

U.S. Department of Education

Full-Service Community Schools: Draft Guidance for Annual Performance Reports

This document provides an updated draft of indicator definitions, related research, and measures for Full-Service Community School (FSCS) grantees for years FY2022 and beyond. 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 from the 2022 Notice Inviting applications. This document has been updated after a previous 60-day comment period and is being posted for a second comment period for 30 days. During this second comment period the public will again be able to weigh in on the indicator definitions, related performance 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, FSCS grantees for FY2022 and beyond will use this guidance to submit data on their program's outcomes, indicators, and performance measures annually.

Additionally, this document contains resources that are provided for the user's convenience. The inclusion of these materials is not intended to reflect its importance, nor is it intended to endorse any views expressed, or products or services offered. These materials may contain the views and recommendations of various subject matter experts as well as hypertext links, contact addresses and websites to information created and maintained by other public and private organizations. The opinions expressed in any of these materials do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. The U.S. Department of Education does not control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of any outside information included in these materials.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Introduction</i> | 3 |
| Indicators and Performance Measures..... | 6 |
| Full-Service Community Schools and Results-Based Accountability..... | 6 |
| Aligning Indicators and Performance Measures Around Results..... | 8 |
| Data Sources..... | 8 |
| Reporting Requirements Based on Absolute and Competitive Preference Priority Categories. | 9 |
| Data Disaggregation..... | 10 |
| <i>Core Indicators</i> | 12 |
| Reporting Item #1: Provision of Services to Students, Families, and Community Members... | 12 |
| Reporting Item #2: Student Chronic Absenteeism Rates..... | 14 |
| Reporting Item #3: Student Discipline Rates, Including Suspensions and Expulsions..... | 16 |
| Reporting Item #4: Staff Characteristics..... | 18 |
| Reporting Item #5: Graduation Rates..... | 21 |
| <i>Locally-Developed Indicators</i> | 23 |
| Reporting Item #6: Changes in School Spending Information..... | 24 |
| Reporting Item #7: School Climate..... | 26 |
| Reporting Item #8: Provision of Integrated Student Supports and Stakeholder Services..... | 28 |
| Reporting Item #9: Expanded and Enriched Learning Time and Opportunities..... | 31 |
| Reporting Item #10: Family and Community Engagement Efforts..... | 33 |
| Reporting Item #11: Collaborative Leadership and Practice Strategies..... | 35 |
| Reporting Item #12: Regularly Convening or Engaging all Initiative-level Partners..... | 37 |
| Reporting Item #13: Organizing School Personnel and Community Partners..... | 39 |
| Reporting Item #14: Regular Assessment of Program Quality and Progress..... | 42 |
| Examples of Using Results-Based Accountability with Multiple FSCS Indicators and Performance Measures..... | 44 |

Introduction

Full-Service Community Schools (FSCS) is a federal place-based program with a focus on enhancing the coordination, integration, accessibility, and effectiveness of services for children and families, with special attention given to those in high-poverty schools, including rural areas facing high poverty rates. The FSCS program, administered by the US Department of Education (Department), provides grant funding to eligible entities to implement community school strategies with one or more local educational agency or the Bureau of Indian Education, and one or more community-based or nonprofit entities. The community schools movement is larger than the FSCS program itself. Nevertheless, the FSCS program provides significant federal funding to support those looking to establish or expand community schools at the school district, region, or state level.

The FSCS statute requires grantees to gather data and report “annual measurable performance objectives and outcomes.” These objectives and outcomes include, “an increase in the number and percentage of families and students targeted for services each year of the program.” Specifically, the statute notes that the annual performance objectives should ensure that “children are—***prepared for kindergarten; achieving academically; and safe, healthy and supported by engaged parents.***” This document¹ provides a draft of key results, indicator and performance measure definitions, and related research to help achieve these ends. This guidance is intended to apply to fiscal year (FY) 2022 FSCS grantees and later. Although this document is focused on data collection and reporting for the FSCS program starting with FY 2022 grantees, much of this guidance may also be useful for those implementing community schools from earlier funding cohorts or those without any federal FSCS funding.

An Evidence-Based, Data-Driven Era for Community Schools

This reporting guidance allows the FSCS program to incorporate lessons learned from recent studies highlighting the impact and research underlying community schools. For example, a 2017 review by the Learning Policy Institute and a more recent study of the New York City Community Schools Initiative showed community schools increased academic achievement, increased attendance, led to higher graduation rates, and improved peer and adult relationships. They also provided evidence that community schools can help to close achievement gaps for low-income students, English learners, and students in special education.² Many of the indicators below allow FSCS grantees to look at similar indicators and outcomes during their own implementation.

In addition to outcomes, grantees should also look at implementation indicators. A national network of community school experts defines community schools as “a strategy that transforms a school into a place where educators, local community members, families, and students work together to strengthen conditions for student learning and healthy

development.”³ This definition shows partnership is an essential component of the community schools strategy, generally, and the federal FSCS program, specifically. As described in this document, FSCS grantees will be expected to gather information about and report on their progress in establishing, assessing, and maintaining partnerships with families and community organizations as part of the implementation of their community schools strategy.

Successful FSCS implementation also relies on the four community schools pillars as the underlying structure for collaborative work, and these four pillars are reflected in this guidance on data collection and reporting for FSCS grantees. The four pillars were explicitly incorporated into the FSCS program beginning with the FY 2022 FSCS grant competition as follows:

1. integrated supports (e.g., social and emotional learning, access to health and nutrition services);
2. expanded and enriched learning time (e.g., after-school enrichment and summer school);
3. active family and community engagement; and
4. collaborative leadership and practices to support high-quality teaching.

As stated in the *Federal Register* Notice for Applications for New Awards⁴, these four pillars are supported by the Science of Learning and Development Alliance and can be used to address the needs of the whole child.⁵

Continuous Improvement in Community Schools

The FSCS strategy is firmly rooted in results-based planning and continuous improvement. The *Community Schools Playbook* names “using data to inform improvements” as one of the elements of successful community schools implementation, noting that “implementation is stronger when partners, educators, and school administrators use data in an ongoing process of continuous program evaluation and improvement, while allowing sufficient time for the strategy to fully mature.”⁶ This guidance reinforces the approach of using data for performance measurement and continuous improvement through tools and methods adapted from the Results-Based Accountability™ (RBA) framework.

A strong organizing framework, grounded in the four pillars and data-driven decision making, is essential for FSCS grantees to bring about the collaborative change that they and their communities want. In their book, *The Community Schools Revolution*, the authors emphasized the collaborative and strategic attributes that are the basis of community schools.

Organizing ... community schools ... demands strategic thinking on the part of educators, families, and community partners. That’s why we describe community schools as a strategy, not a program. Once, we asked a group of school board members from across

the country if their districts' schools had partners that brought programs into their schools; every hand in the room went up. But when we followed up by asking if any of their districts had a plan or strategy for how partners would contribute to results that mattered for the district, no hands were raised. The community school is that strategy.⁷

Managing Community School Implementation at Different Levels

This document recognizes the different type of FSCS grants and the scales at which they are operating and specifies data reporting requirements that are appropriate to each type. While some grantees may be implementing their community schools strategies in a few schools in a single district, others may be rolling out larger initiatives that focus on multiple districts, counties, or even entire states. The levels and types of data reporting need to be appropriate to the scale of the initiatives.

Finally, this document should be seen as placing FSCS grantee reporting requirements in the context of larger data collection efforts that FSCS grantees should undertake to be successful. In the public feedback on the first draft of this guidance, many people suggested additional data or measures that community schools could use to track progress. While we want this guide to address adequately the breadth and depth of the work that FSCS grantees are undertaking, it is not our intention that this guidance be exhaustive of all possible metrics and data that grantees could, or should, be using. Grantees should therefore not see this guidance as limiting the scope of data collection that they can undertake, but rather use it as a starting point to have conversations within their communities about the full range of data that are needed to ensure accountability and success.

This draft document reflects months of conversation with key field partners and leaders, and feedback received during the first public comment period. Those who read the first version of this guidance will note several substantive changes from that version, including:

- adding a more expansive introduction that frames the guidance in the larger context of community schools strategies and data collection;
- placing a stronger emphasis on RBA approaches and terminology, including the three performance measure questions as a framing for data collection and use; and
- including examples of how indicators, performance measures and RBA approaches can work toward grantee-driven results.

This draft of the FSCS guidance will undergo an additional public review period before being finalized at the end of 2023.

Indicators and Performance Measures

Research shows that giving students equitable opportunities to learn requires access to key inputs and conditions for learning. Sometimes referred to as opportunity-to-learn indicators,

indicators and performance measures described in this guidance “generally refer to inputs and processes within a school context necessary for producing student achievement of intended outcomes.”⁸ 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.⁹ In collecting the data on indicators and performance measures, 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.¹⁰ In other words, indicators and performance measures are tools to understand and improve the complex school and community contexts for student performance.

The FSCS Statute notes that applications must include “annual measurable performance objectives 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.”¹¹ These required annual performance measures and outcomes should be situated within a larger strategy for continuous improvement and accountability, with a focus on the four FSCS pillars.

Grantee theories of change or action and logic models can provide the larger strategy context within which indicators and performance measures are situated. Theories of change or action describe the underlying thinking behind the approach and strategies that the grantee and partners will use to achieve their goals, while logic models provide a clearer operational description of how those ideas will be applied in practice.¹² The indicators and performance measures that grantees will collect and report on should align with the strategy and pipeline services included in theories of change or action and logic models.¹³

Full-Service Community Schools and Results-Based Accountability

This guidance uses elements from the RBA framework to help contextualize measures and ensure that data are leading to continuous improvement. RBA typically starts with a *result*, outcome, or *end* and works backwards to identify interventions and pipeline services that will achieve that result. These results are equivalent to the outcomes typically described in a logic model.

