

**SAN FRANCISCO WELCOMING SCHOOLS PILOT
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

2007-2008



**CENTER FOR LGBTQ EVIDENCE-BASED APPLIED RESEARCH (CLEAR)
PACIFIC GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY**

Peter Goldblum, Ph.D., MPH, Director

This evaluation was partially funded by donations from:
Human Rights Campaign Foundation and
The Small Change Foundation

Submitted November 5, 2008

**SAN FRANCISCO WELCOMING SCHOOLS PILOT
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

PREPARED BY:

CENTER FOR LGBTQ EVIDENCE-BASED APPLIED RESEARCH (CLEAR)
PETER GOLDBLUM, PH.D., MPH, DIRECTOR
PACIFIC GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY
(650) 961-7503 x25
pgoldblum@pgsp.edu

San Francisco Welcoming Schools Partners

**Support Services for LGBT Youth of the School Health Programs Department of the San
Francisco Unified School District**

Kevin Gogin
Ilsa Bertolini

PARTICIPATING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Robert Broecker, Alvarado
Sande Leigh, Harvey Milk Civil Rights Academy
Jean Robertson, Grattan

RESPECT FOR ALL PROJECT | GROUNDPARK

Cristy Chung
Eileen Glasser
Barry Chersky

HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN

Kim Westheimer
Laura Szalacha, EdD
Ellen Kahn
Betsey Purcell

CENTER FOR LGBTQ EVIDENCE-BASED APPLIED RESEARCH (CLEAR)

Peter Goldblum, Ph.D., MPH
Amanda Houston-Hamilton, DMH
Allison Briscoe-Smith, Ph.D.
Amelia Fystrom
Ann Bilbrey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[EXECUTIVE SUMMARY](#) 4

[BACKGROUND AND GOALS](#) 5

[EVALUATION PLAN](#) 6

[SAN FRANCISCO WELCOMING SCHOOLS GUIDE](#) 6

[SAN FRANCISCO PILOT SITE OVERVIEW](#) 7

[SAN FRANCISCO WELCOMING SCHOOLS PARTNERS](#) 7

[COMPONENT ONE: IMPLEMENTATION: MILESTONES AND DECISIONS](#) 8

[COMPONENT TWO: INTERVIEWS WITH KEY STAKEHOLDERS](#) 18

[COMPONENT THREE: CLASS ROOM OBSERVATIONS](#) 24

[COMPONENT FOUR: WELCOMING SCHOOLS SURVEY](#) 27

[FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS](#) 29

[APPENDIX A](#) 31

[APPENDIX B](#) 33

[APPENDIX C](#) 36

[APPENDIX D](#) 38

[APPENDIX E](#) 39

[APPENDIX F](#) 40

[APPENDIX G](#) 41

[APPENDIX H](#) 43

Executive Summary

The San Francisco Welcoming Schools Pilot was initiated by the Task Force on Family Diversity Curriculum on January 4, 2007 and concluded for school year 2007-2008 on July 14, 2008. The Human Rights Campaign (HRC) developed this Guide for elementary schools to help teachers create and foster an atmosphere of respect, tolerance and safety for children from diverse family backgrounds, including those with LGBT parents and caregivers. The pilot was implemented by a community partnership including the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), the Human Rights Campaign Foundation (HRCF), the Respect for All Project of Groundspark (RFAP) and the Center for LGBTQ Evidence-based Applied Research (CLEAR). In this pilot school year, three elementary schools participated: Grattan, Harvey Milk Civil Rights Academy, and Alvarado. Each teacher in the three elementary schools taught two lessons from the Welcoming School Guide. Thus, 44 teachers taught 88 classes to 964 students. Approximately 150 parents participated in family forums that introduced the Welcoming Schools Guide and discussed their thoughts and concerns.

Kevin Gogin and Ilsa Bertolini, coordinators for Support Services for LGBT Youth of the School Health Programs Department, selected 19 lessons from the Welcoming Schools Guide to be taught in each school. The lessons were selected to be grade appropriate (see Lesson Plans for Pilot Curriculum in Appendix B). To ensure school-wide engagement in creating a welcoming school each of the three schools created a School Site Taskforce that was made up of teachers, principals, and parents. To maximize teaching effectiveness and produce positive impact on overall school climate, training was provided to all teachers in the three schools. Additional training was provided to Lead Teachers selected from each school to serve as resource contacts for their colleagues. The HRC donated copies of their Welcoming Schools Guide and relevant books to be used in the classroom and library and provided ongoing coordination with other pilot projects in New Bedford, Massachusetts and Minneapolis, Minnesota. RFAP and SFUSD provided training and technical support for teachers, school based community events, and task forces. CLEAR provided program evaluation.

Each stakeholder group (principals, teachers, and parents) had a significant role in the successful implementation of the Welcoming Schools Pilot. Principals took an active role in providing leadership in establishing a supportive environment and communicating with parents through organized family forums to raise awareness of the importance of addressing family diversity, gender stereotyping, name-calling and bullying in their schools. Teachers provided classroom instruction based on the Guide that was unique, creative, and accessible for their students. Going beyond the classroom, teachers developed awareness and intervention skills to decrease bullying and name-calling. Several parents commented that through participating in the Family Forums they were able to bridge school and home in order to reinforce ideas presented and to continue discussions with their children.

The purpose of the current evaluation is to describe the implementation process of the pilot, to ascertain challenges faced in the implementation, to determine whether the Guide was developmentally appropriate for elementary school students, and to measure changes in school climate over the year of participating in the Welcoming Schools Pilot. In reviewing the

Welcoming Schools-related activities in San Francisco, it is clear that the three schools met their goals of teaching the lessons of the Guide to their students. Furthermore, teachers gained skills and awareness through teacher trainings that were well attended and positively evaluated. Originally, evaluators planned to conduct a series of interviews and focus groups with administrators, parents and teachers. Given the intense demand on teachers' and parents' time, these interviews were dramatically curtailed and no focus groups were held. More extensive interviews were conducted with principals and trainers. Even with these limitations, the interviews that were conducted provided rich insights into the implementation of the Welcoming Schools Pilot. In addition, when 6 classes were observed, the evaluators found that 64.6% of the children were either "engaged" or "very engaged" with the activity presented. More than half actively participated in the class activity and less than 40% had off-task or disengaged behavior. A content analysis of the lessons that were observed indicated that in all classes all of the topics related to the stated goals by Welcoming Schools Guide were covered. However, consistent with concerns expressed by several constituent groups, this analysis also found that explicit use of the terms "lesbian", "gay", "bisexual", "transgender" was rare. Finally, an analysis of the surveys of school personnel in the three elementary schools in San Francisco conducted by Laura Szalacha, EdD found that, "While school climate (which is rather high in San Francisco on a 1-5 scale) is not significantly better, all other scales are significantly higher." Surveys taken before and after teacher training and classroom lessons found significant changes in school personnel beliefs and behaviors. They decreased in their stereotypic gender role beliefs and their discomfort in discussing topics related to gender identity and sexual orientation. Furthermore, they were less likely to express concerns that elementary school students were not cognitively ready to discuss these topics. They also increased the amount of time talking about these topics in class.

BACKGROUND AND GOALS

The Human Rights Campaign (HRC) developed the Welcoming Schools Guide for elementary schools to help teachers create and foster an atmosphere where all students feel they belong and where diversity and tolerance are celebrated. This groundbreaking program was piloted in three cities: New Bedford, Minneapolis and San Francisco. The San Francisco Unified School District introduced the Guide in three schools in 2007.

The basic premise of the Welcoming Schools Guide for K-5 elementary schools is that schools should be inclusive. Since families are the core of our identities, to operate successfully in the ever-diversifying American culture, all children need to learn about families different from their own. The guide outlines school and community based strategies to welcome a variety of families. It is based on research that shows a link between an inclusive school climate and academic achievement and mental wellbeing.

Welcoming School Guide has five overarching goals:

- Increased student understanding of, and respect for, family diversity (including families headed by Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning (LGBTQ) parents, single parents, foster parents, grandparents, etc.);
- Increased student understanding of, and respect for, diverse gender roles among students;
- Increased student understanding of the negative impact of stereotyping behavior;

- Reduction of student name-calling and bullying behavior;
- Increased student and teacher perception of their school as a safe and welcoming environment for all students.

EVALUATION PLAN

This report describes four components the San Francisco Welcoming Schools Pilot Program evaluation. The first component provides a narrative description of the program implementation that includes milestone events and decisions by the organizers that occurred during the course of project. The second component provides the results and analysis of individual interviews with key stakeholders (school administrators, teachers, and parents). The third presents the findings from a newly developed procedure for classroom observation of lessons from the Welcoming School Guide being taught. Dr. Allison Briscoe-Smith at CLEAR developed this procedure that aims to assess students' readiness and level of engagement with the material being taught. Analysis on these observations and review of materials produced in the classroom exercises are presented and discussed. Finally, results from the Welcoming Schools Survey developed by Laura Szalacha, EdD to measure school climate before and after teacher training and classroom presentations are presented in the fourth component. In San Francisco this survey was conducted two times during the year.

SAN FRANCISCO WELCOMING SCHOOLS GUIDE

This K-5 resource guide was initiated at the request of parents and educators to meet the needs of students whose family structures are often not reflected in school curricula. The guide outlines school- and community-based strategies to welcome a variety of families, including families headed by gay and lesbian parents, single parents, foster parents, grandparents etc. It is based on research that shows links among academic achievement, mental well-being and an inclusive school climate.

The guide was also written in response to educators who asked for help to address anti-gay name-calling and harassment. It addresses harassment in the context of helping students develop pro-social behaviors as taught in programs such as Second Step. It includes strategies to decrease violence and increase respect for diversity based on race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, class, and ability.

