

Full-Service Community Schools: Fiscal Year 2022 Indicators and Measures

Introduction

This document provides a draft of indicator definitions, related research, and measures for fiscal year (FY) 2022 Full-Service Community School (FSCS) grantees. Specifically, the definitions and measures cover one program measure from section 4625 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA) and 13 additional indicators (6 administrative indicators, and 7 non-administrative indicators) from the FY 2022 Notice Inviting Applications.

The reporting guidance will undergo two public comment periods, one for 60 days and another for 30. During these comment periods the public will be able to weigh in on the definitions, measures, and supporting research base. During this time, U.S. Department of Education staff will make adjustments and incorporate suggestions from the broader community schools' field—including researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. This feedback will be reflected in the final reporting guidance which will be published in the Federal Register. To comply with federal statute and regulations, FY 2022 FSCS grantees will use this guidance to submit data on their program's performance indicators and measures annually.

Index

Performance Indicator Background.....	2
Performance Indicators.....	3
Program Performance Measure.....	4
Administrative Indicators.....	5
Non-Administrative Indicators.....	12
Using Multiple Indicators Together.....	21
Using Locally Developed Indicators and Additional Measures.....	21

Performance Indicator Background

The performance measures described below come from a combination of field-generated community schools research and the Full-Service Community Schools statute.

Research shows that giving students equitable opportunities to learn requires access to key inputs and that performance indicators are one way to understand the complex context for student performance. Sometimes referred to as opportunity-to-learn (OTL) indicators, the **performance indicators** and related measures below “generally refer to inputs and processes within a school context necessary for producing student achievement of intended outcomes.”¹ Research also emphasizes that input and process-focused data serves a critical role in identifying student needs, particularly when considered alongside student performance, and resource allocation.² In collecting the data on the performance indicators, grantees should make connections between multiple data points and student outcomes as a part of a broader logic model or theory of action to better understand how to continuously improve services for students and families.³

The Full-Service Community School Statute notes that Full-Service Community School applications must include “Annual measurable performance objects and outcomes, including an increase in the number and percentage of families and students targeted for services each year of the program” and, “plans for annual evaluation based upon attainment of the performance objectives and outcomes.”⁴ The performance indicators below play a key role in annual measurement and evaluation because they allow grantees to regularly monitor their performance and strengthen their improvement plans.

To help distinguish which indicators can be collected through more-traditional administrative channels and which ones require less-traditional non-administrative collection efforts, the Department has grouped the indicators into “Administrative” and “Non-administrative” categories.

Administrative indicators can be collected primarily through administrative means. These indicators are a starting point to have deeper conversations about school improvement. Local, state, and nationally collected administrative data are not the only source of information that should inform community school improvement. However, it is often easier to collect and report on than other non-administrative measures. As such these data often take primacy in conversations about the progress, evaluation, and impact of community school implementation.

Non-administrative indicators are primarily collected through non-administrative means. Similar to the administrative indicators, these indicators are a starting point to have deeper conversations about school improvement. These data include qualitative data that may require asking students, parents, for information about different aspects of community school functioning and performance.

Performance Indicators

Program performance measure

1. **Provision of services** to students, families, and community members and individuals

Administrative Indicators

2. **student chronic absenteeism** rates
3. **student discipline rates**, including suspensions and expulsions
4. **school climate** information, which may come from student, parent, or teacher surveys
5. **staff characteristics**, including information on the number, qualifications, and retention of school staff, including the number and percentage of fully certified teachers, disaggregated by race and ethnicity, rates of teacher turnover, and teacher experience
6. changes in **school spending information**
7. **graduation rates**

Non-administrative Indicators

8. provision of **integrated student supports and stakeholder services**
9. **expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities**
10. **family and community engagement efforts and impact**
11. **collaborative leadership and practice strategies**, which may include building the capacity of educators, principals, other school leaders, and other staff to lead collaborative school improvement structures, such as professional learning communities
12. **regularly convening or engaging all initiative-level partners**, such as LEA representatives, city or county officials, children's and youth's cabinets, nonprofit service providers, public housing agencies, and advocates
13. **organizing school personnel and community partners** into working teams focused on specific issues identified in the needs and assets assessment
14. **regularly assessing program quality and progress** through individual student data, participant feedback, and aggregate outcomes to develop strategies for improvement⁵

Program Performance Measure

1. Provision of Services

Definition – This indicator stems from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) which, when reauthorized under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015, which authorized the FSCS program.⁶ The provision of services indicator measures the percentage of unduplicated students, families, community members and individuals targeted for services that receive services during each performance year. This means that each student, family member, and community member who participated in program services is counted only once, no matter how many services they participated in or how many times they were served. Unduplicated individuals include previous students who have been disengaged, early learners, infants, and toddlers.

Why this indicator matters – Serving students, families, and community members is at the heart of the FSCS program. Measuring changes in these measures allows grantees and program officers to engage in productive conversations about how to understand changes in implementation and adjust accordingly. For example, if the number of students participating in FSCS program services continues to rise, the leadership team may need to consider adding additional staff to their implementation plan. Or, if the number of family members participating in program services goes down, then the leadership team may need to survey parents to find out why. Overall, this indicator allows grantees to evaluate whether they are meeting their targets for the number of students, family members, and community members they are aiming to serve.

Measures

- 1.a How many unduplicated students were targeted for FSCS program services (target number and actual number)?
- 1.b How many unduplicated family members participated in FSCS program services (target number and actual number)?
- 1.c How many unduplicated community members were targeted for FSCS program services (target and actual number)?
- 1.d How many total unduplicated individuals were targeted for FSCS program services (target and actual number)?

