

SECTION III

"Home Is Where the Time Is ... and the Payoff for School Learning" (Komoski, 81 Percent Solution, 1994)

"... it is through networks that we are beginning to see some healthy dialogue and the breakdown of walls that have divided home and school ... networks are color-blind, age blind, and treat all children and all adults as learners and teachers ... Networks are allowing us to reach some common understandings and common ground. ... " [from an online parent discussion (Priest, Parents Compilation, 1995)]

Parents, Children's Learning Time, Computers and Networking

We live in a country of some *100 million households*, roughly a third of which contain the parents of the 50 million school-age children who spend 180 days each year attending the nation's *85 thousand K-12 public and 15 thousand private schools*. During 1995, for the first time since the appearance of home computers in the late 1970s, millions of parents of school-age children emerged as the driving force of home-computer sales. It is also interesting to note that although the majority of these parents agree that schools are doing well by their children, they feel that they "must supplement what the school teaches" (Grunwald Associates, 1995).

This means that for more and more parents, a home computer is viewed as the most desired means of helping them to supplement school learning. Their reasoning seems to be: if a computer increases the time my child spends actively learning rather than passively watching T.V. or playing video games (from three to five hours a day for many children), then I'll get a computer. In this regard, parents seem to be ahead of most educators in their awareness that home is where the time is (Komoski, *The 81 Percent Solution*, 1994).

It is not that educators aren't concerned about how to increase students' learning time. But many educational policymakers want to accomplish this by lengthening the school day and/or year. Although we know of no comparative cost-effectiveness study of more at-home versus more in-school learning time, a national commission places the cost of lengthening in-school learning time to be in excess of a billion dollars a day. In other words, in excess of \$180+ billion a year, year after year (presumably quite a bit more per year, if the present 180-day school year were to be lengthened). (Cople, 1992, p.7)

One year of such a policy would cost more than twice as much as the current, high-end \$47 billion estimate for installing computers and networking in all the nation's classrooms (McKinsey, 1995). Given these costs, cost-effectiveness seems to be on the side of improving the quantity and quality of children's learning time at home rather than than increasing their in-school time. Millions of parents who can afford a home computer, it seems, are choosing to move in that direction. But will schools join them? And what about the estimated 12 million students whose parents can't afford to have them join their peers in high-tech, at-home learning (Komoski, *LINCT*, 1995)?

In no way wishing to seem glib, we call attention to the comparatively reasonable cost of equipping all school-age children from low-income families with high-tech, at-home-learning tools (i.e., compared to the estimated \$180+ billion-a-year cost of increasing in-school time for all students). The estimated cost of doing this would add roughly another \$23 billion to the \$47 billion estimated for in-school computers and networking.

This estimate includes the use of networkable software that could monitor a student's use and progress on a variety of school-home network activities. Such monitoring of at-home learning could be done as a straightforward extension of the monitoring and progress reporting features of an in-school ILS network. Other, more real-time monitoring might be accomplished by using software such as *Cyber Patrol* (Bray, 1995) and *Discourse* (Discourse, 1995). The latter is marketed by the DuKane Corporation. *Cyber Patrol* is by Microsystems Software, Inc. (<http://www.cyberpatrol.com>).

In addition, non-software-specific monitoring of at-home learning is already being used by a Utah school district, in which one teacher monitors 40 at-home junior high school students via a district-run BBS-based school-home network (*Education Week*, January 10, 1996).

The estimated combined, nation-wide cost of \$70 billion for this high-tech, school-home networking solution would (a) be about one-third the cost of the \$180+ billion spend-more-time-and-money in schools alternative, and (b) not be a recurring annual expense. In addition, it would have the added capability and value of being able to provide high-tech learning, information and communication to parents whose potential employment opportunities would be greatly enhanced.

Do we expect to see such a nation-wide strategy for increasing students' at-home learning time implemented any time soon? Unfortunately, we do not. Given the temper of the times, we expect that schools and communities, and the poverty-level families of students within those communities will have to find low-cost, grassroots solutions to school-home-community networking on their own. Thus, in keeping with our goal of providing practical advice about school-home-community networking, such low-cost solutions are explored in Section V of this report.

If Parents and Policymakers Were to Agree, What Then?

