

U.S. Department of Education

Data Collection and Reporting Guidance for the Full-Service Community Schools Program



Acknowledgments

The guidance was written by members of the Urban Institute—Peter Tatian, Karin Scott, Ariella Meltzer, Travis Reginal, and Megan Gallagher—along with Stephen Kostyo from the U.S. Department of Education. The authors would like to thank the following people for their help in preparing this guidance document.

We thank staff from the U.S. Department of Education Offices of Elementary and Secondary Education; Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development; Institute for Educational Sciences; and General Counsel for their thorough and extensive reviews of multiple drafts of this document.

We would also like to thank the community school researchers, policy experts, practitioners, and members of the public who shared informal and formal comments with our team.

Further thanks go to our Westat partners who provided administrative support and formatted the final document.

Moreover, we want to thank the Full-Service Community School (FSCS) grantees who reviewed and provided feedback on multiple versions of this document. Their hard work, dedication, and constant efforts to support children, families, and communities continues to make the goals of the FSCS program a reality.

Data Collection and Reporting Guidance for the Full-Service Community Schools Program

This document provides the final version of indicator definitions, related research, and measures for Full-Service Community School (FSCS) grantees for fiscal years (FYs) 2022 and beyond. Specifically, the definitions and measures cover one program measure from section 4625 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended, and 13 additional indicators from the fiscal year (FY) 2022 and FY 2023 notices inviting applications (NIAs). This final document was updated after an initial 60-day public comment period and was further revised after a second 30-day public comment period. Feedback from both public comment periods is reflected in this final reporting guidance. To comply with federal statute and regulations, FSCS grantees for FY 2022 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 their 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 and 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

Introduction	1
An Evidence-Based, Data-Driven Era for Community Schools.....	2
Continuous Improvement in Community Schools.....	3
Managing Community School Implementation at Different Levels.....	4
Indicators and Performance Measures.....	5
Full-Service Community Schools and RBA	6
Aligning Indicators and Performance Measures with Results	8
Data Sources	9
Reporting Requirements Based on Absolute and Competitive Preference Priority Categories	11
Navigating the FSCS Guidance for Data Collection and Performance Reporting.....	13
Core Indicators	14
Reporting Item 1: Provision of Services to Students, Families, and Community Members.....	15
Reporting Item 2: Student Chronic Absenteeism Rates.....	17
Reporting Item 3: Student Discipline Rates, Including Suspensions and Expulsions.....	19
Reporting Item 4: Staff Characteristics.....	23
Reporting Item 5: Graduation Rates.....	30
Locally Developed Indicators Choosing Meaningful Locally Developed Indicators.....	33
Reporting Item 6: Changes in School Spending Information.....	35
Reporting Item 7: School Climate.....	37
Reporting Item 8: Provision of Integrated Student Supports and Stakeholder Services	39
Reporting Item 9: Expanded and Enriched Learning Time and Opportunities	41
Reporting Item 10: Family and Community Engagement Efforts.....	43
Reporting Item 11: Collaborative Leadership and Practice Strategies.....	45
Reporting Item 12: Regularly Convening or Engaging All Initiative-Level Partners	47
Reporting Item 13: Organizing School Personnel and Community Partners	49
Reporting Item 14: Regular Assessment of Program Quality and Progress.....	51
FSCS Results-Based Accountability Examples.....	53
Result and data mapping template	54
Results and data mapping example for reducing absenteeism.....	55
Example Result 1: Students Consistently Come to School Prepared to Learn and Engage	58
Example Result 2: Students Show Growth in Academic Performance From Year to Year and Meet High Academic Standards.....	60

Example Result 3: Students Are Safe; Are Physically, Socially, and Emotionally Healthy; and Are Embraced by a Whole-Child Approach..... 62

Example Result 4: Schools Use Nonpunitive, Restorative Discipline Practices to Lower Suspensions, School Violence, and Arrests and Ensure Student, Staff, and Community Safety 64

Example Result 5: School Staff and Community Partners Deliver a Seamless Pipeline of Services to Students and Families..... 66

Example Result 6: School and Community Members Build Structures to Sustain and Scale FSCS, Including Data Systems, Long-Term Funding Plans, and Staff Retention Strategies 68

Example Result 7: Opportunity Gaps and Disparities Among Students Are Continually Reduced..... 70

Example Result 8: The School Functions as a Central Point for Families and Community Members to Engage in Learning and Development..... 72

Endnotes 74

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 children in high-poverty schools, including in rural areas facing high poverty rates. The FSCS program, administered by the U.S. Department of Education (Department), provides grant funding to eligible entities to implement community school strategies with one or more local educational agencies or the Bureau of Indian Education and one or more community-based or nonprofit organizations. The community schools movement is larger than the FSCS program itself. Nevertheless, the FSCS program provides significant federal funding to support entities 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 “children are—**(i) prepared for kindergarten; (ii) achieving academically; and (iii) safe, healthy and supported by engaged parents**”¹ (emphasis added).

This document 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 22 grantees, much of this guidance may also be useful for organizations 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 enables 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, raised graduation rates, and improved peer and adult relationships. The studies also provided evidence that community schools can help close achievement gaps for students from families with low incomes, English learners, and students in special education.² Many of the indicators described in this document enable FSCS grantees to examine similar indicators and outcomes during their 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 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 22 grant competition as follows:

- Pillar 1: Integrated supports (e.g., social and emotional learning, access to health, and nutrition services);
- Pillar 2: Expanded and enriched learning time (e.g., afterschool enrichment and summer school);
- Pillar 3: Active family and community engagement; and
- Pillar 4: Collaborative leadership and practices to support high-quality teaching.

As stated in the Federal Register notice for Applications for New Awards,⁴ these four pillars are supported by the Science of Learning and Development 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 decisionmaking, is essential for FSCS grantees to bring about the collaborative change 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

The guidance in this document takes into account the different types of FSCS grants and the scales at which they are operating and specifies data reporting requirements appropriate to each type. While some grantees may be implementing a community school strategy in a few schools in a single district, others may be rolling out larger initiatives focused 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.

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 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, our intention is not 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 they can undertake but rather use it as a starting point to have conversations within their communities about the full range of data needed to ensure accountability and success.

This document reflects months of conversation with key field partners and leaders and feedback received during the first and second public comment periods. 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, including the three performance measure questions as a framing for data collection and use, and using RBA terminology more consistently;
- providing examples of how indicators, performance measures, and RBA approaches can work toward grantee-driven results;
- addressing situations where data disaggregation may not be feasible or appropriate;
- citing guidance on using data suppression or aggregation to protect the privacy of educational records; and
- designating core indicators required for FSCS grantees and specifying the calculation of common indicators.

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 serve 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 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 indicators 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 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 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 RBA

This guidance uses elements from the RBA framework to help contextualize measures and ensure data are leading to continuous improvement. RBA typically starts with a result, outcome, or end and works backward 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 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 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. However, agencies and organizations have program accountability for the specific pipeline services 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). 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 assess 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 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 will need a combination of indicators to track progress toward specific results and program performance measures to track the progress of the participants served by the pipeline services.

The ***FSCS Results-Based Accountability Examples*** document outlines an approach that grantees can use to define results, select indicators, identify pipeline services, and determine performance measures aligned with those results. ***The results and indicators 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 to the Department and 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 who 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, websites, and other means.

Aligning Indicators and Performance Measures with Results

Consistent with the RBA framework, FSCS grantees are encouraged to align indicators, pipeline services, and performance measures with the results 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 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 reinvent themselves after the disruptions resulting from COVID-19. Specifically, the Department notes that collecting data on indicators as a part of a broader logic model or theory of action can help grantees 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

In 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 track progress effectively.

Data Sources

The **FSCS Results-Based Accountability Examples**, an Appendix to this Guidance Document, presents examples of population-level indicators and program-level performance measures that align with each of the example results:

- **Result 1:** Students consistently come to school prepared to learn and engage.
- **Result 2:** Students show annual growth in academic performance 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 nonpunitive, restorative discipline practices to lower suspensions, school violence, and arrests and to 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.

Each indicator includes a definition; ways to measure the indicator; justification for use of the indicator; examples of the indicator in practice; information on where to source the relevant data for each indicator; and collection, calculation, and disaggregation methods.

Data sources can include more traditional administrative channels and less traditional non-administrative collection efforts. FSCS grantees may need to rely on both types of data sources for reporting:

- **Administrative or core indicators** can be collected primarily through administrative means. These indicators offer a starting point to have deeper conversations about school improvement. Local, state, and nationally collected administrative data are not the only sources of information that should inform community school improvement. However, they are often easier to collect and report on than other non-administrative measures. As a result, 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 present a starting point to have deeper conversations about school improvement. These indicators include quantitative and qualitative data that may require asking students and parents for information about different aspects of community school functioning and performance. Qualitative data sources—such as information gathered from focus groups or interviews with students, families, or teachers; direct observations; case studies;

storytelling or narratives; and community forums—can also be valuable additions to non-administrative or locally developed indicators.

Whatever data sources FSCS grantees use, they should be capable of producing data that can show progress over the course of their FSCS grant. The data source must produce information that can be replicated regularly (such as annually) and that can be reliably compared from one observation to the next. That is, the data source should be able to indicate meaningful changes to determine whether conditions are improving.

Reporting Requirements Based on Absolute and Competitive Preference Priority Categories

The FY 2022 and 2023 NIAs for FSCS grant applications included five absolute 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; and
- **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).

The notice also designated two optional competitive preference priorities to which applicants could choose to respond:

- **Competitive Preference Priority 1.** Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs; and
- **Competitive Preference Priority 2.** Strengthening Cross-Agency Coordination and Community Engagement to Advance Systemic Change.

To track progress more effectively and to improve their ability to achieve results, FSCS grantees should also collect data to facilitate examination by the following two types of disaggregation described. Disaggregated data should be used to identify inequities both at the population indicator level (to understand who is most burdened) and at the program performance measure level (to identify which pipeline services are most effectively addressing inequities).

- **Disaggregation of data by schools and grades.** Outcomes can vary significantly for different schools within the FSCS grant. Although grantees will report most data at the level of the overall grant, additional population and program data for specific schools or grades within those schools will better explain disparities and show 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.

States are also required to report information for students

- who are homeless;
- who are in foster care; and
- whose parents serve in the Armed Forces.

