Community School Leadership: Identifying Qualities Necessary for Developing and Supporting Equity-Centered Principals

Linda K. Mayger & Kathleen Provinzano

Published online: 27 Jul 2020.

Submit your article to this journal

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Community School Leadership: Identifying Qualities Necessary for Developing and Supporting Equity-Centered Principals

Linda K. Mayger [a] and Kathleen Provinzano[b]

aSchool of Education, The College of New Jersey, Ewing, NJ, USA; bSchool of Education, Drexel University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

ABSTRACT

This study determined what principals need to successfully lead community schools and the extent principals are prepared to lead them. The authors of this qualitative study collected data from a broad sample of community school experts, principals, and directors to develop a list of necessary qualities for community school principals. Although the qualities were reflected in the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, practitioners appeared to struggle with operationalizing their espoused commitments to equity and meaningful community engagement into action. The authors partially attribute the disconnect between beliefs and behavior to a lack of coherent preparation that addresses community equity literacy.

Research spanning decades calls attention to the relationship between neighborhood social and economic demographics and academic outcomes (e.g., Green, 2018; Kerr & Dyson, 2016; Sirin, 2005). It is well documented that inequitable neighborhood conditions, particularly in high-poverty urban areas, influence the scale and quality of resources available to students, negatively impacting their overall achievement (Cashin, 2015; T. Green, 2015; Ruiz et al., 2018). This is concerning for many reasons, as 24% of public-school students attend high-poverty schools, and 26% attend mid-high poverty schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019). It is particularly worrisome for racially minoritized youth, who experience higher rates of poverty (Kids Count Data Center, 2019), are more likely to experience multidimensional poverty (Reeves et al., 2016), and typically attend higher-poverty schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019). It is clear that "where schools are located matters" (Green, 2018, p. 487).

Engaging and developing the community around the school is a central strategy for mitigating the devastating effects of poverty on students' well-being and academic performance (Biag & Castrechini, 2016). Despite this knowledge, reform initiatives over the last 25 years have focused on school-based standards and accountability measures (Berliner, 2006), separate and apart from the community context. Schools alone have been tasked with fixing systemic issues associated with disadvantage, namely concentrated poverty and systemic racism (Milner, 2013), but they lack the resources to do so (Lawson et al., 2016). Thus, school principals must resituate improvement efforts through expanded and collaborative partnerships that simultaneously support educational reform and community development (T. Green, 2015; N. Keith, 1996). A growing movement of over 5,000 community schools in the United States and elsewhere internationally offer the landscape for this to occur (Heers et al., 2016).

Community schools acknowledge that traditional school approaches have failed to provide optimal environments for the development of children (Heers et al., 2016). Although there are variations in nomenclature and conceptions of what a community school is (Valli et al., 2016),

CONTACT Linda K. Mayger ✉ maygerL@tcnj.edu 🖃 Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education, The College of New Jersey, 2000 Pennington Road, Ewing Township, NJ 08628, USA.

a consensus on the core elements of a community school has emerged from the expanding literature base and the Coalition for Community Schools, a national organization that provides a venue for information sharing and advocacy on community schools (Lubell, 2011). In a comprehensive review of 143 community school studies and 49 research syntheses, Maier et al. (2017) determined that community schools share four characteristics: (a) integrated student supports, (b) expanded learning opportunities, (c) family and community engagement, and (d) collaborative leadership and practice. At the core of the community school strategy is the belief that the inextricable connection between school and community (Warren, 2005) must be mindfully developed, supported, and nurtured through meaningful partnerships to systematically address myriad needs of schools and communities. Exemplar community schools are positioned as place-based initiatives that extend the reform lens to school and neighborhood contexts by way of interagency collaboration and authentic relationships amongst school and community stakeholders (Dryfoos, 2005; Fehrer & Leos-Urbel, 2016).

Although adept leadership is vital to the effectiveness of a community school, the scholarly literature offers only a few studies focused solely on community school principals. Prior research indicates that community school implementation entails a significant amount of collaboration amongst multiple stakeholders, and principals are oftentimes responsible for cultivating these relationships and leading partnership efforts (FitzGerald & Quiñones, 2018; Sanders, 2016, 2018). Further, Min et al.'s (2017) review of the full-service community school literature explained that transformation into a community school requires a principal who is open to integrating "outsiders" into the school building and leadership structures. These overlapping partnerships require principals to forgo top-down leadership and support decisions "that are made through teams of people from different positions that share responsibility" (Green, 2017, p. 377). Studies also indicate that some community school principals have struggled with managing interpersonal conflicts (Sanders, 2018), resolving interethnic tensions among community members (Galindo et al., 2017), and fully grasping the foundational principles of the community school strategy (Adams, 2019; Mayger & Hochbein, 2019; Medina et al., 2019). The literature is also limited because most of the studies mentioned in this paragraph relied on samples of one to three schools from a single district and none address how community school leaders are developed.

Purpose

The increasing popularity of community schools (Heers et al., 2016) warrants a broader investigation into what principals need to believe and do to successfully lead community school efforts, and the extent to which principals are prepared to lead them. This article does just that. The limitations of the current research base indicate practitioners, policymakers, and faculty in principal preparation programs would benefit from more information about principals and community school leadership. The current study provides this information by engaging a broad, representative group of 47 community school experts, principals, and directors and using multiple qualitative methods to compile a list of characteristics, dispositions, and behaviors of successful community school principals. To interpret the extent the results aligned with the skills and dispositions necessary to address inequities in schools and communities, we drew upon Green's (Green, 2017, 2018) Community Equity Literacy framework (CEL) in our analysis. The study's design also reflects that principal preparation is an area where leadership and policy intersect, as state laws and national accrediting organizations often mandate formal preparation programs be aligned with professional standards (Slater et al., 2018). We, therefore, capitalize on the current study's focus on an emerging area of school leadership to participate in the ongoing examination of the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders' (PSEL) (National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], 2015) accuracy and relevancy recommended by Tucker et al. (2016). With these ends in mind, this research focuses on the following questions:

Which attitudes, characteristics, and behaviors are necessary for principals to successfully lead community schools?

How do those attitudes, characteristics, and behaviors reflect professional standards and CEL?

How have principals learned to lead community schools?

The following sections discuss CEL, the preparation of school principals, and the PSELs. After explaining the methods of the investigation, we share our findings, and conclude the article with a discussion of the study's implications for leading community schools, preparing principals, and fostering equity for historically marginalized students.

Perspectives from the literature and theoretical framework

Community school principals and CEL

Research indicates that school principals and community leaders share a mutual interest in reforming public schools while simultaneously engaging in activities that address inequitable community conditions (Ishimaru & Galloway, 2014; Khalifa, 2012; Lopez, 2003). Schools do not operate in isolation of or separate from their neighborhoods and educational leaders must be prepared to cultivate partnerships and lead within and across school and community landscapes (Keith, 1996, 1999; Khalifa, 2012; Noguera & Wells, 2011; Scanlan & Johnson, 2015; Theoharis, 2007). Green and Rodgers (2019) contend, however "… school leaders are neither prepared to establish equitable and authentic partnerships with families and communities of color nor counter the neighborhood-based inequities that shape students' in-school experiences" (p. 36). Moreover, Green (2018) attributes lack of preparation, in part, to the absence of equity-centered leadership frameworks designed to enhance principals' capacity to generate actions that improve outcomes for both.

Community schools specifically focus on supporting student development by forging partnerships with stakeholders (e.g., parents, community-based organizations, local government, faith-based entities) to address systemic inequities that exacerbate in and out-of-school opportunity and achievement gaps (Maier et al., 2017). It is therefore important to understand how the self-described attitudes and characteristics of community school principals fit within the context of such an equitably driven strategy. As such, we situate this study in the conceptual foundation of CEL. Green (2018) operationally defines CEL as "an awareness/consciousness (i.e., knowledge) and skill set (i.e., actions) to improve equity in schools and communities" (p. 490) through principal leadership that effectively and equitably cuts across school and community contexts. In essence, CEL accounts for "what school leaders (and their teams) know and do in the context of equitable school-family-community engagement" (Green & Rodgers, 2019, p. 38).