But if millions of parents and policymakers were to agree that children should be spending more time learning at home via school-home-community networks, can we expect to see schools, parents, and teachers communicating and cooperating in ways that make this happen? If so, what form will their shared concern and cooperation take? And how can networking facilitate the necessary communication and cooperation to improve learning at home and optimize learning time at school?

Such questions are best answered within the larger systemic context of technological, social, and market dynamics within which schools exist. Yet, many schools seem unable to respond, or even acknowledge that they ought to be responding, within that larger systemic context. As a result, "systemic change," for many educators, is incongruously viewed as something that they are supposed to make happen *within a school system*.

But a school system is not the sort of "closed system" such a view might suggest. Rather, the view of "systemic change" that educators need to focus on is the change that is happening throughout the larger system of societal learning (i.e., change in behavior) within which, at present, school systems seem to be among the slower learners. Just as students and teachers surfing the Internet are being opened to the world, school administrators, too, need to open up to what is happening within the local and global learning ecology in which their schools' seem to be occupying a much smaller niche than they once did. Sixteen years ago Niebuhr presciently addressed this issue as follows:

"Clearly there is a crisis in our schools. The high tech revolution will exacerbate it, and many adjustments are needed. But if adjustments are made out of context of other changes in American society and other institutions' vital role in the learning process, they will inevitably fall short of our goals." (Niebuhr, 1984, p. 12)

Today a parent puts it this way:

"Public education is in trouble. There just aren't enough teachers... and enough parents who are willing to work to promote systemic changes... and the importance of instilling a love of learning in all children that can carry them all through adulthood. ..." [from the online parent discussion cited above]

This online parent is just one of the millions of home computer-using parent for whom school and state technology planners have yet to design educationally appropriate responses:

"State long-range technology plans include teacher training and student learning in their goals. None that I have seen include parents, a serious omission (Dunn, 1996)."


Just how serious this omission of parents this is, is underscored by the 1993 Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll that found that parents' lack of support and interest was one of the top ten problems facing schools (Elam, 1993). School decisionmakers and technology planners should view parents' growing interest in computers and connectivity as a propitious opportunity. The opportunity is one of joining with and supporting parents in a shared interest in improving children's learning through the effective use of networked educational technology in schools and homes.

The Growing School-Home Computer Disparity

Currently, those educators and school board members interested in developing the full educational potential of computers and networking are missing the most rapidly growing aspect of that potential: computers in students' homes. Everyday more and more students are using computers and acquiring at-home network connectivity because parents are convinced that having access to a computer and connectivity "helps my child to do better in school" (Grunwald Associates, 1995). Thus, while most teachers do not have regular access to a computer, in-school networking nor telecommunications, increasing numbers of their students do.

While estimates vary as to how many millions of computers there are in homes of school-age children (50 percent for high-incomes to 5 percent for low-incomes), the more important facts are: 1) more computers are entering children's homes every day, and 2) the child with a computer at home has far greater access to a computer at home than at school. (In schools, the computer-to-student ratio may range from 5:1 to 20+:1, and computer-access time is seldom greater than an hour per week. However, in computer-owning homes the child-to-computer ratio children is most frequently 1:1 and seldom greater than 3:1. In addition, access to a home computer usually is limited only by a child's interest and its parent concern.

An interesting result noted among children with ample access to computers, software and online connectivity at home are comments like: "I'd rather be doing something else at school than computers, because I already learned at home what they are making us do, and I'm bored.... I know I could help some of the other kids, like I do after school here at home, but the teacher doesn't see that." Or, "whenever they let us work with computers on our own at school, there's not enough time to do the kind of stuff I can do at home." [a West Hampton, NY, high school student]

 It would be both impractical and inadvisable for schools to attempt to make as much time available for computer use in school as the 10-to-20 hours a week some children now spend interacting with software and communicating online at home; hours they once spent passively watching television. Given this increasing reality of information-age life, how much time should students spend using computers in school? How much time should be spent in discussing, assessing and evaluating what's been learned? And how much should students apply what they have learned via computer in non-computer contexts — in the living, breathing, non-virtual reality of human give and take, of conflict and resolution, of cooperation and competition. These are just some of the educational implications of the the structural and motivational shifts being prompted by an evolving information society.