The Results Scorecard that FSCS grantees will use for data in annual performance reports (APRs) and ad hoc reports 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 narrative sections of their submissions.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) provides guidelines related to data suppression and disaggregation concerning educational records. In the case of small numbers or cells in datasets, FERPA advises suppressing data or aggregating it to prevent the identification of individual students.¹⁹ FERPA often suggests establishing thresholds for reporting data. If counts fall below these thresholds, the data might be suppressed or reported in a generalized manner to protect student privacy. The Department does not mandate any particular method, nor does it establish a threshold for what constitutes sufficient disclosure avoidance. These decisions are typically left up to the individual states and local educational agencies and institutions.²⁰

In reporting data for FSCS, we acknowledge there may be concerns about collecting detailed information from individual family members, caregivers, or other community members across different types of programming or activities. Grantees should think about the feasibility or appropriateness of collecting data based on different levels of participation. For instance, grantees may not be tracking individual-level data for people who participate in a community-wide event (e.g., townhall meeting, community fair, public awareness campaign) because they do not want to present a barrier to those services. These events typically focus on general outreach or information dissemination to the entire community rather than specific services to individuals or families. Tracking aggregate attendance or overall engagement levels might be more relevant in these cases, rather than detailed data on individual attendees. If grantees encounter difficulties in obtaining disaggregated data for parents, caregivers, or community members in particular situations, they should note these in their APR and discuss with their program officer.

Navigating the FSCS Guidance for Data Collection and Performance Reporting

The Department used the research described in the previous sections to assemble a set of indicators to guide submission of data performance reporting, including annual performance reports (APRs) and Ad Hoc reports for FSCS grantees. These indicators are grouped into 14 reporting items, each including a definition, evidence supporting its use to improve school-based outcomes, data sources, and indicators.

The **Core Indicators** section includes both required and potential (optional) indicators. Required indicators will be reported by all grantees and are intended to be comparable to show collective grantee impact. Grantees can also report on potential indicators from the examples provided or indicators of their own choosing to characterize their progress in a way that aligns with local strategies and goals.

The **Locally Developed Indicators** section follows the same structure, but these indicators enable more flexibility in how grantees report their information. The section contains no required indicators but rather suggestions for potential indicators grantees can use.

All grantees should report on indicators related to specific results, as described in this guidance, but the level of those indicators will vary depending on whether the indicator is core or locally developed. For example, all grantees will report school-level data for each core indicator, such as the numbers and percentages of students in particular schools who are chronically absent. For the locally developed indicators, grantees are encouraged to report at the school-level, but only required to report at the grant level.

Table 1. Level of Indicator Reporting

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

The attached appendix, titled “FSCS Results-Based Accountability Examples,” provides examples of indicators and program performance measures FSCS grantees can use to track progress over the course of their grant and beyond. Grantees can reference these examples when completing their **Results and Data Mapping** templates.

Core Indicators

This section identifies and outlines the data FSCS grantees are required to submit to the Department to fulfil their reporting requirements. FY 22 and later FSCS grantees must collect and report on five core indicators specified by the Department. The Department uses the core indicators to assess the progress of the initiative as a whole, so it is best for FSCS grantees to collect data consistently and uniformly. Ideally, all FSCSs would capture information using similar methods and assessment tools.

Data collection can be challenging and requires focused effort and dedicated staff responsible for collecting and managing it. The Department recognizes that each initiative has access to different data sources and data collection methods, depending on the data collected and shared by local agencies and the strength of cross-agency relationships. Therefore, the recommendations included here are based on commonly available data sources and data collection methods. The recommended core indicator data sources and methods for collection are intended to be feasible, sustainable, and not overly burdensome to the FSCS grantees.

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

Definition

This indicator stems from the 2015 reauthorization of ESEA—titled Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)—which authorized the FSCS program.²¹ 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. Therefore, 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 indicators enables 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. Similarly, if the number of family members participating in program services goes down, the leadership team may need to survey parents to determine why. Overall, this indicator enables grantees to evaluate whether they are meeting their targets for the number of students, family members, and community members they aim to serve.

Data Sources

- Partner administrative data sources
- Regular and ongoing initiative partner surveys on number and types of services provided on individuals (students, caregivers or family members, and community members)

Required Indicators

- 1.a. # of unduplicated students who received FSCS program services (target number and actual number)
- 1.b. # of unduplicated family members participating in FSCS program services (target number and actual number)
- 1.c. # of unduplicated community members participating in FSCS program services (target number and actual number)
- 1.d. # of unduplicated individuals participating in FSCS program services (target number and actual number)

Potential Additional Indicators (Optional)

- # of individuals (disaggregated by student, family member, and community member) who are accessing each program or service offered
- % of the targeted population (disaggregated by student, family member, and community member) accessing each program or service offered
- # of individuals (disaggregated by student, family member, and community member) who are accessing programs or services offered as a result of public engagement and outreach

Additional Resources to Support the Provision of Services

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

Reporting Item 2: Student Chronic Absenteeism Rates

Definition

Students are considered chronically absent after missing 10 percent or more of the school year.²²

Why This Indicator Matters

Chronic absenteeism 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 affects students' 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.²³ Disaggregating the number of students who are chronically absent by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status can illuminate groups of students who are missing substantial class time.

Studying chronic absenteeism enables grantees to focus on students who are not receiving the full benefit of classroom instruction and broader school supports. While this indicator alone does not show why students miss school, it can be combined with other indicators to create and evaluate interventions to meet student needs.²⁴

Analysis by the Department highlights how students of different 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.²⁵ 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 attend school.

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 3 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 about 10 percent for elementary, middle school, and high school students between 2014 and 2018.²⁶

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 percent or more of the school year.

- Data are collected annually through ED Facts as a part of each state’s reporting requirements under ESSA.

Required Indicator

- 2.a. # and % of students in grantee schools who have missed 10 percent or more of the school year for any reason (i.e., excused, unexcused, suspensions) disaggregated by ESSA subgroups (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)

Calculation

For chronic absenteeism, FSCS grantees will need to identify the number of students across each target school who were absent for 10 percent or more of the available school days during which they were enrolled in the school. These are the students who were chronically absent. To calculate, follow these steps:

1. For each student enrolled in a target school during the school year, calculate the percentage of days absent:
 - a. Calculate the number of days absent.
 - b. Calculate the number of days enrolled in school.
 - c. Divide the number of days absent by the number of days enrolled in the school, and multiply by 100. This is the percentage of days absent for each student.
2. Across all target schools, calculate the number of students absent 10 percent or more of the days enrolled at the target school. This is the numerator.
3. Calculate the number of students enrolled in the target schools. This is the denominator.
4. Divide the numerator calculated in step 2 by the denominator calculated in step 3.
5. Multiply by 100.
6. Repeat for each of the subgroups (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status).

Additional Resources to Address Chronic Absenteeism

- [Take Action: Community Schools](#) (Attendance Works)
- [Attendance Playbook: Smart Strategies for Reducing Student Absenteeism Post-Pandemic](#) (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 hold 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 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.²⁷

Disaggregating suspension and expulsion data is also important because racial and special education disparities in suspensions have persisted over time. An analysis of the Civil Rights Data Collections from 2011–18 shows 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.²⁸ Therefore, grantees should consider these factors when analyzing their suspension and expulsion data.

A priority for schools should be 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.²⁹ Collecting data on discipline rates can help schools understand these disparities and develop interventions to address them. This effort is aligned with the work of FSCS.

Indicator in Practice

The 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 showed almost every teacher was using positive discipline practices in their classrooms, with 90 percent using restorative circles and 68 percent 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 percent suspension rate. During the 2018–19 school year, that rate dropped to 3.8 percent.³⁰

Data Sources

School districts are required to report exclusionary discipline action such as suspensions and expulsions annually through ED Facts as a part of each state's reporting requirements under ESSA. The data include demographic characteristics (e.g., sex, race) of the student involved in the incident, the type of disciplinary action, and the reason for the disciplinary action. School districts may also voluntarily collect data on disciplinary actions by other student characteristics, such as disabilities, to better identify and address disparities. Potential sources include the following:

- The Department's Civil Rights Data Collection
- Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
- State- or county-level student discipline dashboards
- School discipline records or office discipline referral data

Required Indicators

- 3.a. # and % of students in grantee schools who received one or more out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)
- 3.b. # and % of students in grantee schools who received one or more in-school or out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)
- 3.c. # and % of students in grantee schools who received one or more expulsions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)

Potential Additional Indicators (Optional)

- # and % of students in grantee schools who received one or more out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by other subgroups (e.g., disability status)
- # and % of students in grantee schools who received one or more in-school or out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by other subgroups (e.g., disability status)
- # and % of students in grantee schools who received one or more expulsions disaggregated by other subgroups (e.g., disability status)

Calculation

For reporting item 3, FSCS grantees will need to identify the number of students across each target school who received one or more in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, or expulsions.

Indicator 3.a: % and # of students in grantee schools who received one or more out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. Across all target schools, calculate the number of students who received one or more out-of-school suspensions during the school year. This is the numerator.
2. Calculate the number of students enrolled in target schools during the school year. This is the denominator.
3. Divide the numerator calculated in step 1 by the denominator calculated in step 2.
4. Multiply by 100.
5. Repeat the calculation for each subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status).

Indicator 3.b: % and # of students in grantee schools who received one or more in-school or out-of-school suspensions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. Across all target schools, calculate the number of students who received one or more in-school or out-of-school suspensions during the school year. This is the numerator.
2. Calculate the number of students enrolled in target schools during the school year. This is the denominator.
3. Divide the numerator calculated in step 1 by the denominator calculated in step 2.
4. Multiply by 100.
5. Repeat the calculation for each subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status).

Indicator 3.c: % and # of students in grantee schools who received one or more expulsions disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)

To calculate, use the following steps:

1. Across all target schools, calculate the number of students who received one or more expulsions during the school year. This is the numerator.
2. Calculate the number of students enrolled in target schools during the school year. This is the denominator.
3. Divide the numerator calculated in step 1 by the denominator calculated in step 2.

4. Multiply by 100.
5. Repeat the calculation for each subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status).

Additional Resources About Student Discipline

- [Building a Positive School Climate Through Restorative Practices](#) (Learning Policy Institute)
 - [School Climate and Student Discipline Resources](#) (U.S. Department of Education)
-

Reporting Item 4: Staff Characteristics

Definition

This indicator measures key characteristics of education staff who drive student success. All staff members in schools bring their unique backgrounds and characteristics, including their preparation, experience, gender, race, and ethnicity, to their work. 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; and
- 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.³¹ In fact, the most important factors that influence student achievement are educators.³² Each component of this performance indicator has a direct tie to student achievement:

- **Teacher certification:** A growing body of research shows that teacher qualifications, including certification, matters for improving student achievement.³³
- **Teacher turnover:** Research is also clear that high rates of teacher turnover negatively affect student learning.³⁴
- **Teacher and leader retention:** When schools retain their teachers and leaders, they can save money and keep effective educators in the classroom.³⁵ High-quality school leaders are associated with increased graduation rates and improved student achievement.³⁶ Conversely, failing to retain effective school leaders can result in decreased test scores across grade levels and subjects.³⁷
- **Teacher experience:** Retention also leads to increased educator experience, which multiple studies show is associated with improved student achievement.³⁸

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

Indicator in Practice

Denver Public Schools (DPS) in Colorado is an example of a school district 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. The school district focuses on recruiting new and experienced educators.
- **Teacher residency programs:** The district has established teacher residency programs that give aspiring educators 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. It has 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. Opportunities include workshops, mentorship programs, and leadership pathways.
- **Career advancement:** DPS offers career advancement opportunities for teachers who want to take on leadership roles. Opportunities include roles such as 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 support 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 to make living in the communities they serve more affordable.

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 and the overall quality of its 61 community schools.³⁹

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 Indicators

- 4.a. Teacher certification: # and % of fully certified teachers, disaggregated by race and ethnicity
- 4.b. Teacher turnover: # and % of teachers leaving the school annually
- 4.c. Teacher retention: # and % of teachers returning to the school annually
- 4.d. Leader retention: # and % of school leadership returning to the school annually
- 4.e. # and % of certified principals, disaggregated by race and ethnicity
- 4.f. Average number of years for school staff working at each community school (disaggregated by teacher, administrator, and support)
- 4.g. Teacher experience: average number of years of experience for teachers

Potential Additional Indicators (Optional)

- # and % of school staff (disaggregated by teacher, administrator, and support) who feel they belong
- Teacher perception of the availability and quality of teachers' professional development, as measured through an annual teacher survey⁴⁰

Calculation

Indicator 4.a. Teacher certification: # and % of fully certified teachers, disaggregated by race and ethnicity

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. Across all target schools in the school year, calculate the number of teachers who hold a regular or state standard teaching license or advanced professional certificate. This is the numerator.
2. Calculate the total number of teachers employed at target schools during the school year. This is the denominator.
3. Divide the numerator calculated in step 1 by the denominator calculated in step 2.
4. Multiply by 100.
5. Repeat for each subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity)

Indicator 4.b. Teacher turnover: # and % of teachers leaving the school annually

Teacher turnover can be calculated at the school, district, and state levels. For this indicator, calculate teacher turnover at the *school level* using the following formula: ((number of teachers who left during the school year) / (average number of teachers during the school year)) x 100.

For this indicator, we define teachers as all regular, full-time classroom teachers not in an administrative position. Therefore, any teacher whose role changes to an administrative position over the course of the school year should not be counted in the numerator or the denominator for the calculation of teacher turnover rate.

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. To find the average number of teachers during the school year, add the number of teachers employed at the beginning of the school year (first month) and the end of the school year (last month), and divide it by 2. This is the denominator.
2. Across all target schools, calculate the number of teachers who left their teaching position during the school year. This is the numerator.
3. Divide the numerator calculated in step 1 by the denominator calculated in step 2.
4. Multiply by 100.

Example: A school had 45 teachers at the beginning of the school year and 50 teachers at the end of the school year. During the school year, 10 teachers left their position. First, calculate the average number of teachers employed during the school year: $(45 + 50) / 2 = 47.5$. Next, calculate the turnover rate: $(10 / 47.5) \times 100 =$ a 21-percent teacher turnover rate.

Indicator 4.c. Teacher retention: # and % of teachers returning to the school annually

Teacher retention can be calculated at the school, district, and state levels. For this indicator, calculate teacher retention at the *school level* using the following formula: $((\text{number of teachers employed during the previous school year who return as a teacher at same school the following school year}) / (\text{total number of teachers employed during the previous school year})) \times 100$.

For this indicator, we define teachers as all regular, full-time classroom teachers not in an administrative position. Therefore, any teacher whose role changes to an administrative position over the course of the summer should not be counted in the numerator or the denominator for the calculation of teacher retention rate.

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. Across all target schools, identify the teachers who were employed during the previous school year. The count of these teachers is the denominator.
2. Of the teachers who were employed during the previous school year, identify the number who returned the following school year. This is the numerator.
3. Divide the numerator calculated in step 2 by the denominator calculated in step 1.
4. Multiply by 100.

Example: A school had 60 teachers employed during the previous school year. At the beginning of the following school year, 54 of those teachers were still employed as teachers at the school. To calculate the retention rate, divide the number of teachers who were still employed by the total

number of teachers employed during the previous school year, then multiply by 100: $(54 / 60) \times 100 =$ a 90-percent teacher retention rate.

Indicator 4.d. Leader retention: # and % of school leadership returning to the school annually

School leader retention can be calculated at the school, district, and state levels. For this indicator, you will calculate leader retention at the *school level*. Leader retention rate can be calculated using the following formula: $((\text{number of leaders employed at school during the previous school year who return as leader the following school year}) / (\text{total number of school leaders employed during the previous school year})) \times 100$. For this indicator, we define school leaders as all full-time principals and vice/assistant principals.

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. Across all target schools, identify the school leaders (i.e., school principal and assistant/vice principal) who were employed during the previous school year. The count of these school leaders is the denominator.
2. Of the leaders who were employed during the previous school year, identify the number who returned to their position the following school year. This is the numerator.
3. Divide the numerator calculated in step 2 by the denominator calculated in step 1.
4. Multiply by 100.

Example: A school had five school leaders employed during the previous school year. Four of the school leaders returned to their role at the beginning of the following school year. To calculate the retention rate, divide the number of school leaders who returned by the total number of leaders employed during the previous school year, then multiply by 100: $(4 / 5) \times 100 =$ an 80-percent school leader retention rate.

Indicator 4.e. # and % of certified principals, disaggregated by race and ethnicity

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. Across all target schools, calculate the number of principals who hold a principal certification and relevant credentials. This is the numerator.
2. Calculate the total number of principals employed in target schools. This is the denominator.
3. Divide the numerator calculated in step 1 by the denominator calculated in step 2.
4. Multiply by 100.
5. Repeat for each subgroup (e.g., race and ethnicity).

Indicator 4.f. Average number of years for school staff working at each community school (disaggregated by teacher, administrator, and support)

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. Determine the last day of the previous school year. This is typically the end date of the previous academic year.
2. For all staff who were employed during the previous school year, identify their hire dates.
3. For all staff who were employed during the previous school year, calculate the total years of employment across all target schools by subtracting each staff member's hire date from the last day of the last school year and dividing by 365: (last day of last school year – hire date) / 365 = years of employment.
4. Sum the total years of employment in each subcategory (i.e., teachers, administrators, support staff). This is the numerator.
5. Determine the total number of staff employed across target schools during the previous school year for each subcategory. This is the denominator.
6. Divide the total years of experience for each subcategory by the total number of staff in each subcategory.

Example: Fifty teachers were employed during the previous school year. Together, they have 250 years of employment at the school. To calculate the average years of employment, divide the total years of employment by the total number of teachers: $250 / 50 = 5$ years. On average, teachers have been employed for 5 years at the school.

Indicator 4.g. Teacher experience: average number of years of experience for teachers

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. For all teachers who were employed during the previous school year, identify the number of years of creditable teaching service.
2. Sum the total years of creditable service for all teachers across all target schools. This is the numerator.
3. Determine the total number of teachers employed during the previous school year across all target schools. This is the denominator.
4. Divide the total years of creditable service (step 2) by the total number of teachers (step 3).

Example: Seventy-five teachers were employed during the previous school year. Together, they have 450 years of creditable teaching service. To calculate the average years of teaching experience, divide the total years of creditable service by the total number of teachers: $450 / 75 = 6$ years. On average, teachers have 6 years of creditable teaching experience.

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). According to the National Center for Education Statistics, the ACGR is “the percentage of students in ... [this] adjusted cohort who graduate within 4 years of starting 9th grade 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.”⁴¹

Why This Indicator Matters

For students, graduating from high school represents the culmination of student success during their kindergarten through grade 12 (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 from high school also have better health outcomes and lower rates of unemployment and are less likely to be involved in criminal activity.⁴² 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 among student subgroups.⁴³ By measuring and analyzing graduation rates among different student populations, such as students of color, students from families with low incomes, 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 systemwide 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 and 2011, CPS expanded the number of Community Learning Centers to 26—each with its own resource coordinator. Between 2011 and 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.⁴⁴ The impact on graduation rates followed with rates increasing almost 7 percentage points between 2014 and 2018 when CPS’s rate reached 77.9 percent.⁴⁵

Data Sources

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

Required Indicators

- 5.a. Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (total average and disaggregated by school)
- 5.b. Four-year adjusted cohort graduate rate disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)

Potential Additional Indicators (Optional)

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

- # and % of students who are enrolled or can enroll in accelerated coursework, including advanced placement, international baccalaureate, and dual enrollment programs; and
- a student-to-school-counselor ratio.

Grantees could also include other indicators that show students are on track for graduation, such as

- # and % of third-graders reading on grade level disaggregated by ESSA subgroup; and
- # and % of ninth-graders taking algebra disaggregated by ESSA subgroup.

Grantees may also want to report on outcomes that happen after 4 years of high school, such as

- extended-year graduation rates (e.g., 5-, 6-, or 7-year rates);⁴⁶ and
- # and % of students who enroll in postsecondary studies, enter into the workforce, or enlist in the military.

Calculation

Indicator 5.a. Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (total average and disaggregated by school)

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. The 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate will be calculated by the school district using the official definition.

2. For a grantee with multiple schools across the same or different school district, calculate a weighted average graduation rate:
 - a. Gather the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each target school.
 - b. For each target school, identify the total number of students enrolled.
 - c. Multiply each school’s graduation rate by the total number of students in that school.
 - d. Sum these values across all schools.
 - e. Divide by the total number of students in all schools combined.
 - f. Multiply by 100.

Example: An FSCS grantee has four target high schools as part of its initiative. To calculate a weighted average across all schools, collect the 4-year cohort graduation rate and total enrollment for each school.

School	4-Year cohort graduation rate	Total enrolled	Calculated value
School A	90%	450	405
School B	66%	1,500	990
School C	85%	600	510
School D	65%	700	455
Total		3,250	2,360

Multiply each school’s 4-year cohort graduation rate by the total enrollment to get a calculated value. Sum these values across all schools: $405 + 990 + 510 + 455 = 2,360$. Then divide by the total number of students in the schools combined: $2,360 / 3,250 = .726$. Multiply by 100: a 72.6-percent 4-year cohort graduation rate.

Indicator 5.b. Four-year adjusted cohort graduate rate disaggregated by ESSA subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status)

To calculate, follow these steps:

1. Repeat steps for Indicator 5.a for each subgroup (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status).

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 Indicators

No one key set of indicators will perfectly assess school quality and progress. However, researchers have compiled best practices to guide the thoughtful selection of meaningful indicators. For example, the think tank FutureEd created the following five questions educators can ask to help them select indicators that promote equity:

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?⁴⁷

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.⁴⁸

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 reflect the values of the community. This toolkit includes guidance on asking well-thought-out questions, creating survey responses, and testing pilot surveys.⁴⁹

Grantees have the flexibility to select and define locally developed indicators that align with their specific community needs, as outlined in their application to the Department. However, it is recommended that grantees establish and maintain a clear methodology for measuring the chosen locally developed indicators throughout the grant period, aiming for consistent and reliable measurement over time. As grantees exercise their discretion in selecting locally developed indicators, grantees should ensure the indicators align with their initiative's overarching results. Consistency in measuring these indicators over the grant period will facilitate

effective reporting and aid in tracking progress, evaluating outcomes, and ultimately, fostering transparent continuous quality improvement within the community served.

The following sections on reporting items 6 through 14 provide examples of locally developed indicators that grantees can use to better track their progress based on the solutions and priorities they are implementing.

Reporting Item 6: Changes in School Spending Information

Definition

This indicator measures the status of an FSCS grantee's match from nonfederal funds that are contributing to their community schools as indicated in section B of the Department's standard form 524.⁵⁰

Why This Indicator Matters

To grow and sustain community school initiatives, grantees need to transparently finance a multilevel (federal, state, and local) infrastructure and build a diversity of funding sources. Community school infrastructure often comes from multiple agencies and programs.⁵¹ For example, community schools often rely on Title I, Title II, and Title IV funding from the ESEA and 21st Century Community Learning Center grants. Some community schools rely on healthcare through Medicaid or local health clinics, nutrition support through subsidized school meals and local food banks, philanthropic investments, and a host of nonprofit-run programs.⁵²

Securing a mix of short- and long-term funding sources enables grantees to leverage existing funds and secure a sustainable set of resources.⁵³ Measuring the trajectory of matching funds can help grantees think about the resources they need to sustain their work and provide insurance against inevitable fluctuations in financing.

Keeping track of the trajectory of matching funding grantees receive to support their community schools matters because adequate and equitable spending is positively associated with improved student outcomes and the sustainability of community school initiatives. It costs money to provide community school services (e.g., integrated student supports, additional instructional interventions, OST programs, early childhood services, professional development for educators, meaningful family engagement). Therefore, gauging whether the trajectory of matching spending is going above, going below, or is on target provides key information for education decisionmakers.⁵⁴

Indicator in Practice

Lincoln Public Schools in Nebraska launched its community schools initiative in 1998 using \$100,000 in private startup money from the local Lincoln Community Foundation. Relying on this funding stream alone was not sustainable. To expand the reach of its community schools, Lincoln tapped into 16 sources, including federal funds (Title I and 21st Century Community Learning Center grants), district and city general funds, in-kind contributions from lead agency partners, and grants from private foundations. Lead agency partners included Lincoln's parks and recreation office, the housing authority, YMCA, family and community centers, and the Boys & Girls Club.

By 2018, the city and district's public funding had led to private matching funds, which involved an interlocal agreement for a recurring investment through the Sherwood Foundation in the district's schools. Through this diversification of funding, Lincoln's community school leaders

report they have grown from 29 to 59 schools with a community learning center, and their work is protected from a decrease in any one funding source.⁵⁵

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 use the following data sources and potential indicators:

- Grantees Budget Information from section B of Standard Form 524

Potential Indicator

- 6.a. Status of a grantee's annual total costs of nonfederal funds as included in their Standard Form 524; grantees should indicate whether these nonfederal funds are above, at, or below the in-kind match commitment included in their federal FSCS application

Additional Resources About Changes in School Spending Information

- [Financing Community Schools: A Framework for Growth and Sustainability](#) (Partnership for the Future of Learning)
- [Innovative Financing to Expand Services So Children Can Thrive](#) (The Harvard Graduate School of Education and Children's Funding Project)

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, academic achievement, and social and emotional development. Research shows that positive school climates correlate with improved attendance, test scores, promotion rates, and graduation rates. A positive school climate can also 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 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 and dryer and opened a clothing closet that provided free articles of clothing at the school. The school also worked with the local government to install streetlights to illuminate areas near campus. The changes positively affected attendance in the short term, which eventually led to improved test scores.⁵⁶

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 use the following data sources and potential indicators. 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 about student and staff perceptions of school safety. The following examples are from states and districts:

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

Potential Indicators

- 7.a. # of support services provided to promote a positive school climate
- 7.b. # and % of students who report feeling safe, as measured by a School Climate Survey
- 7.c. # and % of students who report feeling engaged, as measured by a School Climate Survey
- 7.d. # and % of students who report their school has adequate support services, as measured by a School Climate Survey
- 7.e. # of incidences of bullying or harassment reported during the school 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. At a community school that provides in- and out-of-school support for students, integrated student supports address well-being and out-of-school barriers to learning through partnerships with social and health service agencies. The partnering organizations may include mental and behavioral health agencies and providers, coordinated by a community school coordinator and offering services such as the following:

- medical, dental, and vision care; 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; and
- individuals to assist with housing, transportation, nutrition, citizenship preparation, criminal justice issues, and other services.⁵⁷

Overall, integrated student supports are a student-centered approach to develop, identify, and coordinate community-based resources that target academic and nonacademic barriers to achievement, including academic, social, and health and wellness support.⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹

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.⁶⁰ 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 integrated student supports models also show promising results regarding attendance, school climate, social well-being, and academic achievement.⁶¹

Indicator in Practice

The Partnership for Rural Impact (PRI) includes integrated student supports as a part of its FSCS implementation. Specifically, PRI is working to increase partnerships with medical, dental, vision,

and mental and behavioral health services; housing, transportation, and food security providers; and organizations assisting with criminal justice issues, including reentry 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, third-grade reading proficiency, eighth-grade math proficiency, chronic absenteeism, high school graduation rates, and college graduation.⁶²

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 use state-, district-, or school-level data sources and the following potential indicators.

Potential Indicators

- 8.a. # and % of students receiving integrated student supports and stakeholder services
- 8.b. # of full-time equivalent (FTE) nurses, counselors, and school psychologists who work in grantee schools
- 8.c. # and % of students screened for vision, hearing, and dental concerns
- 8.d. # and % of students who were identified as needing follow-up who received a referral for additional vision, hearing, and dental services
- 8.e. # and % of completed referrals for vision, hearing, and dental services
- 8.f. # of partner-provided supports
- 8.g. # and % of students receiving case management services
- 8.h. Open response: What is the extent to which the grantee facilitated expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities over the past 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 and Learning Policy Institute)
 - [At What Stage of Implementing Integrated Student Supports \(ISS\) 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 through evidence-based strategies (as defined by ESSA). These strategies include programs before school, after school, during school, on weekends, and in summer that provide additional academic instruction, individualized academic support, enrichment activities, or learning opportunities for students at a community school that—

- may emphasize real-world, project-based learning where students can apply their learning to contexts that are relevant and engaging; and
- may include art, music, drama, creative writing, hands-on experience with engineering or science (including computer science), career and technical education, tutoring aligned with classroom success and homework help, and recreational programs that enhance and are consistent with the school's curriculum.⁶³

This indicator combines both added instructional (expanded time) and meaningful and engaging (enriched learning) opportunities. As a result, this indicator may also include the intentional collaboration between educators and community partners to apply project-based learning during in-school time and OST, 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 and 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.⁶⁴ In fact, community schools provide their students with as much as one-third more learning time.⁶⁵ During this time, students participate in arts, physical activity, internships, externships, extracurricular 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.⁶⁶ Plus, students often better understand their community, develop trusting relationships with role models and other adults, and connect their learning in school to new contexts.⁶⁷

Indicator in Practice

One specific example of a school district functioning as a community hub is the Cincinnati Public Schools (CPS) district, particularly through its 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 through:

- extended learning programs, including tutoring and enrichment;
- adult education, job training, and career counseling;
- collaborative partnerships with local organizations; and
- arts, culture, and digital literacy initiatives.

CPS's Community Learning Centers 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 improved educational outcomes and 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 use state-, district-, or school-level data sources and the following potential indicators.

Potential Indicators

- 9.a. # and % of students who participated in expanded and enriched learning opportunities
- 9.b. # and % of students who participated in expanded and enriched learning opportunities beyond the regular school day
- 9.c. # of summer learning programs offered by grantee (by type)
- 9.d. Open response: How has the grantee facilitated expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities over the past year?

Additional Resources About the Expanded and Enriched Learning Time and Opportunities

- [Engage Every Student Initiative](#) (U.S. Department of Education)
 - [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 model involve 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 decisionmaking processes. It also 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 the school serves. These services include educational and employment opportunities for adults, along with various supportive services.

This approach also 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 because it includes key engagement activities with families and the community. Engaging families and community members extends leadership beyond district leaders and school administrators to include teachers, school staff, parents, and community partners.⁶⁸ Family and community engagement efforts can foster capacity building and encourage caregivers as leaders in community schools' decisionmaking processes by drawing on local resources and expertise of partners.⁶⁹

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 and improves school climate.⁷⁰ 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 noncommunity schools.⁷¹

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 six standards: (1) parent/caregiver education programs; (2) communication with parent/caregiver; (3) parent volunteering program; (4) learning at home; (5) shared power and decisionmaking; and (6) community collaboration and resources. This rubric was developed by the Oakland School Board to guide their schools' family engagement efforts.⁷²

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 use the following data sources and potential indicators:

- 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); and
- interviews and focus groups reports (e.g., interviews with staff, community members or community partners to gather insights into the nature and depth of relationships).

Potential Indicators

- 10.a. of family engagement workshops or events that the FSCS initiative hosted
- 10.b. # of family engagement trainings offered to staff
- 10.c. # of cultural competence or antibias workshops offered to staff
- 10.d. # and % of parents or caregivers who attended at least one family engagement event or workshop in the past year
- 10.e. # and % of staff who participated in family engagement training and professional learning over the past year
- 10.f. # and % of parents engaged in decisionmaking committees (e.g., parent-teacher associations, steering committees, policy councils) in grantee schools

Additional Resources About Family and Community Engagement Efforts and Impact

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

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.⁷³

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.⁷⁴

Why This Indicator Matters

Collaborative leadership and practice strategies among 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 making time for collaboration, creating leadership teams, and providing leadership development help improve school organization, enhance student learning, increase the commitment from school staff, and deepen trust between school staff and community members.⁷⁵ School climate, collective capacity, and relationships can all be strengthened through collaborative leadership and practice strategies.⁷⁶

The examples in the definition 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 in the definition, schools may also engage in professional learning communities, site-based leadership teams, labor-management collaborations, and advisory councils.⁷⁷ Monitoring progress on this indicator can ensure community schools move toward a results-based vision grounded in data integrated into the broader efforts of the community.⁷⁸

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 programs and activities, and the principal and community school director work together to make final decisions.⁷⁹

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 use the following data sources and potential indicators:

- School Climate Surveys; and
- school or grantee-designed surveys focused on relationship building between school staff and community partners.

Potential Indicators

- 11.a. # and % of community school partners and staff who participate in community school technical assistance and professional development
- 11.b. # of high-quality professional development opportunities for teachers, leaders, and support staff
- 11.c. Open response: How has the grantee supported collaborative leadership and practice strategies over the past 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.⁸⁰

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 be aware of systemic challenges that can derail change efforts, such as leadership transitions, funding changes, and policies.⁸¹ 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.⁸²

The community school system must also attend to the sustainability elements of political and financial capacity so they have the leadership, policy, and funding support to ensure the system will sustain leadership changes.⁸³ To help grantees track progress toward these ends, they can look at (1) their number of initiative-level partners, (2) how often their initiative-level partners meet, and (3) how their funding changes year over year.

Indicator in Practice

One 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 community organizations, nonprofits, 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 discuss strategies and initiatives aimed at improving student outcomes. These meetings facilitate collaboration and the exchange of ideas.⁸⁴

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 use the following potential indicators.

Potential Indicators

- 12.a. # and % of initiative-level partners who participate in community school leadership meetings
- 12.b. # and frequency of initiative-level partner meetings
- 12.c. Open response: How has the grantee regularly convened or engaged all initiative-level partners?
- 12.d. Open response: How has implementation changed because of 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](#) (National Center for Community Schools)
 - [California Community Schools Partnership Program](#) (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 issues identified in a grantee's needs and assets assessment.⁸⁵

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.⁸⁶ Community school grantees should monitor the organization of school personnel and community partners 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 valuable information about program quality.⁸⁷

Being deliberate in using and creating data to identify who to engage and how we should engage them optimizes the two opposite feelings that propel people into action. Using an RBA or a “plan, do, study, act” approach enhances the chances of turning a data curve headed in the wrong direction.⁸⁸ Within these frameworks, grantees can determine the extent to which they are (1) filling key school personnel positions, such as community school coordinators, and how they are supporting those positions with training and professional development and (2) engaging school personnel and community partners in school-based and community-wide leadership teams. Grantees can then examine (3) whether these efforts result in changes in the cooperation across schools, communities, and families and (4) how services align with the student, family, and community member interests.

Indicator in Practice

Coordination of Services Teams (COSTs) consist of multidisciplinary school staff who regularly convene to ensure systems of support work together to promote student success and well-being.⁸⁹ For example, Felicitas & Gonzalo Mendez High School, a community school in East Los Angeles, organized monthly COST meetings with leaders from its 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.⁹⁰

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 use the following potential indicators.

Potential Indicators

- 13.a. # and % of initiative-level partners who participate in community school leadership meetings
- 13.b. # and frequency of partner meetings
- 13.c. # and % of schools that have filled their community school coordinator position
- 13.d. # of trainings provided for community school coordinators
- 13.e. # and % of schools that have conducted any assets and needs assessments
- 13.f. N# and % of students, parents, and community members who report quality services at the grantee's community schools
- 13.g. Open response: How are community school personnel and community partners implementing programs and services based on the interests of students, families, and community members?
- 13.h. Open response: How often and to what extent are initiative-level partners formally discussing their implementation plan by examining student data, participant feedback, and aggregate outcomes to develop strategies for improvement?
- 13.i. Open response: How well has the grantee regularly convened or engaged all initiative-level partners?

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 involves looking 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.⁹¹

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.⁹² Every community school is different, and each has its own assets, resources, needs, vision, and goals. Process improvement leads to consensus building, which improves on the culture of a school and ensures programs improve the lives of the populations they are intended to serve.⁹³

When community school programs regularly assess the quality and progress of their programs, they are using continuous improvement for collaborative problem solving. Continuous improvement can help overcome implementation challenges in community schools because it enables leadership teams to identify problems and approach them with proven methods such as RBA or “plan, do, study, act” cycles.⁹⁴ Grantees can ensure these regular program reviews are taking place by (1) tracking their frequency, (2) looking at how many schools are conducting assets and needs assessments, (3) examining how many schools are providing grant-supported services, and (4) 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 is 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 decisionmaking, 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 MCPS’s progress. MCPS serves as a model for other school districts striving to ensure high-quality education and well-being for all students.⁹⁵

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 use the following potential indicators.

Potential Indicators

- 14.a. # and % initiative-level partners who formally discuss their implementation plan by examining student data, participant feedback, and aggregate outcomes to develop strategies for improvement on at least a quarterly basis
- 14.b. # and % of target schools that have conducted any assets or needs assessments
- 14.c. # and % of students who participate in the full set of pipeline services supported by the FSCS grant (this includes the three pipeline services grantees are already implementing and the two additional services grantees add throughout the 5 years of the grant)
- 14.d. # and % of students who report quality services at the grantee's community schools as measured by School Climate Surveys

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)

FSCS Results-Based Accountability Examples

This **FSCS Data Collection and Reporting Guidance** document provides information on the data grantees need to report to the Department. This appendix explains how grantees can use their indicators to drive continuous improvement through RBA.

FSCS grantees can use the following eight example results to align their indicators, pipeline services, and program performance measures. These results are based on a review of grantee logic models and other background on full-service community schools.

- Result 1: Students consistently come to school prepared to learn and engage.
- Result 2: Students show annual growth in academic performance 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 nonpunitive, restorative discipline practices to lower suspensions, school violence, and arrests and to 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 to track progress toward each result for the relevant population. The **FSCS Data and Reporting Guidance** document contains evidence-based definitions for indicators included in the FY 22 notice inviting applications.

Grantees should also name the specific pipeline services or programs they will use to achieve each result and the performance measures for those solutions that respond to the three RBA questions (How much are we doing? How well are we doing it? Is anyone better off? See also the section **Full-Service Community Schools and RBA** in the introduction of the **FSCS Data and Reporting Guidance** document). The template in table 1 is a tool that grantees can use, in collaboration with partners and community, to gather this information in one place.⁹⁶

Result and data mapping template

Step 1. State the population-level result. (What is the end result we want to achieve for our target population?)

[fill in description of result, including condition of well-being to attain and the relevant geographic or other population]

Step 2. For the population-level result, identify the core or locally developed indicator(s) that will be used to track progress or achievement of the result.

Indicator(s)

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

Step 3. Identify the pipeline services that will be used to achieve this result. (How do you plan to achieve the result?)

Pipeline services

1. [fill in pipeline service]
 - a. [fill in the goals for this pipeline service]
 - b. [fill in the target population for this pipeline service]
2. [fill in pipeline service]
 - a. [fill in the goals for this pipeline service]
 - b. [fill in the target population for this pipeline service]
3. [fill in pipeline service]
 - a. [fill in the goals for this pipeline service]
 - b. [fill in the target population for this pipeline service]

Step 4. Develop performance measures for each pipeline service or strategy. Performance measures enable you to identify and be accountable for achieving equitable results for the students or families participating in your pipeline services.

Pipeline service: [fill in]

1. How much did we do? (How much service did we deliver?)
 - a. [fill in]
 - b. [fill in]

2. How well did we do it? (How much service did we deliver with high quality?)
 - a. [fill in]
 - b. [fill in]
3. Is anyone better off? (What quantity/quality of change for the better did we produce?)
 - a. [fill in]
 - b. [fill in]

Table 2 shows a completed template for an example FSCS grantee that wants to achieve the result of “Students consistently come to school prepared to learn and engage” (see step 1). The grantee is treating this as a population-level result, so step 1 also contains the relevant population. In step 2, the grantee identified the indicator it will use to track progress toward achievement of the result. The grantee next identified in step 3 the set of pipeline services that the FSCS initiative will implement to achieve the population-level result. The grantee can specify performance measures for each pipeline service or strategy that it will collect and analyze to track progress for pipeline service participants.

Results and data mapping example for reducing absenteeism

Step 1. Population-Level Result

- Students consistently come to school prepared to learn and engage.
- Target population: All middle school and high school students

Step 2. Indicator

1. Percentage of students who are chronically absent (miss 10 percent or more of school days during the year)

Step 3. Pipeline Services

1. Home Visiting Program
 - a. **Program goals:** Foster strong partnerships between families and schools to better coordinate support for students. Promote a sense of belonging for students and families within the school community. Encourage parents and caregivers to be actively involved in the child’s education by providing resources, support, and strategies to overcome absenteeism and academic challenges.
 - b. **Target population:** Families of middle school and high school students with irregular or chronic absenteeism.

2. OST Homework Help Program
 - a. **Program goals:** Develop a consistent routine for completing homework and attending school. Improve time management and organization skills to balance schoolwork, extracurricular activities, and other responsibilities. Foster a positive and supportive environment where students feel connected to their peers and school community. Provide resources and support for managing stress and anxiety.
 - b. **Target population:** Middle and high school students with irregular or chronic absenteeism, academic challenges, and/or other barriers.
3. School On-Site Community Services
 - a. **Program goals:** Assist students in overcoming barriers to regular school attendance (transportation, housing, or other challenges). Offer counseling, therapy, and mental health services to address concerns. Provide on-site health services to address students' physical and mental health needs.
 - b. **Target population:** Middle and high school students with irregular or chronic absenteeism, academic challenges, and/or other barriers (health, transportation, housing, etc.).

Step 4. Performance Measures

Pipeline Service: Home Visiting Program

1. How much did we do? (How much service did we deliver?)
 - a. # of families enrolled in home visiting program
 - b. # of families with a student with irregular or chronic absenteeism enrolled in home visiting program
 - c. # of students who received at least one home visit
 - d. # of home visitors who received training/certification
2. How well did we do it? (How much service did we deliver with high quality?)
 - a. % of enrolled families who received the target number of home visits
 - b. % of enrolled families with a student with irregular or chronic absenteeism who received the target number of home visits
 - c. % of families who report satisfaction with the quality of the home visitation program
 - d. Quality of home visits (as measured by valid and reliable observation tool)
3. Is anyone better off? (What quantity/quality of change for the better did we produce?)
 - a. # and % of families who achieved one or more of the goals they set with the home visitor
 - b. # and % of students enrolled in the home visitation program who improved their attendance from previous month/semester/year

- c. # and % of students enrolled in the home visitation program who were chronically absent last year but are no longer chronically absent

The following section provides possible indicators (core or locally developed), examples of types of associated pipeline services, and possible performance measures for each set of services related to a given result (see also the beginning of this document for the eight example results). Grantees can modify the examples to support grantees in effectively aligning indicators, associated pipeline services, and performance measures for each of their initiative's population-level results.

Example Result 1: Students Consistently Come to School Prepared to Learn and Engage

Result Definition

Students who are supported inside and outside 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 these indicators in conjunction to determine the ways they can better support students to attend school every day, ready to learn and thrive.

Potential Pipeline Services

Home visitation program, OST homework help, and school on-site community services

Potential Performance Measures for Pipeline Services

1. How much did we do?
 - a. # of students receiving or enrolled in pipeline service (actual and target)
 - b. # and type of school on-site community services offered
 - c. # of FTE nurses, counselors, and school psychologists working in grantee schools
 - d. # of school on-site vision, hearing, and dental screenings
 - e. # of referrals to services and supports
 - f. # of home visitors who received training or certification for their role
2. How well did we do it?
 - a. % of target students enrolled in each pipeline service
 - b. % of enrolled students who received the targeted number of home visits
 - c. % of enrolled students who attended OST homework help at least twice per week
 - d. % of enrolled students who report satisfaction with the quality of pipeline service delivery
 - e. % of students who were identified as needing follow-up for a vision, hearing, or dental concern and received referral to follow-up services

- f. % of service delivery providers (e.g., home visitors, afterschool tutors) who received the target level of training or professional development for their role
 - g. Quality of home visits (as measured by valid and reliable observation tool)
3. Is anyone better off?
- a. # and % of families who achieved one or more of the goals they set with home visitor
 - b. # and % of students enrolled in the home visitation program who improved their attendance from previous month/semester/year
 - c. # and % of students enrolled in the home visitation program who were chronically absent last year but are no longer chronically absent
 - d. # and % of students enrolled in OST homework help who regularly complete their homework assignments
 - e. # and % of students enrolled in OST homework help who report improved time management skills and organization
 - f. # and % of students with a vision, hearing, or dental concern who received or are receiving services
 - g. # and % of students receiving school on-site community services who report improved health and well-being (e.g., increase in physical activity, proper nutrition and sleep, mental health and stress management)

Example 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.⁹⁷ 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 Pipeline Services

OST homework help, summer enrichment program, and academic case management

Potential Performance Measures for Pipeline Services

1. How much did we do?
 - a. # of students receiving or enrolled in each pipeline service (target and actual)
 - b. # of community partners providing OST programming and homework help
 - c. # of community partners providing summer enrichment opportunities
 - d. # of academic case managers
 - e. # of referrals to afterschool or summer enrichment programs or academic case management
 - f. # of students with an academic case management plan
2. How well did we do it?
 - a. % of target students who are enrolled in each pipeline service
 - b. % of enrolled students who attended at least 90% percent of summer enrichment program sessions
 - c. % of enrolled students who attended OST homework help at least twice per week
 - d. % of enrolled students who demonstrate enhanced self-efficacy (report improvement in self-confidence and ability)

- e. % of enrolled students who report having access to a caring adult or mentor who supports with goal setting, action planning, and resource coordination
 - f. % of students who report satisfaction with the quality of pipeline service
3. Is anyone better off?
- a. # and % of enrolled students who demonstrated improvement in performance in core academic courses
 - b. # and % of enrolled students who are on track to graduate
 - c. # and % of enrolled students who demonstrate credit recovery and progress toward graduation requirements
 - d. # and % of enrolled students who demonstrate no summer learning loss

Example Result 3: Students Are Safe; Are Physically, Socially, and Emotionally Healthy; 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—physically, mentally, socially, and emotionally. Student supports prioritize the health and wellness of the student and provide preventive, ongoing care.

Indicators

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

Potential Pipeline Services

School on-site community services, restorative justice program, and positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS)

Potential Performance Measures for Pipeline Services

1. How much did we do?
 - a. # of students receiving or enrolled in pipeline services (target and actual)
 - b. # of teachers who received training on restorative justice or positive behavior intervention and support practices
 - c. # of teachers or support staff certified in restorative justice or PBIS practices
 - d. # of school on-site vision, hearing, dental, and mental health screenings
 - e. # of referrals to services and supports
2. How well did we do it?
 - a. % of target students enrolled in each pipeline service
 - b. % of teachers or support staff who attended all training sessions and professional development
 - c. % of students, teachers, and support staff who report regular use of restorative justice practices (e.g., fair and consistent referrals, conflict/resolution techniques, restorative circles)
 - d. Feedback from students on their experience with restorative justice and PBIS programs
 - e. Quality of implementation of PBIS interventions (as measured by a valid and reliable tool)

- f. % of students identified as needing follow-up for a vision, hearing, dental, or mental health concern and received referral to follow-up services
 - g. % of students who report timely access to timely health and mental health services
3. Is anyone better off?
- a. # and % of students receiving school on-site community services who report improved health and well-being (e.g., increase in physical activity, proper nutrition and sleep, mental health and stress management)
 - b. # and % of students with a vision, hearing, dental, or mental health concern who received or are receiving services
 - c. # and % of enrolled students who received one or more in-school or out-of-school suspensions
 - d. # and % of enrolled students who received one or more school expulsions
 - e. # and % of enrolled students who report feeling safe at school and traveling to and from school

Example Result 4: Schools Use Nonpunitive, 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 related to decreasing nonpunitive, restorative discipline practices.

Potential Pipeline Services

Restorative justice program, PBIS, and trauma-informed on-site mental health support services

Potential Performance Measures for Pipeline Services

1. How much did we do?
 - a. # of students receiving or enrolled in pipeline service (target and actual)
 - b. # of credentialed mental health therapists on-site
 - c. # of teachers who received training on restorative justice or PBIS practices
 - d. # of teachers or support staff certified in restorative justice or PBIS practices
 - e. # of referrals to services and supports
 - f. # of mental health awareness activities or campaigns
2. How well did we do it?
 - a. % of teachers and support staff who demonstrate increased knowledge and understanding of mental health issues
 - b. % of teachers who demonstrate ongoing participation in training and professional development related to restorative justice, PBIS, or mental health practices
 - c. % of students who report satisfaction with program services
 - d. % of teachers who report satisfaction with training and professional development
 - e. Level of service collaboration and coordination for on-site behavioral and mental health services as measured by a reliable self-assessment tool and participant feedback

3. Is anyone better off?
 - a. # and % of teachers and support staff who demonstrate increase in knowledge and understanding of mental health issues
 - b. # and % of students and/or teachers who demonstrate change in perceived stigma associated with mental health issues
 - c. # and severity of mental health crises
 - d. # and % of students receiving school on-site community services who report improved health and well-being
 - e. # and % of enrolled students who received one or more in-school or out-of-school suspensions
 - f. # and % of enrolled students who received one or more school expulsion
 - g. # and % of enrolled students who report feeling safe at school and traveling to and from school

Example 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. 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 toward achieving the result of a seamless pipeline.

Potential Pipeline Services

Staff professional development and training programs, regular assessment and progress monitoring processes, partnership engagement initiatives, and family and community engagement programs

Potential Performance Measures for Pipeline Services

1. How much did we do?
 - a. # of initiative-level partners participating in leadership meetings
 - b. # of initiative-level leadership meetings (actual and target)
 - c. # of school coordinators across the FSCS initiative
 - d. # of initiative partners with formal implementation plan for services and associated performance measures
2. How well did we do it?
 - a. % of initiative-level partners who participated in at least 85 percent or more of leadership meetings
 - b. % of leadership meetings implemented with a codeveloped, results-based agenda
 - c. % of initiative-level partners with an assets or needs assessment
 - d. % of initiative-level partners with defined service-level performance measures
 - e. % of students, parents, or caregivers who report satisfaction with the overall implementation of pipelines services

3. Is anyone better off?
 - a. # and % of students, parents, or caregivers who report high levels of engagement with pipeline services provided by FSCS initiatives
 - b. # and % of students, parents, or caregivers who report high levels of support from pipeline services provided by FSCS initiatives
 - c. # and % of partners who report high levels of engagement and satisfaction with FSCS initiatives
 - d. # and % of FSCS leadership staff who report increased competencies related to RBA, results-based facilitation, or adaptive leadership skills

Example 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 because it ensures the long-term provision of integrated support services for children and families in the grantee's community. Priorities for sustainability may be unique to each school and community. These priorities may include funding and diversification, data systems and evaluation, staff development and retention, community engagement and partnerships, policy advocacy and integration, and a 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 decisionmaking 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 the model continues to serve students over the years and facilitate 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 initiatives in their community.

Potential Pipeline Services

Data management processes, long-term funding strategies, strategic partnership practices, staff development plan practices, community engagement and ownership initiatives, policy advocacy strategies, and capacity building related to evaluation and continuous improvement

Potential Performance Measures for Pipeline Services

1. How much did we do?
 - a. # of support staff retained from the previous year
 - b. # of pipeline services that have a defined set of performance measures and clear workflows for data collection, analysis, reporting, and accountability
 - c. # of partner memoranda of understanding that clarify roles and responsibilities to data and reporting
 - d. # of internal and external partner staff trained on the effective use of data systems and data-driven decisionmaking

- e. # of internal and external partner staff who have access to data systems and reporting
 - f. # of professional development opportunities provided to staff members, including workshops, training sessions, and certifications
2. How well did we do it?
- a. Sustainability level of funding sources (analysis of the funding sources' stability and long-term commitment to FSCS initiatives)
 - b. % of pipeline services that have a defined set of performance measures and clear workflows for data collection, analysis, reporting, and accountability
 - c. % of internal and external staff who have access to data systems and reporting and are using them for data-driven decisionmaking
 - d. Satisfaction level of staff related to quality of professional development and training opportunities
3. Is anyone better off?
- a. Long-term financial stability (e.g., ability to maintain, scale, or replicate services and partnerships beyond initial funding periods)
 - b. Teacher, administrator, and support staff retention rates
 - c. Teacher, administrator, and support staff turnover rates
 - d. # and % of staff who report they have the knowledge, skills, and capacity to use data to inform decisionmaking, improve program design, and illuminate and act on disparities

Example Result 7: Opportunity Gaps and Disparities Among 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 improve how students, in particular students with disadvantages, 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 related to 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 Pipeline Services

Academic case management, OST learning opportunities, and college and career-readiness programs

Potential Performance Measures for Pipeline Services

1. **How much did we do?**
 - # of students receiving or enrolled in pipeline services (target and actual)
 - Amount of per-pupil expenditures including FSCS funds
 - # of referrals to services and supports
 - # of FTE nurses, counselors, and school psychologists working in grantee schools
 - # of teacher professional development workshops
2. **How well did we do it?**
 - % of targeted students (e.g., students demonstrating irregular or chronic absenteeism, not on track to graduate) who are enrolled or participating in each pipeline service
 - Accessibility or availability of pipeline services (appropriate level of resource allocation)
 - Sensitivity to and inclusion of diverse cultural backgrounds included in the design and implementation of pipeline services
 - % of students, parents, or caregivers who report satisfaction with the quality of implementation of pipeline services

- % of teachers and support staff who report satisfaction with the level and quality of professional development and training opportunities
 - % of staff and teachers who are fully certified (disaggregated by race and ethnicity)
 - % of enrolled students who demonstrate enhanced self-efficacy (report improvement in self-confidence and ability)
 - % of enrolled students who report having access to a caring adult or mentor who supports with goal setting, action planning, and resource coordination
3. Is anyone better off?
- Teacher, administrator, and support staff retention rates
 - Teacher, administrator, and support staff turnover rates
 - Average retention rate for teachers, administrator, and support staff
 - # and % of enrolled students who demonstrated improved performance in core academic courses
 - # and % of enrolled students who are on track to graduate
 - # and % of enrolled students who demonstrate credit recovery and progress toward graduation requirements

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 close-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. These opportunities 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 as a community hub for learning and development.

Potential Pipeline Services

Family engagement and outreach program, school resource centers, and parent volunteer programs

Potential Performance Measures for Pipeline Services

1. How much did we do?
 - # of families receiving access to pipeline services and resources
 - # and type of community school partners
 - # of professional development and training opportunities available for staff and teachers
 - Amount of time available and dedicated to improving relationship building among school, community partners, and families
 - # of parent volunteers

2. How well did we do it?

- % of parents or caregivers who report increased involvement in their child’s education after participating in or having access to pipeline services or resources
- % of families who report feeling more connected to the school community as a result of their participation in or access to pipeline services or resources
- % of community school partners and staff who report participating in technical assistance or professional development provided by the initiative
- % of parents who volunteer at the school at least once during the school year
- Sensitivity to and inclusion of diverse cultural backgrounds included in the design and implementation of pipeline services and resources
- Improved attendance at and use of initiative-sponsored events and resource hubs

3. Is anyone better off?

- # and % of community school partners and staff who report improvement in leadership and community engagement or outreach practices as a result of professional development or training opportunities
- # and % of parents or caregivers who actively participate in the governance of school and initiative-led decisionmaking (e.g., school parent-teacher organizations, parent policy councils)
- # and % of student, parent, or community-led policy initiatives adopted by the school district

Endnotes

- ¹ Every Student Succeeds Act, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf>.
- ² Oakes, J., Maier, A., and Daniel, J. (2017). *Community Schools: An Evidence-Based Strategy for Equitable School Improvement*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute; Johnston, W.R., Engberg, J., Opper, I.M., Sontag-Padilla, L., and Xenakis, L. (2020). *Illustrating the Promise of Community Schools: An Assessment of the Impact of the New York City Community Schools Initiative*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3245.html.
- ³ Community Schools Forward. (2023). *Framework: Essentials for Community School Transformation* (Community Schools Forward Project Series). Palo Alto, CA: Author. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/project/community-schools-forward>.
- ⁴ U.S. Department of Education. Notice Inviting Applications, 87 Fed. Reg. 41,688 (July 13, 2022), retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2022-15091>.
- ⁵ Science of Learning and Development Alliance. (2020). *Science of Learning and Development: Initial Findings*. Retrieved from 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*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.
- ⁷ Blank, M., Harkavy, I., Quinn, J., Villarreal, L., and Goodman, D. (2023). *The Community Schools Revolution*. Retrieved from <https://www.communityschoolsrevolution.org/>.
- ⁸ Elliott, S.N., and 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., and Biblios, C. (2018). Measuring Opportunity: Redirecting Education Policy Through Research. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(73). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3525>.
- ¹⁰ 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: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/coronavirus/reopening-2.pdf>.
- ¹¹ Every Student Succeeds Act, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015). <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf>.
- ¹² As defined in the funding notice (see footnote 5), “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 (see footnote 5), “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*. Potomac, MD: Author.

¹⁵ Clear Impact. (n.d.) *Results-Based Accountability Glossary*. Rockville, MD: Retrieved from <https://clearimpact.com/results-based-accountability/implementation-guide/glossary/>

¹⁶ 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: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/coronavirus/reopening-2.pdf>.

¹⁷ U.S. Department of Education Notice Inviting Applications, 87 Fed. Reg. 41,688 (July 13, 2022), retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2022-15091>.

¹⁸ U.S. Department of Education Notice Inviting Applications, 87 Fed. Reg. 41,688 (July 13, 2022), retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2022-15091>.

¹⁹ Privacy Technical Assistance Center. (2013). *Frequently Asked Questions—Disclosure Avoidance*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://studentprivacy.ed.gov/sites/default/files/resource_document/file/FAQs_disclosure_avoidance_0.pdf.

²⁰ Privacy Technical Assistance Center. (2013). *Transcript: Best Practices for Access Controls and Disclosure Avoidance Techniques*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://studentprivacy.ed.gov/sites/default/files/training/supporting_materials/Disclosure%20Avoidance%20Webinar_508.pdf.

²¹ Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015), retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf>.

²² Attendance Works. (n.d.). *Chronic Absence*. Retrieved from <https://www.attendanceworks.org/chronic-absence/the-problem/>.

²³ Kostyo, S., Cardichon, J., and Darling–Hammond, L. (2018). *Making ESSA’s Equity Promise Real: State Strategies to Close the Opportunity Gap*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/essa-equity-promise-report>.

²⁴ Ginsburg, A., Jordan, P., and Chang H. (2014). *Absences Add Up: How School Attendance Influences Student Success*. San Francisco: Attendance Works. Retrieved from <https://www.attendanceworks.org/absences-add-up/>.

²⁵ U.S. Department of Education. (2019). *Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation’s Schools: A Hidden Educational Crisis*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/chronicabsenteeism.html>.

-
- ²⁶ Johnston, W.R., Engberg, J., Opper, I.M., Sontag-Padilla, Lisa, and Xenakis, L. (2020). *Illustrating the Promise of Community Schools: An Assessment of the Impact of the New York City Community Schools Initiative*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3245.html.
- ²⁷ Losen, D., and 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; University of California, Los Angeles, Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the Civil Rights Project; Okonofua, J., and Eberhardt, J. (2015). Two Strikes: Race and the Disciplining of Young Students. *Psychological Science*, 26(5). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615570365>; Losen, D., and Martinez, T. (2013). *Out of School & Off Track: The Overuse of Suspensions in American Middle and High Schools*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Civil Rights Remedies; Leung-Gagné, M., McCombs, J., Scott, C., & Losen, D.J. (2022). *Pushed Out: Trends and Disparities in Out-of-School Suspension*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.54300/235.277>.
- ²⁸ Leung-Gagné, M., McCombs, J., Scott, C., and Losen, D.J. (2022). *Pushed Out: Trends and Disparities in Out-of-School Suspension*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.54300/235.277>.
- ²⁹ Steinberg M., and Lacoé, J. (2017). What Do We Know about School Discipline Reform? Assessing the Alternatives to Suspensions and Expulsions. *Education Next*, 17(1): 44–52.
- ³⁰ Klevan, S., Daniel, J., Fehrer, K., and Maier, A. (2023). *Creating the Conditions for Children to Learn: Oakland’s Districtwide Community Schools Initiative*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.54300/784.361>.
- ³¹ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.
- ³² Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.
- ³³ Adamson, F., and Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Funding Disparities and the Inequitable Distribution of Teachers: Evaluating Sources and Solutions. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 20(37). Retrieved from <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., and 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. Retrieved from https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w12828/w12828.pdf.
- ³⁴ Carver-Thomas, D., and Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher Turnover: Why It Matters and What We Can Do About It*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.54300/454.278>; Kini, T., and Podolsky, A. (2016). *Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of the Research*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teaching_Experience_Report_June_2016.pdf.
- ³⁵ Carver-Thomas, D., and Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher Turnover: Why It Matters and What We Can Do About It*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.54300/454.278>.
- ³⁶ Burkhauser, S., Gates, S.M., Hamilton, L.S., and Ikemoto, G.S. (2012). *First-Year Principals in Urban School Districts: How Actions and Working Conditions Relate to Outcomes*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation;

Béteille, T., Kalogrides, D., and Loeb, S. (2012). Stepping Stones: Principal Career Paths and School Outcomes. *Social Science Research*, 41(4): 904–919. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.03.003>.

³⁷ Miller, A. (2013). Principal Turnover and Student Achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 36: 60–72.

³⁸ 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*, 4(4): 286–308. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCC-12-2018-0032>.

³⁹ National Center for Teacher Residencies. Retrieved from <https://nctresidencies.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Building-Systems-of-Innovation-at-Scale-Single-Pgs-Web.pdf>.

⁴⁰ Schneider, J. (2018). *Beyond Test Scores: A Better Way to Measure School Quality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

⁴¹ National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). Public High School Graduation Rates. *Condition of Education*, p. 1. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/coi>.

⁴² Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2023). *Unemployment Rates and Earnings by Educational Attainment, 2022*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/emp/chart-unemployment-earnings-education.htm>; Krisberg, K. (2019). Study: High School Diploma Pays Off in Health, Life Expectancy Benefits. *The Nation's Health*, 49(6): 18. Gale Academic OneFile. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A598620874/AONE?u=anon~63a88b3b&sid=googleScholar&xid=6c411093>.

⁴³ Civic Enterprises and Everyone Graduates Center. (2015). *Building a Grad Nation: Overview of 2012-13 High School Graduation Rates*. Washington, DC: Civic Enterprises; Baltimore, MD: Everyone Graduates Center. Retrieved from http://new.every1graduates.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/2015_BGN_Exec_Brief.pdf.

⁴⁴ Cincinnati Public Schools. (2012). *Transforming Schools Revitalizing Neighborhoods: Cincinnati Public Schools Community Learning Centers Manual*. Cincinnati, OH: Author. Retrieved from <https://dokumen.tips/documents/transforming-schools-revitalizing-transforming-schools-revitalizing-neighborhoods.html?page=1>.

⁴⁵ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (n.d.). *On the Rise: Cincinnati's Community Learning Centers*. New York: Author. Retrieved from <https://futureforlearning.org/media/cincinnati-film-series/>.