Administrative Indicators

2. Student Chronic Absenteeism

Definition – Students are considered chronically absent after missing 10 percent or more of the school year.⁷

Why this indicator matters – Chronic absenteeism is an indicator that is an important focal point for community schools because it highlights students who are missing significant instructional time. Research shows higher rates of chronic absence impacts student's performance in school. For example, students who are chronically absent score lower on tests than students with better attendance, after controlling for race or socioeconomic status.⁸ Plus, disaggregating the number of students who are chronically absent by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status can illuminate groups of students who are missing significant class time. Overall, chronic absenteeism allows grantees to focus on students who are not receiving the full benefit of classroom instruction and broader school supports. While this indicator does not show why students miss school on its own, it can be combined with other indicators to create and evaluate interventions to meet student needs.⁹

Analysis by the U.S. Department of Education highlights how students of races and ethnicities and in different grades experience chronic absenteeism at different rates. Specifically, Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Pacific Islander, Non-English Learners and students of two or more races have experienced higher than average rates of chronic absenteeism. The Department's analysis also showed that students in high school are more likely to be chronically absent than students in elementary and middle school.¹⁰ Thus, disaggregating chronic absenteeism data by race and grade level can shine a light on how different subgroups and grades in a school system may differ in how often they show up.

Measures

How much did we do:

2.a What percent of students in grantee schools have missed 10 percent or more of the school year?

How well did we do it:

2.b What percent of students in grantee schools have missed 10 percent or more of the school year disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status?

Is anyone better off?

2.c What percent of students in grantee schools are chronically absent compared to the prior year?

3. Student Discipline

Definition – Student discipline includes actions that formally or informally remove students from a class, school, or other educational program or activity for violating a school rule or code of conduct. While these practices are often implemented to keep students accountable for their actions and keep schools safe, they can also hinder students’ ability to learn and grow. Student discipline may include detentions, disciplinary transfers, and referrals to law enforcement. For the purposes of performance reporting for FY 22 FSCS grantees, this indicator focuses on suspensions (both in- and out-of school) and expulsions.

Why this indicator matters – Suspensions and expulsions are examples of exclusionary discipline practices that can lead to lost instructional time for historically underserved students, especially for students of color and students with disabilities.¹¹ It is important for schools to reduce the number of suspensions and expulsions because these exclusionary practices have negative impacts on students. For example, students who miss instructional time because of suspensions and expulsions experience higher rates of grade retention, are less likely to graduate, and are more likely to enter the juvenile justice system.¹²

Disaggregating suspension and expulsion data is especially important because racial and special education disparities in suspensions have persisted for over time. An analysis of the Civil Rights Data collections from 2011-2018 show Black, Native American, Hispanic, and Pacific Islander students have been suspended at higher rates than white students. Students with disabilities have also been suspended at higher rates than their nondisabled peers. Intersections of race, and disability status can also increase students’ likelihood of suspension.¹³ Thus, it is important for grantees to consider these factors when analyzing their suspension and expulsion data.

Measures

How much did we do:

- 3.a How many students in grantee schools received one or more in-school suspensions?
- 3.b How many students in grantee schools received one or more expulsions?

How well did we do it:

- 3.c How many students in grantee schools received one or more in-school suspensions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- 3.d How many students in grantee schools received one or more expulsions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?

Is anyone better off:

- 3.e How many students in grantee schools received one or more in-school suspensions compared to the prior year?
- 3.f How many students in grantee schools received one or more expulsions compared to the prior year?

4. School Climate

Definition – School climate refers to a school’s broader environment—the social, emotional, and physical aspects of a school. This school environment includes several factors, including student and staff safety, engagement, and overall well-being. These factors can evaluate the level of safety and security, quality of relationships between students and teachers, and the overall sense of belonging and connectedness among members of the school community.¹⁴ This indicator will be represented by a benchmarked scale score of a student school climate survey based on the ED School Climate Survey (EDSCLS). Benchmarking scaled scores will be reported by level and number, with Level 3 (Most Favorable) representing scores between 400 – 500, Level 2 (Favorable) representing scores between 300 – 400, and Level 1 (Least Favorable) representing scores below 300.¹⁵

Why this indicator matters – School climate can have a significant impact on student learning and academic achievement, as well as their social and emotional development. Research shows that positive school climates correlate with improved attendance, test scores, promotion rates, and graduation rates.¹⁶ In addition, a positive school climate can promote positive behaviors and attitudes among students, improve engagement, and reduce disciplinary problems.¹⁷

The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments identifies 13 school climate subtopics across three domains of school climate—Engagement, Safety, and Environment. Each of these domains includes the following subtopics:

- **Engagement:** cultural and linguistic competence, relationship, and school participation
- **Safety:** Emotional safety, physical safety, bullying/cyberbullying, substance abuse, and emergency readiness/management
- **Environment:** Physical environment, instructional environment, physical health, mental health, and discipline.¹⁸

When schools focus on improving across these domains of school climate, they can help foster accepting, safe, supportive, and challenging environments where students learn best. Schools and districts can evaluate school climate data with other performance indicators to confirm interventions that are working well and to see where there are gaps in program services.

Measures

How much did we do:

4.a What percent level did students at grantee community schools report using an EDSCLS survey?

How well did we do it:

4.b What score between 100 - 500 did students at grantee community schools report using an EDSCLS survey?

Is anyone better off:

4.c What is the change in scores at grantee community schools compared to the prior year?

5. Staff Characteristics

Definition – This indicator measures key characteristics of education staff that drive student success. All staff members working in schools bring their own unique backgrounds and characteristics, including their preparation, experience, gender, race, and ethnicity. For the purposes of this data collection, staff characteristics will prioritize information on:

- (1) the number and percentage of fully certified teachers, as defined by each grantee’s state, disaggregated by race and ethnicity,
- (2) rates of teacher turnover, as measured by the number and percentage of teachers returning to the school annually,
- (3) the retention of school staff as measured by the number and percentage of staff returning to the school annually,
- (4) teacher experience as measured by the average number of years of experience

Why this indicator matters – A substantial body of research confirms that access to qualified and experienced teachers is paramount for student achievement and well-being.¹⁹ In fact, when it comes to factors that influence student achievement, educators are the most important.²⁰

Each component of this performance indicator has a direct tie to student achievement. For example:

- Teacher Certification – A growing body of research shows that teacher qualifications, including certification, matters for improving student achievement.²¹
- Teacher turnover – Research is also clear that high rates of teacher turnover negatively impact student learning.²²
- Teacher and leader retention – When schools retain their teachers and leaders, they can save money and keep effective educators in the classroom.²³ It is also important for schools to retain principals, as high-quality school leaders are associated with increased graduation rates and improved student achievement.²⁴ Conversely, failing to retain effective school leaders can result in decreased test scores across grade levels and subjects.²⁵
- Teacher experience – Retention also leads to increased educator experience, which multiple studies show is associated with improved student achievement.²⁶

Grantees can use information about teacher certification, turnover, and retention to ensure their students do not experience educational disadvantages. Because student’s benefit from certified and experienced educators, grantees can take steps to recruit certified educators, improve the certification of their own staff, and retain the qualified staff they have.