Parent Interest, Educator Disinterest

Many school decisionmakers seem disinterested in the large home-school computer disparity being widened everyday by parents interested in helping their children to do better at school via the purchase of a home computer. Schools seem to view this parental interest as more of a curiosity than something of importance that should be factored into a school's technology planning. If and when a school's decisionmakers begin to take a more serious interest in this activity, they will find they are dealing with a structural disparity that is here to stay. And that it is a disparity with many important implications for the design, development, and use of networking by schools and the communities that support them.

Given parents' interest in computers as at-home learning tools for the entire family, from now on homes will own many millions more computers than schools. Just as they have always owned many more T.V. sets, cable boxes and telephones than schools could possibly own, or even use. Rather than being disinterested in this development, educators might see it as a significant opportunity.

The precipitator of this opportunity — the home-school computer disparity currently being fueled by parents — will become an increasingly important fact of life for schools in the information-age. Clearly, this structural home-school computer disparity and how schools deal with it over the next decade has many implications for schools, teachers, children, parents, communities and the nation. School technology planners responsive to the growing presence of computers and connectivity in students' homes by building school-home connectivity will be enabling the growing "learning communities" vision (Niebuhr, 1984; Komoski, 1987, 1994; Benson, 1995; Cisneros, 1995; Gates 1995) to continue evolving. However, as noted above, strengthening parent's involvement with their children's learning is not yet a focus of technology planning in most schools. Regrettable as this is for all children and parents, it is particularly so for those who are most at risk. Their parents need as much support as they can get.

Recognizing this, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (Cisneros, 1995), intends to have HUD apply the learning communities vision in communities with public housing. If successful, this strategy could be one way of addressing the equity of access issue that must be resolved if learning communities are to achieve inclusiveness (see Section V for other, complementary strategies for addressing the at-home computer access disparity between the nation's information "haves" and "have-nots").

For now we need to address a prior question that is fundamental to schools' potential role in the development of learning communities: Will schools, limit themselves to developing technology plans that network students and teachers across classrooms and across the world but that fail to connect with those same teachers, students and their parents across town?

Especially when:

- 1) School-home connectivity has so many positive implications for improving parent-teacher communication and enhancing and expanding students' at-home learning time (Moursund, 1993; Komoski, 1994; Riley, 1995);
- 2) There is growing evidence that many parents across all socio-economic levels consider having a home computer and online connectivity important to their children's success in school (Grunwald Associates, 1995);
- 3) A majority of parents — even those who feel that schools are doing well by their child — also feel they "must supplement what the school teaches." (Grunwald Associates, 1995)

What Parents Have to Say About Their Need to Be Involved in Improving Their Children's Learning

Consider these comments from parents concerned about the importance of focusing on their involvement with their children's learning:

What is behind orienting parent involvement to the school rather than to children's learning? ...I spent lots of hours involved with the school before I figured out the payoff seemed higher when I got involved in my children's learning. Why does the emphasis seem to be on parent involvement in school rather than on directly involving parents in their children's learning?

... as a parent I'm looking for engagement and a desire to learn. I'm looking for ... an increase in the involvement of all segments of the educational community. ... And I want kids, teachers, administration and parents to know and understand each other when they speak about collaboration, communication, community... [from the online parent discussion cited above]

We sense that these two comments could well serve as a useful, single-item test for every school in the country.

Question: Do parents in our school feel this way?

As they consider this question, educators might also consider these findings from a study of the way parents feel about at-home learning via assigned homework.

The parents who were questioned said they:

- felt ill-prepared to help their children with homework, **not** "unable" to, just inadequately informed about changes in the curriculum and pedagogy;
- wanted more information about the classroom teachers' expectations of their child and of their roles as parents in helping with homework;
- wanted their children to be given adequate homework assignments;
- valued hands-on homework and projects in which the whole family could participate;
- *wanted a two-way communication system that would allow them to become partners on their child's instructional team.* [emphasis added] (Kay, 1994)

If a familiar reality resonates for school decisionmakers from within such comments, it should serve as incentive to make learning-focused school-home, teacher-parent connectivity an essential feature of a schools' networking plans.