Results can be either population or program specific. In RBA language,

Population accountability refers to results that are intended to improve the quality of life for a population, such as children attending one or more community schools or families living within the community school service area.¹⁴

Program accountability refers to results that are specific to how well an individual school, program, agency, or service system is performing. Population accountability is typically seen as a collective responsibility, that is, no one agency or organization is responsible for achieving results for the entire population by themselves. But agencies

and organizations have program accountability for the specific pipeline services that they are delivering and, collectively, these program-level efforts should help “turn the curve” on population-level results.

Consistent with these definitions of accountability, RBA defines two types of data used to monitor and improve performance.

Indicators are measures that track conditions in populations, particularly those that relate to results or ends for those populations. For example, chronic absenteeism and high school graduation rates could be indicators that track academic results for populations of students in community schools.¹⁵

Performance measures are data that indicate how well individual schools, programs, agencies, or service systems are performing. Examples of performance measures could include the number of hours of service delivered through out-of-school time (OST) programming (which would be called an output in a logic model) and how many students in OST programming improve their school attendance (which might be a program-specific outcome).

FSCS grantees will need a combination of indicators and performance measures to track progress toward specific results. RBA uses three overarching questions to frame the selection and use of performance measures.

How much are we doing? This question is specific to the pipeline services that FSCS grantees are implementing to achieve their selected results. For each solution, grantees should have performance measures that can be used to measure the amount of effort being made.

How well are we doing it? This question relates to the quality and effectiveness of pipeline services. For each solution, grantees should have performance measures that can be used to measure whether pipeline services are being implemented well.

Is anyone better off? This question is focused on whether meaningful improvements are being seen in conditions or trends that are aligned with the chosen result. Performance measures in this category would track whether children or families served by particular efforts or programming are demonstrably better off, such as by having better school attendance or more food security.

FSCS grantees are encouraged to collect, track, and report on data that answer each of these three questions *relative to specific results* to allow the Department to track grantee performance. The next section of this guidance outlines an approach that grantees can use to define results and then select indicators and performance measures that are aligned with that result. ***The results, indicators, and performance measures that a grantee designates will***

become the basis for that grantee's annual reporting to the Department under the FSCS program.

As noted previously, these data are valuable not only to the Department but also to school and district staff, local officials, other funders, and the community itself. They provide a means for the FSCS grantees to be accountable to other stakeholders that are involved with or have an interest in their community schools. Grantees should explore ways to share these data with key audiences and engage with them about the data through community meetings, community advisory boards, newsletters, web sites, and other means.

Aligning Indicators and Performance Measures Around Results

Consistent with the RBA framework, FSCS grantees are encouraged to align indicators and performance measures around the results that they and their community want to achieve. Achieving a particular result may require several pipeline services and partners working in aligned action, and the data being used to track progress on that result should similarly capture the range of efforts that are being made. This effort by the FSCS program is consistent with previous guidance the Department has issued to meet the needs of all students as schools as schools reinvent themselves after the disruptions due to COVID-19. Specifically, the Department notes that collecting data on performance indicators as a part of a broader logic model or theory of action can allow grantees to make connections between multiple data points and student outcomes. These connections can give grantees a better understanding of how to continuously improve services for students and families.¹⁶

The Federal Register Notice for Applications for New Awards the Department states that the purpose of the FSCS program is to provide “support for the planning, implementation, and operation of full-service community schools that improve the coordination, integration, accessibility, and effectiveness of services for children and families, particularly for children attending high-poverty schools, including high-poverty rural schools.”¹⁷ While this purpose is an important framing of the high-level expectations for full-service community schools, more specific results are needed to be able to track progress effectively.

Data Sources

The rest of this document has examples of indicators and performance measures that align with each of the example results listed in exhibit A. Each indicator includes a definition, ways to measure the indicator, justification for usage of the indicator, examples of the indicator in practice, and information on where to source the relevant data for each indicator as well as collection and disaggregation methods.

Data sources can include more-traditional administrative channels and which ones require less-traditional non-administrative collection efforts. It is expected that FSCS grantees will need to rely on both types of data sources for reporting.

Administrative or Core 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 or Locally-developed 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 quantitative and qualitative data that may require asking students, parents, for information about different aspects of community school functioning and performance.

Data sources can also include qualitative sources, to capture information that might not be suitably expressed in quantitative terms. Examples of qualitative data might be information gathered from focus groups or interviews with students, families, or teachers, direct observations, case studies, storytelling/narratives, and community forums.

Whatever data sources FSCS grantees use, they should be capable of producing data that can show progress over the course of their FSCS grant. This means that the data source must produce information that can be replicated regularly (such as annually) and that the source should provide data that can be reliably compared from one observation to the next. That is, the data source should be able to indicate meaningful changes that can be used to determine whether conditions are improving or not.

Reporting Requirements Based on Absolute and Competitive Preference Priority Categories

The July 2022 notice for FSCS grant applications included five absolute priorities and two competitive preference priorities.¹⁸

Absolute Priority 1—Title IA Schoolwide Program Eligibility

Absolute Priority 2—Title IA Schoolwide Program Eligibility and Rural Districts

Absolute Priority 3—Capacity Building and Development Grants

Absolute Priority 4—Multi-Local Educational Agency Grants

Absolute Priority 5—FSCS State Scaling Grants

The Department considered only applications that met Absolute Priority 1 or Absolute Priority 2 and one additional absolute priority (Absolute Priority 3, Absolute Priority 4, or Absolute Priority 5).

In addition, the notice designated two optional competitive preference priorities to which applicants could choose to respond.

Competitive Preference Priority 1—Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs

Competitive Preference Priority 2—Strengthening Cross-Agency Coordination and Community Engagement to Advance Systemic Change

All grantees should report on performance measures and indicators related to specific results, as described in this guidance, but the level of those performance measures and indicators may vary depending on the scale of the grant. For instance, grantees in absolute priority 3 and operating at the scale of relatively few schools should specify performance measures and indicators that are specific to populations and programs within those schools and communities, such as the numbers and percentages of students in particular schools and grades who are participating in OST programming or who are chronically absent.

In contrast, grantees in absolute priorities 4 or 5 that are operating with a relatively large number of schools should consider performance measures and indicators that track how many schools are delivering services and achieving specific results. For instance, the number of schools that have OST programming serving at least 40 percent of students or that have chronic absenteeism rates that are below 15 percent.

Data Disaggregation

To track progress more effectively and to improve their ability to achieve results, FSCS should also collect data in such a way that they can be examined by the two types of disaggregation described below. Disaggregated data should be used to identify inequities both at the population indicator level (to understand who is most burdened) and at the performance measure level (to identify which pipeline services are most effectively addressing inequities).

Disaggregation of Data by Schools and Grades – Performance measures and results can vary significantly for different schools within the FSCS grant. Although most data will be reported at the level of the overall grant, additional population and program data for specific schools, or grades within those schools, will provide a better understanding of disparities and how well pipeline services are addressing them.

Disaggregation of Data by Subpopulations – Grantees should define specific subgroup comparisons that are most important for each result. Section 1111(c)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) provides guidance on subgroups of students for statewide accountability that can be used as a reference for FSCS grantees. ESEA requires states to report and disaggregate data for:

- students from major racial and ethnic groups;
- economically disadvantaged students;
- children with disabilities; and
- students with limited English proficiency.

Additionally, states are required to report information for students:

- who are homeless;
- who are in foster care; and
- whose parent(s) serve(s) in the Armed Forces.

The Results Scorecard that will be used for data annual performance report (APR) and ad hoc reporting by FSCS grantees can accommodate disaggregation of indicators and performance measures. Grantees should plan to include key disaggregations of these data in Scorecard. Grantees can include other disaggregated data as attached documents to their APR and ad hoc submissions or discuss these data in the narratives sections of their submissions.

Navigating the FSCS Guidance for Annual Performance Reports

The Department leveraged the research described above to assemble a set of indicators and performance measures to guide annual performance reports for FSCS grantees. Each section includes a definition of the reporting item, evidence supporting its use to improve school-based outcomes, and performance measures. In the ***Core Indicators*** section, these performance measures are required so as to be comparable across grantees and show collective grantee impact. The next section includes ***Locally Developed Indicators*** which follow the same structure, but allow flexibility in how grantees report their information, with suggestions for potential performance measures grantees can use. The end of this document provides examples of indicators and performance measures that FSCS grantees can use to track progress over the course of their grant and beyond. Grantees can use these examples when completing their Results and Data Mapping templates.

Core Indicators

Reporting Item #1: Provision of Services to Students, Families, and Community Members

Definition – This indicator stems from the 2015 reauthorization of ESEA titled the Every Student Succeeds Act, which authorized the FSCS program.¹⁹ 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.

Data Sources:

- Community level surveys of schools and partner organizations on number and types of services provided, which include questions on participant perception of services.

Required Performance 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)?

Potential Additional Performance Measures (Optional)

- How many people (disaggregated by student, family member, and community member) are accessing each program or service offered?
- What is the usage of programs or services offered as a result of public engagement disaggregated by student, family members, and community members?
- What is the percentage of the targeted population (disaggregated by student, family member, and community member) accessing each program or service offered?

Additional Resources to Support the Provision of Services

- [Community School Playbook](#)
(Partnership for the Future of Learning)
- [Technical Assistance Needs Assessment](#)
(Community Schools Forward)

Reporting Item #2: Student Chronic Absenteeism Rates

Definition – Students are considered chronically absent after missing 10 percent or more of the school year.²⁰

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.²¹ 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.²²

Analysis by the Department 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.²³ 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.