Measures

How much did we do:

5.a *Teacher Certification* – What is the number and percentage of fully certified teachers, disaggregated by race and ethnicity?

How well did we do it:

5.b *Teacher turnover* – What is the number and percentage of teachers returning to the school annually?

5.c *Teacher retention* – What is the number and percentage of staff returning to the school annually?

5.d *Leader retention* – What is the number and percentage of school leadership returning to the school annually?

Is anyone better off:

5.e *Teacher experience* – What is the average number of years of experience for teachers?

6. Changes in school spending information

Definition – School spending and changes in school spending are complex calculations. School spending includes salaries, employee benefits, purchased services, tuition supplies, and other expenditures. For FSCS grantees, changes in school spending information can be calculated using the difference in public school expenditures per pupil year over year as measured by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Expenditures per pupil can be calculated by dividing the current expenditures over the entire academic year for a grantee’s grade span by the number of students in those grades in community schools.²⁷

Why this indicator matters – Adequate and equitable per-pupil spending is positively associated with improved student outcomes. It costs money to provide smaller class sizes, additional instructional supports, early childhood programs, and more competitive compensation for educators. Thus, gauging whether spending on students is going up, down, or staying the same provides key information for education decision-makers.²⁸

Data on school spending is important because it provides information about how education resources are allocated and whether resources are being distributed equitably among schools and students. Schools with higher per-pupil expenditures may be better able to provide students with access to high-quality teachers, instructional materials, and technology, while schools with lower per-pupil expenditures may struggle to provide these resources.²⁹

Data on per-pupil expenditures can help identify inequities in education funding and resource allocation. For example, if certain schools consistently receive lower levels of funding than their peers, this may indicate a need for targeted interventions to address these disparities.

Measures

How much did we do:

6.a What is the total amount of per-pupil expenditures at grantee schools as defined by ESSA?

How well did we do it:

6.b What is the difference between the per-pupil expenditures at grantee schools compared to the state's per-pupil expenditures as defined by ESSA?

Is anyone better off:

6.c What is the annual change in the total amount of per-pupil expenditures as defined by ESSA?

7. Graduation rates

Definition – This indicator measures the adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR), which according to the National Center for Education Statistics is “the percentage of students in their adjusted cohort who graduate within 4 years with a regular high school diploma. State education agencies calculate the ACGR by identifying the “cohort” of first-time 9th-graders in a particular school year. The cohort is then adjusted by adding any students who immigrate from another country or transfer into the cohort after 9th grade and subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die.”³⁰

Why this indicator matters – For students, graduating high school represents the culmination of student success during their K-12 education. Students with a high school diploma have improved career opportunities, higher earning potential, greater personal satisfaction, and better life outcomes than their peers without a high school degree. People who graduate high school have better health outcomes, lower rates of unemployment, and are less likely to be involved in criminal activity.³¹ Most colleges and universities require a high school diploma to apply. Thus, high school graduation is also key to accessing higher education.

Graduation rates are important for high schools because they provide a critical measure of school performance, student success, equity, and school improvement. Federal, state, and local accountability systems include graduation rates because they help compare and evaluate school performance, especially by comparing graduation rates across schools and between student subgroups.³² By measuring and analyzing graduation rates among different student populations such as students of color, low-income students, and students with disabilities, schools can identify areas where additional support and resources may be needed. An additional benefit of tracking graduation rates is that multiple years of data can inform system-wide interventions and strategies to drive school improvement.

Measures

How much did we do:

7.a What percentage of students have graduated using the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?

How well did we do it:

7.b What percentage of student have graduated using the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?

Is anyone better off:

7.c What percentage of students have graduated using the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate compared to the previous year?

Non-Administrative Indicators

8. Provision of Integrated Student Supports and Stakeholder Services

Definition – This indicator measures how grantees provide integrated student supports. Integrated student supports at a community school that provide in- and out-of-school support for students, address well-being, and address out-of-school barriers to learning through partnerships with social and health service agencies, including mental and behavioral health agencies and providers, and coordinated by a community school coordinator, which may include—

- (i) Medical dental, vision care, and mental and behavioral health services, including mental health literacy for students and staff, and trauma-informed services to prevent, intervene, and mitigate adverse childhood experiences (ACEs); and
- (ii) Individuals to assist with housing, transportation, nutrition, citizenship preparation, or criminal justice issues and other services.³³

Overall, integrated student supports are a student-centered approach to develop, identify and coordinate community-based resources that target academic and non-academic barriers to achievement, including academic, social, health and wellness support.³⁴ Schools can provide integrated student supports and stakeholder services through multifaceted efforts that adopt a holistic approach that considers the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of students, caregivers, and the broader school community.³⁵

Why this indicator matters – While the mix of integrated student supports varies from school to school, they are generally overseen by a community school coordinator and help students overcome academic and nonacademic barriers to student success. Medical and dental care, physical and mental health services, tutoring, parent education classes, job training, nutrition programs, housing assistance, and restorative programs are common examples of integrated student supports. The long-term impacts of integrated student supports are rooted in the science of learning and development and buttressed by an expanding evidence base.³⁶ Research on integrated student supports has focused on five elements: community partnerships, student support coordination, integration into the school setting, needs assessments, and data tracking. These elements support service delivery and incorporate best practices from child development. Evaluations of ISS models also show promising results regarding attendance, school climate, social well-being, and academic achievement.³⁷

Measures

How much did we do:

8.a Have funds from the Fiscal Year 2022 Full-Service Community Schools grant provided services under the following pillar? Yes or No

8.b What is the number of students receiving integrated student supports and stakeholder services?

