FSCS Data and Reporting Guidance
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

The U.S. Department of Education (the Department) has released the ***Full-Service Community Schools (FSCS) Data Collection and Reporting Guidance*** document to assist grantees awarded in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 or later in meeting reporting requirements to the Department of Education. Since its release, grantees have asked for additional guidance on collecting and reporting for the core and locally developed indicators (reporting items 1-14). This FSCS Data and Reporting Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document compiles those additional questions that the Department has received. This document also answers other miscellaneous reporting questions not covered in the guidance document.

Part I: General Reporting Questions

A. What reporting time periods should be used when we submit our Ad Hoc Report in March?

For *reporting item 1 (Provision of Services to Students, Families, and Community Members)*, grantees should report the number of participants who received services during the performance period (January 1, 2023-December 31, 2023). In recognition of the unique circumstances for Year 1 of the grant, where grant services may not have been in place during the 2022-2023 school year (through July 31, 2023), the reporting should also focus on the number of individuals served during the 2023-2024 school year (August 1-December 31, 2023). Grantees will have the opportunity to update the 2023-2024 school year counts during the 2024 APR reporting process to include participants served in the Spring semester.

For the other core indicators (*reporting items 2-5*), grantees should report on data from the most recently completed school year. For core indicators, grantees should report data that is comparable across school years and comparable across grantees. This means grantees should report baseline data from the 2022-2023 school year. For example, for reporting item 2, you will report on the number and percent of students who were chronically absent during the 2022-2023 academic school year.

For the locally developed indicators (*reporting items 6-14*), grantees may report on activities that took place during the most recent school year and include activities that were implemented up until the end of the performance period (January 1, 2023, to December 31, 2023). The Department will use this information to look for trends, best practices in implementation, and areas where grantees may need additional technical assistance.

B. Will each school have to report on all the core and locally developed indicators?

Grantees need to report data for each school for all the core indicators (*reporting items 1-5*). However, grantees are not required to report for each school on the locally developed indicators (*reporting items 6-14*). Grantees will report on each locally developed indicator and will have flexibility in how to report on the locally developed indicators to the Department.

C. What level of data is required for reporting core indicators?

FY 2022 and later FSCS grantees must collect and report on 5 core indicators specified by the Department. These data should be reported at both the *grant* and *individual school* levels. Grantees can enter core indicator information for target schools separately in Scorecard (the application used for APR and Ad Hoc data reporting), and Scorecard will summarize these data at the grant level automatically. For example, for chronic absenteeism (indicator 2.a) grantees should calculate and enter into Scorecard the number of students absent 10 percent or more of the days enrolled and the number of students enrolled at each target school. Scorecard will then compute the percentages chronically absent for each school as well as the total number and percentage of students chronically absent across all schools.

To the extent data are available, grantees should also report core indicators summarized by *race and ethnicity, ESL learners,* and *students eligible for free or reduced lunch*.

Label	Core Indicators	Locally Developed Indicators
Grantee	Required (will roll up from districts)	Required
District	Required (will roll up from schools)	Encouraged
School	Required	Encouraged

D. How should grantees address challenges in data collection and reporting?

We understand and appreciate that each grantee may face challenges in data collection and reporting. This may include difficulties in collecting certain types of data, for example:

- reporting unduplicated participant counts may be challenging if you are still developing your integrated service data approach;

- reporting data disaggregated by different demographics;

- ability to collect data for some of your target schools, but not all; or

- the school district or state dept of education has not released data.

The required reporting items are used to inform important conversations within the Department. We value your transparency and invite grantees, while doing their best to report all required items, to pass on any specific challenges you have encountered in the narrative portion

("Challenges Encountered") of the Ad Hoc report for each of the reporting items in Scorecard. Grantees can include obstacles related to collecting certain types of data, challenges related to specific indicators, or other difficulties that may impact reporting. Please be clear on what you are able to report at the time and any limitations or differences between the guidance and what you are able to report. This will help us understand the current state of your reporting. Grantees should also report on any steps or plans being taken to address the challenges. For example, you can communicate the anticipated timeline for when the reporting items will be available. This could include the expected data for release of reports or any actions your initiative is taking or plans to take to address the challenges. The information you provide will be valuable in enhancing the Department's collective understanding of reporting challenges.