Indicator in Practice

New York City ‘s Community Schools Initiative (NYC-CS) launched in 2014. The RAND Corporation evaluated the impacts of NYC-CS through the 2017-18 school year and found a myriad of positive results—including improved attendance for all students in all grades across all three years of the study. NYC-CS implemented services across all four pillars of community schools. For example, NYC-CS offered mental health, reproductive health, vision, mentoring, and services for homeless youth. As a result of this robust implementation of community schools, chronic absenteeism fell by around 10% for elementary, middle school, and high school students between 2014 – 2018.²⁴

Data Sources:

- Schools can collect data on chronic absenteeism by using administrative data on attendance and calculating the numbers and percentages of students who miss 10% of the school year or more.

- Collected annually through EDfacts as a part of each state's reporting requirements under ESSA.

Required Performance Measures

- 2.a What number and percent of students in grantee schools have missed 10 percent or more of the school year for any reason (i.e., excused, unexcused, and suspensions)?
- 2.b What percent of students in grantee schools have missed 10 percent or more of the school year for any reason (i.e., excused, unexcused, and suspensions) disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- 2.c What percent of students in grantee schools are chronically absent compared to the prior year?

Additional Resources to Address Chronic Absenteeism

- [Advancing Student Success by Reducing Chronic Absence: Community Schools](#) (Attendance Works)
- [Attendance Playbook: Smart Solutions for Reducing Chronic Absenteeism in the Covid Era](#) (FutureEd)
- [National Student Attendance, Engagement, and Success Center](#) (U.S. Department of Education)

Reporting Item #3: Student Discipline Rates, Including Suspensions and Expulsions

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.

Why this indicator matters

Collecting school discipline data matters because it can help to: Identify and address disparities in discipline rates among different student groups. For example, research shows that Black students and students with disabilities are disproportionately disciplined in schools which leads to lost instructional time.²⁵

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.²⁶ Thus, it is important for grantees to consider these factors when analyzing their suspension and expulsion data.

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.²⁷ Collecting data on discipline rates can help schools to understand these disparities and develop interventions to address them. This is aligned with the work of FSCS.

Indicator in Practice

Oakland Unified Community Schools Initiative began in 2011. Since then, the school has adopted a whole child approach—forming partnerships to provide services to meet the needs of their students. School-based health centers, Coordination of Services Teams, and community school managers have helped strengthen the district’s community school implementation. Data from a 2018 teacher survey administered showed almost every teacher was using positive discipline practices in their classrooms, with 90% using restorative circles and 68% using trauma-informed practices. These practices in combination with additional parent engagement, integrated student support, expanded

learning, and collaborative leadership practices are paying off. During the 2011-12 school year Oakland Unified had an 8% suspension rate. During the 2018-19 school year, that rate has dropped to 3.8%.²⁸

Data Sources:

School districts are required to report exclusionary discipline action such as suspensions and expulsions on an annual basis through EDfacts as a part of each state's reporting requirements under ESSA. The data includes some type of demographic characteristics (e.g., sex or race) of the student involved in the incident, the type of disciplinary action, and reason for the disciplinary action. Potential Sources include:

- The Department of Education's Civil Rights Data Collection
- Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
- State or County level Student Discipline Dashboards
- School Discipline Records/Office Discipline Referral Data

Required Performance Measures

- 3.a What number and percent of students in grantee schools received one or more out-of-school suspensions?
- 3.b What number and percent of students in grantee schools received one or more in-or out-of-school suspensions?
- 3.c What number and percent of students in grantee schools received one or more expulsions?
- 3.d How many students in grantee schools received one or more out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- 3.e How many students in grantee schools received one or more in-or out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- 3.f How many students in grantee schools received one or more expulsions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- 3.g How many students in grantee schools received one or more out-of-school suspensions compared to the prior year?
- 3.h How many students in grantee schools received one or more expulsions compared to the prior year?

Additional Resources about Student Discipline

- [Building a Positive School Climate Through Restorative Practices](#)
(Learning Policy Institute)
- [Restorative and Transformative Justice Toolkit](#)
(Dignity in Schools)

Reporting Item #4: 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:

- the number and percentage of fully certified teachers, as defined by each grantee’s state, disaggregated by race and ethnicity,
- rates of teacher turnover, as measured by the number and percentage of teachers returning to the school annually,
- the retention of school staff as measured by the number and percentage of staff returning to the school annually,
- 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.²⁹ In fact, when it comes to factors that influence student achievement, educators are the most important.³⁰ 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.³¹
- Teacher turnover – Research is also clear that high rates of teacher turnover negatively impact student learning.³²
- Teacher and leader retention – When schools retain their teachers and leaders, they can save money and keep effective educators in the classroom.³³ It is also important for schools to retain principals, as high-quality school leaders are associated with increased graduation rates and improved student achievement.³⁴ Conversely, failing to retain effective school leaders can result in decreased test scores across grade levels and subjects.³⁵
- Teacher experience – Retention also leads to increased educator experience, which multiple studies show is associated with improved student achievement.³⁶

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.

Indicator in Practice

Denver Public Schools' (DPS) in Colorado is an example of a school district that is successfully increasing the number of qualified and experienced teachers through various strategies while implementing a community schools approach. DPS has implemented several strategies to attract and retain high-quality educators:

- *Teacher Recruitment* - DPS actively recruits teachers from diverse backgrounds by attending job fairs, collaborating with teacher preparation programs, and using targeted marketing campaigns. They focus on recruiting both new and experienced educators.
- *Teacher Residency Programs* - The district has established teacher residency programs that provide aspiring educators with hands-on experience in DPS classrooms. These programs help develop a pipeline of talented teachers.
- *Competitive Compensation* - DPS has worked to offer competitive salary and benefits packages to attract and retain teachers. They have negotiated with the teachers' union to ensure fair compensation.
- *Professional Development* - The district invests in ongoing professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their skills and keep them engaged in their careers. This includes workshops, mentorship programs, and leadership pathways.
- *Career Advancement* - DPS offers career advancement opportunities for teachers who want to take on leadership roles. This includes roles like instructional coaches and teacher leaders, providing a clear pathway for growth within the district.
- *Support for New Teachers* - DPS provides comprehensive support for new teachers, including mentoring and induction programs. This helps new educators acclimate to the district and succeed in the classroom.
- *Community Partnerships* - The district collaborates with local universities, nonprofit organizations, and other stakeholders to strengthen teacher preparation and professional development programs.
- *Teacher Housing Incentives* - In response to the high cost of living in Denver, DPS has explored housing incentives for teachers, making it more affordable for educators to live in the communities they serve.

By implementing these strategies, DPS has increased the number of qualified and experienced teachers in its district, ultimately benefiting the educational experiences of its students at the overall quality of its 61 community schools.³⁷

Data Sources:

- The biannual National Teacher and Principal Survey
- Title II reporting under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended
- School district administrative data (e.g., human resource records)

Required Performance Measures

- 4.a *Teacher Certification* – What is the number and percentage of fully certified teachers, disaggregated by race and ethnicity?
- 4.b *Teacher turnover* – What is the number and percentage of teachers leaving the school annually?
- 4.c *Teacher retention* – What is the number and percentage teachers returning to the school annually?
- 4.d *Leader retention* – What is the number and percentage of school leadership returning to the school annually?
- 4.e What is the number and percentage of certified principals, disaggregated by race and ethnicity?
- 4.f Avg. number of years for school staff working at each community school (disaggregated by teacher, administrator, and support).
- 4.g *Teacher experience* – What is the average number of years of experience for teachers?

Potential Additional Measures (Optional)

- What is the percentage of school staff (disaggregated by teacher, administrator, and support) that feel they belong?
- Using a teacher survey – What is the availability and quality of teacher’s professional development?³⁸

Additional Resources about staff characteristics

- [Inequitable Opportunity to Learn: Student Access to Certified and Experienced Teachers](#) (Learning Policy Institute)
- [Building a Strong and Diverse Teaching Profession Playbook](#) (Partnership for the Future of Learning)

Reporting Item #5: 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.”³⁹

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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ 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.

Indicator in Practice

Cincinnati Public Schools' (CPS) Community Learning Centers—what the city calls its community school approach—has made a significant impact on graduation rates. This

rise in graduation rates has coincided with the expansion of site coordinators. In 2006 CPS had nine schools with site coordinators. Between 2009-2011, CPS expanded the number of Community Learning Centers to 26—each with its own Resource Coordinator. And, between 2011-2022, the number climbed to 65—covering all CPS schools. These schools also completed needs assessments with local communities and brought partners into the schools. In the middle of this expansion, in August 2010, CPS earned an effective rating from the state of Ohio—the first urban school district to do so.⁴² The impact on graduation rates followed with rates increasing almost 7 percentage points between 2014 – 2018 when CPS's rate hit 77.9%.⁴³

Data Sources:

- Collected annually through EDfacts as a part of each state's reporting requirements under ESSA
- National Center for Education Statistics ACGR by school

Required Performance Measures

- 5.a What percentage of students have graduated using the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each school?
- 5.b What percentage of students have graduated using the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- 5.c What percentage of students have graduated using the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate compared to the previous year?

Potential Additional Performance Measures For Non-High School Grantees (Optional)

For grantees that are not HS, they may want to use college-and career-readiness indicators or on-time transitions instead and 9th grade on-track measures to signal students are moving toward graduation. For example, college-and career readiness indicators may include:

- What is the percentage of students who are enrolled or can enroll in accelerated coursework—including advanced placement, international baccalaureate, and dual enrollment programs?
- What are the ratios of students to School counselor?

In addition, grantees could include other measures that show students are also on track for graduations such as:

- What is the percentage of 3rd graders reading on grade level disaggregated by ESSA subgroup?
- What is the percentage of 9th graders taking algebra disaggregated by ESSA subgroup?

Grantees may also want to report on activities that happen after 4-years of high-school such as:

- What are the extended-year graduation rates (e.g., 5-, 6-, or 7-year rates)?⁴⁴

- What percentage of students are enrolling in postsecondary studies, entering into the workforce or enlisting in the military?