How well did we do:

8.c For this pillar, please indicate whether Fiscal Year 2022 FSCS grant funds have been primarily spent to:
(A) expand existing services to reach more recipients, (B) improve existing services for current recipients, or (C) provide new services

8.d What percentage of students are using available integrated student supports and stakeholder services?

Is anyone better off:

8.e What percentage of students are using available integrated student supports and stakeholder services compared to the prior year?

9. Expanded and Enriched Learning Time and Opportunities

Definition – This indicator measures how grantees provide expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities. Expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities, through evidence-based strategies (as defined by ESSA), include before-school, after-school, during-school, weekend, and summer programs that provide additional academic instruction, individualized academic support, enrichment activities, or learning opportunities, for students at a community school that—

- (i) May emphasize real-world project-based learning where students can apply their learning to contexts that are relevant and engaging; and
- (ii) May include art, music, drama, creative writing, hands-on experience with engineering or science (including computer science), career and technical education, tutoring that is aligned with classroom success and homework help, and recreational programs that enhance and are consistent with the school's curriculum.³⁸

Expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities may also include the intentional collaboration between educators and community partners to apply project-based learning during in- and out-of-school time, including internships, externships, and opportunities to solve community challenges.

Why this indicator matters – Expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities are essential to schools’ capacity to support students’ academic growth, as well as to help them develop socially, emotionally, and physically. Academic support and enrichment beyond the school day gives students more learning time and more opportunities to succeed in and outside the classroom.³⁹ In fact, community schools provide their students with as much as one-third more learning time.⁴⁰ During this time students participate in arts, physical activity, internships, externships, extra-curricular activities, mentoring, individualized academic supports, and other community connected-learning experiences. These additional opportunities to learn are associated with increased attendance, higher graduation rates, improved social, emotional, and leadership skill development, and reduced incidents of juvenile crime.⁴¹ Plus, students often gain develop a greater understanding of their community, develop trusting relationships with role models and other adults, and connect what they learn in school to new contexts.⁴²

Measures

How much did we do:

9.a Have funds from the Fiscal Year 2022 Full-Service Community Schools grant provided services under the following pillar? Yes or No

What is the number of students participating in expanded and enriched learning opportunities?

How well did we do it:

9.b For this pillar, please indicate whether Fiscal Year 2022 FSCS grant funds have been primarily spent to:

(A) expand existing services to reach more recipients, (B) improve existing services for current recipients, or (C) provide new services

9.c What percentage of students are participating in expanded and enriched learning opportunities?

Is anyone better off:

9.d What percentage of students are participating in expanded and enriched learning opportunities compared to the prior year?

10. Family and Community Engagement Efforts and Impact

Definition – This indicator measures grantees family and community engagement activities.

Active family and community engagement—

- (i) Brings parents and families of students at the community school and community members and leaders into the school as partners in students’ education, including meaningfully involving parents and families in the community school’s decision-making processes;
- (ii) Makes the community school a hub for services, activities, and programs, for students, families, and members of the neighborhood that the community school serves;
- (iii) Provides adults with desired educational and employment opportunities and other supportive services; and

- (iv) Provides centralized supports for families and communities in community schools, which may include English as a second language classes, citizenship preparation, computer skills, art, housing assistance, child abuse and neglect prevention supports, health and mental health, literacy programs, digital literacy training, or other programs that bring community members into a school building for meetings, events, or programming.⁴³

Family and community engagement efforts can foster capacity building and encourage caregivers as leaders in community schools' decision-making processes by leveraging local resources and expertise of partners.⁴⁴

Why this indicator matters – Engaging families and community members extend leadership beyond district leaders and school administrators to include teachers, school staff, parents, and community partners.⁴⁵ Analysis of community schools have shown their supplemental programs can reach over 70% of families with students enrolled in the school.⁴⁶ Reaching a larger percentage of families is important because research shows active family and community engagement in schools increases trust between schools and outside partners, improves school climate.⁴⁷ Additional evidence suggests, families who engage in these schools are more likely to show gains in mathematics, develop English language proficiency, and demonstrate positive attitudes about their school.⁴⁸

Overall, being more inclusive, family and community engagement efforts improve the quality of the decisions being made by schools and districts. Partnering with families and community members on the front end of the community school's implementation process is critical to building the capacity of families and schools.⁴⁹ Purposely enhancing educator and parent capabilities, connections, cognition, and confidence can give community schools a more comprehensive understanding of local strengths and challenges.⁵⁰ As a result of this active family and community engagement, schools become better suited to determining the appropriate mix of services, supports, and opportunities.

Measures

How much did we do:

- 10.a Have funds from the Fiscal Year 2022 Full-Service Community Schools grant provided services under the following pillar? Yes or No
- 10.b What is the number of school and community school partner staff who participated in family engagement training and professional learning over the last year?
- 10.c How many parents are engaged in decision-making committees (e.g., parent-teacher associations, steering committees) in grantee schools?

How well did we do it:

- 10.d For this pillar, please indicate whether Fiscal Year 2022 FSCS grant funds have been primarily spent to:
(A) expand existing services to reach more recipients, (B) improve existing services for current recipients, or (C) provide new services
- 10.e What percent of families attended school events in the past year?

