Summer 8-19-2018

Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in an Urban Louisiana Community: A Case Study

Frederic D. Washington
Concordia University - Portland, fredericwashington25@gmail.com

Summer 8-19-2018

Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in an Urban Louisiana Community: A Case Study

Frederic D. Washington
Concordia University - Portland

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Doctorate of Education Program

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

CERTIFY THAT WE HAVE READ AND APPROVE THE DISSERTATION OF

Frederic Deon Washington

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Mark E. Jimenez, Ed.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Doris Dickerson, Ed.D., Content Specialist

Tony Goss, Ph.D., Content Reader

Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits Have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in an Urban Louisiana Community: A Case Study

Frederic Deon Washington

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the College of Education

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Transformational Leadership

Mark E. Jimenez, Ed.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Doris Dickerson, Ed.D., Content Specialist

Tony Goss, Ph.D., Content Reader

Concordia University–Portland

2018

Abstract

This qualitative case study explored the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit sanctioned programs and services have on schools rated as failing, or *academically unacceptable* by the Louisiana Department of Education during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. The schools represented in this study are in an urban Louisiana community, serving grades K-8. Each of the schools represented in this study partnered with at least four nonprofit agencies that provide services in after school enrichment, community learning centers, fight diversion programs for students, mini grant programs for teachers, and sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention for middle school campuses. This study is rooted in a conceptual framework that encompasses nonprofit organizations, education reform, and transformational leadership. The research questions that guided this study consisted of determining how educators perceived the impact the aforementioned programs and services have on annual school performance, culture, and climate. Twelve educators participated in individual interviews, two focus group discussions that were separated for elementary and middle school teachers, and surveys. The findings from this study indicated that based on their responses, educator participants were able to adequately identify the impact nonprofits have on the performance, culture, and climate of academically unacceptable schools in an urban Louisiana community.

Keywords: climate, culture, education reform, educator perceptions, impact, nonprofits, public schools, school performance

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to two special people in my life. I would like to first dedicate this dissertation to my loving grandmother, Mrs. Ruthie "Emma" Lee Washington. Although dementia may shield you from truly understanding the magnitude of this academic accomplishment, I will always remember the love, support, and encouragement you offered me from early childhood, until my days of undergraduate studies. Although the demands of the Dixie cotton fields of Northern Louisiana limited your formal studies to third grade, you have inspired so many in our community to achieve academically. Over the years I have watched you advocate on behalf of so many to reach their fullest potential. You have always championed "getting your lesson out of the way." I also thank you for investing your time and money into my educational pursuits, even when it wasn't met with popularity. To my mother, Patty Sue Washington, I thank you for always reminding me to pursue my dreams with passion, drive, and authority. Thank you for your unselfish and unwavering love and guidance. I have never been more appreciative of you demanding nothing but my absolute best. I count it all joy that I have you as my mother, confidante, and friend. You have taught us so much about personal sacrifice, faith, and perseverance. Thank you for reminding me to take it one day at a time, remain focused, to walk by faith, never lean to my own understanding, and to always trust in the power of our loving, almighty God.

Acknowledgements

To my faculty dissertation advisor, Dr. Mark E. Jimenez, I would like to extend thanks for your willingness to work with me. I will be forever grateful for your guidance, support, patience, and diligence throughout this process. Your constructive feedback and continuous affirmations ignited a fire that I thought had vanished. I always found your feedback to be rooted in focusing on what all could go right, instead of all that could go wrong. To my committee members, Dr. Doris Dickerson and Dr. Tony Goss, thanks for devoting your time and expertise to my academic pursuits. I am also appreciative of Dr. Angela Owusu-Ansah, Dr. Anne Grey, Dr. Marty Bullis, and Dr. Christopher Maddox for their invaluable consultation and support throughout my doctoral journey.

Ebony, my dear friend, thanks for always reminding me to occasionally unwind and reflect. Also, thanks for always extending positive affirmations and for all of the accountable talks. I am blessed to have you as my friend. Shae, my dear partner in crime since fifth grade: "hey…baby girl!" Thanks for the pep talks and all the laughs during my toughest moments. Dr. Dana-Michelle Fergins, thanks for always lending a listening ear and for devoting time towards editing my material. Charles, thanks for everything you've done for me over the years.

To my colleague, Dr. Deloris "Dee" Vinson-Wright, thanks for allowing me to come by your office to vent, and for always reminding me to keep my "eyes on the prize." Sharing your doctoral journey put so much into perspective. Gwynne, thanks for being my professional mentor and friend over the last decade. This dissertation demanded a great deal of my time, and I am thankful to my close family and friends for understanding when I couldn't take a call or show up to a function. Last but certainly not least, I would like to extend thanks to those who

cheered me on near and far. It's all love from my end. This has been truly been journey of highs and lows that I wouldn't trade for absolutely anything.

List of Tables

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this case study was to explore how teachers working in K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community perceived the impact nonprofit programs have on the performance, culture, and climate of their school. The educators selected to participate in this study represent campuses that were deemed by the Louisiana Department of Education as being academically unacceptable during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. Schools are graded annually and receive grades of A, B, C, D, or F. Schools in the D category are considered to be on academic warning status until a grade of C or higher is earned (Louisiana Department of Education, 2015). Schools that score in the F category are classified by the state as academically unacceptable. This status comes as a result of schools not meeting metrics set by the state, including but not limited to standardized testing, attendance, graduation indexes, and discipline rates (Louisiana Department of Education, 2018).

Under academically unacceptable status, schools are required by the state to establish individualized school improvement plans; and, in some cases depending on the nature of challenges, some schools have to enter corrective action plans, which deals with specific populations of students such as those identified as having special needs (Louisiana Department of Education, 2018). School improvement and corrective action plans include both internal and external based interventions to increase the school performance score. In a series of lawsuits filed against the Louisiana government regarding recently passed education policies pertaining to school performance, educators noted there is a disconnect in collaboration in terms of soliciting input regarding impact of programs and policies in public schools (Farber, 2015; McElfresh, 2016; Schneider, 2014 & 2015; Sentell, 2015, 2017, & 2018; Sills, 2014). Nonprofit organizations and their sponsored programs and initiatives serve as external interventions to

many schools and academic programs; however, recent scholarly research is limited regarding the perceptions of educators on how nonprofit organizations impact the performance, culture, and climate of schools identified as academically unacceptable within a specific geographic region known for low quality of life indicators (Brown, 2013; Weiwei & Qiushi, 2016; Yan, Guo, & Paarlberg, 2014).

Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework of the Problem

Since 2012, Louisiana has experienced historic, unconventional increases in teacher turnover in its public schools, most notable in school districts serving urbanized communities such as Baton Rouge, Lafayette, Lake Charles, Monroe, New Orleans, and Shreveport (Barrett & Harris, 2015; Farber, 2015; Ford & Van Sickle, 2017; Schneider, 2014, 2015; Sentell, 2015, 2017, 2018; Sills, 2014; McElfresh, 2016). The average years of service for retired teachers and retention rates for new teachers has decreased steadily, and as a response educators noted they are often tasked with balancing red tape handed to them from the state, the school district, and in some cases school building administrators without soliciting substantive input (Beltramo, 2014; McElfresh, 2016; Yilmaz & Kilicoglu, 2013). The challenge of bridging the achievement gap between race and class still remains an issue in the American education system (Huang & Sebastian, 2015; McDonough, 2015). The challenge of bridging the achievement gap is more prevalent in one geographic region of the country. Louisiana accounts for the lowest education rankings in American K-12 student achievement and incarcerates the highest number of inmates per capita in the industrialized world (Graff, 2015; Heiner, 2016; Patten, 2016). In addition to poor educational rankings and high incarceration, Louisiana ranks among the highest states in America with negative quality of life indicators such as health and employment (Robison, Jaggers, Rhodes, Blackmon, & Church, 2017).

The topic of improving America's public schools has increased over the last decade, stemming in part from the effects of what is now known as the defunct Federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) (Holbien & Ladd, 2017; Riley, 2014). The legislative act required state education agencies across the country to implement accountability measures for their public schools (Holbein & Ladd, 2017). A significant factor to accountability measures as mandated by NCLB dealt with standardized testing in the core subjects of language arts, mathematics, social sciences, and natural sciences (Sun, Saultz, & Ye, 2017). States were required by NCLB to establish performance metrics for schools and rate them individually based on their performance on standardized assessments, in addition to other factors such as attendance and graduation indexes (Riley, 2014). While the law itself has been replaced, its effects still impact the day-to-day operations of many public schools (Brownell, Bishop, & Sindelar, 2018; Horn, 2018; Louisiana Department of Education, 2014, 2018; Schneider, 2014, 2015; Soliman, 2018).

For the first time in history, many states had to publicly share and confront the realities plaguing their respective public education systems (Sun et al., 2017). The No Child Left Behind Act required states to identify schools that failed to meet performance metrics, and provide students in affected schools an option to transfer to a higher performing school, or supplemental educational services such as tutoring or other academic interventions, offered by the school district or partnering nonprofit organizations (Koyama 2015; Louisiana Department of Education, 2018; Singh, 2015). Although NCLB has been replaced with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), state education agencies still comply with a number of accountability measures as established by the former (Brownell, Bishop, & Sindelar, 2018; Horn, 2018; Louisiana Department of Education, 2014, 2018; Schneider, 2014, 2015; Soliman, 2018).

While the law was replaced in late 2015, the effects of NCLB still impacts public education policies in number of ways, including seeing traditional public schools being seized from the authority of their local districts, to becoming charter schools run by the state (Koyama 2014; Leatherwood & Payne, 2016; Louisiana Department of Education, 2014, 2016, 2018). For many teachers in Louisiana, NCLB and similar education policies have resulted in the implementation of rigorous teacher evaluation metrics, and the value added model, which incorporates student test performance into teacher evaluations (Payne, 2016). The perceptions of such education policies among many educators and the national professional organizations that represent them is negative (Black, 2015).

Research by Holbein and Ladd (2017) indicated that public school educators felt many provisions from the act has created more red tape, hindering time for creativity and implementation of effective teaching practices conducive to their respective, unique set of students. Research by Eslinger (2014) suggested that educators feel NCLB has created pressures to teach to the test, and not educate the whole child. Research shared by Bulkley and Gottlieb (2017) along with Means and Howe (2015) indicated that teachers feel the challenges as reflected in negative quality of life indicators should be considered in the legislative decisions that impact public schools.

Black (2015), Gorton, Williams, and Wrigley (2014), and Means and Howe (2015) shared in their respective research that educators in public schools feel negative academic labels have inadvertent consequences. They added that pressures to teach to the test, constant benchmarking, and cookie-cutter response to intervention programs diminish the nurturing aspects of teaching. They further explained that pressures brought on by state education agencies and district administration to increase school performance scores through standardized

testing has resulted in the neglect of other student needs. Price (2016) and Stern (2016) noted in their respective studies that educating the whole child encompasses higher order thinking in addition to addressing the student's hierarchy of needs.

Nonprofit organizations have positioned themselves in the education arena as an additional intervention towards addressing issues identified in public schools (GuideStar, 2018; Hughes & Silva, 2013; Robertson, 2015). Over the last decade hundreds of nonprofit organizations have formed in Louisiana with missions aligned to support education, while existing ones have shifted their missions to align with education causes (GuideStar, 2018). The respective mission statements and objectives of such nonprofit organizations include tutorial programs, professional development services for novice teachers, fight diversion programs for at-risk students, teenage pregnancy prevention initiatives, education policy research, truancy, performing arts, feeding programs, and housing services to homeless families with school aged children among other social causes that impacts the public education system (GuideStar, 2018).

Nonprofit organizations are founded based on a number of factors, including needs of the community served (Salamon, 2014). Additionally, nonprofit organizations require resources to make their programs work. Resources for nonprofit organizations generally come from resource development initiatives such as soliciting volunteers and fundraising (Salamon, 1999). More complex nonprofits that serve formal populations such as students or patients usually benefit from competitive grants funded by governmental agencies (Salamon, 2015). Nonprofit organizations demonstrate their effectiveness through program evaluation for competitive funding (Salamon, 2014). Program evaluation metrics are usually defined by the nonprofit organizations at the time that competitive funding is sought (Salamon, 1999). Although nonprofit organizations have a presence in public schools, the perceptions of educators on

regarding impact and effectiveness hardly considered during the internal program evaluation process (Banker, Chang, & Feroz, 2014). Baglibel, Samancioglu, Ozmantar, and Hall (2016), Frelin (2015), and Tai and Kareem (2016) indicated within their respective research that soliciting the perceptions of educators on programs is important as they are able to share intimate details and provide salient examples relative to measuring impact.

The themes presented by Burns (2012), Mann (1845), and Salamon (2015) shape a conceptual framework that connects the relevance of nonprofit organization administration, education reform, and transformational leadership. Salamon presents themes relative to the structure and foundation of nonprofit organizations and their role in transforming society. Mann presents themes that provoke thought relative to the social institution of education, transformative learning, and identifying the elements of structural reforms intended to improve teaching, reasoning, and learning. Burns' theory of transformational leadership encompasses the idea that through recognizing the power of moving organizations forward through its people and modifying social constructs, cultivate new effective organizational norms.

Statement of the Problem

The problem statement of this study is rooted in the fact Louisiana has experienced historical increases in teacher turnover over the last five years (Buras, 2013; Farber, 2015; McElfresh, 2016; Owens, 2013; Schneider, 2014, 2015; Sentell, 2015, 2017, 2018; Sills, 2014). Among their reasons for resignation or earlier than planned retirement, educators noted they are often tasked with balancing red tape handed to them from the state, the school district, and in some cases school building administrators (Beltramo, 2014; Schneider, 2014, 2015; Yilmaz & Kilicoglu, 2013). In addition to delivering instruction to students, educators are charged by their superiors to incorporate external initiatives and interventions into their instructional planning

without always being afforded the opportunity to provide any substantive input regarding potential impact prior to implementation (Jia, Jiuqing, & Hale, 2017; Suh, 2016).

Studies indicated that classroom teachers and school based administrators feel a sense of distrust and disconnect from leadership due to such exclusion and often feel that external interventions are ineffective due to lack of fidelity or connection to social causes on school campuses (Ford & Van Sickle, 2017; Gansle & Noell, 2015; Schneider, 2014). In Louisiana, the emergence of nonprofit organizations with a focus on assisting schools classified as failing has been positioned as an additional external intervention (GuideStar, 2018). Nonprofit organizations generally operate in a non-intrusive sense, meaning they typically form as a response to a need in the community (Salamon, 2015).

The rapid expansion of nonprofit programs and their authority in Louisiana includes authorization of charter schools, authorization of teacher certification, administrator credentialing, fight diversion programs, teenage pregnancy prevention programs, and initiatives that promotes the study of education policy. These unique programs have been both embraced with optimism, scrutiny, and controversy by educators nationally (Schneider, 2014, 2015). Nonprofit programs engage in program evaluation, but those processes are typically between the nonprofit organization and providers of grants, volunteers, or other resources (GuideStar, 2018).

As it relates to the Louisiana's public education reform efforts, educators feel there is an overabundance of red tape among other mandates that are intrusive to the learning environment (Boylan & Ho, 2017; Gross & Hill, 2016; Schneider, 2015; Verstegen, 2016). Louisiana educators have not been lobbied for input regarding the impact interventions offered by nonprofit organizations have on schools classified as academically unacceptable. Nonprofit organizations partner with schools as an external intervention to identified concerns; however there is a lack of

uniformity among various nonprofits to determine how their programs impact the annual performance, culture, and climate of schools identified as academically unacceptable (Brown, 2013; Yan, Guo, & Paarlberg, 2014; Weiwei & Qiushi, 2016).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this case study was to explore how teachers working in K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on the performance, culture, and climate of their school. Louisiana educators are often tasked with balancing red-tape while complying with other demands on their jobs, while not having the opportunity to provide input to policy makers or central administration regarding the impact or effectiveness of programs (Farber, 2015; McElfresh, 2016; Owens, 2013; Schneider, 2014, 2015; Sentell, 2015, 2017, 2018; Sills, 2014). Since 2000, hundreds of nonprofit organizations have positioned themselves as an external intervention towards addressing challenges in schools identified as academically unacceptable (GuideStar, 2018). Educators who have direct contact with students are likely able to reflect upon their daily experiences to determine the effectiveness or impact of certain programs and initiatives (Ford & Ihrke, 2016; Paarlberg, Nesbit, Clerkin, & Christensen, 2014; Temple & Reynolds, 2015). There is a significant amount of research literature that connects the relevance of nonprofit organizations, education reform, community engagement, collaboration, and program evaluation; however, there is very limited recent research that explores the impact of nonprofit programs when it comes to K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable through the perceptions of educators (Brown, 2013; Weiwei & Qiushi, 2016; Yan, Guo, & Paarlberg, 2014).

Research Questions

This study focused on the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit programs have on the performance, culture, and climate of their school. The educators participating in this study represent schools that were classified by the state department of education as being academically unacceptable during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. The research questions that guided this study consists of the following:

1. How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on annual school performance ratings?
2. How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on school culture and climate?

Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of the Study

A significant amount of research has been done that connects the relevance of nonprofit organizations, education reform, community engagement, collaboration, and program evaluation (Ford & Ihrke, 2016; Paarlberg, Nesbit, Clerkin, & Christensen, 2014; Temple & Reynolds, 2015). Additionally, said research has shown that nonprofit programs tend to accent existing initiatives supported by schools and community; however, there were insufficient studies that explore how nonprofit organizations impact public schools or structural reforms of struggling public schools in an urban Louisiana community through the perceptions of educators. Additionally, research shows that Louisiana educators feel there is excess red tape among other mandates that are intrusive to the learning environment (Boylan & Ho, 2017; Gross & Hill, 2016; Schneider, 2015; Verstegen, 2016).

Louisiana educators have not been lobbied for input regarding the effectiveness of interventions offered by nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit organizations partner with schools as an external intervention to identified concerns; however there is a lack of uniformity among various nonprofit programs to determine how their programs impact the annual performance, culture, and climate of schools identified as academically unacceptable (Brown, 2013; Weiwei & Qiushi, 2016; Yan, Guo, & Paarlberg, 2014). Findings from the study contribute to literature relative to nonprofits, education and transformational leadership. Findings from this study also contribute to discussions relative to program evaluation and the impact nonprofit programs have on transforming the performance, culture, and climate of schools in urban communities identified as failing.

Definition of Terms

Academically unacceptable: This term is defined as a designation given to schools that fail to meet state established academic benchmarks (Louisiana Department of Education, 2016).

Accountability: This term is defined as established performance expectations held of state education agencies, school districts, school administrators, teachers, staff, parents, and students (Education Week, 2016).

Deep South: This term is defined as a sub region that encompasses the lower states within the Southeastern region of the United States, including Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia (Adelman & Tsao, 2016).

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): This term is defined as the most recent federal law regarding public education policy, replacing the No Child Left Behind Act in 2015 (Dennis, 2017).

GuideStar: This term is defined as an online database that supplies data on all registered nonprofit organizations across America (GuideStar, 2018).

Intervention: This term is defined as specific improvement-based programs and initiatives that are used to correct the academic performance of an individual student, class, or school (Roth, Suldo, & Ferron, 2017).

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB): This term is defined as defunct federal law that mandated a number of provisions relative to economically disadvantaged students, and required individual states to set metrics and identify schools that fell short of making annual benchmarks (Gaddis & Lauen, 2014).

Nonprofit Organization: This term is defined as a business entity that seeks to provide a service based on an established need within the community, unlike for profit business entities, nonprofit organizations must use revenues and resources towards fulfilling the overall scope and mission of the organization. (Salamon 1999; Salamon 2014; Salamon, 2015).

Program Evaluation: This term is defined as a systematic, methodical process by which data and information is collected to answer questions about programs, policies, organizations, and initiatives (Chazin, Pardasani, & Kail, 2015).

Quality of Life Indicator: This term is defined as a measure that allows observers to understand and analyze a certain population of people. Quality of life indicators can include education, health, crime, and employment (Mulligan, 2015).

Red Tape: This term is defined as a policies that generally prohibits organizations or units from engaging in actions without regulation or continuous oversight (Kaufman, 2015).

School Climate: This term is defined as environment reflective of the school's impact on student conduct and behavior, diversity, and morale of parents, teachers, teachers, staff, and students (ASCD, 2018).

School Culture: This term is defined as a reflection of the morale, values and convictions of staff members and how it translates into the daily functions of the school (ASCD, 2018).

School Performance Score: This term is defined as the annual rating, ranging from A to F that is provided to each public school and district in the State of Louisiana, based on academic performance on standardized tests, graduation rates, and attendance (Louisiana Department of Education, 2018).

Stakeholders: This term is defined as individuals, groups, or formal entities that are invested in the prosperity, organizational health, and success of a school (Searing & Searing, 2015).

Urban: This term is defined as a city or municipality in the United States with a population of at least 50,000 people (Pacione, 2014).

Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations

I made two assumptions relative to the study. The first assumption made regarding this study dealt with the knowledge base of the participants. I assumed that educators participating in the study have a thorough understanding of the programs afforded to their schools by nonprofit organizations. This was an assumption because while teachers and staff may be aware of specific programs being offered within their schools as interventions, they may not be aware that such interventions are provided by a nonprofit organization.

The second assumption I made relative to this study dealt with educators being able to provide substantive, honest responses to the interview and focus group questions. I assumed that

while educators may provide reasonable accounts of their lived experiences in order to determine the impact nonprofit programs have on their school, they may sugar coat many of their reflections and thoughts as a result of not wanting to appear to be the negative person on campus. I reminded participants that neither they nor the schools would be identified.

There were four limitations present in this study. The limitations to this study consisted of level of certification obtained by teachers, representatives for each grade level in the study, years of experience, and the number of respondents consenting to participation in the study. In Louisiana, there are different levels of teaching licensure. Standard teaching certificates are issued as Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. Each level is determined by years of experience, evaluations, and continuous professional development. The state also offers special licensures for teachers including: Practitioner Licensure (PL), Temporary Authority to Teach licensure (TAT), and Out of Field Authorization to Teach (OFAT). Practitioner Licensure is granted to individuals in possession of a bachelor's degree, passing scores on the teacher certification exam, and enrollment in an alternative certification program. Individuals with PL licenses are considered highly qualified due to having passing scores on teacher certification exams and their continuous enrollment and progress in alternative certification programs. Individuals with TAT licenses only possess bachelor degrees, do not have passing scores on teacher certification exams, and are staffed in schools where teaching vacancies cannot be filled. TAT holders are not considered highly qualified and are only permitted to work on one year contracts. Out of Field Authorizations are held by certified educators who wish to teach in a high demand subject where they currently lack certification. Pertaining to the participants involved this study, there were variations in level of certification obtained by teachers, representatives for each grade level

in the study, years of experience, and the number of respondents consenting to participation in the study; therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized.

There are three delimitations present in this study. The delimitations of the study consisted of the location of the schools being in an inner-city setting, urban Louisiana. Other delimitations included the combination grade configuration of the schools (K-8), and the number of participants (12 teachers). Multiple schools were selected because incorporating more than one school that has involvement with multiple nonprofit organizations would allow for more diverse responses, helping to achieve better understanding as to how nonprofit programs impact performance, culture, and climate. Eliminating deductive disclosure was achieved through generalizing the term "urban Louisiana community," as opposed to providing information that could discover which particular urban community in Louisiana was used in the study – protecting the identity of participants. There was no mention of people, schools, places, nonprofits, or programs by formal title in the study. Under no circumstance was information pertaining to an individual student, specific program by name, personnel member by name, or specific incident be provided in the study. Under no circumstance was information pertaining to an individual student, specific program by name, personnel member by name, or specific incident be solicited by the investigator. The sharing of information was provided in aggregate, general terms. Selecting a school with combination grade configuration allows for a contribution to the literature regarding the perceptions educators have on the impact nonprofit organizations have on elementary, intermediate, middle, and junior high schools classified as failing, or academically unacceptable.