Additional Resources to Improve Graduation Rates

- [Building a Grad Nation, Progress and Challenge in Raising High School Graduation Rates](#) (Everyone Graduates Center)
- [Improving High School Graduation Rates for All—Evidence Blast](#) (Institute for Education Sciences)

Locally-Developed Indicators

Choosing Meaningful Locally Developed Performance Measures

There is no one key set of measures that will perfectly assess school quality and progress. However, researchers have compiled some best practices to guide the thoughtful selection of meaningful measures. For example, the think tank FutureEd has created five questions to ask to help educators select indicators that promote equity. These five questions are:

1. What student outcomes do you hope to shift by focusing on these indicators?
2. What research exists that links each indicator to those outcomes, particularly for students of color and traditionally underserved groups? Absent such evidence, how do you think improvements on a particular indicator will lead to great student success?
3. How do you plan to measure each indicator and who is expected to collect and report this data?
4. Who are the primary audiences for this data and how will you make it accessible to them?
5. What actions do you hope these audiences will take as a result of this information?⁴⁵

In addition, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) has put together the following set of considerations in determining key equity indicators. Specifically, NAS notes,

“To be effective, a system of equity indicators should provide information that users view as important, credible, and valuable. The system should include indicators that represent constructs that are malleable (capable of being changed) and actionable (easily translated into a plan of action). They should be amenable to change as a consequence of educational policy or practice interventions, and this relationship should be backed by empirical research. Some indicators can play a descriptive, signaling role by calling attention to significant disparities in resources and learning opportunities, such as the distribution of school suspensions and enrollment in advanced placement courses by race and ethnicity across schools and over time. Indicators are much more powerful if the conditions they measure can be shown to be consequential for valued

outcomes, such as high school completion and successful transitions to postsecondary education.”⁴⁶

Finally, the Beyond Tests Scores Project has produced a Toolkit to inform how education leaders, especially those at the district level can build a school quality framework with measures that are reflective of the values of the community. This toolkit includes guidance on how to ask well thought-out questions, creating survey responses, and testing pilot surveys.⁴⁷

Reporting Item #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.⁴⁸

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.⁴⁹

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.⁵⁰ 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.

Indicator in Practice

The *San Francisco Unified School District* (SFUSD) in California serves as an example of a school district making positive changes in school spending to ensure equitable access to

quality education. SFUSD shifted to a student-centered budgeting model, adopted equity-based funding to support disadvantaged students, engaged the community in decision-making, improved transparency in budget reporting, aligned resources with strategic goals, implemented efficiency measures, used data for informed decisions, established performance metrics, invested in teacher retention and development, and allocated funds for specialized services. These changes aimed to create a more equitable and effective educational system, showcasing thoughtful and strategic adjustments to budgeting practices for the benefit of students and communities.⁵¹

Potential Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage the following data sources and potential performance measures:

- Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances
- State-reported per-pupil spending

Potential Performance Measures

- 1. How much did we do?**
 - a. What is the total amount of per-pupil expenditures at grantee schools as defined by ESEA including FSCS funds?
- 2. How well did we do it?**
 - a. What is the difference between the per-pupil expenditures at grantee schools compared to the state's per-pupil expenditures as defined by ESEA?
- 3. Is anyone better off?**
 - a. What is the annual change in the total amount of per-pupil expenditures as defined by ESEA?

Measuring Return of Investment of Community School Coordinators

What is the return of investment (ROI) of community school coordinators as the key position funded by Full-Service Community School grants. ROI demonstrates a coordinator's ability to leverage additional resource calculation for ROI is the complete compensation of a coordinator plus the support (training, office and supplies) received divided by the amount of resources garnered by the coordinator (volunteers, in-kind services from other organizations, and additional funding earned). Grantees may utilize the ROI of coordinators as an early indicator of

their ability to leverage additional resources and coordinate collaboration towards shared results. This also leads to sustainability as most resources garnered are local and already funded.

Reporting Item #7: 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. For the purposes of this indicator, we recommend focusing on student and staff safety.

Why this indicator matters

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

The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments identifies 13 school climate subtopics across three domains of school climate—Engagement, Safety, and Environment. The *Safety domain* includes the following topics: Emotional safety, physical safety, bullying/cyberbullying, substance abuse, and emergency readiness/management. When schools focus on improving across the safety aspect of school climate, they can help foster accepting, safe, supportive, and challenging environments where students learn best.

Indicator in Practice

Florida’s Gibsonton Elementary used school climate information to learn why students were not coming to school. After looking at responses from school climate surveys, the school found out that there were two main barriers (1) students did not have clean clothes, and (2) students felt unsafe walking to and from school in the dark before sunrise. In response, the school installed a washer-dryer and opened a clothing closet that provided free articles of clothing at the school. In addition, the school worked with the local government to install streetlights to illuminate areas near campus. This positively impacted attendance in the short term, which eventually led to improved test scores.⁵²

Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide

continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage the following data sources and potential performance measures. For example, schools and districts can use existing school climate surveys or develop their own climate surveys tailored to the topics they want to focus on. In this case, we recommend developing questions around student and staff perceptions of school safety. Here are examples from other states and districts:

- National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments School Climate Surveys (U.S. Department of Education)
- 5 Essentials Survey for School Improvement (University of Chicago)
- CORE Districts Survey (California CORE Districts)
- Beyond Test Scores Survey Inventory (Beyond Test Scores Project)

Potential Performance Measures

1. How much did we do?

- a. What number and types support services have been provided to promote positive school climate?

2. How well did we do it?

- a. What percentage of students report feeling safe?
- b. How many incidents of bullying or harassment were reported within the past year?
- c. What percentage of students reported feeling engaged?
- d. What percentage of students felt there were adequate support services at their school?

3. Is anyone better off?

- a. What percentage of students report feeling safe as compared to prior years?
- b. How many incidents of bullying and harassment were reported the current year as compared to prior years?
- c. Is school climate...
 - i. (A) improving (B) staying the same (C) declining compared to the previous year?

Additional Resources about School Climate

- [Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates](#) (U.S. Department of Education)
- [School Climate Guide for District Policymakers and Education Leaders](#) (Center for Social and Emotional Education and National School Boards Association)
- [School Climate Measurement and Analysis](#) (National School Climate Center)

Reporting Item #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.⁵³

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.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵

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.⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁷

Indicator in Practice

The **Partnership for Rural Impact** (PRI) includes integrated student supports as a part of its Full-Service Community School Implementation. Specifically, PRI is working towards three specific performance measures to increase its number of partnerships with (1) medical, dental, vision, and mental and behavioral health services; (2) housing,

transportation, and food security providers; and (3) organizations assisting with criminal justice issues including re-entry and expungement. PRI currently provides social, health, nutrition, substance abuse, and mental health services as a part of its community schools approach. Implementing a community schools approach with these integrated student supports PRI has seen improvements in kindergarten readiness, 3rd grade reading proficiency, 8th grade math proficiency, chronic absenteeism, high school graduation rates, and college graduation.⁵⁸

Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage state, district, or school-level data sources and the potential performance measures below.

Potential Performance Measures

1. How much did we do?

- a. What is the number of students receiving integrated student supports and stakeholder services?
- b. What percentage of students are using available integrated student supports and stakeholder services?
- c. What is the number of (Full-time equivalent) FTE nurses, counselors, and school psychologists working in grantee schools?
- d. What is the number of students with vision, hearing, and dental problems?
- e. What is the number of referrals to services and supports?
- f. What is the number and type of partner-provided supports?
- g. For this pillar, please indicate the number of services offered.

2. How well did we do it?

- a. Open response: How has the grantee facilitated expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities over the past year?
- b. What is the percentage of chronically absent and academically challenged students partaking in case management?

3. Is anyone better off?

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

Additional Resources to Support the Provision of Integrated Student Supports and Stakeholder Services

- [A Whole Child Approach to School Improvement Under ESSA: Support for Students in Low-Performing Schools](#) (Communities In Schools)
- [At What State of Implementing Integrated Student Supports Is Your School?](#)
(U.S. Department of Education)

Reporting Item #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.⁵⁹

This indicator combines both added instructional (expanded time) and meaningful and engaging (enriched learning) opportunities. As such, this indicator 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.⁶⁰ In fact, community schools provide their students with as much as one-third more learning time.⁶¹ 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.⁶² 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.⁶³

Indicator in Practice

One specific example of a school district functioning as a community hub is the **Cincinnati Public Schools** (CPS) district, particularly through their Community Learning Centers initiative. CPS has transformed its schools into hubs that provide a wide range of services and support to both students and the surrounding community:

- Extended learning programs, including tutoring and enrichment;
- Adult education, job training, and career counseling;
- Collaborative partnerships with local organizations;
- Arts, culture, and digital literacy initiatives;

CPSs' CLCs demonstrate how a school district can evolve into a community hub that addresses the diverse needs of students and residents. By providing a wide range of services and fostering a sense of belonging and collaboration, CPS has not only improved educational outcomes but also enhanced the overall well-being of the community it serves.

Potential Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide

continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage state, district, or school-level data sources and the potential performance measures below.

Potential Performance Measures

1. How much did we do?

- a. How many students are participating in expanded and enriched learning opportunities?
- b. What percentage of students are participating in expanded and enriched learning opportunities?
- c. What is the percentage of students who participate in expanded learning opportunities beyond the regular school day?
- d. What are the number and types of summer learning programs offered by the grantee?

2. How well did we do it?

- a. Open response: How has the grantee facilitated expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities over the past year?