Is anyone better off:

- 10.f What percent of families attended school events compared to the prior year?
- 10g. Students, families, educators, and community partners who report that they feel involved and are actively engaged in school decisions (e.g., To what extent do you feel you are involved in meaningful decision-making processes at the school?)
(A) All the time (B) Most of the time (C) Some of the time (D) Not at all
- 10.g Families reporting that they feel connected to the school on a community school survey or in a focus group (e.g., To what extent to you (parents and community members) feel welcomed at the school?)
(A) All the time (B) Most of the time (C) Some of the time (D) Not at all

11. Collaborative leadership and practice strategies

Definition – This indicator measures collaborative leadership and practice strategies, which build a culture of professional learning, collective trust, and shared responsibility for each community school. Strategies include—

- (i) At a minimum, a school-based leadership team with representation of student, parent and family leaders and community voice; a community school coordinator; and a community-wide leadership team; and
- (ii) May include other leadership or governance teams, community school steering committees, or other community coalitions, educator learning communities, and other staff to manage the multiple, complex joint work of school and community organizations.⁵¹

Collaborative leadership and practice strategies share accountability and implementation decisions across organizations, roles, and sectors made to improve outcomes for students. Building the capacity of educators, principals, other school leaders, and staff, these strategies should lead to collaborative school improvement.⁵²

Why this indicator matters – Collaborative leadership and practice strategies between students, teachers, and the broader school community improve overall implementation of the other pillars of community schools. Several positive outcomes stem from collaborative leadership and practice strategies. Practices such as creating time for collaboration, creating leadership teams, and providing leadership development help improve school organization, improve student learning, increase the commitment from school staff, and increase trust between those working in the school and community members.⁵³ Further, school climate, collective capacity, and relationships can all be strengthened through collaborative leadership and practice strategies.⁵⁴

The examples in the definition above can broadly be thought of as capacity-building activities and strategies that include community school focused technical assistance and professional development. In addition to the examples of collaborative leadership and practice strategies listed in the definition, schools may also engage in professional learning communities, site-

based leadership teams, and advisory councils.⁵⁵ Monitoring progress on this indicator can ensure community schools move toward a results-based vision based in data that is integrated into the broader efforts of the community.⁵⁶

Measures

How much did we do:

- 11.a Have funds from the Fiscal Year 2022 Full-Service Community Schools grant provided services under the following pillar? Yes or No
- 11.b What is the number of community school partners and staff participating in community school technical assistance and professional development?

How well did we do it:

- 11.c For this pillar, please indicate whether Fiscal Year 2022 FSCS grant funds have been primarily spent to:
(A) expand existing services to reach more recipients, (B) improve existing services for current recipients, or (C) provide new services
- 11.d What percentage of community school partners and staff participated in community school technical assistance and professional development over the past year?

Is anyone better off:

- 11.e What percentage of community school partners and staff participated in community school technical assistance and professional development compared to the prior year?

12. Regularly convening or engaging all initiative-level partners

Definition – Regularly convening or engaging initiative-level partners is a networking space for policy development, resource alignment and communication for leaders whose responsibilities reach across a shared population of residents within a defined geographical region to decide how to build and sustain a system of Community Schools. Community and initiative-level partners include community school coordinators, project directors, LEA representatives, city or county officials, children’s and youth cabinets, nonprofit service providers, public housing agencies, and advocates.⁵⁷

Why this indicator matters – Regularly convening or engaging all initiative-level partners creates the context and capacity for sustainability and expansion. Sustaining and growing a community schools system requires constant attention. Leaders should not take their eyes off key systemic challenges that can derail change efforts such as leadership transitions, funding changes, and policies.⁵⁸ Regular system scans can help identify areas that need attention. The system should refresh and strengthen its leadership and engage the community in a process of continuous improvement.⁵⁹ The community school system must also attend to the key sustainability elements of political and financial capacity so they have the leadership, policy, and funding support to ensure the system will sustain leadership changes.⁶⁰ To help grantees track progress toward these ends, they can look at (a) their number of initiative-level partners, (b) the amount of funding contributing towards sustaining their program, and (c) how their funding changes year-over-year.

Measures

How much did we do:

12.a What is the number of initiative-level partners (e.g., regional-wide agencies with elected and/or senior executives) participating in community school leadership meetings?

How well did we do it:

12.b What is the amount of blended and braided funding contributing to sustainability?

Is anyone better off:

12.c What is the amount of blended and braided funding contributing to sustainability compared to the prior year?

13. Organizing school personnel and community partners

Definition – This indicator measures how state, district, and local leaders deliberately organize school personnel and community partners into disciplined working teams focused on specific issues based on quantitative and qualitative data. Convenings and engagements may be in person or virtual and include teams focused on specific issues identified in a grantee’s needs and assets assessment.⁶¹

Why this indicator matters – Community school experts have identified shared governance structures and strategic community partnerships as important supportive infrastructure for effective community school implementation.⁶² Thus, organizing school personnel and community partners should be something community school grantees monitor to align with best practices in the field. While tracking this indicator does not look at a specific outcome, community school researchers note that measuring implementation provides important information about program quality.⁶³

Being deliberate in using and creating data to identify “who” should be engaged and “how” we should engage them optimizes the two opposite feelings that propel people into action. Using a Results-Based Accountability® or “plan, do, study, act” approach enhances the chances of turning a data curve that has been headed in the wrong direction.⁶⁴ Within these frameworks grantees can look at the extent to which they are: (a) filling key school personnel positions such as community school coordinators and how they are supporting those positions with training and professional development; (b) engaging school personnel and community partners in school-based and community-wide leadership teams. Then, look at (c) if these efforts result in changes in the cooperation across schools, communities, and families; and (d) how services align with the student, family, and community member interests.

Measures

How much did we do:

- 13.a Across all of the schools that will be supported by your Fiscal Year 2022 Full-Service Community Schools grant, how many have completed each of the following activities? Grantees will answer each of items below by marking one of the following: (A) Not complete in any schools; (B) Complete in less than half of the schools; (C) Complete in about half of the schools; (D) Complete in more than half of the schools; (E) Complete for all of the schools; or (F) I don't know
- Filling community school coordinator positions
 - Providing training to community school coordinators
 - Finalizing membership for all required staff, family and partner-organization positions on the school-based leadership team and (if applicable) community-wide leadership teams

How well did we do it:

- 13.c Open response: How has cooperation across schools, communities, and families changed in the past year?