Also included are resources for administrators and educators on ways to support the social and academic growth of children who face severe pressure to conform to narrow gender roles. Many of the lessons with the Guide connect directly to English/Language Arts, History/Social Science and Health standards. The guide, which was developed in Boston, is being piloted by the Human Rights Campaign. The Guide has four basic components.

- Twenty Lesson Plans for K-5: Covering family diversity, gender roles, name-calling and bullying

- Strategies to Create a Caring School Community: Guidelines for administrators, educators, parents, and guardians
- Teachable Moments: Answering student questions, definitions, and research on child development
- Connections to research and standards: Connections with Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and Second Step. Facts on families, bullying, and anti-gay name-calling

SAN FRANCISCO PILOT SITE OVERVIEW

- Three elementary schools--Harvey Milk Civil Rights Academy, Alvarado, and Grattan--in the district received free professional development to help implement the Guide.
- Schools received the Guide and related books at no cost to the district.
- Schools received ongoing technical assistance and an overview of the connections between Welcoming Schools and the Whole School Improvement Plan, the state curriculum frameworks and district standards.
- Schools implemented at least 6 lesson plans in three grades.
- Schools took part in a preliminary curriculum evaluation.
- Schools developed and implemented a plan to involve faculty, administration and parents in the implementation of the pilot.

SAN FRANCISCO WELCOMING SCHOOLS PARTNERS

To achieve the Welcoming School goals in San Francisco, the Human Rights Campaign Foundation joined with The Support Services for LGBT Youth of the School Health Programs Department of the San Francisco Unified School District to pilot the curriculum during School-Year 2007-2008. The Respect for All Project of Groundspark provided professional development for teachers and technical assistance to community forums for parents. The Center for LGBTQ Evidence-based Applied Research (CLEAR) provided program evaluation.

Support Services for LGBT Youth of the School Health Programs Department is completely integrated within San Francisco Unified School District to collaborate with other programs to make schools safer for all students including gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students.

The program includes:

- Curriculum development, training, and implementation;
- Counseling and referral services, including school-site group for students, families, and staff regarding LGBTQ issues;
- Professional developments regarding LGBTQ youth issues;
- Theater presentations;
- Community Based Organizations presentations in elementary, middle, and high school classes;
- Gay Pride Commemorations.

The Respect for All Project of Groundspark seeks to create safe, hate-free schools and communities. It provides youth and adults who guide their development the tools they need to engage in age-appropriate discussions about human differences, preventing prejudice and building caring communities. The project offers a comprehensive set of resources for educators and youth-service providers, including award-winning documentary films, high quality curriculum guides and comprehensive workshop series for professionals and community members (see Appendix F for an outline describing the components of RFAP project coordination).

Center of LGBTQ Evidence-based Applied Research (CLEAR) of the Pacific Graduate School of Psychology aims to improve the lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and questioning people by helping community-based organizations evaluate and research their programs to determine whether what they are doing works. CLEAR is the first research center in the country to specifically focus on LGBTQ applied research. CLEAR has developed an innovative, cost-effective approach that brings together the wealth of research expertise in the San Francisco Bay Area to assist community-based programs. These experts help community providers understand and translate policy statements and clinical best practices into their work with LGBTQ populations. Under the direction of Pacific Graduate School of Psychology professor Peter Goldblum, Ph.D. MPH, CLEAR brokers these relationships and supports them through grant development and project management.

COMPONENT ONE: IMPLEMENTATION: MILESTONES AND DECISIONS

January 4, 2007: San Francisco Initial Task Force on Family Diversity Curriculum is formed

A Task Force was convened by SHPD at the request of the SF Board of Education. Task Force members included Community Based Organization representatives, parents, two staff members from SHPD, two SFUSD teachers, and one SFUSD elementary principal. The Task Force met once a month from January through May, 2007. In addition, Task Force Members met in committees to discuss various topics that arose as a result of the formal meetings.

Goals of the Task Force Meetings were to:

- Review existing curriculum and classroom supplemental materials relating to family diversity, including sexual orientation
- Recommend materials and resources to be utilized in support of existing curriculum
- Clarify procedures that school sites will use in reporting implementation of the Family Diversity/Sexual Orientation Curriculum
- Prepare a Task Force report for the SFUSD BOE Commissioners

The Board Report was completed by community Task Force members by the May 10, 2007 meeting, and was reviewed by SHPD staff and administration following its completion. Several of the suggestions made in the report were implemented by the time report was submitted, others were implemented in 07-08, including:

- Introducing a new lesson to all elementary Health Advocates in February 2007, and providing professional development to Health Advocates regarding the lesson
- Reviewing and piloting a new elementary curriculum, Welcoming Schools, in three elementary schools by January 2008, with the intent of expanding the lessons to other sites by September 2008
- Revising the Coordinated Program Monitoring (CPM) tool to include Family Diversity Lessons, and requesting every school site to complete the CPM tool twice each year under the direction of the school site administrator

Task Force members created a budget at the request of the BOE.

August of 2007: Initial national meeting with Welcoming Schools (WS) held in San Francisco.

In attendance representatives from Human Rights Campaign Foundation, project directors, teachers from San Francisco Schools, representations from Our Family Coalition, The Respect For All Project, Evaluators from CLEAR and Laura Szalacha from University of Illinois, Chicago were also present. The all day meeting was facilitated by Kim Westheimer, consultant to the HRCF Family Project. Kim outlined the project and set the agenda. (Appendix D).

1. Introductions
2. Setting the stage
 - a. One thing I have learned about creating an LGBT inclusive elementary school is. . .
 - b. One thing I would like to know about creating an LGBT inclusive elementary school is. . .
3. Brief overview of each organization's work and connection to this project.
4. Welcoming Schools Updates
5. Overview of Evaluation model and survey
 - a. Evaluation methods
 - b. Process
6. Survey Feedback
7. Lunch
8. What else do we want to know from stakeholders?
9. What else should we be taking into consideration?

September 21st 2007 Welcoming School Meeting with Respect for All Project (RFAP) and SFUSD and CLEAR held at Ground Spark.

Discussed:

- Discussed roles and responsibilities of three partners (SFUSD, RFAP, CLEAR)
- Generated questions for teacher and parent interviews (see Appendix C, Questions for Interviews and Focus Groups)
- Reviewed the process of Institutional Review Board at Pacific Graduate School (PGSP) and Informed Consent (see Appendix G for Informed Consent forms)

October 11th 2007 Welcoming School Meeting with CLEAR, Respect for All Project and SFUSD, held at Ground Spark

Discussed:

- The School Climate Surveys: SFUSD (Ilsa) will take responsibility for identifying teachers and collecting surveys.
- The Respect For All Project will provide local coordination of the San Francisco project at each of the school sites, the facilitation team and for the SF Task Force (SFUSD, RFAPP, CLEAR)
- Qualitative Evaluation: a) Interviews of key stakeholders related to understand the implementation process: hopes and barriers before they teach and then to re-interview as to how they felt the class went b) Classroom observations and work product of students participating in lessons within the Guide. Issues include: How to measure student engagement? How to reassure teachers that we are not evaluating their teaching skill?
- Stipends for teachers and parent participation in interviews and focus groups.
- Professional development activities including: a) teacher training and b) family forums
- School Site Task Force will be responsible for organizing the family forum, RFAP will provide on-site technical assistance for each of the three school sites and assistance during to the forum. CLEAR will send observers to record the process.
- Discussed the inclusion of LGBTQ material in family diversity aspect of Guide.
- Working relationship with Boston Welcoming Schools group
- Family Coalition in Oakland is also using Welcoming Schools Guide and will participating in School Climate Survey
- RFAP will conduct initial site meetings with each of the principals

Decided:

- Principals would be the first to be interviewed and to discuss logistics for identifying teachers for interviews and focus groups.
- Ask Dr. Briscoe-Smith, CLEAR evaluator in charge of Classroom Observations, to discuss her plans for development of observation instrument..
- The final evaluation report will include both qualitative (CLEAR) and quantitative (Laura Szalacha) data.

October 16th 2007, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the expectation of participating schools was sent to principals by Kevin Gogin and Ilsa Bertolini of School Health Programs Department (see Appendix A).

November 16th 2007 Welcoming School Meeting with Respect for All, SFUSD and CLEAR held at Ground Spark

Discussed:

- Need for a comparison group to better evaluate the participation in class presentations. For example, compare classes that were given lessons from the Guide vs. those that were not to compare the level of engagement in two types of classes.

- The concern that the Welcoming Schools Guide could be implemented with little discussion of LGBTQ issues. Decided to discuss this with teachers during teacher professional development. Finalized the schedule and procedure for teaching lessons from the Guide.
- The development of procedures for Classroom Observations led by Dr. Allison Briscoe-Smith, CLEAR evaluator
 - Find standardized way to measure engagement
 - Co-ordinate efforts with evaluators in Boston at Wheelock College
 - Train PGSP student coders in terms of engagement, including inter-rater reliability. Each student must have practice experience observing five students to develop reliability.
 - Develop hypothesis for both qualitative and quantitative data
 - Provide data that explains what has happened and what we have seen
 - Develop procedure that captures both individual and group behavior and includes both stimulus behavior (teacher and/or student) and response behavior (teacher and/or teacher)
 - Remember we are piloting the observational techniques, as well as, the lessons themselves.
 - Need minimum of 6 classroom observations so all grades are represented
 - Need Spanish speaking observers for Spanish language classes
 - Develop procedures that do not disrupt classroom and do not use audio recording devices
 - Develop clear communication system between observers and teachers

Announced:

- Lessons will be begin in April
- Each school will decide on dates and let us know
- Make sure to communication with principals, keeping the up-to-date on exactly what is going on.
- Have coders review the lessons from the Guide so they have a better grasp of the material.

Decided: Change Resource Teacher training to come before other teacher training.