4. Is anyone better off?

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

Additional Resources about the Expanded and Enriched Learning Time and Opportunities

- [Engage Every Student Initiative](#) (U.S. Department of Education)
- [Afterschool Program Toolbox](#) (Afterschool Alliance)
- [Expanding Learning: A Powerful Strategy for Equity](#) (Policy Analysis for California Education)

Reporting Item #10: Family and Community Engagement Efforts

Definition – Family and community engagement efforts in the FSCS involves bringing parents, families, community members, and leaders into the school as partners in students' education. This engagement encompasses meaningful involvement of parents and families in the school's decision-making processes. Furthermore, it transforms the community school into a central hub that offers a wide range of services, activities, and programs for students, families, and the local neighborhood it serves. These services include educational and employment opportunities for adults, along with various supportive services. Additionally, this approach provides centralized support within community schools, encompassing offerings such as English as a second language classes, citizenship preparation, computer skills, art programs, housing assistance, child abuse and neglect prevention supports, health and mental health services, literacy programs, digital literacy training, and other initiatives designed to involve community members in school-related activities, events, or programs.

Why this indicator matters

The indicator matters significantly as it encompasses key engagement activities with families and the community. Engaging families and community members extend leadership beyond district leaders and school administrators to include teachers, school staff, parents, and community partners.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶ For example, one study found that parents at community schools had higher response rates to school climate surveys than parents from a comparison group of non-community schools.⁶⁷

Indicator in Practice

Oakland Unified School District in California uses a Rubric for Evaluating School-Site Family Engagement as a continuous improvement tool for its community schools. The rubric describes what makes a school emerging, developing, or thriving across 6 standards. These standards focus on (1) Parent/Caregiver Education Programs; (2) Communication with Parent/Caregiver; (3) Parent Volunteering Program; (4) Learning at Home; and (5) Shared Power and Decision Making; and (6) Community Collaboration and Resources. This rubric was developed by the Oakland School Board to guide their schools' family engagement efforts.⁶⁸

Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage the following data sources and potential performance measures:

- Program event participation records (e.g., participation in FSCS events, workshops, activities)
- Community surveys and feedback reports (e.g., survey responses related to the community's perception of the depth and effectiveness of community partnerships)
- Interviews and focus groups reports (e.g., interviews with staff, community members or community partners to gather insights into nature and depth of relationships)

Potential Performance Measures

1. How much did we do?_

- a. How many family engagement workshops or events were hosted this year?
- b. How many family engagement trainings were offered this year?
- c. How many workshops on cultural competence and anti-bias practices were provided to staff?

2. How well did we do it?

- a. What percentage of parents or caregivers attended at least one family engagement event or workshop in the past year?
- 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?
- c. How many parents are engaged in decision-making committees (e.g., parent-teacher associations, steering committees) in grantee schools?

3. Is anyone better off?

- a. What percent of families attended school events compared to the prior year?
- b. How have families' feelings of connectedness to the school compare to the prior year?

Additional Resources about Family and Community Engagement Efforts and Impact

- [Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships](#)
(Harvard University)
- [National Association for Family, School, and Community Engagement Toolkits](#)
(NAFSCE)

Reporting Item #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 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. Strategies may also 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.⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰

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. Collaborative leadership is needed to position schools as a community hub. 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.⁷¹ Further, school climate, collective capacity, and relationships can all be strengthened through collaborative leadership and practice strategies.⁷²

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, labor-management collaborations, and advisory councils.⁷³ 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.⁷⁴

Indicator in Practice

In Lincoln, Nebraska, each community school has a ***School Neighborhood Advisory Council*** (SNAC) that includes parents, youth, neighborhood residents, educators, community-based organizations, and service providers, reflecting the diversity of the surrounding neighborhood. The SNAC assists in planning, communicating, and overseeing school programs. Each SNAC makes recommendations for specific programs and activities, and the principal and community school director work together to make final decisions.⁷⁵

Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage the following data sources and potential performance measures:

- School climate surveys
- School or grantee-designed surveys focused on relationship-building between school staff and community-partners

Potential Performance Measures

1. How much did we do?

- a. What is the number of community school partners and staff participating in community school technical assistance and professional development?
- b. What programs exist to provide high-quality professional development opportunities for all teachers?

2. How well did we do it?

- a. Open response: How has the grantee supported collaborative leadership and practice strategies over the past year?
- b. What percentage of community school partners and staff participated in community school technical assistance and professional development over the past year?

3. Is anyone better off?

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

Additional resources about collaborative leadership and practice strategies

- [Strong Collaborative Relationships for Strong Community Schools](#)
(National Education Policy Center)
- [Making the Difference: Research and Practice in Community Schools](#)
(Coalition for Community Schools)

Reporting Item #12: Regularly Convening or Engaging all Initiative-level Partners

Definition – Regularly convening or engaging initiative-level partners and individuals means creating 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, local educational agency representatives, city or county officials, children’s and youth cabinets, nonprofit service providers, public housing agencies, and advocates.⁷⁶

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.⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸ 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.⁷⁹ To help grantees track progress toward these ends, they can look at (a) their number of initiative-level partners, (b) how often their initiative-level partners meet, and (c) how their funding changes year-over-year.

Indicator in Practice

One specific example of a school district regularly convening partners is the ***Community Schools initiative in the New York City Department of Education*** (NYCDOE). NYCDOE partners with various community organizations, non-profits, and local agencies to create community schools that serve as hubs of support for students and families. The district hosts regular partnership meetings where representatives from schools, community organizations, and government agencies come together to discuss strategies and initiatives aimed at improving student outcomes. These meetings facilitate collaboration and the exchange of ideas.⁸⁰

Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage the following data sources and potential performance measures.

Potential Performance Measures

- 1. How much did we do?**

- a. What is the number of initiative-level partners participating in community school leadership meetings?
 - b. How often do initiative-level partners meet?
- 2. How well did we do it:**
- a. Open response: How has the grantee regularly convened or engaged all initiative-level partners?
- 3. Is anyone better off?**
- a. Open response: How has implementation changed due to regular convenings and engagement with initiative-level partners?

Additional resources about regularly convening or engaging all initiative-level partners

- [Building Community Schools: A Guide for Action](#)
(Center for Community Schools)
- [California Community Schools Partnership Program](#)
(The California Department of Education)

Reporting Item #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.⁸¹

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.⁸² 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.⁸³

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 RBA or “plan, do, study, act” approach enhances the chances of turning a data curve that has been headed in the wrong direction.⁸⁴ 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.

Indicator in Practice

Coordination of Services or ***COST Teams*** consist of multidisciplinary school staff who regularly convene to ensure systems of support work together to promote student success and wellbeing.⁸⁵ For example, Felicitas & Gonzalo Mendez High School, a community school in East Los Angeles, organized monthly COST team meetings with leaders from its key partners InnerCity Struggle, Promesa Boyle Heights, the Partnership for Los Angeles Schools, and Communities In Schools of Los Angeles. These meetings are facilitated by the community school coordinator.⁸⁶

Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage the following data sources and potential performance measures:

Potential Program Performance Measures:

4. How much did we do?

- a. What is the number of initiative-level partners participating in community school leadership meetings?
- b. How often do initiative-level partners meet?
- c. How many schools have filled their community school coordinator position?
- d. How many trainings have there been for community school coordinators?
- e. Across all of the schools that will be supported by your FY 2022 FSCS grant, how many have conducted any assets and needs assessments? Grantees will answer 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
- f. How often are initiative-level partners formally discussing 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

5. How well did we do it?

- a. Open response: How well has the grantee regularly convened or engaged all initiative-level partners?
- b. Open response: How has cooperation across schools, communities, and families changed in the past year?
- c. Open response: Are students, parents, and community members reporting quality services at the grantee's community schools?

6. Is anyone better off?

- a. Open response: How are community school personnel and community partners implementing programs and services based on the interests of students, families, and community members?
- b. Have student engagement levels changed?
- c. How have student feelings of support changed compared to the prior year?

Additional Resources for Organizing School Personnel and Community Partners

- [Stages of Development Tool](#)
(Community Schools Forward)
- [Scaling Up School and Community Partnerships](#)
(Coalition for Community Schools)

Reporting Item #14: Regular Assessment of Program Quality and Progress

Definition - This indicator is related to the annual evaluation requirement for the FSCS program described in Section 4625 of ESEA. 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.⁸⁷

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.⁸⁸ 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.⁸⁹

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.⁹⁰ 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.

Indicator in Practice

Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) in Maryland is a prime example of a school district dedicated to continuous improvement. It's one of the nation's largest and most diverse districts and has received recognition for its commitment to ongoing improvement. Key aspects of MCPS's continuous improvement efforts include data-driven decision-making, comprehensive strategic planning involving various stakeholders, investments in professional development, a focus on equity and inclusion, active community engagement, exploration of innovative programs, regular assessment and evaluation, feedback loops for adjustments, collaborative partnerships, and recognition for its progress. MCPS serves as a model for other school districts striving to provide high-quality education and well-being for all students.⁹¹

Data Sources:

Grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on this item in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide continuous improvement toward their program goals. This reporting will be done via open response to the department. In that response grantees may leverage the following potential performance measures.

Potential Performance Measures

1. How much did we do?

- a. How often are initiative-level partners formally discussing 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

2. How well did we do it?

- a. Across all of the schools that will be supported by your Fiscal Year 2022 Full-Service Community Schools grant, how many have conducted any assets and needs assessments? Grantees will answer 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
- b. 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)

3. Is anyone better off?

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

Additional resources for regularly assessing program quality and progress

- [Theory of Action for Community School Transformation](#)
(Community Schools Forward)
- [Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts](#)
(Institute of Education Sciences)

Examples of Using Results-Based Accountability with Multiple FSCS Indicators and Performance Measures

Based on a review of grantee logic models and other background on full-service community schools, below are 8 example results that FSCS grantees can use to align their indicators and performance measures (exhibit A).

Exhibit A: Example FSCS Results

Result #1: Students consistently come to school prepared to learn and engage.

Result #2: Students show growth in academic performance from year-to-year and meet high academic standards.

Result #3: Students are safe, healthy - physically, socially, and emotionally, and are embraced by a whole-child approach.