The leadership knowledge and skills associated with CEL manifest as five constructs that emanate from research on school-community partnerships and various educational leadership theories. These include cross-boundary, community-based educational, school reform and community development, and organizational equity leadership approaches (Green, 2017). CEL constructs, (a) develop asset-based perspectives, (b) understand community history, (c) navigate community power structure, (d) leverage community assets, and (e) advocate for school and community equity, are designed to "perpetually inform leaders' actions to improve school and community conditions, [and] are consistent with the new national Professional Standards for Educational Leaders" (Green, 2018, p. 491), specifically Standard 8 which is clustered within the Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community domain (Gordon et al., 2017).

Green (2017) suggests school leaders may interpret critical leadership approaches like CEL as entirely too theoretical, with little implementation practicality. In an effort to make it more accessible, he outlines three epistemologies by which school-community engagement is practiced, while also highlighting the critical role principals play in each. Positivism includes traditional school-centered activities, where principals' primary focus is on relations and not engagement with parents

(e.g., bake sales and one-time school events). Interpretivist or collaborative frameworks are relationship-focused and boundary spanning, where leaders give a range of school and community stakeholders a space for expressing perspective and decision-making power (e.g., a community school). Finally, the critical or social justice tradition is similar to the collaborative approach, but educational leaders work in solidarity with community-based participants and "view school-community interactions as an equity-centered partnership against injustice rather than just involvement, relations, or engagement" (Green, 2017, p. 378). For example, school leaders and their teams play an important role in community organizing designed to challenge conventional systems of power and privilege. Moreover, critical frameworks encourage principals to collectively take part in actions that disrupt entrenched and recurring cycles of school and community inequities. The challenge, according to Green (2017), is training principals in a way that extends social justice frameworks beyond rhetoric and into meaningful practices.

Principal preparation

The literature offers little information specifically related to preparing principals for equity-centered partnership with communities. Although the programs that prepare school principals may reflect the needs of the increasingly global societies where they are situated, principal preparation in the U.S. is particularly sensitive to the bureaucratic pressures of state policies and the requirements of national accrediting organizations (Slater et al., 2018; Young & Crow, 2017). State policies mandate the initial licensure requirements that affect candidate recruitment, coursework, and field experiences at the pre-service level. Many states have also been moving toward a system of continuous leadership development for school principals that requires induction programs, mentoring, and ongoing professional development upon assuming a formal position (Hitt et al., 2012; Roach et al., 2011; Vogel & Weiler, 2014).

The landscape of pre-service principal preparation has changed considerably since the early 2000s. Presently, colleges and universities are issuing far more educational leadership degrees than there are corresponding school leadership positions, and an increasing number of leadership candidates are graduating from lesser resourced, nonselective institutions (Perrone & Tucker, 2019). Moreover, since the Great Recession, states have disinvested in public higher education, which has driven tuition increases and prevented some price-sensitive candidates from pursuing licensure (Carpenter et al., 2017). These changes prompt questions about who is being recruited into the principalship and whether candidates are consistently being provided programs with a format and content that sufficiently prepare them to lead the nation's increasingly diverse schools.

Although pre-service preparation programs differ in structure, experts agree that exemplary programs share several components (Anderson et al., 2018; Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Hitt et al., 2012; Orr, 2011). Effective programs intentionally recruit a diverse and committed pool of candidates and support them by establishing social networks. They offer a coherent curriculum that is aligned to national professional standards (Young et al., 2016) and require candidates to participate in a sustained and intentionally focused field-based internship with an effective mentor principal (Lochmiller & Chesnut, 2017; Ni et al., 2019; Orr & Orphanos, 2011; Perez et al., 2011).

Beyond alignment to professional standards, the content of pre-service principal preparation programs varies. Of relevance to the current study's focus on preparing principals who can foster equity-centered community partnerships, Marshall (2004) encourages leadership preparation programs to augment their emphasis on management and leadership theory by requiring courses where emerging leaders engage with topics related to social justice and implement projects that attempt to redress inequities in school settings. Furman (2012) pulled from a decade of scholarship to develop a framework outlining how to prepare school leaders with both a critical consciousness about social justice issues and the skills necessary for action. Furman's (2012) framework incorporates reflection and action across five domains (a) personal understanding and developing a capacity for action, (b) interpersonal awareness and building caring relationships, (c) knowledge of the community and

promoting inclusiveness in decision making, (d) critical examination of systems and working to reform schools and districts, and (e) awareness of socio-political, economic, and environmental contexts and educating others about them. While this is just a small representation of the scholarship that theoretically explores approaches to preparing school leaders to promote equity and social justice, far fewer studies explicitly research the effects of implementing specific pedagogical practices (Byrne-Jiménez et al., 2017).

Empirical studies that document equity-oriented pedagogical interventions tended to focus on changing aspiring principals' beliefs and dispositions, such as recognizing inequities in schools and communities and challenging candidates' deficit thinking about students and their families. A recent study centered on preparing school leaders to lead in diverse contexts exemplifies this focus, describing how emerging school leaders who participated in critical reflection and carefully facilitated conversations about race and social justice developed antiracist identities (Diem et al., 2019). Similarly, in a comprehensive study of a preparation program that conformed to an andragogical framework, Brown (2006) documented positive changes in pre-service principals' self-perceptions and understandings of societal tensions. Brown (2006) also acknowledged, however, that aspiring principals only "began to entertain ways they could actually act on their newly found set of beliefs and notions" (p. 728) and recounted how candidates' year-long internship experiences offered them first-hand experiences with inequities, but left the candidates uncertain about how to appropriately respond.

We found two studies that incorporated instructional techniques that went beyond changing aspiring school leaders' beliefs and dispositions by fostering their ability to act. Liou and Hermanns (2017) prepared principal candidates to actualize equity and excellence in schools with changing demographics by requiring a cohort of 24 leadership candidates to implement a change initiative that addressed a site-based problem. The projects took place during the candidates' internships and were part of an integrated approach to address deficit thinking and low expectations across the curriculum. Winkelman (2012) similarly described the results from a comprehensive project that required emerging school leaders to create and implement equity plans at their schools, finding that the participants' reflections showed them successfully taking action to promote socially just outcomes.

Professional standards for educational leaders

Professional educational leadership standards reflect the ideal dispositions and behaviors of practicing school leaders and play a substantial role in the development of school principals. Through their influence on state policies and key role in program accreditation, professional standards inform the preparation, hiring, professional development, supervision, and evaluation of school leaders (Roach et al., 2011; Vogel & Weiler, 2014; Young & Perrone, 2016). The Council of Chief State School Officers (2008) originally created the Inter-State School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards in 1996. By 2011, 45 states and Washington, D.C. had adopted the ISLLC standards or an adapted version of them (Anderson & Reynolds, 2015; McCarthy et al., 2016). The five remaining states – Arkansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas – developed their own standards that are similar to the ISLLC standards in content (McCarthy et al., 2016).

The PSELs are the current, revised version of the ISLLC standards. Created in 2015, the PSELs consist of the 10 interdependent domains shown in Figure 1 NPBEA, 2015). The creators of the PSELs collaborated with hundreds of stakeholders, including practitioners and researchers, to ensure that the revised standards reflect current societal needs and are supported by empirical evidence (Tucker et al., 2016; Young et al., 2016). Each domain includes a general statement followed by 6 to 12 elements that describe the work necessary to meet the standard. The 10 PSEL domains maintain the ISLLC standards' former focus on data-based school improvement, instructional leadership, professionalism, developing a positive school culture, and operational management. The PSELs demonstrate greater emphasis on cultural responsiveness and equitable practices

Standard 1: Mission, Vision, and Core Values

Standard 2: Ethics and Professional Norms

Standard 3: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness

Standard 4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Standard 5: Community of Care and Support for Students

Standard 6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel

Standard 7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff

Standard 8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Communities

Standard 9: Operations and Management

Standard 10: School Improvement

Figure 1. The domains of the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], 2015).

by devoting an entire standard to these topics (Prociw & Eberle, 2016; Young et al., 2016). Compared with the former standards, the PSELs also approach student learning and wellbeing from a more holistic perspective and with an increased focus on physical and emotional health (Prociw & Eberle, 2016).

Overall, the relevant literature suggests that principals come to their work with widely varying preparation to assume community school leadership. As we set out to determine the qualities of successful community school principals, the frameworks of professional standards and CEL provided tools for better understanding how the structures currently in place support the development of principals who can enter into equity-centered partnerships with communities. The following pages offer a detailed account of this investigation.

Methods

Research design

This study involved two phases of data collection to provide a broad view of community school leadership from multiple perspectives. Phase one used the Delphi method, which allowed a panel of experts on community schools to deliberate on the topic of community school leadership while avoiding the interpersonal distortions inherent in face-to-face group dynamics (Hasson et al., 2000; Hsu & Sandford, 2007). Phase two relied on semi-structured interviews and focus groups to obtain practitioners' opinions on community school leadership, validate the results of the Delphi panel, and reveal how principals developed their ability to lead community schools.

Sampling method and samples

The Delphi phase of the study required an intentionally selected panel of 5 to 30 diverse and respected experts (Clayton, 1997). We assembled the Delphi panel by contacting via e-mail 40 individuals drawn from three groups: community school scholars and published authors, leaders in community school coordinating organizations, and experienced district-level decision-makers. We identified these individuals through referrals from leaders in national community school organizations and web searches for community school award winners and published authors. A geographically and professionally diverse group of 15 individuals from the three aforementioned groups agreed to participate (Table 1). The panel was 67% female, 80% White, and 13% Black/

Table 1. Profile of the Delphi panel.

Community school involvement	State
Technical assistance provider	IL
Higher education (2)	IN
State leadership (2)	MI
Leadership in a national organization (3)	MN
Leadership in a coordinating agency (4)	NY
School district leader (5)	OH
	OK
	TN
	National (2)
	PA (5)

n = 1, unless indicated by a numeral enclosed in parentheses. Totals within categories may be greater than 15 participants due to individuals holding multiple positions.

African American. The participants had between 3 and 50 years of experience working with community schools (M = 16.4, SD = 11.7). Demonstrating esteem within the field of community schools, the Delphi panel included a state commissioner of education, two recipients of awards for their work with community schools, four current or former advisory board members from national community school organizations, and five published authors collectively responsible for more than 55 publications related to community schools or community-engaged leadership.

The interview phase of the study included 14 community school principals and 18 community school coordinators or directors representing 18 schools from six school districts in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Maine. We purposefully selected schools that had a site-based community school coordinator or director and were fully implementing the community school strategy for at least 2 years. Full implementation was defined as the implementation of Maier et al. (2017) four components: integrated student supports, extended learning opportunities, family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership. We confirmed that sites had adhered to the community school strategy in one or more of the following ways: an author's direct involvement with the schools for 2 years or longer, confirmation from the school's coordinating community-based organization, or a description of the school and its programming in published literature. We strove for a sample that represented the diversity of the community school landscape, and thus included schools from all levels, urban schools, a rural school, schools using district-directed structures, schools using lead-partner structures, university-assisted schools, a charter school, schools participating in a regional coalition, and a school that was the sole community school in its district. As indicated in Table 2, the

Table 2. Demographic profile of the interview participants.

	n	%
Position		
Principal/assistant principal	14	44
Coordinator/director	18	56
Race/ethnicity		
Black/African American	4	13
Hispanic/Latinx	9	28
White	19	59
Community school experience		
0–2 years	11	34
3–5 years	8	25
6–8 years	7	22
9+ years	6	19
School level		
Elementary	18	56
Middle	9	28
High	3	9
Multiple	2	6

participants ranged in experience with community schools from 1 to 12 years. The interview sample was 72% female, 28% Latinx, and 13% Black.

Delphi panel procedures and analysis

The Delphi method involves a series of iterative rounds focused on a particular topic whereby a moderator solicits unstructured feedback separately from each Delphi panelist, organizes, and statistically aggregates the responses, and solicits additional insights from participants until a consensus is reached (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). We defined consensus as 80% of panelists rating each item in the two highest categories on a 7-point Likert scale (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). While communication by moderator potentially mitigates the influences of social pressure on participants' opinions, we remained aware that the moderator must avoid biasing the results by completely representing the panelists' ideas, striving for accuracy, and using participants' own wording whenever possible (Hasson et al., 2000).

During round 1, we sent each Delphi panelist an electronic survey via Qualtrics, asking them standard demographic questions and three open-ended questions to solicit their opinions regarding the necessary attitudes, characteristics, and behaviors associated with successful and unsuccessful community school principals. Round 1 had a 100% response rate among those who agreed to participate on the panel. Each researcher separately analyzed the round 1 data to develop a representative list of statements that included and accurately reflected all participants' ideas (Clayton, 1997; Hasson et al., 2000). Initial inter-rater reliability between the two researchers was 87%. Next, in an approach similar to grounded theory described by Hennink et al. (2011), we aggregated our individual text analyses to develop a consensus list of 31 preliminary statements distinguishing effective principal leadership for a community school.

In round 2, Delphi panelists rated each statement on a scale of 0 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) and offered critiques of the individual statements. Round 2 had a 93.3% response rate. Ratings from round 2 were statistically summarized using measures of central tendency and open-ended critiques were analyzed qualitatively. Upon analysis, the researchers agreed that three statements generated sufficient variation in responses and critical feedback to prompt a revision of the statements and initiate a third round.

In round 3, the panelists rated and critiqued the revised statements. Round 3 had an 80% response rate. Ratings from the third round were statistically summarized using measures of central tendency and participants' open-ended comments regarding the revised statements were considered. After analysis, we accepted two of the revised statements and reverted the third back to the higher-rated original text, thus developing a list of 31 attitudes, characteristics, and behaviors common to successful community school principals.

Interview and focus group procedures and analysis

In May through September 2019, the researchers separately conducted in-person, semi-structured interviews with principals and focus groups with community school directors. The interview protocol began with four questions to determine how the schools were implementing the community school strategy by asking the participants to describe their schools' approach to integrated student supports, extended learning opportunities, family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership. The next series of questions solicited participants' perspectives on community school leadership and their opinions regarding the results of the Delphi panel. Principals were also asked how they learned to lead community schools. During the interviews and focus groups, the participants conducted a forced ranking of the 31 Delphi statements by sorting them into six groups with ascending point values to reflect the factors most relevant for principal leadership in their contexts. The Delphi statement rankings were analyzed using descriptive statistics.

Coding of the interview and focus group data involved multiple levels of analysis (Patton, 2015). At the first level, each researcher separately coded the data using deductive codes representing the 31 Delphi statements, elements from Green's (2017) epistemological framework, and methods of principal preparation taken from the literature review. Codes also emerged from the data, such as the characteristic "adaptable" and the various ways participants learned to lead community schools (e.g., "community school conferences"). The researchers met regularly to compare results, reconcile emerging codes, and reach consensus on interpretative differences (Saldaña, 2016). At the second level of analysis, the coded data were compared to identify convergent patterns, divergent data, and emerging themes. After finalizing the list of necessary qualities of community school leaders (Appendix A), we compared the list to the PSEL standards for alignment.

Our research design is limited by the make-up of the samples and the types of data we collected. Although we sought to include a variety of perspectives and experiences, the practitioner interviews were centered in the northeastern U.S. and thus may not represent the full variety of community school contexts. We also did not seek the opinions of parents, students, and community partners. Therefore, some elements of community school leadership may remain unexplored. The data we collected are perception data and the information about how participating principals were prepared is based solely on self-reports, which are subject to retrospective bias. To ensure the trustworthiness of our work, we described our methods in detail, triangulated data sources, and included the perspectives of 47 individuals associated with community schools in varying capacities. In the results that follow, we use participants' own words to describe what they believed was required to success-fully lead community schools, the extent those qualities reflected CEL and the PSELs, and how the principals learned to lead community schools.

Results

The necessary qualities of community school principals

Table 3 lists abbreviated versions of the 31 consensus statements from the Delphi panelists ranked in order of their final Delphi panel ratings and comparing the highest and lowest ranked statements across participants. A vast majority of the statements not only had strong agreement across panelists, but principals and community school directors also concurred that all but two of the Delphi panel statements were vital qualities of community school principals. Although we listed the statements separately, the principals and directors regularly remarked that they viewed the components of community school leadership as interconnected, indicating the list of qualities should be interpreted holistically. The following paragraphs describe the consensus statements and participants' perspectives in terms of four general themes: building collaborative relationships, implementing the community school strategy, operating with an equity lens, and reforming systems.

Building collaborative relationships

Participants believed that community school leadership is shared relational work requiring principals who are predisposed toward collaboration. As a result, community school principals must possess strong interpersonal and communication skills, enabling them to work closely with a broad spectrum of people. When describing the relational behavior of principals, a Delphi panelist wrote, "They build a team among partners and staff as a critical part of how they lead…. They set high expectations for people around them and offer support to help people be successful." Other relational qualities considered necessary for community school principals included being respectful, approachable, and predisposed to building trust and appreciating parents.

An additional necessary characteristic of being "adaptable" emerged from the principal and director interviews. Using the practitioners' responses as a guide, we defined adaptable as "flexible and responsive to changing conditions." Although participants admitted that adaptability was somewhat in tension with the characteristics "strategic and focused," practitioners recognized that

Table 3. Statements indicating the attitudes, characteristics, and behaviors of successful community school principals as ranked by various participants.

Statement	Delphi	Principals	CSDs	PSEL
Builds trust with others	(green)	(green)	(green)	2
Promotes collective responsibility	(green)			7, 8
Relationship focused	(green)			5
Builds a collaborative relationship with CSD	(green)	(green)	(green)	7
Accountability and results focused	(green)	(green)		7
Nurtures a student-centered school culture	(green)			5
Operates with an equity lens	(green)	(green)		3
Strategic and focused	(green)			1
Understands and values the whole-child approach	(green)	(green)	(green)	7
Committed and persistent				2
Integrates the community school strategy		(green)	(green)	10
Respectful listener, open and approachable				7, 8
Strong interpersonal skills				2
Fiscally responsible and uses resources efficiently				9
Optimistic and positive attitude		(orange)		2
Rigorously uses data				10
Driven to achieve		(orange)	(orange)	10
Appreciates the key role of parents				8
Change agent, adept at adaptive leadership				10
Culturally responsive leader				3
Growth mindset				6
Collaborates and shares leadership			(green)	7, 8
Links community school with student learning				5
Servant leadership				8
Innovative risk taker willing to try new things		(orange)	(orange)	10
Courageous				2
Skilled communicator	(orange)			2
Visionary big-picture thinker	(orange)		(orange)	1
Strong organizational skills	(orange)	(orange)		9
Present and active in the community	(orange)		(orange)	8
Well-respected by the school district	(orange)	(orange)	(orange)	9

Green indicates top-five ranking. Orange indicates bottom five ranking. Greater than five cells of one color within a column indicates tied ranks. CSD = Community School Director or Coordinator.

the level of collaboration they sought and the challenging nature of their work required leaders who were, in their words, "willing to bend" and "able to roll with anything that comes your way." One of the most commonly cited reasons for why community school principals need to be adaptable was the co-location of community partners in the school building. From a principal's perspective, co-location was difficult because, "You are inviting someone into your space." From a community school director's point of view, the metaphorical question was, "How do we blend the families so that we aren't always reminded we're in someone else's house?" For both principals and directors, flexibility and responsiveness were necessary qualities for community school leaders.

A majority of principals and directors viewed community school leadership as a shared practice, which led some participants to conclude that although the qualities and behaviors on the list were necessary, some of them were not specific to the principal. For example, one director believed the cultural responsiveness was less important for the principal because, "I think as a team we have this covered because even our front desk operators, they're all bilingual." Other participants ranked some statements lower because they thought the community school directors filled the visionary or organizing roles. A common area where many directors took the lead was on the exemplar, "present and active

in the neighborhood and broader community." Some participants reasoned that being in the community was the director's job, while other explanations reflected practical reasons, such as the director living closer to the school, making it more convenient for the director to attend community events.

Implementing the community school strategy

According to the second major theme, community school principals must fully understand and work to implement the basic components of the community school strategy. The Delphi panelists believed principals need to develop an overarching vision and take a holistic approach – educating the whole child and using the community school strategy as a cohesive framework for the whole school rather than offering a collection of isolated and disconnected programs or services. Although it could be considered redundant with the dispositions of building trust and being relationship focused, panelists believed it was important to explicitly articulate the centrality of the relationship between the principal and the community school director. A panelist explained, "it's really important to clarify that the community school director is part of the school leadership team." Finally, participants thought that managing a community school's expanded programming and multiple sources of funding requires principals to have the practical skills of organization and fiscal responsibility.

While practitioners and the Delphi panel agreed that understanding and implementing the community school strategy was vital, principals and directors repeatedly told us that they were still working toward fully integrating the strategy and making solid links with the instructional program. One principal explained, "I do think that integration piece is hard," while another admitted, "We're not integrating the components all the way, but it's just because that's where we are right now." These observations reflected FitzGerald and Quiñones (2018) conclusion that community school leadership involved a complex journey of simultaneously "being and becoming" (p. 6). While principals did not dispute that the behaviors listed by the Delphi panel were important, they viewed some of them as more aspirational than fully achieved.

Operating with an equity lens

The Delphi panelists believed that successful community school principals make decisions based on equity and promote socially just outcomes. One panel member articulated the core of this theme by saying, principals must have "Firm commitments to children, families, and communities with value orientations supportive of equity." To those ends, successful community school principals nurture a student-centered culture and are culturally responsive. Also fitting within this theme were promoting collective responsibility among stakeholders and having an orientation toward servant leadership whereby leaders perceive the school as belonging to the community.

While the Delphi panelists agreed on each of the consensus statements, their deliberations revealed disagreement regarding the extent that community school leaders should center the school in their work. An early statement – prioritizes education first – was heavily revised after receiving comments such as this one, "Too school-centered. You meta-communicate that a community school is yet another school improvement initiative." In a similar manner, panel members debated the role of parents. One panelist critiqued the statement about appreciating the key role of parents in children's learning, saying, "You've relied on a conventional model of parent involvement. Community schools that thrive empower and employ parents." Another panelist cautioned against language that might imply a "fix-then-teach" orientation, explaining, "The assumption is, 'School's okay, the problems with the kids – and by extension, their families.'" But a different panelist pointed out that principals are school district employees and said, "The context of the broader school district so impacts the principal and what he/she can do with best of intentions."

Principals and directors did not share the Delphi panel members' concerns about the extent community schools should be school-centered. Instead, the primacy of the school in their work was implicit or explicit in each conversation we held with principals and directors, as made evident by this principal:

It's a school first and the doors of the building will close if you're not getting the results that a school should be getting. So, it doesn't matter how many kids have free glasses or how many kids have an internship at MSG Classroom, or anything, if you're not hitting graduation marks and not providing a good solid education to kids.

Thus, participants recognized that their districts' ongoing support for the community school strategy was necessary and dependent upon whether the schools could demonstrate success on metrics of value to central office administrators.

Reforming systems

The final theme was that community school principals required dispositions and characteristics to successfully reform systems within their schools, districts, and communities. As one Delphi member explained, community school principals maintain, "positive energy … despite being aware of all of the challenges associated with systems change work." The personal characteristics of principals who are change agents include being committed and having a growth mind-set, which manifests in a disposition toward continuous learning and improvement and a willingness to take risks and try new things. These principals are also strategic and focused, informed by data, concentrated on results, and able to hold people "accountable for clear and high expectations." While the panelists believed that community school principals would benefit from being respected within their school districts, they also recognized that developing systems that support equitable outcomes may require principals to courageously question long-standing policies or rules, which could put principals in conflict with the central office.

Practitioners were less focused on characteristics and behaviors related to systems change and disagreed with two of the statements within this theme. Many principals and directors pointed out that the exemplar "driven to achieve" was either vague or redundant. In one focus group, a coordinator pointed out, "You can be achieving a lot of things that are not necessarily the important things." Other practitioners supported its removal by noting that being "driven" overlaps with being "committed and persistent" and "achieve" overlaps with "results focused." A second area of practitioner divergence from the Delphi panel involved the exemplar "well-respected by the school district." Although the principals from district-directed community schools appeared to be more concerned with remaining on positive terms with the central office, other principals had concerns about the inclusion of this factor. One principal remarked, "I don't really care if they like me or not." Another said, "It's not about me. It's about the students or families." Due to these concerns, and because being "well-respected" is arguably not a characteristic or behavior inherent to the principal, we removed the statement from the final list of Necessary Qualities of Community School Leaders, which is located in Appendix A.

Community school leadership, the PSELs, and CEL

We compared the ranked statements from Delphi panelists, principals and CSDs, with the PSELs to determine the level of alignment between them, as illustrated in Table 3. Only three of the necessary qualities were not explicitly described in the PSEL explanatory documents NPBEA, 2015): (a) optimistic and positive attitude, (b) strong organizational skills, and (c) servant leadership. Each of these statements, however, fit within one of the 10 PSELs. Similarly, some of the statements with specific references to community schools were conceptually similar to a PSEL descriptor. For example, "Integrates the components of the community school strategy into the school's vision as a cohesive strategy for the whole school" aligns closely with "Promotes coherence among improvement efforts and all aspects of school organization, programs, and services" (p. 18).

Five or more community school principal statements clustered in the standards Ethics and Professional Norms, Professional Community for Teachers and Staff, Meaningful Engagement for Families and Communities, and School Improvement (see Table 3). Notably, these areas included the expanded material in the revised standards (Prociw & Eberle, 2016). While none of the listed qualities fit into the PSEL related to curriculum and instruction, we suspect it was due to the

participants' interpretation of the study's purpose as identifying unique elements of community school leadership rather than a reflection that participants thought community school principals are not instructional leaders.

The necessary qualities of community school principals are also inclusive of the five factors espoused by Green (2017) in the CEL Framework (see Table 4), indicating experts see a need for community school principals to foster stronger and more meaningful partnerships between the neighborhood school and local community. Moreover, panelists' crafted statements aligned with Standard 8, Meaningful Engagement with Families and Communities, which the CEL framework intentionally represents. Experts identified effective community school principals as those who are active participants in their neighborhoods and broader communities, engage in servant leadership, and distribute decision-making power amongst stakeholder groups. Additionally, when panelists ranked the statements, equity-centered statements such as operates with an equity lens, builds trust with others, relationship focused, values the whole-child approach, and promotes collective responsibility fell within their top five. Interestingly, however present and active in the community ranked in the experts' bottom five in terms of importance.

Despite the Delphi statements' seemingly strong alignment with the PSELs and CEL framework, the practitioners' rankings of partnership-driven, equity-centered statements were mixed. For example, present and active in the community ranked in the bottom five for directors but collaborates and shares leadership fell within the top. Principals valued the importance of the whole-child approach, operating from an equity lens, and building trust with others, yet many of their descriptions of community school leadership offered a weak representation of CEL. Although narratives included statements like "we want to empower our families," and "we have an open-door policy here and parents have become our partners," most feedback received from practitioners situated school-community partnerships within the traditional (positivist) and collaborative (interpretive) frameworks Green (2017) discussed. For example, community school leaders collectively identified events like family game nights, heritage celebrations, language classes, and case management services when discussing how they engage with parents and community members. Once principal stated, "we're trying to be creative with how we get parents in the door," and another expressed the school leadership team is "revamping beginning of the year open houses, offering potluck opportunities for

Table 4. Comparison of the community equity literacy framework and the necessary qualities for community school principals.

Community equity literacy[a]	Necessary qualities
Asset-based perspective	Growth mind-set (e.g., looks for opportunities to learn; supports the learning and success of school staff, parents, and community partners.) Operates with an equity lens (e.g., believes all children can learn; supportive of outcomes indicative of educational, social, and economic justice) Appreciates the key role of parents in children's learning
Understand community history	Present and active in the neighborhood and in the broader community Culturally responsive leader (e.g., inclusive, values diverse perspectives, reflects the cultures of the population within the school, learns to speak the primary language of the community.)
Leverage community assets	Builds a collaborative and trusting relationship with the community school director Collaborates, shares leadership, and substantively involves stakeholders in decision making (e.g., actively engages with planning teams and leadership councils, includes partner staff in hiring decisions)
Navigate community power structure	Present and active in the neighborhood and in the broader community
Advocate for school and community equity	Courageous (e.g., challenges central office when necessary, questions long-standing policies or rules, engages in difficult conversations) Promotes collective responsibility for all children and their families Servant Leadership: Espouses a firm conviction that the school belongs to the community and school faculty and staff are stewards of the school serving to benefit children and families. Change agent: adept at adaptive leadership and able to navigate systems change work.

[a]Framework in "From Positivism to Critical Theory: School-Community Relations Toward Community Equity Literacy," by T. L. Green, 2017, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 30(4), 370–387.

families to come in to just try and get everyone together." Few expressed the concept of community beyond parent engagement with the school, although most recognized that parent engagement should include addressing the needs of the family. Several principals seemed confused when we questioned them about how their schools implemented the collaborative leadership component of the community school strategy and offered few specifics beyond establishing a close relationship with the community school director.

Further analysis revealed few patterns in the characteristics of principals with greater propensity to develop authentic school-community partnerships. Three principals operated primarily from the school-centered or "fix then teach" perspective of positivism. Nine principals were in the middle interpretivist category and focused on meeting families' needs within the school, but only four of those principals were explicitly working toward family empowerment. Only two principals exhibited a critical lens and advocated for equitable systems change in their districts and communities. The principals' races and ethnicities, genders, or years of experience as principals or working with community schools appeared to have little association with their perspectives toward families and communities. Each of the principals expressed enthusiasm for working in a community school, whether they had guided their school through adoption of the strategy or joined an established community school. Principals with the most and the least developed understandings of community engagement all worked for a school district where the superintendent was a public proponent of social justice, and equity was a formal aspect of the district's vision. The differentiating factor appeared to be how the most school-centered principals came to understand the community school strategy.

Learning to lead community schools

The interview protocol explicitly asked principals how they learned to lead community schools. The responses revealed a patchwork of methods with inconsistencies even among principals from the same district. Only two principals mentioned components of a university principal preparation program as being related to community school leadership – a diverse internship experience and an instructor who discussed community schools. Four of the principals learned as assistant principals in community schools prior to assuming leadership of one. Most principals cited national community school organizations and regional community-based organizations as substantially contributing to their understanding of how to lead community schools. A few principals referred to the National Center for Community School's "best-selling free book," *Building Community Schools: A Guide for Action*, which many simply called the "blue book" (Lubell, 2011). The principals with a deeper understanding of school-community partnerships more often described learning to lead from formal mentoring, visiting other community schools, and/or attending community school workshops and national conferences.

The only apparent commonality among the three positivist principals was that, for differing reasons, they seemed to lack external connections to community school organizations. One of the school-centered principals was from a geographically isolated school with a district-directed structure and had assumed leadership after the school was no longer connected to its originating community-based partner. Another principal was in his second year as a lead principal and had not yet attended any community school workshops or conferences. Although this novice principal had served as an assistant principal at a community school, he admitted having had little direct involvement with the community school strategy in his former role. The third school-centered principal led a community school from a strong regional coalition for 9 years, but she dismissed the information offered by the coordinating community-based organization as too abstract. The principal explained that when she was new to the school she was, "Involved with just getting the schedule and the managerial part done" and since then had relied primarily on "trial and error" to find practical, concrete solutions to the issues that concerned her most.

Overall, principals discussed their preparation to lead in terms of the practical and structural elements of implementing the community school strategy rather than normative aspects or underlying theories of action. Principals cited social supports as being most helpful in their ongoing leadership of community schools, but principals from larger districts and regional coalitions had greater access to exemplary community school principals with whom they could collaborate, network, and share ideas and experiences. Some principals independently sought out community school resources and practitioners online through social media. When participants mentioned the types of resources and supports they wished were available, they tended to focus on legalities and finances such as "How Title 1 funds are used" and "Strategic ways that you can access district funds to make resources available."

Discussion and conclusion

At the inception of this study, we set out to determine the qualities required for leading community schools, the extent those qualities reflected CEL and professional standards, and how principals learned to be community school leaders. We successfully answered the research questions with evidence that we assert is transferable to most community school contexts. One of the study's most significant findings was the agreement of 47 diverse community school experts and practitioners on a comprehensive list of 30 characteristics, dispositions, and behaviors necessary for successful community school principals. The validity of these qualities was further demonstrated by their strong alignment with both the PSELs and Green's (2017) CEL framework, supporting the list's appropriateness as a guide for hiring and developing community school principals. Yet, our findings also revealed a disconnection between what practitioners said was important and the examples they provided to illustrate how those beliefs were manifested in their schools. In particular, principals believed equity and authentic community collaboration were important, but many had difficulty operationalizing those values into tangible, aligned behaviors. A sizable proportion of participating principals exhibited a school-centered or service-oriented approach to working with families and were more comfortable sharing leadership with professionals from community-based organizations than with parents.

The inconsistencies between the principals' beliefs and their behavior begs the question, "Why?" It could be that the methods we used and the questions we asked failed to fully capture participants' beliefs, practices, or preparation to lead, but that did not appear to be the case for the participants with whom we have had direct contact for multiple years. All of the participating principals showed enthusiasm for working in community schools and appeared authentically committed to improving the lives of marginalized students. Deficit thinking, personal cost (Theoharis, 2007), and reluctance to change the power differential with parents (Noguera, 2001) are all common barriers to social justice leadership and may have been factors for some participants. The explanation that best fits the evidence is that many of the participants were focused on applying technical solutions to solve immediate problems (Theoharis, 2007), which oriented the principals toward building programs and helping individuals rather than working toward systems change (Noguera, 2001). That many principals lacked preparation to lead a community school and received minimal cohesive professional development or formal mentoring in community school leadership seemed to be contributing factors for the principals who understood the structural aspects of the community school strategy without fully grasping the underlying theories of action in regard to parent empowerment and systems change. Other researchers have found similar patterns of principals comprehending the mechanics of community schools without fully understanding the strategy's foundational tenets (Adams, 2019), particularly in regard to intense collaboration (Medina et al., 2019), and the need to address systemic inequities within and beyond the school (McKinney de Royston & Madkins, 2019). Our findings substantiate Green's (2017) concern that school leaders, who are often absorbed with practical matters, may find critical leadership approaches too theoretical.

The community school strategy recognizes the inextricable link between schools and their local communities. As such, cultivating meaningful partnerships designed around student, family, and community development are critical components of their mission. Principals play an instrumental role in orchestrating these relationships (Ishimaru, 2013), yet they often lack requisite knowledge and skills to move beyond service provision to approach partnerships from a critical perspective that acknowledges both school- and community-based inequities (Keith, 1999). This is particularly problematic for urban schools situated in high-poverty neighborhoods because as Green (2018) noted, there is a well-documented relationship between "inequitable community conditions" (e.g., systemic racism, and concentrated poverty), and schools' resources, opportunities, and outcomes (p. 487).

Unjust circumstances outside the school exacerbate disparities within the school, but principals' actions are still very much focused on the latter (P. M. Miller et al., 2011). Our findings support these claims, as participating principals expressed that the purpose behind community school programming is to create equitable conditions for students and families, but they often framed community engagement as the primary responsibility of the community school director. The participation of the director is critical but is not a replacement for the school principal equalizing power relationships by meeting people where they live and working in harmony with neighborhood stakeholders to disrupt the systems of oppression that are generating in-school challenges in the first place (Green, 2017). If community schools are to be conceptualized as effective improvement strategies that attempt to level the resource playing field (Maier et al., 2017), they need principals at the helm who see leadership as a community-based practice (Khalifa, 2012) that is equity-centered and focused on reducing opportunity gaps across school and community landscapes (Warren, 2005).

Leading community schools in this way necessitate that principals be fluent in the policies influencing school and community contexts and willing to engage in systems change work. P. Miller et al. (2014) write that for equitable conditions to be realized, "… school leaders must understand and strategically engage federal, state, district, and school-level education policies as well as wide-ranging public policies that shape students' and families everyday out-of-school lives" (p. 135). Findings from this study suggest that although participants valued the importance of the whole-child approach, along with operating from an equity-centered position, many still encapsulated leadership actions as entirely school-based and solely situated in existing district, state, and federal education policies. Instead, leaders should be prepared in such a way that allows them to see where issues and policies intersect so they can advance systemic reforms that balance the learning needs of students with developmental, community, and family outcomes (Lawson & van Veen, 2016).

The participating principals' lack of preparation for leading community schools suggests that there is a need to reconsider multiple points in the principal development pipeline. Our analysis considered the relevancy of the PSELs and determined that the current professional standards provide an appropriate framework to inform the development of leaders with the baseline skills and dispositions for effectively leading community schools. However, most currently practicing principals were formally prepared under the ISLLC standards, which were less focused on equity, cultural responsiveness, and engaging families and communities (Prociw & Eberle, 2016), and many aspiring principals are presently enrolled in preparation programs that have not yet aligned their coursework with the PSELs. Furthermore, the adoption of revised standards was just the first step in updating an entire interconnected system that involves state regulations and accreditation requirements, as well as the faculty, curriculum, and instructional materials in pre-service preparation programs (Young & Crow, 2017; Young & Perrone, 2016). As this process is likely to take several years, we foresee an ongoing need for systematic mentoring or coaching and professional development for in-service principals to help them develop the dispositions and skills that support the formation of authentic partnerships with families and community members. Reaching in-service principals will probably require coordination between school districts, university faculty, and

community-based organizations because each of these entities is unlikely to have both the capacity and the access to implement a comprehensive training effort on its own.

Professional standards and lists of necessary qualities provide the "what" in regard to principal preparation without telling us the "how." Our findings offered few specifics regarding how to prepare school principals who are predisposed toward authentic collaboration and fostering equitable outcomes in their schools and communities and able to act in ways that manifest those beliefs into reality. Many of the participating principals primarily learned on the job, reflecting what Roach et al. (2011) referred to as an "environmental norm of best practice based on existing knowledge and experience" (p. 104). Although principals may find an *ad hoc* strategy of learning from other practitioners useful for finding practical solutions to their immediate concerns, this approach tends to sustain the status quo without challenging the systems that perpetuate inequities (Roach et al., 2011). Furman's (2012) framework for preparing equity-centered leaders indicates that preparation programs must intentionally and coherently assist aspiring principals in developing both critical consciousnesses and capacities for action at the personal, interpersonal, community, systemic, and societal levels. Some pedagogies that support this endeavor include critical reflection, multiple perspective taking (Young & Crow, 2017), experiential learning, exposure to varied educational settings (Brown, 2006), and implementing equity plans to address site-specific problems (Liou & Hermanns, 2017; Winkelman, 2012). Principal candidates should become able to align their work with explicit theories of action, such as Green's (2017) CEL framework or Ishimaru and Galloway's (2014) high-leverage equitable practices. Finally, although we have focused primarily on the preparation of school principals, our participants made clear that the ongoing viability of community school initiatives is dependent on the support of district administrators (Adams, 2019; Medina et al., 2019). We, therefore, suggest that district administrators also need CEL and would benefit from the approaches we outlined in this paragraph.

We focused this study on leadership in community schools, but our findings are just as applicable to school leaders facing inequitable neighborhood conditions and insufficient resources without the added supports of community-based organizations and the structure of the community school strategy. If the principals who have chosen to work in community schools feel unprepared and struggle with moving beyond their ideals into meaningful practice, there is little reason to assume that principals in traditional schools are better positioned. School leaders of all types need to develop skills and dispositions to work effectively in contexts where community-based inequities shape students' in-school experiences. Our work indicates that there is a need for a systemic approach to developing, supporting, and nurturing school leaders who are ready and able to establish meaningful community partnerships and reform inequitable systems.

Disclosure statement

ORCID

Linda K. Mayger 🅳 http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5462-0999

References

Adams, C. M. (2019). Sustaining full-service community schools: Lessons from the Tulsa area community schools initiative. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, *24*(3), 288–313. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2019.1615924

Anderson, E., & Reynolds, A. (2015). The state of state policies for principal preparation program approval and candidate licensure. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, *10*(3), 193–221. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775115614292

Anderson, E., Winn, K. M., Young, M. D., Groth, C., Korach, S., Pounder, D., & Rorrer, A. K. (2018). Examining university leadership preparation: An analysis of program attributes and practices. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, *13*(4), 375–397. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775117735873

Berliner, D. C. (2006). Our impoverished view of educational reform. *Teachers College Record*, *108*(6), 949–995. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00682.x

Biag, M., & Castrechini, S. (2016). Coordinated strategies to help the whole child: Examining the contributions of full-service community schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *21*(3), 157–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2016.1172231

Brown, K. M. (2006). Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and andragogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *42*(5), 700–745. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06290650

Byrne-Jiménez, M., Gooden, M. A., & Tucker, P. D. (2017). Facilitating learning in leadership preparation: Limited research but promising practices. In M. D. Young & G. M. Crow (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (2nd ed., pp. 173–201). Routledge.

Carpenter, B. W., Scribner, S. M. P., & Lindle, J. C. (2017). The political and economic contexts of educational leadership preparation. In M. D. Young & G. M. Crow (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (2nd ed., pp. 40–52). Routledge.

Cashin, S. (2015). *Place, not race: A new vision of opportunity in America*. Beacon Press.

Clayton, M. J. (1997). Delphi: A technique to harness expert opinion for critical decision-making tasks in education. *Educational Psychology*, *17*(4), 373–386. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144341970170401

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, B., & Orr, M. T. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Diem, S., Carpenter, B. W., & Lewis Durham, T. (2019). Preparing antiracist school leaders in a school choice context. *Urban Education*, *54*(5), 706–731. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918783812

Dryfoos, J. (2005). Full-service community schools: a strategy—not a program. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *107*, 7–14. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16315512

Fehrer, K., & Leos-Urbel, J. (2016). "We're one team: Examining community school implementation strategies in Oakland. *Education Sciences*, *6*(3), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci6030026

FitzGerald, A. M., & Quiñones, S. (2018). Working in and with community: Leading for partnerships in a community school. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *18*(4), 511–532. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2018.1453938

Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis: Developing capacities through preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *48*(2), 191–229. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11427394

Galindo, C., Sanders, M., & Abel, Y. (2017). Transforming educational experiences in low-income communities: A qualitative case study of social capital in a full-service community school. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(15), 140S–163S. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216676571

Gordon, S. P., Taylor-Backor, K., & Croteau, S. (2017). Recommended capacities for educational leadership: Pre-reform era scholars versus reform-era scholars versus national standards. *NASSP Bulletin*, *101*(3), 188–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636517726856

Green, T. (2015). Leading for urban school reform and community development. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *51*(5), 679–711. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15577694

Green, T. L. (2017). From positivism to critical theory: School-community relations toward community equity literacy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *30*(4), 370–387. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1253892

Green, T. L. (2018). Enriching educational leadership through community equity literacy: A conceptual foundation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *17*(4), 487–515. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2017.1326148

Green, T. L., & Rodgers, M. (2019). Exploring the preliminary development of the Community Equity Literacy Leadership Assessment (CELLA) for school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *57*(1), 36–49. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-05-2017-0058

Hasson, F., Keeney, S., & McKenna, H. (2000). Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *32*(4), 1008–1015. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.t01-1-01567

Heers, M., Van Klaveren, C., Groot, W., & Maassen van den Brink, H. (2016). Community schools: What we know and what we need to know. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 1016–1051. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315627365

Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative research methods*. SAGE.

Hitt, D. H., Tucker, P. D., & Young, M. D. (2012). *The professional pipeline for educational leaders*. University Council for Educational Administration.

Hsu, C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation*, *12*(10), 1–8. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/pare/vol12/iss1/10

Ishimaru, A. (2013). From heroes to organizers: Principals and education organizers in urban school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *49*(3), 3–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X12448250

Ishimaru, A. M., & Galloway, M. K. (2014). Beyond individual effectiveness: Conceptualizing organizational leadership for equity. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *13*(1), 93–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2014.890733

Keith, N. Z. (1996). Can urban school reform and community development be joined? The potential of community schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(2), 237–268. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124596028002008

Keith, N. Z. (1999). Whose community schools? New discourses, old patterns. *Theory into Practice*, 38(4), 225–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849909543858

Kerr, K., & Dyson, A. (2016). Networked social enterprises: A new model of community schooling for disadvantaged neighborhoods facing challenging times. *Education Sciences*, 6(20), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci6030020

Khalifa, M. (2012). A re-new-ed paradigm in successful urban school leadership: Principal as community leader. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 424–467. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11432922

Kids Count Data Center. (2019). *Children in poverty by race and ethnicity in the United States*. https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/tables/44-children-in-poverty-by-race-and-ethnicity

Lawson, H. A., & van Veen, D. (2016). A shared rationale for new school designs with place-based differences. In H. A. Lawson & D. van Veen (Eds.), *Developing community schools, community learning centers, extended-service schools and multi-service schools: International exemplars for practice, policy, and research* (pp. 23–47). Springer International Publishing.

Lawson, M., Alameda-Lawson, T., & Richards, K. (2016). A university-assisted, place-based model for enhancing students' peer, family, and community ecologies. *Education Sciences*, 6(4), 16. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci6020016

Liou, D. D., & Hermanns, C. (2017). Preparing transformative leaders for diversity, immigration, and equitable expectations for school-wide excellence. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(5), 661–678. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-10-2016-0227

Lochmiller, C. R., & Chesnut, C. E. (2017). Preparing turnaround leaders for high needs urban schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(1), 85–102. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-11-2015-0099

Lopez, M. E. (2003). *Transforming schools through community organizing: A research review*. Harvard Family Research Project.

Lubell, E. (2011). *Building community schools: A guide for action*. Theoryofchange.org. http://www.theoryofchange.org/wp-content/uploads/toco_library/pdf/NCCS_BuildingCommunitySchools.pdf

Maier, A., Daniel, J., Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2017). *Community schools as an effective school improvement strategy: A review of the evidence*. Learning Policy Institute.

Marshall, C. (2004). Social justice challenges to educational administration: Introduction to a special issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X03258139

Mayger, L. K., & Hochbein, C. D. (2019). Spanning boundaries and balancing tensions: A systems perspective on the role of community school coordinators. *School Community Journal*, 29(2), 225–254. http://www.schoolcommunitynetwork.org/SCJ.aspx

McCarthy, M., Shelton, S., & Murphy, J. (2016). Policy penetration of the ISLLC standards. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 15(2), 221–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2015.1093149

McKinney de Royston, M. M., & Madkins, T. C. (2019). A question of necessity or of equity? Full-service community schools and the (mis)education of black youth. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 24(3), 244–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2019.1615920

Medina, M. A., Cosby, G., & Grim, J. (2019). Community engagement through partnerships: Lessons learned from a decade of full-service community school implementation. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 24(3), 272–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2019.1615923

Miller, P., Pavlakis, A., Lac, V., & Hoffman, D. (2014). Responding to poverty and its complex challenges: The importance of policy fluency for educational leaders. *Theory into Practice*, 53(2), 131.138. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.887888

Miller, P. M., Brown, T., & Hopson, R. (2011). Centering love, hope, and trust in the community: Transformative urban leadership informed by Paulo Freire. *Urban Education*, 46(5), 1078–1099. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085910395951

Milner, H. R., IV. (2013). Analyzing poverty, learning, and teaching through a critical race theory lens. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 1–53. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12459720

Min, M., Anderson, J. A., & Chen, M. (2017). What do we know about full-service community schools? Integrative research review with NVivo. *School Community Journal*, 27(1), 29–54. http://www.schoolcommunitynetwork.org/SCJ.aspx

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019, May). *Concentration of public-school students eligible for free of reduced lunch*. Institute for Education Sciences. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_clb.asp

National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA]. (2015). *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015*. Author.

Ni, Y., Rorrer, A. K., Pounder, D., Young, M., & Korach, S. (2019). Leadership matters: Preparation program quality and learning outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(2), 185–206. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-05-2018-0093

Noguera, P. A. (2001). Transforming urban schools through investments in the social capital of parents. *Psychology*, 16(1), 725–750. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9mj097nv

Noguera, P. A., & Wells, L. (2011). The politics of school reform: A broader and bolder approach for Newark. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 2(1), 5–25. https://doi.org/10.5070/B82110065

Orr, M. T. (2011). Pipeline to preparation to advancement: Graduates' experiences in, through, and beyond leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 114–172. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010378612

Orr, M. T., & Orphanos, S. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 18–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010378610

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage.

Perez, L. G., Uline, C. L., Johnson, J. F., Jr, James-Ward, C., & Basom, M. R. (2011). Foregrounding fieldwork in leadership preparation: The transformative capacity of authentic inquiry. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 217–257. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010378614

Perrone, F., & Tucker, P. D. (2019). Shifting profile of leadership preparation programs in the 21st Century. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(2), 253–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18799473

Prociw, S., & Eberle, F. (2016). Shift in emphasis in new standards for educational leaders. *Policy Update, National Association of State Boards of Education*, 23(1), 1–2. http://www.nasbe.org/wp-content/uploads/Prociw_Leader-Stds-Final.pdf

Reeves, R., Rodrigue, E., & Kneebone, E. (2016). *Five evils: Multidimensional poverty and race in America*. The Brookings Institution.