November 11th 2007 Phone Interview with Suzanne H. Pasch, Ph.D., Founding Director, Center for Scholarship and Research, Wheelock College, Boston MA , evaluator of Boston Welcoming Schools Interview. by Peter Goldblum, CLEAR Director

Dr. Pasch has interviewed teachers and parents from New Bedford School district about Welcoming Schools Guide. Teachers were interviewed after their initial professional training session.

- A comment that was made on several occasions was that they only had one binder and did not know the content of the lessons.
- Teachers were more open in the individual interviews than in the focus groups.
- Teachers noted that there were many gay and lesbian teachers but they did not participate in focus groups.
- In survey data few teachers identified as gay or lesbian
- Teachers in focus groups did not want to talk about their level knowledge and skills related to LGBTQ issues

Parents: (individual interviews and focus groups)

- Question about what do you think of the program did not engender much discussion. Parents talked more about their concern regarding the developmental appropriateness of material than did teachers. They couched their concern by saying that they thought that other parents would resist based on the age of the students.
- They wanted to know whether sexual behavior would be discussed.
- Parents were concerned and confused about how decisions were made related to which classrooms were selected to receive Welcoming Schools' teaching.
- No parents were outright hostile to the program. Parents seemed open to their children learning tolerance but were worried that having the school contradict the churches opinions about homosexuality would confuse the children.
- Parents understood that LGBT issues were central to the program.
- Parents wanted to know more about the specific lessons to be taught and wanted to know before the class, not "when my child comes home afterwards."

December 6th 2007 Interview and Focus Group Training for CLEAR Students.

Dr. Amanda Houston- Hamilton led training for Andrea Feit, Ann Bilbrey and Mimi Fystrom was held at Dr. Houston-Hamilton's office. The purpose was to provide training to conduct interviews, focus groups and the role this plays when doing community based research. The students received references materials on background material for focus groups, ethics, additional research support materials, IRB documents, and project materials. (see Appendix D). Students practiced conducting interviews during the training.

January 18th 2008 Grattan and Alvarado Elementary School. Principals Interview, at their schools

Amanda Houston-Hamilton and Mimi Fystrom conducted the interview. The purpose was to gain information and insight as to their feelings and beliefs about the WS program and possible barriers related to implementation of the program. (See results of administrator interviews)

January 25th 2008 Welcoming School meeting with CLEAR, Respect for All Project and SFUSD, held at Groundspark.

Discussed

- Task Force Meeting, Family Forum, teacher trainings.
- Should we have separate LGBT parent focus group? What are the implications for these parents confidentiality?
- Interviews with principals from Grattan and Alvarado

Decided

- CLEAR will develop evaluation for Family Forums and procedures for parent interviews and focus groups.
- CLEAR will develop announcement of focus groups and interviews for parents and teachers
- CLEAR will go to professional training and Community Meetings to recruit parents and teachers. Consider how to use information gathered at these meetings to inform questions in

interviews and focus groups.

January 25th 2008 Administrator Interviews: Cristy Chung (Respect for All) and Kevin Gogin and Ilsa Bertolini (SFUSD).

Mimi Fystrom, Ann Bilbrey and Peter Goldblum conducted interviews. Interviews were held at Groundspark. The purpose was to gain information and insight as to their feelings and beliefs about the WS program and perceived barriers to implementation.

February 8th 2008 Lead Teacher 8 hour training, held at SFUSD Health Education Center.

Cristy, Barry, Elaine, provided instruction. In attendance were: Kevin, Ilsa, Ann, Mimi, Peter, lead teachers from Grattan, Alvarado, Harvey Milk, and Harvey Milk Principal. Purpose was to acquaint lead teachers to their roles (Appendix E, Key Roles) give teachers skills to implement the program in their school, as well as, to engage teachers' thinking about gender stereotypes, the harm name calling and bullying can have on children, and the importance of fostering acceptance of family diversity. The training provided lead teachers skill training and resources to be able to help other teachers and be leaders in the school as a whole. During the discussion with lead teachers some concerns were expressed from teachers that they were not informed in the beginning as to the amount of work involved. They suggested to have written surveys instead of interviews because of time commitment.

February 11th 2008 Grattan 2 hour teacher training (all teachers).

In attendance were: Cristy and Mimi, and all teachers from Grattan. Purpose was to expose and educate all teachers on the WS program. They went over the WS binder. Began to discuss gender stereotyping, the consequences of name-calling and bullying and how to foster an inviting environment for children who have diverse families. Lead Teachers were in charge and taught all the other teachers what they learned at the Led Teacher Training. The teachers were placed into groups by grade and discussed the lessons they would be doing.

February 15th 2008 Welcoming school meeting with Respect for All, SFUSD, and CLEAR, held at Ground Spark. .

Discussed:

- Friday's Lead Teacher Training and Family Forum and teachers' feedback. Some teachers appeared surprised about the amount of work for them and the principals as part of the evaluation process, even though this had been discussed with the principals. The overall impression by trainers and observers was favorable. Further identified need to better communicate with both teachers and principles. (See evaluation of Lead Teacher Training).
- Feedback from some lead teachers that materials for 1st grade are not LGBT specific enough.
- The timing of lessons and whether they can be included in Gay Pride Month in April.
- Things to consider if the program is to be continued next year:
 - Better planning of timing of training of teachers

- Clearer articulation of evaluation process
- The number of schools that will participate
- The number of Guides and resource books given to each school
- Better communication with principals

Decided:

- Drop the comparison class and only observe teachers teaching the WS Guide.
- Develop a letter outlining the expectations of teachers and specifying the incentives: a \$25 gift certificate
- Discuss with teachers in professional development the need to include specific LGBTQ discussion.

February 22nd 2008 interview with Harvey Milk Principal, at Harvey Milk Elementary School.

Peter and Mimi conducted the interview.. Purpose was to gain information and insight as to their feelings and beliefs about the WS program. Also to have them express their concerns and possible barriers related to implementation of the program.

March 3rd 2008 Harvey Milk 1 hour teacher training (Open only to Harvey Milk teachers)

Definition of Family Forum: The "Family Forum" was a planned project component to help engage the larger school community in the Welcoming Schools project. It could be an event that was already happening or a separate event which ever made the most sense for each community. Each school site task force was responsible for planning the event and the goal was to share the WS project and give each school community the opportunity to talk about inclusive education.

March 13th 2008 Grattan Family Forum, at Grattan Elementary School, parents, teachers, principal attended

Eighty parents participated in a pot-luck held by Grattan and childcare was provided. Cristy Chung from Respect for All, Mimi and Ann from CLEAR attended. The purpose was to introduce Welcoming Schools to parents and to discuss issues related to family diversity. CLEAR also used the opportunity to recruit parents for interviews. The principal welcomed parents and discussed the goals of the Welcoming School Program. She specifically discussed the role LGBT material in the Guide including gender stereotyping and the importance to foster acceptance for all children. The group discussed the role that Grattan should have in the program.

The principal showed three videos created by students on the subject "It's A Family." The first video was of an African American girl who lived in an extended family. She discussed living with her mother, father, brother, sisters, and grandparents. She also discussed the importance her aunts, uncles, and cousins in her life. The next family was headed by a lesbian couple. This couple had adopted two girls. The couple was currently getting divorced. The girls discussed what it is like living with two moms, "It's not different than living with a mom and dad, and they

still love me the same.” They also discussed their feelings of having to move back and forth between homes and living through a divorce. The final family was a single mother household. The boy talked about his close relationship to his mom. He discussed not having a father involved in his life, “I have my mom and she really loves me.”

After the video the principal gave a talk about family diversity and how important it is to have a welcoming school environment for all different types of families. At this time the children went to play (child care provided), and the parents watched the movie “It’s a Family” After the film there was a discussion among parents. Parents were asked to talk to the parents next to them to learn about their family diversity. After that, there was a group discussion. One woman brought up religion as an issue of family diversity and was concerned because it was not addressed in the video. The principal explained that the video did but they did not watch all of the video. The principal validated the parent’s concerns. The program ended with telling parents about the research collecting contact names for interviews.

March 14th 2008 interview with teachers from Harvey Milk,

Mimi interviewed one 1st grade teacher and one resource teacher. The purpose was to have teachers express their views and beliefs related to the Welcoming Schools Guide Pilot and incorporating LGBT issues into elementary educations. (see Appendix B)

March 12, 2008 Lead Teacher Follow-up Meeting

Eileen Glasser of the Respect for All Project facilitated a second meeting of lead teachers. In attendance were 16 teachers and two principals. According to Ms. Glasser, “They were completely on board. Each school comfortably reported about their all staff trainings and their family forums. They unanimously said that their biggest challenge is time and energy and their biggest need is more books. They said it is hard to share one set of books over 20-odd classrooms. After their reports, I gave them ten minutes to read through the sections of the binders with questions and suggested responses. Some of them chatted but most of them focused and got to know the materials in the Guide. Then I gave them their pop-quiz in the form of the concentric circle. We did 6 scenarios, which, in retrospect was probably one or two too many. Nevertheless they were very engaged in it and enjoyed that part of the agenda the most. They followed the directions well in terms of taking turns speaking and listening and in terms of staying on topic. We then talked as a group about how the exercise was for them and charted some of the suggestions they found most helpful. Then we did a very brief Next Steps discussion, but they were mostly too tired to focus at that point. They were very appreciative that we were ensuring they would get the whole \$65 and get paid through RFAPP instead of through the district. The end of the training was a bit anti-climactic, but overall I think left feeling like they had gotten real substance out of the day. Sandy was asking what the next steps are. I have the sense that the schools are enthusiastic about the program but may not carry it forward without some structure there encouraging them to do so, so I think it would be good for us to give that some thought.”

April 7th 2008 Alvarado Family Forum, held at Alvarado Elementary School,

About 20-25 families came to Family forum that started at 8:30am. This allowed parents to come to forum without needing child care. Breakfast was provided for parents and interpreter for Spanish speaking only parents. The forum began by discussing the Gay Pride Assembly that would happen right after the family forum. The principal talked about the importance of LGBT families being represented in schools and curriculum.