Result #4: Schools use non-punitive, restorative discipline practices to lower suspensions, school violence, and arrests, and ensure student, staff, and community safety.

Result #5: School staff and community partners deliver a seamless pipeline of services to students and families.

Result #6: School and community members build structures to sustain and scale FSCS, including data systems, long-term funding plans, and staff retention strategies.

Result #7: Opportunity gaps and disparities between students are continually reduced.

Result #8: The school functions as a central point for families and community members to engage in learning and development.

Using these results or other locally-developed results, FSCS grantees should define indicators that will be used track progress toward that result for the relevant population. Throughout this guidance document suggested evidence-based definitions are provided for indicators included in the FY2022 NIA. Grantees should also name the specific pipeline services or programs that they will use to achieve that result and the performance measures for those solutions that respond to each of the three RBA questions. The template provided in exhibit B is a tool that grantees can use, in collaboration with partners and community, to gather this information in one place.⁹²

Exhibit B: Result and Data Mapping Template

| |
|---|
| <p>Result and Data Mapping</p> <p>State the Result (What is the end that we want to achieve?)</p> <p>[fill in description of result, including condition of well-being to attain and the relevant geographic or other population]</p> |
| <p>Fill in part A <u>or</u> B depending on whether this is a population- or program-level result</p> <p>Part A. Population-Level Result:</p> <p>What is the Population for this Result: [fill in]</p> <p>List the Pipeline Services that Will be Used to Achieve this Result:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. [fill in]2. [fill in] <p>Part B. Program-Level Result:</p> <p>Name the Program or Solution for this Result: [fill in]</p> <p>What is the Target Population for this Program: [fill in]</p> |
| <p>Indicators:</p> <p>Indicator(s) that Will Be Used to Track Progress Toward this Result</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. [fill in]2. [fill in] |
| <p>Performance Measures:</p> <p>How Much Did We Do? (How much service did we deliver?)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. [fill in]2. [fill in] <p>How Well Did We Do It? (How much service did we deliver with high quality?)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. [fill in]2. [fill in] <p>Is Anyone Better Off? (What quantity/quality of change for the better did we produce?)</p> |

1. [fill in]
2. [fill in]

As an example, suppose that a FSCS grantee wants to achieve the result of “Students consistently come to school prepared to learn and engage.” The specific result would be entered into the Result and Data Mapping template (exhibit C). The grantee is treating this as a population-level result, so the relevant population (“all middle and high school grade students”) is entered in that section, along with the specific pipeline services that the grantee will implement to achieve this population-level result. The grantee then specifies population-level indicators and program performance measures that it will collect and report on to track progress toward this result.

Exhibit C: Results and Data Mapping Example For Reducing Absenteeism

| |
|---|
| <p>Result and Data Mapping</p> <p>State the Result (What is the end that we want to achieve?)</p> <p>Students consistently come to school prepared to learn and engage.</p> |
| <p>Fill in part A <u>or</u> B depending on whether this is a population- or program-level result</p> <p>Part A. Population-Level Result</p> <p>What is the Population for this Result: All students in the two full-service community schools</p> <p>List the Pipeline services Will be Used to Achieve this Result:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Home visiting program 2. OST homework help program 3. School on-site community services <p>Part B. Program-Level Result:</p> <p>Name the Program or Solution for this Result: n/a</p> <p>What is the Target Population for this Program: n/a</p> |
| <p>Indicators:</p> <p>Indicator(s) that Will Be Used to Track Progress Toward this Result</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage of students who are chronically absent (miss 10 percent or more of school days during the year) |
| <p>Performance Measures:</p> |

How Much Did We Do? (How much service did we deliver?)

1. Number of students receiving a home visit
2. Number of students attending OST homework help program
3. Number of students using on-site community services

How Well Did We Do It? (How much service did we deliver with high quality?)

1. Percentage of chronically absent students who received a home visit
2. Percentage of students who missed 10 percent or more of school days for unexcused reasons
3. Percentage of chronically absent students attending OST homework help program
4. Percentage of chronically absent students using on-site community services

Is Anyone Better Off? (What quantity/quality of change for the better did we produce?)

1. Number of students who improved their attendance from previous month/semester/year
2. Number of students who were chronically absent last year but are no longer chronically absent

Example Result #1: Students consistently come to school prepared to learn and engage.

Result Definition – Students who are supported inside and outside of the classroom to be their best selves come to school more frequently, ready to engage with course material. Community Schools play a crucial role in encouraging students to show up by providing the necessary services that focus on students as part of a larger picture.

Indicators: **Student chronic absenteeism, integrated student supports, and school climate** are important indicators of whether students come to school and in what ways they are able and willing to engage in the classroom. Community schools should evaluate all of these indicators in conjunction to determine the ways they can better support students to show up to school every day, ready to learn and thrive.

Potential Performance Measures:

1. How much did we do?

- What is the number of students receiving integrated student supports and stakeholder services?
- What is the number and type of partner-provided services?
- What is the number of Full-time equivalent (FTE) nurses, counselors, and school psychologists working in grantee schools?
- What is the number of students with vision, hearing, and dental problems?
- What is the number of referrals to services and supports?

2. How well did we do it?

- What percent of students in grantee schools have missed 10 percent or more of the school year for excused absences, disaggregated by ESEA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- What percent of students in grantee schools have missed 10 percent or more of the school year for unexcused absences, disaggregated by ESEA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- What percent of students in grantee schools have missed 10 percent or more of the school year for suspensions, disaggregated by ESEA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- What percent of students are using available integrated student supports and stakeholder services?
- What is the percent of students with vision, hearing, and dental problems receiving services for those problems?
- What number and types of other support services did we provide to promote positive school climate?

3. Is anyone better off?

- a. What percent of students in grantee schools are chronically absent compared to the prior year?
- b. What percent of students are using available integrated student supports and stakeholder services compared to the prior year?
- c. What percent of students with vision, hearing, and dental problems are receiving services for those problems compared to the prior year?
- d. What percentage of students report feeling safe?
- e. How many incidents of bullying or harassment were reported within the past year?
- f. What percentage of students reported feeling engaged?
- g. What percentage of students felt there were adequate support services at their school?
- d. What percentage of students report feeling safe as compared to prior years?
- e. How many incidents of bullying and harassment were reported the current year as compared to prior years?
- f. Is school climate...
 - i. (A) improving (B) staying the same (C) declining compared to the previous year?

Result #2: Students show growth in academic performance from year-to-year and meet high academic standards.

Result Definition – Students in strong community schools should show high levels of academic achievement and steady growth from year to year on federal, state, and district standards. Meeting these standards is important for expanding college and career pathways for all students.

Indicators: *Graduation rates* and *expanded and enriched learning opportunities* are indicators of academic performance and high academic standards. Expanded and enriched learning time can help students experience rich, student-focused instruction in classrooms, more learning time, and hands-on learning activities across a range of subject areas.⁹³ In turn, students feel more engaged with their learning and are more likely to stay in school throughout their K-12 careers, resulting in higher graduation rates.

Potential Performance Measures:

1. How much did we do?

- a. What are the numbers and types of afterschool learning opportunities provided?
 - i. Which community partners are involved with providing afterschool learning opportunities?
- b. What are the number and types of summer learning opportunities provided?
 - i. Which community partners are involved with providing summer learning opportunities?

2. How well did we do it?

- a. What is the number and percentage of students who have graduated using the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each school, disaggregated by ESEA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- b. What gaps (if any) exist in graduation rates between ESEA subgroups?
- c. What is the percentage of students in each school who participate in afterschool learning opportunities?
- d. According to school level surveys, what barriers exist for students in participating in afterschool or summer learning opportunities?

3. Is anyone better off?

- a. What percentage of students are participating in afterschool or summer learning opportunities compared to prior years?
- b. What percentage of students have graduated using the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate compared to the previous year?

Result #3: Students are safe, healthy - physically, socially, and emotionally, and are embraced by a whole-child approach.

Result Definition – In a strong community school, students are supported to be the best versions of themselves in every aspect – physical, mental, social, and emotional. Student supports prioritize the health and wellness of the student and provide preventative, ongoing care.

Indicators: School climate, provision of services, and integrated student supports are all indicators of a whole-child approach to student success.

Potential Performance Measures:

1. How much did we do?

- a. How many students were targeted for FSCS program services?
- b. How many community members were targeted for FSCS program services (target and actual number)?
- c. What is the number of students served by the integrated student support programs?
- d. How many students are served by multiple integrated student support programs?
- e. What is the number and type of programs or services offered as part of the school or district's integrated student support system?
- f. What is the number of outreach events, workshops or communication efforts aimed at reaching the target population?
- g. What number and types of support services did the school, district, or state provide to promote positive school climate?

2. How well did we do it?

- h. What is the service utilization rate? (the percentage of eligible students or participant who are utilizing the program services or resources)
- i. What is the intervention dosage? (the percentage of total prescribed program service received by student or participant)
- j. What is the student or participant satisfaction rate regarding the quality of services and support received?
- k. What percentage of students report feeling safe?
- l. How many incidents of bullying or harassment were reported within the past year?
- m. What percentage of students reported feeling engaged?
- n. What percentage of students felt there were adequate support services at their school?

3. Is anyone better off?

- o. What percentage of students have dental, vision, or hearing problems?
- p. What percentage of students report access to timely mental health services?
- q. What is the percentage of students participating in academic achievement activities? (e.g., state assessments, SAT, ACT)
- r. What percentage of students are on-track to graduate or promoting on time from one grade to the next?
- s. What is the percentage of students enrolling in post-secondary activities? (e.g., 2-year college, 4-year university, military, career)
- t. What percentage of students report feeling safe as compared to prior years?
- u. How many incidents of bullying and harassment were reported the current year as compared to prior years?
- v. Is school climate
 - i. (A) improving (B) staying the same (C) declining compared to the previous year?