E. For locally developed indicators, should grantees report on all reporting items (6-14) or can they select which ones they report on?

Reporting items 6-14 are required, as outlined in the FY 2022 and FY 2023 Notices Inviting Applications (NIA). Grantees should report on one or more locally developed indicators in each of reporting items 6-14. Locally developed indicators can be quantitative measures, such as the "# of funding sources contributing to the grantee's community schools over the past year" or the " # and % of students who report feeling safe as measured by a school climate survey," or qualitative measures, such as open responses on the extent to which grantee facilitated expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities over the past year or how the grantee has facilitated expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities over the past year.

F. What level of detail is expected in "open response" questions for locally developed indicators?

When using open response options for locally developed indicators, grantees should convey enough information to communicate clearly and meaningfully about the progress being made. This can include details about community conditions and challenges, newly created or strengthened partnerships, new or expanded solutions, key accomplishments and successes, and opportunities for further growth and improvement. Details about accomplishments and successes can include descriptions of performance measures or other ways progress is being measured, the penetration and scale of solutions, ways you know that solutions are being delivered with high quality, and whether you are reaching targets set by you or the community.

G. Can adjustments be made to locally developed indicators, in the future, based on evolving data collection practices or program needs?

While the guidance document stresses that grantees should be consistent in how they define and report indicators over the course of the grant, it is acceptable for grantees to add additional indicators to subsequent report periods. Grantees should continue to report any indicators that they originally set out to collect at the outset of the grant for the entire grant period.

H. Our schools have already begun providing services and programs related to integrated student supports and enriched learning time, prior to us receiving the grant. For Ad Hoc reporting, do we report on those existing services and programs that were offered before the grant? Or just on programs and services supported by the FSCS efforts alone?

One requirement of the grant is that there are 3 pre-existing services that are integrated into the community school work at your target schools. There may be instances where those existing services are being expanded or improved as you are implementing your grant and applying continuous quality improvement practices. Grantees can use the narrative section of the report to discuss the services or programs provided prior to receiving the grant and how those services have been enhanced or expanded with the grant. For example, there may have been family engagement efforts at your target schools prior to the grant. In the narrative section, you can discuss how those engagement efforts have been expanded as part of the grant initiative.

I. In the narrative section for the core indicator reporting items (1-5), since 22-23 is baseline year, do we just put N/A for the "Explanation of Progress" section as there is no progress for the baseline year before we got started?

In the narrative, grantees are encouraged to provide insights into the progress of implementation for the pipeline of services, illustrating how the initiative is preparing for or providing services during the report period.

J. Can we add, or embed additional, performance measures into the locally developed indicators (reporting items 6-14) or additional indicators that reflect measures we may have written into our evaluation plan in our proposals?

Yes. Grantees should feel free to add additional indicators.

K. If we have the same data measure for more than one reporting item, should we report it twice or provide a different measure for one of them (reporting items 6-14)?

In some cases, certain indicators may be relevant to multiple aspects of your FSCS initiative, reflecting the interconnected nature of your programming and outcomes. While it may seem intuitive to avoid reporting duplicate data measures, it is important to recognize that some indicators may align with multiple reporting items. The key consideration is to ensure that each reporting item captures a distinct dimension of your FSCS initiative, even if there is some shared data between them.

L. When submitting your Year 2 budget, does that include carryover?

Yes, the budget template that was previously shared with grantees includes information so that you can share next year's budget, including any carryover. The Department has asked that FY22 grantees submit their Year 2 plus carryover budget by February 16, 2024 (extended from the original deadline of February 1). Grantees should provide enough detail so that the Department can analyze how you plan to spend your money and determine if the items are allowable, allocable, and reasonable. If you need an extension submission of your Year 2 budget, please share this request with your Project Officer.

The Bi-Annual Expenditure Reporting Template (available in Scorecard) will focus on the funds that were obligated, expended, and/or drawn down from the G5 system over the first year of the grant (January 1, 2023-December 31, 2023). Grantees will report their expenditures for year one in the Ad Hoc Report.