A documentary of two men who adopted a little boy was shown. The film discussed their struggles and prejudice they faced (i.e. women can take care of children better). One of the fathers was present and answered questions from the parents. The forum was short because of difficulties with the DVD. After this there was a gay pride assembly and the entire school put on presentations having to do with LGBT topics. All the grades presented on stage that included poems, songs, stories, and the play plays And Tango Makes Three. Elaine from Respect for All, Kevin & Ilsa from SFUSD, and Mimi from CLEAR were present.

April 11th 2008 Welcoming School Meeting with Respect for All, SFUSD, and CLEAR, held at Ground Spark

Discussed:

- Difficulties in scheduling classroom observations
- The classroom observation procedure to answer question whether students are developmentally prepared to discuss sexual orientation and family diversity issues. Also important to understand what is the level of exposure and understanding the elementary students already have before the lessons.
- Discussed observer training

Decided:

- Limiting the number of focus groups to one for teachers and one for parents

April 16th 2008 Harvey Milk Family Forum, held at Harvey Milk

Forty-five parents attended a pasta dinner for parents to discuss the Welcoming Schools Guide. As a project to prepare kids for the family forum they made a 'Harvey Milk Family Diversity Tree'. Each child made a leaf of his/her family and the leaf was placed on the tree in the auditorium where the family forum was held.

The principal made welcoming statements and introductions. She discussed the importance of family and the importance of family diversity and how to make a school safe for children. As a project, the principal had pre-selected several families to talk about their family and "how it is unique". The first family--an interracial family-- discussed the role cultural played in their family, and how to expose their children to both cultures. They discussed their different religions and ways that they expose children to both religions. The next was a lesbian family. The daughter spoke about her feelings having two moms. She discussed how 'we are no different than other families'. The daughter in the last pre-selected family required being in a wheel chair. Her mother, who is single, shared how important her daughter is to her. The daughter talked about how her mother takes care of her and is "the best mom".

Afterwards other children were asked to come up and briefly discuss their families. These students came from African American families, Indian families, Caucasian families, different types of religion families, and grandparent headed households. The overarching themes from all the children were: my parents care for me, we have lots of fun together, and they love me.

After that the children either went out to play on the playground, or made tie-dyed t-shirts. Childcare was provided. While the children played the parents watched "It's a Family" and had a discussion afterwards. There were no concerns expressed about the video and many people "learned about families that I did not know before." Next the families were asked to discuss with another family their diversity. The family forum ended with discussion about research and parents signed up for interviews/focus groups.

In attendance were: teachers, parents, Barry from RFAP, and Mimi. Purpose was to introduce program to parents and to raise awareness of family diversity and LGBT issues.

April 23rd 2008 Grattan Classroom Observations-

Held at Grattan Elementary School. Did observation on 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade. Jessica, Juanita, Keri, Rachel, Malique and Mimi were there. Purpose was to begin to assess whether children are emotionally and behaviorally engaged in the WS material.

April 28th 2008 Grattan Classroom Observations-

Held at Grattan Elementary School. Did observations on grade K. Mimi, Siobhan and Suniti were there. Purpose was to begin to assess whether children are emotional and behaviorally engaged with the WS material.

May 21st 2008 Harvey Milk Classroom Observations.-

Held at Harvey Milk. Did observation on 4th grade and 1st grade. Jessica, Keri, Mimi and Malique. Purpose was to begin to assess whether children are emotionally and behaviorally engaged in material.

May 28th 2008 Harvey Milk Classroom Observations- CANCELED

June 11th 2008 Welcoming school meeting with Respect for All, SFUSD, and CLEAR,

Discussed:

- Difficulty scheduling parents and teachers for interviews.
- Many teachers have not kept their agreements about teaching the lessons from the Guide.
- Situation in Minneapolis in which a small group of parent objected to teaching the WS material. Their objection include the Groundspark film It's a Family.

Decided:

- CLEAR would purchase tape recording device that connects with the phone to interview teachers and parents by phone. This requires revising the IRB protocol.

- Ilsa and Kevin would intervene with principals to motivate them to comply with their agreements to participate in the program.

June 15th 2008 Parent interview, scheduled.

Mimi did face to face interview with mother of 6 year old and 8 year old boys who attended Grattan Elementary School. Purpose was to get the parents view of the program, if it has helped them or changed their views and what they would like to see in the future for the program. This parent discussed the importance of school/home alliance to foster acceptance.

June 19th 2008 Parent interview, scheduled

Parent canceled, and unable to reschedule.

July 14th 2008 parent interview.

Mimi did phone interview with mother of a Kindergarten (daughter) at Grattan Elementary School. Purpose was to get the parents view of the program and how the program has impacted her daughter and what they would like to see improved. This parent discussed how her child's response to being "mixed race" and how the program has helped her. The parent also reports "it brought the LGBT issues to my attention, I would have never thought about some of that.

COMPONENT TWO: INTERVIEWS WITH KEY STAKEHOLDERS

PURPOSE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviews and focus groups of key informants (school administrators, teachers, and parents) were proposed to describe program development and implementation. This information was to be gathered to assist other school districts to develop similar programs using the Welcoming School Guide. Evaluation researchers developed the questions for both interviews and focus groups in collaboration with staff at SFUD, Suzanne Pasche of Wheelock College in Boston, and the national coordinator of the Welcoming School Project, Kim Westheimer of Boston (See Appendix B). Participants were queried about 1) their awareness and understanding of the program 2) their willingness to participate or have their children participate in Welcoming School Pilot 3) their perception of need, value, and use of their time for such a program 4) feedback about the program goals and activities 5) perceived barriers to effective implementation of the program 5) suggestions for improving the program outcomes, and 6) identified strengths or resources to reduce perceived barriers and increase successful implementation. After considerable discussion with administrators and outreach to teachers and parents, evaluators realized that the possibility of gathering enough individuals for focus groups was not possible.

METHOD

Three graduate students from CLEAR were trained to conduct and interpret findings from interviews and focus groups by Dr. Amanda Houston-Hamilton, an expert in qualitative research. The Coordinators of the Welcoming Schools Pilot Project, Kevin Gogin and Ilsa Bertolini, both employees of the school district, and Christy Chung, Respect for All Project, helped identify and recruit participants and arrange for space to conduct these activities. Teachers and parents participating in the interviews received a \$25.00 gift certificate to Trader Joes supermarket. After signing the informed consent document, participants were either interviewed in person or by phone. Interviews lasted from 30 minutes to an hour. Two principals, two school administrators, three trainers, one teacher, and two parents were interviewed.

Since this pilot included a small sample of key informants, the methods were not as formal as they might have been in a larger study. For example, no special software was necessary.

An interviewer transcribed each of the tapes and these transcriptions were organized as written into outlines. The key questions of the interviews were highlighted and emergent themes collapsed. The method used was a shortened qualitative process of careful review, sorting, coding, and identifying patterns within the coded material. This process was completed several times as each review added to the understanding of the phenomenon. Two researchers conducted an initial sort and one then took the lead in the analysis and write-up. This research team edited the draft and had opportunities to expand or challenge interpretations.

RESULTS

In reviewing the material from these interviews, one question emerged that seemed to encompass all other questions asked: *“What are the challenges in implementing the Welcoming School Guide Program in San Francisco”*.

1. Limited awareness and involvement of parents in support of the Pilot Project and its messages.

Parents were concerned that they knew very little about the lesson from the Guide before or after application of Welcoming Schools. They felt disappointed that there had been no conversation with other parents around the school and, therefore, they generated neither the “buzz” nor full support for full realization of the goals of the pilot. A parent who would have liked to be more involved was not well used. It was not clear to the interviewed parents what role other parents played in the development of the teaching. In at least one school, there were some casual conversations, all positive, but again they did not happen in a way that maximized parent energy.

Teachers, on the other hand, worried parents might feel blind-sided. However, their suggested solution was permission slips rather than more inclusion. Thus, parents knew nothing about the Guide when they went to the Family Forum. While the Forum was a helpful introduction, more specifics on lessons from the Guide were desired, such as what the children would experience would have been helpful to increase parent buy-in.

Not fully understanding the Project also left parents unable to provide follow-up to reinforce the teachings with the children or other parents. *“(You) need follow-up for parent and guides for teachers to help parents speak with each other and to their children.”* Even after the

implementation, parents were to some degree unclear about the content of the Guide or what developmental issues are embedded. A lead teacher worried that some parents may get a new language, but without more connection, follow-up, and resources use it in an inappropriate way. The parents interviewed offered a solution: increased training and involvement of parents in networking and learning from each other.

2. There is concern among school staff that some parents will have difficulty accepting the lessons from the Guide based on their cultural and religious values about sexuality, homosexuality, or about communication with children in general.

Some teachers and administrators believed significant parent objections were going to be an obstacle to implementation. This concern seemed attached especially to the past experience with the religious and cultural objections of Latino parents not only to discussing sexuality, but to the school's role in instilling any moral values in their children: *"what is correct or what is not correct"*. School staff worry an LGBT-inclusive curriculum may appear to some families to be the *"indoctrination of young people, (forcing them) to approve of something that the family does not"*. As another respondent put it, *"I think there are a lot of family members who have really strong beliefs that it's not okay to be teaching about LGBT people in schools and that piece makes me the most nervous and (so) I think we struggle with how to respond"*.

Parents seemed less worried about negative responses from other parents, though as one parent acknowledged, *"You will always have those (parents) who are resistant."* A principal concurred that the primary obstacle in reaching parents may not be the topic as much as *"how much we can hook the kids in."* If the kids show excitement, the parents will come along because they want to see their children in a learning mode.