Result #4: Schools use non-punitive, restorative discipline practices to lower suspensions, school violence, and arrests, and ensure student, staff, and community safety.

Result Definition – Students thrive in school when they feel safe and secure in their classrooms and communities. A strong community school should promote a positive school climate that keeps students out of the school-to-prison pipeline.

Indicators: *School discipline* and *school Climate* are key indicators of whether schools are achieving the intended result as it pertains to decreasing non-punitive, restorative discipline practices.

Potential Performance Measures:

4. How much did we do?

- a. How many training workshops focused on restorative approaches were held?
- b. How many teachers were trained through these workshops (what percentage of teachers)?
- c. How many restorative circles/interventions were held?
- d. How many students/classrooms are receiving restorative practices?
- e. What number and types of other support services did we provide to promote positive school climate?

5. How well did we do it?

- a. What number and percent of students in grantee schools received one or more out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by ESEA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- b. What number and percent of students in grantee schools received one or more in-school-suspensions disaggregated by ESEA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- c. What number and percent of students in grantee schools received one or more expulsions disaggregated by ESEA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status)?
- d. How many teachers are certified in restorative justice approaches?
- e. What percentage of students report feeling safe?
- f. How many incidents of bullying or harassment were reported within the past year?
- g. What percentage of students reported feeling engaged?
- h. What percentage of students felt there were adequate support services at their school?

6. Is anyone better off?

- a. How many students in grantee schools received one or more out-of-school suspensions compared to the prior year?
- b. How many students in grantee schools received one or more expulsions compared to the prior year?
- c. What percentage of students report feeling safe as compared to prior years?
- d. How many incidents of bullying and harassment were reported the current year as compared to prior years?
- e. Is school climate...
 - i. (A) improving (B) staying the same (C) declining compared to the previous year?
 - ii. Open response: How has the grantee's efforts impacted school climate?

Result #5: School staff and community partners deliver a seamless pipeline of services to students and families.

Result Definition – This result represents a commitment to the well-being and success of students and families. It signifies a dedication to holistic development, collaboration, and the creation of a nurturing educational environment where every student can thrive. By investing in such a pipeline, community schools can invest in a brighter future for students and communities.

Indicators: *Regular assessment of program quality and progress, regularly convening or engaging all initiative-level partners, and organizing school personnel and community partners* are key indicators of how well schools and community partners are delivering their pipeline of services to students and families. The definition of each is provided and examples of possible performance measures to assess progress of specific solutions for the result are presented in detail. Indicators in practice are provided to show how other schools or initiatives have worked towards achieving the result of a seamless pipeline.

Potential Performance Measures:

1. How much did we do?

- a. What is the number of initiative-level partners participating in community school leadership meetings?
- b. How often do initiative-level partners meet?
- c. What is the number and percentage of schools that have filled the community school coordinator position?
- d. How many trainings have been provided for community school coordinators?
- e. How often are initiative-level partners formally discussing 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

2. How well did we do it?

- a. Open response: How has the grantee regularly convened or engaged all initiative-level partners?
- b. Open response: How has cooperation across schools, communities, and families changed in the past year?
- c. Across all of the schools that will be supported by your FY 2022 FSCS grant, how many have conducted any assets and needs assessments? Grantees will answer 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

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

3. Is anyone better off?

- a. Open response: How are community school personnel and community partners implementing programs and services based on the interests of students, families, and community members?
- b. Have student engagement levels changed compared to the prior year?
- c. How have student feelings of support changed compared to the prior year?

Result #6: School and community members build structures to sustain and scale FSCS, including data systems, long-term funding plans, and staff retention strategies.

Result Definition – Sustainability of the FSCS model is paramount as it ensures the long-term provision of integrated support services for children and families in your community. Priorities for sustainability may be unique to each school and community; however, these priorities may include: funding and diversification, data systems and evaluation, staff development and retention, community engagement and partnerships, policy advocacy and integration, and scaling plan. Securing stable, long-term, and diverse funding sources guarantees the continuity of services and resources that can reduce disruptions to care. Coordinated, longitudinal data systems enable evidence-based decision-making and program improvement, leading to accelerated results for students and families. Staff retention strategies maintain experienced educators, support staff and leaders who are essential to building trust in the community. A proactive approach helps secure funding, build community trust and buy-in, maintain high quality standards and ensure that the model continues to serve students over the years and allow for long-term, positive outcomes.

Indicators: *Changes in school funding, regular assessment of program quality and progress, and organizing school personnel and community partners* are key indicators of whether schools are achieving the intended result of sustaining FSCS in their community.

Potential Performance Measures:

1. How much did we do?

- a. What is the number of diverse funding sources secured?
- b. What is the number of community partnerships?
- c. What is the number of solutions or programs that have a defined set of performance measures and clear workflows for data collection, analysis, reporting and accountability?
- d. What is the number of staff trained on the effective use of data system and data-driven decision-making?
- e. What is the number of internal and external staff who have access data systems and utilize them for decision-making?
- f. What is the number of professional development opportunities provided to staff members, including workshops, training sessions, and certifications?

2. How well did we do it?

- a. What is the sustainability of funding sources? (analysis of the funding sources stability and long-term commitment to FSCS initiatives)

- b. What percent of total solutions or programs have a defined set of performance measures and clear workflows for data collection, analysis, reporting and accountability
- c. What is the percent of internal and external staff who have access data systems and are utilizing them for decision-making?
- d. What are the staff satisfaction and engagement levels? (e.g. school climate survey, staff engagement survey)

3. Is anyone better off?

- a. What is the long-term financial stability? (e.g., ability to maintain, scale and/replicate services and partnerships beyond initial funding periods)
- b. What are the teacher, administrator, and staff retention rates? (e.g., human resource records)
- c. What are the teacher, administrator, and staff turnover rates? (e.g., human resource records)
- d. Open response: Do staff have the knowledge, skill and capacity to use data to inform decision-making, improve program design, and illuminate and act on disparities?

Result #7: Opportunity gaps and disparities between students are continually reduced.

Result Definition – This result is focused on remedying educational inequities. FSCS provides a platform to bring together the needed stakeholders to bring needed improvements in how students, in particular disadvantaged students, are served. This result reflects a belief in the potential of every individual and the transformative power of education in building a more equitable and thriving world. It promotes a fair and just society where everyone has the chance to reach their full potential, regardless of their race, socioeconomic status, or other factors.

Indicators: *Staff characteristics* in terms of training and retention, *changes in school spending*, and *the provision of integrated student supports* are important indicators for measuring the efforts that schools are taking to reduce disparities.

Potential Performance Measures:

4. How much did we do?

- a. What is the total amount of per-pupil expenditures at grantee schools as defined by ESEA including FSCS funds?
- b. What is the number of referrals to services and supports?
- c. What is the number of FTE nurses, counselors, and school psychologists working in grantee schools?
- d. How many teacher professional development workshops are held?

5. How well did we do it?

- a. Teacher Certification – What is the number and percentage of fully certified teachers, disaggregated by race and ethnicity?
- b. Teacher turnover – What is the number and percentage of teachers leaving the school annually?
- c. Teacher retention – What is the number and percentage teachers returning to the school annually?
- d. Leader retention – What is the number and percentage of school leadership returning to the school annually?
- e. What is the number and percentage of certified principals, disaggregated by race and ethnicity?
- f. What is the average number of years for school staff working at each community school? (disaggregated by teacher, administrator, and support)
- g. Teacher experience – What is the average number of years of experience for teachers?
- h. What is the availability and quality of their professional development?⁹⁴
- i. What is the number of FTE nurses, counselors, and school psychologists working in grantee schools?

- j. What is the difference between the per-pupil expenditures at grantee schools compared to the state's per-pupil expenditures as defined by ESEA?
- k. What is the unduplicated number of students receiving integrated student supports and stakeholder services?
- l. What percentage of students are using available integrated student supports and stakeholder services?
- m. Open response: How has the grantee facilitated expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities over the past year?

Example Result #8: The school functions as a central point for families and community members to engage in learning and development.

Result Definition – This result matters because it signifies a commitment to building strong, empowered communities where education is a shared responsibility. It recognizes that education extends beyond the classroom and that schools can be catalysts for positive change and growth within their neighborhoods. When schools become central hubs for learning and development, they foster stronger, more closely-knit communities. Encouraging families and community members to engage in learning reinforces the importance of lifelong learning. By serving as central points for learning, schools can provide access to a wide range of educational resources, including workshops, libraries, computer labs, and community classes, which may not be readily available elsewhere. Learning and development opportunities offered by schools can help community members acquire new skills, furthering their personal and professional growth. This can be particularly valuable for adults seeking to improve their career prospects.

Indicators: *Collaborative leadership and practice strategies* and *family and community Engagement efforts and impact* are key indicators of whether schools are achieving the intended result of schools serving a community hub for learning and development.

Potential Performance Measures:

1. How much did we do?

- a. What is the number and type of services offered?
- b. What is the number of community school partners and staff participating in community school technical assistance and professional development?
- c. What programs exist to provide high-quality professional development opportunities for all teachers?
- d. How much time was devoted to improving relationship-building among school and community partners?

2. How well did we do it?

- a. How many parents reported increased involvement in their child's education after participating in our programs?
- b. What percentage of students' families reported feeling more connected to the school community as a result of our efforts?
- c. In what ways has the grantee supported collaborative leadership and practice strategies over the past year?
- d. What percentage of community school partners and staff participated in community school technical assistance and professional development over the past year?

- e. In what ways did school and community partners practice relationship-building, if any?
- 3. Is anyone better off?**
- a. What percentage of community school partners and staff participated in community school technical assistance and professional development compared to the prior year?
 - b. In what ways do community school partners and school staff report feeling connected and engaged with one another?
 - c. What is the demographic breakdown of families participating in our engagement activities, and are there disparities in participation based on factors like income or ethnicity?

