rather than burn them.

> In conflict situations with parents and/or when threats are made I look at what is the humour, break up this situation or say no in an authoritative manner with the aim of still building relationships, for example prohibition order is a bridge burner. At the end of the day need to be able to approach people and you can’t do this if there is prohibitions order…..Here is the problem how can we go about it.

As Champy (1995: 82) states:

> a culture which squashes disagreement is a culture doomed to stagnate, because change always begins with disagreement. Besides disagreement can never be squashed entirely. It gets repressed, to emerge later as a pervasive sense of injustice, followed by apathy, resentment, and even sabotage.

Participants of the school sites discussed the difficulties and complexities of teacher engagement in this vision based approach. In some sites there was full support yet in others not all teachers came on board from the beginning and the school leaders reflected that “even now there were still teachers with concerns.” The phrase that Donaldson (1993: 12) uses in terms of reflecting on restructuring efforts in the shift away from traditional approaches is it’s like “rebuilding a 747 while it’s in the air.”

As previously mentioned, conceptualising the development of FSS also as the development of community was deliberate in one school, but could also be seen in the experiences of the other two schools where consultation rather than leader–directed processes were used.

This approach is recognised widely in FSS literature as the best approach to ensure parent engagement, sustainability and success of services. “The community school concept works best when it is developed from the ground up, not laid over some other approach that isn’t working” (Children’s Aid Society 2001: 20). Research also states the importance of building relationships with the key stakeholders for consultation and change to be truly effective. “Building relationships of mutual trust and respect in which possibilities for change could be considered thoughtfully before being put into practice” (Kemmis 2000: 19).

The feedback from the participants in this study support this view in their recognition that schools were no longer seen as just a place for children but also for entire family and that
community spirit had increased. Participants also reflected an increased emotional connection to school. Both agency representatives and parents commented on this advance.

*The community spirit is a lot greater. There is more connection between the parents and the school (Parent),*

And

*More than just a place where you drop your kids off creates greater involvement (Lead Agency).*

Parents valued the sense of community, “*It’s a more intimate community*” (Parent) and noted how included they felt:

*Developing equal relationships with parents: the opinions and expertise of the parents of the school are valued and respected by the admin staff (Parent).*

Even recognising that as with any programme or initiative there will be disagreement, overall parents believed that the change has brought benefits.

*There will always be a few parents who can’t be pleased but I experience more positives than negatives from parents now and find that even when there are negatives there are parents there who defend the school’s position (Parent).*

Whether or not ‘community’, however defined, has been achieved one representative from a lead agency comments:

*My first introduction that I recall was to do with the Domestic Violence counselling service and the proposal to use the building for some family activities. Then came the PACMAN⁵ and some other services, the increasing presence of social work students, until now, five or so years later when the school is buzzing with activity. I’d say the vision was always there about how to have the school be community with all the things that would help community, but the action of it has taken that time. It still isn’t there yet, but there are certainly signs (Lead Agency).*

From a policy perspective, these moves to extending the school into and with the external community presents some considerations, not least of which is the location of responsibility and with it, accountability. The Karmel Report argued for responsibility to reside with people involved in the actual task of schooling and it went so far as to say that the school should be the nucleus of the community centre jointly managed by education, health, welfare, cultural and sporting agencies, which would generally increase its fruitfulness (Interim Committee of the Australian Schools Commission 1973: 13). This repositions agencies rather than the local community as authorities. Cummings (1994) identified some of the shortcomings of this social justice model approach to FSS in Australia by referring to the expectations of schools and the demands on teachers increasing over the last few years as they are expected to solve an increasing number of social problems and the like. However it was also noted that

---

⁵ Parents and Community Members Actively Networking, the name given by parents to a purpose built building.
“Conventional approaches where discrete agencies and organisations take responsibility for selective parts of a problem tend to maintain or compound the level of fragmentation of resources, duplication of effort and overlap that currently exists” (ACEE Beckett 1996: 7). What we are seeing in the case of these three schools implementing their FSS model is less devolution to agencies but the attempt to include all stakeholders in the responsibility for addressing some of the needs of families and children. While there are likely to still be concerns about displacing the educational purpose “Any further extension of teaching resources into community liaison work would further weaken the schools’ essential purpose of education” (Committee of Review 1989: 121), these schools believe that purpose in these situations is best served by including parents and the community in how their needs are to be addressed as partners in this effort. These schools have grappled with the dilemma presented as to whose responsibility this should be and have set out to do this themselves.

FSS development is an area which has many layers of complexity. On the surface one would expect stakeholders to report on developing partnerships as a gradual process, with significant amounts of consultation and collaboration with all key stakeholders and ongoing review to ensure all are working towards a shared vision. This would indeed be the way, if one was to write a practical how to book for a replica model approach, such as Building a Community School (Children’s Aid Society 2001) for a school wanting to develop the FSS model on their site. Engaging all stakeholders so that they all worked towards a common and jointly understood vision has been an ongoing task. While participants in all three sites demonstrated a clear purpose of what they were aiming to achieve with their community, they also recognised that this took time and that the details of how to achieve the purpose were often worked through as the FSS was being developed. As one Lead Agency representative noted “There was a greater development of thinking behind the purpose of the FSS over time.” The development of the FSS was not a linear process, even though they started with similar concerns and aims. Some preparation was evident, but as this was largely an unknown process and outcome there still needed to be trust that the aim was worth the process. Collaborative measures to try to develop the FSS at each site sought to engage all stakeholders in the ownership of the process.

Developing the FSS

Reflection was probably one of the key activities in both acknowledging people’s concerns and helping them to ‘own’ the process.

One participant recalls starting to discuss how to proceed:

*We self-reflected looked at what is wrong, why do staff not want to come to work, why are parents coming into office shouting, why is the school being vandalised? We asked the hard questions asked people to be honest and accepted their honesty. We used a framework of community and school renewal to try and identify the things that were happening in the school either the causation or the start of the issues. They wanted the school to be a place where kids could go and the staff didn’t want to respond in a way that wouldn’t be seen as*
defensive. It had to come to a head and this started the journey. The extended service thus started from this point (Staff Member).

Another reflected:

The community wanted a school that they could engage with but didn’t know how to express that in a way that was useful and the staff did not know how to respond in a way that was not seen as defensive you know what do you know about this I am the teacher type of attitude (Staff Member).

A number of strategies were used to both engage the interests of the stakeholders and work on the ideas of what might be possible. One staff member recalls: “We took all the School Council to look at a model at another school and then looked at pros and cons and drew up a model and got started.” Another tells of the:

“Need for agencies, there were a lot of parent surveys, parent interview process, what staff needed, seeing what agencies were able to come on board and what would be useful for our school.”

In all three sites there were ongoing review processes in place. Changes were made to service delivery, parent involvement and partnerships over time. Participants mentioned their ongoing planning, monitoring and reviewing, the need to retarget services to meet identified needs, break partnerships with agencies who were not sharing the same vision. Participants stated that this approach was successful for their school as it gave them opportunity to modify, respond to feedback, self-reflect and retarget and redirect as required. As one Principal stated: “It takes a long time... you need to start small and build over time.”

This starting of a programme and seeing how it would run is illustrated by a staff member:

It was one playgroup once a week in a Kindy class run by parents. For a year I would supervise and look at what they were doing and really it was about getting the parents to connect with their toddlers and babies there was a strong focus on early literacy and play type skills just building vocab. We had about 6 to 8 toddlers and the following year the numbers grew to about 15 (Staff Member).

Another tells of targeting services to meet identified needs:

We didn’t seem to be targeting the right parents those who were struggling with their language we then began to seek funding through a variety of sources to look at how we can employ someone who can go out and reach out to parents who typically would not be engaged in school so that year we employed a fulltime family support worker to try to engage with the families who are difficult to engage in. We also made a connection with the local librarian who would come down and read stories to the children at playgroup time also appointed a teacher to run the playgroup and made it a lot more structured. Also at the same time started having arrangement with health department for a nurse to come down (Staff Member).

Another example started as a teacher initiative and then involved parents and volunteers:

We developed a scholar dollar homework program for a number of kids who weren’t progressing academically who would not do their homework. Initially teachers being the
person who were managing it and we accessed parent help and once it was running quite well we got more parents in through the passport program becoming more mentors and now it has been going for more than 2 years and now it is completely run by parents. Parents go in and mentor their children and other people's children. When we first started there were not many children and parents involved and now huge difference. Coming from the teacher point of view if there was a child in your class who did not want to do their homework and the Mum was beside herself it gave us the chance to say here is the scholar dollar club attend there get the homework out of the way. The success has been teachers and parents both supporting it. It has been that successful that we have a parent who is illiterate but is now being mentored (Staff Member).

Agency participants also reviewed their involvement. One Agency participant recalls: We still have a worker there at the school. It went from us initially being external and cascading programs into the school to actually taking a much more concerted effort and starting to embed a worker in the school. The worker is still there part time and has been there for two years (Lead Agency).

However, as has already been mentioned, agencies which did not fully engage with what the school wanted to do had their involvement terminated. As one staff member states, having different aims or interpretations of what should be provided and how was not going to work. For this site this was important enough to sever the partnership if the agency was not prepared to work in partnership with similar goals.

If any agency or service that comes on board does not buy into that vision and we have had a few who weren’t willing to share the information and wanted to work in isolation then they did not share the vision so they end up leaving as the clash of vision and direction is just too difficult to work with (Staff Member).

This view reflected an integrity and strong vision which would not be compromised. This is often a challenge for leaders when developing their FSS is the compromising of values and philosophies to seize an opportunity of service or funding.

From the outside looking in, the FSS at the three different sites the development of services seem so embedded it is as if they have been there for a considerable amount of time. Although participants acknowledged the journey has been slow all three sites have progressed considerably from such small beginnings to now having such a wide range of services over such a relatively short period of time. As previously stated it has taken 15 years in one school, but from a parent’s perspective, it has been worthwhile.

The school is a different place now. There is so much available now for our kids and us (Parent).

That this was not the whole experience in the development of the FSS, however, is not surprising. Forming ongoing and effective relationships that are the partnerships on which FSS are founded takes time and attention to the processes of engagement, ensuring the vision or purpose continues to be understood and supported and negotiating through differences of viewpoints are also essential.
Engaging and Working with Lead Agencies

Having ideas of forming partnerships and sustaining them takes more effort than just inviting participation. The aims for these schools have been to have services integrated on the school sites and with external organisations embodying commitment to shared visions and implementation of services.

The partnerships at each school varied in shape, size and structure with some of the lead agencies being involved from the commencement of the FSS whilst others became partners later. Some of these lead agencies had an integral role in the shaping the overall development of the FSS whereas others were more on the development of their particular service. Many of the lead agencies at each site had a position on the School Board which replaced the School Councils for the Independent Public Schools and have considerable responsibilities in setting the direction of the schools (Department of Education 2012).

In some schools the lead agency approached them initially and offered a service and then from this the service expanded. In some FSS partnerships were formed through looking at services available within the local community. Agencies reported developing the partnership in response to needs in the area, response to direct request and having similar desires and vision. In some cases the initial partnership then developed into a joint funding arrangement. Some agencies reported that initial use of services began slowly but this increased significantly over time as awareness of services increased, benefits were recognised and relationships between parents, the school and lead agency improved. Participants also stated that as services and partnerships developed there were more opportunities to build in even more services to meet the needs of the students and their families. What was also evident in the schools was a change to the partnership model with the parents and lead agencies as well as an evolution of the partnerships over time. This example illustrates these developments:

We were getting a lot of referrals for trauma specific children from three schools and a lot of the families were having difficulty bringing their children to sessions so we actually approached the schools to offer the service free of charge on the school site rather than seeing them at our offices. This was picked up well by the schools and trialled in term 3 and 4. Through the GP on site at this school the children were able to get access to the mental health plan easily. We continued with this school as they had the GP support. We then negotiated for 2011 with the school also purchasing our service we would then be the psychologist involved in the school. We now have a psychologist working four days a week funded by our agency and the school (Lead Agency).

Agency representatives both suggested services and responded to requests, not initially having any awareness of the aims or structure of what constituted a FSS model. For one agency it was stimulated by “Having a similar desire to tackle community issues holistically” (Lead Agency). Another already had a commitment to partnership working and so working with the school made sense because:
"When looking at the area it was identified as a fairly significant needy area and the school is bang right in the middle of it. Our agency is passionate about partnership working and looking at the needs of the local community" (Lead Agency).

Parent engagement started by the schools and increasing parent involvement had an influence on the specific provisioning of services to meet parent needs. As the schools responded to parent feedback on the current services and proposed services so then did parent engagement increase. One agency recognised the potential for further services to be delivered because of the developments of parent-school relationships which prepared the ground well:

More services have been introduced at the school due to the relationship between the school and its parents. The services seem to begin as a generic idea and then get tailored towards what the community requires through participation (Lead Agency).

These relationships have been crucial in having parents and community members use the services available from agencies. As one agency representative stated: “Our agency does a concentrated approach to make a bigger difference rather than spread the resources too far” (Lead Agency). For this agency:

The usage of all the services has increased dramatically due to the increased awareness of the services on offer that were previously underutilized. The relationship that develops due to the connection between the school and the community through one or more activities inadvertently sees the community take up more of the services the school has on offer (Lead Agency).

These partnerships with external agencies are valued by the school staff who see the added resources they bring. For one staff member it was making the most of the opportunity: “You start to just add things into your school and opportunities come along” (Staff Member). While another reflects that:

“In developing culture the partnerships were the catalyst because they provided the resource- school was broke but back then no funding and now the school is wealthy in both financial and human resource”(Staff Member).

However positive staff in this study are now to the FSS and the range of partnerships that exist, these services and their implementation were not introduced without some challenges. Attention has needed to be paid to how to form and sustain ongoing relationships with agencies.

One of the challenges that has been identified in community school research and also by the participants in this research is the sharing of power and thinking strategically when forming alliances. Stokes and Mclean (2000: 27) identified factors for Principals to consider when seeking out and forming strategic alliances. “The central interest of schools and community agencies do not always coincide. There needs to be a reason why links are made. Such links are not outcomes on their own. It was the Principal who had an astute understanding of the way particular alliances could meet the self interest of both parties.” In part this goes against
the essence of partnership working, but on the other hand it has meant for these three schools that deliberate choices have been made as to what relationships have been pursued.

**Towards Forming Sustainable Partnerships**

Developing equal partnerships between external agencies, parents and community members with and within schools is not the norm for many schools, who may have relationships but on their own terms. Having FSS models meant rethinking the nature of those relationships and also the nature of the changes envisaged. As previously quoted from Kemmis (2000: 24) the change process in schools is slow and in particular the ‘habitual relationships’ which are no longer useful to the current purpose present challenges.

However within schools the mantra is often in the now. What can we do to make a difference to our students/children? This, at times, can be at risk with the issues of sustainability and brevity of funded programs causing scattered resources and workload impacts as well as a lack of clarity in directions. There are several contributors to this situation such as:

- funding provisions allocated annually with no commitment for future planning;
- parental pressures of wanting programs for their children who are in the school now not in the future; and
- staff transiency issues impacting on prioritising of programs. Schools want to make the most of the skills of current staff regardless of whether it is the right timing.

Different time scales and expectations can also cause conflicts with partnerships and the jumping of development steps which may not be deemed an essential at the time but later may result in the lack of long term sustainability of particular programs. As already quoted, Collins & McCray (2011: 139) also encountered this issue in their research of twenty practitioners working in multi-agency contexts within the UK.

Despite these pressures, the three schools persisted with the gradual approach with their developing their FSS. Research participants consider there to have been some success particularly in sustained parent involvement. Staff members have seen more parents become involved:

> In this area there is a need and the impact is huge it is established it is something that we just do it is not an extra. Biggest impact for this school is parent involvement (Staff Member),

and:

> As they have so many services the parents are more keen to be involved. We are getting kids on board, the passport system is massive and has ownership by parents (Staff Member).