One respondent felt parents who spend more time around school would have less problem with the lessons from the Guide because they see for themselves not only the teasing and gender stereotyping, but the resultant pain they cause children who are seen as "different". As a consequence, parents are more likely to understand the need for such an intervention. Another noted, *"I think of this one... boy whose mom is a staff here and she is very concerned about it. Of course she sees it more often than other parents might see it because she is here"*. Conversely, parents who don't see what teasing does to a child or who think it's just part of growing up without viewing the real-time context of teasing or bullying for their child, may not understand the need for this type of project nor that it may be, in fact, in support of their religious values.

In one final related point, respondents felt girls experienced school bullying around gender non-conforming issues less. It is not clear if they, as a consequence, felt parents of girls would feel more or less engaged in the Pilot of the Guide.

Ultimately the best balance between parent inclusion and unnecessarily fanning controversy is unclear. Some respondents, however, suggest that keeping a low profile for LGBT teaching simply out of fear of generating negative parental response may backfire: *"When the school talked more about the process, the exposure of parents generated excitement. Schools may*

hesitate for fear of creating opposition, but parents found the conversation (about the Project) with friends at school helpful to implementation”.

3. The pre-existing climate of a school affects the implementation at every level of its process.

Both parents and teachers spoke of the importance of school climate (e.g. the diverse environment, supportive attitude of principals, and a culture that values discussion) to their positive sense of its capacity to implement the Guide. So much of the Pilot’s success depends “*on how each teacher implements it and how the school integrates it into their everyday culture and climate*” that if the school presents hurdles to affecting integration, the classroom work will have limited effectiveness.

It happened that each parent in this study was very certain of the high standards within their child’s school for tolerance and openness about gay families and, thus, were confident about success of the pilot project. However, even in San Francisco, every school culture may not project an invitation to LGBT-related conversations even when they clearly demonstrate that they value diversity in every other way. Therefore, implementation of this kind of curriculum may not occur in the places that most need a vocabulary for discussing gender and sexual differences, inclusion, and acceptance. For example, based on her observation that some schools in the District were not openly discussing the California Supreme Court decision on gay marriage, one parent was hesitant to discuss gay issues and was not confident that schools other than her own would welcome discussions about LGBT people. Even the principal in a school known to be fairly open-minded, worried “*for certain parents and staff members, it is difficult to raise (sexual preference) just because (it) has sex right in it and it becomes a more personal question for people*”.

Ironically, school staff and parents that foresee no problems may provide a special challenge to planning and implementation because they are not able to provide necessary insights nor do they anticipate strategies to facilitate the success of such a potentially risky lessons. One respondent felt the staff of some partner schools might be surprised by stereotypic points of view that exist in their school or their surrounding communities, even within neighborhoods in or close to the Castro district.

4. The Welcoming Schools Guide is not as specific and explicit as the units the District has used in the past. Though staff worried that parents might be offended by LGBT aspects of the lessons, several also were concerned the omission of material particular to LGBT people would allow schools to leave out important educational opportunities.

Several respondents who had seen other District LGBT study programs strongly felt that this product had hidden “*the LGBT language*” too well among its more general diversity material, especially in the K-2 lessons. Their arguments against this style were several. First, only if you make an explicit statement about LGBT families, do you clearly show these particular families the respect you are advocating within diversity.

Second, this absence of targeted gay content was seen as a weakness that presents other challenges for teachers: *“I think (in) some of the lessons it would be really easy to not be LGBT specific, to just be sort of ‘Welcoming Schools’. You know? We just want to be welcoming. It’s part of the problem of a lot of school climate programs where they’re teaching respect for each other and trying to help the kids learn to relate to each other, but they are not addressing the real bias and prejudice that are affecting . . . those school climates. So I think there is a tendency for programs to sort of gloss over the hard parts and there is nothing . . . that really forces teachers to have to go that next step. So it’ll be a little up to them”*. In other words, young children may not be able to navigate less than concrete conversation on the topic of acceptance. A teacher felt, *“If you’re only teaching without being specific then they won’t know what you are thinking or what they should be thinking about. You need to be explicit t . . . , but I do like general lessons that don’t just focus on this type of family”*. A principal agreed both that the LGBT discussion should be imbedded within teaching about family diversity [*inclusive*] and that *“I think you need to say ‘gay’ for kids to understand you are talking about this issue [explicit].”*

A third, but related concern for elementary school kids was, *“If you are not explicit, you will not prepare (the children) for middle school (where) victimization, raging hormones, and bigger kids all come into play and kids can get seriously hurt, whether physical or emotions (sic)”*. Expanding on this issue of gender non-conforming behavior, another staff member felt the goal was not only personal safety and understanding, but also *“creating kids who can stand up. . . who can not be offended by the injustice and (who) say something”*.

5. Getting all the school players to participate is an on-going and difficult task.

Finding the right motivator for getting tired, working parents to the table was seen as a major barrier. Some parents’ cultures may not reinforce that they have an important role in school life under any circumstances or they might not have the work or family flexibility to be able to go to school meetings. Parents are asked to engage in many school activities. One respondent specifically foreshadowed that *“getting people to (the Family Forums) is going to be a challenge”*.

Similarly, teachers are stretched to the maximum with many additional expectations regularly loaded onto already heavy teaching and student support activities. *“The amount of work involved right now, our teachers are starting to be like, ‘Oh my goodness, this is a lot of work’. . . Some of our teachers that are asked to be on this committee are already on 4 other committees.”*

6. The teachers will need multi-level support for an emotionally evocative process.

The openness of school principals is seen as one key to teacher comfort with the Project, but the wider support system around the teachers has to be better planned to get the most out of them and the lessons from the Guide. A principal thoughtfully observed, *“Emotional (topics) and resistance may be something (teachers) are not comfortable coming to me about, especially since they know I am (openly gay). . . (they) probably feel that if they have problems with (an LGBT curriculum) I am not the best person to come and talk to.”*

Another staffer stated a similar concern for the teacher's own emotional needs, *"I think teachers will feel shy about how they are going to respond to students and (so they) feel nervous. . . . Huge allies of the LGBT community still struggled in the classroom with 'what am I gonna say if this comes up. And 'what if they start to giggle'. And 'I'm uncomfortable with saying the words out loud to the kids'. And 'I'm afraid how the parents are going to respond'."*

Indeed a teacher confirmed that *"some of the family and emotional stuff, I think, is a little harder because it is new for me"*. However, s/he also felt particularly unprepared to address parent concerns and requested that additional resources they might require be made available.

The program trainers were aware of the challenge of providing *"really good tools"* for teachers, but felt teachers also need many opportunities to practice. Otherwise *"they are going to have to jump in and do it"*. Therefore, another supportive solution the trainers offered to this challenge was *"continued professional development for teachers"*.

Discussion:

The development and implementation of these lessons highlights the 3 distinct domains that must be considered within schools. These domains are not simply "constituencies" or "interests", they represent genuine differences in worldview, educational objectives, and sense of accountability. For instance, we might expect school administrators to relate to the economic-social-political climate or changing "community standards", complex issues well beyond the school itself, but that sustain the capacity of the schools to exist. They bring a set of broader macro-level assumptions of challenges and opportunities.

Parents, on the other hand, are at a micro-level of concern: focusing on their child's unique experience and on the responsibilities for reinforcing their own values. While the values differences among parents regarding homosexuality and gender conformity must be acknowledged, the values expressed in the Guide of tolerance and physical and emotional safety for their children are common to all. However, they will have to be couched in the terms that are meaningful for them. As suggested by a respondent, *"even resistant parents offer an opportunity to reach out and have a conversation and hopefully do a little bit of education"*.

Clearly school staff members feel challenged by the real or imagined threat that parents pose to successful implementation. Paradoxically, supportive parents in this pilot offer themselves as allies to overcome any real parental resistance. Such an education effort must merge the interests of parents who wish to be more active and inclusive with the needs of administrators to manage the possible public controversies. While great effort was invested in family forums, further consideration of ways to involve parents could improve this outreach even more. To this end, the parents in these interviews would like more resources on how to talk about LGBT issues in their home. *"We can get (to the children) on many levels"* so they'd like specific language to help them communicate with their kids and with teachers.

Keeping parents more integrated into the conversation and the educational tasks around LGBT and gender non-conforming issues may be as big a cultural change for some schools as the Guide

itself. One parent suggested use of the weekly parent school newsletter could have kept them informed on the project.

Teachers are the obvious central functional linkage in the Guide because their domain lies within the school walls where they are accountable to both parents and administrators. Furthermore, both parents and administrators tend to be protective of teachers – who were acknowledged by all to be overworked and stretched well beyond their job titles -- and want them to be successful. But also want teachers to keep each of them informed of the details of their work.

Teachers not only need new information and training, they require additional resources. Specifically they need “compensation time” and educational credit for training.

In conclusion, according to our interviews, “welcoming schools” is a philosophy, not only for students, but also for all stakeholders (parents, administrators, and teachers). Achieving a school climate that welcomes all students and their families requires engaging in open and respectful communication related to acceptance of differences, including those of diverse sexual and gender identities. Everyone can benefit from the development and reinforcement of healthy social connections.

COMPONENT THREE: CLASS ROOM OBSERVATIONS

PURPOSE OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

As part of the larger Welcoming School's Evaluation Project data was collected on children's level of engagement with lessons from the Guide. The Welcoming Schools Guide is geared towards elementary schools to help teachers create and foster an atmosphere where all students feel they belong, where diversity and tolerance are celebrated. SFUSD has requested support in assessing the implementation of this Guide into the schools and the piloting of the lessons in the classroom. One of the recurring questions posed about the viability of this program is "whether children will get it," and "whether they will be able to handle the content." The current engagement data will hopefully address these questions by quantifying and documenting how interested/engaged children were with the lessons provided. The field of educational psychology has defined engagement as:

Children who are engaged show sustained behavioral involvement in learning activities accompanied by a positive emotional tone. They select tasks at the border of their competencies, initiate action when given the opportunity, and exert intense effort and concentration in the implementation of learning tasks; they show generally positive emotions during ongoing action, including enthusiasm, optimism, curiosity, and interest (Chapman).