Part II: Indicator-Specific Questions

A. How should grantees set targets for reporting item 1?

Reporting item 1 measures the number and percent of unduplicated students, families, community members and individuals targeted for services that receive services during each performance year. To set targets for reporting item 1, grantees should first clearly identify their target population for their solutions. This may include students attending your target schools as well as families, community members, and other individuals. Next, you should assess the capacity of your program to deliver services. Evaluate factors such as available resources, staff and infrastructure that may impact the scale of service delivery.

B. For reporting item 1, our district has multiple U.S. Department of Education grants with overlapping priorities, especially around engagement. We do not feel we can accurately represent the impacts of FSCS by including data from prior or existing efforts. Should we only include participation counts for services funded directly through the FSCS grant?

We appreciate the commitment to ensuring accurate and comprehensive reporting. Grantees should count program participation in services that were funded directly through the FSCS grant as well as matching funds. Services provided through matching funds have either been defined by grantees in their application or otherwise approved by the Department. At the same time, we recognize that there may be other complementary work happening through other programs and funding streams. Grantees can provide context and should feel free to discuss how you are coordinating with other funding sources to ensure the highest quality services reach the students who need them most.

C. Do we have to report unduplicated counts for reporting item 1? Our schools have not started this process and we are wondering what this would look like if needed.

We encourage grantees to report unduplicated participants to the best of your ability. Reporting unduplicated counts across multiple programs and partners may require a coordinated approach. While we understand that each initiative and community may take a unique approach, one option is to develop a system of unique identifiers within a centralized data management system in order to track unique participation across partners and programs. This integrated service data approach ensures a comprehensive view of each participant's pathway through the FSCS initiative and will ensure the accurate reporting of unduplicated participation counts. This approach can also enhance coordination among partners.

D. For reporting item 1, how should schools report free and reduced lunch numbers, and/or what numbers should they report?

In schools where free and reduced-price lunch information is collected at the individual-level, reporting involves submitting the total counts of students eligible for either free or reduced-price meals. However, some schools participate in the "Community Eligibility Provision" and are not required to report individual counts of economically disadvantaged students for the school lunch program. Instead, these schools report a "Claim Percentage" representing the % of students identified as eligible for free meals based on direct certification or other means. Grantees should work with their schools to determine the most accurate data to report on the count of students and can report any challenges in the narrative portion of the Ad hoc report.

E. For reporting item 1, how do you define family members? How do you define a family? How do you define community members?

The Department does not provide specific definitions for family, family members, or community members. The definition of these categories may vary based on the unique characteristics of your community and initiative. Grantees have the discretion in defining these categories in a manner that best aligns with the initiative's results, target population and community dynamics. The key consideration is to ensure consistency in how you define and report these categories from year to year.

F. Regarding reporting item 1, we have ethical concerns about gathering personal information from community and family members for the demographic we serve being high need, and possibly undocumented. Any recommendations on how to best navigate this?

This is a complex issue that requires careful consideration and sensitivity, particularly when serving high-need and potentially undocumented populations. We appreciate your commitment to upholding ethical standards in data collection practices. While there may be inherent difficulties in collecting certain demographic information, there are ways to address privacy concerns and

mitigate potential risks. We recognize that each community and context present unique challenges and considerations. To provide more targeted guidance and support, we encourage grantees to discuss their specific concerns with your Project Officer who can provide or connect you to more tailored recommendations and assistance.

G. For reporting item 4.f, what is the definition for "support staff"? Does this include counselors, media specialists, music, art, PE, athletic coaches?

The Department does not provide specific definitions for support staff. The definition of this category may vary based on the unique characteristics of your community and initiative partners. Grantees have the discretion in defining these categories in a manner that best aligns with the initiative's results, target population, and partners. The key consideration is to ensure consistency in how you define and report this category from year to year.

H. Is there a measurement for regular convenings/meetings (reporting item 12)?

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. However, the guidance document provides a set of potential indicators that can be used for reporting item 12, including:

- \# and % of initiative-level partners who participate in community school leader meetings
- \# and frequency of initiative-level partner meetings
- Open response to the question: how has the grantee regularly convened or engaged all initiative-level partners?
- Open response to the question: how has the implementation changed due to regular convenings and engagement with initiative-level partners?

I. How do we seek feedback, other than surveys, for measuring initiative-level meetings/convenings (reporting item 12)?

Seeking feedback beyond traditional surveys for measuring initiative-level meetings and convenings is a thoughtful approach. Other alternative approaches could include focus groups with a representative group of participants or one-on-one interviews with key stakeholders, participants, or community members. While each method offers unique advantages, you should select the best set of methods for your initiative.

J. How do you organize qualitative and quantitative data effectively to look at the organization of school personnel (reporting item 13)?

Reporting item 13 "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." While grantees are not required to report on this indicator in a specific way, grantees may consider the potential indicators for reporting item 13 outlined in the guidance document.

To organize your qualitative and quantitative data effectively, grantees can develop a data framework that outlines the key variables and categories you want to examine, including both qualitative and quantitative dimensions. Once data is collected, you can integrate the data sets and analyze. Collecting both quantitative and qualitative data serves as a powerful validation mechanism. While quantitative data provides numerical insights into certain aspects of organizing school personnel, qualitative data can capture nuanced experiences and perspectives providing more depth and context. Quantitative findings can be cross verified against qualitative insights. For example, if data indicates a high staff-to-student ratio, qualitative data can explore how this impacts the quality of interactions and support provided to students.

K. How is "organizing school personnel and community partners" (reporting item 13) different from reporting items 11 and 12?

Reporting item 13 focuses on how school personnel are organized and mobilized to support the FSSC initiative's results. It can assess the structures, systems and processes put in place to encourage coordination and alignment among the school and partners. Reporting items 11 and 12 assess collaborative leadership strategies and effectiveness of regularly convening or engaging partners, respectively. Each reporting item addresses different aspects of collaboration, coordination and leadership within the FSCS initiative.

Part III: Scorecard Reporting Questions

A. What happens if we hit the "Submit" button in Scorecard for the Ad Hoc report and we forgot something? Does the system notice and "flag" that we forgot something?

Scorecard will not "flag" or notify a grantee if a section or item is missing from the report. Grantees should be careful to review their report for accuracy and completeness before clicking the "Submit" button in the system. If a grantee notices that something is missing or needs to be changed before the submission date and time of March 1, 2024, 5PM ET, they should update or revise the item in the report. However, if a grantee notices that a reporting item is missing or needs to be revised after the Scorecard has been locked, please notify Dan Duncan at Clear Impact (dan@clearimpact.com) and he can manually unlock the Scorecard for you to make the revision.

Please be aware that for the upcoming APR report submission, a grace period has been established by the Department. Grantees are allowed to submit their report until March 12, 2024.

B. For the cover sheet, can you use an electronic signature or must you print it out to sign?

Grantees should complete the fillable PDF, then print out the form, sign the form, upload it to your desktop and save the document as a PDF. Then you can upload the PDF to the appropriate section in Scorecard.

C. What if we have an additional race category to report other than what is already in Scorecard?

If there is an additional race or ethnicity category that is not currently included in the Ad hoc report, please send an email to Dan Duncan so that he may add it for you or show you how to add the field manually to the Scorecard. Reaching out to Dan will ensure that aggregated indicators are calculated and reflected correctly in the final report.

D. Our district combines the Asian and Pacific Islander populations into one category, but they are separated in Scorecard. I am wondering if I should enter a "0" in one of the race categories?

Grantees can take that approach. Please also note your approach in the narrative section "Challenges Encountered" for the reporting item so that your Program Officer can understand the data in context.

E. Is there a limit on the number of characters or words that grantees can enter in the narrative section of the Ad hoc report?

No, there is no limit.

F. Are grantees responsible for "nesting" the schools and school districts in Scorecard so that measures can be "rolled up" from schools to districts to grant?

No, creating the tags and ensuring indicators are nested and rolled up accurately will be completed by staff at Clear Impact.

G. Can grantees modify the wording in the locally developed indicators currently in Scorecard? For instance, our climate survey may have different wording or questions we want to report on. Or should we just create a new one and delete the one we won't use?

Grantees are not required to report on the locally developed indicators in a specific way. Grantees will be given latitude to report on these items in a fashion that best suits their individual needs and to guide continuous improvement toward their program goals. Grantees can modify the

wording in the existing "potential" indicators entered in Scorecard or create new indicators and delete any that they are not using.