⁴⁶ Kostyo, S., Cardichon, J., and Darling-Hammond, L. (2018). *Making ESSA's Equity Promise Real: State Strategies to Close the Opportunity Gap*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/essa-equity-promise-report>.

⁴⁷ Olson, L., and Toch, T. (2021). *Changing the Narrative: The Push for New Equity Measures in Education*. Washington, DC: FutureED. <https://www.future-ed.org/changing-the-narrative-the-push-for-new-equity-measures-in-education/>.

⁴⁸ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2019). *Monitoring Educational Equity*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, p. 35. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25389>.

⁴⁹ Schneider, J., Noonan, J., Carey, A., Hersey, K., Marshall, J., McGovern, K., and Pavao, M. (n.d.). *Measuring School Quality Beyond Test Scores: A Toolkit*. Amherst, MA: Beyond Test Scores Project; Quincy, MA:

Massachusetts Teachers Association. https://www.beyondtestscores.org/s/Measuring-School-Quality_A-Toolkit.pdf.

⁵⁰ Deich, S., and Neary, M. (2019). *Financing Community Schools: A Framework for Growth and Sustainability*. Washington, DC: Partnership for the Future of Learning. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/assets/downloads/Financing-Community-Schools-Brief.pdf>; Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.

⁵¹ Deich, S., and Neary, M. (2019). *Financing Community Schools: A Framework for Growth and Sustainability*. Washington, DC: Partnership for the Future of Learning. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/assets/downloads/Financing-Community-Schools-Brief.pdf>.

⁵² Kostyo, S., and Miller, T. (2023). *Federal Funding Sources for Community Schools*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/federal-funding-sources-community-schools-report>.

⁵³ Deich, S., and Neary, M. (2019). *Financing Community Schools: A Framework for Growth and Sustainability*. Washington, DC: Partnership for the Future of Learning. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/assets/downloads/Financing-Community-Schools-Brief.pdf>.

⁵⁴ Baker, B.D. (2018). *How Money Matters for Schools* (Research brief). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/how-money-matters-brief>.

⁵⁵ Deich, S., and Neary, M. (2019). *Financing Community Schools: A Framework for Growth and Sustainability*. Washington, DC: Partnership for the Future of Learning. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/assets/downloads/Financing-Community-Schools-Brief.pdf>; Lincoln Community Learning Centers. (n.d.) *Leadership Structure*. Lincoln, NE: Retrieved from <https://clc.lps.org/leadership-structure/>.

⁵⁶ Bryant, J. (2021). *How a Florida School Improved Test Scores With a Simple but Powerful Community Approach*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <https://nepc.colorado.edu/blog/how-florida-school>.

⁵⁷ U.S. Department of Education. Notice Inviting Applications, 87 Fed. Reg. 41,688 (July 13, 2022), retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2022-15091>.

⁵⁸ Moore, K.A., Lantos, H., Jones M.R., Schindler, A., Belford, J., Sacks, V., and Harper, K. (2017). *Making the Grade: A Progress Report and Next Steps for Integrated Student Supports*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/publications/making-grade-progress-report-next-steps-integrated-student-supports>.

⁵⁹ Sacks, V., Moore, K.A., McClay, A., and Piña, G. (2022). *Integrated Student Supports in Schools May Boost Lifetime Incomes for Students in Families With Low Incomes*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.56417/2754c1596w>; Moore, K.A., Caal, S., Carney, R., Lippman, L., Li, W., Muenks, K., Murphey, D., Princiotta, D., Ramirez, A.N., Rojas, A., Ryberg, R., Schmitz, H., Stratford, B., and Terzian, M.A. (2014). *Making the Grade: Assessing the Evidence for Integrated Student Supports*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends. Retrieved from <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*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.

- ⁶⁰ Sacks, V., Moore, K.A., McClay, A., and Piña, G. (2022). *Integrated Student Supports in Schools May Boost Lifetime Incomes for Students in Families With Low Incomes*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.56417/2754c1596w>; Moore, K.A., Caal, S., Carney, R., Lippman, L., Li, W., Muenks, K., Murphey, D., Princiotta, D., Ramirez, A.N., Rojas, A., Ryberg, R., Schmitz, H., Stratford, B., and Terzian, M.A. (2014). *Making the Grade: Assessing the Evidence for Integrated Student Supports*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends. Retrieved from <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*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.
- ⁶¹ Moore, K.A., Lantos, H., Jones M.R., Schindler, A., Belford, J., Sacks, V., and Harper, K. (2017). *Making the Grade: A Progress Report and Next Steps for Integrated Student Supports*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/publications/making-grade-progress-report-next-steps-integrated-student-supports>; Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.
- ⁶² Partners for Rural Impact. (n.d.). *Measuring Progress to Success*. Retrieved from <https://partnersrural.org/our-impact/>.
- ⁶³ U.S. Department of Education. Notice Inviting Applications, 87 Fed. Reg. 41,688 (July 13, 2022), retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2022-15091>.
- ⁶⁴ Putnam, R.B. (2016). *Our Kids: The American Dream in Crisis*. New York: Simon & Schuster; Bennett, P.R., Lutz, A.C., and Jayaram, L. (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. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/0038040711431585>.
- ⁶⁵ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.
- ⁶⁶ Oakes, J., Maier, A., & Daniel, J. (2017). *Community Schools: An Evidence-Based Strategy for Equitable School Improvement*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- ⁶⁷ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.
- ⁶⁸ Mapp, K.L., and Bergman, E. (2019). Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships (Version 2). Retrieved from <https://www.dualcapacity.org/>.
- ⁶⁹ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.
- ⁷⁰ Bryk, A.S., Sebring, P.B., Allensworth, E., Easton, J.Q., and Luppescu, S. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons From Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ⁷¹ Olson, L.S. (2014). *A First Look at Community Schools in Baltimore*. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore Education Research Consortium. Retrieved from <http://baltimore-berc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/CommunitySchoolsReportDec2014.pdf>.
- ⁷² O Oakland Unified School District. (n.d.). *Standards for Meaningful Family Engagement*. Retrieved from <https://www.ousd.org/student-family-community-engagement-office/standards-for-meaningful-family-engagement>; Klevan, S., Daniel, J., Fehr, K., and Maier, A. (2023). *Creating the Conditions for Children to*

Learn: *Oakland's Districtwide Community Schools Initiative*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/ousd-community-schools-initiative-brief>.

⁷³ U.S. Department of Education. Notice Inviting Applications, 87 Fed. Reg. 41,688 (July 13, 2022), retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2022-15091>.

⁷⁴ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.

⁷⁵ Daniel, J. (2017). *Strong Collaborative Relationships for Strong Community Schools*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <https://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/leadership>; Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>.

⁷⁶ Coalition for Community Schools. (n.d.). *School-Community Partnerships Essential in a Reauthorized ESEA*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools.

⁷⁷ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/>; Blank, M., Melaville, A., and Shah, B. (2003). *Making the Difference: Research and Practice in Community Schools*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools. Retrieved from <https://www.communityschools.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/01/CCSFullReport.pdf>.

⁷⁸ Coalition for Community Schools. (2017). *Community Schools: A Whole Child Framework for School Improvement*. Retrieved from <https://www.communityschools.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/11/Community-Schools-A-Whole-Child-Approach-to-School-Improvement1.pdf>.

⁷⁹ Lincoln Community Learning Centers. (n.d.). *Leadership Structure*. Lincoln, NE: Author. Retrieved from <https://clc.lps.org/leadership-structure/>.

⁸⁰ Campo, S., and Fernandez, A. (2022). *Technical Assistance Needs Assessment*. (Community Schools Forward Project Series). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>.

⁸¹ Campo, S., and Fernandez, A. (2022). *Technical Assistance Needs Assessment*. (Community Schools Forward Project Series). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>.

⁸² Regional Educational Laboratory Program. (2020). *Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Science. Retrieved from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/4005>.

⁸³ Germain, E., Oakes, J., and Maier, A. (2023). *Theory of Action for Community School Transformation* (Community Schools Forward Project Series). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/media/3936/download?inline&file=csf_theory_of_action_community_school_transformation.pdf.

⁸⁴ New York City Community Schools. (n.d.). *The New York City Story*. New York: Author. Retrieved from <https://nyccommunityschools.org/#:~:text=The%20Community%20Schools%20Initiative%20in,schools%20and%20served%2021%2C000%20students>.

⁸⁵ Campo, S., and Fernandez, A. (2022). *Technical Assistance Needs Assessment*. (Community Schools Forward Project Series). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>.

⁸⁶ Oakes, J., Germain, E., and Maier, A. (2023). *Outcomes and Indicators for Community Schools: A Guide for Implementers and Evaluators* (Community Schools Forward Project Series). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/media/3937/download?inline&file=CSF_Outcomes_Indicators_Community_Schools.pdf.

⁸⁷ Oakes, J., Germain, E., and Maier, A. (2023). *Outcomes and Indicators for Community Schools: A Guide for Implementers and Evaluators* (Community Schools Forward Project Series). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/media/3937/download?inline&file=CSF_Outcomes_Indicators_Community_Schools.pdf.

⁸⁸ Clear Impact. (n.d.). *What Is Results-Based Accountability?* Rockville, MD: Retrieved from <https://clearimpact.com/results-based-accountability/>; Regional Educational Laboratory Program. (2020). *Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Science. Retrieved from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/4005>.

⁸⁹ Center for Healthy Schools and Communities (n.d.). *Coordination of Services Team Guide*. Alameda, CA: Alameda County Health Care Services Agency. https://cpehn.org/assets/uploads/archive/149_cost_toolkit_single_pdf.pdf.

⁹⁰ Thompson, C. (2021). *Felicitas & Gonzalo Mendez High School: A Community School That Honors Its Neighborhood's Legacy of Educational Justice*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/shared-learning-mendez-brief>.

⁹¹ Regional Educational Laboratory Program. (2020). *Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Science. Retrieved from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/4005>.

⁹² Regional Educational Laboratory Program. (2020). *Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Science. Retrieved from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/4005>.

⁹³ Ishimaru, A.M. (2020). *Just Schools: Building Equitable Collaborations with Families and Communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

⁹⁴ Campo, S., and Fernandez, A. (2022). *Technical Assistance Needs Assessment*. (Community Schools Forward series). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/community-schools-forward-technical-assistance-needs-assessment/>.

⁹⁵ Montgomery County Public Schools. Evidence of Learning Framework. Retrieved from <https://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/evidence-of-learning-framework/>.

⁹⁶ 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 they will use for annual reporting.

⁹⁷ Partnership for the Future of Learning. (2018). Second Pillar: Expanded and Enriched Learning Time and Opportunities. In *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/chapter-4>.