Summary

I began this chapter by providing an introduction to the study and an overview of the background, context, history, and conceptual framework pertaining to the problem. Also in this chapter I introduced the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, and the research questions. The presentation of research questions is followed by the rationale, relevance, and significance of the study, and definitions of key terms relative to the study. I also presented assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study. In the next chapter I will provide a review of research and methodological literature that encompasses existing findings and scholarly contributions to subjects concerning Characteristics of Schools Classified as academically unacceptable, Transforming Schools through Community Engagement, Public Education and the Nonprofit Sector, Using Input to Achieve Organizational Change, and Using Program Evaluation to Measure Social Impact.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

For this case study, I explored the perceptions of teachers regarding how nonprofit programs impact the performance, culture, and climate of K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community rated academically unacceptable. The literature presented in this chapter accents the themes of Burns (1978), Mann (1845), and Salamon (2003) as established in the conceptual framework of the study. The purpose of this literature review was to examine existing literature that connects the relevance of nonprofit organizations, education reform, community engagement, collaboration, and program evaluation. The research and methodological literature covered in this chapter consists of the following: Characteristics of schools classified as academically unacceptable, transforming schools through community engagement, public education and the nonprofit sector, using input to achieve organizational change, and using program evaluation to measure social impact. The review of research and methodological literature will be followed by the review of methodological issues, synthesis of research findings, and will wrap up with a critique of previous research.

Conceptual Framework

There are three themes that shape the scope of this study. Salamon (2015) presented themes relative to the structure and foundation of nonprofit organizations and their role in transforming society. Mann (1845) presented themes that provoke thought relative to the social institution of education, transformative learning, and identifying the elements of structural reforms intended to improve teaching, reasoning, and learning. Burns' (2012) theme of transformational leadership promotes achieving organizational change and transformation through connecting individuals to the scope and mission of the organization. Salamon, Mann, and Burns offered themes that are in essence interconnected and are relevant to understanding how nonprofit organizations may influence structural reforms in public schools (Kamil & Elder,

2015; Salamon, 2015). Salamon (2012) identified the function of social provision as the idea where nonprofit organizations formulate as a response to needs of the community that may not necessarily be met by the government.

Salamon's (1999) function of social provision reinforces Mann's (1845) emphasis on the importance of value, knowledge, and opportunity. Mann proposed the Theory of Value, which encompasses the teaching of practical knowledge. Although the teaching of practical knowledge is not necessarily embedded in fostering supernatural constructs, it does not nullify the fact that creativity and imagination are important, but rather such things should be cultivated based on nature itself. Within this same theory, Mann proposed that through the Theory of Value, educational attainment adds value to the life of the poor. Through the Theory of Value, Mann sensed that it is the obligation of public education to ensure equity among the masses.

Salamon's (1999) function of social provision accents Mann's (1845) Theory of Value in the respect that such needs generally guide the scope, mission, and objectives of nonprofit organizations, which are in turn used to develop programs that are conducive to addressing the respective needs of the community (Alexander, 2014). In addition to the social provision of nonprofit organizations, Salamon also proposed that the value guardian function is rooted in the belief that citizens have individual autonomy to take action in their community by formulating unique programs or organizations. Burns' (2003) reflection and theory of transformational leadership accents what Salamon (2015) theorizes as the essential functions of a nonprofit organization: service provision, value guardian, advocacy and problem identification, and social capitalism.

Achieving transformational leadership and change within social organizations such as schools and nonprofit organizations embodies identifying issues and proposing solutions that are

grounded in social capitalism. Data driven decision making processes are important to transforming organizations; however, people will not produce the best data if they are not equipped with the necessary tools, leadership, morale, and support (Burns, 2012). Through connecting the individual to the mission of the organization, encouraging the promotion of feeling a sense of belonging to the organization, and considering that leadership is a moral endeavor above all else, is what it will take to mobilize people and achieve organizational change. The essence of nonprofit organizations is largely rooted in the power of people, from assembling a board of directors, to managing volunteers, to engaging the community. Vital to successful nonprofit organizations is the ability to use social capital to achieve their respective missions and goals (Salamon, 2014). This is also true for other human service organizations such as educational institutions, including public schools (Hughes & Silva, 2013). In the education system, continuous professional development among other structural reforms prompt educators to engage in self-reflection to refine their crafts (Moore & Cochran, 2012).

In conclusion, themes proposed by Burns (1978, 2005), Mann (1845), and Salamon (1999) reflect a background in nonprofit organizations, education reform, and transformational leadership, respectively. The thematic connections found among the three theorists are complementary, as each recognizes the importance of achieving change and favorable outcomes through morale, knowledge, and values (Tell, 2015). Each theorist acknowledged the significance of matching individual to purpose in order to achieve transformational change. Organizational leaders within nonprofits and schools engage in program evaluation in effort to determine if they are on track to achieve their respective defined goals. Through program evaluation, organizational leaders are permitted to identify and scale both strengths and weaknesses (Mitchel & Berlan, 2016). The attitudes and motivations of individuals who are

essential bodies to the organization play a significant role in the productivity of the organization (Burns, 2012). The theories presented by Burns, Mann, and Salamon, acknowledge the significance of founding new and reforming existing organizations and social institutions to remain relevant to the changing needs of society.

Review of Research and Methodological Literature

Characteristics of Schools Classified as academically unacceptable

Mann (1845) championed comprehensive learning and equity. He theorized that all children were capable of learning, regardless of race, or socioeconomic status. Reinforcing his theory on education being an equalizer among the masses, Mann presented reforms that focused on inclusiveness. Researchers have connected several underpinnings of Mann's theory to the foundation to influential education policies (Jennings & Sohn, 2014). An example of such influential education policies was a federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). NCLB required that individual states establish metrics on how to grade schools and inform parents of each school's performance (von der Embse, Pendergast, Segool, Saeki, & Ryan, 2016; Wieczorek, 2017)

Although the law has been replaced, a number of provisions from NCLB still impact accountability in many states (Louisiana Department of Education, 2018). One such instance is the provision of NCLB that required states to identify schools that fell short of modest metrics as failing, or academically unacceptable as described in southern states (Adair, 2015; Ledesma, 2015; Watson, 2015). Schools classified as academically unacceptable are required to do a number of things regarding relative to enhancing public knowledge of interventions. Administrators working at schools identified as academically unacceptable must alert parents and guardians of its performance. Secondly, administrators or designees must offer the parents

and guardians a choice to send their students to a higher performing school (Louisiana Department of Education). If the parent or guardian chooses to keep their student in the original school classified as academically unacceptable, the parent is then given the option to enroll their child in supplemental educational services, which usually includes tutorial or other types of academic interventions offered by the district or partnering organizations (Ledesma, 2015).

Adair (2015), Ledesma (2015), and Watson (2015) explained there are a number of common characteristics among schools in the United States that are classified as failing. Ledesma et al. also indicated that single parent households, poverty, substandard housing, and minority households were the common external factor when considering the communities served by schools classified as academically unacceptable. Further research by Adair and Watson pointed out that higher performing schools typically represent middle class, dual parent households. Schools with large populations of students living in poverty are designated as Title I schools. Title I schools receive additional monies that are used for a range of things such as extra instructional personnel, materials, tutorial services, parental engagement programs, and enrichment programs, such as field trips (Matsuraira, Hosek, & Walsh, 2012).

Researchers presented studies that underlined another key distinction between schools rated academically unacceptable and their higher performing counterparts is the presence of experienced, qualified educators (Green & Munoz, 2016; Jennings & Sohn, 2014). Research conducted by Arnold and Sableski (2016) showed there is a disparity in the number of experienced educators working in urban, inner-city schools serving minorities. Herman and Reinke (2017) added to Arnold and Sableski's study by noting schools with inexperienced faculty members are likely to have significantly higher discipline problems among students. Discipline in the classroom contributes to increased distractions, disallowing effective instruction

to take place. Andrews, Richmond, and Stroupe (2017) and Lerman (2014) concluded that education policy greatly impacts the performance of a school, particularly those struggling to bridge the achievement gap.

Transforming Schools through Community Engagement

Salamon (2014) theorized that the function of social provision is where social organizations formulate as a response to meeting the needs not being addressed fully by governmental agencies. Davies and Davies (2014), Harris (2016), and Mozolic and Shuster (2016) indicated in their research that public elementary and secondary schools may not necessarily have access to healthy endowments to ensure funding of supplemental programs as their private and parochial counterparts. The needs of public schools that may not necessarily be met by their sponsoring school districts (Egalite, Mills, & Wolf, 2016; Ikpa, 2016). Such public schools rely heavily on community engagement and other partnerships to ensure support for additional programs and initiatives.

Lang (2015), Mallett (2013), and Officer, Grim, Medina, Bringle, and Foreman (2013) emphasized in their research that public school districts engage in two levels of solicitation of partnerships. The first level of solicitation is where school districts reach out to community organizations such as businesses, media outlets, and nonprofit organizations. School districts tend to direct outreach to organizations and businesses with mission statements favorable to supporting education, training, and development (Perkins, 2015; Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2016). Duffy and Gallagher (2015) along with Wright and Suro (2014) explicated in their respective studies that individuals within the school building often use personal connections to cultivate partnerships through community organizations.

Burns (2003) theorized that members within the organization must feel a sense of belonging and connection the organization's core mission and goals. Braunsberger and Flamm (2013) along with Kronick, Lester, and Luter (2013) both indicated in their respective research that in addition to internal connections to organizations made by staff and clientele, external connections are invaluable to public sector organizations as well. Studies conducted by Frederico and Whiteside (2016), Polesel, Klatt, Blake, and Starr (2017), and Dixon, Slanickova, and Warwick (2013) inferred that businesses feel compelled to partner with public schools for reciprocal purposes. The business community understands there is value in an educated workforce and thus see their involvement with schools as an investment in business, individuals, and community (Laine & Hämäläinen, 2015; Wagner, Newman, & Javitz, 2016; Farias & Sevilla, 2015).

Research by Horvath and Harazin (2016) and Kumari (2016) supported the assertion that partnerships between education organizations and community organizations are effective and provide a dual benefit to both organizations. Further, Frederico et al. (2016) and Dixon et al. (2013) discussed in their respective studies how partnerships with schools and community organizations are not limited solely to addressing existing challenges. They added in their conclusions that engagements between schools and community organizations serve as both an answer to existing challenges in addition to proactively cultivating initiatives that likely mitigate potential challenges.

Levkoe et al. (2016) conducted a study involving the engagement between academics and community organizations, including nonprofit organizations. Levkoe et al. acknowledged that the history between educational institutions at both the secondary and postsecondary levels and community organizations is longstanding. Paluta, Lower, Anderson-Butcher, Gibson, and

Iachini (2016), Park, Lin, Liu, and Tabb (2015), and Gesell et al. (2013) conducted qualitative studies that evaluated the effectiveness of school-based programs and initiatives that are supported by community organizations. They were all able to list among their respective conclusions that programs supported by community organizations proved to be more effective and lasted longer.

Hlalele and Tsotetsi (2016), Human-Vogel and Dippenaar (2013), and Tannehill and McPhail (2017) conducted studies that looked at community engagement with public schools differently. Instead of focusing on how community engagement influences the culture and climate of the school by individual programs or partnerships, researchers took a look at how community engagement could assist educator candidates with field experiences (Hlalele et al., 2016; Human-Vogel et al., 2013; Tannehill et al., 2017). Gaikhorst, Beishuizen, Zijlstra, and Volman (2015), Hlalele et al., and Newton (2017) acknowledged in their studies that attracting teachers in inner city, urban communities is a challenge that hinders improving schools.

Bland, Church, and Luo (2014), de la Varre, Irvin, Jordan, Hannum, and Farmer (2014), Hlalele et al. (2016), and Jungert (2014) elucidated in their studies that there is a strong disconnect between what student teacher candidates are taught versus what they experience firsthand. Specifically, Hlalele et al. explored how to promote the adaptive capabilities of student teacher candidates through community engagement processes. The research design and methodology consisted of soliciting student teacher candidates from an education program at a participating university. Hlalele et al. concluded from the responses given in the focus group interviews that student teacher candidates felt their experiences improved their civic participation, it prompted them to learn how to improvise in unexpected situations, and enhanced their professional development.

LeChasseur (2014), Stevenson (2015), and Wentworth, Mazzeo, and Connolly (2017) emphasized throughout their studies that community partnerships with educational institutions influence continuous engagement between community and social organizations. They further expounded on the idea that businesses tend to connect with social organizations in a way that further accents their branding. This means that businesses saw value in showing a constant presence with community. Businesses are enabled to expand their name recognition base and enhance opportunities simultaneously though extended partnerships with educational organizations.

Public Education and the Nonprofit Sector

Burns (2003) theorized that accomplishing transformational leadership and change within social organizations such as schools and nonprofit organizations embodies identifying issues and proposing solutions that are grounded in social capitalism. A significant amount of research has been done that acknowledges the relationships between nonprofit organizations and public schools (Ford & Ihrke, 2016; Paarlberg, Nesbit, Clerkin, & Christensen, 2014; Temple & Reynolds, 2015). The caliber of nonprofit organization engagement with public sector organizations such school districts largely differ in terms of mission and goals (Kellner, Townsend, & Wilkinson, 2017; Pandey, Kim, & Pandey, 2017; Word & Carpenter, 2013). Paarlberg et al. indicated in their research findings that nonprofit organizations engage with public schools to assist with transformation in the area of culture, climate, academic interventions, and leadership development.

Findings by Mozolic and Shuster (2016) and Weinstein and Israel (2014) support the views expressed by Kellner et al. (2017), Pandey et al. (2017), and Word et al. (2013) in regard to how engagements between nonprofit organizations and schools vary. The most common

partnerships between nonprofit organizations and schools are cultivated through both direct and indirect shared missions; for example, a nonprofit organization with a mission of eliminating hunger within the community may provide take home meal services to a school where a significant number of its students are below the poverty line (Joppa, Rizzo, Nieves, & Brown, 2016; Minzer, Klerman, Markovitz, & Fink, 2014). The relationships between public schools and nonprofit organizations are collective, due to the commonality of both sectors being human service oriented.

Brown (2013), Weiwei and Qiushi (2016), and Yan, Guo, and Paarlberg (2014) indicated in their studies that although the country has faced a recession the presence of nonprofit organizations in urban school settings has increased over the last decade. Moore and Kochan (2013) and Shirrell (2016) mentioned in their respective research that increased accountability measures has prompted schools with less than stellar academic marks to reach out to community organizations, including the business and nonprofit community to address academic achievement. Urban public schools rely on organizations such as nonprofits to supplement resources that aren't readily available as they would be in their higher performing, more affluent counterparts (Kellner, Townsend, & Wilkinson, 2017; Pandey, Kim, & Pandey, 2017; Word & Carpenter, 2013).

Austin and Isokuortti (2016), Ertas and Roch (2014), and Tell (2015), indicated in their studies that nonprofit organizations have expanded their scope within the public education arena, shifting from supplemental services to management. Roch (2015) introduced a study that looked at how the management framework of charter schools impacted the working conditions of educators. Roch explained that there are different management models with public charter

schools including nonprofit organizations, for-profit educational management firms, and stand-alone charter schools that are operated by governmental entities.

Hughes and Silva (2013) and Robertson (2015) acknowledged in their respective research that the relationships between nonprofit organizations and public sector organizations such as schools exist; however, the caliber of engagement and effectiveness of programs could be better quantified. Other studies acknowledge the presence of nonprofit organizations in the public school sector, but argue nonprofit organizations must clearly define their place in the school building (Chingos & West, 2015; Garcia & Morales, 2016; Hammack, 2016). Jang, Valero, Kim, and Cramb (2015) studied nonprofit collaborations with communities and public schools in a southern state. Jang et al. proposed a qualitative study to understand and categorize collaborations between schools and nonprofit organizations. Within their study, Jang et al. presented a literature review which examined the subjects of collaboration processes and collaboration benefits and challenges.

Jang et al (2015) and Kroeger, Beirne, and Kraus (2015) emphasized that not all collaborations are successful and tense relationships between schools and community organizations such as nonprofits were prevalent. Communication and collaboration among nonprofit organizations and schools largely vary. The nature of partnerships between schools and nonprofit organizations tend to be non-formal in nature as opposed to contractual agreements between human service organizations and corporate entities. Siegel-Hawley, Thachik, and Bridges (2017) and Green (2017) indicated in their studies that nonprofit organizations with an intent focus on collaboration and relationship building with organizations such as schools tend to be more challenging in the respect of management of accountability and communication within the organization.

Genao (2014) used a qualitative research approach to study the relationships between inner city schools in the northern section of the United States and nonprofit organizations. Genao asserted that the purpose of the study was to examine the how governmental organizations, nonprofits, and schools utilize resource sharing within a collaboration framework. The methodology used by Genao consisted of using existing data, literature, and reports to compare the effectiveness and value of innovative nonprofit alternative education programs to existing programs offered by the local school district.

The findings from Genao's study pointed out that the students participating in the innovative alternative education programs connected to nonprofit organizations performed better academically than their counterparts in traditional public schools. Genao further asserted while collaboration is essential to innovative programs such as the one used in the study, incentives for both students, faculty, and administrators played a more significant part in the level of performance in the school. Genao noted that there were few limitations and implications in the study, including the need for additional studies to reveal more significant effects of collaboration, in-depth quantitative studies that assess the effects of collaboration with alternative education programs, and linking collaboration constructs with applicable training programs and initiatives.

Tell (2015) and Austin and Isokuortti (2016) reiterated in their research that the relationships between nonprofit organizations and public sector agencies such as public schools are most effective when both organizations have a shared view of quality of life indicators, such as education, health, and socioeconomic status. Paarlberg et al. (2014) introduced a study that looked at the relationship between nonprofit organizations and public schools. At the beginning of their study, the country's economy was rebounding from the 2008 economic recession. As a

result of the recession, many nonprofit organizations found healthy revenue streams decline. In effort to fulfill their mission with fewer resources, nonprofit organizations sought to partner with other human service related organizations to achieve their respective missions, objectives, and goals.

Using Input to Achieve Organizational Change

Burns (2003) proposed a theory that assesses leadership through the perspective of social capital, motivation, and achieving success through developing people. Burns (2012) defined transformational leadership as the process by which organizational change is rooted in the behavior of people. Bonner, Greenbaum, and Mayer (2016), Fernandez and Camacho (2016), and Gu, Tang, and Jiang (2015) explained in their respective research that leaders and managers must consider the needs and interests of the people within their organization. They also acknowledged in their findings that when individuals feel a sense of belonging to an organization, they feel compelled to perform beyond metrics outlined in an evaluation.

Jia, Jiuqing, and Hale (2017), Men (2014), and Suh (2016) acknowledged in their research that the perceptions of individuals within an organization is important when considering structural changes. Beltramo (2014) and Yilmaz and Kilicoglu (2013) suggested in their phenomenological studies that educators feel a strong sense of disconnect between themselves and school leaders when changes and new initiatives are implemented without input. Dodson (2015) conducted a qualitative study soliciting the perceptions of school principals relative to educator effectiveness and mastery of their respective content areas.

To guide his study, Dodson developed an online survey with predetermined questions. The limitation to Dodson's study was a lack of open ended questions, which may have provided a more in-depth, descriptive perceptions. The only area within the survey that allowed for more

open-ended questions was the section allowing them to suggest changes that they would make to the overall educator evaluation framework. Utilizing local directories and online searches by individual school districts within the state, Dodson solicited responses from 1,100 active school principals within a southern state. Of the 1,100 principals emailed, only 308 or 28% responded. From his surveys Dodson was able to conclude from predetermined questions that principals within the southern state were not pleased with the revamped educator evaluation system nor the content assessments they were required to take.

Additionally, Dodson was able to conclude that the revamped evaluation system had a negative effect in terms of retention of both administrators and classroom teachers. While the revamped evaluation system negatively impacted morale, Dodson noted that some respondents felt the new system attributed to more favorable results with instructional methods. Dodson's research findings align with the assertions provided in the studies by Beltramo (2014) and Yilmaz and Kilcoglu (2013) relative to the importance of soliciting input prior to implementing organizational change.

Grarock and Morrissey (2013) conducted a study that assessed the insights of classroom teachers and their aptitude to work as educational leaders within early childhood learning centers. Unlike the study proposed by Dodson (2015), Grarock and Morrissey used interviews instead of surveys with predetermined questions and responses. The interviews prompted the teachers to reflect on their experiences in order to frame a thoughtful response regarding their confidence and ability to function as educational leaders within their working environment.

The results from the structured interviews showed that all participants actively sought new ways to improve instruction for their students, but only those teachers with leadership titles and roles actually felt they influenced the leadership framework within their schools. Grarock

and Morrissey were able to conclude in their study that formal titles and permitted authority influenced the level of confidence with teachers in the school. Dennis, Gordon, Howden, and Jindal-Snape (2017) and Namei and Insoo (2017) indicated that the perceptions of stakeholders outside of the organization is influential to enacting change.

Using Program Evaluation to Measure Social Impact

Burns (2003) theorized that organizations such as community nonprofits, educational organizations, churches, and hospitals reflect a significant component of transformational leadership, which in effect uses the power of influencing people to achieve desirable outcomes. Mye and Moracco (2015) discussed in their research the importance of using program evaluation as a means to measure social impact. Dillman and Christie (2017), and Mitchell and Berlan (2016) indicated in their respective studies that program evaluation has a dual purpose. The first purpose of program evaluation is for organizations to scale the impact their programs have on community. The second purpose of program evaluation as noted by Dillman et al. and Mitchell et al. is for organizations to better understand how to maximize resources and eliminate waste.

Research by Minzer, et al. (2014) supports the assertions of Dillman et al. (2016) and Mitchell et al. (2017) in terms of program evaluation serving multiple purposes, but added that organizations also face pressures by external entities who are financially vested in programs that impact community. Arvidson and Lyon (2014) introduced a study that underlined the idea that nonprofit organizations must consistently affirm their social impact to stakeholders for a number of reasons, namely for resource development and fundraising. Arvidson et al. sought to study how nonprofit organizations have reacted towards a demand by stakeholders to know their social impact. Arvidson et al. also found that competitive grants pressured nonprofit organizations to

be more involved with program evaluation to accurately scale the social impact of their programs.

Carnochan, Samples, Austin, and Myers (2017) and MacIndoe and Barman (2013) noted in their research that a number of factors such as scope of outreach and budget size influence their approach program evaluation, particularly in organizations that use program evaluation reports as a means to stay financially afloat. When organizations have the autonomy to formulate their reports, more grey areas are found than it would have been had funding agencies defined program evaluation metrics. Paluta, Lower, Anderson, Gibson, and Iachini (2016) conducted a study that examined the quality of grant funded after school programs that are largely administered by schools and nonprofit organizations. The research question presented by Paluta et al. was how stakeholders with direct involvement with program evaluation perceived the effectiveness of grant funded after school programs.

The grant funded after school programs evaluated in this study were identified as Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers with three components. The components of the after school programs included literacy and support programs, character education programs, and academic interventions, or tutoring services. The methodology used in this study involved identifying 405 organizations that administers the grant funded after school tutoring program. The 405 organizations were identified through a state owned database. The state database includes information on organizations participating in the grant funded after school programs. At the half-way mark of the academic year, each organization were emailed links to an online 15 to 20 survey for stakeholders to complete.

Paluta et al. (2016) identified stakeholders for the purposes of their study as school employees, community organizations, and business partners. The data collection process

occurred for three months. A total of 3,928 individuals were provided a survey, and 3,388 responded. Within the 3,388 responses, 332 of the 405 organizations were represented. Of the 3,388 responses, 76% were from female participants, 23% were from male participants, and the remaining one percent declined to disclose their gender. As far as race, 80% of the responses were from white/ non-Hispanics, 13% were from African Americans, while the remaining seven percent of responses came from multi-racial and Hispanics. Paluta et al. was able to conclude from their study that stakeholder perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the grant funded after school program were positive.

Review of Methodological Issues

Flemming and Closs (2016), Trainor and Leko (2014), and Wascher et al. (2017) indicated that qualitative research is important in the respect that it facilitates promoting data for the use of understanding needs, cases, and behaviors. Cleland (2017) and Wolfe (2017) indicated in their respective studies that qualitative research involves naturalistic observations in effort to understand a phenomenon or case. The studies reviewed in this chapter reflect both observation and documentation of the behaviors, opinions, desires, and needs of individuals relative to nonprofit organizations and public schools. The qualitative studies included in the review of research and methodological literature include a number of strengths including the simplification and management of data without compromising complexity and context (Gwernan-Jones et al., 2016). Approximately 83% of the primary research articles included in the review of research included qualitative research approaches, phenomenological and case study research designs, and interviews, focus groups, and surveys as the research methods.