And parents too are pleased with the outcomes. One parent considers “It’s a more intimate community” while another feels valued through “developing equal relationships with parents: the opinions and expertise of the parents of the school are valued and respected by the admin staff.”
In the words of another parent:

Parents are well informed as to what is going on and how to access it, offered to all with no discrimination it is universal it doesn’t matter where you are from you are treated the same and offered the same services and on a needs basis and if something it is not working it gets changed. So many workshops going to one and then you get drawn into more and word of mouth. We do have a lot more parents helping out and willing to access services.

The participants reflected on the progress of developing sustainable partnerships with its challenges, frustrations, benefits as well as the changes and impacts these had over time. Participants were able to clearly articulate challenges yet despite this the majority of participants presented a viewpoint of the journey being worth it yet still very much in process.

As Hughes et. al. (2007: 80) state in their discussions on Building Stronger Communities, “Naming the issues and challenges and making people aware of them can be a first step in bringing people together to work for the common good….. People are empowered to act as they find others with similar concerns and interest.”

Integration and Partnership Working

A significant example of partnership work and the integration of agencies into the schools is the student placements which are at each school site as part of University learning. These are training new professionals but they also bring services into the school, such as nursing, physiotherapy and social work. Having these services and the relationships with the Universities, while providing needed and valued services bring their own pressures.

The University students have been a challenge as we are dealing with students on a high rotation so some students may stay for 8 weeks, some 6 months some 4 weeks, so lots of handover and lots of different people in the classroom, setting up boundaries with them in terms of education as lots of them have – how to visit class teacher timing, communication, student teachers are aware of all rules but other disciplines may not have the same understandings. It takes lots of time to set these things up (Staff Member).

Another staff member sums up some of these issues through this narrative but ends with the realisation that the work involved did indeed have benefits:

I was requested to coordinate the University services of nursing, occupational therapy, physiotherapy and social work in the school. This meant that I was out of my classroom for half a day a week in carrying out this role. Although I was pleased to be given the opportunity initially the challenges in setting up this new intercollaboration model were overwhelming. I had to start from scratch. There was no model to follow, no documents to work from. I had to develop processes, guidelines, induction procedures and files and effective communication measures together with meeting schedules and agendas all within a very short period of time. The aim of setting up these processes was to ensure that all these interprofessional practices could work effectively together to make a difference for the student. I recall speaking to the Principal when asked to continue in this role and my question at the time is what is in it for me and my students. I saw what I was doing was taking my eye off the ball of teaching and it was impacting negatively on my own classroom. I was asked to reconsider and give it more time. The Principal also offered additional support to take away
some of the paperwork and legwork so I could focus more on the practical measures for the students in our early childhood block. Two months later we revisited my role when looking at plans for this interprofessional practice for the following year. I was able to willingly commit to continuing. The journey has been huge and very steep and way outside my comfort zone. However having now had the benefits of these services working directly with my students and my colleagues’ students and seeing the increased benefits both academically and socially it has made the hard work worth it. It wasn’t until I saw how much it impacted positively for the students could I say that I was fully behind this initiative (Staff Member).

Another staff member agrees:

There have been many positive factors of the integrated approach of all working together. We have learnt a lot about each others’ disciplines and the importance of outside services being involved on school site has deepened understanding of the services (Staff Member).

For the three schools how the changes are introduced so that they meet the needs and address the initial challenges require constant review and attention. Particularly, partnerships and parent involvement are central to the design and sustainability of FSS. Community development researchers (Mapp 2007; Dryfoos 2000; Barkin 2005) emphasise the importance of the community needing to be influential in directing how the school deliver the services. They highlight the importance in FSS of consultation with community participants rather than direction by experts be it either the Principal or lead agency.

Kretzmann and McKnight (1993: 209), who strongly advocate school and community partnerships because of the assets each has, also maintain that the whole community is a resource which needs to be mapped and reviewed with the emphasis being on productive relationships.

“Schools should not only be seen as an “educational institution” but also as a rich collection of resources which can be used for strengthening the social and economic fabric of the entire community. When the assets of both the school and the local community have been mapped, then the school and community agencies / institutions can begin to work together to develop a series of partnerships that will connect the school with the ongoing process of building a stronger community”.

Henderson et. al. (2007: 14-18) identify some typical responses to family-school relationships, with the Fortress School being at one end of a continuum and the Partnership School at the other. The Fortress school is characterised by the view that parents belong at home, not at school. If students don’t do well, it’s because their families don’t give them enough support. It has an attitude of ‘We’re already doing all we can. Our school is an oasis in a troubled community. We want to keep it that way’. Next is the Come if We Call School which views parents as useful when the school wants something, but generally they are more useful in helping their children at home. An Open door school expects that parents can be involved at the school in many ways and usually by invitation for school designated activities. While the Partnership school genuinely believes that all families and communities have something great to offer. The school accepts that it has a task in doing what is necessary to work closely
together to make sure every single student succeeds. The schools in this study aim to be Partnership schools.

During the research period all schools had an independent review as required by the IPS status. The reviews commented on the FSS operations at the schools.

**School Reviews**

**Challis Cluster School**
The school was commended on the following:

- The recognition by the school of the range of complexities of family and societal difficulties reflected by the wide range of planned programs and services to meet the needs of its students.
- The sourcing of funding and partnerships which have resulted in a range of services being available to assist parents and children on site.
- The ECEC as visionary in establishing the Challis Parenting and Early Learning Centre as an integrated multi agency resource for Challis schools and community focussing on early learning programs for children 0-3 years and support programs and services for families and cares. It will be a lighthouse model of management and coordination for the recently announced Government initiative to fund parent and child centres designed to coordinate service of health, parenting and education on the grounds of a primary school.
- The ECEC leadership team making strategic use of business and interagency professional partnerships for the purpose of improving student outcomes.

**Roseworth Primary School**
This review notes that the agencies work within the school to provide support, information, professional development and service to the students, staff and families in a synergetic manner (Education Department of Western Australia 2012: 3). It adds that the presence of particularly the Fogarty Foundation and the Smith Family serve to provide for ongoing support which is sustainable, and notes that the establishment of a new health centre to be built during 2013 will continue the aim towards the school becoming a community hub. The partnership with Curtin University and other community organisations has resulted in an increase in beneficial resources for the school (Education Department of Western Australia 2012: 4).

The reviewers concluded that there is a strong vision and ethos evident in the school focused on a commitment to excellence in teaching and excellence in leadership, quality partnerships with parents; and provision of extended services from birth in a safe, stimulating, inclusive learning environment. There is clear evidence that the partnerships are having the intended impact in improving student outcomes (Education Department of Western Australia 2012: 5).
They also noted that “There is clear evidence that the partnerships are having the intended impact in improving student outcomes” (Education Department of Western Australia 2012: 13).

**Neerigen Brook Primary School**

The Review commended the school for its approach to integrated services as a major strategy for engaging parents to contribute to student learning noting that:

> The introduction of programs to engage parents and children from the early years is a strength of the school (Education Department of Western Australia 2012:4)

Of particular note was the provision of remedial and developmental services through the presence on the school site of health and welfare students as part of the university partnerships. These were noted as providing much needed services for the pupils. Engaging parents and assisting in building their capacity was also commended.

**Summary**

The three schools in this study have all been recognised through their formal reviews for having attended to the needs of their communities in strategic and imaginative ways, justifying the decisions they made in seeking to extend the ‘normal’ school offerings through full service provisions. While these acknowledgements were welcome to these schools, as they themselves recognised through their contributions to this study, they were also quick to acknowledge that seeking to address some of the needs identified was not possible on their own. There was evidence across all three sites of the community’s social capacity to work collectively to enhance students and their families’ health, education and well-being as well as solve challenges and problems as they arose. Strong evidence was demonstrated by participants’ viewpoints of community resilience and strength which facilitated the success of the full service school models across these sites. There were also strong elements of high levels of parent and community engagement in these models as well as ownership of the school programs and initiatives as well as the problems as they arose. Community resources were capitalised to meet the needs of the school community.

Chapter Five focuses on the Theory of Change approach in relation to this study and utilises some of the criteria as they apply to the development and implementation of the FSS in the three schools in this study, and a set of understandings to contribute to a framework for evaluation at some later stage. Or in other words, if we want to know if the FSS works, we might use these tools to examine that question.
CHAPTER FIVE- CHANGE, LEADERSHIP AND PARTNERSHIPS: ELEMENTS OF THE FULL SERVICE SCHOOLS

The description of the development and implementation of the FSS in the three schools in the three sections of the previous chapter suggested three main aspects which affected and contributed to the way they have progressed. They reflect the concerns of the school stakeholders that firstly This is not working and the way the school and education systems do not necessarily meet the needs of children and families in the areas in which these three schools are located, and so change is needed; secondly that How can I make a change indicates the importance of leadership with its vision for something different was a significant force in how these schools undertook their FSS models; and the realisation in We can’t do this on our own that partnerships with supportive agencies, parents and the local community were crucial in enabling the FSS to be implemented. Systems change, leadership and partnerships, then, are the three themes which will be examined in this chapter again using the reflections of the stakeholders.

As this thesis started with the intent of being able to contribute to further understanding of the FSS models and possibly to their improvement and more widespread adoption, it is appropriate that a ‘Theory of Change’ (Cummings et al. 2007) process helps to discuss the findings in this study. As already mentioned, Cummings and her colleagues undertook an evaluation of the Full Service Extended Schools Initiative in Great Britain which intended to ensure that at least one school in every Local Government area had a comprehensive range of health and welfare services. They employed a ‘Theory of Change’ in their evaluation (Cummings et al 2007: 12) which sought to examine how what the participants in their study identified as being important was considered likely to lead to long-term outcomes. As a type of Appreciative Inquiry (Bushe 1995), or Action Research (Stringer 2007) this process is a formative but outcomes-focussed approach to assessing activity. Following Connell & Kubisch’s (1995: 17) definition of Theory of Change as applied to comprehensive community initiatives (CCI) of which arguably the FSS could be considered to be an example in microcosm, the process is anticipated to ‘determine its intended outcomes, the activities it expects to implement to achieve those outcomes, and the contextual factors that may have an effect on implementation of activities and their potential to bring about desired outcomes’. The schools in this study have not formally instituted evaluations of their FSS models, but have practically adopted processes which assist them to learn from what works, change what doesn’t, and direct their activities towards a long term goal. Assessing what is happening, reflecting on what could be, planning for future activities and putting into place strategies as a result of those activities are classic methods for these approaches.
While this study is not an evaluation it finds the Theory of Change approach useful for a number of reasons. Firstly, as Weiss (1995: 71/2) states having an understanding of what the expectations are of a programme (in this case the FSS) and how and why it will/should operate is a key starting criterion. It also seeks to explain what is currently not working and why that might be (the theory). Assumptions should be articulated, methods for operating outlined and goals clarified. This study offers both an examination of some of these criteria as they apply to the development and implementation of the FSS in the three schools in this study, and a set of understandings to contribute to a framework for evaluation at some later stage. Or in other words, if we want to know if the FSS works, we might use these tools to examine that question.

**Systems Change**

**How do systems impact on FSS?**
This discussion starts by considering the first of the main issues related to the earlier presentation discussion in Chapter Four (*This isn’t working*). It will be remembered that for the three schools the reason they embarked on the FSS process was because, in the words of one staff member ‘*This isn’t working*’, meaning that what was being offered to children and their families was not producing the educational results which were desired. School staff realised that they were far from being able to teach children in the classroom because of a range of negative indicators, some of which were resistances on the part of the school community, but others were beyond the usual scope of school activities. Angry negative children and parents were one part of the system, but on the other were possibly several generations of disengaged, disadvantaged families whose experiences included poverty, substance abuse, violence, mental illness and others. As discussed in Chapter Two, review of the literature, Dryfoos (1994), Bronfenbrenner (1986) and Dyson (2009) have explored the impact of systems outside the school and their impact on school processes and resources. 

In the case of these three schools, their assessment of the design of educational services was not necessarily such that they were engaging parents and children. With this realisation came the decision to allocate relatively scarce resources to try to engage parents and children, and restructure how the school managed its activities. All of this put extra pressure on schools already under considerable pressure to improve educational scores, attendance and behaviour. Their decision to try to address issues that have long been recognised as noted earlier in the Karmel Report (1977), but are those which should not be the sole responsibility of schools to solve, have presented these schools with challenges as well as the perceived rewards. Schools are being expected to deal more and more with societal issues, even while policy makers are prioritising the traditional and core business of schools, a circumstance which generates no little tension in quite what schools should be doing. Kerr & West (2010: 48) raise the valid concern of education policy needing to focus on the aspects that schools can impact stating that “Schools should not be charged with solving problems over which they exercise only marginal influence.” These schools, however,
consider that while the social problems may be beyond their scope of influence, they were affecting them within the school on a daily basis and hence needed some attention. Their reports of some improved attendance, improved behaviour and better parent engagement indicate to them that they were right to take the course they chose. As one staff member stated:

Changes in the families prior to the FSS starting and to now have been very dramatic. The parents before were very dramatic, the families were very transient, although we still have those situations they were less than before. We have more families who are willing to see if they can have any of these services that can help them and prior to that there were no services (Staff Member).

The traditional FSS assumes that resources, in the form of providing social services, are necessary to address the issues facing children and families, and these schools sought to provide these resources through their partnerships with external agencies. Assisting families to access much needed services when in settings outside the school there are long waiting times has been shown to be valued parts of the FSS. But Bronfenbrenner’s (1986) conceptualisation of systems is greater than merely improving access to services, although that has an important function. Children’s and their families’ connectedness to the supportive systems around them is as important, and ultimately will be more important once acute needs are met. This realisation underpins these schools’ insistence on engaging parents and community as fundamental to their FSS.

While these schools report greater involvement by parents the imperative of the core business, the educational purpose, of the school remains. And this is sometimes in tension with the FSS. There are two perspectives here. On the one hand is the view that the effectiveness of extended services flow from good school educational processes (Children’s Aid Society 2001: 16) and the other believes that extended services schools are themselves vehicles for educational systemic change (Dryfoos 2010: 2). This latter view takes the position that societal outcomes are as important as the educational ones, a position that would result in schools becoming social service agencies (Munford 2003: 94). Kemmis (2000: 42) sums up the tension by saying that

If efforts are over focussed on engaging the community in learning activities based in the school the needs of the student may be neglected or on the other hand if efforts to improve schools are too enthusiastically focussed on changing only the curriculum inside the classroom it may begin to neglect the concerns of the students’ wider community.

He concludes that it is important that curriculum in some way reflects the essence of a FSS in that it should be ‘organic, inclusive, integrated, negotiated’ rather than being solely outcomes focused. Being able to manage these tensions, and in particular not merely shaping a FSS to fit the curriculum, is, in his view, a matter for school administrators. For the school leaders in this study it is also a matter for government and the policy makers. Funding is one significant issue, as is a recognition that the education enterprise affects more than the children in the school. But the way education is delivered in WA at present does not readily include
understandings and applications of the FSS model. Having government subscribe to the FSS and actively involved in funding, coordination and policy attention on more equitable schooling as well as including the early years within the Education Act regulations were all matters raised by participants in this study. One Principal believed a greater coordination role was needed:

\[
\text{at our government level, the silo mentality, so that we are not all working in our own discreet areas. It needs to be around what children’s developments and families need and then integrated around a school site (Principal).}
\]

This idea of government coordination was also supported by a representative from an agency with the aim of the FSS model being more widely adopted:

\[
\text{Good in the bigger picture to have greater coordination from the Government having a fairly clear idea going forward if this is to spread across to other schools (Lead Agency).}
\]

This coordination needs to be supported by adequate funding. As one agency member stated:

\[
\text{Funding is the key because you can’t get that coordination of services without paying for it. It is not a role which you can just give to anyone, need to have someone with the necessary skills (Lead Agency).}
\]

A view which is reiterated by a parent:

\[
\text{Funding is important, ongoing pressure because it is outside what a school provides because we are outside of the box those things aren’t funded. Government needs to look at where they prioritise their funding (Parent).}
\]

Because so much attention was paid by these schools to early years supports, participants were also keen that government include the 0-3 year olds in the broader Education Act to ensure supports are both integrated and targeted appropriately. This gets to the heart of the overall aim of the FSS which is to ensure that children from low socio-economic areas have at least equal access to resources and opportunities as those children in higher socio-economic areas. Kerr and West raise this point of educational equity when they ask “what it is about the lives and educational experience of children that lead them to underachieve at school” (Kerr & West 2010:15) leading to the suggestion that the policy statement of narrowing the gap is less about a fairer system and more about achieving good academic results. One indicator of imbalance of resources can be found in the financial supports provided to schools from their parent and community bodies which in some places can exceed $50,000 annually. In locations in this study, it was with a sense of pride that one parent noted:

\[
\text{Our school fundraised $750 last year from a range of activities held throughout the year (Parent).}
\]

Funding is not the only significant challenge. As mentioned above the introduction of initiatives and services also put extra strain on already stretched staff. While “the temptation of a free service is difficult to turn down” and that “yes the pace is fast but we want the help
for our students now not in two years’ time” are common responses, these schools are still having to meet the challenges of increased expectations from all concerned.

Research (Wolstenholme et. al. 2008) suggests that an ever increasing range of services or too large a range of services can weaken the school’s ability to meet its students’ needs, manage change effectively resulting in the potential to overload the school with initiatives or services. Too many responsibilities can take the school away from its core curriculum focus and too many initiatives can destabilise and hinder the development of consistent procedures and processes within FSS.

The participants in this study believe that taking action on what might be considered to be more social rather than educational issues is necessary for their schools faced with the challenges of non-engagement and serious social ills amongst their cohorts. The changes (outcomes) they sought were improved engagement and better ability of the children to participate productively in their education. While many participants would not necessarily cite Bronfenbrenner (1986), their actions in implementing the FSS indicate they believe that systems affect each other and so what happens in families and communities has a direct bearing on children in schools (their theory or explanation). They also believe that it is beyond them entirely to undertake this work and they are looking for support and systems change within the institutional and political spheres to support them do this work more effectively (methods). The desire for change to meet the identified needs need to be balanced with the ability to manage the systems appropriately. The task of managing these systems rests largely with the leadership of the schools, and this is the next significant theme to be discussed.

Leadership

What are the key elements of leadership within FSS?
Chapter Four dealt with how and why the FSS started in these three schools, and central to those descriptions was the vision and decisions of school leaders, predominantly the Principal, along with other senior school staff. While it may seem obvious to state, as nothing in schools generally proceeds without the active involvement of Principals and senior staff, because this initiative is out of the normal functioning of schools, the FSS is as a direct result of Principals in particular deciding to do something different. How the FSS developed in these schools cannot be understood without considering the role leadership played. In applying their Theory of Change to the evaluation of FSES in the UK, Cummings et. al. (2007: 4) found, unsurprisingly, that ‘the development of FSES approaches tended rely heavily on the dynamism of head teachers and other school leaders, and to be conceptualised in terms of what they saw as priorities.’ This was the case in these three schools, as was described in the previous chapters. Other staff, parents and agency representatives clearly identified that it was largely the enthusiasm, vision and drive of the Principal which ensured that the FSS continued. One staff member states:
Leaders’ passion, organisation, dedication, need to be champions in what they do need to see the bigger picture, I think they need to have a component of everything but still need to have a passion. I think dedication is the most important thing for the FSS. The Principal needs to be dedicated in what they do and believe and where they see the school going (Staff Member).

And an agency representative reflects:

You can have the best product and program but you actually need people who are committed to run it. So if you have a Principal who is lukewarm the chances of it being successful are much harder. Our agency wanted to work with Principals who were enthusiastic and committed who wanted to make a difference in their schools (Lead Agency).

While a parent believes:

It needs to have a steady leadership with continuity and be approachable and relaxed (Parent).

A great deal of pressure is therefore placed on Principals to meet the varying and increasing needs. One staff member summarises some of the expectations:

Importance of Principal to have passion and to keep trying. Need to be able to sell the school and get groups involved in the school and you need to be a doer and an action person and be prepared to fail, you have to believe that it is something that will work for the children (Staff Member).

While another summarises the challenges:

I feel at the moment there is not enough stakeholders to sustain the FSS if there was a change of Principal. As it does chew up a lot of time. Too much time for the FSS for some Principals, some aspects would continue the parts that were easy to manage would continue. The key to be a successful FSS would be for the Principal to have that vision and philosophy. It always starts with leadership (Staff Member).

In one school, at least one staff member believed that the FSS had been sufficiently embedded so that:

“If the Principal was to leave it would be a part of the culture it has been embedded it has become part of what we do here and is a sign of a good program and a good leader.”

The development of the FSS entails more than just good management skills by the Principal. Fuller (2001) differentiated between management and leadership and sees leadership as dealing with uncertainty and finding solutions to new problems. Peter Senge (1990 in Royal 1997: 3) states ‘the Principal who is able to adapt a vision to new challenges will be more successful in building strong school cultures’.

Research has demonstrated that leadership is the force driving the community school initiative (Dryfoos et. al 2005: 130) with its identified elements including releasing unilateral control, teamwork, and shared leadership. Mendez-Morse (1992: 8) cite Gordon and McIntyre (1978) in supporting their findings of effective leadership in schools and identified
Principals’ “ability to work with different kinds of people having various needs, interests and expectations” as their strongest asset. They go on to say that: “Leaders of change are proactive. They take initiative, anticipate and recognise changes in their organisational environment, and begin to explore possible courses of action to respond to those changes.” Mendez-Morse (1992: 10)

At all three sites participants mentioned the strong skills and entrepreneurial characteristics that the Principal had in negotiating resources for FSS programs. Participants across the three sites indicated that their Principals had the ability to work with different groups of people and use their initiative and organisational skills to meet needs and respond to change. As one agency representative summed up:

*Leadership is paramount to FSS becoming embedded at the school. As with any change in a system that is already operating there are pivotal points whereby people involved have to discontinue existing methodology and begin the transition into the new system. Once embedded the FSS model will be self-sustainable as it is driven by a whole of community approach for change and not by one leader (Lead Agency).*

Additionally, they also identified that the type of leadership evolved over time to include parents, staff, agency representatives in the leadership activities, which is another important characteristic of leadership – the ability to delegate and share responsibilities. This shared leadership and vision approach was identified by participants as a motivator for commitment and a willingness to continue to work on the school site or remain in the partnership. As one staff member says:

*A lot of people lead the school, admin, team leaders, parent liaison officer, lead agencies, parents lead it, do their thing. It will evolve with new things that come along, how can we link that in to meet different education needs (Staff Member).*

Participants also reflected there are elements of creativity and risk taking in the leadership style of the FSS across the three sites as well as an ability to be open to change and respond to changing needs. The leaders were seen as ‘ideas’ people together with a perseverance to get things done and do whatever it takes to meet the needs of their school communities. These leadership skills were also seen as one of the key requirements for the success of the FSS. As one staff member stated: “This model would not work if you didn’t have a leader who was very innovative and willing to put in all the extra time involved.”

These leadership characteristics have also been reflected in research in the community schools leadership in the US. “You need to be a risk taker to enter into this type of partnership. I am going to use an analogy you must think outside the box, think about possibilities that are not necessarily apparent or not advocated in the traditional running of the school” (Dryfoos et. al 2005: 131).

Managing the FSS is not without its challenges. Workload, balancing the needs of the FSS versus instructional leadership, managing the change management process from traditional
school model to FSS model, resilience, developing skills and knowledge in the area of community development and brokering partnerships were all identified by participants. One Principal stated:

> You need to balance instructional leadership versus full service leadership. The school needs to have a go out and getter and then a whole lot of more doers. You need to look at who is the broker- who is going to do the sell and broker the partnerships, sell case, sell school part of my role is to go out and sell the parts of the school (Principal).

And a staff member recognises the challenges present in managing staff: “you do bump heads. Traditional role- maybe feel that they are not being supported.” And another:

> The FSS is incredibly time consuming and needs commitment e.g. breakfast club, setting up things, who is going to do what I am doing when I am meeting developing partnerships (Staff Member).

The identification by participants of the need for a broker and a salesperson in the FSS is an interesting one and certainly a different direction for schools in their staffing. Traditionally in schools the focus was the core educational program however with expansion of services, increasing student needs and the competitive market it is now not uncommon in schools to employ a public relations coordinator. However, in FSS we are now seeing leaders who can not only market the school but broker partnerships with agencies, mining companies, small and big businesses for finance as well as services. The skills this role would entail is not part of the traditional Bachelor of Education and would therefore require someone with this role to either have this background or be a quick study on the job. As we have seen, forming and sustaining relationships across these sectors is an important role, the skills for which are not inherent or part of Principals’ training. Leadership of an educational institution with education imperatives may be at the core of what is expected of these Principals and senior staff, but, as we have seen, collaborative mechanisms are essential if the FSS are to work.

Considering schools as communities, both as community hubs in which the wider neighbourhood participates, and communities incorporating different organisations and groupings is more akin to the systems thinking of Bronfenbrenner (1986) than perhaps the traditional view of schools as institutions. Incorporating leadership understandings from both systems and community rather than hierarchical government institutional forms of organisation is necessary. Here understanding how collaborative relationships work, the role of defining common visions and missions, with new structures, the need for joint decision making and allocation of resources is crucial to how FSS can operate. We have seen that in these 3 schools some aspects of these features work better than others and at different points in the process. But collaboration as a leadership skill is important for FSS leaders.

For the Principals one of the biggest challenges was the workload. Principals found it a constant challenge of running the school as well as running the FSS model. Also noted by all was the additional pressure of working hard to resource effective services and funding to support them. So, as one Principal notes:
Incredibly difficult workload enormous to the point of being unmanageable - running a tricky school and be an educational leader, lead curriculum and manage behaviour and trying to be innovative and run a complex FSS model for parents from when they are pregnant. The workload huge essentially trying to run two entities - complexities of school, educational leader and trying to run a FSS (Principal).

Participants suggested that one of the solutions to this could be having an additional coordinator in the school whose sole role is to coordinate the services or for the Lead Agency to be the coordinator of the services on site. Representatives from agencies contribute these ideas:

If there can be a coordinator in the school and help coordinate all the other services I think it would be a great help. I think that they would be a coordinator not just at this school but servicing a larger group but also being more aware of all the issues in the community, if it was possible to have a coordinator it might alleviate some of the challenges (Lead Agency), and the reflection that:

Lead agency will be a crucial part of sustainability. Lead agency takes over the service and the school can then get on and do what schools do (Lead Agency).

Within Western Australia the decision by Principals for their school to become a FSS is a voluntary one unlike oversees where it can be a national decision and organised accordingly. Thus the big advantage here is that decision to take on the additional workload is voluntary and therefore does not become an industrial issue. However the disadvantages are the risk of burn out for the Principal, potential for the model to cease if the Principal moves to another school and the general lack of government funding as it is not government policy. While it has been a decision at these schools to operate the FSS, these ongoing issues are ones which school leaders will need to address for the sustainability of their models. Now that these schools have been operating their FSS models for some years, questions of sustainability require different considerations, as mentioned above, what happens when the current leader leaves? School leaders in this study have been mindful to try to extend their leadership models to ensure that not only do other staff understand and accept the vision and the aim of the FSS in their school, but they also become part of the overall leadership process. One staff member identifies the need for a team approach in which they are “able to maintain the same vision, get the right people and the right partnerships.” Encouraging staff to recognise the benefits to them and the students in the FSS approach is one necessary step, at the same time as including them in the decision making process which is the essence of taking a community approach to the school. Royal & Rossi (1997: 1) citing Bryk and Driscoll, suggest that “a strong sense of community can facilitate staff members’ instructional efforts and enhance their personal wellbeing...have found that in communally organised schools staff morale is higher, teacher absenteeism is lower, and teachers are more satisfied with their work.”

One of the ways of helping to ensure staff support is through employing staff who express an interest in this type of school and this way of working, an opportunity which is afforded these
schools as they are all Independent Public Schools. Stokes and Mclean (2000: 10) identified both positives and negatives to this aspect but saw this ability as critical to the success of FSS. “Schools needed the flexibility to appoint staff who could work in this way and who were committed to locating the school and curriculum within the community.” Stokes and McLean (2000: 25) note, however, the challenges expressed by staff that developing links with the community could take time away from the core business of their school and in the end decided only to form partnerships only where there was a direct link between what the agency could offer and the curriculum. This decision related to teaching and learning programs as well as student welfare programs. The school then mapped the links between the agencies and the curriculum to give a clearer picture of school/community involvement.

For one staff member in this study this approach reinforced his/her view of how the Principal managed the process:

In gaining staff support the Principal has always been very open in his/her communication explaining why doing it and the benefits, lots of background info rather than we simply need to have this due to our clientele. [She/He] bought the staff with [her/him] on the journey which I think makes a huge impact for staff (Staff Member).

Other concerns have also needed to be addressed. One staff member recalls:

Challenges have been financial, teacher expectations grew initially, and over the years teachers have got used to it and don’t see it as an additional to their role but assistance to their role. When it first started the teachers were worried that it would be adding to their expectations as a workload issue. One of the difficulties of FSS, as it does not operate in the traditional sense as a PS, when you come from schools in Australia, schools in Australia focus on the core function of education of students. Parents are not a focus at all apart from when you see them at termly meetings as something to avoid. This is confronting the issue being involved with the parents and some staff find that difficult. Some staff would prefer the traditional model of the school (Staff Member).

While another states:

Having so many different agencies in the school for staff they feel that might be an issue and children getting pulled out of class getting access to services but also missing class time. When changes to days for services for children this impacts on the teachers. The managing of the services impacts on the administration role (Staff Member).

And:

Have to be able to get teachers to understand that they are making a difference (Staff Member).

For one parent the teachers still do not fully accept the parent presence:

some teachers have said “You’re taking my job”, [parent] team don’t feel comfortable or welcome in the staffroom, treated as parents not partners (Parent).
School leaders of FSS grapple with these challenges, ones for which they are not necessarily trained, nor do they fit neatly into the core business of the school. However, it is because the core business of the school in these schools is not working to its optimum that these school leaders have decided to do something different, something akin to what Cavanagh & Silcox (2002: 7) call school renewal. They consider something extra is required of school leaders who take this rather than the reform route: “it is expected that leaders with proclivity for school renewal need to be more determined, more committed and more resolute in effecting long term sustainable change than those motivated towards school reform, restructuring or school improvement.” For these school leaders a major part of the school renewal process is through the FSS system which relies on forging and sustaining good relationships with external health, welfare and social services agencies.

Schools which take on community functions as these 3 schools have done, find themselves confronted by the horizontal and vertical complexity of systems. Similarly, FSS must pay attention to ‘context, the flexible and evolving nature of the interventions, [and] the breadth of the range of outcomes being pursued...’ (Kubisch et. al. 1995: 3) all through the actions of the leaders whose previous experiences differs markedly and for which, in this terrain, they are not necessarily well prepared.

A Theory of Change approach to understanding the progress of the FSS is both context-specific and mindful of some core principles which, as already stated, have much in common with others of similar approaches such as Appreciative Inquiry (AI). Located in and for organisations, AI emphasises the role played by and need for creative and collaborative leadership (Bushe 1998). The process of sourcing and reporting on the ‘best’ stories from an organisation allows an assessment of these leadership activities. Here in this present study, leadership has been seen to be central and inspiring – encompassing some of the ‘best’ stories characteristic of AI, but also of a Theory of Change. One example, already reported, concerned the establishment of an inter-professional suite of services for children through partnerships with university students. Staff members, agency representatives and parents have reported their appreciation for such coordinated services of occupation and speech therapy, social work, nursing and others which directly connect children, families and education in the school. Allocating a teacher to undertake out-of the classroom coordination of this process meant being able to communicate effectively to the staff member and other teachers the merits of this approach, rearrange school schedules, negotiate with agency and professional service providers and others, all of which address horizontal and vertical complexity in context, with flexible and evolving interventions (Kubisch et al 1995).

In this section participants highlighted the tension that existed between parents and staff on the school site and how initially the teacher’s protectiveness in the education of the students was a barrier to parent engagement. On the surface this may appear as a simple barrier to be overcome but this research has demonstrated that building a shared vision and school renewal processes are by no means simple or easily achieved. These processes are challenging
and require more than basic management skills. They need leadership skills as well as strong understandings about the change management process. Negotiation of these processes means establishing effective partnerships, which is the remaining major theme to be discussed here.

**Partnerships**

**What are the key elements of partnerships within FSS?**

Partnerships is the third of the major themes to emerge from the discussions with school and agency participants in this research. The necessary partnerships for effective FSS encompass many relationships, perhaps the most evident is those between the school and agencies which provide the services to the school community either on or off the school site. However, the notion of school as community also intimates that the relationship between parents and community members and the school and the relationships within the school are no less important.

**Agency Partnerships**

Partnerships are most often considered in a formal sense and for the purpose of this study the term partnership in its formal sense is defined as “an agency working with the school either located on or off site towards a shared goal in meeting the needs of students and their families” (Press et. al. 2010: 82). Inter professional and interagency will also be considered as synonymous with partnerships and will be defined as “collaboration and cooperation by professionals from different disciplinary backgrounds” (Press et. al. 2010: 82). Although collaboration and cooperation are often considered to encompass different aspects of working together (Winer & Ray, 1994), and for the purposes of working out how to enact partnerships, enable a set of useful practices, Press et al (2010) and others link them together.

In this study not all the partnerships were legally or procedurally formalised; in fact in the main they rested on agreements between the schools and the agencies for the agencies to provide services to the school community, either on or off the school site. Predominantly also, the agencies provided their services as part of their work rather than as a fee for service, which the schools could not have readily afforded. Where agreements were established they were formed under two main frameworks of either a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Community Use of School Facilities Agreement. All three sites have a MOU for the Health Department for the health services that are provided on their site through the child health nurse which work on site or the community use of school facilities agreement. Community Use of School Facilities Agreement were used by sites for activities such as Little Athletics.

There were varying degrees of shared control and management as joint initiatives across the sites with schools and their lead agencies. Challenges that arose across the sites were in relation to the different disciplines, protocols and processes. Lead agency participants discussed the difficulties in working within the regulatory constraints of school and agencies,
diverse staff and agencies on site as well as the drive to meet performance indicators and their impact on the quality of service.

Research has suggested that diversity of partnerships working together can have mixed results. Potentially it could lead to an increase in perspectives and skills applied to solving complex problems- facilitating team effectiveness (Howarth & Morrision 2007). Alternatively it could be the basis of task and intergroup conflict, resulting in poor team outcomes (Kvarnstrom 2008).

One school staff member identifies some of the issues:

There is an interesting dynamic in the school where there is almost a hidden hierarchy of status or respect for the agencies when they move around the school, coming in to staff meetings or when we all get together at the FSS meetings. For the teachers there is a bit of an apathy for the agencies that don’t work directly with the child, it is almost like they can’t do the jigsaw link and simply don’t see how for example the agency that provides the food relief is just as valuable as the agency which provides the occupational therapy service to the student in their class. Sometimes the staff can be a bit insular and I am not sure that their value system does not sometimes cloud their judgement in being able to see the bigger picture. I have noted that it is only when they are directly involved with the agencies that do not work directly in the classroom do they then begin to understand the benefits and how they work. However the hierarchy still exists and the agencies that work directly in the classroom seem to have more of a voice in the school (Staff Member).

The importance of building and maintaining relationships with lead agencies was identified as one of the most critical factors in developing partnerships. Schools recognised that treating the agencies as ‘walking ATMs’ (Lead Agency) that are not appreciated or respected would be counterproductive, even though, as we have seen, some agency representatives sometimes felt ‘used’. Rather there was a concerted effort made by the leadership and staff at the FSS to build and develop reciprocal partnerships. It was also evident across the sites that there was a willingness by both the school and the agencies to define together the organisational expectations for the school, children and families and for themselves to change practices where needed to make the partnership work. While this willingness sometimes needed further attention to ensure the agencies felt valued by the schools and the school’s situations and concerns acknowledged by the agencies, both groups recognised the need for workable partnerships.

Research also reflects this practice:

Successful partnerships of lead agencies and the school are those that are not viewed as an outside agency parachuting in to save the schools but rather as a partner willing to work with the school on behalf of students and their families, with the goal to add value and enhance capacity (Children’s Aid Organisation 2001: 27).
As agencies are a key component of FSS participants also acknowledged that joint ownership is critical in partnership formation as well as having a shared commitment to the same vision. This viewpoint is also reflected in research. Stokes and Mclean (2000: 30) state

> Viable partnerships must have obvious advantages and some utility for all parties if they are to be sustained. Priorities may be different, the timing can be wrong or, simply, people may not get on. School/community links must be seen as useful; otherwise, the effort taken to initiate and sustain them does not correspond to the benefit derived.

In formulating partnerships with agencies Principals and agency representatives mentioned the complexities in successfully sustaining partnerships including funding, the right person and personality, creative skills, holistic approach and shared vision. Some partnerships within the FSS were formed through utilising existing contacts whereas others were formed through the Principal initiating contact with an agency in order to meet a school need. It appears that in some FSS the partners have then become advocates and have helped schools link into new opportunities. One Principal sums it up thus:

> Success of the program is attracting small buckets of money and the right person. Need to buy into the vision- it is not about co-locating the service it is about integrating the service. Personality is also a key (Principal).

A growing body of research (Wong et. al. 2012: 81; Dryfoos 1994) argue that integrated services involving a team of professionals potentially offer a highly effective strategy for providing families with access to a range of seamlessly or ‘joined-up’ services. There are however few empirical studies within Australia into how these interagency collaborations work in practice. This study adds valuable insights from the participants’ viewpoints in how they attempted to make these interagency collaborations work and be effective to meet the needs of their community.

It has already been mentioned that partnerships with agencies have been subject to trial and error approaches leading to some starting and others being discontinued for a variety of reasons. The strength of the partnership and the shared belief that they are making a difference was identified by participants as being one of the keys to sustaining partnerships, along with the importance of long term commitment. It was not explicitly explored with each site as to what ideal characteristics comprise the right partnership, although some factors that have emerged from this research mention a commitment to the philosophy, openness, communication initiative, forward thinking and ability to adapt. But these have within them needs for on-going attention as well as there being other challenges. Identifying and then enacting a shared purpose while managing different disciplines’ protocols and processes, including confidentiality, and negotiating the relative expertise of the partners are complex matters, which do not necessarily fall within the range of learned skills of either partner. Practical matters, such as funding, staffing, available facilities and resources are other concerns. The pace of change in introducing and integrating new services requires care.
Vision Building and Shared Beliefs – Towards Partnership Work

The process of developing and then implementing shared visions was a deliberate and sometimes contested process for the schools. As Hall (2005: 188) states: “Multiple stakeholders with diverse agendas and motivations are often difficult to reconcile and lack of shared goals and vision is a recognized impediment to multi-agency working.” There can be a tendency to push the shared vision, values and philosophy to an extent so much so that the positive impact of the diversity of the different professional practices is reduced. Collins and McCray (2011: 1) suggested the importance of embracing and maintaining the diversity among the professionals. In their study lead agency participants discussed the difficulty of competing demands within their own roles, organisation and other agencies which impeded their ability to practice in a responsive way. For some agencies the practitioners experience rival policy drivers and multiple aims – what Bateson (2000 in Prenkert 2006: 476) called the “double bind” where, ‘contradictory and paradoxical interaction between a subject (practitioner) and its social context is present’. Whereas McCray & Collins (2011: 38) believed that:

> diverse approaches and specialist knowledge were found to provide stimulus for agencies to work together; participants emphasizing that improving outcomes for children was dependant on maintaining the differences between service providers.

Despite these challenges, the schools persevered. One agency representative recalls:

> We had meetings to try to develop a shared vision and there was a lot of discussion and some wafty common goals but although they were written down I doubt they really meant much to anyone there as really it seemed to be just another step that we can tick off that we can complete. I don’t think the shared vision is something that you write down and then that is it. I really believe it is in your interactions and the philosophy and goal posts change over time as you get to know each other and the needs and what works best. What I have noted at this school is that the child is always at the centre. At times it moved away from that and got messy and a bit muddled especially when we were all chasing the funding but what we all always seemed to come back to was the child and that seemed to be our shared vision – what is best for the child? (Lead Agency).

Keefe and Howard (1997: 37) state that vision building never ends.

> It is an ongoing process that engages all members of the organisation in continual reflection on what they together want to create. All must see the picture of the future clearly, not just the leaders.

This also includes the agency partners. For the school leaders one necessity was staff development to encourage seeing the possibilities change offers and encourage shared ownership as well as engendering inter professional relationships and collaboration.

The development of collaborative service provision in a FSS is a complex task. FSS have dual roles: one of working with the school community and one of working with other agencies. The
complexity of having these two roles presents an ongoing challenge for them of keeping both roles continuing whilst building processes and the school-community/agency linkages.

James (ACEE, 2000: 4) defines collaboration as:

> a philosophy of practice in which approaches are truly integrated, with all stakeholders participating as equal partners in decision making, resource planning and implementing programs or strategies. It moves beyond student or client focussed approaches towards a family and community centred approach.

Similarly the word community may have different meaning to different schools and organisations. Sergiovanni (1996: 48) in Building Community in Schools defined it as:

> Communities are collection of individuals who are bonded together by natural will and who are bound to a set of shared ideas and ideals. This bonding and binding is tight enough to transform them from a collection of “I’s” into a collective “we”. As a “we” members are part of a tightly knot web of meaningful relationships.

The definition, although idealistic, does provide some direction but also reflects viewpoints of the participants on the way that their FSS have become more inclusive over time. At each of the sites documentations and participants responses reflected different cultures, and different methods of working and expectations. Some of the commonalities were starting from a common ground with the aim of developing one school community team with one mission, one vision and a common set of goals and objectives.

Participants in this study also recognised the positive impacts of having diverse personnel and agencies working on site towards a shared vision as well as insights into their own professional frameworks. Another agency representative describes his/her experience:

> There are a few areas from which the agencies and the FSS staff work from but we all know where they are and we can drop in and ask for help or bounce ideas whenever we need to. There is a helpful welcoming vibe in the school and I like the way everyone works together to help the kids. The meetings are great when we can all get together and share and map which students we are working with and discuss student progress and agency progress in terms of overall goals. The only problem with these meetings is that not everyone can attend on the day that the meetings is set. Over the space of the year in which we have been involved there has been huge improvements both in the communication strategies as well as in the interprofessional collaboration (Lead Agency).

And a school staff member reflects that:

> Through having the agencies on site especially those that worked directly with my students it helped me to think more about the way I taught and the strategies I used. They asked questions and observed me in my interactions with my students this made me self-reflect and also ask why I did what I did and was it useful and making a difference to the student. I really valued their input and the strategies they suggested helped the students (Staff Member).
Overall the inter-disciplinary work is valued by some of the staff and agency representatives. One staff member sums up the aims of the process:

\[\text{It has grown and every year a new service and getting people on board. The Principal spreads the vision and people buy into that vision. What we have that is different here is that we have an integrated services approach. They go to a team meeting and they talk about OT, speecie and they all talk about what they can do for that family. The child is in the middle and the team look at what we can do to support that child. We are not working in silos or working independently of each other, a lot of information is shared and it is great as it means that the child gets a comprehensive service rather than fragmented services (Staff Member).}\]

There are significant bodies of research into the inter collaboration model. Edwards (2009) uses the term \textit{distributed expertise} to refer to a network of expertise spread across the many knowledge bases and skills of different professions. In contrast to the professional silos that seek to preserve established practices and interests by demarcating disciplinary boundaries around practitioners. Edwards (2009: 38) contends that when practitioners see themselves as part of such a network, they are better able to look across the lives of vulnerable children, identify the complex components of risk and work together to disrupt trajectories of exclusion. Similarly Anning et. al. (2006) argue that, when different kinds of knowledge are distributed across and flow freely around an inter-professional team, the team is able to respond flexibly to changing circumstances, requirements and needs. In contrast to only seeing the lead agencies as having the expertise, or the agencies themselves considering they are the only ones with that expertise, exploring each other’s’ knowledge and skills, learning from each other and contributing to each other’s’ enactment of the work is part of the collaborative endeavour.

It is perhaps to be expected that school staff and agency staff will view the FSS mission from within their own frames of reference. An agency representative states:

\[\text{There can be sometimes in this school a bit of a dump and leave approach. They expect us to be the fix it and solve the problems with minimal engagement from them. It needs to be a shared ownership and they have to spend the time and get involved for the collaboration to work. Some of the staff still want to work in a traditional approach wanting the service to take the student out of their class and work with them regularly. I am not sure if this is simply a workload issue or they want a break from the child’s behaviours. Sometimes when I try to catch up with staff they say they don’t have the time as it is their DOTT time and and it feels like they are doing me the favour, it can be quite frustrating. I don’t think they really get what collaboration is all about and it is disrespectful when they don’t value our service (Lead Agency).}\]

While a school staff member sees the situation differently:

\[\text{They don’t seem to understand the pressures on us and how much work and planning we have to do. I value having the services in my classroom and working with my students but I can’t afford to give all my DOTT meeting with them to discuss one student when I need to be planning, programming and assessing for the whole class. I feel rude when I have to put}\]
boundaries in place and cut meetings short. I think there needs to be some processes here put in place. I find it hard telling them so I just try to avoid (Staff Member).

This points to one of the needs of collaborative work where existing boundaries may serve traditional purposes but need revisiting if there is to be a working partnership. As one agency representative states:

You've got to have people who are willing to step outside their own traditional roles and who are comfortable with their own abilities in their role. You need to have people who are willing to step outside their boundaries (Lead Agency).

At the same time, establishing clear expectations is necessary, thereby imposing certain boundaries. Another agency representative states that it is important to:

support our staff to set the boundaries. We needed to establish with the school clear boundaries around Principal expectations and staff expectations (Lead Agency).

While stepping outside boundaries may work at the interpersonal level, at a policy level, it is a different matter. Agency and school policies and procedures can get in the way. One agency representative reflects:

There has been lots of teething issues. The school model is very different from what we do. We are trying to work in a system where there are old rules and we have had to adjust to that but the rules have not been adjusted. The philosophy of working with the Education Department is very different there is a lot of pressures such as time in regards to funding and there can be a tendency to have your work compromised (Lead Agency).

In addition to negotiating agency procedural requirements, it is possibly even more important for the partnerships to establish their own protocols. Stokes and Mclean 2000: 27 note that “Protocols provide a process that can last longer than individual personalities involved.”

For some teachers and parents the diverse theoretical, ethical and practical perspectives of agencies were not always in accordance with their own views. However this is not uncommon. Kemmis (2000: 21) in his research in FSS in Victoria also identified this challenge of welfare and education often being disparate cultures. The school often being the main agency seeking and encouraging inter-agency partnerships may be at odds with the modes of operation of other agencies. Trying to overcome the regulatory constraints of the school and agencies, schools counteracted by putting in place detailed protocols and processes with partnerships through documentations such as memorandums of understandings and through integrated service meetings, reflecting findings previously by Dryfoos et. al. (2005: 193) who also identified the importance of putting these protocols and processes into place:

A memorandum of understanding clearly describes each party’s commitment and the roles and responsibilities and expectations for all participating organisations before the initiative begins.

Another central issue of interagency working is that of confidentiality and how each agency manages it. One agency representative reflects:
Being on site does have some difficulties as some parents are very wary of the school and they don't want the information going back to the school. Parents are like I don't want the school knowing my business (Lead Agency).

While a Principal is also aware of associated issues:

The sharing of information is problematic and a benefit, certain agencies are bound by certain laws. We didn't want a Mum to have to tell her story 15 times over. Story to be told once and then as a team to decide on action plan to meet needs (Principal).

All these issues in establishing and implementing a shared vision are summed up by Robinson et. al. (2008:7) who state:

Even when governance, leadership, organisational culture and ethos are all conducive to interprofessional practice, practitioners face demanding challenges associated with the imperative to broaden their professional roles and responsibilities, change well sedimented, traditional practices, and develop new knowledge and skills.

One parent sums up the importance of shared vision, while at the same time pointing to the issue of funding:

As long as the vision is shared by the parties involved then the only challenges, in my opinion, to be met are monetary. I'm sure as with all schools there is never enough money to do everything you want so we learn to prioritise and chase every possible source of funding. I think they are sustainable in the fact that they are ongoing reviews as to the effectiveness of programs. As long as we can justify why a program needs to be in place then we will find a way to sustain it (Parent).

Working the partnerships: Managing the Practicalities of Funding and Resources

For both the lead agencies and the schools funding was raised as an ongoing concern. The sustainability of programs and services are dependent on ongoing funding as well as the amount of funding available currently. Additionally schools and agencies found the grant writing processes tedious and the acquittal processes long winded. Most agencies, including schools do not have dedicated staff to assist in seeking and extra-curricular funding.

But acquiring sufficient money to run services is not the only issue. Even if unlimited or sufficient resources were available, these would not necessarily mean schools and agencies would be in accord over their use. Education and social needs do not automatically align in the views of agency personnel or educators.

One agency representative says:

It is frustrating at times as I feel the school only wants me to offer one type of service for the students and that is simply not what our agency is about. It is a very simplistic approach to meet the needs of the student and although I understand this is their most pressing need and that is where they want to prioritise their funding of our service, at times I feel undervalued and feel like I am working more for the education department needs than my own agency (Lead Agency).
While a school staff member notes:

The agency asked us to put more money into their service otherwise they would have to cut back. They see the school as having a lot of additional funds to allocate because it is a low socio economic school. They don’t understand it is not that I don’t value their service because I do. It is more simply that I have to spend the school funds on human resources ie. staffing first in order to teach the students and meet their educational needs first and then secondly to coordinate the additional FSS programs and strategies that we have put in place. It resulted in an awkwardness with the agency that I really didn’t want, they took it personally as if I didn’t believe in the service that they were offering or appreciate all their hard work (Staff Member).

These tensions are also present in the research literature (Cummings et al. 2006; Dryfoos 1996), with McCray & Collins (2011: 137) commenting that gaps in service provision and inconsistencies of assessments affected the work:

A discrepancy between the high expectations of service users and practitioners alike and the limited resources available to achieve them was presented. Feelings of powerlessness and inadequacy were evidenced by practitioners’ use of metaphors referring to “lack of magic” or “magic wands”.

Nevertheless, as one agency representative says:

Funding is the key because you can’t get that coordination of services without paying for it. It is not a role which you can just give to anyone need to have someone with the necessary skills (Lead Agency).

Finding the money to pay for services takes time and skill. While for one school currently they believe they are managing adequately:

I believe that there will be ongoing challenges in relation to services, right now we are running on a high and going very strong. Our budgets are very well managed but there may come a time, as there has been in the past, when the partners may not have so much to contribute and/or we are not in such a good position financially. Adequate forward planning hopefully will stop the challenge being too great, although our admin team are great. As a board and a school we are still learning about some of these things (Parent).

There is likely to be a time in the future when funding becomes an issue. One parent, like others in the study, has already mentioned the necessary role of government in the funding issue. But funding isn’t the only practical resource issue.

Facility use and maximising resources is an ongoing challenge. The tension between the educational purpose of the school and the social welfare purpose of the FSS was ever present in relation to location, use of space and external matters such as the potential for having community members present on the school grounds at different times of the school day. There does not appear to be a simple answer to this dilemma as both society expectations of schools and social welfare demands on schools appear to be increasing yet schools function on fixed budgets and are located on school sites within fixed boundaries. One staff member
recalls: “Facility use is an issue - when Crossways came on site there was a concern about having other people on site who were not connected to the school” (Staff Member), and another states that the “Biggest challenge is finding the balance is it impacting enough for using that room, is it going to be worth it” (Staff Member) before concluding “in the end it is.”

For the most part schools provide the facilities which are used by agencies visiting the school sites to deliver services. These are usually bought or sourced from the education systems rather than from agencies. While the services are acknowledged as a valuable contribution, there may still be an imbalance of provision leading to what Stokes & McLean (2000: 31) identify as the potential for lower socio economic schools to reinforce the “unequal distribution of resources” through the “school’s links with outside agencies”, with wealthier schools with wealthier stakeholders attracting better and more resources.

Unequal distribution of resources is not the only issue: establishing satisfactory working arrangements brought about by co-location requires attention is paid to matters beyond resourcing, and returns to issues of vision, management, roles etc. As noted in research (Frost & Robinson 2007; White & Featherstone 2005; Frost et.al. 2005; Moran et.al. 2007) unrealistic expectations may arise if the necessary strategies and planning are not put in place before co-locating services from partners. Wolstenholme et.al. (2008: 6) state that:

There may be the unrealistic expectation that locating professionals in the same physical space would in itself result in effective multi-agency working.

Factors that promote success in this context can be described as the simple opposites of barriers and include:

- appropriate resources (including personnel and financial)
- willingness to be involved
- understanding of roles and responsibilities
- good communications and information sharing practices
- clearly defined protocols
- supportive leadership and management.

Research participants identified these as possible pitfalls. One agency representative comments:

As a partnership participant I would say something that FSS need to be aware of is that just because you have several agencies working from the same building or site it does not necessarily mean that good inter collaboration occurs. There needs to be structures and processes put in place that facilitate these processes and they need to be ongoing. Yes there can be incidental collaboration but without deliberate practices put in place you are not maximising the benefit for the students and their families which is really what the FSS model is supposed to be about. At this school they have put these structures in place through regular integrated service meetings, the appointments of coordinators for students and families, self review processes with shared planning, goal setting, actions and reviews and
opportunities to integrate into learning team meetings and staff meetings. All these steps together have made this integrated model have significant positive impacts in a relatively short period of time (Lead Agency).

Capitalizing on partners’ strengths and aligning them to the goals of the school and community was a clear commonality across all three sites. Ongoing issues of bridging the gap between FSS partners and staff and discrepancy between the philosophy and staff attitudes requires well thought out and specific steps. Participants suggested that staff development needed to be ongoing and staff need to be involved in monitoring the effectiveness of initiatives and services to ensure shared ownership in the service delivery and partnership process. It was found that greater staff involvement in the inter-professional collaboration work was a key factor to ensuring greater success. Several staff members talked about how they perceived agency relationships by noting the common aim for better outcomes for children and the willingness to work together. This is summed up by one staff member who says:

Although we have lots of different agencies all have one goal that is to better the lives of the students and the community. Our agencies talk to each other (Staff Member).

The central partnership of FSS is undoubtedly between agencies and schools, as the engaged agencies have the services and understandings to be able to address the social service needs of children and families. Furthermore, even though these relationships require attention and dedication to make them work, they are essentially relationships between professionals for whom such interactions are not unexpected or unknown. The relationship and partnership with parents and the wider neighbourhood or community, presents more of a challenge, as the traditional forms of relationship are not between professionals and often not conceptualised as between equals. Parents are often on the receiving end of school actions and deliberations. How parents and community have been and can be included as partners is subject for the next section.

Parents and Community Partnerships
Initially, the FSS started because of the recognition that parents and children were not sufficiently responsive to what was being provided educationally. In fact some parents and children were actively and sometimes forcefully rejecting the educational service and its structures, through violent and damaging actions. This recognition led to one of the main aims of the FSS being to engage parents and the local community. They too needed to be partners. While agency representatives acknowledged that the FSS had changed parents’ perceptions somewhat, and staff members commented that more parents are engaging with the school in more positive ways, this does not necessarily translate into partnerships where parents believe they have an equal and recognised role in how the FSS operates. As one agency representative notes:

School and education need to look at getting the parents more consistently involved, schools may see themselves as the key stakeholders rather than the parents (Lead Agency).
While parents have been the focus and, as we have seen, have generally responded positively to the FSS model, they are still somewhat peripheral to its main operations. Relationships, however, are developing and these are encouraging more constant activity and more parents to participate, especially with teachers. Staff members have noticed this improvement.

*It has definitely helped develop relationships with parents, parents were very negative about coming to teachers or admin and there were a lot of complaints. That has all settled down and parents are definitely more willing to see teachers or admin about any concerns and they are more willing to ask for help which I believe builds that relationship (Staff Member).*

One staff member believes that the parent liaison officer at one school is a useful position to have to encourage better engagement:

*Even things like having the parent liaison officer having that relationship that keeps the teachers on one side and the parents on the other. Being able to go through that middle person has allowed the parents to feel more comfortable in learning how to help their children academically (Staff Member).*

One of the difficulties remains, however, is how to achieve inclusivity for all parents under the FSS model approach. At times services and support in these FSS may be targeted initially for families and students deemed to be at risk however one of the dilemmas may be how to ensure programs are in place to meet the needs of all members of the community not just those in acute need. This focus tends to contradict the strengths-based approach mentioned earlier, as well as implying that parents are there to receive a service rather than to be equal partners in the development and implementation of the model. How these tensions are overcome will be crucial to the development of the FSS.

There is the tendency to focus more on service provision than partnership in much of the literature when considering the relationship between schools and parents. For example, Bowes (2000: 4) reviewed parent education and support programs in the US and found that there were positive outcomes for parent child relationships as well as increased engagement by parents in their child’s school and education. She concludes that building relationships is the key factor in these results. These do not extend to partnerships in which parents are seen as independent from the services provided to them. The importance of moving from a service provision mode to a partnership or collaborative mode is perhaps indicated by Martin et. al. (1999: 71) whose research into schools and community education across Scotland reiterated that:

*building a partnership with parents, as our case studies have indicated, results in collaborative activity which supports both the values and purposes of the school and the values and purposes of the community.*

For these researchers, the most effective partnerships are those which understand that the school is a central part of the surrounding community and vice versa believing that each can make contributions to each other through "Inclusiveness; recognising social as well as
academic goals”; that both parents and children have learning needs and wants and meeting these can “raise expectations through education achievement”; that local people can and do have knowledge and skills which can be accessed through “Involving local people in decision-making”; and that it is important for the democratic process, as well as people’s belief in their own self-worth, that parents and children be given the opportunity to participate as citizens through “Democratic participation and active citizenship” through supporting and enhancing their capacity to participate as active citizens in their children’s schools (including governance and management of schools) and in their communities. These goals and processes of the community school system Martin et. al. (1999) examined in Scotland have applicability in WA.

Not only does this reiterate the strengths approaches pursued by the 3 schools, in recognising that parents have abilities and capacities, but it also serves to reinforce and develop social capital building opportunities which could be missed due to not exploring the other strengths of parents and community members. Bringing together social and education goals is considered by participants in this study and the initiators of the FSS to be essential for the intended outcomes of successful educational progression for the children. Developing and supporting social capital (Putnam 1993: 35) is both a strategy and an outcome, for the mutual trust and supportive networks characteristic of social capital are believed to benefit both school and community.

**Staff Partnerships**

Another central partnership is with staff. It has already been seen that the school staff participants in this study have, for the most part, been supportive of the FSS, while at the same time mentioning some of their hesitations. Engaging staff and involving them in the development and implementation of the model has been a necessary and ongoing process. Those staff who have not participated in this research may well have different views, or, possibly, not have a good idea as to how and why the FSS started or its aims. As the FSS become more established in the schools, and with the changes in school staff, it is going to be important to ensure that staff are appraised of the purposes and processes of the FSS, while at the same time inviting them to contribute to shaping and developing the model.

Staff in this study are able to identify how and why the FSS is beneficial to them. The engagement of parents, children better prepared for learning, staff wanting to work in the school are all valued. As one staff member says:

*One thing has grown from the next- I am buoyed by the fact that in this short period of time 10 to 15 years is quite a short period of time in terms of community development create a school which is now a school of choice for parents, staff, a renowned learning environment for kids, it’s got resources that other schools would dream for (Staff Member).*

This sense of wanting to be part of the school community is reiterated by another staff member who says:

*It creates an environment of community engagement where the engagement comes from the community out it is not always us asking, people are now asking to buy in and now we*
get approached by agencies people can we do this with you and that is the growth mechanism of the school (Staff Member).

This results, for this next staff member, in the potential for children’s success, where previously this might not have been the case.

The extended service is a community service as well- turn kids around because they are engulfed in a culture of support you are going to be able to do well and fit in (Staff Member).

A prime focus for all three schools, as mentioned previously, was on early intervention which was enacted largely through the provision of early childhood activities involving parents with their children. Encouraging attendance at such services as play group and 3-year-old kindy has been significant for these three schools. One Principal notes the benefits in parent engagement: “The engagement of the parents is much higher as started developing a relationship from when the kids are born.” And another reflects on the academic results of having children present in the school so much earlier:

For the kids that go through 3 year old program the difference is amazing! They go through a whole orientation program, know classroom where everything is- so therefore in kindy the teachers can start with explicit teaching in week 2 of the year (Principal).

Staff members also notice the difference:

Demographics of the community are staying the same or getting worse but we are seeing now because we have such a big group of 3 yr olds going through when they get to Kindergarten they are ready to go the transitioning to school is there they are switched on so that gap is getting smaller and closing. So for school age children we can see there is a payoff in terms of literacy, numeracy and social skills (Staff Member).

This is supported by this reflection from a staff member involved in early childhood education who did not previously see the value of engaging with parents so centrally.

Stepping out of my comfort zone- getting the kids to a point and the parents to a point that I don’t think I would have been able to get them to before. Previously you teach the kids parents used to be seen as a separate entity just people to pick the kids up now seeing the importance of them being involved. It’s got me to the point of actually getting the parents involved and seeing the importance of them and seeing that they play knowing that there is not that engagement at home and knowing that when that is bought into the school then makes a difference (Staff Member).

Another teacher values being able to get on with the job of being a teacher:

Workload wise teachers we do not have to be a social worker for our students this has been a huge help and has freed us up to focus on teaching the students (Staff Member).

For one teacher it was the FSS that attracted her/him to apply to work in the school, knowing that there were extra supports for students.

Have only been here 2 years and it is actually one of the things that attracted me to apply for here because I thought with those systems in place there would be more support as a classroom teacher (Staff Member).
However, translating this appreciation of the benefits the FSS can bring into partnerships with staff so that they become both supporters and drivers of the FSS in their schools is an ongoing task and necessary for the continuation of the model, even if and when it changes. While Cummings et. al. (2007) focused less on staff partnerships than those with agencies in their evaluation, it was clear that staff were an integral part of how the FSS or extended schools operated. Citing difficulties in partnership working, although referring more to those with agencies, can also be read to refer to staff. Ensuring staff understand and have commitment to the vision and its implementation is essential to how the FSS will develop.

Student Partnerships
The final partnership is that with students. In the development and implementation of the FSS the students have been the main targets and not considered by any of the research participants as partners in the enterprise. Yet, as well as being the focus for services and inclusion, it is worth considering that it is on their engagement and contributions that rests the success of the FSS model. A future development may well be to see the role student partnerships can play.

Summary
The participants in this study have identified what is necessary to maintain their FSS. Firstly they recognised that what they had been doing had to change as it was not meeting the needs of the school community. But they also recognised that it was not their sole responsibility: the entire system needed to change to ensure equity for their school community. The way the education system operates in order to support children achieve in schools was a major concern with all that accompanies such change: interagency collaboration, adequate resourcing and measures to engage disengaged parents. In this change endeavour, however, they also recognised that local school-based change would not have occurred without the vision and leadership of the Principal. And lastly, without forming working relationships with the other stakeholders Principals would not have been able to make any changes that would last. These three aspects meet the requirements of a Theory of Change: identifying what is wanted to occur as a result of the change process, what activities are to be employed to achieve it and an assessment of the contextual factors which have an effect on the activities. How well or otherwise these schools have achieved their aims requires an ongoing assessment, but, despite some of the challenges they faced, these three schools consider that their adoption and implementation of the FSS model was both necessary and worth their effort.

The next chapter extends this theorising to explore some possible frameworks which could offer guidance for stakeholders in schools to conceptualise how FSS may be planned and implemented.
CHAPTER SIX- CONCEPTUALISING FSS IN WA

The previous chapter discussed the three major themes which emerged primarily from the discussion with study participants and through observation of the operations of the FSS at the three schools. Systems change, leadership and partnerships have been identified as crucial in both understanding and explaining how these schools have operated their FSS models. While not specific at the outset of the initiation of the FSS process or as part of the data collection, a Theory of Change approach to examine the data and possibly to contribute to further studies was used in Chapter Five. This has enabled perhaps a better understanding of what Dyson & Todd (2010: 119) believe is the outcome of using such a method, which is to change how outcomes are considered. Rather than focusing on effectiveness, the potential for change is what is important, the activities used to effect change and centrally the roles of the actors or stakeholders. Here we have seen how leadership has been crucial in establishing the FSS, but this could not have happened without the willingness to change how schools operate and without the collaboration of stakeholders. That some systems still need further change and some partnerships strengthened is unquestioned, but there is here potential for those mechanisms and relationships to be developed at least at the local level.

The use of three conceptual frameworks to assist in the process are now offered. These may be useful for future school leaders who are interested in establishing FSS.

Conceptual Frameworks

What are appropriate frameworks and approaches to FSS

The frameworks which were mentioned in Chapter Two are:

- six conditions of learning identified by the Coalition for Community Schools. (Blank & Berg, 2006: 9).
- three approaches to FSS (Beckett 1997: 9); and
- four approaches to community development (Taylor et. al. 2008:87.

Conditions of Learning

The Coalition for Community Schools Conditions of Learning (Blank & Berg, 2006: 9) as discussed in Chapter Two provides a framework to evaluate the progress of these FSS. These are repeated here.

Condition 1- the school has a core instructional program with qualified teachers, a challenging curriculum and high standards and expectations for students;
Condition 2- Students are motivated and engaged ;
Condition 3- the basic physical, mental and emotional health needs of young people and their families are recognised and addressed;
Condition 4 – There is mutual respect and effective collaboration among parents, families and school staff;
Condition 5 –Community engagement, together with school efforts, promotes a school climate that is safe, supportive and respectful and connects students to a broader learning community; and
Condition 6- Early childhood development is fostered through high quality, comprehensive programs that nurture learning and development (Blank & Berg, 2006:9).

Among these six conditions are those which represent what most school Principals within Western Australia would be aiming to achieve, especially Conditions 1 and 2, with the remainder being acknowledged as being important, if only because they are also expectations of the Education Department. The extent to which schools develop specific strategies to focus on some of these others, however, such as Condition 6, community engagement, is probably variable. For the three schools in this study, engaging the community is one of the main strategies they use in order to try to meet their other conditions in the recognition that for many parents re-engaging with the school is vital for their children’s educational progress. Additionally in these schools exist higher than usual health and welfare needs that fall within Condition 3, a circumstance that may not be present in all schools to the same degree. These six conditions for learning could be a useful evaluative tool and framework for schools initiating and developing FSS and assist in developing suitable strategies whilst still meeting current WA’s strategic directions: Education Department of WA’s Classroom First Strategy; A focus on student achievement and the Strategic Plan for WA Public Schools 2012–2015 (Department of Education Western Australia (2013) all identify outcomes which focus primarily on student success.

Schools initiating FSS face the challenge of balancing between core instruction and community development, a point noted in current FSS literature where pressures to meet educational standards are high as well as ensuring schools respond to their communities (Ainscow et. al. 2010: 43).

The viewpoints of the participants have presented that there can be significant tension in meeting educational attainment targets whilst still striving for community engagement and a safe and inclusive learning for all. That these two aims can sit in opposition to each other has been raised earlier and researchers (Ainscow et. al. 2010: 14) question how they may be addressed in tandem. “First, when policy makers talk about “narrowing the gap”, they usually mean creating a more equal system in terms of “results”- and access to the resources and opportunities needed to get good results. A question that needs to be asked is whether this would create a fairer- or more equitable- school system for all children and young people? Will narrowing the gap, as currently measured reflect the values and aspirations of all groups?” They go on to note that children’s academic performance cannot be divorced from other aspects of their development and what happens to them in their families and communities. It is this that the FSS strive to address. While the implementation of FSS is not solely about resourcing, without resources the inequalities in accessing education because of the additional and different system needs are likely to continue if not increase. The circumstances which led to the commencement of the FSS in these three schools cannot be addressed by educational strategies alone.
One recommendation that has come out of FFS research from participants who have also faced this challenge is for schools to develop an accountability framework shared by the partnerships and the schools with clear goals and targets. Simons (2011: 4) cites Brabek et al. 2003:187-194 in his study of Schools in the Community which identified the importance of a publicly accountable monitoring process that is sufficiently transparent to allow constituents to assess whether or not particular initiatives are contributing to the achievement of the goal and partners are fulfilling their respective roles. Another recommendation is to have a clear allocation of roles and responsibilities or if funding permits, an additional coordinator in the school whose sole role is to coordinate the services or for the Lead Agency to be the coordinator of the services on site. FSS could develop their own framework which encompasses strategic directions of the system as well as their FSS aims in collaboration with their partnerships and use this framework to analyse and use data collated together to allow better targeting of intervention services and assist in forward strategic planning and integration of services into the school. The Theory of Change referred to in Chapter 5 offers possibilities here to enable participants to focus on the outcomes they want to achieve and develop strategies to help meet those. The caution would be, as stated by Morrison & Glenny (2012: 382) “some professionals may be gaining more from this activity than service users.” This will be discussed more in relation to the Community Development Instrumental approach later in this chapter.

The FSS in this study were paying attention to all of the six Conditions for Learning through their meeting Education Department strategic directions, but additionally devising strategies within the FSS model to specifically address health and welfare needs, the engagement and inclusion of parents and community in collaborative processes and focus on the early years. These have presented challenges. To develop effective collaboration (Condition 4) amongst people who had not previously been encouraged to participate in any way other than attend parent-teacher meetings and belong to the Parents and Citizens Associations has required patience and alternate strategies. A key feature noted by the stakeholders was reorienting attitudes towards parents as having strengths not only deficits. But behavioural change accompanying attitudinal change is a long term endeavour.

How FSS might structure their model to incorporate all of these conditions productively may be considered by assessing different approaches to FSS.

**Assessing the Approaches to FSS**

In Chapter Two, three approaches to the full service school model suggested by research (Beckett 1997: 9) were presented: social justice, economic rationalist, and universal approaches. Two of the three approaches, the economic rationalist and social justice approach could be described as ideological opposites. These opposing ideologies also created competing tensions within the school sites studied.

*Social Justice Approach*

The social justice approach gives priority to social responsibility and to equity in education (Beckett 1997: 9). One of the key issues for Australia nationally as the FSS movement continues
to expand across schools is the devolution to the school of responsibility for the community. The difficulties for this approach is that by not addressing social problems then this ignores students and their lived experiences and as Beckett (1997: 8) points out dealing with social problems claims a lot of teacher’s time. Herein lies the dilemma if the way forward for schools is to expand to become FSS then is it the school’s responsibility to source and develop alliances and partnerships to meet the diverse social justice needs of their community? Or should this be a Government responsibility? Some previous initiatives, such as Every Child Matters in the UK in the 2000s were instrumental in the Full and Extended School Services to take account of these additional considerations. Where governments have acknowledged their social responsibilities then this would seem to be a natural inclusion. However, as many governments are reducing their social expenditures, the FSS requirements are less likely to be funded leaving schools to select whether or not to extend their activities into the community.

Participants in this study also identified the challenges that the social justice approach brings. Across all three sites there was a philosophy of recognising the importance of a holistic approach. Bridging the gap between education and other Government agencies and an agenda for interagency cooperation and inter-sectoral collaboration was recognised as a challenge that needed to be addressed with pressing urgency. One parent has already been quoted as referring to government funding priorities, acknowledging the additional resources needed to sustain the FSS in particular, but also the social welfare needs of families more generally.

**Economic Rationalist Approach**

As mentioned above, this approach is ideologically opposed to the Social Justice approach as for the economic rationalist approach the primary goals are to rationalise resources and streamline services to ensure efficient and effective use of scarce educational resources (Beckett 1997: 9). The emphasis is on educational resources which seems to suggest that social welfare resources are not considered as being within the remit of the schools, except where Independent Public Schools so decide to use their resources for these purposes. In times of reduced funding, this seems less likely or possible. Current State budget cuts and Federal Better Schools Plan (see postscript) have relevance here. With Principals being asked to look at different ways of delivering programs within the current budget constraints this will put greater pressure on the sustainability of FSS. As identified by Beckett (1997: 3) a market reform agenda impacts on the work of schools. They are expected to be efficient in their service delivery which is subject to financial auditing and accountability. Auditing for social returns is not included in this schema. Criticisms of the market reform agenda are the possibility of causing social stratification which can result in an effective decline in funding. This results in a lack of services and programs which in turn compound educational and social problems for these schools, whereas more affluent schools become stronger and attract more affluent families. Schools are increasingly looking to their local communities for extra funding and resources. Schools in higher socio economic areas successfully target fundraising for their resources. As Stokes and McLean (2000:31) stated earlier, this might result in further effecting greater unequal distribution of resources.
As noted in section three of Chapter Four ‘We can’t do it on our own’ there was an ongoing frustration and tension in the areas of funding to support the services. The strains of a system following an economic rationalist approach have also been reported in literature (Cummings et al. 2006; Dryfoos 1996; McCray & Collins 2011). Schools within WA including the three FSS have already sought out corporate partnerships as a strategy to sustain their FSS programs.

**Universal Approach**

The universal approach occurs when schools themselves take the initiative to provide the social work role by inculcating a philosophy of keeping children engaged with well-resourced programs, adequate student welfare and a good level of parent participation. But, both the participants in this study and the literature (Beckett 1997: 8) agree that the practice of social work is not the business of teachers or the education system. An early review of schools warned that schools ran risks to their educational purposes if they extended further into the community (Committee of Review Of New south Wales Schools 1989). Another implication could be the distraction for a school by taking on too many responsibilities.

While it would appear clear that the current policy environment in WA favours an economic rationalist position, there may be an argument for the social justice position as witnessed by the introduction of service centres in schools for parent and children support (see postscript). This suggests recognition by government that some school communities require additional attention to enable them to provide education effectively. However, this is less a social justice position than an extension of the economic rationalist approach which accepts that the provision of residual services is necessary under certain conditions. The FSS system of parent partnerships is less the purpose than the parent and child centres being mechanisms for the delivery of protective measures for identified families.

The FSS in this study vary in their ability to be self-sustaining, in part associated with the current policy positions. FSS in WA have evidently followed a Universalist approach to date, but this may well change in the future if government policy extends its incursion into the social field and requires more uniform adherence to government goals and provisions. Here it may be that the next dimension of a conceptual framework may assist schools in their development.

**Conceptual Approaches to Working with Communities**

Taylor et. al. (2008: 87) have identified four conceptual approaches to working with communities for the areas of health and social care development. However they can equally be applied to FSS when considering FSS initiation and implementation. Each of the four conceptual approaches provide useful insights into this study as a mechanism to view the progress, philosophy and changes made to FSS during their implementation and development journey.

**Contributions Approach**

The contributions approach is defined by Taylor et. al. (2008: 89) as involving voluntary donations of time, labour, knowledge and skills. However there is usually no expectation that
contributors would be influential in decision making about how resources are used, or in the project directions. The major criticisms of this approach are communities seen as contributors rather than participants (Midgley 1986: 24 in Taylor et. al. (2008: 89)) and that the contribution approach may not be sustainable.

This approach could be viewed as a more traditional view that some staff may have of their parent community. While the contributions approach may apply inasmuch as teachers generally do value some support from parents, fundraising for example and cooperation in how their children engage with education, we saw extensive comments from senior school staff and some parents in Chapter Four that not all teachers saw the value of engaging parents if it meant involvement in how the school should operate. Supporters of the FSS model here could extend their view of the contributions parents might make and how they may support them. For the schools which take a strengths approach finding value in the skills and attributes parents already possess has been a valuable first step.

**Instrumental Approach**

The instrumental approach is conceptualised Taylor et.al. (2008: 94) as involvement by individuals, groups and communities according to a strategy designed by professionals to improve health or social well-being. It is also sometimes referred to as a top down approach attracting the criticism that the consultation process can be considered as tokenism, with very little involvement by community members in decision making.

Using an instrumental approach to developing community in areas where there are considerable needs is often considered to be the only option, especially by professionals who have not witnessed any impetus for creative change on the part of the community. For this reason many programmes start from the vision and initiation of the experts. It could be argued that this has been the case of the FSS in these sites. This, however, takes a very unidimensional view of community in considering that the only actions that have mattered are those of the leaders. The earlier comment quoted from Morrison & Glenny (2012) offered the caution of the possibility of the only people to benefit from change processes could be the professionals.

We have seen that early strategies did seek to engage all members of the school community in the vision and its implementation. This has not been uniformly successful with some parents doubting the value of providing services to parents rather than to children, and with some teachers unwilling to participate in parent activities. And for this reason, an instrumental approach can only ever make modest gains in the change effort.

**Community Empowerment Approach**

This approach is known as a bottom-up approach. As cited by Taylor et. al. (2008: 99) Rifkin et. al (2000) describe empowerment of local people through becoming involved in determining priorities and solving problems. In the process they increase their knowledge and skill base thereby achieving a sense of control over their environment. Criticisms of this approach are that the empowerment of one group may result in the disempowerment or expense of another
(Labonte 2005: 85 in Taylor et. al. 2008: 99) and that the term empowerment is used loosely with community members not really achieving real power in decision making.

The intent of adopting the FSS was not ostensibly to empower parents; rather it was to improve the schooling experience for children. However, this in itself is a complex task in the social circumstances of these schools, as was recognised by the Principals who initiated them. Nevertheless, whether any of them intended that parents particularly should become empowered is still questionable. Initially the approaches appeared more instrumental, but as time progressed the empowerment of parents became more apparent. One staff member has already been quoted as referring to the unsolicited positive actions of parents, a circumstance that was not usual prior to the FSS, indicating a certain level of empowerment of parents. The empowerment approach could have been a factor in school leaders working out how to engage parents and taking the strengths approach in their efforts. Here the philosophy moved from perhaps a more contributory approach (parents as fundraisers) or instrumental approach (Parents are told what they need to do) to a strengths-based approach where parents are seen as having skills and can contribute to decision making and community capacity.

*Developmental Approach*

This final approach is described by Oakley and Marsden (1984: 19 in Taylor et. al. 2008: 102) as one where local people collectively are actively involved in a project over which they exert some influence. Rifkin et. al. (1996:83 in Taylor et. al. 2008:v102) define the key elements of a developmental approach:

- the local people are involved in decision making;
- both the processes of participation and task achievement are valued; and
- participation results in meeting local participants’ objectives.

While the FSS started in each school from the initiation of the school leaders, the aims were always to involve and include parents as much as possible in a partnership. The aims of a developmental approach were common to all three sites.

Taylor et. al. (2008: 105) also identify numerous challenges to this approach including working in an environment with the demands for achievement of highly targeted objectives, insufficient resources and mismatch between government goals and targets and community goals and targets. These challenges are largely systemic and were recognised above while discussing system change. It is also no easy matter to re-engage people once they have become disengaged and especially to encourage equal participation where there is likely to be mistrust. The leadership of the FSS remains firmly in the hands of the school leaders, but amongst these three schools there is the desire to broaden this scope and include parents.

Taylor et. al. (2008: 106) suggest that creating an either or dichotomy to approaches in community development is flawed and can be time consuming, impractical and lacking in strategic focus, supporting Rifkin et. al’s (1996 in Taylor et. al. 2008: 106) suggestions that both
task achievement and building community capacity can and should coexist. What was clearly evident from all three sites was that an instrumental approach was used at least initially, albeit not deliberately, with the intent of both assisting parents and community to take more of the initiative and to become equal partners in the process. Elements, therefore, of empowerment and developmental approaches may be anticipated. Although none of the school leaders are trained in community development, enacting these development processes is evidence of the principles of inclusion and collaboration that are necessary to achieve collective change.

While these schools do not deliberately use Community Development approaches or strategies, these conceptual frameworks do have the potential to assist in the development and management of FSS. School leadership who wish to institute FSS may find community development input from external agencies to be of benefit.

Summary

Three frameworks have been discussed here as ways of conceptualising the FSS. Each has a contribution to planning for and implementing FSS. The Conditions for Learning provide a set of criteria for assessing what measures are in place to support children’s education and, where they are not present, indicators for their provision. Most schools will attend to the educational strategies, but schools such as in this study must also be mindful of health and welfare concerns and engaging parents who may not be fully engaged in their children’s education. Reaching out further into the community to support this endeavour is arguably the task of all schools, but an imperative for schools which have fewer resources, particularly human resources. The Approaches to FSS offered by Beckett (1997) permit an analysis of the particular philosophy suited to the school and its socio-political setting. Assessing where the likely enablers and constraints may be in the environment can indicate where efforts need to be and are most fruitfully expended. Taking a social justice approach, for example, in a political climate of economic rationalism, without alternate resources, is likely to fail. Schools may accept that the economic and political conditions may be best suited to forming partnerships with government to institute the, albeit residual, service provision offered by the parent and child centres. This may at least bring some resources into the school and offer later opportunities for extending into a more universalist provision. And, finally, the community approaches offer direction for school leadership as to the type of provision that is possible and the skills and knowledges needed to implement it.

We have seen that the schools in this study have, without deliberately using any of these frameworks, endeavoured to provide the necessary conditions for learning in the recognition that more than purely educational work is necessary in their schools; seek to apply a universalist approach to their FSS because they recognise that the whole child and family must be considered and if that means taking on a social provision then that is what is necessary; and finally seek to include parents as partners in their FSS aiming to meet developmental requirements. Importantly, they have all also moved their FSS from focusing solely on the
deficits of the social circumstances to seeking the parents’ strengths in their inclusion as participants in the FSS.

The following and final Chapter concludes this study.
CHAPTER SEVEN – CONCLUSION

This study was undertaken to explore and better understand both the circumstances which prompted the development and implementation of the three FSS in WA and the experiences of those most involved in their formation. It is hoped that an in-depth description and analysis of these circumstances and events may contribute to further developments in the understanding of and establishing FSS. This research reflects the experiences of the people who participated. The interpretivist case study provided for the multiple viewpoints and realities to come to be considered. It also provided opportunities for a deep understanding of the different perspectives formed from each of the study sites. The qualitative research approach has served to develop greater understanding of complex phenomena including system change, leadership and partnerships which have been shown to be crucial in the experiences of these three schools, and as part of those processes the importance of community development processes and approaches, developing practices and processes with multiple partnerships, and parent engagement and empowerment. The challenges too have been explored and some of the mechanisms the schools have used may well be able to be transported into other schools wishing to start FSS.

The ‘one-stop-shops’ subsequently established either on or off the school sites to provide remedial services for families and children were intended to address a range of social problems negatively affecting children, such as the effects of drug and alcohol abuse, violence in the home, the lack of parental interest in learning and so on by providing counselling services, homework classes, health clinics, after school activities and such like. These types of service provision have become incorporated into the functioning of schools in the US, the UK, where they are more often known as extended, community or integrated (Kellett 2011) schools, and in Australia.

Full Service Schools are service mechanisms; that is, they are organised according to service principles. They exist to provide services that are lacking or those currently not appropriate to the service user. Decisions as to the services needed, their design and target group are made by people responsible for service delivery, not those who receive those services, although there is a certain market force in operation: those services that are not attractive or useful to the service user will not be used. School principals and related staff are included in the category of ‘service provider’ even when the services are provided off site, as, where a FSS programme exists, they are a conduit between services and service users who are predominantly families with children at the school. The model, then, is an extension of social services organisations rather than facilities or resources which emerge from the conditions and desires of the local families and community. This is so no matter how well used by local community members the FSS services are or how much consultation as to the specific services to be provided has been conducted.

Most FSS start from a deficit framing of families which extends to the communities in which they live. Programmes such as this rely largely on external designs, resourcing, labour and
project ideas, and very little on internal or ‘home-grown’ local priorities and as such do not extend to structural change or the sort of transformation Maton (2005) had in mind in relation to cultural change, or to any great degree of group empowerment, capacity building or relational community building in order to enhance children’s educational progress.

FSS, then, can be conceptualised as largely a remedial response to negative social and health indicators affecting children’s participation in education, with the added proviso, though, that families and communities have a major role to play in redressing the imbalances. Taken from this view, forming partnerships with relevant others to assist in children’s educational progress is a major aim and strategy of FSS to attend to the ‘whole’ child. What has been identified is the importance of building time into the development processes in order to ensure that the school community is not destabilised, to allow cultural changes to take place and that there is joint ownership and shared decision making processes as interventions and initiatives are introduced. Finally the findings of this study reinforce the need for FSS to have a strategic emphasis on being intentional in the work. To keep the focus on the child - for all parties to agree that their goal is to serve children and their families.

In response to one of the sub questions of this research *what are the approaches and frameworks for FSS* the following is surmised. With these considerations in mind, there are a number of approaches which can be taken to consider and institute FSS: an evaluative framework (Conditions of learning); developing a structure (Universal approach), and applying a process (Community Development approaches). They help to set the existing FSS in a conceptual context as well as potentially providing tools for future development.

While each school is distinct in its setting, activities and approaches, there is much which is shared between them, and it was found that each had to work hard to ensure that the vision of and for a FSS was communicated well and in an inclusive way so that parents and partner agencies could understand the intent and become involved in helping make it a reality. Communication processes therefore and having inclusive approaches were essential in this endeavour. All schools realised they had to change the way they operated and be outward looking to promote a sense of the school community which extended beyond the school gate as well as invite others to participate within the boundaries of the school. Importantly they all realised the vital role parents played in this venture and this required that they consciously revise the relationship between teachers and parents and also the prevailing attitude concerning parents in low socio-economic areas whose circumstances were beset with multiple disadvantages. In this regard, parents needed to be reconceptualised as not only having needs but also having considerable strengths that could be used effectively to help their children as well as contribute to the overall experience of the FSS. This strengths approach was significant in helping schools to establish their particular form of FSS.

This study offers a conceptual framework for assessing FSS and for planning for implementation of FSS. This conceptual framework which is detailed in Chapter Six provides
for an evaluative process to be undertaken as to the current situation in schools as where to focus energies to assist children engage more productively with education by using the Six Conditions of Learning (Blank & Berg 2006). Following that, assessments of the sort of FSS and its structure are suggested (Beckett 1997). Processes to implement and enact FSS activities are then suggested from four different community development approaches (Taylor et. al. 2008). Together these three frameworks provide a practical guide for schools wishing to start a FSS.

In response to how do systems impact on FSS it is evident that, schools are part of larger systems which must be considered and while the study was undertaken before the changes in budget and policy direction which have followed in 2013/14, it was still evident that the larger policy environment in WA is not one which is actively supportive or enabling of the types of system changes which are necessary for FSS to be fully and effectively functioning. For this various measures need to be considered. It has been clear that the training and expectations of teachers does not align with the social welfare needs of communities in which there are multiple concerns requiring attention in order for children to be able to engage productively with their education. Nor do they have the skills to manage the complex structures and processes needed to form effective partnerships with both agencies and parents, both of whom require different responses. Other than including such knowledge and skills development in their pre-service training, some other ways need to be found within the preparation of teachers and senior staff to enable schools to become partners with the supports that are needed.

At the next level of operation, the organisational policy settings of Departments, changes are necessary to ensure understanding and acceptance of the extended role and perspective of schools so that, rather than expecting schools to shoulder the entire burden of attending to social welfare needs, interagency collaborative mechanisms are envisioned and supported. This has to some extent been foreshadowed by the establishment of Parent and Family centres at some selected schools, but the lessons from these three schools are that equal relationships and inclusion on parents’ terms is by no means guaranteed, but are essential for the effective management of FSS. Re-conceptualising, therefore, the role of agencies and their relationships between each other, is necessary. Again, this requires policy at the higher levels to both recognise and accept the value of a holistic approach to the support of children and their families which includes education alongside other provisions. All these are substantial changes in how governments conceptualise their remit and in the current climate not anticipated to be implemented. This, then leaves schools to forge these paths themselves. We have seen how these three schools became so concerned about what was happening for their families and children that they embarked on their FSS journeys and faced the challenges as best they could. This is unsustainable in the long term, but with the extension of Independent Public Schools in WA the opportunities are present, if not the resources.
If there is no other outcome from this research, to instigate a full evaluation of FSS to provide more detailed assessments of benefits and challenges may contribute to encouraging policy makers to include the possibility of Full Service Schooling in policy determinations and resource decision making. In the meantime, these three schools continue to provide as they can to the needs of their communities. In conclusion this study has demonstrated how three FSS have taken on the challenge of providing a holistic approach to education and overcome social, functional and structural barriers and numerous challenges yet persevered. It is a testament to the stakeholders of these FSS in this study of the benefits that these school communities are now experiencing.
POSTSCRIPT

Child and Parent Centres

In 2012 the Education Department of Western Australia committed to $28.8 million over four years to establish the centres on public school sites in areas with the highest concentration of developmentally vulnerable children. Child and Parent Centres provide early childhood support, services and programs to parents with children up to eight years old (including parents expecting children). Most services focus on the needs of children from birth to four years as these are the years when children experience the greatest rate of development. Each Child and Parent Centre is managed in partnership with a well-respected non-government organisation. Working with government agencies, community organisations, schools and local groups, the non-government organisation will coordinate services that respond to the needs of the local community.

Child and Parent Centres are being established in 16 communities throughout Western Australia. Located on public school sites, these family-friendly centres will be open to all parents and carers. (Department of Education Western Australia (2013) Schools and You, Child and Parent Centres http://det.wa.edu.au/schoolsandyou/detcms/navigation/before-school/#toc4). Both Roseworth PS and Challis PS have been allocated a Child and Parent Centre.

Changes to WA Public School Funding

In 2013 it was announced by the Department of Education of Western Australia that changes were being made to public schooling in Western Australia to prepare for a new student-centred funding model in 2015. The funding model was based on the work of Professor Richard Teese from The University of Melbourne, who reviewed the current funding system. The new model will focus on the educational needs of students and will also provide for specific school characteristics to ensure every student is given the same opportunities for a high quality education. Department of Education Western Australia (2013) Schools and You, Changes to Public School Funding (http://det.wa.edu.au/schoolsandyou/detcms/schoolsandyou/schools-and-you/news/facts-on-changes-to-education-assistants-in-public-schools.) As part of the move towards this new
model the Department had made adjustments to cost structures. These cost structures have included reduced funding for school budgets, support staff and supplementary funding provided to address areas such as community development, specialised programs and attendance. Principals have been asked to look at different ways of delivering programs within these budget constraints.
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## APPENDIX ONE

### Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage Western Australia Local Government Areas

#### Most disadvantaged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Local Government Area (LGA)</th>
<th>Usual Resident Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Halls Creek</td>
<td>3,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ngaanyatjarraku</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wiluna</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Menzies</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Derby-West Kimberley</td>
<td>6,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Upper Gascoyne</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Laverton</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cue</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kellerberrin</td>
<td>1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Meekatharra</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Most advantaged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Local Government Area (LGA)</th>
<th>Usual Resident Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peppermint Grove</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cottesloe</td>
<td>7,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nedlands</td>
<td>20,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Statistical Local Area (SLA)</td>
<td>Usual Resident Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kwinana</td>
<td>23,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>30,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>50,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wanneroo - South</td>
<td>41,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stirling - Central</td>
<td>98,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bassendean</td>
<td>13,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gosnells</td>
<td>91,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Swan</td>
<td>93,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>84,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bayswater</td>
<td>55,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greater Perth Statistical Local Areas**

**Most disadvantaged**

**Most advantaged**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in Perth</th>
<th>Statistical Local Area (SLA)</th>
<th>Usual Resident Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>23,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>8,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Subiaco</td>
<td>16,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>East Fremantle</td>
<td>6,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>11,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mosman Park</td>
<td>8,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Perth</td>
<td>38,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above tables list the top and bottom ten ranked Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Western Australia, and the top and bottom ten ranked Statistical Local Areas (SLAs) in Greater Perth, according to the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage. There are a total of 142 LGAs with SEIFA scores in Western Australia, and 37 SLAs in Greater Perth (i.e. the Perth Statistical Division).

SEIFA indices show an average ranking for areas. The socio-economic conditions of individual residents in any one area will vary, and there may be relatively advantaged residents living in areas labelled as disadvantaged and vice versa. For example, the Kwinana SLA was the lowest ranked SLA in Perth. However, on breaking this area down into Census Collection Districts, the ABS found that around one-fifth of residents fell into the most disadvantaged areas while four-fifths lived in less disadvantaged areas. (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2033.0.55.001 - Census of Population and Housing: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA), Australia 2006 [http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mediareleasesbytitle/87E66027D6856FD6CA257417001A550A?OpenDocument])
### Observation Protocol Sample

**Venue:** School Site, commenced in school board room  
**Date and Time:** Wednesday 14\(^{th}\) September, 12.15pm  
**Participant:** Three parents and one staff member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Focus</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Information - time, place, date and setting</td>
<td>Afternoon in school board room, sitting around a table. There were no interruptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Information - portraits of the participant, reconstruction of dialogue, description of physical setting, accounts of activities</td>
<td>There were three parents who came to the meeting one parent bought a child. One of the parents was now a staff member on site. There was a relaxed feel to the room. Participants were keen to share their communication and experiences. It was an interesting dynamic in having a new parent in the group who had only been at the school for the last 6 months which gave an outsider perspective. She was also very positive and happy to talk in front of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Information - researcher’s personal thoughts; feelings, ideas, problems, impressions and prejudices</td>
<td>Difficulty previously separating as a researcher from the Principal role. As this was identified in previous observation protocol was more aware of this for this interview. I was a lot more relaxed and demonstrated better listening and questioning skills which resulted in a stronger interview. I was surprised on the depth of engagement, support, loyalty and passion on the questions that were discussed. I was worried going in on interviewing parents as a group as there may be a reluctance to share honestly or speak up however I found that this was not the case in fact parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enjoyed listening to each other and all the participants had opportunity to share their experiences.
Reflections were perhaps to look at questioning style for future interviews to see if I can get more depth to answers rather than answers reflecting loyalty to school and selling the school or is this simply an accurate version of how the participants felt.

Table 2 Interview Summary Form Sample

Date: 31st August 2011                     Time: 1pm
Duration of Interview: 45 minutes
Place: Staff Member’s Office
Where did the interview take place? Was the venue suitable? Does anything need to be changed for future interviews?
Venue suitable as it allowed the door to be closed to ensure confidentiality and minimise interruptions.

How easy was it to establish rapport? Were there any problems and how can this be improved for next time?
It was very easy to establish rapport as I had known the staff member for a number of years. I was aware that there would be a need for me to separate from my role as colleague to a researcher.

What were the main issues which arose in the interview? Did any issues arise which need to be added to the interview schedule for next time?
I was also aware due to the easy established rapport of the need to be aware of confidentiality and sensitivity in dealing with the data. This would need to be followed up with the transcript and analysis as part of the member checking of this research to ensure
these areas were addressed and that I had accurately recorded the staff member’s experiences and viewpoints and that the analysis reflected this.

Is the interviewee willing to be contacted again?

yes
Source #1
Cumming, J (1994) Catering for the needs of all young adolescents: Towards an integrated approach. Unicorn, vol.20, no.2

Citation

Summary
The Coalition for Community Schools has built and expanded on aims and beliefs from the organisations which are part of the coalition and have developed six conditions for learning. Their belief is that the best outcomes for students will be realised when as many conditions are in place as possible. Schools agree to abide to the following conditions in joining the Coalition.

Evaluation
It’s very relevant to the topic and offers a model that can be used as a theoretical framework for the three case studies. It is also well written and accessible. The authors have completed many other articles on areas of full service all adding valuable information.

Relationship to other sources:
From this research perspective these conditions have relevance as a possible theoretical framework or structure or as a possible evaluation or planning tool for FSS within Australia which are initiating or developing their FSS. Provides a different viewpoint to UK, Scotland and Australia although there are similarities.

Paraphrased ideas or direct quotations to use in paper
The conditions are as follows:
Condition 1- the school has a core instructional program with qualified teachers, a challenging curriculum and high standards and expectations for students.
Condition 2- Students are motivated and engaged in learning- both in school and in community settings, during and after school
Condition 3- the basic physical, mental and emotional health needs of young people and their families are recognised and addressed.
Condition 4 – There is mutual respect and effective collaboration among parents, families and school staff.
Condition 5 – Community engagement, together with school efforts, promotes a school climate that is safe, supportive and respectful and connects students to a broader learning community.
Condition 6- Early childhood development is fostered through high quality, comprehensive programs that nurture learning and development.(Blank & Berg, 2006:9).
## APPENDIX FOUR- AUDIT TRAIL SAMPLE

**Date:** October 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participants</th>
<th>School Staff</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At each school site:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff x 5</td>
<td>5 stakeholders from each school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead agencies x 3</td>
<td>Principal, Deputy, social worker, school chaplain, SAER, teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents x 3</td>
<td>Partner Lead Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these agencies are those which have had ongoing and in depth involvement in the school from its establishment of the FSS model and have also been involved in its implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finally parents who are involved in an ongoing way with the FSS will be sought to participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Challis</th>
<th>All complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Nb at Roseworth partnership Mission Australia rep has moved on need to chase address.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design open ended questions for interviews for the three groups</strong></td>
<td>Roseworth: All complete except Mission Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neerigen Brook: Still waiting on 2 parent interviews to completed on the third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td>Challis: Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observational Protocol</strong></td>
<td>Roseworth: Completed except for Mission Australia interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formulate table</strong></td>
<td>Neerigen Brook: Completed except for 2 x parent interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document analysis</strong></td>
<td>Challis: All collected and in review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roseworth: All complete except Mission Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neerigen Brook: Completed except for 2 x parent interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation Protocol**

- Demographic information: time, place, date and setting
- Descriptive information: portraits of the participant, reconstruction of dialogue, description of physical setting, accounts of activities
- Reflective information: researcher’s personal thoughts; feelings, ideas, problems, impressions and prejudices (Creswell, 2009, p. 181)

**Document analysis**

- Documents publicly available relating to policy will be sought
and reviewed from areas such as both the state and federal Education Departments, and School site documents. Documents such as policy statements, regulations and guidelines relevant to each site will also be utilised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Log</th>
<th>All research methods are open for inspection and to provide an open accountability to demonstrate research reasoning and the chain of evidence on which it is based</th>
<th>Ongoing update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Complete interview summary form at the end of each interview</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseworth</td>
<td>All collected and in review process</td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Checking</td>
<td>Member checking occurred to determine accuracy with participants. Data that was taken back included themes, case analysis, part of the end product. Where appropriate follow up interviews occurred</td>
<td>Challis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roseworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neerigen Brook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


APPENDIX FIVE - DATA ANALYSIS

How Have Full Service Schools in WA been Initiated and Implemented?

An in-depth analysis of the three case studies occurred. The analytical strategy utilised was a comparative thematic analysis. Thematic analysis was used for this research as it “yields insightful interpretations that are contextually grounded” (Wiebe, Durepos, & Mills, 2009: 927). The five purposes of meaning making are described by Boyatzis in Weibe et al (2009:. 927) “(1) of seeing, (2) of finding relationships, (3) of analysing, (4) of systematically observing a case and (5) of qualifying qualitative data”. From this will emerge a thick description of the FSS in WA. This will be supported by the triangulated approach of incorporating the multiple data sources (observations, documents with the interview material as well as the reflective material from the research log). As Denzin (1989:247) notes the combination of considering alternate possible interpretations (theories) and methods aids in providing for breadth and depth to the analysis.

Analysis of data by a collective case study approach is challenging. One of the challenges was trying to derive the essence of the content from the large volumes of data without losing the context.

To ensure reporting back was consistent with the views of the stakeholders from all three sites an ongoing member checking process occurred for all interview transcripts to ensure the record was accurate. A second process occurred in developing the research products in which information recorded was sent to the relevant stakeholders for confirmation, validation and verification (Punch 2009:316).

To ensure procedural dependability in the areas of data collection, data reduction and summaries, reconstruction of data and results of syntheses and findings, process notes and preliminary plans a clear audit trail was developed this was used to demonstrate how the researcher collated the data and how it was analysed to arrive at the conclusions. Regular peer debriefing (Flick2006:376) also occurred as part of this research process with individuals not involved in the research in order to reveal any researcher’s blind spots and to ensure derived conclusions were accurate and objective.

Themes were derived from the data through a thematic coding process. Themes that emerge from the data together formed a thorough picture of the full service school. Data analysis
was an ongoing process which involved continual reflection in a flexible model in which data collected was revisited throughout the analysis process. The data analysis occurred concurrently with the research process and data collation. Data was continually refined and reorganised in light of the emerging results. The analytical themes were followed through the formulation of open ended questions, collection of data and the subsequent analysis of data on a range of topics.

The data was collated across the three research sites and set within the relevant contexts, whilst still allowing for the potential comparison of relevant themes. In summary:

Collated data was reviewed with the overall aim of integration for findings and conclusions. Collated data consisted of all available material (non structured and structured interviews, empirical data, exploratory data and observations), literature and documents. A triangulated process was used to establish themes and add validity to the data where appropriate; Member checking occurred to determine accuracy with participants. Data that was taken back included themes, case analysis, part of the end product. Where appropriate follow up interviews occurred;

Analysis was made to identify converging perspectives (ideas, concepts common to all or a number of groups and diverging perspectives (ideas, concepts found only in one or a few groups). Meaning was assigned to data and devised concepts were analysed. Transcripts content were also analysed to identify substantive statements;

As issues become highlighted they were then explored subsequently through data collection and analysis in the other case studies;

As part of the analysis process the cycling back through documents and revising coding was ongoing;

Interpretative insights were recorded in research memos;

Significant themes/ issues and substantive statements were also identified which were then categorised. The substantive statements were allocated to a theme/issue; and Identification and isolation of issues, themes from all collated data together with readings were used in conjunction to identify issues and themes.

The nature of this study took into account the subjective nature of the stakeholders involved. Everyone has their own world view and it is recognised that this shapes their understandings.
As part of the analysis process following the interviews a review process occurred in which the following reflection form was utilised as part of the research log.

Inductive Coding - Range of Categories
Beginning- How the FSS Started= B
Development of FSS= D
Principal/ Leadership- pink= L
Partnerships= P
Vision/mission/ philosophy= VP
Data= D
Facilities-F
Sustainability= S
Parent Involvement= PI
Parent Perspectives= PP
Use of and Development of Services= S
How Lead Agency involvement began= LA
Challenges/ Difficulties= C
Benefits= Be
Results= R

Emergent Themes
1. Development
1.1 Needs of kids- academic, social, early intervention
1.2 Early intervention strong focus
1.3 Needs of parents
1.4 strengths based changes to approaches over time
2. Strong partnerships of lead agencies
2.2 Communication
2.3 Review
3. Strong partnership of parent involvement
3.1 Changes over time
3.2 What made the changes
4. Strong leadership
4.1 Lead agencies
4.2 Principal- characteristics- workload, time, length of stay, passion, drive, clear sense of direction. perseverance
4.3 Parents
4.4 Admin and other staff

5. Shared vision/mission
5.1 With lead agencies and school
5.2 With school and parents

6. Sustainability and challenges
6.1 Ongoing financial commitment- difficult to project
6.2 Need key people to drive and coordinate
6.3 Need people to review, mentor, communicate, manage partnerships
6.4 All extra staffing costs money
6.5 Many lead agencies are funded by private on an annual, bi annual or 3 yr basis
6.6 Schools uncertain of their own ongoing funding

7. Facilities and resource use
7.1 Creative use of facilities
7.2 creative use of funding

Conceptual Framework – Draft of emergent themes into a flow or diagram picture
Strong partnership of lead agencies
Plus strong partnership of parent involvement
Plus strong leadership
Plus share vision/mission/philosophy
Plus ongoing finances
Equals a FSS

Emergent Themes from Transcripts
1. Development
1.1 Needs of kids- academic, social, early intervention

Ch Lee
Big gap between our kids when they started PP and the rest of the State, this was backed up by the PIPS data.

In response to identified needs and social impact of chn coming through and then from that developed into the integrated model.

Our 2000 AEDI data and pips big gap kids performance when entering pp in comparison to kids from across the state the pips data also provided more data.

We initially looked at changing our pedagogy and our curriculum in Kindy and PP try and better meet the needs of the kids but really what we had to try and do was to look at what was happening from 0 to 3.

So in 2005 we started a playgroup and then in 2006 we started it.

One playgroup once a week in a kindy class run by parents all the school council to look at a model out Quinns Beach way and then looked at pros and cons and drew up a model and got started. For a year I would supervise and look at what they were doing and really it was about getting the parents to connect with their toddlers and babies there was a strong focus on early literacy and play type skills just building vocab we had about 6 to 8 toddlers and the following year the numbers grew to about 15.

We didn’t seem to be targeting the right parents those who were struggling with their language we then began to seek funding through a variety of sources to look at how we can employ someone who can go out and reach out to parents who typically would not be engaged in school so that year we employed a fulltime family support worker and to try to engage with the families who are difficult to engage in. also made a connection with the local librarian who would come down and read stories to the chn at playgroup time also appointed a teacher t run the playgroup and made it a lot more structured.

Targeted chn for 3 yr old program targeted to provide early intervention for a group of chn at risk flooded them with services.

2010 whilst good for 16 chn and although they had a good start it wasn’t necessarily going to reflect in my results as there were 80 other chn not being catered for so in 2010 we opened it up to 3 yr olds in our catchment area full time teacher for 3 yr olds, ran 3 yr old kindy 2 groups of 20 focus on oral language, play skills, social and emotional development and then teacher had one day to coordinate all the services.

1.2 Early intervention strong focus.
See above for Lee ch

1.3 Needs of parents

See above for Lee ch

1.4 Strengths based changes to approaches over time

2. Strong partnerships of lead agencies

2.2 Communication

2.3 Review

3. Strong partnership of parent involvement

3.1 Changes over time

3.2 What made the changes

4. Strong leadership

4.1 Lead agencies

4.2 Principal- characteristics- workload, time, length of stay, passion, drive, clear sense of direction, perseverance

Lee Ch- Lee 9th year at challis

Staying at school because I love it and staying to be a part of big legislative changes that will make it easier for the next person who will take over.

Lee Ch - Excellent deputy- to be able to manage school

Equal amount of time into both entities

Also about

Priorities are literacy, aboriginal education and the parenting centre

Been about developing our leadership so that I can spread the opportunities around, creating opportunities for other people to step up and learn about how to engage agencies and keep them happy and making sure everybody is buying into the vision.

The entire staff buy into the one vision so there is no struggle they all buy in and there is a common set of beliefs agreements that we all agree to and stick to . All their performance management is linked to the vision and making sure that they are able to achieve what the beliefs are about.

4.3 Parents

4.4 Admin and other staff

5. Shared vision/ mission

5.1 With lead agencies and school
Lee Ch - Need to buy into the vision- it is not about collocating the service it is about integrating the service
Personality- is also a key
We also have extended school services which are for chn 4 and above
5.2 With school and parents
6. Sustainability and challenges
6.1 Ongoing financial commitment- difficult to project
6.2 Need key people to drive and coordinate
6.3 Need people to review, mentor, communicate, manage partnerships
Lee Ch- Success of the program is attracting small buckets of money and the right person
Lee Ch- We asked and received funding from various mining groups, we had extra services given to us from the Health Department.
This year expanded right out to a whole pile of services for the model. We had the statewide specialist services
We went into a partnership last year with save the chn – 11 parents and chn from our school attending playgroup
We also ran aboriginal parent capacity building workshops
We have 4 groups of 20 for 3 yr olds
Aboriginal- is always about reengaging and reinvigorating relationships
A project which has evolved overtime and some years better than others- coordinator appointed for Aboriginal health and wellbeing, also coordinates the aeios- 0.8FTE
Massive amounts tied up in staffing- need the money to employ people and the right people to employ
6.4 All extra staffing costs money
See above Lee staffing
6.5 Many lead agencies are funded by private on an annual, bi annual or 3 yr basis
6.6 Schools uncertain of their own ongoing funding
Lee Ch- As long as the money comes in it will be sustainable

Need to have a holistic approach to our funding schemes.

We need to stop the Federal versus State acquittals for the future
Almost at the point of being sustainable as long as the money comes in
We need to have a holistic approach to funding

6.7 Workload
Lee Ch - Incredibly difficult workload enormous to the point of being unmanageable- running a tricky school and be an educational leader, lead curriculum and manage behaviour and trying to be innovative and run a complex fs model for parents from when they are pregnant. Workload huge essentially trying to run 2 entities- complexities of school, educational leader and trying to run

6.8 Legalities
Lee ch- Education act needs to change for 0 to 3 and need to change at our government level the silo mentality so that we are not all working in our own discreet areas it needs to be around what childrens’ developments and families need and then integrated around a school site.

7. Facilities and resource use
7.1 Creative use of facilities
7.2 Creative use of funding
See above Lee Ch
7.3 Need versus resource availability
Lee ch Referrals all vying for the same service however services still not meeting the needs and therefore have to prioritise.

8.0 Results/ benefits
8.1 Increase in services and numbers of involvement
Lee ch- We also have extended school services which are for chn 4 and above
Two components- whole raft of services for 0 to 3 which we call the challis parenting and early learning centre with all of the different agencies and services involved. We also have extended services which are usually different agencies
Programs for 0 to 3 programs for school age kids
8.2 Evaluation measures

Thematic Analysis - How Have Full Service Schools in WA been Initiated and Implemented?
### Initiated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Lead agency involvement</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Problems/ Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>Low socio</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Incidents/ Crisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership - Principal, parents, lead agencies</th>
<th>Lead agencies Challenges, development, communication</th>
<th>Partnership management</th>
<th>Resource Management Facilities Funding</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal – passionate and driven, fss dependant on Principal</td>
<td>Leadership Workload,</td>
<td>Communication Community development Vision, mission, ownership</td>
<td>Policies/ Regulations and Systems Legalities</td>
<td>Evaluatio n</td>
<td>Challenges benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1

#### Questions and Analytical Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Data and Analysis Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development and Sustainability</td>
<td>Interviews Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
how needs were established
and the decision made to
implement FSS;
the rationale behind trials and
implemented approaches;
how the FSS was initiated, by
what mechanisms;
how the FSS was implemented
and critical success factors and
inhibitors that affected
implementation and ongoing
development.
Do you see your FSS as
sustainable if yes why if no why
not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges/ Limitations</th>
<th>Document Analysis</th>
<th>Data collection matrix to identify emerging commonalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the challenges/ limitations you have faced in the development of the FSS in terms of the items below and how have you overcome them in terms of factors such as funding, facilities, liability issues, people challenges, communication, time and workload.</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Positive Factors | |
|------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What have been the positive factors that impacted on the initial development of your FSS? In terms of within the school and external to the school</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Data collection matrix to identify emerging commonalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the impact for the school in terms of factors such as attendance, retention, parent participation, student academic progress</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics were generated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Data collection matrix to identify emerging commonalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interagencies/Partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you identify the interagencies/ programs that were to be a part of the FSS? Which ones have made the most difference and why? How did you establish the partnerships with the interagencies? How do you make the school-agency links work? How did you identify its effectiveness? How do you sustain these partnerships?</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics were generated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Data collection matrix to identify emerging commonalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>