Roach, V., Smith, L. W., & Boutin, J. (2011). School leadership policy trends and developments: Policy expediency or policy excellence? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 71–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010378611

Ruiz, L. D., McMahon, S. D., & Jason, L. A. (2018). The role of neighborhood context and school climate in school-level academic achievement. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 61(3–4), 296–309. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12234

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual of qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Sanders, M. (2016). Leadership, partnerships, and organizational development: Exploring components of effectiveness in three full-service community schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 27(2), 157–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2015.1030432

Sanders, M. (2018). Crossing boundaries: A qualitative exploration of relational leadership in three full-service community schools. *Teacher College Record*, 120(4), 1–36. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Crossing-Boundaries%3A-A-Qualitative-Exploration-of-Sanders/b1a2db4e8363dca07f8f0a1dfdb5710a6020889d

Scanlan, M., & Johnson, L. (2015). Inclusive leadership on the social frontiers: Family and community engagement. In G. Theoharis & M. Scanlan (Eds.), *Leadership for increasingly diverse schools* (pp. 162–186). Routledge.

Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 417–453. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003417

Slater, C. L., Garcia Garduno, J. M., & Mentz, K. (2018). Frameworks for principal preparation and leadership development: Contributions of the International Study of Principal Preparation (ISPP). *Management in Education*, 32(3), 126–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020617747611

The Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008*. Author.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06293717

Tucker, P. D., Anderson, E., Reynolds, A. L., & Mawhinney, H. (2016). Analysis of evidence supporting the Educational Leadership Constituent Council 2011 Educational Leadership Program Standards. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 11(1), 91–119. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775116641664

Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2016). Typologizing school-community partnerships: A framework for analysis and action. *Urban Education*, 5(7), 719–747. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085914549366

Vogel, L., & Weiler, S. C. (2014). Aligning preparation and practice: An assessment of coherence in state principal preparation and licensure. *NASSP Bulletin*, 98(4), 324–350. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636514561024

Warren, M. R. (2005). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(2), 133–173. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.75.2.m718151032167438

Winkelman, P. (2012). Collaborative inquiry for equity: Discipline and discomfort. *Planning and Changing*, 43(3/4), 209–222. https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/31596853/Planning_and_Changing_Volume_43%283%29.pdf?response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DLearning_to_Lead_An_Examination_of_Innov.pdf&X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=ASIATUSBJ6BAEZ3OAKIH%2F20200504%2Fus-east-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20200504T205504Z&X-Amz-Expires=3600&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Security-Token=IQoJb3JpZ2luX2VjEEQaCXVzLWVhc3QtMSJHMEUCIQCD0gc2oL0VENUhiJS58woJrUkeOKUw7AWY6LAykKuTYAIgLnt%2Fcu1yaXNma3UXp%2BVWUXcc7gqZzhzpTMZ7rgb88kEqtAMIfRAAGgwyNTAzMTg4MTEyMDAiDKWAXTrZP1PYdT%2FrmSqRA3YqElcGRDlB5AaDiayq4FeLMt4SMDiTHsqa4vnDdd8eusBppRjiEqrjy%2BUsgjKucN7UypR1mE4X%2FekYxgGTRnWtxfgHroxjkqTUVKx%2Bg%2BpdGwAIQtckYY9mCzi2X2405doBShIpi0mf5OjASGsxVjcqb4GoTjJmBjm%2BPvSeQKFq3HofO1NWNl6Kp%2B%2Fdk3DtAKgiptQkC9Rz5hUeoUbYecCm0Djra0Ral%2FczrLjE9K1b8Wmy6pz%2B

2FhmWwZXCBO0QQ4LUr4Own3W1ZXpKIXMGCLvQNqm7VV4cZt0CcYuUsKvj1y0zPq0WYX%2BwsfsMLqo%
2 B c J V I m l n % 2 F o a s 2 i y 6 f G 6 A W %
2FhLRO9S7aXKpJZ6gTjp60CftoTz3tN75ISuibiilaGQ6Bm63OuQyF1nNfG1frDzMYIpDfvyNx6fOjL3lLo799RsreY%
2 B 4 B % 2 F 6 7 F M w D C B Z 8 n o z S l 9 J Y K t R c Y H Y T % 2 B C c Z j d b 7 v t r X W U B z w u h w d %
2 F H b q L m R N Q i Z I z n L R f O F 6 s Y N L p Z r G t B b v p C f b 1 N 3 X 5 j 8 E Y K N j u %
2FrWAhICMJXpwfUFOusB4FGodjuUa3fMbJ11lSEKX07XF9kcsb4H777Awx0pnnrbgqR4Xdfm3TgPsVkgI9HWisF
pJef0f3lsfFNF5Hkjcs%2BLCjI5oafvsAAOVFmjwl%2F2b3lDSCIHuDfnZmqwv%2FBtIaVYujBrSvy%
2 F F 0 X Y C Y C N k T x D E L Y g z 4 1 c U g t X p z g H R 2 I i z 6 0 r V Z C d k 2 E Z Y B s 9 V X q b I c K g a %
2BPNkVmCusQil0E5nRh44g18t5h3ImJ2Z9Y3dxbOGS5B5lxnhr5dOuADoOtc%2BJ0csT6sR4Syb7pvie%
2 F I e M r 2 0 k 2 % 2 F f y b % 2 B c e e u 6 x w P C Y v Q 6 R j T q Z 2 7 Q N l 8 f w % 3 D % 3 D & X - A m z - S i g n a t u r e =
fdb226c9234446f1b47e7cb618c1757c5e6a6c91fe2ecb3ae748b188fe9f3800#page=62

Young, M. D., & Crow, G. M. (2017). Introduction. In M. D. Young & G. M. Crow (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (2nd ed., pp. 1–12). Routledge.

Young, M. D., Anderson, E., & Nash, A. M. (2016). Preparing school leaders: Standards-based curriculum in the United States. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 16(2), 228–271. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2017.1298812

Young, M. D., & Perrone, F. (2016). How are standards used, by whom, and to what end? *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 11(1), 3–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775116647511

Appendix A   The Necessary Qualities of Community School Principals

Personal Characteristics

Committed and persistent (e.g., problem solver, does "whatever it takes" to best support kids)

Optimistic and positive attitude

Growth mind-set (e.g., looks for opportunities to learn; supports the learning and success of school staff, parents, and community partners.)

Adaptable: Flexible and responsive to changing conditions

Courageous (e.g., challenges central office when necessary, questions long-standing policies or rules, engages in difficult conversations)

Strong interpersonal skills (e.g., empathic, compassionate, welcoming, demonstrably appreciative of others' efforts)

Respectful listener: approachable and open to feedback

Attitudes and Dispositions

Operates with an equity lens (e.g., believes all children can learn; supportive of outcomes indicative of educational, social, and economic justice)

Understands and values the whole-child approach (e.g., physical and mental health, social and emotional wellbeing, access to quality enrichment opportunities, positive youth development, trauma-informed practices, restorative practices)

Culturally responsive leader (e.g., inclusive, values diverse perspectives, reflects the cultures of the population within the school, learns to speak the primary language of the community.)

Builds trust with others (e.g., exhibits integrity, leads by example)

Skilled communicator (e.g., engaging story teller, keeps people informed, clear about expectations, celebrates successes)

Servant Leadership: Espouses a firm conviction that the school belongs to the community and school faculty and staff are stewards of the school serving to benefit children and families.

Appreciates the key role of parents in children's learning

Strategic and focused (e.g., makes decisions based on what is needed and makes sense and not on what has always been done)

Strong organizational skills (e.g., consistent routines, delegates effectively)

Accountability and results focused

Visionary big-picture thinker

Innovative risk taker willing to try new things

Relationship focused

Behaviors

Nurtures a student-centered school culture and climate

Promotes collective responsibility for all children and their families

Present and active in the neighborhood and in the broader community

Collaborates, shares leadership, and substantively involves stakeholders in decision making (e.g., actively engages with planning teams and leadership councils, includes partner staff in hiring decisions)

Builds a collaborative and trusting relationship with the community school director

Integrates the components of the community school strategy into the school's vision as a cohesive strategy for the whole school, rather than co-location of programs and services.

Makes solid links between the community school strategy, the instructional program, and student learning (e.g., involves teachers, aligns community school programming and the school improvement plan)

Rigorously uses data to promote continuous organizational learning and improvement

Fiscally responsible, uses resources efficiently

Change agent: adept at adaptive leadership and able to navigate systems change work.