METHOD

A procedure to observe and measure the level of “engagement” among the students participating in the Welcoming Schools Pilot Project was developed by Dr. Allison Briscoe-Smith and a group

of graduate students headed by Amelia Fystrom. Dr. Briscoe-Smith conducted training on this procedure. It has been suggested that engagement can be quantified through either questionnaire or observational methods (Chapman). In this case we chose to collect data both qualitatively and through observation of children receiving lessons from the Welcoming Schools Guide. An observational coding system was developed for this purpose (see Appendix H). As this was a pilot study the psychometric properties of the measures, in addition a summary of the ratings will be provided.

During Phase I of the project teachers were approached and asked if they would agree to have observers in their classrooms. A time was then scheduled and 2 trained coders and a field note taker came to the classrooms. Six classrooms were observed including 1st through 4th grades. A total of 130 children were observed. As stated above, lessons addressing all 5 objectives of Welcoming Schools were observed. The trained coders used the Welcoming Schools Rating Scale to code each child in the classroom. A time-sampling method was used. In order to assess for reliability of the measure, in each classroom at least 5 children were observed and coded simultaneously by the coders. The research assistant taking field notes described what was occurring in the classroom, wrote down notable utterances by the children or teacher and also documented children's level of attention and engagement.

Results

A total of 6 classrooms were observed with a total of 130 children who were coded. Classrooms included a kindergarten, 2 first, 1 second, 1 third and 1 fourth grade classrooms. The observation period was typically 50 minutes with each child being observed for 30 seconds. In terms of reliability, the items ranged in their Kappa's from .348-.669 indicating most items had moderate inter-rater reliability. The chart below presents the Kappa's for each item and the Inter-class correlation for the last item "on the whole how engaged do you think the child was."

Item	Kappa (*Inter-rater reliability)
Did the child look at the teacher/presenter/speaker	.464
Did the child pay attention?	.348
Did the child participate in the task?	.669
Did the child show "engaged" body language?	.453
Did the child show "engaged" affect?	.277
Did the child demonstrate off task behavior?	.571
On the whole how engaged do you think the child was	.497

It should be noted that the question about whether the child participated in the task shows substantial reliability across raters. Likewise whether a child was off task during the class was found to be moderately reliable, as were whether the child looked at the presenter, showed engaged body language and how, overall, engaged he or she was. In future studies we should either retrain coders on the two least reliable questions -- whether the child paid attention and showed engaged affect -- or potentially drop those questions from future coding.

With a moderate reliability established, the summary of ratings can be examined. As demonstrated below in the table most of the children were engaged in the lessons. According to the last question 64.6% of the children were either engaged or very engaged with the activity presented. More than half actively participated in the lessons and less than 40% had off task behavior or, rather, disengaged behavior.

Item	Percentage of Yes's
Did the child look at the teacher/presenter/speaker	87.7
Did the child pay attention?	92.3
Did the child participate in the task?	59.2
Did the child show "engaged" body language?	79.2
Did the child show "engaged" affect?	65.4
Did the child demonstrate off task behavior?	39.2

How engaged do you think the child was?	Percent of Class
Not at all	6.2
Mildly engaged	29.2
Engaged	42.3
Very Engaged	22.3

These results are mirrored in the qualitative data. The field notes universally indicate that children were actively engaged and participating in the lessons. In each class, however, there was at least one child who was not engaged, distracted, or was being disciplined for off task behavior. The field notes also noted that towards the end of the classes -- usually after 40-45 minutes of instruction -- children would become more likely to engage in off-task behavior. The qualitative data also provides a rich opportunity to see how students are making sense of the material they are presented. For example, in a 2nd grade classroom where the book "Who ever you are" by Lynn Fox was read, students had to answer the question "what do all people have in common?" The following is a list of what was generated:

- all have a soul
- all have a spirit
- all have a heart (not talking about the organ but meaning the ability to care for others)
- all have brains
- all have eyes (one boy said: "but they don't always work the same")
- all have bones
- all have clothing (one girl said "but we don't all dress the same")
- all have thoughts and dreams ("but they are all different")
- all have pain
- all have imagination

Another example was in a 1st grade classroom where the lesson focused on "feeling welcome." Children defined what welcome meant and then also talked about things that both made them feel welcome and unwelcome. This led to a conversation about bullying and also what things they could do to make others feel welcome. The idea of inclusiveness is brought to life in these examples.

Their definitions of welcome included:

- welcome means like you feel like you're loved
- welcome means like you don't feel sad, you feel good at school
- welcome means speaking to me, they're near me
- welcome means ok to come here
- welcome means it's like you can come and follow
- welcome means it's like you come to me and all will be well
- welcome means like something to make them happy (them: kids, new kids)
- welcome means if they speak a new language, come and speak to them
- welcome means when they feel good and they don't want to be anywhere else

The content of the classes addressed included: gender roles/stereotypes, how people are different and the same, families and different constellations of families, how to be welcoming and how to identify and avoid bullying. Each of the Welcoming Schools goals was represented in the classes observed.

However, none of the content in observed schools was LGBT specific. The closest came in discussing that some families have two "mommies" or "daddies." One teacher interviewed, however, made the point that he included LGBT material in his class.

DISCUSSION

It appears that the current measure is an effective means of assessing child engagement. It is an easy tool to use, has an overall moderate reliability, and provides a snapshot of child engagement. In addition to this measure, the qualitative data clearly adds to the richness of the data and elucidates how the objectives of inclusiveness can be met. The results of this data indicate that children are engaged with the Welcoming School Guide. There were no indicators of children being distressed or overwhelmed by the material

COMPONENT FOUR: WELCOMING SCHOOLS SURVEY

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

The third arm of the San Francisco Welcoming Schools evaluation was conducted by Laura Szalacha, EdD from the University of Illinois, Chicago who surveyed school personnel two times during school year 2007-2008 to measure their comfort related to five dimensions of diversity in schools: 1) school climate, 2) gender roles and expression, 3) children's cognitive maturity to discuss issues of gender and sexual identity, 4) personal comfort, and 5) teaching practices. The same measure was given to schools in San Francisco, Minneapolis, and New Bedford. The measures were given twice in this school year to determine whether the teacher training and the teaching of Welcoming Schools' lessons would have an impact on dimensions measured.

METHOD

Eighty-five (85+ school personnel (71.3% classroom teachers, 3.3% administrators, 25.5% other educational staff) completed the initial measure. The average age of respondents was 42 (SD 10.4) and average years of experience was 16 (SD 9.2). Of these, 87.1% were female and 12.9% were male. Ethnically, 65% indicated that they were white, 7% indicated they were “Of Color” and 28% did not specify their ethnicity. The second round of surveys was completed by 41 school personnel. The measure queried the respondents on their school’s policies and procedures related to race/ethnicity, religion, actual or perceived sexual orientation, physical ability, nationality, and actual or perceived gender identity. Other areas surveyed were: frequency of taunting and slurs; obstacles to addressing sexual orientation and gender roles and expression; internal and external dimensions of diversity; and school-identified needs.

RESULTS

To date, analysis of the data allows us to compare differences between the two rounds of surveys in school personnel’s perception of school climate, their comfort in addressing all aspects of diversity, their attitudes and beliefs related to sexual orientation and gender identity, their beliefs about whether children in elementary school can benefit from talking about gender roles and expression, and their teaching practices. Given that no comparison schools that were not exposed to the Welcoming Schools teacher training and classroom experiences were included, these results must be viewed with caution. In fact, the main purpose of the pilot study was to pilot the instruments and the procedures for implementation. Even so, the encouraging results should lend weight to the importance of this project. Overall, the results suggest that school personnel perceive the school climate in San Francisco (4.20 out of 5) to be high even on the first round of surveys. No change in this score was noted over the two surveys. However, all other scales are significantly higher. That is, they indicated less stereotypic gender role beliefs, they were more likely to agree that elementary school children can benefit from classroom discussions of this topic, they felt more personal comfort, and they provided more teaching about LGBT and gender expression.

Table 1: Region Geographic Region = 1.00 California

Group Statistics(a)

	TIME	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
School_Climate	1.00	85	4.2026	.52375	.05681
	2.00	41	4.3385	.49801	.07778
Gender_Role_Beliefs	1.00	84	3.6698	.54812	.05981
	2.00	41	4.7203	.48651	.07598
Child_Dev_Discussion	1.00	83	2.9225	.47570	.05221
	2.00	40	3.8571	.28229	.04463
Comfort_Level	1.00	86	3.4719	.50046	.05397
	2.00	41	3.7172	.33297	.05200
	1.00	68	2.3603	1.05738	.12823

Teaching_Pract ices	1.00	68	2.3603	1.05738	.12823
a Region Geograph ical Region =	1.00	34	3.8407	1.01470	.17402

DISCUSSION

The lack of change in school climate should be no surprise given the short duration of this study. School climate includes school policies and procedures, which even at the beginning of this study were quite high in the San Francisco School District (60% felt there exist clear procedures for violation of procedures that covered a whole range of diverse groups, 74% felt there was access to a good selection of multicultural books, 48% felt that teachers have access to books depicting a diversity of families with Lesbian/Gay parents or caregivers, 70% felt that if confronted with a situation dealing with sexual orientation or gender expression, that they knew who to contact for support or assistance. Consistent with qualitative data gathered from interviews, 52% of the school personnel fear that parents will object to the schools' addressing these topics. An interesting confluence of findings from the surveys and classroom observations found that teachers were more likely to believe that elementary students are developmentally ready to discuss topics of sexual orientation and gender expression after they participated in this project. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of the classroom observations that the students were engaged in during the Welcoming Schools classroom activities.

FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The implementation of this pilot project required great effort and coordination on the part of many people: the Task Force, the coordinators of the Support Services for LGBT Youth of the Schools Health Programs Department, the trainers from the Respect for All Project, Administrators, Teachers, and Parents. This effort was aided by sound consultation from Kim Westheimer, consultant to the Families Program of the Human Rights Campaign Foundation. Success of the pilot can be measured first by the fact that approximately 960 students received enriched curriculum on family diversity, gender stereotyping, bullying, and name-calling. Moreover, 44 teachers received advanced training in sensitivity to LGBT issues and skills for teaching lessons from the Welcoming Schools Guide, managing conversations about sexual identity and family diversity, and confronting name-calling and teasing. Finally, 150 San Francisco parents participated in discussions of the Welcoming Schools Pilot.
2. The Welcoming Schools Guide should be viewed as more than a one-time classroom curriculum. The Guide should be at the center of a comprehensive approach to enhance a community conversation related to respect for differences including those of diverse sexual and gender identities. As schools embrace this ongoing program, efforts to continually involve parents in leadership roles may help to further increase "buy-in" by parents and enable trust to build within parent and teacher communities to address these difficult topics.

3. In order to adequately implement the Welcoming Schools Guide additional resources must be provided. This includes enough materials related to the lessons from the Guide, such as books, but also resources to compensate teachers for additional time burdens and to provide adequate evaluation services.
4. While a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (see Appendix A) describing the precise involvement and time required of teachers, parents, and administrators was provided upfront, the pilot suffered somewhat by the last-minute expansion of the evaluation component. This expansion increased demands on participants. Further recommendations specific to the evaluation will be provided in recommendation #5.
5. Further refinement of evaluation procedures are needed that will accurately assess success of the program in improving school climate and meeting the goals of the Guide. An important lesson learned in San Francisco is the need for “least burdensome” forms of evaluation. If focus groups interviews are continued, the evaluation team suggests that telephone interviews may be less burdensome than face-to-face. Interviews should be focused on teachers and parents and should come toward the end to assess what worked and what needs to be altered. Further development of the Classroom Observation technology appears to have great potential. In order to accurately assess classroom engagement, a comparison to instruction of other equivalent material taught by the same teacher would help to understand whether engagement with this material is different from other topics. Finally, continued use of the School Climate Survey over several years will provide invaluable information on the usefulness of the program. Again, more systematic use of comparison groups -- such as schools that only provide classroom lessons vs. those that provide enriched teacher training vs. the full comprehensive approach -- would be useful.
6. Continued discussion related to best practices for inclusion of LGBT material in the Guide is needed. In San Francisco, given that the school personnel perceive a positive school climate toward LGBT issues (see Survey Results), the lessons should be tailored to be more explicit in addressing LGBT issues and using the appropriate vocabulary to accurately portray these issues. At the same time, in other locations, modifications may be necessary for schools along a spectrum of knowledge and comfort addressing LGBT issues to provide instruction that meets the needs of their specific school environment. This discussion should include the HRC authors of the Guide and all stakeholder groups across the country. Eventually, assessment procedures should be developed to help school districts articulate long term strategies that start where their school is and move towards more explicit discussion of LGBT issues as the climate improves.

APPENDIX A
Memorandum of Understanding with Schools



San Francisco Unified School District
School Health Programs Department
1515 Quintara Street
San Francisco, CA 94116-1273
Tel 415.242.2615
Fax 415.242.2618
www.healthiersf.org

TO: Robert Broecker, Principal
Alvarado Elementary

FROM: Ilsa Bertolini
School Health Programs Department

Kevin Gogin
School Health Programs Department

October 16, 2007

CC: Meyla Ruwin, Director
School Health Programs Department

REGARDING: Memorandum of Understanding:
Welcoming Schools Family Diversity Guide

Thank you for your interest in, and application to, pilot the elementary family diversity curriculum “Welcoming Schools” within your school. As was explained briefly in the application process there are particular requirements regarding implementation of the pilot project. The agreement below outlines these expectations. Your signature at the end of the document will act as your acceptance of the expectations. Please return the signed MOU by Friday, October 26, 2007.

Each school site will:

- Assist with administering written surveys and verbal interviews regarding family diversity curriculum to faculty persons prior to the professional development
- Require all staff to attend the two hour professional development addressing curricular expectations for all faculty, January 2008
- Select six teacher leaders. The teacher leaders will be required to attend:
 - One all day professional development on the February 8, 2008 District Professional Development Day
 - An additional two hour professional development follow up

- Ensure that every teacher will teach two lessons from the Welcoming Schools Curriculum in April 2008
- Form a task force made up of the principal, teachers and other staff, and family members to help support and lead the school in their efforts to fully integrate family diversity curriculum
- Host a family forum/event prior to implementation of the lessons, that will help the school community understand the importance and scope of this project
- Teachers will complete post instruction evaluation
- Evaluators will also be present in classes prior to the curriculum pilot, as well as during implementation, working with teacher schedules
- Evaluators will review student projects/work related to the curriculum.

By signing, I commit our school to participate fully in the Welcoming Schools pilot program as stipulated in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Principal Name (please print)

School

Principal Signature

Date

Mode of communication that is best for you: phone_____

email_____

Email address:_____

Phone number:_____

Please fax (415.242.2618) or sent via school mail the signed MOU by Friday, October 26, 2007.

APPENDIX B
GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPATION IN WELCOMING SCHOOLS
CURRICULUM GUIDE PILOT

SCHOOLS WILL RECEIVE:

1. A two hour Welcoming Schools training for all faculty;
2. Ten hours of for the select faculty members who will implement the Welcoming Schools Curriculum;
3. Five copies of the Welcoming Schools curriculum and a set of smaller modules to be used by educators;
4. Relevant books to use in the classroom and library;
5. Support for school-based committee and community events;
6. Follow-up technical assistance from Welcoming Schools Staff;
7. Guidance to insure that Welcoming Schools lesson plans align with state curriculum frameworks, district standards; and Second Step.
8. Evaluation results.

WELCOMING SCHOOLS PILOT SITES WILL:

9. Work with either an existing committee or develop a new committee comprised of administrators, educators, and community members that will meet periodically to a) develop school-specific goals and objectives for use of the curriculum which relate to the school's mission and existing curriculum, b) plan community events, and c) be a liaison between Welcoming Schools, faculty, and the community. Welcoming schools staff will provide support and assistance to this group – including an introductory workshop.
10. Agree to teach lesson plans as outlined in the attached chart.
11. Highlight ways that the curriculum relates to the school's mission and existing curriculum in one or more events for family members. (See Family Programs in the Welcoming Schools Guide.)
12. Participate in a program evaluation using assessment tools provided by Welcoming Schools. These may include teacher surveys, documentation of curriculum use, and a compilation of student work.

LESSON PLANS FOR PILOT CURRICULUM*

K	1	2	3	4	5
Understanding and Respecting Family Diversity					
What is a family	What is a Family	That's a Family OR Creating Families	That's a Family OR Creating Families	That's a Family OR Creating Families	Family Diversity Scavenger Hunt OR Families Portrayed in our Culture
	Growing a Family Photo Tree or Tree of Caring	Growing a Family Photo Tree OR Tree of Caring	Growing a Family Photo Tree OR Tree of Caring	Family Quilt OR Family Diversity Scavenger Hunt	Family Quilt OR That's a Family
Gender Roles and Stereotypes					
We are all Human Beings	We are all Human Beings	We Are all Human Beings	We are all Human Beings OR Girls Like, Boys Like	We are all Human Beings OR Girls Like, Boys Like	Media Sleuths
Girls Like, Boys Like, Kids Like	Girls Like, Boys Like, Kids Like	Fairytale Rulers, Rules & Renegades	Fairytale Rulers, Rules & Renegades	Fairytale Rulers, Rules & Renegades OR Media Sleuths	Fairytale Rulers, Rules & Renegades
Addressing Name-calling and Bullying					
A Welcoming Classroom	A Welcoming Classroom	A Welcoming Classroom OR Creating a Classroom Community	Name Calling and Feeling Safe in School	Name Calling and Feeling Safe in School	I was Just Kidding
	Words Can Hurt	Words Can Hurt	Don't Just Stand By	Don't Just Stand By	Think Before you Act

*Each pilot school will implement lesson plans in at least three grades. Each grade selected by the school will implement lesson plans from at least two of the three categories in the curriculum (Family Diversity, Gender Stereotypes, and Name-Calling.) Different grades will choose different categories as deemed appropriate by the school so that the school as a whole will have implemented lesson plans from each of the three categories.

For example, a school may come up with the following plan for piloting the curriculum:

	Family Diversity	Gender Roles and Stereotypes	Addressing Name-Calling and Bullying
1st Grade	X	X	
3rd Grade	X		X
5th Grade		X	X

Another school could decide to use this model:

	Family Diversity	Gender Roles and Stereotypes	Addressing Name-Calling and Bullying
K	X		X
1rd Grade	X	X	
3rd Grade	X		X

APPENDIX C

Questions for Informant Interviews and Focus Group

(Parents, Teachers, Staff, Administrators)

1. For parents and staff: Are you familiar with the WELCOMING Schools program?

Prompt if anyone says “not familiar”: Welcoming Schools is a program that addresses three topics: Family Diversity, Gender Stereotypes, and Name Calling and Bullying. The family diversity segments of the guide address all kinds of families including multiracial families, households with one parent, two moms or dads, grandparent headed families, adoptive families, and families with other grown-ups. Teachers in some classrooms will be teaching lessons to help children to better understand and deal with these issues. So, we are interested in your ideas and perceptions and want your anonymous responses to several questions. We will audiotape this conversation with your permission so that we accurately capture exactly what is said. OK?