In saying this, we recognize that for many school technology planners this may require rethinking a current networking design — technically, educationally, even philosophically. The challenge is to think as systemically and comprehensively as possible about the potential of improving learning for all students and their families via a community-wide network. Much of what we have said in Section II should be helpful for the technical side of such rethinking; and Section IV provides a structured model to help with the learning and educational-values aspects of the task. Section V describes what can be done to apply the results of such thinking in developing school-home-community networks using today's technologies in ways that prepare schools and their communities for a future as a learning community. The important first step in that evolution is to create a network that responds to the needs of students and parents "where they live." Home is where the time is — and where educators will find the most cost-effective pay off for improving school learning.

Supporting What Parents Say: Research and National Leadership

Were all schools to consider both thinking and acting systemically in the direction of school-home-community networking, they would not only be responding to concerned parents, but also to the urgings of longstanding research evidence and political leadership. The research evidence of a generation ago mentioned in Section II (Priest, 1973), and of many other researchers has been newly and greatly reinforced by the research-based message contained in the recent, *A New Generation of Evidence: The Family is Critical to Student Achievement* (Henderson, 1994). In addition, the need for schools to attend to the importance of school-home networking is also reflected in one of the eight National Education Goals developed by the nation's governors during the Bush Administration and which is currently being greatly emphasized by the former South Carolina Governor and now Secretary of Education, Richard Riley. This National Education Goal Number 8 reads as follows:

Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children. (Riley, 1993)

This goal is the focus of the Department of Education's 1993 publication, *Strong Families, Strong Schools: Building Community Partnerships for Learning*, (Riley, 1993) that addresses the importance of


parental involvement for improving children's learning at home and at school. The case made in Strong Families, Strong Schools makes clear that despite decades of research demonstrating the importance of parental involvement to children's success as learners, schools and parents still have much to accomplish.

Most schools have lack an identifiable mechanism for actively engaging parents and teachers in a cooperative process of communication focused on producing consistent positive effects on student learning. For instance, in too many schools, the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) is more of a parent-parent association that that does not often succeed in making parent-teacher communication and cooperation around the issue of children's learning a major priority.

Nor do many school administrators make teacher-parent communication and cooperation around the issue of children's learning a high priority. One encouraging sign, however, is the increasing use by schools of the parent-teacher voice-mail messaging systems mentioned in Section I. It will be interesting to see if, as we suggested in Section II, whether during the next few years such systems begin:

- focusing more on promoting and enhancing learning (as Homework Hotline now does) rather than simply reporting on a student's progress or lack of progress;
- evolving into e-mail or hybrid voice/e-mail networks (as Parlant's ParentLink now does).

Schools considering such voice messaging systems should be looking for signs of evolution in these directions as they make decisions about school-home-community networking.

 Whether schools opt for a turn-key voice messaging system or for adding a school-home online connection to their existing networking plans, the evidence is that teachers and parents will welcome it and use it (Bauch, 1995). And if the parent-teacher communication made possible by such systems is focused directly on communication related to improving learning (not just reporting on learning), the long-range effects on learning are likely to be quite positive. We say this not only on the basis of Bauch's well-documented efforts since the late 1980s (Education Week, January 10, 1996), but also on the basis of the positive outcomes of: NYNEX's Project TELL in low-income homes in New York City; a 40 household experiment in Birmingham, Alabama by the IT Network of Dallas, Texas enabling parents to view teachers' lesson plans as well as their child's school work and homework assignments, and the State of Indiana's Buddy Project that has placed computers in students' homes in many communities (Lightspan, 1995)

But the existence of school-home networking does not automatically lead to its being used to communicate about learning. In fact, the one example we found of a PTA actually communicating via a school's computer network was not related to the improvement of student learning. But perhaps a move in that direction has started in the months since we discovered this brief online report:

I am helping the PTA organization for our [county] school system, which comprises about 180 schools, begin to look at how we can improve communications through the use of online communications. We have traditionally used meetings, phone calls, a [PTA] president's letter, and a printed newsletter for most of our communication. Within the last year or so we have added FAX capability as well. Now, more people have the capability to use a computer and modem and we are finding it increasingly effective to use the new electronic network our school system set up this year." [from the online parent discussion cited above]

How the technology seems to be motivating parents

Although it is difficult to know, it is tempting to speculate about whether some parents' purchase of a home computer is accompanied by a feeling that, because school doesn't make it easy for them to help with their child's learning, buying a home computer will enable them to take positive action in that direction.

As noted, parents know first hand that:

- 1) Children have considerable time at home during which they could be using a computer to enhance or extend their in-school learning ("Otherwise, they'll just continue learning God knows what from T.V. and video games");
- 2) The three to five hours a day many children spend on T.V. and/or video games could be better spent learning "information-age skills" via a computer that will prepare them for a future in which most jobs will require them to use a computer.

But the mere presence of a computer is not going to transform at-home time into school-related learning time. However, its acquisition by parents can send an important message to their children. The parent who expects, and ensures, that a child devote at-home time to using a computer is communicating a great deal. And, if a parent devotes time, as many do, to the selection, purchase and use of appropriate learning software and online connectivity, the communication is reinforced. If, in addition, parents actually spend time jointly exploring and learning with their child via computer, two additional messages are being communicated:

1. Devoting time to learning together with computers is time well spent;
2. Spending time like this more important than watching TV.

These messages are particularly important not only because so many children spend as much time watching TV and playing video games as they do learning in school, but because they promote the value of learning as a family. Whether primarily motivated by frustration with children's video habits or other reasons, every week millions of parents are either acquiring their first computer or buying more software and/or online access for one already acquired. Despite this growing evidence of parental interest in at-home access to computers and connectivity, most schools — literally and figuratively — are not yet making the connection with at-home learning time and teacher-parent communication and cooperation toward optimizing that time.

In most cases, whether parents are looking for guidance about which computer software, about specific homework assignments or about strategies for improving their child's learning, they are not being helped much by what ought to be their most obvious, informed and trustworthy source. This is particularly unfortunate regarding software advice, in light of evidence that children who used software at home that was directly related to in-school activities learned significantly more from home computer use than children using software that was less related (Hess, 1987)

Let's consider the situation of any parent who might ask a school for some help related to the purchase of a computer and appropriate learning software/online learning experiences for their child. While the parent may get some informal advice from a computer savvy teacher or technology coordinator, most schools have no outreach effort to assist parents in their search for appropriate computer learning experiences for a child at home.

As a result, most computer-owning parents are faced with a dilemma: on the one hand they lack educationally sound information about software and at-home computer use; on the other hand they are deluged by commercial services offering software products in an info-mercial, mode. As schools lack a proactive means of providing parents with the help they need, the vacuum is filled with information about heavily advertised products — that will seldom be appropriate for meeting the learning needs of a particular child within a specific aspect of the school curriculum at a particular time.

Schools — perhaps working with the community's library — could readily provide a parent-friendly, curriculum-connected appropriate source of assistance. Even without a community-wide computer network,

such a service easily could be integrated into a community-wide e-mail and/or voice-messaging system. However, a local, online computer network could have the additional capability of actually providing a range of appropriate electronic learning resources to homes, via extended site-licensing agreements for resources stored on a network server. At-home, "homework site-licensing" arrangements could be negotiated with software products are being used at school. In a way, textbooks have always come with such licensing.

The "Edutainment" Factor

In the absence of such locally-networked information, a marketing network of children's "edutainment" products is constantly competing for parents' attention and dollars. Such products are being targeted to the almost 50 percent of high-income U.S.homes with children that currently own at least one computer (Tagliabue, 1995). Children in these homes, as members of the younger generation of "information haves," are all potential points-of-sale for edutainment products and related online services.

While "edutainment" products do engage learners (especially the preliterate young), many such products suffer from developers who invest more in entertainment value than in valued learning outcomes. This was the practice that prompted the term's invention a generation ago, when it was initially used to contrast Sesame Street's high quality "edutainment" (educationally-effective, rigorously-researched and engagingly-entertaining), with a spate of funny-but-frothy audio-visual wanna-be's that hit the school market and bounced off (Komoski, 1972).

It remains to be seen whether parents will become as discriminating as many teachers became about the lack of learning quality of those early "edutainment" products. If they do, must they do it on their own? Or will schools and parents find ways of positively and cooperatively shaping the home and school learning marketplaces so that these related marketplaces can best serve the learning needs of all of America's children. As mention in Section II, there are currently more than 17,000 educational software products within the school/home educational marketplace (EPIE Institute, The Educational Software Selector (TESS) Database, CD-ROM Version, January, 1996). Although, about a third of these products are being marketed primarily to homes, there is wide overlap. Schools would do well to make teacher-parent communication and cooperation on the evaluation and appropriate in-school and at-home use of these school-home overlapping products. We believe that schools will find that teachers who are also parents of school-age children will be effective leaders of such cooperative teacher-parent efforts.

Beyond the Edutainment Diet: "Educational Protein"

Such parent-teacher cooperative efforts could greatly facilitated by the use of a school-home-community network. Such a school-home-community network would enable effective communication, guidance, and access to information and learning resources between schools and homes plus the community's libraries, museums and other commercial and noncommercial learning resources. Their collective task will be to discern and to use those resources in which "educational protein" is not diluted and dissipated by attention-grabbing irrelevancies, but enriched with intrinsically-motivating content presented engagingly, even humorously, in student-relevant contexts.


Communication about such matters on a school-home-community network would not only be teacher-to-parent, but parent-to-teacher, parents-to-parents, students-to-students, student-to-teacher, teacher-to-student, etc. It would also include communication between all of the above with local libraries, museums, and a range of local social services and volunteer organizations. It would relate not only to information and resources about computer-facilitated learning, but to the full scope of learning, teaching and other concerns that parents, teachers, students and the community share.

We see the learning-enhancing potential of having all parties communicating and sharing information, ideas and strategies as enormous. Such networked, learning-focused communication would form a dynamic matrix through which an evolving learning community could be successfully self-generated, self-examined and continuously improved.

Within this communication matrix we also see the potential for schools, teachers, students and parents to continuously improve the long-imperfect loop of feedforward and feedback upon which successful teaching-

learning depends (Komoski, 1988) The models presented in Section IV of this report reflect this approach to school-home, community-wide networking.

Imagine for a moment, a community-wide network through which teachers communicate with parents about: the importance of working with their child on a particular project during the next few weeks.... about visiting a specific web site on the Internet with a child, and what to do once there... about the how's, why's of using specific software programs to meet a child's particular learning needs... about taking their child to a particular exhibit at a local museum... about reading to their child from a particular book in the next few days... or discussing a current local or national issue... or about some recommended "kitchen science" experiments for parents to do with their children and... oh yes, also providing online progress reports on how a child is doing at school....and on how well he or she is able to apply and discuss when in school has been learned at home.

 A student's ability to discuss, to interrelate and perhaps debate with others what she/he has learned and produced becomes increasingly important in the networked world of knowledge exploration, constructivist learning and computer-aided portfolio building (see Section IV: K-12 Networking Model). As students becoming increasingly adept at producing "professional-looking" multimedia works, constructed with point-and-click facility and increasingly sophisticated text and style editors, teacher and parents may need to assure themselves that students are as conversant with content as they are with process.

Imagine also, parents communicating with other parents and teachers about other matters related to their child's learning: about organizing a field trip around for students around a group science project ...about helping another parent get the most out of some new music software for their child that another child has both enjoyed *and learned from*...about how to get the most out of a particular productivity tool... about software that doesn't measure upabout communicating with a teacher on a homework assignment that's confusing or that seems unrelated to the curriculum as the parent understands it.

Imagine further, small groups of students engaging in an online, at-home discussion of an assigned topic and producing a point-by-point summary of their conclusions, agreements and disagreements for peer and teacher review... students working with a local mathematics, science, music or literature online mentor... students designing their own projects, gathering online data.... studying local civic issues online.... conducting online interviews, and, oh yes.... developing an on-the-net language-learning relationship with a "net pal" in the country whose language a student is learning at school.

Now consider both the human values and educational benefits evidenced in these scratch-the-surface examples. All of the above could begin happening, today, in any school community willing to commit to making it happen.

The important point for school technology planners and community policymakers to realize is that making this happen need not be approached as something to be achieved at some future date..." when we have the resources and the luxury of taking on this sort of outreach with parents and the community."

While we understand such feelings, expansion of a school's planned or existing network into a school-home-community network for learning and communication is something any school and community can start doing today with today's technology (see Section V, An Achievable Vision). The major resources required for the task are commitment, clarity of purpose and creativity. It's not that money is not needed also. However, financially, any school that is planning to spend money on networking can very likely expand its current networking plans without expanding its networking budget. It is not the networking budget that needs to expand, it's vision, careful planning and money-saving ideas for getting the job done that can make school-home-community networking a reality.