Is anyone better off:

- 13.d Open response: How are community school personnel and community partners implementing programs and services based on the interests of students, families, and community members?

14. Regularly assessing program quality and progress

Definition – This indicator is related to the annual evaluation requirement for the Full-Service Community School Program described in Section 4625 of ESEA as amended. Regularly assessing program quality and progress is the process in which services and programs are managed by measures that explain how well the program is going and what can be done to improve it. Regularly assessing program quality looks at the frequency in which community school grantees formally discuss, present, and make changes to their implementation plan by examining individual student data, participant feedback, and aggregate outcomes to develop strategies for improvement.⁶⁵

Why this indicator matters – Regularly assessing program quality and progress can help education leaders, practitioners, and stakeholders agree on specific challenges, identify ways to address those challenges, and study their implementation practices.⁶⁶ Every community school is different. Each with its own assets, resources, needs, vision, and goals. Process improvement leads to consensus building which improves upon the culture of a school, but also ensures programs improve the lives of the populations for which they are intended to serve.⁶⁷

When community school programs assess the quality and progress of their programs on a regular basis, they are utilizing continuous improvement for collaborative problem-solving. Continuous improvement can help overcome key implementation challenges in community schools because it allows leadership teams to identify problems and approach them with proven methods such as Results-Based Accountability® or “plan, do, study, act” cycles.⁶⁸ Grantees can ensure these regular program reviews are taking place by (a) tracking their

frequency, (b) looking at how many schools are conducting assets and needs assessments, and (c) examining how many schools are providing grant-supported services, and (d) monitoring the percentage of students using those services.

Measures

How much did we do:

- 14.a How often are initiative-level partners formally discussing to their implementation plan by examining student data, participant feedback, and aggregate outcomes to develop strategies for improvement?
(A) monthly (B) bi-monthly (C) bi-annually (D) annually

How well did we do it:

- 14.b Across all of the schools that will be supported by your Fiscal Year 2022 Full-Service Community Schools grant, how many have completed each of the following activities? Grantees will answer each of items below by marking one of the following: (1) Not complete in any schools; (2) Complete in less than half of the schools; (3) Complete in about half of the schools; (4) Complete in more than half of the schools; (5) Complete for all of the schools; or (6) I don't know
- Conducting any assets and needs assessments
 - Providing at least one grant-supported service to students or families, using either school-based staff or partner organizations to deliver services
- 14.c What percentage of students are participating in the full set of pipeline services supported by the FSCS grant? (Note: this includes the 3 pipeline services grantees are already implementing and the 2 additional services grantees add throughout the 5 years of the grant)

Is anyone better off:

- 14.d Open response: Are students, parents, and community members reporting quality services at the grantee's community schools?

Using Multiple Indicators Together

The indicators above should not be used in isolation. Instead, they should be evaluated in different combinations to better understand school conditions and to identify possible improvement practices. For example, grantees can pair chronic absenteeism, school discipline, and school climate data with information about the four pillars of community schools. This way they can see how participation in integrated student supports, expanded learning time and opportunities, family engagement, and collaborative leadership practices correlates with attendance, suspensions and expulsions, and student's perceptions of their engagement, safety, and environment. Further, grantees can also examine how individual measures such as the percentage of community school partners and staff participating in community school

technical assistance and professional development correlates with other indicators (e.g., school climate and graduation rates) and other measures (e.g., teacher turnover and retention).

Using Locally Developed Indicators and Additional Measures

Grantees are not limited to only collect the information described in this guidance document. Assessing and informing progress towards community school improvement is a complex process that is unique to each site. Recent community school leaders have offered a set of indicators and outcomes to monitor short-, medium-, and long-term progress toward achieving locally determined goals.⁶⁹ Additional indicators can also illuminate data to foster continuous improvement for community schools. Plus, schools, districts, and states can also use student, parent, and teacher surveys to collect and report additional information.⁷⁰

Endnotes

- ¹ Elliott, S. N., & Bartlett, B. (2016). Opportunity to Learn. In Oxford Handbooks Online Scholarly. Research Reviews. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- ² Pflieger, R. H., Wilson, T. S., Welner, K. G., & Biblos, C. (2018). Measuring opportunity: Redirecting education policy through research. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(73). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3525>
- ³ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. (2021). ED COVID-19 Handbook, Volume 2: Roadmap to Reopening Safely and Meeting All Students' Needs Washington, DC. This report is available on the Department's website at <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/coronavirus/reopening-2.pdf>
- ⁴ The Every Student Succeeds Act. (2015).
- ⁵ U.S. Department of Education. (2022). Applications for New Awards; Full-Service Community Schools Program. Federal Register. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/07/13/2022-15091/applications-for-new-awards-full-service-community-schools-program>
- ⁶ Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (2015).
- ⁷ Attendance Works. (n.d.) www.attendanceworks.org
- ⁸ Kostyo, S., Cardichon, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2018). Making ESSA's equity promise real: State strategies to close the opportunity gap. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ⁹ Ginsburg, A., Jordan, P., & Chang H. (2014). [Absences Add Up: How School Attendance Influences Student Success](https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Absences-Add-Up-How-School-Attendance-Influences-Student-Success.pdf). Attendance Works.
- ¹⁰ U.S. Department of Education. [Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools \(ed.gov\)](https://www.ed.gov/datacollection/civilrights/chronicabsenteeism). Civil Rights Data Collection
- ¹¹ Losen, D. J., & Martinez, P. (2020). *Lost opportunities: How disparate school discipline continues to drive differences in the opportunity to learn*. Palo Alto, CA/Los Angeles, CA: Learning Policy Institute; Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the Civil Rights Project, UCLA.
- ¹² Steinberg, M. P., & Lacoce, J. (2017). What do we know about school discipline reform? *Education Next*, 17(1), 1-23.
- ¹³ Leung-Gagné, M., McCombs, J., Scott, C., & Losen, D. J. (2022). Pushed out: Trends and disparities in out-of-school suspension. Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/235.277>
- ¹⁴ Kostyo, S., Cardichon, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2018). Making ESSA's equity promise real: State strategies to close the opportunity gap. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ¹⁵ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/sites/default/files/EDSCLS_Questionnaires.pdf; National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments. (n.d.) ED School Climate Surveys Student Survey. ED School Climate Survey item bank. [School Climate Survey COVID-19 Item Bank | National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments \(NCSSLE\) \(ed.gov\)](https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/sites/default/files/EDSCLS_Questionnaires.pdf)
- ¹⁶ MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(1), 73–84.; Stewart, E. B. (2008). School structural characteristics, student effort, peer associations, and parental involvement: The influence of school- and individual-level factors on academic achievement. *Education and Urban Society*, 40(2), 179–204.; Hardre, P. L., & Reeve, J. (2003). A motivational model of rural students' intentions to persist in, versus drop out of, high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(2), 347–356.; Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 180–213.; Christle, C. A., Jolivette, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2007). School characteristics related to high school dropout rates. *Remedial and Special Education*, 28(6), 325–339.
- ¹⁷ Boccanfuso, C., & Kuhfeld, M. (2011). *Multiple responses, promising results: Evidence-based, nonpunitive alternatives to zero tolerance*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.; Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (2001). What schools do to prevent problem behavior and promote safe environments. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 12(4), 313–344.
- ¹⁸ National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments. (n.d.). Topics. <https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/topics>
- ¹⁹ Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2006). How changes in entry requirements alter the teacher workforce and affect student achievement. *Education Finance and Policy*, 1(2), 176–216; Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2007). How and why do teacher credentials matter for student achievement? (NBER Working Paper 12828). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research; Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D., Gatlin, S. J., & Vasquez Heilig, J. (2005). Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, Teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(42). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v13n42.2005>; Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/does-teaching-experience-increase-teacher-effectiveness-review-research>;
- Goe, L. (2007). The link between teacher quality and student outcomes: A research synthesis. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality; Ladd, H. F., & Sorensen, L. C. (2017). Returns to teacher experience: Student achievement and motivation in middle school. *Education Finance and Policy*, 12(2), 241–279; Podolsky, A., Darling-Hammond, L., Doss, C., & Reardon, S. (2019). California's positive outliers: Districts beating the

- odds. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/positive-outliers-districts-beating-odds>; Cardichon, J., Darling-Hammond, L., Yang, M., Scott, C., Shields, P. M., & Burns, D. (2020). Inequitable opportunity to learn: Student access to certified and experienced teachers. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ²⁰ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). Community Schools Playbook.
- ²¹ Adamson, F., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Funding disparities and the inequitable distribution of teachers: Evaluating sources and solutions. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 20(37). <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1053>; Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 291–309.; Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2007). How and why do teacher credentials matter for student achievement? (NBER Working Paper 12828). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research
- ²² Carver-Thomas, D. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/454.278>; Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research. Palo Alto: Learning Policy Institute.
- ²³ Carver-Thomas, D. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/454.278>
- ²⁴ Burkhauser, S., Gates, S. M., Hamilton, L. S., & Ikemoto, G. S. (2012). First-year principals in urban school districts: How actions and working conditions relate to outcomes. (Technical report). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation; Béteille, T. Kalogrides, D., & Loeb, S. (2012). Stepping stones: Principal career paths and school outcomes. *Social Science Research*, 41(4), 904–919.
- ²⁵ Miller, A. (2013). Principal turnover and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 36, 60–72.
- ²⁶ Podolsky, A., Kini, T. and Darling-Hammond, L. (2019), "Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of US research", *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 286-308. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPC-12-2018-0032>
- ²⁷ Every Student Succeeds Act. (2015). Additional information on per-pupil expenditures can be found via the National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). Public School Expenditures. *Condition of Education*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cmb>
- ²⁸ Baker, B. D. (2018). How money matters for schools (research brief). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ²⁹ Kirabo Jackson, Rucker Johnson, and Claudia Persico. "The Effects of School Spending on Education and Economic Outcomes: Evidence from School Finance Reforms." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* (2016), pp. 157-218; Julien LaFortune, Jesse Rothstein, and Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach, "School Finance Reform and the Distribution of Student Achievement," National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 22011, February 2016. Kevin Carey and Elizabeth Harris provide an overview of both studies at https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/12/nyregion/it-turns-out-spending-more-probably-does-improve-education.html?_r=0
- ³⁰ National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). Public High School Graduation Rates. *Condition of Education*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/coi>
- ³¹ Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Unemployment Rates and Earnings by Educational Attainment", 2020. U.S. Department of Labor. www.bls.gov/emp/chart-unemployment-earnings-education.htm; Kleinman, Rebecca E., et al. "The Relationship Between Educational Attainment and Health Behaviors: Implications for Racial and Ethnic Disparities." *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 103, no.11,2013, pp.1974-1980; Kleiner, M. and LaLonde, R. (1995). The Impact of High School Curriculum on Vocational Education and Earnings." *Journal of Labor Economics*, vol. 13, no. 3, 1995, pp. 355-89.
- ³² Civic Enterprises & the Everyone Graduates Center (2015). Building a Grad Nation: Overview of 2012-13 High School Graduation Rates. America's Promise Alliance. http://new.every1graduates.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/2015_BGN_Exec_Brief.pdf
- ³³ U.S. Department of Education. (2022). Applications for New Awards; Full-Service Community Schools Program. Federal Register. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/07/13/2022-15091/applications-for-new-awards-full-service-community-schools-program>
- ³⁴ Moore, K.A., Lantos, H., Jones M.R., Schindler, A., Belford, J., Sacks, V., Harper, K. (2017). Making the Grade: A Progress Report and Next Steps for Integrated Student Supports. Child Trends. <https://www.childtrends.org/publications/making-grade-progress-report-next-steps-integrated-student-supports>
- ³⁵ Sacks, V., Moore, K.A., McClay, A., & Piña, G. (2022). Integrated student supports in schools may boost lifetime incomes for students in families with low incomes. *Child Trends*. <https://doi.org/10.56417/2754c1596w>; Moore, K.A., Caal, S., Carney, R., Lippman, L., Li, W., et al. (2014). Making the Grade: Assessing the Evidence for Integrated Student Supports. *Child Trends*. <https://www.childtrends.org/publications/making-the-grade-assessing-the-evidence-for-integrated-student-supports/>; Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ³⁶ Sacks, V., Moore, K.A., McClay, A., & Piña, G. (2022). Integrated student supports in schools may boost lifetime incomes for students in families with low incomes. *Child Trends*. <https://doi.org/10.56417/2754c1596w>; Moore, K.A., Caal, S., Carney, R., Lippman, L., Li, W., et al. (2014). Making the Grade: Assessing the Evidence for Integrated Student Supports. *Child Trends*. <https://www.childtrends.org/publications/making-the-grade-assessing-the-evidence-for-integrated-student-supports/>

- [integrated-student-supports/](#); Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ³⁷ Moore, K.A., Lantos, H., Jones M.R., Schindler, A., Belford, J., Sacks, V., Harper, K. (2017). Making the Grade: A Progress Report and Next Steps for Integrated Student Supports. Child Trends. <https://www.childtrends.org/publications/making-grade-progress-report-next-steps-integrated-student-supports/>; Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ³⁸ U.S. Department of Education. (2022). Applications for New Awards; Full-Service Community Schools Program. Federal Register. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/07/13/2022-15091/applications-for-new-awards-full-service-community-schools-program>
- ³⁹ Putnam, R. (2016). Our Kids; Pamela R. Bennett, Amy C. Lutz, and Lakshmi Jayaram (2012). Beyond the Schoolyard: The Role of Parenting Logics, Financial Resources, and Social Institutions in the Social Class Gap in Structured Activity Participation. *Sociology of Education* 85(2) 131–157, 2012.
- ⁴⁰ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁴¹ Oakes, J., Maier, A., & Daniel, J. (2017). Community Schools: An Evidence-Based Strategy for Equitable School Improvement. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ⁴² Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁴³ U.S. Department of Education. (2022). Applications for New Awards; Full-Service Community Schools Program. Federal Register. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/07/13/2022-15091/applications-for-new-awards-full-service-community-schools-program>
- ⁴⁴ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁴⁵ Mapp, K. L. & Bergman, E. (2019). Dual capacity-building framework for family-school partnerships (Version 2). <https://organizingengagement.org/models/dual-capacity-building-framework-for-family-school-partnerships/>
- ⁴⁶ Castrechini, S., & London, R. A. (2012). *Positive student outcomes in community schools*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- ⁴⁷ Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Easton, J. Q., & Luppescu, S. (2010). Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- ⁴⁸ Castrechini, S., & London, R. A. (2012); Biag, M., & Castrechini, S. (2016). Coordinated strategies to help the whole child: Examining the contributions of full-service community schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 21(3), 157–173
- ⁴⁹ Mapp, Karen L., & Kuttner, P. (2014). Partners in education: A dual capacity-building framework for family school partnerships
- ⁵⁰ Mapp, Karen L., & Kuttner, P. (2014). Partners in education: A dual capacity-building framework for family school partnerships
- ⁵¹ U.S. Department of Education. (2022). Applications for New Awards; Full-Service Community Schools Program. Federal Register. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/07/13/2022-15091/applications-for-new-awards-full-service-community-schools-program>
- ⁵² Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁵³ National Education Policy Center. (2017). Strong Collaborative Relationships for Strong Community Schools. <https://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/leadership>; Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁵⁴ Coalition for Community Schools (n.d.). *School-community partnerships essential in a reauthorized ESEA*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools.
- ⁵⁵ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*; Blank, M., Melaville, A., & Shah, B. (2003). *Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools
- ⁵⁶ Coalition for Community Schools (2017) Community schools: A whole child framework for school improvement. Retrieved August 1, 2018 from <http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/CommunitySchools-A-Whole-Child-Approach-to-School-Improvement1.pdf>.
- ⁵⁷ Campo, S. & Fernandez, A. (2022). Technical Assistance Needs Assessment. Community Schools Forward. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>
- ⁵⁸ Campo, S. & Fernandez, A. (2022). Technical Assistance Needs Assessment. Community Schools Forward. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>
- ⁵⁹ Regional Educational Laboratory Program. (2020). Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/4005>
- ⁶⁰ Germain, E., Oakes, J., & Maier, A. (2023). Theory of action for community school transformation. Community Schools Forward Project Series. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/project/community-schools-forward>
- ⁶¹ Campo, S. & Fernandez, A. (2022). Technical Assistance Needs Assessment. Community Schools Forward. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>
- ⁶² Oakes, J., Germain, E., & Maier, A. (2023). Outcomes and indicators for community schools: A guide for implementers and evaluators. Community Schools Forward Project Series.

<https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/project/community-schools-forward>

⁶³ Oakes, J., Germain, E., & Maier, A. (2023). Outcomes and indicators for community schools: A guide for implementers and evaluators. Community Schools Forward Project Series.

⁶⁴ Clear Impact. (n.d.). What is Results-Based Accountability? – RBA Implementation Guide.

<https://clearimpact.com/results-based-accountability/>; Regional Educational Laboratory Program. (2020). Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts.

<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/4005>

⁶⁵ Regional Educational Laboratory Program. (2020). Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/4005>

⁶⁶ Regional Educational Laboratory Program. (2020). Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/4005>

⁶⁷ Ishimaru, A. (2020). Just Schools: Building Equitable Collaborations with Families and Communities. Teachers College Press.

⁶⁸ Campo, S. & Fernandez, A. (2022). Technical Assistance Needs Assessment. Community Schools Forward.

<https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>

⁶⁹ Oakes, J., Germain, E., & Maier, A. (2023). Outcomes and indicators for community schools: A guide for implementers and evaluators. Community Schools Forward Project Series.

<https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/project/community-schools-forward>

⁷⁰ Franks, K., Oo, E., Tatian, P.A. (2015). Preparing and Fielding High-Quality Surveys. Urban Institute.

<https://www.urban.org/research/publication/preparing-and-fielding-high-quality-surveys>