The studies presented in the review of research and methodological issues underlines Trainor and Leko (2014) and Wolfe's (2017) assertion that the qualitative research approaches

are conducive to furthering discovery to a scholarly cause. The common documented strengths of the research and methodological literature reviewed is that the qualitative approach allowed researchers to gather data from participants based on their experiences in a way that allows for more comprehensive discovery. Cleland (2017) and Flemming and Closs (2016) underlined that another key distinction of qualitative research designs aligns with the idea that researchers are allowed to generate new ways of understanding new data. At the core of studies analyzed in the review of research and methodological literature is the strength of being able to code and develop themes based on the responses of individuals.

Notable weaknesses in the methodological literature include participant recruitment and retention, ambiguity, and researcher bias. Batterham (2014), Hanza et al. (2016), and Robinson et al. (2016) indicated that participant recruitment and retention for face to face data collection methods such as interviews and focus groups presented more challenges than telephone or internet collection. Batterham (2014) and Cleland (2017) discussed in their respective research that the communication with primary participants and alternates should be of equal effort, in the event alternates are needed. Research by Gomersall and Astell (2015) revealed how open ended questions in interviews and focus groups can allow for ambiguity in qualitative studies.

Hashemifard et al. (2017) and Wolfe 2017 noted that follow up questions allows researchers the opportunity to access more terms that are essential for connecting themes during the coding process. The review of research and methodological literature for this section revealed that qualitative studies are limited, meaning that the findings of such research cannot be generalized. The review of research and methodological literature for this section also revealed that researcher bias is also an area of concern in terms of qualitative research methods. Researcher bias was addressed in number of ways including triangulation, selection of unfamiliar

study sites, and noting assumptions relative to the topic of study at the appropriate time. Jonker and Pennink (2007) explained that triangulation in qualitative research involves the application of multiple data sources. Given (2008) noted that triangulation allows researchers to prove, disprove, or expound upon certain cases.

Synthesis of Research Findings

This review of literature provided a plethora of information relative to the scope of this study, which connects nonprofit organizations, transformational leadership, and public education; however, in my observation most research stopped short of assessing the impact nonprofit organizations and their programs have on transforming struggling public schools that serve inner city students. The research findings accent the themes of nonprofit organization administration, public education reform, and transformational leadership as provided in the conceptual framework. Through the review of more than 500 and the inclusion of more than 140 primary, scholarly articles, I was able to establish that the connection between nonprofit organizations and schools exist, linked by inadvertent shared missions that ultimately impact people (Ford & Ihrke, 2016; Paarlberg, Nesbit, Clerkin, & Christensen, 2014; Temple & Reynolds, 2015).

Nonprofit organizations that specialize in assisting other public sector organizations have grown expediently over the last decade (Ertas & Roch, 2014; Tell, 2015). Research shared by Joppa, Rizzo, Nieves, and Brown, 2016, and Minzer, Klerman, Markovitz, and Fink, 2014 underlined the position of nonprofit organizations responding to the needs of community. Hlalele and Tsotetsi (2016), Human-Vogel and Dippenaar (2013), and Tannehill and McPhail (2017) indicated in their research the significance of promoting effective nonprofit programs that serve public sector organizations such as public hospitals and schools. The research of

Carnochan, Samples, Austin, and Myers (2017) and MacIndoe and Barman (2013) further indicated that while the intent of such programs and partnerships are positive, program evaluation is essential to determining effectiveness. In regard to organizational effectiveness, Beltramo (2014), Dodson (2015), Grarock and Morrissey (2013), and Men (2014) clarified within their research that soliciting the perceptions of individuals within the organization is important as they have firsthand experiences of programs, practices, strengths, and weaknesses.

The research and methodological literature reviewed presents themes that shapes the foundation of studying the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofits have on the performance, culture, and climate of K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable. The three themes that emerged from this review of research and methodological literature encompasses acknowledgement that partnerships between nonprofit organizations and struggling schools exist, program evaluation is essential to measuring the overall scope and reach of programs, and that input from stakeholders is essential to organizational development and transformation. These three themes connect the relevance of studying the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofits have on the performance, culture, and climate of K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable.

Critique of Previous Research

The research and methodological literature reviewed in this chapter accents the overall scope and conceptual framework of the study. The conceptual framework focuses on connecting the themes of nonprofit organizations, public education reform, and transformational leadership. The research findings provided by Jia, Jiuqing, and Hale (2017), Men (2014), and Suh (2016)

underlined the theme of transformational leadership presented by Burns (2013). The findings from Jia et al., Men, and Suh acknowledged human capital is essential to organizational change.

The research and methodological literature presented in this review confirms that a significant amount of research has been done that acknowledges the relationships between nonprofit organizations and public schools (Ford & Ihrke, 2016; Paarlberg, Nesbit, Clerkin, & Christensen, 2014; Temple & Reynolds, 2015). Additionally, said research has shown that nonprofit programs tend to accent existing initiatives supported by schools and community; however, gaps exists between the research and methodological literature in terms of measuring or exploring the impact nonprofit programs have on annual performance ratings of schools identified as struggling academically (Paarlberg, et. al., 2014). Specifically, the research and methodological literature presented in this section connects the relevance of nonprofit organizations and schools, but gaps are presented in recent research (Temple & Reynolds, 2015).

Recent research is extensive in discussing how community partnerships impact relationships, participation, and engagement in public schools, but lacks in distinguishing how established programs and processes within such partnerships directly impact annual performance ratings (Horvath & Harazin, 2016; Jungert, 2014; Kumari, 2016). The review of research and methodological literature for this study underlines the assertion that nonprofit programs are inspired by various social phenomena. The review of research and methodological literature also revealed a gap in the program evaluation aspect of measuring social impact, meaning nonprofit programs are typically evaluated internally (Arvidson & Lyon, 2014; Mitchell & Berlan, 2016). Collaborative program evaluation processes between nonprofits and partnering organizations is rare, as nonprofit organizations typically channel their program evaluation activities to conciliate donors, prospective volunteers, and competitive grant funding agencies.

The research findings by Delgado (2015) and Miguel and Gargano (2017) signify that the theme of public education reform as outlined by Mann (1845) is relevant in academia, as the number of terminal degrees with a specialization in educational leadership has increased. Research provided by Groble and Brudney (2016), and Seaworth (2012) supported the inclusion of nonprofit organizations and their respective programs as a means of scholarly inquiry; however, because nonprofit studies as an academic major and discipline is a rather new phenomenon, literature on nonprofit education is limited. I noticed in my review of research literature that there were studies provided by Alves (2014), Patel, Schmid, and Hochfeld (2012), and Valero, Jung, and Andrew (2015) inadvertently connected the themes of nonprofit organization administration, education, and transformational leadership.

While there are studies that acknowledge the relationship between nonprofit organizations and schools, I could not locate any recent qualitative or quantitative research literature that takes into account the perceptions of educators or parents regarding the effectiveness of such programs as a school turnaround intervention that is reflected in annual school performance reports. The research methods in their studies encompassed phenomenology, case studies, and narrative inquiry research. Evaluating perceptions of individuals for the purpose of scholarly research is not limited to qualitative research approaches (Aronson, Janke, & Traynor 2012; Larkin & O'Connor, 2017). Generally, research involving perceptions of individuals is associated with qualitative research designs (Aronson, et al., 2012). I found from extensive research literature searches that qualitative approaches in terms of exploring perspectives tend to yield more data for observation. Delphi studies provide insight on perceptions, but its use of multiple round surveys eliminates the researcher's ability to code extensively (Stewart, Lambert, Ulmer, Witt, & Carraway 2017).

Summary

In summary, I have presented research literature that encompasses the following: Characteristics of Schools Classified as academically unacceptable, Transforming Schools through Community Engagement, Public Education and the Nonprofit Sector, Using Input to Achieve Organizational Change, and Using Program Evaluation to Measure Social Impact. Each of these topics support the conceptual framework of exploring the perceptions of educators regarding how nonprofit programs impact the culture and climate of K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community. The review of research and methodological literature will be followed by the review of methodological issues, synthesis of research findings and critique of previous research. In the next chapter, I will discuss the research method for this study.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The academic performance of select K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community have been officially classified by the state department of education as academically unacceptable (Louisiana Department of Education, 2016). This means schools did not achieve pre-established benchmarks relative to academics and attendance. Research supports that nonprofit organizations engage with public schools to promote their respective missions (Mozolic & Shuster, 2016; Weinstein & Israel, 2014). Research also supports that nonprofit programs exist to target specific needs within a school setting; however, there is limited recent research that explores the impact nonprofit organizations have on the performance, culture, and climate of schools classified as academically unacceptable in the urban southern communities in the United States through the perceptions of educators (Brown, 2013; Weiwei & Qiushi, 2016; Yan, Guo, & Paarlberg, 2014).

For this study, I explored the perceptions of educators regarding how nonprofit programs impact the performance, culture, and climate of K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community, classified as academically unacceptable by the Louisiana Department of Education. This study involved teachers from K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community that have existing partnerships with nonprofit organizations. In this chapter I will discuss the research questions, purpose of the study, the research population and sampling method, instrumentation, and data collection. I will also discuss data analysis procedures for this study. I will also discuss the limitations of the research design for this study. I will conclude this chapter with discussing validation and expected findings along with ethical issues.

Research Questions

This study focused on the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit programs have on the performance, culture, and climate of their school. The educators participating in this study represented schools that were classified by the state department of education as being academically unacceptable during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. The research questions that guided this study consists of the following:

1. How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on annual school performance ratings?
2. How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on school culture and climate?

Purpose and Design of the Study

The purpose of this case study was to explore how teachers working in K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community perceived the impact nonprofit programs have on the performance, culture, and climate of their school. Louisiana educators are often tasked with balancing red-tape while complying with other demands on their jobs, while not having the opportunity to provide input to policy makers or central administration regarding the impact or effectiveness of programs (Schneider, 2014, 2015). Since 2000, hundreds of nonprofit organizations have positioned themselves as an external intervention towards addressing challenges in schools identified as academically unacceptable (GuideStar, 2018).

Educators who have direct contact with students are likely able to reflect upon their daily experiences to determine the effectiveness or impact of certain programs and initiatives (Ford &

Ihrke, 2016; Paarlberg, Nesbit, Clerkin, & Christensen, 2014; Temple & Reynolds, 2015). Research literature acknowledges the scope and connections between nonprofit organizations, structural reforms in education, community engagement and investment, and program evaluation to measure social impact; however, recent research that explores the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit sanctioned programs and services have on structural reforms in a cluster of schools classified as academically unacceptable (Brown, 2013; Guo & Paarlberg, 2014; Weiwei & Qiushi, 2016).

This study included a qualitative research approach and a single case study as the research design. Creswell (2013) and Yin (2014) indicated that a case study prompts the researcher to explore realistic, contemporary cases over an established period of time. The aforementioned are conducted through what Creswell describes as in-depth data collection methods, sometimes involving multiple sources of information. Creswell (2013) further explained that case studies help researchers achieve understanding of participants relative to perceptions of programs, processes, or policies. This case is bound by geographical location, specific nonprofit programs, specific school ratings, and grade configurations. A single case study was appropriate for this study in the respect that effort is being made to understand the impact nonprofit programs have on the annual performance ratings, culture, and climate of schools classified as academically unacceptable in an urban Louisiana community through the perceptions of educators (Yin, 2014).

Because school performance scores and other data released by the state education agency only includes information relative to standardized test performance and attendance, it was necessary to explore the impact of nonprofit programs through the perceptions of educators. These educators have intimate knowledge of both their personal involvement with these

organizations, and the students they teach. In that respect, the educators who participated in this study were able to competently connect, through observation and experiences, how nonprofit sanctioned programs and services accent the school's mission of fostering culture and climate, which ultimately impacts school performance ratings (Minor & Benner, 2018; Reaves, McMahon, Duffy, & Ruiz, 2018). Emphasis on specific school performance ratings numerically, from direct reports permits deductive disclosure, which compromises the confidentiality of participants.

Through salient examples, educators connected how nonprofit sanctioned programs and services impact culture, climate, and school performance. Simply reviewing school report cards released by the state does not provide sufficient information that discloses partnerships with organizations such as nonprofits, which makes exploring the impact through the perceptions of educators the most feasible approach. In terms of exploring perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit organizations have on the performance, culture, and climate of schools, the data collection process for this study included surveys, focus group discussions, and interviews guided by open-ended questions and follow ups.

Yin (2014) noted that single case studies involving small groups provide understanding to general experiences of persons or institutions. While states have varying accountability systems, there are metrics in place that appraises the annual performance of schools (Louisiana Department of Education, 2018). Research indicates that academic disparities exists in nearly every urbanized community within the United States system (Huang & Sebastian, 2015; McDonough, 2015). Yin asserted that utilizing a case study as the research design will ensure that the study addresses ideas and questions pertaining to nonprofit interventions and how they

impact the performance, culture, and climate of K-8 schools classified as academically unacceptable in an urban Louisiana community.

Research Population and Sampling Method

Creswell (2013) suggested using between five and 25 participants for interviews in qualitative studies; he also suggested using between five and eight participants for focus group discussions in case studies. The targeted number of participants in this study was eight to 12 educators, including four to six classroom teachers representing elementary grades K-5, and four to six classroom teachers representing middle grades six to eight from schools in an urban Louisiana community that were classified as academically unacceptable by the state department of education during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. The participants represented K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community, classified by the state department of education as academically unacceptable that are engaged with nonprofit organizations.

Purposeful, homogenous sampling was the technique used for participant recruitment. The participants were purposefully selected through identifying nonprofits that has existing partnerships with public schools classified as academically unacceptable. Creswell (2011) and Palinkas, Horwitz, Green, Wisdom, Duan, and Hoagwood (2015) indicated that purposeful, homogenous sampling is a technique in which people, units, or cases encompass similar characteristics. In the case of this study, the participants all represent schools within the same community, each are practicing classroom teachers, each participant represents schools with designation of academically unacceptable by the state department of education, and all teachers have worked in the schools during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school sessions. Creswell and Palinkas et al. indicated that purposeful, homogenous sampling is applicable to studies driven by research questions seeking to address issues specific to a particular group. This

was achieved by using the GuideStar nonprofit database to identify nonprofit organizations by region and mission statement terms. The GuideStar database permitted the input of specific terms such as *education, schools, academic, students,* and *improvement* in addition to narrowing search items by geographic location. Once search results were provided, I located four nonprofits with different programs and mission statements that work with a cluster of schools classified as academically unacceptable.

Upon receiving approval from the IRB at Concordia University (Appendix A), I proceeded with the participant recruitment process (Appendix B). After receiving administrative approval from the school district officials the following day (Appendix C), I introduced this study via email (Appendix D) to 50 teachers from five schools officially classified as academically unacceptable by the state department of education that has existing partnerships with nonprofit organizations. I explained that I needed eight to 12 total volunteer participants for the study – four to six teachers from the K-5 grade configuration, and four to six teachers from the sixth through eighth grade configuration. A timeline of 120 hours, or five business days was provided for response.

I was able to secure the maximum number targeted for participants, which was 12: six elementary educators and six middle school educators. Selection for the initial participants was made based on those who replied first. The remaining respondents were consenting alternates. I explained that no compensation of any kind would be provided to participants. I also expressed written and verbal gratitude for their time and participation (Appendix E). During the established time of 120 hours for consent form review, I allowed volunteers to ask questions relative to their role as participants in the study. After the participants granted consent in writing, I began the data collection process.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation in research consists of the tools and conditions by which the researcher measure objects of interest to their study in the data-collection process (Salkind, 2010). Instrumentation for this study consisted of analyzing data from participant interviews, focus group discussions, and a survey. Creswell (2013) indicated that interviews, focus groups, surveys, documents, and reports are acceptable forms sources of information that can be used in case studies. Participants were prompted in their interviews (Appendix F) and focus group discussions (Appendix G) to detail how programs and services provided through nonprofit organization partnerships impact the transformation efforts within their school building. A total of nine questions and statements were used to drive the interview and focus group discussions. The survey (Appendix H) included a Likert Scale of eight questions with a range of one to five ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Participants were prompted in the surveys to indicate on a scale of one to five how they feel regarding the impact of specific programs provided through nonprofit partnerships. The survey responses are provided in Table 2 within the discussion of data and results. Questions were created to incorporate specific nonprofit programs such as teenage pregnancy prevention, fight diversion, teacher professional development, literacy initiatives, and truancy to help direct the individual interviews and focus group discussions.

Data Collection

The three methods for collecting data for this study included individual interviews, two focus group discussions, and a survey. The first means of data collection involved individual interviews of all participants. These data collection methods encompassed prompting educators to discuss through salient examples how nonprofit programs impact school culture, climate, and ultimately school performance ratings. Published school performance rating reports only include

information relative to performance on standardized tests and attendance (Louisiana Department of Education, 2017). Educator participants are able to connect through examples and experiences how specific programs have contributed to changes in culture and climate. Educator participants also have the ability to connect how such programs may contribute culture, climate, and school performance. School report cards and data from state education agencies do not reflect quantification, nor qualification of how nonprofit partnerships impact culture, climate, and school performance.

The individual interviews involving the 12 participants took place in a neutral setting away from public school campuses, at a local library conference room, and each interview took place in 30 minute intervals during a six hour block. The second means of data collection involved two focus group discussions. The two focus group discussions were for elementary and middle school teacher participants, respectively. Each focus group had six discussants. Like the interviews, the focus group discussions took place in a neutral setting away from public school campuses, at a local library conference room. The interviews and focus group discussions involved open ended questions (Appendixes F and G). The questions used for the interviews and focus groups were similar in effort to triangulate data effectively.

The focus group discussions lasted two hours each. I utilized the voice memorization feature on my mobile tablet and laptop computer to record the responses of the participants. The purpose of two devices recording was for backup in the event there is a device malfunction. A malfunction did not occur. Although the interviews and focus group discussion were recorded, I made written notes during each session. The contents of the recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim. The recorded contents were properly discarded immediately after transcription took place. The third means of data collection involved a survey that was provided

to the 12 participants after both the interviews and focus group discussions ended. Each participant was emailed a link to an IRB approved web-based survey through Qualtrics (Appendix H). The survey included a Likert Scale of eight questions with a range of one to five ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Participants were each provided unique user name and password credentials to access the survey. Links to the survey were emailed directly to each participant.

Identification of Attributes

Because this study was rooted in exploring the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofits have on academically unacceptable schools in an urban Louisiana community, communication and collaboration are the two attributes that defined this study. Social organizations have a dual responsibility as it relates to internal and external functions. Schmuck, Bell, and Bell (2012) asserted that the engagements of organizations accentuates components reflective of collaboration, understanding the importance and application of team work, ensuring a strong relationship with constituents, and skills in governance, decision making, and problem solving. From an external perspective, such organizations have to ensure effectiveness towards their respective clientele. Clientele from the external perspective can have direct dealings with the organization such as patients, students, or advising.

LaFasto and Larson (2001) noted that teamwork and collaborative effort is the process whereby "people with different views and perspectives coming together, putting aside their narrow self-interests, and discussing issues openly and supportively in an attempt to solve a larger problem" (p.18). Rosen (2013) added to this definition by stating that collaboration is "working together to create value while sharing a virtual or physical space" (p.15). Additionally, Rosen (2013) shared ten cultural elements that are present in organizations that facilitate

collaboration. The ten cultural elements shared by Rosen are developing trust, sharing ideas, having common goals, embracing innovation, exploring if the physical/ virtual environment is conductive to collaboration, collaborative chaos: making room for the unexpected, constructive confrontation: taking a stance on the idea and not the person, communication, increasing the senses of community or belongingness, and creating value to bring competitive advantages.

Data Analysis Procedures

Ramlo (2015) explained that qualitative data is often subjective and rich in nature. He further added such data is presented in words as opposed to numbers typically used in quantitative research. Flick (2013) noted that data analysis in qualitative studies includes the systematic process of examining and coding contents from interview transcripts, researcher notes from observation, and other text-based materials to further enhance understanding of contemporary cases. The data analysis plan included:

1. Transcribing verbatim all interactions from the individual interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys.
2. Implementing open coding. This allowed a probe for important statements from individual participants that have specific application to nonprofit programs and services. Important statements will include illustrative words, expressions, or sentences that have a specific meaning to each participant as they recount their experiences (Boeije, 2014). I created a list of connotations that are commonly used between participants in their experience with nonprofit programs and services.
3. Implementing axial coding. This allowed me to explore the connections between categories presented by the participants in the interviews, focus group discussions, and

surveys (Boeije, 2014). I looked for common themes experienced by all participants in their work as educators working with nonprofit programs and services.

The participants in the case study represent diverse roles within the school building, which establishes the use of multiple data sources in the data collection process. Assigned roles within an organization and the experiences that follows shape varying worldviews. This is defined as triangulation. Jonker and Pennink (2007) explained that triangulation in qualitative research involves the application of multiple data sources. Given (2008) noted that triangulation allows researchers to prove, disprove, or expound upon certain cases.

The interpretation of data from open coding began with scanning terms to seek distinct concepts and categories from the responses provided in the interviews, surveys, and focus group discussions by case study participants. In addition to seeking distinct concepts and categories from the responses provided in the interviews, focus group discussions and survey responses, I categorized contents from the data based on relevance. Getter, et al. (2016) and Ludden, O'Brien, and Pasch (2017) explained that with open coding researchers use highlights and other notations in effort to distinguish between categories or themes presented through the data collection process. I used multi-color highlighters as a means to both organize common terms and concepts presented in the interview transcripts. From there I used the highlighted, common terms presented in the data to formulate an outline.

Unlike axial coding, open coding focuses primarily on terms to clarify concepts and categories (Getter, et al., 2016). The concepts and themes presented from common terms found in open coding allows for axial coding to take place. The interpretation of data from axial coding was done by re-reading the interview and focus group discussion transcripts from case study participants, confirming that the categories and themes found through open coding accurate

reflect the responses provided (Glaser & Strauss, 2013). Axial coding allowed me to explore how the concepts and categories are related through noting common terms, ideas, and reflections.

Limitations of the Research Design

The limitations presented in the research design of this study included the of level of certification obtained by teachers, representatives for each grade level in the study, years of experience, and the number of respondents consenting to participation in the study. The aforementioned limitations reflect the participants of the study, and the demographic of teachers within the community targeted in this study, and cannot be generalized to other populations where nonprofit sanctioned programs interact with urban public schools. Bartlett and Vavrus (2016) explained that while case studies are fitting for studying applied and social sciences such as education, criminal justice, psychology and social work, limitations exist.

Merriam and Netcoh (2017) noted that limitations of case studies include complexities in generalizing the results to apply to the general population, incorporation of the researcher bias, and the amount of time it takes to collect and analyze data. Although there are limitations to case studies, Blomdahl (2017) and Fusch and Ness (2017) indicated in their respective research that the aforementioned limitations can be addressed if the researcher incorporates triangulation which requires the collection of data from multiple sources to ensure validity. For this study, triangulation was achieved through the use of multiple data sources including interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys. Dogan (2016) and Preetha (2014) noted in their research that the bias of the research should be addressed in the ethical consideration section.

Validation

Internal Validity

Triangulation through the use of multiple data collection methods was employed to ensure validation of the findings from this study. Individual interviews, two focus group discussions, and surveys were the instruments used to collect data for this study. Peters and Nielsen (2017) noted that internal validity confirms how sound an instrument is measured in a qualitative study. Yin (2014) noted that case studies must encompass data collection procedures that are varied in effort clarify any potential instances of ambiguity. Creswell (2013) noted single case studies provide for reasonable inquiry into contemporary qualitative research approaches. Creswell and Yin (2014) noted that surveys, interviews, and focus groups permits participants to make connections of content, reflect, and elaborate in detail, further establishing credibility to the study.