Part IV: RBA or Other General Performance Management Questions

A. How do grantees identify metrics that matter to program implementation and impact?

Grantees have already developed a logic model for their initiative outlining the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact. Grantees can leverage this foundational document along with the RBA framework to inform the development of implementation and impact measures. In the RBA framework, there are three types of performance measures:

- Quantity (how much did we do?)

- Quality (how well did we do it?)

- Impact (Is anyone better off?)

Implementation measures are typically categorized as "quality" measures within the RBA framework as they give us information on the extent to which service activities are implemented as intended—focusing on the quality and fidelity of the implementation. Impact measures, on the other hand, directly reflect the desired changes or improvements that result because of participation in the program or services. Grantees are encouraged to review and utilize the FSCS Results-Based Accountability Examples (a part of the guidance document), which includes templates and a set of examples on how grantees can organize and align their indicators, pipeline services and performance measures around their initiative's results. When developing performance measures, it is essential to clarify the goals of the program or service so that the measures align to the overall results. It is recommended that key stakeholders, like program staff, community members and partners, are involved in the development process to gather diverse perspectives, offer transparency, and build ownership of the measures. It is important to select measures that are valid and reliable for assessing implementation and intended impact. Explore existing data and research related to similar programs or initiatives and leverage national or local databases, reports and/or studies to inform your measure development. Grantees can also use existing tools, surveys, and assessments that have been validated for accuracy and consistency. This is an iterative process that benefits from a regular review process that can assess the relevance and effectiveness of selected measures. Grantees should be prepared to adjust performance measures based on changing program dynamics, emerging needs, or shifts in priorities.

B. Does measuring provision of services include measuring uptake or just offerings?

Measuring the provision of services can encompass both assessing the offerings of services and the uptake or utilization of those services. It involves not only identifying the ranges of services available but also the extent to which students (or other individuals) actively engage with and benefit from those services. For example, if a community school offers after school tutoring services, measuring provision of services would include tracking the number of students enrolled in the tutoring program and their attendance (uptake) in addition to detailing the program's structure and curriculum (offerings).

C. Is dosage part of performance measures?

Yes. Dosage can refer to the specific amount or frequency of a service received by an individual. It provides a detailed measure of how much a particular service or intervention an individual or group has utilized. Service dosage can be considered a performance measure for most pipeline services. In the framework of Results-Based Accountability, there are three types of performance measures:

- Quantity (how much did we do?)
- Quality (how well did we do it?)
- Impact (Is anyone better off?)

Service dosage is typically categorized as a "quality" measure within the RBA framework as monitoring dosage allows insights into the quality of implementation. Tracking dosage allows grantees to understand if the intended services are provided at the desired level of intensity or fidelity. Dosage is critical for linking services to outcomes. It helps in understanding the relationship between the level of service and the outcomes achieved.

D. In a data-driven school, how can you collect feedback in meaningful ways without causing "survey fatigue?"

Collecting feedback without causing survey fatigue involves thoughtful planning and consideration of other methods. Grantees can utilize short and targeted surveys focusing on specific aspects of interest. Minimizing the number of questions and time for completion can support more engagement and better response rates. Some initiatives have found that short, "pulse" surveys (instead of lengthy annual surveys) can help provide timely feedback without overwhelming participants. Grantees can also incorporate varied feedback channels beyond surveys, like suggestion boxes, focus groups, or collecting feedback during natural touchpoints like parent-teacher conferences or staff meetings. This can help minimize the additional time and effort required for feedback collection. It is important to periodically check-in with stakeholders to assess their levels of satisfaction or fatigue with feedback loops so adjustments can be made in the future. With careful planning and consideration, a FSCS initiative can foster a culture of continuous improvement and feedback without overwhelming stakeholders with survey fatigue.

Part V: Other Questions

A. Will there be an annual grantee meeting like the one we had in December 2023 or was that a one-time thing?

The Department is planning on having another conference for FSCS grantees in November or December 2024. We are excited to be able to host in-person engagements with you.

FSCS grantees are also encouraged to attend the 2024 National Community School and Family Engagement Conference (CSxFE) that is coming up on May 29-31 in Atlanta, GA. We anticipate holding a pre-meeting on May 29, 2024, for FSCS grantees.