Endnotes

- ¹ This document was prepared in part by Peter Tatian, Ariella Meltzer, Travis Reginal, Karin Scott, and Megan Gallagher from the Urban Institute, based on an earlier version produced by the US Department of Education.
- ² Oakes, J., Maier, A., & Daniel, J. (2017). *Community Schools: An Evidence-Based Strategy for Equitable School Improvement*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute; Johnston, William R., John Engberg, Isaac M. Opper, Lisa Sontag-Padilla, and Lea Xenakis, *Illustrating the Promise of Community Schools: An Assessment of the Impact of the New York City Community Schools Initiative*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2020.
https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3245.html.
- ³ Community Schools Forward. (2023). *Framework: Essentials for community school transformation*. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/project/community-schools-forward>
- ⁴ 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>
- ⁵ Science of Learning and Development Alliance. (2020). *Science of Learning and Development: Initial Findings*. https://soldalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/SoLD-Science-Translation_May-2020_FNL.pdf
- ⁶ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁷ Blank, Martin, Ira Harkavy, Jane Quinn, Lisa Villarreal, and David Goodman. (2023). *The Community Schools Revolution*. <https://www.communityschoolsrevolution.org/>
- ⁸ Elliott, S. N., & Bartlett, B. (2016). *Opportunity to Learn*. In *Oxford Handbooks Online Scholarly Research Reviews*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- ⁹ 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>
- ¹⁰ 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>.
- ¹¹ The Every Student Succeeds Act. (2015).
- ¹² As defined in the funding notice, "*Logic model* (also referred to as a theory of action) means a framework that identifies key project components of the proposed project (i.e., the active "ingredients" that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes and describes the theoretical and operational relationships among the key project components and relevant outcomes."
- ¹³ As defined in the funding notice, "*Pipeline services* means a continuum of coordinated supports, services, and opportunities for children from birth through entry into and success in postsecondary education and career attainment. Such services shall include, at a minimum, strategies to address through services or programs (including integrated student supports) the following: (a) High-quality early childhood education programs. (b) High-quality school and out-of-school-time programs and strategies. (c) Support for a child's transition to elementary school, from elementary school to middle school, from middle school to high school, and from high school into and through postsecondary education and into the workforce, including any comprehensive readiness assessment determined necessary."
- ¹⁴ Results Leadership Group. (2010). *The Results-Based Accountability™ Guide*.
- ¹⁵ Clear Impact. (n.d.) *Results-Based Accountability Glossary*.
<https://clearimpact.com/results-based-accountability/implementation-guide/glossary/>
- ¹⁶ 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>
- ¹⁷ 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>
- ¹⁸ 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>
- ¹⁹ *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. (2015).
- ²⁰ Attendance Works. (n.d.) www.attendanceworks.org
- ²¹ 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.
- ²² 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-Arrival-Influences-Student-Success.pdf). Attendance Works.

- ²³ U.S. Department of Education. [Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools \(ed.gov\)](#). Civil Rights Data Collection
- ²⁴ Johnston, William R., John Engberg, Isaac M. Opper, Lisa Sontag-Padilla, and Lea Xenakis, Illustrating the Promise of Community Schools: An Assessment of the Impact of the New York City Community Schools Initiative. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2020. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3245.html.
- ²⁵ Losen, D., & 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.; Okonofua, J. & Eberhardt, J. (2015). Two Strikes: Race and the Disciplining of Young Students. *Psychological Science* Col. 26. No. 5; Losen, D. & Martinez T. (2013). Out of School & Off Track: The Overuse of Suspensions in American Middle and High Schools. The Center for Civil Rights Remedies: UCLA; 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>
- ²⁶ 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>
- ²⁷ Steinberg M., and Lacoé, J. (2017). What Do We Know about School Discipline Reform? Assessing the Alternatives to Suspensions and Expulsions. *Education Next*, V17 n1 p44-52
- ²⁸ Klevan, S., Daniel, J., Fehrer, K., & Maier, A. (2023). Creating the conditions for children to learn: Oakland's districtwide community schools initiative. Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/784.361>
- ²⁹ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). Community Schools Playbook.
- ³⁰ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). Community Schools Playbook.
- ³¹ 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
- ³² 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.
- ³³ 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>
- ³⁴ 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.
- ³⁵ Miller, A. (2013). Principal turnover and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 36, 60-72.
- ³⁶ 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>
- ³⁷ Denver Public Schools. <https://equity.dpsk12.org/extended-learning/>
- ³⁸ Schneider, J. (2018). *Beyond Test Scores: A Better Way to Measure School Quality*. Harvard University Press.
- ³⁹ 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>
- ⁴⁰ 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.
- ⁴¹ 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
- ⁴² Cincinnati Public Schools. (2012). *Transforming Schools Revitalizing Neighborhoods*. Cincinnati Public Schools Community Learning Centers Manual.
- ⁴³ Partnership for the Future of Learning. <https://futureforlearning.org/media/cincinnati-film-series/>

- ⁴⁴ Kostyo, S., Cardichon, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2018). *Making ESSA's equity promise real: State strategies to close the opportunity gap*. Implementing an Extended-Year Graduation Rate. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ⁴⁵ Olson, L. & Toch, T. (2021) Changing the Narrative: The Push for New Equity Measures in Education. Future ED. <https://www.future-ed.org/changing-the-narrative-the-push-for-new-equity-measures-in-education/>
- ⁴⁶ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2019). *Monitoring Educational Equity*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25389>
- ⁴⁷ Measuring School Quality Beyond Test Scores: A Toolkit. (n.d.) Beyond Test Scores Project and Massachusetts Teachers Association. https://www.beyondtestscores.org/s/Measuring-School-Quality_A-Toolkit.pdf
- ⁴⁸ 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>
- ⁴⁹ Baker, B. D. (2018). How money matters for schools (research brief). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ⁵⁰ 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 https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/12/nyregion/it-turns-out-spending-more-probably-does-improve-education.html?_r=0
- ⁵¹ San Francisco Unified School District. <https://www.sfusd.edu/>
- ⁵² Bryant, J. (2021). How a Florida School Improved Test Scores With a Simple but Powerful Community Approach. National Education Policy Center. <https://nepc.colorado.edu/blog/how-florida-school>
- ⁵³ 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>
- ⁵⁴ 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>
- ⁵⁵ 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*.
- ⁵⁶ 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*.
- ⁵⁷ 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*.
- ⁵⁸ Partners for Rural Impact <https://partnersrural.org/our-impact/>
- ⁵⁹ 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>
- ⁶⁰ 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.
- ⁶¹ *Partnership for the Future of Learning*. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁶² Oakes, J., Maier, A., & Daniel, J. (2017). *Community Schools: An Evidence-Based Strategy for Equitable School Improvement*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ⁶³ *Partnership for the Future of Learning*. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁶⁴ 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/>
- ⁶⁵ *Partnership for the Future of Learning*. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.

- ⁶⁶ 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.
- ⁶⁷ Olson, L. S., *A First Look at Community Schools in Baltimore*, Baltimore, Md.: Baltimore Education Research Consortium, December 2014. As of October 18, 2019: <http://baltimore-berc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/CommunitySchoolsReportDec2014.pdf>
- ⁶⁸ Oakland Unified School District. (2022); Klevan, S., Daniel, J., Fehrer, K., & Maier, A. (2023). *Creating the conditions for children to learn: Oakland's districtwide community schools initiative*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/ousd-community-schools-initiative-brief>
- ⁶⁹ 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>
- ⁷⁰ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*.
- ⁷¹ 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*.
- ⁷² Coalition for Community Schools (n.d.). *School-community partnerships essential in a reauthorized ESEA*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools.
- ⁷³ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*; Blank, M., Melville, A., & Shah, B. (2003). *Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools
- ⁷⁴ 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>
- ⁷⁵ Lincoln Community Learning Centers. <https://clc.lps.org/leadership-structure/>
- ⁷⁶ Campo, S. & Fernandez, A. (2022). *Technical Assistance Needs Assessment*. Community Schools Forward. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>
- ⁷⁷ Campo, S. & Fernandez, A. (2022). *Technical Assistance Needs Assessment*. Community Schools Forward. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>
- ⁷⁸ 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>
- ⁷⁹ 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>
- ⁸⁰ New York City Community Schools. <https://nyccommunityschools.org/#:~:text=The%20Community%20Schools%20Initiative%20in,schools%20and%20served%2021%2C000%20students>.
- ⁸¹ Campo, S. & Fernandez, A. (2022). *Technical Assistance Needs Assessment*. Community Schools Forward. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>
- ⁸² 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>
- ⁸³ Oakes, J., Germain, E., & Maier, A. (2023). *Outcomes and indicators for community schools: A guide for implementers and evaluators*. Community Schools Forward Project Series.
- ⁸⁴ 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>
- ⁸⁵ Center for Healthy Schools and Communities (n.d.). *Coordination of Services Team Guide*. Alameda County Health Care Services Agency. https://cpehn.org/assets/uploads/archive/149_cost_toolkit_single_pdf.pdf
- ⁸⁶ Thompson, C. (2021). *Felicitas & Gonzalo Mendez High School: A community school that honors its neighborhood's legacy of educational justice*. Learning Policy Institute.
- ⁸⁷ 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>
- ⁸⁸ 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>

⁸⁹ Ishimaru, A. (2020). *Just Schools: Building Equitable Collaborations with Families and Communities*. Teachers College Press.

⁹⁰ Campo, S. & Fernandez, A. (2022). *Technical Assistance Needs Assessment*. Community Schools Forward. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>

⁹¹ Montgomery County Public Schools. <https://www2.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/>

⁹² Use of this specific template is not required, but FSCS grantees should provide this information in some form to the Department to enumerate the data that they will use for annual reporting.

⁹³ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/chapter-4>

⁹⁴ Schneider, J. (2018). *Beyond Test Scores: A Better Way to Measure School Quality*. Harvard University Press.