Dependability

In qualitative research, dependability refers to the level of data stability over time and conditions. For this study, dependability was reflected in the consistency of items and questions presented in the interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys. The interview, focus group, and survey items each reflect the conceptual framework and research questions that guided this study. When considering the dependability of data, it was important to question whether the findings of a research inquiry will be the same if similar participants in a similar fashion as initially done (Bukowski, 2016). In the case of this study, participants were selected from multiple school buildings within the same community. The items for this study were designed so that educators could provide substantive input relative to their perceptions on how nonprofit sanctioned programs impact performance, culture, and climate of schools rated academically

unacceptable in an urban Louisiana community. Dependability allows other researchers to achieve similar findings and conclusions about data.

Confirmability

Connelly (2016) noted that confirmability in qualitative research refers to objectivity and how the findings of research are supported by the data collected. She further added that confirmability reflects the voice of participants and the conditions of the study. For this study, confirmability was established by including data collection methods such as interviews (Appendix F), focus groups (Appendix G), and surveys (Appendix H) from the participating elementary and middle school educators. Each of the aforementioned data collection methods reflects the voice of the 12 participants in this study. The interview, focus group, and survey items reflect the research questions that guided this study. Various data collection methods such as interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys contribute to objectivity in qualitative research (Creswell, 2013). Confirmability does not encompass researcher bias.

Expected Findings

Prior to conducting the data collection portion of the study, I expected to arrive to at least four findings significant to answering the research questions guiding this study. I expected the first finding from the case study to affirm that the relationships between nonprofit organizations and public schools classified as academically unacceptable is generally positive. I also expected that the perceptions of the educators involved in the study will also be generally positive. Thirdly, I expected the participants to discuss explicit incidences that shape the scope of impact nonprofit organizations have on improving the performance, culture, and climate of schools. I expected that interviews, surveys, and focus groups discussions with educator participants would adequately answer the research questions pertaining to how nonprofit sanctioned programs

impact culture, climate, and student performance on assessments, which ultimately impacts the annual school performance rating (Louisiana Department of Education, 2016). School performance ratings and reports only provide information relative to data on assessments and attendance. Educator perceptions are essential because, they are able to draw connections through examples, in explaining the impact nonprofit programs have on culture, climate, and ultimately school performance. I expected my findings would answer the research questions presented.

Ethical Issues

Conflict of Interest Assessment

I served as investigator of this study, in addition professional role as academic counselor with an organization that is not affiliated with any aspect of this study. There were no potential instances of bias towards the participants as I did not have a relationship or direct association of any form. None of the participants in the study have any relationships with the Concordia University System in the capacity of student, alumni, or employee. This was verified through cross checking degrees and credentials through the online (public access) educator lookup service provided by the state department of education.

Researcher's Position

I avoided ambiguity, biases, and deviation off topic by only discussing what the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Concordia University approved for this study. I have never and will not visit the campus of the selected schools, as I want to avoid social interaction and any potential preconceived ideas with participants. Interviews and the focus group discussion were be held offsite of the schools in the meeting room at the local public library. I did not share any information about the report to individual participants, and will refrain from doing so until the

whole group has been notified. At the beginning and end of each data collection session, I reminded participants they signed a consent form and that the study is confidential. I also reminded them to refrain from sharing information until the study has officially concluded.

Ethical Issues in the Study

I made the IRB aware of explicit details regarding methodology, data collection procedures, recruitment, instrumentation for the study. Once permission was granted to conduct my study by the IRB, I worked to ensure that the identities of communities, schools, nonprofit organizations, and participants was not compromised – this is referred to as eliminating deductive disclosure. All data collected was saved to a secured cloud account and external drive. The data has also been printed, boxed, and stored in secure keeping for minimum of five years, and will be provided to the IRB or university if needed.

Summary

I have presented the research questions, purpose and design of the study, research population and sampling method. I also presented the instrumentation methods, data collection procedures, and limitations of the research design. I wrapped up this chapter by discussing validation, expected findings, and addressing ethical issues. Through triangulation, the methodology used in the study explored the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit organizations have on improving K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community that are classified as academically unacceptable by the state department of education. The data solicited from the interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys provided findings on how nonprofit organizations impact the transformation efforts of K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community, through the perceptions of educators.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore how teachers working in K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years perceived the impact nonprofit programs have on the performance, culture, and climate of their school. To ensure validity, data was collected using three methods: individual interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys. Jonker and Pennink (2007) explained that triangulation in qualitative research involves the application of multiple data sources. Given (2008) explained that triangulation permits researchers to prove, disprove, or expound upon certain cases. In this chapter I will discuss the description of the research sample, research methodology and analysis, summary of the findings, presentation of summary and results, and a summary of the chapter. I conducted participant recruitment, developed the interview, focus group, and survey items, in addition to administering them to the participants in the study. Additionally, I was responsible for transcribing, coding, and analyzing the contents from the data collection process to answer the following research questions:

1. How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on annual school performance ratings?
2. How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on school culture and climate?

Upon gaining full approval from the IRB on February 6, 2018, I secured permission from the appropriate district officials to recruit participants for my study. Permission from school

district officials was granted in writing with the appropriate signatures affixed on February 7, 2018. The statement of permission accents the requirements as established in the research method section and IRB application. Participant recruitment began on February 15, 2018, and the desired number of participants for the study, including a pool of alternates was secured on February 23, 2018. The data collection process, including 12 individual interviews, two focus group discussions, and the completion of 12 surveys took place between March 2, 2018 and March 3, 2018 – which was during a weekend, providing adequate participation time. Specifically, the 12 individual interviews were held on Friday, March 2, 2018 during a six hour block. The six hour block allowed for thirty minutes of interview time with each individual participant. The following day, I facilitated two focus group discussions for elementary and middle school teachers, respectively. The focus group discussions lasted two hours each.

Following the focus group discussions, each participant was provided a link, username, and password to access the survey. This was done to protect the integrity of the survey. The surveys were created and administered through Qualtrics. The transcription of interviews took place between March 4, 2018 and March 5, 2018. The transcription of the focus group discussions took place between March 6, 2018 and March 7, 2018. I analyzed data collected from the surveys between March 8, 2018 and March 9, 2018. The coding of interview responses took place between March 12, 2018 and March 14, 2018. The coding of focus group responses took place between March 15, 2018 and March 18, 2018. I thoroughly analyzed and made written notes about all of the data collected through interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys between March 19, 2018 and March 23, 2018. The recorded interviews and focus groups were immediately and properly discarded following transcription. All written comments, notes, and appropriate forms are secured in a confidential location.

Description of the Sample

This study took place in a Louisiana metropolitan area, greater than 400,000 residents, representing more than 12 urban residential communities, and where at least a 25% of its elementary (K-5) and middle school (grades sixth through eight) campuses have been classified by the state department of education as being academically unacceptable as a result of low annual performance marks. Purposeful, homogenous sampling was used for this study. Creswell (2011) and Palinkas, Horwitz, Green, Wisdom, Duan, and Hoagwood (2015) noted that purposeful, homogenous sampling is a method in which people, units, or cases involve similarities. In the case of this study, similarities include teachers working at schools in an urban Louisiana community that have been classified as academically unacceptable during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school sessions. The partnerships that these schools have with nonprofit organizations in the specific areas of after school enrichment, community learning centers, mini grant programs for teachers, fight diversion, and sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention. Creswell and Palinkas et al. added that purposeful, homogenous sampling is appropriate for qualitative studies driven by research questions seeking to address issues specific to a particular group.

Purposeful, homogenous sampling was the technique used for participant recruitment. The participants were purposefully selected through identifying nonprofits that has existing partnerships with public schools classified as academically unacceptable. This was achieved by using the GuideStar nonprofit database to identify nonprofit organizations by region and mission statement terms. The GuideStar database permitted input to of specific terms such as *education, schools, academic, students,* and *improvement* in addition to narrowing search items by

geographic location. Once search results were provided, I located four nonprofits with different programs and mission statements that work with a cluster of schools classified as academically unacceptable in the areas of after school enrichment programs, community learning centers, sex respect/ teenage pregnancy prevention, fight diversion, and mini grant programs.

Creswell (2013) advised using between five and 25 participants for interviews in qualitative studies; he further advised that a range of five and eight participants for focus group discussions were appropriate for qualitative case studies. The recruitment process included introducing the study to 50 educators working in schools applicable to the study, with the goal of securing a minimum of eight but not more than 12 participants. The participants would reflect the overall demographic of teachers working in schools reflected in this study, representing an average of 14 years of classroom teaching experience. The number of participants in this study was 12 educators, including six classroom teachers representing elementary grades K-5, and six classroom teachers representing middle grades six through eight from schools in an urban Louisiana community that were classified as academically unacceptable by the state department of education during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. Nine of the participants were African American, two of the participants were white, and one teacher identified as other. Only one of the participants identified as being male.

There was no purposeful inclusion or exclusion of vulnerable population groups for this study. Participants were contacted via their professional email accounts with permission of the school district. The email explained that permission has been granted from the district to contact them. I further explained the purpose of the study and what would be required of the participants in terms of time and participation. Demographic, credentialing, and years of experience information on each participant was provided through responses from the first set of interview

questions, and was verified s through public educator look up, furnished through the department of education, pursuant to the Louisiana Sunshine Law, which in part permits the release of public records. Each participant has been provided an alias to ensure confidentiality.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Alias	Age	Sex	Race	Grade/Subject	Experience (Years)
Mary	56	F	Black	5 – Mathematics/Science	34
Betty	36	F	White	4 – Self Contained/SPED	15
Marva	26	F	Black	6 – English/ Social Studies	05
Sheila	46	F	White	3 – Self Contained (Regular)	21
Darius	29	M	Black	4 – Mathematics/Science	07
Mesha	34	F	Black	8 – History, Arts and English	11
Lauren	36	F	Black	8 – Mathematics/Science	17
Marcie	44	F	Black	7 – Inclusion (SPED)	23
Jasmine	36	F	Black	2 – Self Contained (Regular)	14
Maria	26	F	Hispanic	K –Self Contained (Regular)	03
Alicia	38	F	Black	6 – Physical Education/Math	16
Amy	29	F	Black	7 – S.T.E.M. Electives	03

Research Methodology and Analysis

The research for this study included a qualitative research approach and a single case study as the research design. Creswell (2013) and Yin (2014) specified that a single case study enables the researcher to explore realistic, contemporary cases over an established period of time. The above-mentioned are channeled through what Creswell describes as in-depth data collection methods, sometimes involving multiple sources of information. The established period of times for this case study included the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. Creswell (2013) further explained that case studies help researchers achieve understanding of participants relative to perceptions of programs, processes, or policies. A single case study was appropriate for this study because effort was made to understand the impact nonprofit programs have on the performance, culture, and climate of schools classified as

academically unacceptable in an urban Louisiana community through the perceptions of educators (Yin, 2014).

Upon receiving the desired number of participants conducive to the study, each participant was provided with directions relative to interview and focus group discussions via email. Regarding the individual interviews, each participant was given an assigned time to arrive for their interview. Prior to the interview, I introduced myself, and reintroduced the purpose of the study. I asked the participants did they have any questions or concerns relative to the interviewing process or study. I reminded the participants to refrain from disclosing any content from the interviews, and that no compensation of any kind would be provided for their time. From there, I proceeded with asking open-ended questions relative to perceptions of nonprofit programs and the impact they have on the performance, culture, and climate of academically unacceptable K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community. Once the recorded questions and responses were completed, I reminded the participants to refrain from disclosing details of the study or interview. I asked if they had any questions or comments.

In order to answer the research questions, three methods for collecting data included individual interviews, two focus group discussions, and a survey administered through Qualtrics. The first form of data collection in order to answer the research questions involved individual interviews of the 12 participants. The individual interviews took place in at a public library conference room, with each interview commencing in 30 minute intervals during a six hour block. The second form of data collection involved two focus group discussions. The two focus group discussions were for elementary and middle school teacher participants, respectively. Each focus group had a panel of six discussants. Similar to the interviews, the focus group

discussions took place in a neutral setting away from public school campuses, at a local library conference room.

The interviews and focus group discussions involved open ended questions (Appendixes F and G). The questions used for the interviews and focus groups were similar in effort to triangulate data effectively. The focus group discussions lasted two hours each. I utilized the voice memorization feature on my mobile tablet and laptop computer to record the responses of the participants. The purpose of two devices recording was for backup in the event there is a device malfunction. No malfunction with the either of the recording devices occurred before, during, nor after the data collection process. I also made written notes during each session. The contents of the recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim. The recorded contents were properly discarded immediately after transcription took place. The third form of data collection involved a survey that was provided to the 12 participants after both the interviews and focus group discussions ended. Each participant was emailed a link to an IRB approved web-based survey through Qualtrics (Appendix G). The survey included 8 questions with a range of 1 to 5 ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The survey contents reflected what was asked during the interviews and focus group discussions to ensure validity. Participants were each provided unique user name and password credentials to access the survey.

Flick (2013) explained that data analysis in qualitative studies comprises of the systematic process of examining and coding contents from interview transcripts, researcher notes from observation, and other text-based materials to further enhance understanding of realistic, contemporary cases. The data analysis plan for this case study included: transcribing verbatim all interactions from the individual interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys. Open coding allowed me to explore important statements from individual participants that have

specific application to nonprofit programs and services. Axial Coding allowed me to explore the connections between categories presented by the participants in the interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys (Boeije, 2014).

Saldaña (1999) noted that codes in qualitative research encompasses single words or phrases that assigns attributes to data reflective of language or graphics. Coding permits the researcher to link data collected to the idea of the study. Saldaña (2015) further explained that such data can be found in the transcripts from interviews and notes from observations, among other documents that may be relevant to the data collection of a particular study.

Saldaña (1999) also noted that coding manually permits the researcher to have more control over and the ownership over the work, while acknowledging that electronic coding software permits the researcher to store, organize, and manage data for verification and reflection. For the purpose of this study and as advised by Saldaña, open and axial coding was done manually, followed by entering the contents from the transcripts onto the MAXQDA software for organization. Saldaña (2015) urged that MAXQDA among three other programs is effective for managing and organizing data. Axial coding according to Saldaña (1999) further expounds upon open coding, and is most appropriate for analyzing data from interview transcripts and notes.

The topics covered in the interviews, focus group discussions, and the survey were designed to answer two research questions dealing with the perception of educators regarding the impact nonprofit programs have on the annual performance of schools classified as academically unacceptable, in addition to their perceptions regarding the impact nonprofit programs have on culture and climate of schools classified as academically unacceptable in an urban Louisiana community. In order to answer the first research question, participants were prompted to discuss

their familiarity with and thoughts on programs in the area of after school for all, community learning centers, sex respect/ teenage pregnancy prevention, fight diversion, and the mini grant programs.

The interpretation of data from open coding included scanning terms to seek distinct concepts and categories from the responses provided in the interviews, surveys, and focus group discussions by case study participants. When looking at the transcripts from the interviews, I immediately recognized repetitive terms and similar phrases used by participants when answering interview questions and focus group discussions. Pertaining to data collected to answer how educators perceived the impact nonprofit programs have on the annual school performance rating, frequent terms and phrases included, *tardiness, attendance, perfect attendance, lower suspensions, keeping students in class, presence, appearance, turnout, motivated to attend school, motivated to attend class, regular attendance, rollcall, burden reduced on preparation, less preparation, add to lessons, supplemental, supplement teaching, alleviate lesson planning pressure, simple lesson planning, adjusting to new standards, clarifying, networking with other teachers, shared successful strategies, best instructional practices, interventions, response to interventions, academic assistance, direct supplemental instruction, catch up, benchmarks, extended learning sessions, applied learning, field trips, relevance to instruction, new technology, computers, tablets, college credit, materials, instructional materials, manuals, guides, books, supplies, resources, funding,* and *sponsor.* Pertaining to data collected to answer how educators perceived the impact nonprofit programs have on school culture and climate, frequent, open terms and phrases from the interview and focus group discussions included, *discipline, fewer fights, low student confrontations, disruptions, infractions, referrals, fight diversion, motivation, incentive, habitual offense,*

reduced fights, trainings, workshops, teacher in-service, conferences, institutes, professional development, PD (professional development), attitudes, motivation, encouragement, morale, self-esteem, pride, positive attitudes, improved communication, improved relations with peers, character, helps teachers balance, encourages teachers, peace of mind knowing resources are there, change attitudes towards work, motivated to plan, fired up, and *makes the job task less burdensome.*

From there, I categorized contents from the data based on relevance. Getter, et al. (2016) and Ludden, O'Brien, and Pasch (2017) clarified that with open coding researchers use highlighters and other notations in effort to effectively differentiate between categories or themes presented through the data collection process. I used multi-color highlighters as a means to both organize common terms and concepts presented in the interview transcripts. Then, I used the highlighted, common terms presented in the data to formulate an outline. The concepts and themes presented from common terms found in open coding allows for axial coding to take place.

Through categorizing frequent terms and phrases according to participant responses to the interview questions and focus group discussions, the first theme of student attendance emerged in order to answer the first research question. Terms such as *tardiness, attendance, perfect attendance, lower suspensions, keeping students in class, presence, appearance, turnout, motivated to attend school, motivated to attend class, regular attendance,* and *rollcall* each relate to student attendance in the American public school (Corcoran, Elbel, & Schwartz, 2016; Cosgrove, Chen, & Castelli, 2018). Based on the transcribed responses, the aforementioned terms and phrases were common responses among the participants in the study.

Through categorizing frequent terms and phrases according to participant responses to the interview questions and focus group discussions, the second theme of instructional practices emerged in order to answer the first research question. Terms and phrases such as *burden reduced on preparation, less preparation, add to lessons, supplemental, supplement teaching, alleviate lesson planning pressure, simple lesson planning, adjusting to new standards, clarifying, networking with other teachers, shared successful strategies,* and *best instructional practices* each relate to the subject of instructional practices in the American public school (Maas & Lake, 2018; Donahue & Vogel, 2018). Based on the transcribed responses, the aforementioned terms and phrases were common responses among the participants in the study.

Through categorizing frequent terms and phrases according to participant responses to the interview questions and focus group discussions, the third theme of academic interventions emerged in order to answer the first research question. Terms and phrases such as *interventions, response to interventions, academic assistance, direct supplemental instruction, catch up, benchmarks, extended learning sessions, applied learning, field trips,* and *relevance to instruction* each relate to the subject of academic interventions in the American public school (Reno, Friend, Caruthers, & Smith, 2017; Eckert, Hamsho, & Malandrino, 2017). Based on the transcribed responses, the aforementioned terms and phrases were common responses among the participants in the study.

Through categorizing frequent terms and phrases according to participant responses to the interview questions and focus group discussions, the fourth theme of instructional resources emerged in order to answer the first research question. Terms and phrases such as *new technology, innovative devices, computers, tablets, college credit, materials, instructional materials, manuals, guides, books, supplies, resources, funding,* and *sponsor* each relate to the

subject of instructional resources in the American public school (McDuffie, Choppin, Drake, Davis, Brown, & Borys, 2017). Based on the transcribed responses, the aforementioned terms and phrases were common responses among the participants in the study.

Through categorizing frequent terms and phrases according to participant responses to the interview questions and focus group discussions, the first theme of student discipline emerged in order to answer the second research question. Terms such as *discipline, fewer fights, low student confrontations, disruptions, infractions, referrals, fight diversion, motivation, incentive, habitual offense,* and *reduced fights* each relate to student behavior and discipline in the American public school (Arif & Mirza, 2017; Hambacher, 2018). Based on the transcribed responses, the aforementioned terms and phrases were common responses among the participants in the study.

Through categorizing frequent terms and phrases according to participant responses to the interview questions and focus group discussions, the second theme of professional development opportunities emerged in order to answer the second research question. Terms such as *trainings, workshops, teacher in-service, conferences, institutes, professional development,* and *PD (professional development)* each relate to faculty and staff professional development and continuous learning in the American public school (Telese, 2012; Garcia & Gomez, 2017). Based on the transcribed responses, the aforementioned terms and phrases were common responses among the participants in the study.

Through categorizing frequent terms and phrases according to participant responses to the interview questions and focus group discussions, the third theme of student morale emerged in order to answer the second research question. Terms such *attitudes, motivation, encouragement, morale, self-esteem, pride, positive attitudes, improved communication,*

improved relations with peers, and *character* each relate to student morale in the American public school (Cashwell, 1995; Johnson, Johnson, & Taylor, 1993). Based on the transcribed responses, the aforementioned terms and phrases were common responses among the participants in the study.

Through categorizing frequent terms and phrases according to participant responses to the interview questions and focus group discussions, the fourth theme of staff morale emerged in order to answer the second research question. Terms such *helps teachers balance, encourages teachers, peace of mind knowing resources are there, change attitudes towards work, motivated to plan, fired up to work,* and *makes the job task less burdensome* each relate to staff morale in the American public school (Byrd-Blake, Afolayan, Hunt, Fabunmi, Pryor, & Leander, 2010). Based on the transcribed responses, the aforementioned terms and phrases were common responses among the participants in the study.

The interpretation of data from axial coding was done by re-reading the interview and focus group discussion transcripts from case study participants, confirming that the categories and themes found through open coding accurate reflect the responses provided (Glaser & Strauss, 2013). Axial coding allowed me to explore how the concepts and categories are related through noting common terms, ideas, and reflections. I used MAXQDA software to upload the audio from the recording devices for transcription and coding. Although the software transcribes the recorded content directly from the device, I cross referenced the newly transcribed text in MAXQDA with my written notes, to make sure nothing was left out. As noted in my IRB application, I discarded the recordings immediately after transcribing.

Summary of the Findings

Findings for Research Question 1. In order to answer the research question of, "how do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on annual school performance ratings," I conducted 12 one-on-one interviews with teachers, facilitated two focus group discussions, and administered a survey. The following themes were developed from analyzing the responses provided through interviews, focus group discussions, and the responses provided to the survey: *student attendance, instructional practices, academic interventions, and instructional resources*. In analyzing participant responses in their focus group discussions and interviews, a high level of emphasis was placed on attendance. Participants shared that supplemental programs such as community learning centers, after-school for all, and fight diversion affects student attendance. Participants noted in their responses that supplemental programs such as the ones offered to their schools by community nonprofits keeps students in class. Mesha, a middle school teacher explained:

> I have had students who would not come to school, or they would ride the bus to school in their school uniforms, and sneak off campus prior to rollcall to skip. Four of the male students in particular began coming to class regularly, because they wanted to participate in the after school for all robotics program. I have also noticed the number of suspensions decreasing.

Marcie, also a middle school teacher noted that her special education students would hardly attend class and on the days they did come, they were would not grasp lessons due to poor

attendance. Marcie shared how a nonprofit basketball program was the catalyst for getting students to attend class. Marcie explained:

> My 4th period boys hardly came to school and when they did decide to come, it was extremely difficult reaching them because they hadn't been in class for the foundation lessons; but once they got interested in the basketball program and learned school was required to participate, they began coming to class, and on time. The following nine-week period, each of the students in the after school for all basketball program had netted perfect attendance. The programs are fun, engaging, and they keep students in class.

In analyzing participant responses in their focus group discussions and interviews, a high level of emphasis was placed on instructional practices. Participants shared that supplemental programs such as community learning centers, after-school for all, and the mini grant program effects instructional practices. Participants noted in their responses that supplemental programs such as the ones offered to their schools by community nonprofits helps educators with planning. Darius, an elementary school teacher noted in his interview response that such programs are a plus to what he is already doing in the classroom. Darius specifically remarked:

> We are continuously burdened with paperwork, paperwork, paperwork! In addition to developing and writing our lesson plans, we have to also separately document our intervention plans, benchmarking, and other accommodations for students. The after school for all and community learning centers allow us to incorporate what we are doing throughout the day with our scholars after school. It allows for reteaching.

Participants also mentioned how new academic standards in literacy and numeracy have been quite an adjustment. They noted in their responses that supplemental programs provides them the opportunity to assess the effectiveness of interventions in a setting a way from school,

which takes away from the pressures of unannounced evaluations. Shelia, a veteran elementary school teacher explained:

> In the afterschool setting we are allowed to pilot intervention methods to our students individually. This allows us to scale how much time is needed and what are the likely glitches that can be addressed prior to teaching a formal lesson or intervention. It is literally a win-win for the students and myself. I get extra practice in refining my interventions, and they are getting supplemental instruction at no additional cost.

Both elementary and middle school educators agreed that community learning centers provides an opportunity for educators to become creative and resourceful in the instructional planning and assessment process. Lauren, who teaches middle school STEM subjects indicated that current partnerships between nonprofit organizations specializing in community learning centers provides her the window to diversity her instructional methods. She noted:

> Prior to the community learning centers, I always viewed whole group instruction as the all towards getting results. The idea of differentiating instruction always seemed to be tedious and pointless in my classrooms, but I was wrong. Participating in the community learning centers has allowed me to see the effectiveness in instructing smaller groups and developing instructional tasks based on the interest of the student. These programs have made me rethink how to deliver instruction.

In analyzing participant responses in their focus group discussions and interviews, a high level of emphasis was placed on academic interventions. Participants shared that supplemental programs such as community learning centers, after-school for all, and the mini grant program impacts academic interventions. Participants noted in their responses that supplemental programs such as the ones offered to their schools by community nonprofits provides additional

interventions and resources to students who need them. In the focus group discussion involving elementary school teachers, participants noted that at the elementary level building time into the day for interventions has been difficult to balance in addition to other mandates from the district. Sheila remarked, "I am able to use data from student activities in the community learning centers as an additional means to monitor student progress." The participants in the other focus group, representing middle school teachers indicated the community learning centers and the mini grant program facilitates further ability to monitor student progress and offer appropriate interventions. Alicia teaches middle school math, and shared:

> I was awarded a mini grant for $1,500, and that helped me purchase interactive math workbooks, games, and manipulatives. Because I have diverse students with various skillsets, these resources helped me craft an intervention plan that has worked. Students have been engaged now, more than ever.

Educators from both focus groups noted that mini grants can be both competitive and then there are those that are awarded by default to teachers and schools that meet certain criteria set by the partnering nonprofit organization. Amy explained how mini grant funding allowed her to move lessons beyond the classroom. She noted:

> I wrote one grant to a nonprofit that partners with our school for only $200.00. The $200.00 was to cover the bus fees required by the district for field trips. In addition to the $200.00 that I was awarded, another nonprofit that partners with our school covered admissions to the science museum. The lesson provided by the museum dealt with measurement, which was perfect because it included the basics to an upcoming unit! Being able to reference the field trip to hook students into the lesson was amazing!

In analyzing participant responses in their focus group discussions and interviews, a high level of emphasis was placed on instructional resources. Participants shared that supplemental programs such as the mini grant program impacts instructional resources. Participants noted in their responses that supplemental programs such as the ones offered to their schools by community nonprofits provides educators with additional resources to reach students. Participants in both focus group discussions shared how stretched educators are when it comes to securing instructional resources, and how assistance from nonprofits in the form of mini grants supplements instructional resources that are conducive to raising student achievement.

Findings for Research Question 2. In order to answer the research question of, "How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on school culture and climate," I conducted 12 one on one interviews with teachers, facilitated two focus group discussions, and administered a survey. The following themes were developed from analyzing the responses provided through interviews, focus group discussions, and the responses provided to the survey: *student discipline, professional development, student morale, and staff morale*. In analyzing participant responses in their focus group discussions and interviews, a high level of emphasis was placed on student discipline. All participants shared that supplemental programs such as community learning centers, after-school for all, and fight diversion affects student discipline. Participants noted in their responses that supplemental programs such as the ones offered to their schools by community nonprofits keeps students on task. All of the participants noted a reduction in fights on their campus as result of the nonprofit fight diversion program. Darius explained during the focus group discussion:

> I had this group of boys who would fight every single day, and if they did not fight on campus, they were fighting on the way to school, or from. Suspensions were up, and 20 unexcused absences for any student, let alone a fourth grader, is unacceptable. I have watched how the fight diversion program has transformed these boys from mischievous to inquisitive scholars.

Participants who teach middle school echoed the sentiment of Darius, noting that fight diversion has not only reduced the number of fights on campus from year to year, but students are transitioning and becoming more accountable for their actions. Participants also discussed how interest and involvement in after school for all sanctioned programs impact discipline, lowering suspension rates, increasing attendance, student performance on benchmarks, and ultimately school performance. Marva said:

> I'm glad we have this on our campus. It is an incentive for students to act right. Our school performance score has increased every year and now we are less than one point away from climbing out of AUS which is good because we don't have to worry about the state coming in and taking over.

In analyzing participant responses in their focus group discussions and interviews, a high level of emphasis was placed on professional development. Participants shared that supplemental programs such as the mini grant program impacts professional development. Participants noted in their responses that supplemental programs such as the ones offered to their schools by community nonprofits keeps them abreast on current trends and issues that relate to their professional endeavors. Participants in both focus groups noted that relevant professional development is essential to improving student outcomes. Darius discussed how a $4,000.00 grant allowed him to see best practices in action through professional development. Other

teachers echoed similar instances where mini grants permitted them to attend professional development programs. Betty shared:

> The mini grant program allows me to observe effective practices in action. I received a grant to visit a school in Atlanta where lessons were being taught to engage at-risk students. At that particular school, I was able to ask questions and bring back resources to my own classroom. My students love the chants, methods, and incentives. The most beneficial aspect of the trip was the fact that I was able to pass along what I learned to other teachers, which essentially was the ripple effect – in a good way.

In analyzing participant responses in their focus group discussions and interviews, a high level of emphasis was placed on student morale. Participants shared that supplemental programs such as after school for all and community learning centers impact student morale. Participants noted in their responses that supplemental programs such as the ones offered to their schools by community nonprofits affirms to a sense of ease and belonging to students, as evidenced by reduced referrals, class disruptions, fights, and student participation. Participants in both focus groups noted that relevant programs impact student morale and self-esteem. Participants shared in their interviews, focus groups, and verified through the survey that such programs have inspired students to become more active in class discussions. Lauren shared:

> …my eighth grade students have learned of accountable talk, and practice it in the public speaking after school for all program. I have noticed that students are not only actively participating in class discussions, but they are inspiring their classmates to do so as well.

In addition to Lauren's remarks on supplemental programs such as after school for all impacting student participation, other participants noted how students continuously express gratitude and favorable opinions of the programs. Lauren and Betty both expressed how

elementary and middle school students become acclimated to these programs and inquire about additional programs that could be afforded when school is out for the summer. Marcie shared that students are constantly incorporating character education lessons from the community learning centers and after school for all programs into activities. She noted:

> Students teach me affirmations all the time, and I have several favorites. I have even taught some of my student's affirmations to educators at national conferences.

In analyzing participant responses in their focus group discussions and interviews, a high level of emphasis was placed on staff morale. Participants shared that supplemental programs such as after school for all and community learning centers, and the mini grant program impacts staff morale. Participants noted in their responses that supplemental programs such as the ones offered to their schools by community nonprofits affirms to a sense of ease and assurance to staff members. Participants in both focus groups noted that relevant programs impact staff morale and motivation towards the job. Participants shared in their interviews, focus groups, and verified through the survey that such programs have served as additional support. Marva shared:

> Sometimes too many programs can be distracting and overwhelming, but these programs do not come off as intrusive, because we know how to take what they're offering and make it work for our students.

Presentation of the Data and Results

Impact on Annual School Performance Ratings. The research question, "how do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on annual school performance ratings," was answered through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and a survey. As it relates to the individual interviews, all participants shared they felt nonprofit

programs in the areas of fight diversion, after school enrichment, community learning centers, and mini grants positively impacted annual school performance ratings. In regard to answering the research question pertaining to how nonprofit programs impact the annual performance of schools classified as academically unacceptable, participants were able to illustrate their perceptions through four themes: improved student attendance, enhanced instructional practices, increased time for academic interventions, and the availability of supplemental instructional resources. All of the respondents to the survey indicated that nonprofit programs positively impact the academic performance of their schools annually. All of the schools represented in the study saw increases in their annual school performance scores during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school sessions. The perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit programs have on the annual school performance of academically unacceptable schools in an urban Louisiana community is positive. Educators expressed that nonprofit sanctioned programs such as fight diversion, community learning centers, after school enrichment, and mini grants supplement initiatives favorable to improving annual school performance ratings.

Student Attendance. The first theme to emerge encompassed student attendance. According to the participants in the study, nonprofit programs in the areas of after school enrichment, fight diversion, community learning centers, and sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention programs have an impact on attendance. All participants shared they felt programs impacted attendance in terms nonprofit programs keeping students engaged. Specifically, educators teaching beyond primary grades (fourth grade and above) shared that nonprofit programs such as after school enrichment, fight diversion, community learning centers, and sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention programs typically have programming that is unique to students and draws compels them to continuously participate in programs. Mesha shared that at

her middle school students would be eager to attend school just to take advantage of after school programs. Marcie, a middle school special education teacher shared that more than half of her students returned to class regularly after athletic programming offered during an after school enrichment program that attracted students.

Both focus group discussions addressed how nonprofit programs provide a relief in response to strained resources in the classrooms and that students see these programs as extra-curricular, fun, and engaging enough to keep students in school. All participants teaching elementary school referenced in their individual interviews and in the focus group discussion how programs in the arts are continuously being eliminated, alienating student interest in school. All the participants agreed in the focus group discussions that such after school programming impacts attendance. All participants affirmed that after school programs impact student interest and attendance, and from there attendance affects school performance. Specifically, Mary, Marva, Mesha, and Marcie shared individually how student performance on benchmarks improved as a result of improved, persistent attendance. The four educators noted that growth on benchmark assessments were consistent with growth on annual standardized tests, which is a large portion of how annual school performance ratings are calculated.

Instructional Practices. The second theme to emerge relative to answering the first research question encompassed instructional practices. According to the participants in the study, nonprofit sanctioned community learning centers impacts annual school performance ratings through supporting instructional practices. Specifically, participants teaching at the elementary school level shared how community learning centers provide opportunities for refining instructional practices. Darius noted how the community learning centers allows him to incorporate what he is doing with his fourth grade math students throughout the day, with

programming in the community learning centers. Sheila, also an elementary school teacher noted how community learning centers have eased the burden of adjusting to new academic standards for her third grade math and English students.

Like the elementary school teachers, the middle school teachers noted in their interviews and focus groups that community learning centers supplement instructional practices, adding in general that such programs alleviate some of the pressures associated with lesson planning. Participants noted in their various focus groups that additional resources relevant to the curriculum and academic standards already in place alleviates pressures for classroom teachers, as they are permitted to dedicate more time to instruction, as opposed to being consumed with frivolous paperwork. Lauren shared that the dual focus on content from both her school and the community learning centers eases the lesson planning process as additional methods can be incorporated. Many nonprofit organizations partner with multiple schools, particularly with programs similar to community learning centers. Both focus groups indicated that community learning centers promote enhanced instructional practices through networking. Participants shared and agreed that community learning centers allows for networking with teachers at other schools, specifically with sharing instructional practices that are most effective. All participants noted community learning centers positively impact instructional practices, adding that instructional practices is a significant variable in school performance scoring.

Academic Interventions. The third theme to emerge relative to answering the first research question encompassed academic interventions. According to the participants in the study, nonprofit sanctioned community learning centers and mini grant programs impacts annual school performance ratings through supporting academic interventions to students in the areas of numeracy and literacy. Participants in both focus groups shared how their campuses have placed

a strong focus on response to intervention, which Betty, Mary, Jasmine, and Maria described as a block within the instructional period where teachers provide supplemental instruction to students, who may need academic assistance with catching up on an important skill or benchmark. All participants noted how incorporating interventions can be difficult in addition to balancing other responsibilities. Darius shared how community learning centers permit him to work directly with his students in an extended setting, which adds to the interventions covered in school. The participants representing middle schools accented the concerns echoed by Darius. They noted in their focus group discussion how the 15 to 20 minute response to intervention blocks embedded in the instructional day is not sufficient time to get students caught up with mastering specific academic benchmarks.

In addition to the community learning centers, the participants in the study indicated in their interviews and focus group discussions that the mini grant program impacts academic interventions. Alicia and Amy discussed how the mini grant program allowed them to purchase technology and other assistive resources to effectively administer response to intervention to students. Alicia, who teaches middle school physical education and mathematics shared specifically how a $1,500.00 grant allowed her to purchase a set of interactive math workbooks, software, and manipulatives. Alicia further shared how the items secured from the mini grant supplemented current standards for her math students. Alicia provided details on how the grant provided software and manipulatives that engaged students, sparking their interest in the subject. All participants shared how mini grant programs aid in supporting academic field trips, increasing student access to technology, and assessments. Amy explained how a mini grant she was awarded through a nonprofit allowed her to incorporate a field trip to the science museum into her academic intervention. Amy noted that the science museum held an exhibit on

measurement, and how the lesson at the museum supplemented a future lesson that required prerequisite skills in measurement. Other participants echoed how mini grant programs have allowed intervention based learning to occur on field trips to museums, literary rallies, and other academic sanctioned events such as music and art festivals. Darius shared that mini grant funding allows him to pick up the pacing of lessons due to supplemental academic interventions afforded through educational field trips. The remaining participants indicated in their interviews that additional funding through programs such as the mini grant allows for continued exploration of methods, programs, and resources that are essential to instruction, assessment, learning, and ultimately annual school performance scores.

Instructional Resources. The fourth theme to emerge relative to answering the first research question encompassed instructional resources. According to the participants in the study, nonprofit sanctioned community learning centers and mini grant programs impacts annual school performance ratings through enhancing instructional resources. The participants reiterated in their respective focus group and interviews the need for additional instructional resources in the classroom. Maria noted how the mini grant program provided her the opportunity to acquire manipulatives, e-books, and games that were helpful to getting her kindergarten students caught up. Maria shared that these programs assisted her students with learning the basics of the alphabet, counting, color recognition, and understanding shapes. The remaining participants who were elementary school teachers agreed that the mini grant program has provided them the opportunity to acquire instructional resources that are conducive to effective instruction in literacy and numeracy. Participants who were middle school teachers shared that in addition to promoting innovation and new instructional resources, the nonprofit

sanctioned mini grant programs support existing initiatives that would have otherwise been eliminated if it were left up to dwindling educational funding.

Mesha and Lauren shared how funding had been cut for programs that allowed middle school students to earn early high school Carnegie units (credits) for Algebra I, Computer Science I, and Biology I. The nonprofit sanctioned mini grant program afforded to their students not only permitted students to earn up to three high school credits; but the courses themselves provided students with opportunities to get ahead on subject content. Additionally participants shared that early start programs accent student performance on benchmarks and standardized assessments, which ultimately impacts the annual school performance rating. All participants noted that one of the most prevalent interventions in their schools since being labeled academically unacceptable by the state are the presence of such nonprofit sanctioned programs. The further noted that each of their schools saw increases in their overall school performance scores. Their numbers were verified through public records request.

Impact on Annual School Culture and Climate. The research question, "how do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on school culture and climate," was answered through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and a survey. As it relates to the individual interviews, all participants shared they felt nonprofit programs in the areas of fight diversion, after school enrichment, community learning centers, and mini grants positively impacted school culture and climate. Although sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention programs are offered to middle school students, all participants noted these programs were not widely used on their campuses to measure impact.

In regard to answering the research question pertaining to how nonprofit programs impact the culture and climate of schools classified as academically unacceptable, participants were able to illustrate their perceptions through four themes: improvements in student discipline, increased professional development opportunities, improved staff morale, and improved student morale. All of the respondents to the survey indicated that nonprofit programs positively impact the culture and climate of their school. All of the schools represented in the study saw increases in their annual school performance scores during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school sessions. These same schools also saw reductions in the numbers of referrals and fights logged from year to year during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school sessions. The perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit programs have on the culture and climate of academically unacceptable schools in an urban Louisiana community is positive. Educators expressed that nonprofit sanctioned programs such as fight diversion, community learning centers, after school enrichment, and mini grants supplement initiatives favorable to improving relations, culture and climate.

Student Discipline. The first theme to emerge relative to answering the second research question encompassed student discipline. According to the participants in the study, nonprofit sanctioned community learning centers, after school enrichment programs, sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention, and fight diversion programs positively impact student discipline, culture and climate. All participants agreed that after school enrichment programs typically afford students enrichment activities that are favorable to their interests. Darius shared how a group of male students in class would fight every single day to the point that suspensions was not an option as the infractions would net a minimum of 20 unexcused absences per student in two grading periods alone, which fellow participants agreed was grossly unacceptable for fourth

grade students. Darius noted that the athletic component of the nonprofit sanctioned after school enrichment programs taught the male students character and the elements of team work. Darius noted how those same students would be the ring leader for conflict resolution among their peers. Other participants offered similar accounts to Darius' in the respect after school enrichment programs provide students the opportunity to build relationships and character, which ultimately reflects discipline both on and off campus.

Participants teaching on middle school campuses discussed how the nonprofit sanctioned fight diversion program impacts discipline within the school building. All middle school teachers noted they had experiences where students who entered the fight diversion program returned to school committing fewer infractions. Mesha, Marva, and Lauren all shared examples detailing how the nonprofit sanctioned fight diversion programs served as a disciplinary intervention for students who fought habitually in previous school years. From year to year, all participants noted that there was a strong correlation between the reduced numbers of fights on campuses participating in the fight diversion program. The number of fights at the six middle school campuses represented in the study have reduced from year to year. Participants shared the number of fights logged at their respective schools over the last three years. Their numbers were verified through public records request. The public record did not include specific information about students or details regarding the circumstances of their infraction. For the protection of students and their families, the document only provides raw numbers from year to year relative to infractions per school.

Professional Development Opportunities. The second theme to emerge relative to answering the second research question encompassed professional development opportunities. According to the participants in the study, nonprofit sanctioned mini grant programs provided a

number of opportunities for professional development. All participants shared how a nonprofit sanctioned mini grant provided them and their fellow colleagues on campus to participate in intense training in lesson planning and differentiating instruction to meet the learning needs of students. Participants in both focus groups discussed how some professional development programs can be redundant and not anything new to what they learned over the years; however, they noted that school-wide professional developments funded through nonprofit mini grants allow them the opportunity to collaborate, share ideas, and incorporate what is working already with the elements of new initiatives.

Betty noted how such professional development programs afforded through the mini grant allows her the opportunity to observe effective methods in action. Mary added that as a 34 year veteran teacher, the mini grant allows her to participate in professional development programs that keeps her updated on methods. Darius shared how a mini grant in the amount of $4,000 permitted him to visit inner city schools in a major city on the west coast. Darius noted that he was able to see initiatives in process with academically at risk students, and was able to apply what he learned to the classroom. Darius noted how the mini grant program has inspired him to launch his own professional development programs to assist peers. All participants agreed in follow up questions during both the interviews and the focus group discussions that while professional development can be seen as burdensome, they are beneficial towards improving school culture and climate. The participants all agreed that the mini grant initiative plays a vital role in their professional development opportunities.

Student Morale. The third theme to emerge relative to answering the second research question encompassed student morale. According to the participants in the study, nonprofit sanctioned mini grant programs, after school enrichment, and fight diversion programs positively

impact student morale. Participants reiterated a number of points relative to how these programs provide students with additional alternatives and outlets for challenges they face at home. Darius noted that in several academically unacceptable elementary schools, there are students two to three grade levels behind. He further explained that there are fourth grade students who look forward to such programs as it takes away from early responsibility such as getting their younger siblings prepared for school, or assisting them with their homework.

Participants from both focus groups seemed to agree with Darius in the respect that added burdens contribute to the stress of younger students, which ultimately effects their temperament. Participants also shared of one initiative provided through the mini grant that permits students in academically unacceptable Schools to learn public speaking, character, and citizenship. All participants noted how these programs have resulted in a change of student conduct, self-esteem, and overall participation in class activities. Lauren shared how her eighth grade math and science students who participated in they become more eager to participate in class discussions. She further explained that even when students did not know the answer to a question, the volunteered to engage in what she called accountable talk, which allows students to discuss the subject matter and seek understanding from their peers.

Participants indicated in their respective interviews and focus group discussions that the nonprofit sanctioned after school enrichment and community learning centers reminds students that services are available. Lauren, Betty, and Mesha, and Darius noted specifically how students continuously express gratitude for programs that allow them to do things they would otherwise not be allowed to do due to lack of funding. Participants also shared how students recognized the privilege in being able to take part in such programs as after school enrichment and community learning centers. Participants noted that students look forward to after school

enrichment and even community learning centers. Marcie shared that her middle school students often reference important topics, lessons, and activities from such programs into their daily activities during school; for example, Marcie discussed how students learned to create raps and songs to learn important concepts and themes from the after school enrichment and community learning centers. Participants indicated that student referrals to the discipline office has declined. Participants agreed through their surveys, interviews, and focus group discussions that nonprofit sanctioned programs greatly impact student morale, which in effect impacts school culture and climate.

Staff Morale. The fourth theme to emerge relative to answering the second research question encompassed staff morale. According to participants in the study, nonprofit sanctioned mini grant, after school enrichment, and community learning centers impact staff morale. Participants shared that while external interventions can be intrusive at times, nonprofit sanctioned programs such as the mini grant, after school enrichment, and community learning centers are not required; but rather resources on campuses that are available if needed. Sheila, Marva, Amy, and Marcie shared that knowing such programs exist offers a sense of peace of mind. Darius indicated that while he understands nonprofit programs such as mini grants and community learning centers have to do their own internal program evaluations, their data helps him with preparing reports that would otherwise be time consuming. The participants noted their appreciation for such programs as it reminds them they are not alone in their work to raise student achievement in effort to develop students as productive, viable members of society. Participants agreed through their individual survey responses, interviews, and focus group discussions that nonprofit sanctioned programs greatly impact staff morale, which in effect impacts school culture and climate.

Table 2

Participant Survey Responses

Survey Item	Strong (Agree)	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly (Disagree)
Programs afforded to my school by nonprofit organizations positively impact culture and climate.	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Programs afforded to my school by nonprofit organizations positively impact the annual school performance rating.	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Programs afforded to my school by nonprofit organizations reflect what is needed on our campus.	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Within the five programs afforded to my school some programs are better needed on our campus than others.	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%
I feel the fight diversion program has contributed to the reduction the number of fights, disturbances, and suspensions on campus.	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
I feel the teacher academy/mini grant program has contributed to my professional development and growth in the classroom.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
I feel that the community learning centers and after school for all programs provide enriching programs to students that is relevant to improving grades, behavior, and/or attendance.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
I feel that programs such as teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect impacts attendance and student performance.	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%

Summary

I began this chapter by reintroducing the purpose of the study as well as reiterating the research questions that were explored. Also in this chapter I provided a description of the sample used for this study. Research Methodology and Analysis is also addressed. From there I also presented summary of findings relative to the case study. The summary of findings is followed by the presentation of the data and results. Educators working in schools classified as academically unacceptable in an urban Louisiana community view the impact nonprofit programs have on the performance, culture, and climate as positive. Educators noted that such programs have impacted schools in the areas of student attendance, instructional practices, academic interventions, instructional resources, student discipline, professional development, staff morale, and student morale. The next chapter will focus on discussions and conclusions relative to the study.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

The research for this study included a qualitative research approach and a single case study as the research design. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit programs and services have on elementary and middle schools in an urban Louisiana community that have been deemed academically unacceptable by the state department of education. Specifically, the nonprofit programs in this study focused on after school enrichment and extracurricular programs, tutorial programs through community learning centers, teacher grant and supplemental funding programs, sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention, and fight diversion. Twelve educators working in K-8 settings in an urban Louisiana community were selected through purposeful sampling. Within the sample of 12 educators, half of them represented elementary grades K-5, while the remaining half represented middle school grades sixth through eighth.

Yin (2014) and Creswell (2013) noted that a single case study facilitates the exploration of realistic, contemporary cases over an established period of time. The above-mentioned are channeled through what Creswell describes as in-depth data collection methods, occasionally encompassing multiple sources of information. The participants worked in the aforementioned settings during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school sessions. Through interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys, educators provided insight and salient examples on how nonprofit programs impact school performance, culture, and climate of their respective schools. This chapter will provide summary of the results of the study, discussion of the results, discussion of the results in relation to the literature, limitations of the study, implications of the results for practice, policy, and theory. The conclusion of this chapter will follow the recommendations for further research section.

Summary of Results

Through the use of individual interviews, two focus group discussions, and the administration of surveys, this study explored the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit programs and services had on the performance, culture, and climate of schools rated academically unacceptable by the state department of education. I manually and digitally transcribed the contents from participant responses, and engaged in open and axial coding, to identify themes in effort to answer the research questions that guided the study. Getter, et al. (2016) and Ludden, O'Brien, and Pasch (2017) explained that with open coding researchers use highlighters and other notations in effort to effectively differentiate between categories or themes presented through the data collection process. Saldaña (1999) noted that in qualitative research, coding permits the researcher to effectively link data collected to the idea of the study.

The first research question to guide this study encompassed exploring how educators perceived the impact nonprofit programs and services have annual school performance ratings. The identified themes for the first research question consisted of student attendance, instructional practices, academic interventions, and instructional resources. The second research question to guide this study encompassed exploring how educators perceived the impact nonprofit programs and services have school culture and climate. The identified themes for the second research question consisted of student attendance, instructional practices, academic interventions, and instructional resources. In their responses, participants provided confident, salient answers that were instrumental in answering the research questions guiding this case study, noting the impact nonprofits have on their respective schools is positive.

Discussion of the Results

Triangulation was used in the data collection process in order to ensure validity of the data collected, transcribed, and coded for this study. Interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys were used, and the data collected from each method confirmed the findings of this study. The research and methodological literature examined for this study acknowledges that partnerships between human service organizations such as nonprofits and public schools has existed for decades. The research and methodological literature indicates that program evaluation metrics are effective tools for nonprofit organizations to scale their impact to maintain existing streams of resources, or to cultivate new resources entirely (Paarlberg, Nesbit, Clerkin, & Christensen, 2014; Ford & Ihrke, 2016; & Temple & Reynolds, 2015). Regarding recent scholarly research in the area of nonprofit organizations and public schools, exists a gap that does not encompass how specific programs collective contribute to transformation efforts in struggling schools. The results of this study encompasses data collected from interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys. The results of this study contributes to the existing gap in research pertaining to exploring the impact specific nonprofit programs have on culture, climate, and performance of struggling schools, though the perceptions of educators.

Jonker and Pennink (2007) noted that triangulation in qualitative research comprises of the application of multiple data sources to ensure validity. Given (2008) explained that triangulation sanctions researchers to prove, disprove, or expound upon certain cases in qualitative research. The data collected was used to answer the two research questions that guided this qualitative case study in understanding the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit have on schools classified as academically unacceptable by the Louisiana Department of Education.

RQ 1: How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on annual school performance ratings?

Participants in the study perceived nonprofit programs and services positively impact annual school performance ratings for academically unacceptable Schools in an urban Louisiana community. Educators participating in this study considered the impact of nonprofit programs and services have on the annual school performance ratings of schools to be positive. Participants provided a number of generalized accounts to support their feedback in the interviews, focus groups, and surveys. The participants in this study indicated that while some programs can interrupt and stifle ongoing initiatives, structured programs that are aligned with an identified need in the school building are appropriate. Educators were able to identify the effects of programs and how those programs correlate to annual school performance ratings. The common themes that developed from the participant responses encompassed student attendance, instructional practices, academic interventions, and instructional resources.

Increased student attendance impacts academic performance because students are less likely to miss school, and when students are at school, they are likely to absorb academic material, which they wouldn't otherwise have access to, not attending class (Corcoran, Elbel, & Schwartz, 2016; Cosgrove, Chen, & Castelli, 2018). The participants in this study noted how nonprofit programs, specifically enrichment programs motivate students to come to school, which is a requirement for school based, nonprofit sanctioned programs such as after school for all programs, that promote enrichment activities such as sports, technology, etiquette, and performing arts. Participants discussed how improved student attendance as a result of interest in nonprofit after school for all enrichment programs had a domino effect inside the classroom.

Participants were able to relate how fight diversion programs resulted in reduced out of school suspensions which impacted student attendance positively.

Additional time devoted to academic and enrichment activities permits adequate reflection of academic strengths and weaknesses, and permits educators to use supplemental programs such as community learning centers to address student learning needs. Participants in the study discussed how access to supplemental education programs such community learning centers provide additional time for students to master academic material, where initial lack of interest of academic weakness is present. Interventions was a term frequently used when discussing how these programs impact annual school performance ratings. Participants shared that when structured and apply to the challenges unique to the teacher and students, interventions can be effective. Interventions in community learning center settings often consist of fewer students, which allows for individualized instruction (Reno, Friend, Caruthers, & Smith, 2017 and Eckert, Hamsho, & Malandrino, 2017). Individualized instruction, reteaching, additional instructional resources, and supplemental lessons are effective methods of intervention for the academically at-risk student. Programs that promote professional development and instructional resources have an impact on pedagogy, critical thinking, and classroom management. Pedagogy, critical thinking, classroom management, and receptiveness to professional development are conducive to school turnaround. Participants in this study indicated that the sex-respect/teenage pregnancy prevention programs are essential to educating adolescents about safety and sex; however, they contended that such programs are likely more effective with those students beyond the sixth grade. Sexual education programs can be effective in promoting abstinence, sexually transmitted disease prevention, and advocating sex respect. Middle school educator

participants were able to shed the most light on how sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention impacts student attendance, which ultimately impacts the annual school performance ratings.

RQ 2: How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on school culture and climate?

Participants in the study perceived nonprofit programs and services positively impact the culture and climate of academically unacceptable Schools in an urban Louisiana community. Educators participating in this study considered the impact of nonprofit programs and services have on school culture and climate to be positive. Participants provided a number of generalized accounts to support their feedback in the interviews, focus groups, and surveys. Culture and climate encompasses the schools overall effect on the student and reflects the practices that go on each day (ASCD, 2018). The aforesaid also takes into account relationships between the school, and its respective stakeholders, which is inclusive of parents, teachers, students, and community. The common themes that developed from the participant responses encompassed student discipline, professional development, student morale, and staff morale.

Educator participants shared that nonprofit programs inclusive of teacher mini grants, after school for all enrichment programs, community learning centers, sex respect/teenage pregnancy prevention, and fight diversion impact school culture and climate. Specifically, educators in both focus groups agreed unanimously that the impact on culture and climate afforded by nonprofit organizations is evident from daily observations. One of the most frequent examples to come up dealt with student excitement about programs such as after school for all enrichment, which provides fun, extracurricular programming to students. Other examples provided included references to students realizing the privilege and pride of being on task and

maintaining eligibility to participate. Participants noted that there was a correlation between the behavior and academic performance of students enrolled in such programs. Students who are involved feel a sense of connection and belonging to the school and are less likely to act out. Extracurricular programming correlates to student behavior and academic performance.

Student behavior and academic performance can greatly impact the structure and flow of classroom instruction (ASCD, 2018). Educators can become overwhelmed in classroom environments become stressed due to the demand of supplemental resources, instructional interventions, or positive behavior reinforcement. Educator participants noted significant declines in referrals and out of school suspensions. Improved academics and involvement in programs have prompted students to be better receptive to authority figures and their peers. There is a correlation between the performance and morale of educators who feel supported, versus those who do not (Byrd-Blake, Afolayan, Hunt, Fabunmi, Pryor, & Leander, 2010). The educator participants discussed at length how nonprofit sanctioned programs afforded to their schools are welcomed, because they boost positive morale among staff and students. Educator participants identified challenges on their campus and provided salient examples, connecting the program components with favorable outcomes relative to culture and climate.

Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature

The conceptual framework of this study is rooted in the themes of nonprofits, structural reforms in education, and transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Mann, 1845; Salamon, 2003), which ultimately shaped the literature review for this qualitative case study. Salamon, Mann, and Burns offered themes that are in essence interrelated and are relevant to understanding the structure and processes of nonprofits, education reform, and transformational leadership. Additionally, the explication of the themes by Salamon, Mann, and Burns clarifies

the relevance of connecting various social institutions to address population. Mann avowed that identifying the elements of structural reforms intended to improve teaching, reasoning, and learning were essential to change. Burns' transformational leadership supports what Salamon theorizes as the essential functions of a nonprofit organization: service provision, value guardian, advocacy and problem identification, and social capitalism.

Research acknowledges the challenges of failing schools, establishes the existence of community engagement/nonprofit partnerships with public schools, and establishes that program evaluation is used to measure social impact. The aforementioned findings from the literature accents participant educator responses in their interviews, focus groups, and surveys. The data collected from participant educators verifies that engagements between nonprofit organizations can be studied to scale program effectiveness. The results of this study accents existing literature in the areas of nonprofit organizations and public schools, by connecting how collective nonprofit sanctioned programs impact culture, climate, and school performance through the perceptions of educators. Regarding effectiveness and impact of nonprofit sanctioned programs, organizations usually design their own program evaluation metrics through consultation of experts or organizations in other geographical areas that may have similar targets or mission statements.

The data collected from interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys accents research literature that suggests supplemental programs such as nonprofit initiatives, compliment resources. The participants in this study provided responses that validates the assertions of Davies and Davies (2014), Harris (2016), and Mozolic and Shuster (2016) in the respect that public elementary and secondary schools serving low socioeconomic areas are at a competitive disadvantage compared to their counterparts, and the existence of nonprofit sanctioned programs

permits increased opportunities for innovation. Participants further added these programs ensure that the competitive edge between students at lower and higher performing schools, is moderately addressed. Also in relation to the literature, participants discussed that reciprocity exists between schools and nonprofits in that respective goals and objectives are interconnected, thus providing the opportunity for dual interventions (Braunsberger & Flamm, 2013; Kronick, Lester, & Luter, 2013). Dixon, Slanickova, and Warwick (2013), Frederico and Whiteside (2016), and Polesel, Klatt, Blake, and Starr (2017) explained that businesses feel obliged to partner with public schools for reciprocal purposes.

The results of this study accent existing studies on the subject of nonprofit organizations and public schools, that highlight how through in-depth discussions, likely through interviews and focus groups educators are permitted to reflect and provide substantive feedback relative to programs and policies (Lang, 2015; Mallett, 2013; Officer, Grim, Medina, Bringle, & Foreman, 2013). The scale of human service organizations such as nonprofit organizations in terms of engagement with public sector organizations such school districts largely differ in terms of mission and goals (Kellner, Townsend, & Wilkinson, 2017; Pandey, Kim, & Pandey, 2017; Word & Carpenter, 2013). Nonprofit organizations engage with public schools to assist with transformation in the area of culture, climate, academic interventions, and leadership development.

Limitations

The findings of this qualitative case study were partial to four limitations. The limitations to this study consisted of level of certification obtained by teachers, representatives for each grade level in the study, years of experience, and the number of respondents consenting to participation in the study. Twelve educator participants is sufficient for case studies, as noted

by Creswell (2013); but this number may not be sufficient to be representative of all Louisiana urban educators working in schools deemed academically unacceptable by the state department of education. Educator experience, content area, certification, contributes to the type of responses participants provide during the data collection process. This study was limited to 12 educators from the elementary (grades K-5) and middle school (grades sixth through eighth) levels, who had different levels of certification, routes to certification, in one urban Louisiana community. Secondary educators (grades 9-12) were not represented in this in this study. Educator consent and participation was strictly voluntary, and the elimination of deductive disclosure was employed in this case study to ensure confidentiality.

Implications of the Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory

The perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofits have on academically unacceptable schools in an urban Louisiana community was explored using interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys, with a qualitative case study as the research approach and design. Studies conducted by Horvath and Harazin (2016) and Kumari (2016) support the claim that partnerships between education organizations and community organizations such as nonprofits are effective and provide a dual benefit. The results of this study offers no concrete benefits to the participant nor the researcher; however, the results and the qualitative case study may contribute to scholarly discussions relative to nonprofit organizations, nonprofit education programs, structural reforms in public schools through community partnerships, and determining the relevance and feasibility to expanding such programs in areas where need is identified.

Regarding implications to policy, nonprofit organizations rely on multiple streams for resource development and funding (Salamon, 1999). Additionally, a number of governmental organizations such as school districts, state departments of education, city councils, and

county/parish commissions or police juries allocate portions of their respective budgets to nonprofit programs that provide services favorable to social impact (Salamon, 2003). Governmental organizations typically consult with nonprofit organizations in effort to address longstanding issues using shared resources, in instances where funding may be limited. Funding for supplemental education programs provided through nonprofit sanctioned programs is being threatened at the federal level, from a budgetary policy perspective (Ujifusa, 2018). Opposite of what existing literature presents, and opposite of the findings in this study, officials feel spending for such programs should be streamlined (Kamenetz, 2018).

In addition to budgetary policies that governmental bodies and corporations may consider relative to maintaining or cultivating new funding streams for nonprofit organizations and programs, exists implications for professional practice in both the nonprofit and public education sector (Salamon, 1999). Nonprofit boards, executives, staff, and volunteers are expected to ensure both duty of care and loyalty to their respective organizations and mission (Salamon, 2003). The perceptions of educators regarding programmatic impact of nonprofit sanctioned initiatives encompasses reflection of the roles and responsibilities of those rending external interventions such as after school enrichment, community learning centers, teacher mini grant programs, sex respect/ teenage pregnancy prevention, and fight diversion programs. This study contributes to the exiting body of knowledge relative to nonprofits, transformational leadership, and structural reforms in education; therefore, from a policy perspective, the aforementioned organizations could use the findings of this study to further champion budgetary policies that support nonprofit sanctioned programs in area public schools.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following are offered as recommendations for further research relative to nonprofit organizations and how its programs impact schools that struggle with academic performance, culture, and climate:

- This study could be replicated with the inclusion of high school educators.
- This study could be replicated in other urban areas reflective of low quality of life indicators beyond Louisiana, or the Deep South region of the United States.
- This study could be replicated in rural settings where schools have challenges with culture, climate, and academic performance.
- This study could be replicated with the inclusion of the perceptions of school administrators and nonprofit board members.
- There could be a study that examines the correlation between what is reported from internal program evaluations of nonprofits, versus what schools are reporting.
- Subsequent studies could encompass the perceptions of students who are of mature age to offer substantive responses to the research question, such as middle and high school students.

Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofit programs and services have on schools identified as academically unacceptable in an urban Louisiana community. The interviews, focus groups, and surveys were designed specifically to answer the research questions of, “how do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact

nonprofit programs have on annual school performance ratings," and, "How do teachers at K-8 schools in an urban Louisiana community classified as academically unacceptable perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on school culture and climate?"

Burns (2003) theorized that organizations such as community nonprofits, educational organizations, churches, and hospitals mirror a significant component of transformational leadership, which in effect uses the power of influencing people to achieve desirable outcomes. Elements of transformational leadership were shared from educator participants when discussing how such programs impact culture and climate, placing emphasis on how it impacts students and staff in the building. The results from this study revealed that the perceptions of educators regarding the impact nonprofits have on academically unacceptable schools in an urban Louisiana community is that such programs positively impact student attendance, instructional practices, academic interventions, instructional resources, student discipline, professional development, student morale, and staff morale.

The findings of this study extends knowledge in the disciplines reflective of the themes presented in the conceptual framework which guided this study. The current body of knowledge through scholarly literature connects, nonprofit administration and research, transformational leadership, and structural reforms and public schools. The findings from this study extends knowledge in the field of education, nonprofit management, and transformational leadership studies, in the respect that it explores through the perceptions of educators how collective nonprofit program in the areas of after school enrichment, community learning centers, fight diversion programs for students, mini grant programs for teachers, and sex respect / teenage pregnancy prevention for middle school campuses, impact culture, climate, and ultimately school performance, specifically of schools classified as academically unacceptable in an urban

Louisiana community. Transformational leadership is rooted in achieving organizational change through motivating people (Burns, 1978). Educators were able to connect how nonprofit sanctioned programs changed behaviors of both students and staff within the building, which affects culture and climate (Minor & Benner, 2018; Reaves, McMahon, Duffy, & Ruiz, 2018). Participants contend that culture and climate were positively impacted as a result of partnerships between schools and nonprofit sanctioned programs, with these changes ultimately being reflected in the school performance.

References

Adair, J. K. (2015). An effective science tutorial model for at-risk, academically unacceptable students in grades 4–8: A Delphi study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *76*(6), 1–438.

Adelman, R. M., & Tsao, H. (2016). Deep South demography: New immigrants and racial hierarchies. *Sociological Spectrum*, *36*(6), 337–358.

Alexander, K. (2014). *"Financing public schools: theory, policy, and practice"*. London: Routledge.

Alves, M. (2014). Social accountability as an innovative frame in civic action: The case of Rede Nossa São Paulo. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, *25*(3), 818–838.

Andrews, D. C., Richmond, G., & Stroupe, D. (2017). Teacher education and teaching in the present political landscape. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *68*(2), 121–124.

Arif, M. I., & Mirza, M. d. (2017). Effectiveness of an intervention program in fostering academic resilience of students at risk of failure at secondary school level. *Bulletin of Education & Research*, *39*(1), 251–264.

Arnold, J. M., & Sableski, M. (2016). Consistency and change: becoming a literacy leader in an urban school. *Literacy Practice & Research*, *41*(2), 54–59.

Aronson, B. a., Janke, K. K., & Traynor, A. P. (2012). Investigating student pharmacist perceptions of professional engagement using a modified Delphi process. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *76*(7), 1–7.

Arvidson, M., & Lyon, F. (2014). Social impact measurement and non-profit organizations: Compliance, resistance, and promotion. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary &* Saldaña *Nonprofit Organizations*, *25*(4), 869–886.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2018). School culture and climate. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/research-a-topic/school-culture-and-climate-resources.aspx

Austin, M. J., & Isokuortti, N. (2016). A framework for teaching practice-based research with a focus on service users. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 36*(1), 11–32.

Baglibel, M., Samancioglu, M., Ozmantar, Z. K., & Hall, G. E. (2014). The relationship between school principals' perceived change facilitator styles and teachers' attitudes towards change. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM)), 42*(3), 55–67.

Banker, R., Chang, H., & Feroz, E. (2014). Performance measurement in nonprofit governance: an empirical study of the Minnesota independent school districts. *Annals of Operations Research*, *221*(1), 47–71.

Barrett N., Harris D. (2015). *Significant changes in New Orleans teacher workforce*. Retrieved from http://educationresearchalliancenola.org/files/publications/ERA-Policy-Brief-Changes-in-the-New-Orleans-Teacher-Workforce.pdf

Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. K. (2016). *Rethinking case study research: a comparative approach*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Batterham, P. J. (2014). Recruitment of mental health survey participants using Internet advertising: content, characteristics and cost effectiveness. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, *23*(2), 184–191.

Beabout, B. R., & Cambre, B. M. (2013). Parental voucher enrollment decisions: Choice within choice in New Orleans. *Journal of School Choice*, *7*(4), 560–588.

Beltramo, J. b. (2014). The experiences of teacher-assistant principals in Catholic elementary schools: Boundary spanners and player managers. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *18*(1), 111–136.

Black, D. W. (2015). Federalizing Education by Waiver?. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, *68*(3), 607–680.

Bland, P., Church, E., & Luo, M. (2014). Strategies for attracting and retaining teachers. *Administrative Issues Journal: Education, Practice & Research*, *4*(1), 9–18.

Blomdahl, M. (2017). Diversionary theory of war and the case study design. *Armed Forces & Society (0095327X)*, *43*(3), 545–565.

Bonner, J. j., Greenbaum, R., & Mayer, D. (2016). My boss is morally disengaged: The role of ethical leadership in explaining the interactive effect of supervisor and employee moral disengagement on employee behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *137*(4), 731–742.

Boucher, D. (2017). Utility of V. O. Key's black population density theory in the desegregation of southern U.S. public universities 1948–1963. *Journal of Negro Education*, *86*(1), 25–39.

Bounds, P. S. (2017). Contextual factors related to African American adolescent career development. *Career Development Quarterly*, *65*(2), 131–144.

Bowen, M. S. (2017). Review of the African American experience: Psychoanalytic perspectives. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, *34*(2), 266–269.

Boylan, R. T., & Ho, V. (2017). The unkindest cut of all? State spending on health, education, and welfare during recessions. *National Tax Journal*, (2), 329.

Braunsberger, K., & Flamm, R. (2013). A mission of civic engagement: Undergraduate students working with nonprofit organizations and public sector agencies to enhance societal

wellbeing. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations, 24*(1), 1–31.

Brown, A. (2013). Waiting for superwoman: White female teachers and the construction of the "neoliberal savior" "in a New York City public school. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS), 11*(2), 123–164.

Brown, C. P., & Lan, Y. (2015). A qualitative metasynthesis comparing U.S. teachers' conceptions of school readiness prior to and after the implementation of NCLB. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 45*1–13.

Brownell, M. T., Bishop, A. M., & Sindelar, P. T. (2018). Republication of "NCLB and the demand for highly qualified teachers: Challenges and solutions for rural schools." *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, *37*(1), 4–11.

Buerger, C., & Harris, D. (2015). How can decentralized systems solve system-level problems? An analysis of market-driven New Orleans school reforms. *American Behavioral Scientist, 59*(10), 1246–1262.

Bukowski, L. (2016). System of systems dependability – Theoretical models and applications examples. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, *151*76–92.

Bulkley, K., & Gottlieb, J. (2017). Policy images of teachers: How influential actors construct images of teachers. *Teachers College Record*, *119*(4), 1–34.

Buras, K. L. (2015). 'Thank God for Mississippi!' How disparagement of the South has destroyed public schooling in New Orleans—and beyond. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *90*(3), 355–379.

Buras, Kristen L. (2013). New Orleans education reform: A guide for cities or a warning for communities? (Grassroots Lessons Learned, 2005–2012). *Berkeley Review of Education*, *4*(1).

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Perennial.

Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: a new pursuit of happiness*. New York: Grove Press.

Burns, J. M. (2012). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Open Road Media.

Byrd-Blake, M., Afolayan, M. O., Hunt, J. W., Fabunmi, M., Pryor, B. W., & Leander, R. (2010). Morale of teachers in high poverty schools: A Post-NCLB mixed methods analysis. *Education & Urban Society*, *42*(4), 450–472.

Carnochan, S., Samples, M., Austin, M. J., & Myers, M. (2014). Performance measurement challenges in nonprofit human service organizations. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *43*(6), 1014–1032.

Cashwell, C. S. (1995). Family functioning and self-esteem of middle school students: A matter of perspective? *Journal of Humanistic Education & Development*, *34*(2), 83.

Chazin, R., Pardasani, M., & Kail, B. L. (2015). The better future international's family care model: using focus group discussions for program evaluation. *Journal of HIV/AIDS & Social Services*, *14*(4), 373–391.

Chingos, M. M., & West, M. R. (2015). The uneven performance of Arizona's charter schools. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, *37*(1), 120S–134S.

Ciolino, M. S., Kirylo, J. D., Mirón, L., & Frazier, K. (2014). Education reform in New Orleans: Voices from the Recovery School District. *Policy Futures in Education*, *12*(4), 463–468.

Clandinin, D. J. (2013). *Engaging in narrative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Cleland, J. A. (2017). The qualitative orientation in medical education research. *Korean Journal of Medical Education, 29*(2), 61–71.

Connelly, L. M. (2016). Understanding research. Trustworthiness in qualitative research. *MEDSURG Nursing*, *25*(6), 435–436.

Cook, M. R. (2016). Counter-narratives of slavery in the Deep South: the politics of empathy along and beyond River Road. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *11*(3), 290–308.

Corcoran, S. P., Elbel, B., & Schwartz, A. E. (2016). The effect of breakfast in the classroom on obesity and academic performance: Evidence from New York City. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*, *35*(3), 509–532.

Cosgrove, J. M., Chen, Y. T., & Castelli, D. M. (2018). Physical fitness, grit, school attendance, and academic performance among adolescents. *Biomed Research International*, 1–7.

Creswell J. W. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed method research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Currie, E. (2017). Confronting the North's South: On race and violence in the United States. *International Journal for Crime, Justice, & Social Democracy*, *6*(1), 23–34.

Davies, P., & Davies, N. M. (2014). Paying for quality? Associations between private school income, performance and use of resources. *British Educational Research Journal*, *40*(3), 421–440.

de la Varre, C., Irvin, M. J., Jordan, A. W., Hannum, W. H., & Farmer, T. W. (2014). Reasons for student dropout in an online course in a rural K–12 setting. *Distance Education*, *35*(3), 324–344.

Delgado, R. (2015). Waiting for a second cargo shipment: public education as great equalizer. *Wake Forest Law Review*, (1), 219.

Dennis, A., Gordon, L., Howden, S., & Jindal-Snape, D. (2017). An evaluation of a Scottish higher education 'student transitions' enhancement theme: Stakeholders' perceptions and recommendations for future activities. *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, *5*(2), 22–30.

Dennis, D. V. (2017). Learning from the past: What ESSA has the chance to get right. *Reading Teacher*, *70*(4), 395–400.

Desmond, R. A., Jackson, B. E., & Waterbor, J. W. (2017). Disparities in cancer survivorship indicators in the Deep South Based on BRFSS data: Recommendations for survivorship care plans. *Southern Medical Journal*, *110*(3), 181–187.

Dillman, L. l., & Christie, C. A. (2017). Evaluation policy in a nonprofit foundation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *38*(1), 60–79.

Dixon R, Slanickova D, Warwick P. Business school partnerships for globalization. *Journal of Teaching in International Business* [serial online]. July 2013; *24*(3/4):198–213.

Dodson, R. L. (2015). Kentucky principal perceptions of the state's new teacher evaluation system: A survey analysis. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *39*(2), 53–74.

Dogan, S. (2016). Conflicts management model in school: A mixed design study. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *5*(2), 200–219.

Donahue, E., & Vogel, L. l. (2018). Teacher perceptions of the impact of an evaluation system on classroom instructional practices. *Journal of School Leadership*, *28*(1), 31–55.

Downs, M. L. (2015). Black freedom, white resistance, and red menace: Civil Rights and anticommunism in the Jim Crow South. *The Alabama Review*, (1), 126.

Duffy, G., & Gallagher, T. (2015). Collaborative evolution: the context surrounding the formation and the effectiveness of a school partnership in a divided community in Northern Ireland. *Research Papers in Education*, *30*(1), 1–24.

Dyson, M. R. (2016). Rethinking Rodriguez after Citizens United: the poor as a suspect class in high-poverty schools. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy*, (1), 1.

Eakin, S. (2000). Giants of American Education: Horace Mann. *Technos: Quarterly for Education and Technology*.

Eckert, T. L., Hier, B. O., Hamsho, N. F., & Malandrino, R. D. (2017). Assessing children's perceptions of academic interventions: The Kids Intervention profile. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *32*(2), 268–281.

Education Week. (2016). Quality Counts 2016: State report cards map. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/qc/2016/2016-state-report-cards-map.html?intc=EW-QC16-TOC

Egalite, A. J., Mills, J. N., & Wolf, P. J. (2017). The impact of targeted school vouchers on racial stratification in Louisiana schools. *Education & Urban Society*, *49*(3), 271–296.

Ertas, N. n., & Roch, C. H. (2014). Charter schools, equity, and students enrollments: The role of for-profit educational management organizations. *Education & Urban Society*, *46*(5), 548–579.

Eslinger, J. C. (2014). Navigating between a rock and a hard place: Lessons from an urban school teacher. *Education & Urban Society*, *46*(2), 209–233.

Farber, K. (2015). Why great teachers quit: And how we might stop the exodus. New York, NY: Skyhorse Publishing.

Farías, M., & Sevilla, M. (2015). Effectiveness of vocational high schools in students' access to and persistence in postsecondary vocational education. *Research in Higher Education*, *56*(7), 693–718.

Fernandez, J. j., & Camacho, J. j. (2016). Effective elements to establish an ethical infrastructure: An exploratory study of SMEs in the Madrid region. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *138*(1), 113–131.

Flemming, K., Closs, S. J., Hughes, N. D., & Bennett, M. I. (2016). Using qualitative research to overcome the shortcomings of systematic reviews when designing of a self-management intervention for advanced cancer pain. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *15*(1), 1–11.

Flick, U. (2013). *The Sage handbook of qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage.

Ford, M. R., & Ihrke, D. M. (2016). Comparing nonprofit charter and traditional public school board member perceptions of the public, conflict, and financial responsibility: is there a difference and does it matter?. *Public Management Review*, *18*(7), 972–992.

Ford, T. G., Van Sickle, M. E., Clark, L. V., Fazio-Brunson, M., & Schween, D. C. (2017). Teacher self-efficacy, professional commitment, and high-stakes teacher evaluation policy in Louisiana. *Educational Policy*, *31*(2), 202–248.

Frederico, M., & Whiteside, M. (2016). Building school, family, and community partnerships: Developing a theoretical framework. *Australian Social Work*, *69*(1), 51–66.

Frelin, A. (2015). Relational underpinnings and professionality – a case study of a teacher's practices involving students with experiences of school failure. *School Psychology International*, *36*(6), 589–604.

Fusch, P. I., Fusch, G. E., & Ness, L. R. (2017). How to conduct a mini-ethnographic case study: A guide for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, (3), 923.

Gaddis, S. M., & Lauen, D. L. (2014). School accountability and the black–white test score gap. *Social Science Research*, 4415–4431.

Gaikhorst, L., Beishuizen, J. J., Zijlstra, B. J., & Volman, M. L. (2015). Contribution of a professional development programme to the quality and retention of teachers in an urban environment. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(1), 41–57.

Gansle, K. A., Noell, G. H., Grandstaff-Beckers, G., Stringer, A., Roberts, N., & Burns, J. M. (2015). Value-added assessment of teacher preparation. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, *51*(2), 106–111.

Garcia, A., & Gomez, M. (2017). Player professional development: A case study of teacher resiliency within a community of practice. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *66*, 349–359.

Garcia, P. K., & Morales, P. Z. (2016). Scaling up success for English language learners in charter schools: Exploring the role of charter school authorizers. *Journal of School Choice*, *10*(4), 495–515.

Gefter, L., Morioka-Douglas, N., Srivastava, A., & Rodriguez, E. (2016). Supporting at-risk youth and their families to manage and prevent diabetes: developing a national partnership of medical residency programs and high schools. *Plos ONE*, *11*(7), 1–16.

Genao, S. (2014). Measuring the effectiveness of an alternative education collaboration. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *28*(4), 432–450.

Gesell, S. B., Sommer, E. C., Lambert, E. W., de Andrade, A. V., Whitaker, L., Davis, L., & ... Barkin, S. L. (2013). Comparative effectiveness of after-school programs to increase physical activity. *Journal of Obesity*, *2013*, 1–8.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (2013). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. New Brunswick: AldineTransaction.

Gomersall, T., Astell, A., Nygård, L., Sixsmith, A., Mihailidis, A., & Hwang, A. (2015). Living with ambiguity: A metasynthesis of qualitative research on mild cognitive impairment. Gerontologist, i(5), 892–912.

Good, T. L. (2008). *21st century education: a reference handbook*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Gorton, J., Williams, M., & Wrigley, T. (2014). Inspection judgements on urban schools: A case for the Defence. *Urban Review*, *46*(5), 891–903.

Graff, G. Redesigning racial caste in America via mass incarceration. *Journal of Psychohistory* [serial online]. Fall2015 2015; 43 (2):120–133.

Grarock, M., & Morrissey, A. (2013). Teachers' perceptions of their abilities to be educational leaders in Victorian childcare settings. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, *38*(2), 4–12.

Green, A., & Munoz, M. (2016). Predictors of new teacher satisfaction in urban schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, *26*(1), 92–123.

Green, T. L. (2017). Community-based equity audits. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *53*(1), 3–39.

Groble, P., & Brudney, J. (2016). Going by the book: preparing nonprofit leaders for volunteer risk and liability through nonprofit education programs. *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership*, (4), 331.

Gross, B., & Hill, P. T. (2016). The state role in k-12 education: From Issuing mandates to experimentation. *Harvard Law & Policy Review*, *10*(2), 299–326.

Grover, L. T., & Horent, E. (2015). Black in the south: Policy implications of racial disparity for the working poor. *Loyola Journal of Public Interest Law*, *17*(1), 145–182.

Gu, Q. q., Tang, T. T., & Jiang, W. j. (2015). Does moral leadership enhance employee creativity? Employee identification with leader and leader-member exchange (LMX) in the Chinese context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *126*(3), 513–529.

GuideStar. (2018). Reports and Form 990's for donors, businesses, and grant makers. Retrieved from http://www.guidestar.org/

Gwernan-Jones, R., Moore, D. A., Cooper, P., Russell, A. E., Richardson, M., Rogers, M., & ... Garside, R. (2016). A systematic review and synthesis of qualitative research: the influence of school context on symptoms of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties*, *21*(1), 83–100.

Hambacher, E. (2018). Resisting punitive school discipline: Perspectives and practices of exemplary urban elementary teachers. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)*, *31*(2), 102–118.

Hammack, F. M. (2016). Schooling for social mobility: High school reform for college access and success. *Journal of School Choice*, *10*(1), 96–111.

Hanza, M., Goodson, M., Osman, A., Porraz Capetillo, M., Hared, A., Nigon, J., & ... Sia, I. (2016). Lessons learned from community-led recruitment of immigrants and refugee participants for a randomized, community-based participatory research study. *Journal of Immigrant & Minority Health*, *18*(5), 1241–1245.

Harris, C. (2016). Procuring advantage in a competitive landscape. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy & Practice*, *31*(1/2), 135–150.

Hashemifard, T., Vaezi, A. A., Mazloomy, S. S., Kamalikhah, T., Khankolabi, M., Andishmand, A., & Baghianimoghadam, M. H. (2017). Exploring the adaptive experiences of children with parents of myocardial infarction: A Qualitative Study. *Electronic Physician*, *9*(7), 4906–4913.

Heiner, B. (2016). The procedural entrapment of mass incarceration. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, *42*(6), 594–631.

Herman, K. C., & Reinke, W. M. (2017). Improving teacher perceptions of parent involvement patterns: Findings from a group randomized trial. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *32*(1), 89–104.

Hlalele, D. D., & Tsotetsi, D. C. (2016). Promoting student teachers' adaptive capabilities through community engagement. *Perspectives in Education, 34*(3).

Holbein, J. B., & Ladd, H. F. (2017). Accountability pressure: Regression discontinuity estimates of how No Child Left Behind influenced student behavior. *Economics of Education Review*, *58*, 55–67

Horn, I. S. (2018). Accountability as a design for teacher learning: Sense making about mathematics and equity in the NCLB Era. *Urban Education*, *53*(3), 382–408.

Horvath, G. Á., & Harazin, P. (2016). A framework for an industrial ecological decision support system to foster partnerships between businesses and governments for sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *114*, 214–223.

Huang, H., & Sebastian, J. (2015). The role of schools in bridging within-school achievement gaps based on socioeconomic status: a cross-national comparative study. *Compare: A Journal Of Comparative & International Education*, *45*(4), 501–525.

Hughes, K. B., & Silva, S. M. (2013). Charter schools best practices'. Authentic leadership and context matter. *Advances in Educational Administration, 18,* 171–156.

Human-Vogel, S., & Dippenaar, H. (2013). Exploring pre-service student-teachers' commitment to community engagement in the second year of training. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *32*(2), 188–200.

Ikpa, V. W. (2016). Politics, adequacy, and education funding. *Education*, *136*(4), 468–472.

Jabbar, H. (2016). The visible hand: markets, politics, and regulation in post-Katrina New Orleans. *Harvard Educational Review*, (1), 1.

Jang, H. S., Valero, J., Kim, J., & Cramb, K. (2015). Understanding the diverse forms of nonprofit collaborations: A case study of communities in schools of north Texas and its partner organizations. *Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs*, *1*(2), 100.

Jasper, W. F. (2011). Protecting rights: Loyal Americans targeted by the SPLC. (Cover story). *New American (08856540)*, *27*(19), 10–18.

Jennings, J., & Sohn, H. (2014). Measure for measure: How proficiency-based accountability systems affect inequality in academic achievement. *Sociology of Education*, *87*(2), 125–141.

Jia, M., Jiuqing, C., & Hale, C. L. (2017). Workplace emotion and communication: Supervisor nonverbal immediacy, employees' emotion experience, and their communication motives. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *31*(1), 69–87.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Taylor, B. (1993). Impact of cooperative and individualistic learning on high-ability students' achievement, self-esteem, and social acceptance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *133*(6), 839–844.

Johnson-Burel, D., Drame, E., & Frattura, E. (2014). Participatory research in support of quality public education in New Orleans. *Educational Action Research*, *22*(3), 288–305.

Jonker, J. (2007). *The essence of research methodology: a concise guide for master and PhD students in management service*. New York, NY: Springer.

Joppa, M. C., Rizzo, C. J., Nieves, A. V., & Brown, L. K. (2016). Pilot investigation of the Katie Brown educational program: A school-community partnership. *Journal of School Health*, *86*(4), 288–297.

Jungert, T. (2014). Motives for becoming a teacher and their relations to academic engagement and dropout among student teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *40*(2), 173–185.

Kafle, N. (2013). Hermeneutic phenomenological research method simplified. *Bodhi: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *5*(1), 181–200.

Kamenetz, A. (2018). Students march; DeVos gets grilled; The funding gap widens.

Kamil, A., & Elder, S. (2015). *Great is the truth: secrecy, scandal, and the quest for justice at the Horace Mann School*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kaplan, R. M., Howard, V. J., Safford, M. M., & Howard, G. (2015). Original article: Educational attainment and longevity: results from the regards U.S. national cohort study of blacks and whites. *Annals of Epidemiology*, *25*, 323–328.

Kaufman, H. (2015). *Red tape: its origins, uses, and abuses*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Kearney, M. S., & Levine, P. B. (2016). Income inequality, social mobility, and the decision to drop out of high school. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 333.

Kellner, A., Townsend, K., & Wilkinson, A. (2017). 'The mission or the margin?' A high-performance work system in a non-profit organization. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *28*(14), 1938–1959.

Koyama, J. (2015). When things come undone: the promise of dissembling education policy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *36*(4), 548–559.

Kroeger, S., Beirne, J., & Kraus, T. (2015). You make the road by walking: A case study of partnership and collaboration. *Action Research*, *13*(4), 354–371.

Kronick, R. F., Lester, J. N., & Luter, D. G. (2013). Conclusion to higher education's role in public school reform and community engagement. *Peabody Journal of Education (0161956X)*, *88*(5), 657–664.

Kumari, J. (2016). Public–private partnerships in education: An analysis with special reference to Indian school education system. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *47*, 47–53.

LaFasto, F. M., & Larson, C. E. (2001). *When teams work best: 6,000 team members and leaders tell what it takes to succeed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Laine, K., & Hämäläinen, R. (2015). Collaborative business planning in initial vocational education and training. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, *67*(4), 497–514.

Lang, C. (2015). Raising quality of life through community partnerships. *Vanguard (Oklahoma State University)*, 26–27.

Larkin, P., & O'Connor, D. (2017). Talent identification and recruitment in youth soccer: Recruiter's perceptions of the key attributes for player recruitment. *Plos ONE*, *12*(4), 1–15.

Leatherwood, D. & Payne, C. (2016). Putting no child left behind, behind us: Rethinking education and inequality. *Social Service Review, 90*(3), 562–570.

LeChasseur, K. (2014). Critical race theory and the meaning of "community" in district partnerships. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *47*(3), 305–320.

Ledesma, S. (2015). Academically unacceptable: An elementary school's journey to reform. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A1, 76*

Lerman, S. (2014). Mapping the effects of policy on mathematics teacher education. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *87*(2), 187–201.

Levkoe, C., & Wakefield, S. (2016). The Community Food Centre: Creating space for a just, sustainable, and healthy food system. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 32–61.

Lichtenstein, B., & Weber, J. (2016). Losing ground: Racial disparities in medical debt and home foreclosure in the Deep South. *Family & Community Health: The Journal of Health Promotion & Maintenance*, *39*(3), 178–187.

Louisiana Department of Education. (2014). Louisiana's call to action: Recovery School District opportunities.

Louisiana Department of Education. (2015). Louisiana Believes: Annual school performance reports and detailed data 2014–2015.

Louisiana Department of Education. (2016). Louisiana Believes: Annual school performance reports and detailed data 2015–2016.

Louisiana Department of Education. (2017). Louisiana Believes: Annual school performance reports and detailed data 2016–2017.

Louisiana Department of Education. (2018). BESE policies-bulletins. Retrieved from http://bese.louisiana.gov/documents-resources/policies-bulletins

Ludden, A. B., O'Brien, E. M., & Pasch, K. E. (2017). Beliefs, behaviors, and contexts of adolescent caffeine use: A focus group study. *Substance Use & Misuse, 52*(9), 1207–1218.

Maas, T., & Lake, R. (2018). Passing notes: Learning from efforts to share instructional practices across district-charter lines.

MacIndoe, H., & Barman, E. (2013). How organizational stakeholders shape performance measurement in nonprofits: Exploring a multidimensional measure. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *42*(4), 716–738.

MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *12*(1), 73–84.

Makarova, E., & Birman, D. (2016). Minority students' psychological adjustment in the school context: an integrative review of qualitative research on acculturation. Intercultural Education, 27(1), 1–21.

Mallett, C. A. (2013). The Medicaid school program: An effective public school and private sector partnership. *Children & Schools*, *35*(1), 33–40.

Mann, H. (1845). *Lectures and annual reports on education*. Cambridge: Published for the editor.

Matsuraira, J. D., Hosek, A., & Walsh, E. (2012). An integrated assessment of the effects of Title I on school behavior, resources, and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, *31*(3), 1–14.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

May, A. M., & McGarvey, M. G. (2017). Gender, occupational segregation, and the cultural divide: Are red states different than blue states? *Review of Regional Studies*, *47*(2), 175–199.

McDonough, I. K. (2015). Dynamics of the black–white gap in academic achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, *47*, 17–33.

McDuffie, A. R., Choppin, J., Drake, C., Davis, J., Brown, J., & Borys, Z. (2017). Middle school mathematics teachers' use of CCSSM and curriculum resources in planning lessons. *North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education*, 39.

McElfresh, A. (2016). Why Louisiana teachers are leaving the classroom. Retrieved from https://www.theadvertiser.com/story/news/local/education/2016/12/07/why-louisiana-teachers-leaving-classroom/95093068/

Meens, D., & Howe, K. (2015). NCLB and its wake: Bad news for democracy. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(6), 1–44.

Men, L. R. (2014). Strategic internal communication: Transformational leadership, Communication Channels, and Employee Satisfaction. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *28*(2), 264–284.

Miguel, C., & Gargano, J. J. (2017). Moving beyond retribution: Alternatives to punishment in a society dominated by the school-to-prison pipeline. *Humanities (2076-0787)*, *6*(2), 1–9.

Minor, K. A., & Benner, A. D. (2018). School climate and college attendance for black adolescents: moving beyond college-going culture. *Journal of Research on Adolescence (Wiley-Blackwell)*, *28*(1), 160–168.

Minzner, A., Klerman, J. A., Markovitz, C. E., & Fink, B. (2014). The impact of capacity-building programs on nonprofits: A random assignment evaluation. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *43*(3), 547–569.

Mitchell, G., & Berlan, D. (2016). Evaluation and evaluative rigor in the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, *27*(2), 237–250.

Moore, S., & Kochan, F. (2013). Principals' perceptions of professional development in high- and low-performing high-poverty schools. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, *22*(2), 167–181.

Morsy, L. (2017). Mass incarceration and the achievement gap: the impact of imprisoned parents on children shows how criminal justice policy is education policy. *The American Prospect*, (2), 12.

Mozolic, J., & Shuster, J. (2016). Community engagement in K–12 tutoring programs: A research-based guide for best practices. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education, 6,* 143–160.

Mulligan, G. (2015). Global handbook of quality of life: Exploration of well-being of nations and continents. *Journal of Regional Science*, *55*(4), 673–675.

Mye, S., & Moracco, K. (2015). “Compassion, pleasantry, and hope”: A process evaluation of a volunteer-based nonprofit. *Evaluation & Program Planning*, *50,* 18–25.

Namei, K., & Insoo, I. (2017). Analysis of stakeholders' perceptions of zero tolerance policy for school violence in South Korea. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, *14*(1), 61–78.

Netcoh, S. (2017). Research paper: Balancing freedom and limitations: A case study of choice provision in a personalized learning class. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 66,* 383–392.

Newton, G. (2017). Research on why teachers quit uncovers key to retention. *Education Journal*, (290), 13.

Officer, S. H., Grim, J., Medina, M. A., Bringle, R. G., & Foreman, A. (2013). Strengthening community schools through university partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education (0161956X), 88*(5), 564–577.

Ousey, G. C. (2017). Crime is not the only problem: Examining why violence & adverse health outcomes co-vary across large U.S. counties. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 50,* 29–41.

Owens, C. D. (2013). *Exploring the relationship between COMPASS students learning measures and high school math teachers' sense of efficacy in two northeast Louisiana school districts* (Order No. 3578811). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I. (1503667595).

Paarlberg, L., Nesbit, R., Clerkin, R., & Christensen, R. (2014). Leading, following or complementing in economic crisis: A conceptual model illustrating nonprofit relationships with public schools. *Administrative Sciences (2076–3387), 4*(2), 120–136.

Pacione, M. (2014). *Progress in Political Geography (Routledge Revivals).* New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health, 42*(5), 533–544.

Paluta, L. M., Lower, L., Anderson-Butcher, D., Gibson, A., & Iachini, A. L. (2016). Examining the quality of 21st Century Community Learning Center after-school programs: Current practices and their relationship to outcomes. *Children & Schools*, *38*(1), 49–56.

Pandey, S., Kim, M., & Pandey, S. K. (2017). Do mission statements matter for nonprofit performance?. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, *27*(3), 389–410.

Park, H., Lin, C., Liu, C., & Tabb, K. M. (2015). The relationships between after-school programs, academic outcomes, and behavioral developmental outcomes of Latino children from immigrant families: Findings from the 2005 National Household Education Surveys Program. *Children & Youth Services Review*, *53*77–83.

Patel, L., Schmid, J., & Hochfeld, T. (2012). Transforming social work services in South Africa: Perspectives of NPO managers. *Administration in Social Work*, *36*(2), 212–230.

Patten, D. (2016). The mass incarceration of nations and the global war on drugs: Comparing the United States' domestic and foreign drug policies. *Social Justice*, *43*(1), 121.

Peck, J. (2016). The right to work, and the right at work. *Economic Geography*, *92*(1), 4–30.

Perkins, T. (2015). School–community partnerships, friend or foe? The doublespeak of community with educational partnerships. *Educational Studies*, *51*(4), 317–336.

Peters, S. J., & Pereira, N. (2017). A Replication of the internal validity structure of three major teaching rating scales. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *28*(2), 101–119.

Polesel, J., Klatt, M., Blake, D., & Starr, K. (2017). Understanding the nature of school partnerships with business in delivery of vocational programmes in schools in Australia. *Journal of Education & Work*, *30*(3), 283–298.

Preetha, R. (2014). An integrated approach towards legitimization of single case design-working paper. *Procedia Economics And Finance*, *11*(Shaping the Future of Business and Society), 812–818.

Price, H. E. (2016). Assessing U.S. public school quality. *Educational Policy*, *30*(3), 403–433.

Ramlo, S. (2015). Theoretical significance in Q methodology: A qualitative approach to a mixed method. *Research in the Schools*, *22*(1), 73–87.

Reaves, S., McMahon, S. D., Duffy, S. N., & Ruiz, L. (2018). The test of time: A meta-analytic review of the relation between school climate and problem behavior. *Aggression & Violent Behavior*, *39*, 100–108.

Reif, S., Pence, B., Hall, I., Hu, X., Whetten, K., & Wilson, E. (2015). HIV diagnoses, prevalence and outcomes in nine southern states. *Journal of Community Health*, *40*(4), 642–651.

Reno, G. D., Friend, J. J., Caruthers, L., & Smith, D. (2017). Who's getting targeted for behavioral interventions? Exploring the connections between school culture, positive behavior support, and elementary student achievement. *Journal of Negro Education*, *86*(4), 423–438.

Riley, C. (2014). De-essentializing No Child Left Behind. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, *13*(4), 622–629.

Robertson, W. (2015). Mapping the profit motive: the distinct geography and demography of for-profit charter schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *23*(69/70), 1–27.

Robinson, L., Adair, P., Coffey, M., Harris, R., & Burnside, G. (2016). Identifying the participant characteristics that predict recruitment and retention of participants to randomized controlled trials involving children: a systematic review. *Trials*, *17* 1–17.

Robison, S., Jaggers, J., Rhodes, J., Blackmon, B. J., & Church, W. (2017). Correlates of educational success: Predictors of school dropout and graduation for urban students in the Deep South. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *73,* 37–46.

Roch, C. H., & Na, S. (2015). Nonprofit, for-profit, or stand-alone? How management organizations influence the working conditions in charter schools. *Social Science Quarterly (Wiley-Blackwell)*, *96*(5), 1380–1395.

Rosen, E. (2013). *The bounty effect: 7 steps to the culture of collaboration*. San Francisco, CA: Red Ape Publishing

Roth, R. A., Suldo, S. M., & Ferron, J. M. (2017). Improving middle school students' subjective well-being: Efficacy of a multicomponent positive psychology intervention targeting small groups of youth. *School Psychology Review*, *46*(1), 21–41.

Salamon, L. M. (2014). *Leverage for good: an introduction to the new frontiers of philanthropy and social investment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Salamon, L. M. (2015). *The resilient sector revisited the new challenge to nonprofit America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Salamon, L.M. (1999). *America's nonprofit sector: A primer*. New York: The Foundation Center.

Saldaña, J. (2015). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Savage, M. J., & Drake, S. M. (2016). Living transdisciplinary curriculum: Teachers' experiences with the international baccalaureate's primary years programme. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *9*(1), 1–20.

Schmuck, R.; Bell, S.; & Bell, W.; (2012), *the handbook of organizational development in schools and colleges: Building regenerative change*. (5th ed.). Santa Cruz, CA: Exchange Pointe International (EPI).

Schneider, M. K. (2014). *A chronicle of echoes: who's who in the implosion of American public education*. New York City: Information Age Publishing.

Schneider, M. K. (2015). *Common core dilemma: who owns our schools?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Seaworth, A. (2012). Rice University: Building an academic center for nonprofit education. *Continuing Higher Education Review, 76,* 175–182.

Sentell, W. (2017). Louisiana teachers to face tougher job reviews in new school year under controversial evaluations. Retrieved from http://www.theadvocate.com/baton_rouge/news/politics/article_b80af760-76d5-11e7-b99a-9b931f3ecda5.html

Sentell, W. (2017). Louisiana's tougher tenure law sparks exodus of up to 1,700 teachers, report says. Retrieved from http://www.theadvocate.com/baton_rouge/news/education/article_604e1632-f850-11e6-ba76-a3e8cd558fca.html

Sentell, W. (2018). Louisiana's teacher shortage is real; here's what caused it, how state lawmakers look to solve it. Retrieved from http://www.theadvocate.com/baton_rouge/news/education/article_cf0ad310-3375-11e8-99a3-2b8866c895ad.html?utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter&utm_campaign=user-share

Shirrell, M. (2016). New principals, accountability, and commitment in low-performing schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *54*(5), 558–574.

Siegel-Hawley, G. g., Thachik, S., & Bridges, K. (2017). Reform with reinvestment: Values and tensions in gentrifying urban schools. *Education & Urban Society*, *49*(4), 403–433.

Sills, M. (2014). Teacher may face penalties for bailing early: Lafayette explores fines for early resignations. Retrieved from http://www.theadvocate.com/acadiana/news/education/article_7012b150-d237-5b8c-a39b-48501750faa8.html

Singh, M. (2015). Influence of socioeconomic disadvantages on mathematics achievement: A multilevel cohort analysis. *Journal of Educational Research*, *108*(5), 347–357.

Soliman, J. (2018). The Even Start family literacy program: The rise and fall of family literacy and the need for its return. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy*, *25*(3), 427–450.

Stern, R. (2016). Principled Neglect and Compliance: Responses to NCLB and the CCSS at an expeditionary learning middle school. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, *15*(4), 448–480.

Stevenson, Z., & Shetley, P. R. (2015). School district and university leadership development collaborations: How do three partnerships line up with best practices? *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, *20*(1/2), 169–181.

Stewart, J., Lambert, M. D., Ulmer, J. D., Witt, P. A., & Carraway, C. L. (2017). Discovering quality in teacher education: Perceptions concerning what makes an effective cooperating teacher. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *58*(1), 280–299.

Stringfield, S., Teddlie, C., & Suarez, S. (2017). Classroom interaction in effective and ineffective schools: Preliminary results from phase III of the Louisiana school effectiveness study. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, *52*(1), 4–14.

Suh, Y. (2016). The role of relational social capital and communication in the relationship between CSR and employee attitudes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *23*(4), 410–423.

Sun, M., Saultz, A., & Ye, Y. (2017). Federal policy and the teacher labor market: Exploring the effects of NCLB school accountability on teacher turnover. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, *28*(1), 102–122.

Tai Mei, K., & Kareem, O. A. (2016). Teacher attitudes toward change: A comparison between high- and mediocre-performing secondary schools in Malaysia. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, *44*(1), 105–127.

Tannehill, D., & MacPhail, A. (2017). Teacher empowerment through engagement in a learning community in Ireland: Working across disadvantaged schools. *Professional Development in Education*, *43*(3), 334–352.

Telese, J. A. (2012). Middle school mathematics teachers' professional development and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, *105*(2), 102–111.

Tell, S. (2015). Can a charter school not be a charter school?. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)*, *13*(2), 315–347.

Temple, J. A., & Reynolds, A. J. (2015). Using social-impact borrowing to expand preschool-to-third grade programs in urban schools. *Journal Of Education For Students Placed At Risk*, *20*(4), 281–292.

Tighe, J. R., Needle, E., & Hawkins, R. (2015). Race, space, and the Urban South: Then and now. *Journal of Policy Practice*, *14*(2), 96–113.

Trainor, A. A., & Leko, M. (2014). Qualitative special education research: Purpose, rigor, and contribution. *Remedial & Special Education*, *35*(5), 263–266.

Ujifusa, A. (2018). House spending bill would give small boost to education, reject cuts by DeVos.

University of Indiana. (n.d.). Internal Validity. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~p1013447/dictionary/int_val.htm

Valero, J. N., Jung, K., & Andrew, S. A. (2015). Does transformational leadership build resilient public and nonprofit organizations? *Disaster Prevention & Management*, *24*(1), 4–20.

Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2016). Typologizing school–community partnerships. *Urban Education*, *51*(7), 719–747.

Verstegen, D. A. (2016). Policy perspectives on state elementary and secondary public education finance systems in the United States. *Educational Considerations*, *43*(2), 25–32.

Virginia, W. (2016). Research Methods: Triangulation. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, *11*(1), 66–68.

von der Embse, N. P., Pendergast, L. L., Segool, N., Saeki, E., & Ryan, S. (2016). The influence of test-based accountability policies on school climate and teacher stress across four states. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *59*, 492–502.

Wagner, M. M., Newman, L. A., & Javitz, H. S. (2016). The benefits of high school career and technical education (CTE) for youth with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *49*(6), 658–670.

Ware, L. (2017). Discriminatory discipline: The racial crisis in America's public schools. *UMKC Law Review*, *85*(3), 739–772.

Wascher, S., Salloch, S., Ritter, P., Vollmann, J., & Schildmann, J. (2017). Methodological reflections on the contribution of qualitative research to the evaluation of clinical ethics support services. *Bioethics*, *31*(4), 237–245.

Watson, H. I. (2015). An examination of the effect of the support field strategist program on academic achievement in 'academically unacceptable' Louisiana high schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A1*, *76*,

Weinstein, G. I. (2014). From Alaska: A 21st Century Story of indigenous self-determination in Urban American public education. *Diaspora, Indigenous & Minority Education*, *8*(4), 223–236.

Weiwei, L., & Qiushi Wang1, q. (2016). What helped nonprofits weather the great recession? *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, *26*(3), 257–276.

Wentworth, L., Mazzeo, C., & Connolly, F. (2017). Research practice partnerships: a strategy for promoting evidence-based decision-making in education. *Educational Research*, *59*(2), 241–255.

Wieczorek, D. (2017). Principals' perceptions of public schools' professional development changes during NCLB. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *25*(8/9), 1–49.

Williams, K., & Hebert, D. (2017). Secondary school administrators' perceptions of Louisiana's COMPASS system as a framework for teacher evaluation. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, *14*(1), 19–30.

Wilson, E. K. (2016). The new school segregation. *Cornell Law Review*, *102*(1), 139–210.

Wolfe, M. J. (2017). Post-Qualitative filmic research in education: Utilizing a “re/active documentary” methodology. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *23*(6), 427–437.

Word, J. J., & Carpenter, H. (2013). The new public service? Applying the public service motivation model to nonprofit employees. *Public Personnel Management*, *42*(3), 315–336.

Wright, K., & Suro, Z. (2014). Using community–academic partnerships and a comprehensive school-based program to decrease health disparities in activity in school-aged children. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, *42*(2), 125–139.

Yan, J., Guo, C., & Paarlberg, L. E. (2014). Are nonprofit antipoverty organizations located where they are needed? A spatial analysis of the Greater Hartford region. *American Statistician*, *68*(4), 243–252.

Yilmaz, D., & Kiliçoglu, G. (2013). Organizational change process: A study in Turkish primary public schools. *Educational Planning*, *21*(2), 19–39.

Yost, B. L. (2017). A phenomenology study of first-year teachers looking at the shared lived experience of learning to grade. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, *77.*

Appendix A: Concordia University IRB Approval

CONCORDIA
UNIVERSITY
-PORTLAND, OREGON-

DATE:	February 6, 2018
TO:	Frederic Washington, M.S.
FROM:	Concordia University - Portland IRB (CU IRB)
PROJECT TITLE:	[1160322-1 and -2] Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in Urban Louisiana Communities: A Case Study
REFERENCE #:	EDD-20171205-Jimenez-Washington
SUBMISSION TYPE:	New Project and Modifications
ACTION:	APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE:	February 6, 2018
EXPIRATION DATE:	February 6, 2019
REVIEW TYPE:	Expedited Review

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Concordia University - Portland IRB (CU IRB) has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

Your project includes research that will be conducted within an institution that is not Concordia University. As such, you need to have their permission to conduct research. You are responsible for contacting and following the procedures and policies of Concordia University and the other institution where you conduct research. You cannot begin recruitment or collection of data within that institution until you receive approval from that institution.

This submission has received Expedited Review based on the applicable federal regulations.

Attached is a stamped copy of the approved consent/assent form(s). You must use this/these stamped versions. The consent form has been edited slightly and stamped as approved. Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the project and insurance of participant understanding followed by a signed consent form. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require that each participant receives a copy of the consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. The form needed to request a revision is called a Modification Request Form, which is available at www.cu-portland.edu/IRB/Forms.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. Please email the CU IRB Director directly, at obranch@cu-portland.edu, if you have an unanticipated problem or other such urgent question or report.

All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must be reported promptly to this office.

This project requires continuing review from the CU IRB on an annual basis. Please use the appropriate forms for this procedure. Your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date of February 6, 2019.

You must submit a close-out report at the expiration of your project or upon completion of your project. The Close-out Report Form is available at www.cu-portland.edu/IRB/Forms.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after the completion of the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. OraLee Branch at 503-493-6390 or irb@cu-portland.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Concordia University - Portland IRB (CU IRB)'s records. February 6, 2018

Appendix B: Request for Permission to School District

Frederic D. Washington
[redacted]
Shreveport, Louisiana 71115-2257
[redacted]

[redacted] Parish School Board
Attn: [redacted], Superintendent
cc: [redacted] Chief Academic Officer
[redacted]
[redacted], Louisiana 7[redacted]

02/07/2018

Greetings, [redacted]

I hope this letter finds you well. I am Frederic Washington and I am currently pursuing my doctor of education degree with a concentration in leadership and transformation through the College of Education at Concordia University Portland.

My dissertation proposal titled, "Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in Urban Louisiana Communities: A Case Study" was recently approved for study by the institutional review board (IRB). The purpose of the study is to explore the perceptions of teachers regarding the impact nonprofit organization programs have on the performance, culture, and climate of urban K-8 schools rated by the Louisiana Department of Education as "F" or Academically Unacceptable.

I am writing this letter seeking permission to recruit between 8 and 12 teachers to participate in this study. The data collection methods (interviews, focus group discussion, and survey) will take place off campus, outside of school hours. This study seeks to understand their perceptions of external programs afforded to schools by nonprofit organizations.

The identities of teachers, schools, specific organizations, and specific neighborhoods will be redacted, and no sensitive information that would compromise the identity of students will be solicited. Discussions will focus solely on their perceptions of programs and how they impact performance, culture, and climate. Information pertaining district sanctioned policies or direct sponsored programs will not be solicited or included. Information relative teacher satisfaction will not be solicited or included.

If you have any additional questions or concerns, please contact me at the information provided above. If you want to talk with a participant advocate other than the investigator, you can write or call the director of our institutional review board, Dr. Oralee Branch (email obranch@cu-portland.edu or call 503-493-6390).

Respectfully,
Frederic D. Washington, M.S.

Appendix C: Approval from School District

[redacted] PARISH SCHOOL BOARD

POST OFFICE BOX [redacted] LOUISIANA [redacted]
AREA CODE [redacted] Telephone [redacted]

[redacted]
Superintendent

February 7, 2018

Frederic D. Washington
[redacted]
Shreveport, LA 71115-2257

Dear Mr. Washington:

I commend you on your efforts to pursue an advanced degree. Your dissertation entitled *"Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in Urban Louisiana Communities: A Case Study"* (urban K-8 schools rated by the Louisiana Department of Education as "F" or Academically Unacceptable) within the [redacted] Parish School District has been approved.

Your project will be coordinated through the office of [redacted], Supervisor-Accountability and Data, via e-mail at [redacted].

Research participation of [redacted] employees is strictly on a voluntary basis.

Approval of the research study does not mandate/require [redacted] employees to participate.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

[redacted]
Chief Academic Officer

c: Elementary School Directors
Middle School Directors
[redacted], Supervisor – Accountability and Data
Elementary Principals
Middle School Principals

Appendix D: Informed Consent Form

Concordia University – Portland Institutional Review Board
Approved: February 6, 2018; will Expire: February 6, 2019

CONSENT FORM

Research Study Title:	Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in Urban Louisiana Communities: A Case Study
Principal Investigator:	Frederic D. Washington
Research Institution:	Concordia University Portland
Faculty Advisor:	Mark E. Jimenez, Ed.D.

Purpose and what you will be doing:

The purpose of this study is to explore how teachers working in K-8 schools classified as Academically Unacceptable in urban Louisiana communities perceive the impact nonprofit programs have on performance, culture, and climate. We expect approximately 12 volunteers (6 elementary teachers – grades K-5, and six middle grades teachers – grades 6-8). We will begin enrollment on approximately February 5th, 2018 and will end enrollment on February 19th, 2018. To be in this study you will need to have worked at a [redacted] Parish Elementary or Middle school during the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 academic terms. The school would have needed to be classified as Academically Unacceptable (AUS) by the Louisiana Department of Education during at least one school year during the specified academic terms. To be in this study, you will need to be able to participate in an individual interview that will last 30 minutes. A week following the individual interviews, you will participate in a 2 hour focus group discussion with teachers who work in schools with similar grade configurations. Following the interview and focus group discussion, you will be emailed a survey to wrap up. During the interview and focus group discussion, you will be asked similar questions which will prompt you to discuss how nonprofit programs impact the performance, culture, and climate of your school. Although interview, focus group, and survey questions will not ask for specific information such as names, titles, locations, and specific programs, you are strongly encouraged to respond generally to focus group questions in the event of discomfort. The survey at the end will allow you to further share your thoughts regarding the subject topic.

Risks:

There are no risks to participating in this study other than providing your information. However, we will protect your information. We will record interviews. The recording will be transcribed via the investigator, and the recording will be deleted when the transcription is completed. When we or any of our investigators look at the data, none of the data will have your name or identifying information. We will only use a secret code to analyze the data. We will not identify you in any publication or report. The recording will be deleted as soon as possible; all study documents will be destroyed 3 years after we conclude this study. I also want to share that the interview, focus group discussion, and surveys will not prompt participants to disclose specific names or specific incidents.

Benefits:

As a participant, you may not directly benefit from the study; however, findings from the study will contribute to discussions relative to program evaluation and the impact nonprofit programs have on transforming the performance, culture, and climate of schools in urban communities identified as failing.

Concordia University – Portland Institutional Review Board
Approved: ; will Expire:

Confidentiality:
This information will not be distributed to any other agency and will be kept private and confidential. The only exception to this is if you tell us abuse or neglect that makes us seriously concerned for your immediate health and safety.

Right to Withdraw:
Your participation is greatly appreciated, but we acknowledge that the questions we are asking are personal in nature. You are free at any point to choose not to engage with or stop the study. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer. This study is not required and there is no penalty for not participating. If at any time you experience a negative emotion from answering the questions, we will stop asking you questions.

Contact Information:
You will receive a copy of this consent form. If you have questions you can talk to or write the principal investigator, Frederic D. Washington at [redacted] or call [redacted] you want to talk with a participant advocate other than the investigator, you can write or call the director of our institutional review board, Dr. Oralee Branch (email obranch@cu-portland.edu or call 503-493-6390).

Your Statement of Consent:
I have read the above information. I asked questions if I had them, and my questions were answered. I volunteer my consent for this study.

_____	_____
Participant Name	Date
_____	_____
Participant Signature	Date
_____	_____
Investigator Name	Date
_____	_____
Investigator Signature	Date

Investigator: Frederic D. Washington; email: fredericwashington25@gmail.com
c/o: Professor Mark E. Jimenez, Ed.D.;
Concordia University – Portland
2811 NE Holman Street
Portland, Oregon 97221

Appendix E: Written Gratitude to Participants of the Study

From the Desk of Mr. Frederic D. Washington

Participants' First and Last Name
Numerical Mailing Address
City, State, Zip
xxx-xxx-xxxx

March 4, 2018

Greetings, Participant:

I hope this letter finds you well. I wanted to extend gratitude to you for participating in my study titled, Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in Urban Louisiana Communities: A Case Study.

The information provided through your interview, focus group discussion with colleagues, and survey input will contribute to the existing literature pertaining to education, nonprofits, and transformational leadership.

As noted before, during, and after the recruitment process, your privacy is protected and your name will not be published in any literature pertaining to your participation in this study. At the time the study is approved and published, a copy for review will be available.

Should you have any additional questions pertaining to your participation in this study, please contact me immediately.

Once again, thanks for your participation.

Respectfully,

Frederic D. Washington

Frederic D. Washington

Appendix F: Interview Items

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Please share many years have you been teaching at your current school and what grades/subjects do you teach? Do you teach regular education or special education?

2. Please share your total years of experience as teacher of record in Louisiana.

3. Did you complete teacher certification through a traditional program or via alternative certification?

4. Please share and describe your familiarity with (any or all of) the following programs: fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant program, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers.

5. Please share and describe your involvement or interaction with (any or all of) the following programs: fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant program, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers.

6. How do you feel about these programs being offered to your school?

7. Describe how these programs impact the culture and climate of your classroom.

8. Describe how these programs impact the annual school performance ratings?

9. Do you feel these programs positively or negatively impact school culture and climate? Explain.

10. Do you feel these programs positively or negatively impact the annual school performance rating? Explain.

11. Do you feel the programs discussed reflect what is needed in your school building pertaining to performance, culture, and, climate? Explain.

12. Please share any other ideas, comments, or thoughts pertaining to what we discussed.

Appendix G: Focus Group Items

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. **As teachers working in schools classified as Academically Unacceptable by the Louisiana Department of Education, describe how you feel about programs such as fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers.**

2. **Explain how these programs accent the core mission and objective of your school.**

3. **Describe how these programs impact the culture and climate of the overall school setting.**

4. **Describe how these programs impact the annual school performance ratings.**

5. **Explain how these programs align with the needs of your school.**

6. **Do you feel that one of these programs is more effective in terms of addressing performance, culture, and climate than others? If so, which program(s) and why?**

7. **Do you feel that one of these programs is less effective in terms of addressing performance, culture, and climate than others? If so, which program(s) and why?**

8. **Do you feel that teacher input directly to nonprofit organizations could impact the quality of programs offered to schools?**

9. **Please share any other ideas, comments, or thoughts pertaining to what we have discussed.**

Appendix H: IRB Approved Survey

SURVEY

SURVEY ITEM	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Programs afforded to my school by nonprofit organizations (fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers) positively impact culture and climate.					
Programs afforded to my school by nonprofit organizations (fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers) positively impact the annual school performance rating.					
Programs afforded to my school by nonprofit organizations (fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers) reflect what is needed on our campus.					
Within the five programs afforded to my school (fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers), some programs are better needed on our campus than others.					
I feel the fight diversion program has contributed to the reduction the number of fights, disturbances, and suspensions on campus.					
I feel the teacher academy/mini grant program has contributed to my professional development and growth in the classroom.					
I feel that the community learning centers and after school for all programs provide enriching programs to students that is relevant to improving grades, behavior, and/or attendance.					
I feel that programs such as teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect impacts attendance and student performance.					

- Do you feel nonprofit programs (fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers) positively or negatively impact annual school performance ratings?

- Do you feel nonprofit programs (fight diversion, teacher academy/mini grant, after school for all, teenage pregnancy prevention/sex respect, and community learning centers) positively or negatively impact culture and climate within the school building?

- Please share any other thoughts, ideas, or questions relative to the content of this survey.

Appendix I: Statement of Original Work

The Concordia University Doctorate of Education Program is a collaborative community of scholar-practitioners, who seek to transform society by pursuing ethically-informed, rigorously- researched, inquiry-based projects that benefit professional, institutional, and local educational contexts. Each member of the community affirms throughout their program of study, adherence to the principles and standards outlined in the Concordia University Academic Integrity Policy. This policy states the following:

Statement of academic integrity.

As a member of the Concordia University community, I will neither engage in fraudulent or unauthorized behaviors in the presentation and completion of my work, nor will I provide unauthorized assistance to others.

Explanations:

What does "fraudulent" mean?

"Fraudulent" work is any material submitted for evaluation that is falsely or improperly presented as one's own. This includes, but is not limited to texts, graphics and other multi-media files appropriated from any source, including another individual, that are intentionally presented as all or part of a candidate's final work without full and complete documentation.

What is "unauthorized" assistance?

"Unauthorized assistance" refers to any support candidates solicit in the completion of their work, that has not been either explicitly specified as appropriate by the instructor, or any assistance that is understood in the class context as inappropriate. This can include, but is not limited to:

- Use of unauthorized notes or another's work during an online test
- Use of unauthorized notes or personal assistance in an online exam setting
- Inappropriate collaboration in preparation and/or completion of a project
- Unauthorized solicitation of professional resources for the completion of the work.

Statement of Original Work

I attest that:

1. I have read, understood, and complied with all aspects of the Concordia University-Portland Academic Integrity Policy during the development and writing of this dissertation.
2. Where information and/or materials from outside sources has been used in the production of this dissertation, all information and/or materials from outside sources has been properly referenced and all permissions required for use of the information and/or materials have been obtained, in accordance with research standards outlined in the *Publication Manual of The American Psychological Association*

Digital Signature

Frederic D. Washington

Name (Typed)

08/01/2018

Date

Appendix J: Concordia University IRB Closeout Approval

CONCORDIA
UNIVERSITY
-PORTLAND, OREGON-

DATE:	August 6, 2018
TO:	Frederic Washington, M.S.
FROM:	Concordia University - Portland IRB (CU IRB)
PROJECT TITLE:	[1160322-2] Perceptions of Educators Regarding the Impact Nonprofits have on Academically Unacceptable Schools in Urban Louisiana Communities: A Case Study
REFERENCE #:	EDD-20171205-Jimenez-Washington
SUBMISSION TYPE:	Amendment/Modification
ACTION:	APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE:	August 5, 2018
EXPIRATION DATE:	February 6, 2019
REVIEW TYPE:	Administrative Review

Thank you for your submission of Closure/Final Report materials for this project. The Concordia University - Portland IRB (CU IRB) has APPROVED your submission and closed your project.

This submission has received Administrative Review based on the applicable federal regulations.

Congratulations on your achievements, both in reaching this milestone in finishing your dissertation and in the benefits that your research brings to the scholarly community and institutions involved.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after the completion of the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. OraLee Branch at 503-493-6390 or irb@cu-portland.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Concordia University - Portland IRB (CU IRB)'s records. August 6, 2018