2.The Welcoming Schools curriculum addresses these three issues: Family Diversity, Gender Stereotypes and Name Calling/Bullying. From what you have learned about the Welcoming Schools program, what do you think these terms mean?

Prompt if LGBT not mentioned: A large focus within the material is related to Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender (LGBT) issues. How should that be incorporated into the teaching?

TEACHERS only prompt: Some Welcoming Schools recommended texts address lesbian/gay/bisexual (LGBT) families specifically. Other texts require teachers to bring up LGBT families. Would you be more or less likely to use a text that specifically addresses LGBT families? Can you say more about this decision?

3.Now that you have been introduced to the Welcoming Schools Pilot program, what do you think of this program?

- a. Prompts: Is it important to have such a program? Is this program consistent with your values? Do you think it is developmentally appropriate? If you think it is NOT developmentally appropriate can you say more about why? How do you think others (teachers, staff/administration, parents) will respond?
- b. Tell me (a bit more) about the need for such a program? Have you seen incidents where students have been teased because of their family make-up or being too masculine or too feminine? Please describe an incident that stands out for you.
- c. **For administrators only:** Why did you choose to have the program at your school? Do you think teachers will support the program? Do you think parents will support the program?

4. Do you think that addressing issues of Family Diversity, Gender Stereotypes, and Name Calling/Bullying will positively impact individual students or the school as a whole?

- a. Prompt: What are some positive outcomes that you can imagine?
- b. Prompt: Can you identify any risks in doing this program?

5. What barriers do you see to the program being implemented effectively?

- a. **Prompt:** Do you anticipate any hesitance from parents, administrators, teachers, students?
- b. **Prompt:** If so, what do you imagine the hesitance will focus on?
- c. **Prompt:** What, if any, concerns do you have about teachers knowledge and skills in teaching this material?
- d. **Teachers only:** Do you feel comfortable in teaching LGBT specific material? Do you feel competent in teaching LGBT specific material? Do you think you have the knowledge, skills, and support to implement the Welcoming Schools program?

6. What suggestions or ideas do you have for reducing barriers?

Prompts for specific stakeholders:

- a. **Teachers:** what kinds of support will you need? Do you feel that you have the knowledge and skills to do what is being asked of you?
- b. **Administrators:** What can administration do to assure the success of the program?
- c. **Parents:** What role do you think parents should play?

7. What suggestions do you have for improving the program?

8. What strengths or resources will help in reducing barriers and improving the program?

9. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your thoughts or feelings about the Welcoming Schools Guide and pilot program?

APPENDIX D
Agenda for Welcoming Schools Meeting
San Francisco



Welcoming Schools Project
Initial School Site Meeting Agenda

November 15, 2007

1. Introductions
2. Review mission and goals of Welcoming School Project
3. Teacher Leaders
 - a. Purpose and responsibilities
 - b. Identify potential teachers
4. Task Force
 - a. Purpose and responsibilities
 - b. Membership
5. Project Timeline
 - a. Review
 - b. Schedule Trainings and Meetings
 - i. 2 hr Professional Development training for all school staff
 - ii. Task force meetings
6. Compensation for teachers
7. Evaluation process
 - a. Purpose of the evaluation process
 - b. Pre-survey distribution and collection plan
 - c. Help identify contacts for CLEAR interviews
8. Review Action Items

APPENDIX E Key Roles



We are really excited to be working with Grattan on this pilot project. Your help in filling the following key roles will help us ensure its success. Please be assured that we will be respectful of everyone's time and energy. Thank you in advance your additional commitment to this exciting new project.

Teacher Leaders

Teaching Staff who will help their school implement the lessons from the Welcoming Schools Guide. Each grade will be responsible for teaching 2 lessons from the guide. Ideally each school site will select 6 teachers – one from each grade. The main responsibilities of each Teacher Leader include:

- Attend an all day professional development session on February 8, 2008. (currently a District Professional Development Day)
- Attend an additional two hour professional development session as follow up. (Teacher Leaders will be compensated with a \$60 stipend)
- Identify two teacher leaders who would like to participate in the Welcoming Schools Task Force.
- Being a resource for other teachers, school staff and families.

Welcoming Schools Task Force

A team made up of the principal, teachers and other staff, and family members who will help support and lead the school in their efforts to fully integrate family diversity curriculum. Their main tasks are:

- Meet four times this year starting with the first meeting in December.
- Help identify areas the school would like to focus on to help the school community be a safe and welcoming school for all children and their families.
- Plan and conduct a Family/Community Forum in the spring.
- Be a resource to the Evaluators and help identify focus group and interview participants.



APPENDIX F
RFAP – Project Coordination

Components of Work with Sites:

- Meet with Principals to outline work
- Provide 10 hours of training to 18 Lead Teachers/School Staff – 6 from each of the 3 school sites
- Provide 2 hours of training to full staff at each of the 3 school sites
- Coordinate and support development of School site teams and meet with them at least 4 times throughout the school year.
- Help school site teams plan and implement family focused events at each site
- Maintain local coordination of project at school sites, facilitation team and SF WS Team – RFAP, SFUSD and CLEAR
- Provide ongoing TA with school sites.

School Site Work - Timeline

November 2007

- 11/14-15 Initial Site Meetings with principals at each of the 3 school sites to go over project, define work and evaluation
- 11/20- 11/29 Pre-Survey distributed and collected

December 2007

- 12/6-12 First School Site – Task Force planning meetings at each of the 3 school sites

January 2008

- 1/10-15 Second School Site – Task Force meetings at each of the 3 school sites

February 2008

- 8 hour Professional Development Training to 18 Lead Teachers and 3 Principals
- 2 hours of Professional Development Training to full staff at each of the 3 school sites
 - Grattan 2/11
 - Harvey Milk – 2 1hour trainings 2/26 and 3/11
 - Alvarado – 2 1hour trainings 3/11 and 4/8
- 2/12-13 Third School Site – Task Force planning meetings at Grattan and Harvey Milk

March

- 2 hour Professional Development Training to Lead Teachers and Principals
- 3/6 Third School Site – Task Force planning meetings at Alvarado
- Family Event at Grattan

April

- Family Event at Alvarado and Harvey Milk
- Implementation of class room lessons

May

- Fourth School Site – Task Force planning meetings at each of the 3 school sites
- Post-Survey distributed and collected

APPENDIX G
Informed Consent Form for Parents to Participate in
Focus Group or Interview

Purpose: The Center for LGBTQ Evidence-based Applied Research (CLEAR) at Pacific Graduate School of Psychology under the direction of Peter Goldblum, Ph.D., MPH has been asked to evaluate the development and implementation of the San Francisco Welcoming Schools Guide Pilot Project. As part of this evaluation we are conducting interviews and focus groups with individuals who have been introduced to the program and have a stake in its success: parents, teachers, and administrators.

Procedures: If you agree to participate in this study, you will participate in either an interview or in a focus group to better understand your thoughts and reactions to the inclusion of the Welcoming School Guide curriculum to San Francisco's ongoing health sequence. The interview or focus group will be audio taped and material will be transcribed. Participation in the study will take about two hours (focus group) and thirty minutes (interview) and will be held at _____ . Your decision to participant or not to participate will not affect you or your children at school.

Risks: The foreseeable risks associated with participating in the focus group are minimal. Some people may experience mild discomfort while discussing the subject matter during the focus group. A list of appropriate resources related to the topic will be available for further information or assistance.

Confidentiality: Participants in the focus groups are encouraged to keep information shared in the group within the group. The moderators of he group will discuss the importance of keeping material discussed within the group. The Focus groups will be transcribed removing any identifying information. The audiotapes will be erased after the study to ensure that confidentiality is maintained. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from this study. Quotations may be used in publications with the understanding that the person's identity will be held confidential. Any quotations that are used will be modified to protect the identity of both the participants and any adolescents that may be referred to in the focus group. All records will be kept in locked files so that only the study investigators have access to them. The consent forms will be kept in a locked file cabinet separate from the research data. If instances of child abuse, which include physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, and neglect, are discussed, they will need to be reported to child protective services as required by the law. If soon-to-occur physical injury to self or another person is discussed, this will need to be reported, as required by law.

Benefits: Benefits to you for participating may include your knowledge that your opinions are valued and will be considered carefully in future development of the Welcoming Schools Guide Project.

Payment: You will receive a small token of appreciation for your participation in this evaluation. You will receive a \$25.00 gift certificate from Safeway.

Questions: This study has been explained to you by _____ and your questions were answered. If you have any other question about the study, you may call Dr. Peter Goldblum at 650-843-3503.

Questions about your rights as a participant in this study may be presented to the IRB Chair, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, 935 E. Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303.

Consent: You have been given copies of this consent form to keep. Participation in research is voluntary. You have the right to decline to participate or to withdraw at any point in this study without jeopardy to your employment status.

If you wish to participate, you should sign below

Date

Participant's Signature for Consent

Date

Person Obtaining Consent

APPENDIX H

WELCOMING SCHOOLS CHILD ENGAGEMENT CODING SHEET

Directions: 1st, identify five children who you and your partner will code simultaneously. Each label these children on your sheets as 1...5. Code those 5 children first- at the same time with your partner. Then divvy up the rest of the class and code from there (do not number these children) Using your stop watches observe a child for 30 seconds. Then record your observations (within 20 seconds). Then move on to the next child.

During your observation:

Did the child look at the teacher/presenter/speaker? Y N N/A

Did the child pay attention? Y N N/A

Did the child participate in the task? Y N N/A

- hand raised
- on task
- asking answering
- talking to group members
- making on tasks statement

Comments:

Did the child show “engaged” body language?
This can be either positive or negative Y N N/A

Did the child show “engaged” affect?
This can be either positive or negative Y N N/A

Did the child demonstrate **off task** behavior? Y N N/A

On the whole how engaged do you think the child was:
Not at all mildly engaged engaged very engaged

Other notes:

