California Department of Education

**Report to the Governor and the Legislature:
2023 Formative Evaluation of the California Community Schools
Partnership Program**

Prepared by:

**Career and College Transition Division
Student Support Services Branch**

DECEMBER 2023

Description: Annual report on the California Community Schools Partnership Program

Authority: California *Education Code* sections 8901–8902

Recipient: The Governor and the Legislature

Due Date: December 31, 2023

California Department of Education

**Report to the Governor and the Legislature:
2023 Formative Evaluation of the California Community Schools Partnership
Program**

Table of Contents

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor and the Legislature:
2023 Formative Evaluation of the California Community Schools Partnership Program

Executive Summary

This report is required by California *Education Code* Section 8902(n), which requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide annual formative evaluations of the California Community Schools Partnership Program (CCSPP) to the Governor and the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature, beginning in 2023 and ending with a final comprehensive report in 2031. The evaluations are to include outcome data; an analysis of the nature and kind of services provided and changes made within schools; areas of progress and challenges to be addressed; and evidence of best practices and successful strategies of integrating multiple sources funding sources to meet school improvement goals.

The CCSPP is the nation's largest investment in community schools. This "whole child" educational approach is based on collaboration between school staff, families, and community partners to support robust, culturally relevant learning. The CCSPP emphasizes the Four Pillars of Community Schools: integrated support services, family and community engagement, collaborative leadership, and extended learning opportunities.

In response to longstanding inequities exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, California supported CCSPP investments in 2020, 2021, and 2022. In 2020, the California Legislature allocated $45 million in Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) to support existing community schools throughout the state. Then, between 2021 and 2022, the Legislature allocated a historic $4.1 billion in state dollars to support new and existing community schools, particularly those serving high concentrations of high-need students.

The following report is the inaugural CCSPP formative evaluation. It opens with survey findings from the 2020 ESSER community schools cohort, for which the California Department of Education (CDE) worked with WestEd to provide technical assistance and conduct survey evaluations. The data reveal significant improvements in services and practices in each of the Four Pillar of Community Schools areas and suggest substantial progress in the implementation of the CCSPP despite the challenges that were posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. WestEd's complete findings are provided in Appendix 1.

This report also details the CCSPP statewide implementation and the technical assistance systems for over 1,400 CCSPP school site grantees from the 2021 and 2022 cohorts across the state. While the implementation timeline did not allow for data analysis from the CCSPP cohorts, the report describes the breadth and depth of statewide implementation at the school and district levels. It also describes the

comprehensive system of technical assistance, which provides guidance for planning and implementation grantees at the county, region, and state levels.

Overall, this report underscores the significance of community schools as an effective school transformation strategy. The enthusiasm with which these community schools' strategies have been embraced highlights the need for continuous support to sustain and expand community school programs.

You will find this report on the CDE's CCSPP web page at https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/hs/ccspp.asp. If you need a copy of this report, please contact Lisa Clark-Devine, Education Programs Consultant, Community Schools Office, at LClark-Devine@cde.ca.gov.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Hamed Razawi, Education Administrator, Career and College Transition Division, at HRazawi@cde.ca.gov.

Introduction

A community school is a "whole child" school improvement strategy where the local educational agency (LEA)[1] and school(s) work closely with school staff, students, families, and the community. LEAs supporting community schools partner with community agencies and local government to align community resources to improve student outcomes. These partnerships "provide an integrated focus on academics, health and social services, youth and community development, and community engagement."[2]

Community school initiatives have mostly been driven at the local level with the support of philanthropy and LEA budget investments. In 2020, the California State Legislature and the Budget Act of 2020 directed $45 million in 2020 ESSER funds to LEAs across the state to receive grant funding to support the coordination of partners and administration of services for existing community school programs.

With momentum growing around the efficacy of the community schools approach, especially in communities disproportionately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, the California Legislature passed the California Community Schools Partnership Act[3] in 2021 and allocated over $3 billion for the program. In 2022, the Legislature increased funding by $1.1 billion, bringing the CCSPP amount to over $4.1 billion and extending the life of the program until 2031.

The CCSPP is an equity-driven initiative that prioritizes schools whose unduplicated pupil count exceeds 80 percent of the overall enrolled student body. This investment marks the largest investment in school transformation through community school strategies in the nation. This investment also signals state leaders' support for elevating the community schools model as an approach LEAs should consider for their own resource allocation.

Recently, LEAs have been forced to rethink the direct connection between schools and families and to examine the link between schools and community services, including ways in which these links can be strengthened. Community schools strategies can be an effective approach to mitigate the academic and social impacts of emergencies that affect local communities, improve school responsiveness to student and family needs, and organize school and community resources to address barriers to learning. Community schools include four evidence-informed programmatic features (known as

---

1. An LEA is defined as a school district, county office of education, or charter school.

2. Coalition for Community Schools: Community Schools Fact Sheet. https://www.communityschools.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/05/CS_fact_sheet_final.pdf.

3. California Community Schools Partnership Act. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&division=1.&title=1.&part=6.&chapter=6.&article=.

the Four Pillars of Community Schools), captured in state law, which are aligned and integrated into high-quality, rigorous teaching and learning practices and environments:

- Integrated support services
- Family and community engagement
- Collaborative leadership and shared decision-making
- Extended/expanded learning time and opportunities

The CDE conducted and facilitated a community input process to create the California Community Schools Framework (Framework),[4] which outlines California's intentional approach to community schools as a school transformation initiative rooted in equity and charged with changing outcomes for students most impacted by present and historical educational disparities. In January 2022, the California State Board of Education (SBE) approved the proposed Framework. While the referenced legislative language establishes the process and structure of the program, the Framework is the guiding document that informs the expected equity outcomes for California community schools.

To meet the current moment, it is important not to view community schools as one initiative among many that are currently being funded in California but as an equity-enhancing strategy that aligns with and can help coordinate and extend a wide range of state, LEA, and school site initiatives. These initiatives include new state investments in youth-focused behavioral health, nutrition, universal prekindergarten, and expanded learning as well as ongoing efforts involving a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), social-emotional learning, college and career readiness, and school improvement. As with these investments, the California Legislature has invested in community schools as another way to transform education in California.

This inaugural report will provide information gathered from the 2020 ESSER grantee cohort, on current 2021 and 2022 cohort CCSPP grantees, and the establishment and activities of the statewide CCSPP technical assistance system. This report serves as the first formative evaluation of the 2021–22 CCSPP, as required by statute.

Subsequent annual formative evaluations of the $4.1 billion state investment and program will be completed by a formative evaluation contractor who will be selected through a request for proposals (RFP) process. The CCSPP Formative Evaluation RFP was released on December 20, 2023, with selection of a contractor expected in early spring 2024. Due to the CCSPP implementation timeline, 2021 and 2022 Planning and Implementation Grant cohorts submitted their first annual reports to the CDE on November 30, 2023 (Implementation Grant School Sites) and December 22, 2023 (LEAs both Planning and Implementation grantees). The Statewide Transformative Assistance Center (S-TAC) and the CDE are currently reviewing these initial submissions and will include data and analysis based on this round of reporting in the

---

4. California Community Schools Framework
   https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/hs/documents/ccsppframework.docx.

next report. The next annual formative evaluation will be submitted to the Governor and the Legislature in December 2024.

2020 ESSER Community Schools Cohort

The community schools program was originally appropriated through the ESSER Fund and the Budget Act of 2020. This original appropriation provided $45 million in funds to the ESSER iteration of community schools. Considering the disruptions to both education and service access due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the pandemic's disproportional impact on disadvantaged students, the ESSER iteration of community schools sought to support vulnerable students and their families. The Request for Applications prioritized activities related to the Four Pillars of Community Schools and responses to COVID-19.

In February 2021, the CDE awarded 20 grants to 19 LEAs to support community school implementation. The 19 grantees included county offices of education (COEs [36.8 percent]), school districts (47.4 percent) and charter schools (15.8 percent). Grantees supported between one and 73 school sites each for a total of 206 school sites. Grantees were in geographically diverse locations across the state and represented varied locale types, including large cities, midsize cities, suburbs, and rural areas.

The ESSER Community Schools cohort had the opportunity to obligate grant funds to improve their community schools from March 13, 2020, through September 30, 2022. Thus, the ESSER cohort implemented grant activities as schools continued to grapple with the impacts of COVID-19, including fluctuations in remote versus in-person instruction; ongoing health concerns for staff, students, and families; and the economic repercussions of the pandemic for many families. Additionally, it is important to note that while the ESSER Community Schools cohort was directed to focus implementation on the Four Pillars of Community Schools, this early iteration predated the release of the CCSPP Framework (2022). Thus, the Framework was not available as a resource to guide grantee and school practices during the grant period.

The CDE contracted with WestEd to provide technical assistance to grantees and to conduct an evaluation of the ESSER Community Schools cohort. Technical assistance was grounded in a needs assessment and included one-on-one support, webinars, and peer learning sessions among grantees. A summary of the findings is provided below, and the full evaluation is provided in Appendix 1.

ESSER Community Schools Cohort Evaluation

WestEd administered Grantee and School Surveys to ESSER Community Schools cohort grantees and school sites in fall 2021 and fall 2022. There was a 100 percent response rate for the 19 grantees; for the 206 school sites, there was a 73 percent response rate in fall 2021 and a 69 percent response rate in fall 2022.

To analyze the survey data, WestEd conducted descriptive and inferential analyses to detect changes over time in programmatic outcomes supported by the ESSER-funded Community Schools grants. Additionally, WestEd conducted a thematic content analysis of open-ended items to understand grant areas of focus, strengths, and needs. The study found statistically significant gains in the extent to which the schools were able to

engage in desired community school activities over the course of the grant year from fall of 2021 to fall of 2022. These gains include the following, as organized by the Four Pillars of the Community Schools:

In the area of Integrated Student Supports, the schools were able to offer significantly more:

- Medical services
- Dental services
- Legal services
- Housing services for students and families experiencing homelessness
- Attendance supports
- Dropout prevention
- Tutoring

They also reported that they were able to provide significantly more access for students and families to:

- Educational technology
- Assistive technology for students with disabilities
- Mental health services and supports

In the area of Extended Learning Time and Opportunities, schools that received community schools grants significantly increased their ability to offer students:

- Summer and/or weekend learning opportunities and programs
- After-school programs
- Arts integration
- Mentoring
- Internships or other service-learning opportunities

Schools were significantly more likely to report that these programs were well-coordinated with school day learning and that educators had resources to plan and execute expanded learning time activities and to use project-based learning strategies that connect to real-world experiences.

There were significant gains in the extent to which schools were able to implement a Coordination of Services Team (COST) as well as develop partnerships with community partners in the following areas:

- Early childhood education (e.g. childcare, Early Head Start, Head Start)
- Medical and mental health services
- Nutrition services
- Social services
- Housing services
- Family centers

- Crime prevention
- Violence prevention
- Legal services

In the area of Family and Community Engagement, schools reported that they were significantly more able to offer events or supports to students and families in the following areas:

- Improving reading and math skills
- Social and emotional skills
- Digital literacy
- Job search and preparation services
- Access to legal services
- Language supports
- Physical health

Schools reported they were significantly more able to engage in Collaborative Leadership and Practices with health professionals, governmental agencies, community service organizations, parents, and school staff both to provide services and to share in data collection and analysis for continuous improvement.

As school leaders commented on the strengths they had developed, they often pointed to family engagement and partnerships:

[Our school's biggest strength was to] amplify parent and student voices and encourage families to see themselves as active agents and regain their power… help them feel heard and take up space in their communities.

[Our school's biggest strength was] building the support network of sustainable resources and services for our school community within our school site while integrating a network of community relationships, resources, services, and partnerships.

Schools also pointed to their improvements in school culture, relationship building, and coordination of services; provision of professional development; and ability to navigate the COVID-19 pandemic as strengths. The WestEd evaluation noted that:

The strengths highlighted by grantees and schools span the Four Pillars of Community Schools and are consistent with practices and strategies vital for strong community school implementation... The number, variety, and magnitude of improvements are especially impressive given the context of grant implementation. In particular, the grant was made available as schools continued

to grapple with the impacts of COVID-19 and deal with supporting students and families as they re-entered in-person instruction. The 2021–22 school year was a challenging year across the country as staff and students re-established norms and relationships, while continuing to navigate health and economic concerns.

Finally, grantees and schools discussed the needs they have moving forward. As summarized by WestEd:

> Grantees shared a consistent message—they need sustained, flexible, and long-term funding to continue and expand this work. This funding could be used to develop and maintain partnerships; hire and retain staff; collaborate with others doing community schools work; develop and provide professional development; carry out needs and assets assessments in the community; and develop and operate comprehensive wellness centers. Schools echoed this need with requests for continued funding with no expiration date being the most common request. At the school level, funds were requested to maintain and expand current programs (e.g., wellness centers, food pantries, hire key staff, and support new partnerships). Other areas of need related to memorandums of understanding (MOUs) and contracts, staff training and hiring, understanding Medi-Cal reimbursement, and other resources to support the work (e.g., physical space).

It was noted that LEAs who are the grantees for multiple schools should be enabled to systematically meet schools' requests for further assistance with MOUs, budgeting, hiring, professional development, understanding of Medi-Cal, and increasing supports that may require community partners.

While this first evaluation data is based on self-reported data from grantees and school liaisons, the analysis of pre/post survey data of the ESSER Community Schools cohort provides promising evidence about the outcomes associated with participation in the CCSPP.

This context, coupled with the short time between the pre- and post-surveys, makes these findings—despite the limitations—noteworthy and potentially significant as we turn to implementation at scale across the state. The following section provides a comprehensive overview and update of our statewide implementation of the CCSPP. In future years' reports, the CDE will have access to both formative assessment and annual progress report (APR) data on the CCSPP itself. We anticipate that our future findings will follow the initial indicators from the survey results detailed above but look forward to building upon the initial foundation and highlighting our learnings in our subsequent reports.

California Community Schools Partnership Program: Planning Grants, Implementation Grants, and Technical Assistance Structure

The CDE, in collaboration with and approval from the SBE, has implemented the CCSPP with full fidelity to the legislative intent outlined in California *Education Code* sections 8900–8902 and the Budget Acts of 2021 and 2022. As noted in the introduction, the first APR data from Cohort One Grantees was due on November 30, 2023. The data analysis from more than 269 grantees (Planning and Implementation grants) and 458 school sites is currently being scored, coded, and analyzed. The CDE looks forward to sharing those data and the analysis with the SBE in spring 2024 and to the Legislature in the December 2024 annual report. The following section of this report details the CDE's implementation activities and the status of allocations to the field in accordance with the statute.

To guide its grantmaking and creation of a statewide technical assistance system for CCSPP schools, the CDE conducted listening sessions in 2021 and presented the Framework to the SBE in January 2022. The Framework now serves as the guiding document to support the implementation of the CCSPP at the school, district, county, and state levels. In addition to signaling California's intent to adopt the Four Pillars of Community Schools, the Framework identifies four cornerstone commitments that will help define California's community schools implementation: (1) a commitment to assets-driven and strength-based practice; (2) a commitment to racially just and restorative school climates; (3) a commitment to powerful, culturally proficient, and relevant instruction; and (4) a commitment to shared decision-making and participatory practices.

The Framework also highlights key conditions for teaching and learning and the successful implementation of school transformation plans based on the Science of Learning Development. Finally, the Framework includes detailed descriptions of four proven practices for successful community schools implementation that include (1) Community Asset Mapping and Gap Analysis, (2) identification and assigning of a Community Schools Coordinator as a discreet role at both the LEA and school site level, (3) site-based and LEA-based shared decision-making councils, and (4) integration with and alignment to other relevant investments and programs such as universal transitional kindergarten and expanded learning.

The Framework is widely used in the field and forms the basis for our technical assistance guidance at the statewide and regional levels. All grantees commit to implementing programs aligned to the commitments in the Framework. The Framework has become a national model with several states using the Framework to guide the implementation of community schools initiatives. The Framework can be accessed on the CDE CCSPP web page at https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/hs/ccspp.asp.

State law established grant opportunities starting in the 2021–22 fiscal year through the 2030–31 fiscal year, as follows:

- Planning grants (at least 10 percent of 2021 funding = $287,416,400) for the 2021–22 and 2022–23 program years. Grants are up to $200,000 per qualifying entity for LEAs with no community schools. Planning grants have a matching requirement of one-third with grant periods of up to two years. Any remaining planning grant funding after 2022–23 shall be made available for implementation grants.

  - Cohort 1: In 2021–22, the SBE approved planning grant funding for 192 LEAs, for a total allocation of $38,200,122 (https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr22/documents/may22item02a1rev.docx). Subsequently, one LEA appealed and was awarded a planning grant, which brought the total number of planning grants to 193 and $38,400,122.

  - Cohort 2: In 2022–23, the SBE approved planning grant funding for 226 LEAs, for a total allocation of $44,294,432 (https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr23/documents/mar23item09a1rev.docx) in planning grants to another 226 LEAs, which brought the total planning grant allocations to $83,294,554.

- Implementation grants (up to 70 percent of 2021 funding = $2,191,251,800) for the 2021–22 through 2030–31 program years. Annual grants between $100,000 and $500,000 per school are available for new, expanded, or continuing community schools, with a matching requirement of one-third and grant periods of five years.

  - Cohort 1: In 2021–22, the SBE approved Implementation Grant funding for 76 LEAs, supporting 458 school sites, for a total allocation of $625,575,000 (https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr22/documents/may22item02a2rev2.docx). Of these school sites, 447 were at or above the 80 percent unduplicated student preference set in statute, and 11 were in rural LEAs serving between 70–80 percent unduplicated students.

  - Cohort 2: In 2022–23, the SBE approved Implementation Grant funding for 128 LEAs, supporting 570 school sites, for a total allocation of $750,500,000 (https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr23/documents/may23item09a1.docx). Of these school sites, 551 schools serve 68 percent or more unduplicated students, 15 are rural schools that serve 58 percent or more unduplicated students, and four schools have a non-stability rate of 58 percent or higher (a student is considered non-stable when they are continuously enrolled for less than 245 days or when they exit the school with a disqualifying exit).

  - In alignment with statute, the Framework, and the identified priorities of the SBE, the Cohort One and Two grant cycle awardees represent the

breadth and diversity of our state's public education system. The following information details CDE's ongoing efforts to meet statutory prioritization while serving the entire state through CCSPP implementation.

CCSPP Grantmaking to LEAs by Region

Region	Planning Grants—Cohort 1	Planning Grants—Cohort 2	Implementation Grants—Cohort 1	Implementation Grants—Cohort 2	Total
Bay Area	$6,397,718 32 grants	$5,091,487 26 grants	$217,312,500 19 grants	$121,125,000 25 grants	$349,926,705 102 grants
Capitol Area	$2,391,649 12 grants	$5,573,927 28 grants	$13,537,500 3 grants	$46,312,500 6 grants	$67,815,576 49 grants
Central Coast	$2,786,824 14 grants	$2,786,927 14 grants	$3,562,500 2 grants	$16,862,500 4 grants	$25,998,751 34 grants
Central Valley	$5,733,108 29 grants	$8,092,543 41 grants	$99,750,000 18 grants	$136,325,000 18 grants	$249,900,651 106 grants
Greater Los Angeles	$8,191,863 41 grants	$7,145,834 36 grants	$106,400,000 11 grants	$234,412,500 38 grants	$356,150,197 126 grants
Northern California	$5,517,295 28 grants	$6,604,236 34 grants	$39,662,500 8 grants	$65,075,000 12 grants	$116,859,031 82 grants
Southern Coast	$4,597,808 23 grants	$5,999,753 30 grants	$95,000,000 12 grants	$118,750,000 22 grants	$224,347,561 87 grants
Southern Inland	$2,783,857 14 grants	$3,399,725 17 grants	$50,350,000 3 grants	$11,637,500 3 grants	$68,171,082 37 grants
State Total	**$38,400,122 193 grants**	**$44,694,432 226 grants**	**$625,575,000 76 grants**	**$750,500,000 128 grants**	**$1,459,169,554 623 grants**

Note: To view a list of counties in each region, refer to page 26.

Planning Grants

The 2021 Budget Act allocated $287,416,400 for planning grants to be awarded during the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years to LEAs with no existing community schools. Planning grants are for up to $200,000 for up to two years.

Cohort 1 Planning Grants

In May 2022, the SBE approved over $38 million for Cohort 1 planning grants to 193 eligible LEAs (https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r17/ccspp21resultspg.asp) consisting of:

- 86 charter schools
- 15 COEs
- 92 school districts

Cohort 2 Planning Grants

In March 2023, the SBE approved over $44 million for Cohort 2 planning grants to 223 eligible LEAs (https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r17/ccspp22resultspg.asp) consisting of:

- 77 charter schools
- 10 COEs
- 136 school districts

Overall, the CDE awarded over $82 million to 416 LEAs for planning grants. According to legislation, remaining planning grant funds will be used for implementation grants.

Implementation Grants

The 2021 Budget Act allocated $2,011,914,800 for implementation grants. An additional $204,721,846 was added to implementation grants from the remaining planning grant funds, which brought the total to $2,216,616,646. In 2022, legislation was revised and added another $992,554,000 toward implementation and/or extension grants. The CDE will determine the best use of these additional funds after the Cohort 3 implementation grants are determined. Implementation grants are up to $500,000 annually for a school site for up to five years.

Cohort 1 Implementation Grants

For Cohort 1, the CDE allocated $500 million for grant awards. After reviewing applications, the SBE, at their May 2022 meeting, approved over $625 million for Cohort 1 implementation grants to 76 eligible LEAs (https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r17/ccsppimp21results.asp) consisting of:

- 16 charter schools
- 10 COEs
- 50 school districts

The total number of school sites being supported by a Cohort 1 implementation grant is 458. Of those awarded, 447 of the school sites were at or above the 80 percent unduplicated student preference set in statute, and 11 were in rural LEAs serving between 70–80 percent unduplicated students per the SBE-adopted grantmaking preference for rural schools.

Cohort 2 Implementation Grants

For Cohort 2, the CDE allocated $700 million for grant awards. In March 2023, the SBE approved over $749 million for Cohort 2 implementation grants to 128 eligible LEAs (https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r17/ccsppimp22results.asp) consisting of:

- 43 charter schools
- 7 COEs
- 78 school districts

The total number of school sites being supported by a Cohort 2 implementation grant is 570. Of those awarded, 551 of the school sites were at or above the 68 percent unduplicated student threshold for this cohort, 15 were in rural LEAs serving between 58–68 percent unduplicated students, and four schools were funded due to their Non-Stability Rate[5] being above 58 percent.

Thus far, the CDE has awarded over $1.37 billion to 204 LEAs supporting 1,028 school sites for implementation grants.

Cohort 3 Implementation Grants

The CDE released the Cohort 3 Implementation Grant Request for Applications (RFA) on November 13, 2023, applications due on February 9, 2024. As described in the fiscal analysis section below, approximately $1.8 billion remains for Cohort Three and Cohort Four. There are several factors that impact the allocation of these funds, including the statutory priority criteria, application quality, and how many planning grantees apply for implementation grants. As such, it is impossible to predict precise allocation amounts for the Cohort Three and Cohort Four Implementation Grant cycle. And, given the number and makeup of planning grantees, the CDE fully expects to award the remaining funds in the last two cohorts. The timeline for the Cohort Three CCSPP RFA is listed below:

---

5. A student is considered non-stable when they are continuously enrolled for less than 245 days or when they exit the school with a disqualifying exit.

Date	Activity
November 13, 2023	RFA release date
February 9, 2024	Applications must be received at the CDE by 11:59 p.m. Pacific Time
February–April 2024	Scoring of applications
May 2024	Proposed grantees announced and presented to the SBE for approval
Two weeks after the May SBE meeting	Appeals must be received by the CDE
June–July 2024	Grant Award Notification letters released
July 1, 2024	Project term begins
August 2024	Disbursement of funds
June 30, 2029	All funds must be expended

- Extension grants (at least 20 percent of 2021 funding = $574,832,800) for the 2025–26 through 2030–31 program years: Grants are intended to extend implementation funding from five to seven years. LEAs may receive up to $100,000 annually per community school with a one-to-one matching funds requirement.

- Implementation and Extension Grant note: The 2022–23 Budget Act increased the total amount for Implementation grants and Extension grants from $2,766,084,600 (the grant amounts from 2021) to $3,758,638,600 (with the additional $1,132,554,000 and subtracting the $140,000,000 for county coordination grants described below). This additional allocation will allow the CDE to fund Implementation grants at a greater number of schools, ensure sufficient funding for eligible planning grantees to receive Implementation grants, and ensure eligible implementation grantees receive Extension grants.

- Coordination grants ($140,000,000 available) are awarded annually for a minimum of seven years. Grants range from $200,000 to $500,000 per COE with a minimum of two CCSPP grantees in their county. To date, 52 COEs have been funded through Coordination grants.

    - In 2022–23, the SBE approved Coordination Grant funding for 41 COEs, for a total allocation of $13,950,000 (https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r17/ccsppcg22results.asp).

- In 2023–24, the CDE awarded 52 COEs for a total allocation of $17,150,000 (https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r17/ccsppcg23results.asp).

- Formative Evaluation: Per statute, the CDE plans to contract with an expert evaluator to conduct annual comprehensive formative evaluations of the CCSPP. The Career and College Transition Division has issued an RFP with a proposed start date of July 1, 2024 ([https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r17/ccsppformeval24rfp.asp)](https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r17/ccsppformeval24rfp.asp). Per the state contracting manual, it is critical that all potential bidders are given access to identical information and facts and that all bidders are treated fairly.

For more information, please visit the CDE CCSPP web page at https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/hs/ccspp.asp.

CCSPP Technical Assistance System

The CCSPP technical assistance system is composed of a lead technical assistance center, known as the S-TAC, that works closely with the CDE and eight Regional Technical/Transformational Assistance Centers (R-TACs). The S-TAC started work in summer 2022, and the R-TACs began work in summer 2023.

Statewide Transformational Assistance Center—S-TAC

The S-TAC is led by the Alameda County Office of Education; partners include the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Center for Community Schooling, the National Education Association, and Californians for Justice.

During the 2022–23 school year, the S-TAC team established a range of learning spaces to provide CCSPP planning and implementation grantees an opportunity to deepen their familiarity with the community schools approach and effective implementation strategies and to learn from other grantees across the state. These learning spaces included a weekly 60-minute virtual Collective Learning Space (CLS), a monthly Community of Transformational Practice (CoTP), monthly webinars, and an annual summit. The S-TAC also engaged R-TACs in monthly one-on-one sessions aimed at strengthening relationships between the S-TAC and R-TACs and to collectively construct a coherent strategy for delivering support to CCSPP grantees across the state. To explore the opportunities and resources available, visit the Alameda COE S-TAC web site at https://www.acoe.org/stac.

Collective Learning Space—CLS

The CLS provided grantees with technical assistance and support during the interim period before the R-TACs were established. The CLS meetings started in August 2022 and aimed to build foundational awareness and understanding of the Framework and, later, the California Community Schools Fundamentals, which included the "Overarching Values" informing the work and the "Capacity Building Strategies: A Developmental Rubric" to guide and gauge community schools implementation. The space provided grantees opportunities for networking, meaning-making, and engaging in one-to-one,

small- and whole-group generative conversations to promote collaboration and address immediate questions with the S-TAC team. The meetings established a true community—one where grantees shared experiences and struggles in a safe space and received support from the S-TAC team, the CDE, and peers on the ground. Grantees often shared weekly updates including successes and wins, frustrations, and concerns, and grantees looked to one another to find out what was working for others in the field.

The CLS culminated at the end of May 2023 and hosted approximately 1,284 CCSPP grantees in total. The average attendance per month was 35 attendees, with fall sessions going as low as 16 and 19 and winter sessions spiking to 82 and 52. The spike we observed in the winter was caused by hiring that districts and counties had begun in the fall. Many new hires joined the space in search of guidance and support. The CLS remained a vibrant space for collaboration and resource sharing across the state's multiple regions. The CLS will be carried over into Year Two.

Community of Transformational Practice—CoTP

In Year One, the major goals of the CoTP centered on the Framework. We used the Framework to outline the roles and responsibilities of the State, the S-TAC, the R-TACs, COEs, and district/charter organizations in the implementation of the CCSPP. Within the monthly CoTP meetings, the S-TAC provided clear and timely communication about administrative (both fiscal and operational) elements. The space allowed for the S-TAC and COEs to share resources and address important issues like staffing to ensure success of the initiative.

Following specific protocols, the CoTP served to elevate, foster, and document county expertise related to the Framework to advance school system transformation. The monthly meetings nurtured relationships of trust across institutions and regions (including R-TACs) to build a network of colleagues navigating and supporting CCSPP implementation. Starting in the winter, the sessions included a spotlight section that showcased a county's journey and areas of expertise. This element strengthened the networks across the COEs. Eight monthly CoTPs were held in Year One. Over time, the CoTP represented an authentic community of learners with over 100 members attending consistently and representing regions across our state—from Shasta to Imperial counties and from Los Angeles to Fresno and Kings counties.

The following outcomes represent the collaboration across the S-TAC and COEs:

- Mapping of community school bright spots across the state. Several COEs, including both urban, suburban, and rural communities, shared their expertise and approaches to building policies, systems, and practices that can advance the community school reform strategy.

- Individual internal assets and needs mapping at the county level grounded in the Framework and a growth plan. Each COE grappled with questions about leveraging their existing assets while seeking assistance to address gaps or areas of need.

- A method for documenting system transformation practices/models/ideas at the district and county level to share widely with other COEs and educational partners.

- Development of a COE/R-TAC Workgroup to help develop a set of best practices for running meaningful and impactful regional CoTPs.

As the work transfers over to the eight R-TACs in the fall of 2023, the blueprint for the work has been created by the S-TAC's CoTP in the first year.

Monthly Webinars

The inaugural webinar took place on July 29, 2022. Afterwards, the S-TAC sought to create a collaborative space for learning through the sharing of ideas, resources, wisdom, and first-hand experiences from the ground. The first webinar included vignettes from each organization that comprises the S-TAC. These short stories highlighted the richness that comes from collaborative work across organizations that share similar ideals around democracy, justice, and education. The concept of sharing concrete examples from various communities became a robust segment of every webinar thereafter. The "voices from the field" segment grew to include students, families/caregivers, teacher leaders, community partners, districts, charters, and COEs—all of whom shared their journeys in real time. The content of the webinars was continuously shared in other spaces like the CLS and the CoTP for COEs.

Nine webinars were hosted in Year One and covered a variety of topics. A total of 1,369 participants attended the S-TAC webinars. On average, participants attended one to two webinars. Webinar topics included the following:

- **Steering committees.** Voices from the field included parents, teacher union leaders, teacher leads, site administrators, and community partners from Anaheim Union High School District and Oakland's Coliseum College Prep Academy.

- **Partnerships and relationship-based collaboration.** Staff from Californians for Justice shared their work in advancing student voice and leadership. Staff from the California Alliance for the Boys and Girls Club highlighted the importance of expanded learning opportunities designed to meet the needs, assets, and aspirations of students.

- **Culturally relevant family engagement practices** framed by the dual capacity framework (2021). Staff from community-based partner True North Star shared the perspectives of Native American communities in Northern California.

- **Student leadership and voice.** Students from Long Beach and Monterey shared their leadership journeys and voiced their aspirations as students and leaders in their respective communities.

- **Integrated student supports.** Los Angeles Unified School District, Shasta COE, and the UCLA Community School personnel shared the importance of building coherent systems that integrate data, personnel, services, and progress monitoring tools to deliver quality educational and social services to students and families.

- **Shared leadership.** West Contra Costa Unified School District staff shared the journey to create shared leadership across their entire community schools' collaborative, which includes the City of San Pablo and multiple community partners.

- **S-TAC resources.** Foundational S-TAC resources—the overarching values of community schools, capacity-building strategies, and self-assessment tools— were reviewed and shared with grantees. Teams discussed the alignment across the resources.

The webinar planning space became a fertile ground for collaboration among grantees and their communities, school districts, COEs, and community partners. The webinars showcased the community schools' work across multiple contexts in California while providing meaningful and helpful resources to the field.

Study Tours/On-Site Learning

The S-TAC hosted two study tours at the UCLA Community School in the Koreatown/Pico-Union area of Los Angeles as part of the learning experience for grantees. The study tours took place on December 5, 2022, and May 18, 2023. The first study tour was tailored to the needs of R-TACs and provided an opportunity for R-TACs and partners to visit classrooms, have a guided tour by students, and spend time hearing first-hand accounts about community schooling from teacher leaders, students, community-based partners, and support staff. The visit allowed 30 participants (representing seven of the eight R-TACs) to capture their learning in an interactive reflection tool that captured the values and spirit of the Framework. In addition, Los Angeles Unified School District Principal Queena Kim offered pre- and post-Zoom sessions to answer questions and share additional resources with participants.

The spring study tour was open to a broader audience and included a guided tour by students, classroom visits, and a poster session that showcased the collective learning inquiry-based projects that staff engages in as part of their professional learning plans. Student researchers also presented their posters with detailed descriptions of their community-based research projects.

R-TACs also participated in the Global Deep Learning Lab, hosted by New Pedagogies for Deeper Learning, from April 17–18, 2022, in Anaheim. At the invitation of the Stuart Foundation, R-TACs, along with leaders of California's allied initiatives (e.g., Golden State Pathways, dual enrollment, etc.), collectively engaged in a shared learning experience focused on whole child education, culturally responsive pedagogy, strategies for coherence, authentic assessments, and more. Presenters included global

leaders such as Michael Fullan, Shawn Ginwright, Joanne Quinn, and Zaretta Hammond.

Annual Summit

On June 16, 2023, the S-TAC hosted the first annual, in-person CCSPP Summit. More than 950 CCSPP grantees, researchers, policymakers, partners, educators, students, and families came together from across California to exchange lessons learned, ideas, and effective practices to inform and deepen California's commitment to community schools. Forty-nine counties, from Imperial County in the southern region of the state to Shasta County in the northern part of the state, were represented.

The one-day event was held at the San Francisco Hilton Union Square. The Summit Planning Committee received 66 requests for proposals and selected 47 sessions to present during one of the two 75-minute break-out sessions.

A student advisory was critical to the Summit's development, and youth leaders served as the event's Master of Ceremonies, a keynote speaker, and workshop facilitators as well as sharing powerful testimony during an afternoon panel session. Student leaders spoke on their classroom experiences, the importance of student voice and shared power, and the opportunity for community schools to address issues stemming from systemic racism. Parent leaders also shared their experiences navigating the educational system and helping to establish positive relationships in schools.

Presentations were facilitated by students and community school educators in rural and urban communities and in alternative programs as well as community-based organizations and community school partnerships. Presenting organizations included (but were not limited to):

- Building Healthy Communities
- California Afterschool Network
- CDE
- California Health and Human Services
- California Partnership for the Future of Learning
- Children's Aid National Center for Community Schools
- Community Schools Learning Exchange
- COEs from across the state
- Fusion Charter School
- Learning Policy Institute
- Reclaim Our Schools, Los Angeles
- R-TACs
- True North Organizing Networks
- UpValley Family Centers

More than 60 community-based organizations representing students, families, and community schools partners participated in the one-day event. In response to the Summit feedback form, 91 percent of respondents indicated that they received helpful

information from breakout sessions, and 83 percent of respondents indicated that they plan to implement all or some of the knowledge or tools from the particular session attended. (Note that approximately eight percent of participants responded to feedback forms.)

Resource Development and Dissemination

In Year One, the S-TAC team worked to develop and curate a number of resources to support both planning and implementation grantees across the state. Resources developed in Year One include the following:

- **Overarching Values.** This document synthesizes the Framework. The Overarching Values assist CCSPP grantees in operationalizing the Four Pillars of Community Schools, commitments, conditions, and practices that comprise the Framework to help make sense of how they are interconnected and entwined to guide the work of community schools.

- **Capacity-Building Strategies: A Developmental Rubric.** This document serves as a road map for LEAs and school sites as they work toward transforming their schools to community schools. The Capacity-Building Strategies align with the Framework, its overarching values, and CCSPP statutory requirements. The rubric is structured in three sequential phases of growth and development and consists of phase-specific strategies and activities that assist LEAs and schools in gauging their growth and progress.

- **LEA and School-Level Self-Assessment Tools.** Companion tools to the Capacity-Building Strategies: A Developmental Rubric, the self-assessment tools are intended to guide reflection and action-planning across each phase of the implementation process.

- **Collaborative Leadership Structures Guide.** This document defines collaborative leadership and describes how it can improve outcomes for young people and build a system that ensures alignment and coherence between all interest holders.

- **Needs and Assets Assessment Guide.** This resource provides a step-by-step process to needs and assets assessment. Executed well, the needs and assets assessment creates a shared understanding of the needs and assets of a school and community and fosters collective responsibility and accountability for outcomes related to a shared vision of student success.

In developing these resources, the S-TAC aimed to enact a democratic, collaborative, and transparent process by sharing iterations of resources with advisory board members, nonprofits/community partners (e.g., California Partnership for the Future of Learning, Community Schools Learning Exchange), research organizations (e.g., WestEd and Learning Policy Institute), the CDE, and CCSPP grantees to incorporate their valuable feedback into working drafts. The S-TAC developed structures to ensure

collaboration with experts across the field, including bimonthly meetings with the S-TAC Advisory Board (five meetings held between July 2022 and June 2023) plus a focused meeting to solicit feedback on working drafts of the APR. In sum, six iterations of the Capacity-Building Strategies document and APR were shared with partners and Deep Dive Transformation Partners for review and feedback. Two iterations of the self-assessments and Needs and Assets Assessment Guide were shared with partners and Deep Dive Transformation Partners. Public comment was also solicited, via a Google form, on the APR, self-assessments, and Needs and Assets Assessment Guide.

The S-TAC will continue to engage with grantees, including transformation partners and advisory board members, to ensure the S-TAC is curating, developing, and sharing the resources and tools that will support the work of schools and districts across the state. Based on feedback received on working drafts of available resources, the S-TAC will continue to make revisions to ensure resources meet the needs of grantees. The S-TAC will also develop and provide a range of supports to grantees via videos, webinars, and R-TAC engagement (including CoTPs) to guide and encourage the use of S-TAC developed tools and resources.

Data Measurement, Reflection, and Growth

The S-TAC aimed to nurture and develop the implementation and improvement capacity of CCSPP grantees by supporting the use of data for the purposes of measurement, reflection, and growth. With this objective in mind, the S-TAC has (1) partnered with the CDE to collect data and craft data-collection tools, (2) drafted a Multiple Measures framework, and (3) identified Deep Dive Transformation Partners to understand CCSPP implementation from a systems perspective. These efforts are intended to align and build upon each other and are anchored in the goal of creating a practice of continuous improvement to bring long-term positive impact for students, families, educators, and communities.

Statewide Evaluation Efforts

The S-TAC helped build the state's capacity to learn about the implementation of the CCSPP by working alongside the CDE to help fill the evaluation void currently present in the program. In Year One, the S-TAC assisted WestEd in their design of a Year One survey of Cohort One CCSPP grantees via three rounds of feedback. The Year One survey was administered by WestEd in spring 2023 and yielded a tremendous response rate, with 99 percent of CCSPP grantees responding to the survey and 438 of 459 of participating schools (95 percent) completing the school survey. This survey gave WestEd and the CDE baseline data to be compared with the post survey.

The S-TAC also designed an optional Implementation Plan Template (aligned with the Capacity-Building Strategies) and developed an APR required of all CCSPP Grantees. As with other resources developed by the S-TAC, feedback on the APR was solicited from advisory board members, partners, and practitioners. A total of six iterations of the APR were shared with partners. A special convening of the advisory board was held to gather feedback on the APR, and public comment was solicited through the distribution

of a Google form to CCSPP grantees. As of the date of this report, the CDE has received completed APRs from 92 percent of Cohort 1 planning and 80 percent of Cohort 1 implementation grantees (LEA level), including 96 percent of the implementation school sites.

Regional Technical Assistance Centers—R-TACs

There are eight R-TACs supporting regional COEs, school districts, and charter schools. The R-TACs support not only CCSPP grantees but prospective grantees as well. The S-TAC and the CDE meet with each R-TAC monthly as well as five times throughout the year. This structure ensures that the CCSPP technical assistance systems are cohesive and aligned throughout the state as well as highlighting areas of concern.

R-TAC partners include (but are not limited to) Community Schools Learning Exchange, Fresno Pacific University, Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health, National Center for Community Schools, Parent Institute for Quality Education, Partners for Rural Impact, and Turnaround for Children. The following table shows the eight R-TAC regions.

R-TAC Region	Counties Served	Lead
Bay Area	Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Sonoma	Santa Clara COE
Capitol Area	Alpine, Colusa, El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Sierra, Solano, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba	Sacramento COE
Central Coast	Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and Ventura	Monterey COE
Central Valley	Amador, Calaveras, Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Stanislaus, Tulare, and Tuolumne	Fresno COE
Greater Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Los Angeles COE
Northern California	Butte, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Mendocino, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity	Shasta COE
Southern Coast	Imperial, Orange, and San Diego	San Diego COE

R-TAC Region	Counties Served	Lead
Southern Inland	Inyo, Mono, Riverside, and San Bernardino	San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

All R-TACs will provide, at a minimum, the following support to community schools in their region:

- **Regional Technical Assistance Needs Assessment.** The needs assessment will be used to determine content areas for technical assistance webinars and peer consultancy sessions. The needs assessment is included early in the timeline to provide timely feedback so that needs assessment findings can inform decisions about the provision of technical assistance to CCSPP grantees.

- **Regional Community of Practice Meetings.** Monthly regional community of practice meetings are designed to address immediate regional CCSPP needs. It is a space for the R-TACs to provide communication about administrative and programmatic elements. The space allows for the R-TAC and COEs to share resources and address important components such as staffing to ensure success of the initiative.

- **Regional Webinar Peer Learning Sessions.** Based on the needs assessment findings and discussions with the S-TAC and the CDE, the R-TACs will identify the most pressing topics to serve as the focus for regional webinars, peer learning sessions, and content development (e.g., topical and content areas of interest). A key activity provided to grantees will be webinars that include opportunities for peer learning.

- **Ongoing Regional Technical Assistance Support.** Additional technical assistance for all regional COEs and grantees is ongoing on an as-needed basis via telephone, email, or other virtual means. R-TACs are meeting with all regional COEs and grantees to build relationships to help ensure program success.

Coordination Grants

Coordination grants are awarded to COEs with a minimum of two CCSPP grants in their county. The purpose of this formula-driven allocation is to provide COEs with resources to coordinate county-level governmental, nonprofit, community-based organizations and other external partnerships to support community school implementation in their county. This program will help LEAs build capacity to plan, implement, and coordinate community schools. Coordination Grant funds will be awarded on an annual basis for up to seven years. The R-TACs support COEs with this endeavor.

Thus far, $31,100,000 has been awarded to COEs for Coordination grants:

- In 2022–23, 41 COEs were awarded a Coordination Grant totaling $13,950,000.
- In 2023–24, 52 COEs were awarded a Coordination Grant totaling $17,150,000.

Between the coordination grants to COEs, R-TAC contracts leading regional support networks, and the S-TAC's leadership contract in this statewide system of CCSPP support all LEAs in California have a support system helping with the implementation of California's community school model. Future implementation grantees and existing planning and implementation grantees are supported to realize the goals of the Framework, which includes the Four Pillars of Community Schools in statute and other critical implementation priorities.

Conclusions

This inaugural report demonstrates the initial and potential impact of the CCSPP as a once-in-a-generation program that could transform public education outcomes. The initial findings from the 2020 Community Schools cohort survey results show notable improvements in community school practices observed across the entire grantee cohort. All grantees showed meaningful improvement in their collaborative leadership and practices for educators and administrators. At the school level, meaningful change was observed for all Four Pillars of Community School implementation, and numerous items across pillars—such as family supports and student and family access to integrated services— demonstrated significant improvement even as schools struggled to stabilize in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. While the proof of impact will be forthcoming as we analyze 2020 cohort outcome data over the course of full program implementation, initial indicators are positive and signal confidence in the CCSPP's potential, particularly as it was scaled in 2021 and 2022.

This report also describes how the CCSPP has been implemented at scale across California with fidelity to the statutory equity priorities in the planning and implementation grant cycles as well as the statewide system for technical assistance. The completion of five grant cycles that meet statutory intent as well as the construction of a robust technical assistance program indicate that the CCSPP is in full implementation. With more than 1,400 planning and implementation grantees awarded across the state spanning the geographic, school type, and regional diversity of our state while maintaining the statutory equity priorities, the CCSPP has set the foundation to meet the racial justice and school transformation vision that drove this investment and established our program. Future evaluations will include student outcome measures. The CDE will share a more expansive formative evaluation that includes the 2021 and 2022 implementation grant cohorts in the December 2024 report.

Appendix

California Community Schools Partnership Program

Findings From the Pre-Post Assessment of the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund Cohort

Ashley Boal
Taylor Gara
Justine Zimiles

June 2023

Suggested citation:

Boal, Ashley, Taylor Gara, and Justine Zimiles. *California Community Schools Partnership Program: Findings from the Pre-Post Assessment of the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund Cohort*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd, 2023.

WestEd is a nonpartisan, nonprofit agency that conducts and applies research, develops evidence-based solutions, and provides services and resources in the realms of education, human development, and related fields, with the end goal of improving outcomes and ensuring equity for individuals from infancy through adulthood. For more information, visit WestEd.org. For regular updates on research, free resources, solutions, and job postings from WestEd, subscribe to the E-Bulletin, our semimonthly e-newsletter, at WestEd.org/subscribe.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Community schools utilize a school improvement model that integrates traditional academic school supports with those from community partners and local government agencies (e.g., physical health, mental health, parent education) to support the whole child and their families. Schools utilizing this model seek to remove barriers to accessing critical resources so that students and families have the supports they need to thrive. Community schools typically do this by focusing on four evidence-informed programmatic features known as the Four Pillars of Community Schools (California Department of Education [CDE] 2020; CDE 2022; Partnership for the Future of Learning n.d.):

- **Integrated Support Services**: Initiatives, programs, and activities that support student success including the accessibility of physical health, mental health, social–emotional, academic, and social services. This involves early intervention and screening, coordination of services among county and local education agencies (LEAs), professional development, service contracts, and planning time.

- **Family and Community Engagement**: Building, maintaining, and strengthening relationships with families and community members. This includes acquiring collective wisdom from families and the community in forming authentic, trusting relationships to inform decision-making and promote engagement. Activities include professional development for administrators, teachers, and staff; programming to build and strengthen relationships; home visits; community partnerships; and family events.

- **Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators**: Professional development and activities that establish a culture of shared responsibility among students, families, and community members. This includes bolstering supports and developing a shared vision of community schooling, including assets and needs assessments; training and planning meetings with staff, community members, and local organizations and institutions; partnerships with community-based organizations; and continuous refinement of the community school strategy.

- **Extended Learning Time and Opportunities**: Before and after school programs, including summer programs and school-day learning that enrich curriculum through community-based learning. Examples of student opportunities include tutoring, mentoring, arts integration, job training, and

internships. Supports and activities for educators and staff include stipends and planning time to acquire deeper learning strategies and pedagogies and enhance coordination.

California Community Schools Partnership Program (CCSPP)

The California Community Schools Partnership Program (CCSPP) was originally appropriated through the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund, California Senate Bill 820 Chapter 110, and the Budget Act of 2020. This original appropriation provided $45 million in funds to the ESSER iteration of CCSPP, which was built on three assumptions (CDE 2020):

1. The COVID-19 pandemic has created additional barriers to learning by worsening challenges related to poverty, such as food insecurity, housing and employment instability, and inadequate health care.

2. Community schools use a valuable approach to integrate education, health, and mental health services and efficiently deliver these services to students affected by COVID-19.

3. Community schools that provide integrated supports, cultivate community partnerships, and provide expanded learning opportunities will help mitigate trauma and loss of learning related to COVID-19.

Additionally, considering the disruptions to both education and service access due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the pandemic's disproportional impact on disadvantaged students, the ESSER iteration of CCSPP sought to support vulnerable students and their families.

As outlined in the CDE's RFA, grant funding could be used to expand and sustain existing community schools; coordinate and provide health, mental health, and support services to students and families; and deliver training and support for staff to develop best practices by integrating student supports into their schools (CDE 2020). These funds were intended to provide a mechanism to bolster services and supports at schools currently operating using a community schools model to increase physical health, mental health, and student support services, as well as train staff to better integrate student supports and social–emotional learning (SEL).

In February 2021, the CDE awarded 20 grants to 19 local education agencies (LEAs) to support community school implementation. The 19 grantees included County Offices of Education (COEs; 26.3 percent), districts (47.4 percent), and single sites (26.3 percent). Each grantee supported 1 to 73 school sites depending on the scope and structure of their grant. Grantees were located in geographically diverse locations across the state

and represented varied locale types, including large cities, midsize cities, suburbs, and rural areas.

This cohort (herein referred to as the CCSPP ESSER Cohort) had the opportunity to obligate grant funds to improve their community schools from March 13, 2020, through September 30, 2022. Thus, the CCSPP ESSER Cohort implemented grant activities as schools continued to grapple with the impacts of COVID-19, including fluctuations in remote versus in-person instruction; ongoing health concerns for staff, students, and families; and the economic repercussions of the pandemic for many families. Additionally, it is important to note that the CCSPP ESSER Cohort predated the release of the California Community Schools Framework (2022). Thus, the framework was not available as a resource to guide grantee and school practices during the grant period.

Methodology

WestEd developed online surveys for lead grantee agencies (herein referred to as grantees) and school sites that received an ESSER-funded CCSPP grant. The Grantee Survey was administered to 19 grantees[1] and the School Survey was administered to the participating school sites associated with each grantee. The pre-survey was administered in the fall of 2021 and the post-survey was administered in the fall of 2022. To analyze the survey data, WestEd conducted descriptive and inferential analyses to detect changes over time in programmatic outcomes supported by the ESSER-funded CCSPP grant. Additionally, WestEd conducted a thematic content analysis of open-ended items to understand grant areas of focus, strengths, and needs moving forward.

Survey Development

Survey items for both the Grantee Survey and the School Survey were developed in the summer of 2021[2] based on a review of Allowable Activities and Costs listed in the RFA, as well as a literature review of community school practices (e.g., Institute for Educational Leadership 2017; Johnston et al. 2022; Partnership for the Future of Learning n.d.). The RFA prioritized activities related to the Four Pillars of Community Schools and responses to COVID-19. As described previously, the Four Pillars of Community Schools include: Integrated Support Services; Family and Community Engagement; Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators; and Extended Learning Time and Opportunities.

WestEd constructed a series of items representing the implementation of each community school pillar at the grantee and school level. Each survey was organized into the following sections: Partnership and Cross-System Coordination; Planning and Operations; Supports and Services; and Implementation and Programmatic Goals. The section Implementation and Programmatic Goals was comprised of open-ended questions (e.g., *As the lead grantee agency, what is your primary focus in supporting the CCSPP sites?*). Most other sections were comprised of 4-point Likert-scale items

1. Twenty ESSER-funded CCSPP grants were awarded to 19 grant recipients with Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) receiving two grants. LAUSD was asked to complete one grantee-level survey.

2. The CCSPP ESSER Cohort and the surveys developed for this evaluation predate the release of the California Community Schools Framework (2022). Thus, the framework did not inform the development of survey items.

(1 = *Not at All*; 2 = *Small Extent*; 3 = *Moderate Extent*; 4 = *Large Extent*) with *Not Yet but Planning to*, and *Don't Know* response options. However, one section in the School Survey measured responses using a dichotomous *Yes* or *No* scale, with *Don't Know* and *Not Yet but Planning to* response options.

The Grantee and School Surveys covered the same topics but were designed with unique items to represent how programs and practices vary across the two levels of implementation. For example, the Grantee Survey had a stronger focus on coordination and guidance and inquired about providing resources and professional learning opportunities. In contrast, the School Survey dealt with the extent to which community schools had the necessary resources, supports, and planning time to engage in activities. For example, the School Survey included 15 items used to assess if community schools have contracts in place with community partners and agencies to offer a variety of support services. The School Survey also asked about specific student supports and family engagement activities ideally offered by community schools.

The pre- (Fall 2021) and post- (Fall 2022) survey items were identical for both the Grantee and School Surveys, except for two open-ended items specific to the COVID-19 pandemic that were included in the pre-surveys and omitted in the post-surveys. Additionally, multiple versions of the Grantee Survey were created to collect information from each type of LEA that received an ESSER-funded CCSPP grant. Although the content remained the same across survey versions, the language in each survey was tailored for LEAs that operated as COEs, school districts, or single sites.

Survey Administration

WestEd administered the Grantee and School Surveys to CCSPP ESSER Cohort grantees and school sites at two time points, Fall 2021 and Fall 2022. The surveys were administered via Qualtrics, an online survey platform, and invitations were distributed via email. Outreach was conducted by both the CDE and WestEd to ensure a high rate of participation. Pre-surveys were administered between September 10 and November 1, 2021, and post-surveys were administered between October 3, 2022, and January 10, 2023. Grantee directors were asked to complete the Grantee Survey and facilitate the completion of the School Survey by the person most familiar with the CCSPP at each school site.

Participants

One pre- and post-survey was submitted by the grantee director or the individuals the grantee director assigned to complete the survey for all 19 grantees, representing a 100 percent response rate at both time points. Grantees were instructed to ask the person

most familiar with CCSPP at each school site to complete the School Survey. In some cases, school sites submitted more than one survey response inadvertently (e.g., two people independently completed the survey for their school). Duplicate responses were dealt with to prioritize the most complete responses, followed by the fewest "Don't Know" responses, and finally most recent responses. This process resulted in pre-survey responses from 150 of 206 schools (a 73 percent response rate) and post-survey responses from 143 of 206 sites (a 69 percent response rate).

Analysis

Community School Pillars Scale Construction

Survey items were categorized into four domains (i.e., scales) that represented the implementation of each of the Four Pillars of Community Schools in practice. Items measured the extent to which practices were implemented on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = *Not at All*; 2 = *Small Extent*; 3 = *Moderate Extent*; 4 = *Large Extent*) The response option *Not Yet but Planning to* was coded as a "1," equivalent to a *Not at All* response. The response option *Don't Know* was coded as missing.

Scale reliability and internal consistency analyses were conducted for each scale using the final analytic sample. Cronbach's alpha (α) was used to confirm that the items comprising each scale were highly correlated and represented single constructs. The alpha values for each scale ranged between 0.78 and 0.92. These values indicate that there is a high level of internal consistency among the items in each scale (Tavakol and Dennick 2011). The tables below display Cronbach's alpha for each scale for the Grantee and School Surveys, respectively. Additionally, the Appendix includes tables that display all items included in each scale.

Grantee Survey, Four Pillars of Community Schools Scale Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)

Scale	Number of items	Pre-survey alpha (α)	Post-survey alpha (α)
Integrated Support Services	15	0.80	0.91
Family and Community Engagement	8	0.79	0.82
Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators	12	0.84	0.82
Extended Learning Time and Opportunities	6	0.86	0.85

School Survey, Four Pillars of Community Schools Scale Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)

Scale	Number of items	Pre-survey alpha (α)	Post-survey alpha (α)
Integrated Support Services	24	0.92	0.91
Family and Community Engagement	14	0.88	0.88
Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators	19	0.91	0.91
Extended Learning Time and Opportunities	11	0.82	0.78

Although most items were organized into scales, it is important to note that 15 items from the School Survey relevant to the Integrated Support Services pillar were analyzed independently as they used different response options (*Yes, No, Not Yet but Planning to*, and *Don't Know*). *Not Yet but Planning to* responses were treated as *No* responses and *Don't Know* responses were treated as missing data for the analysis of these items.

Missing Data

Because the analysis focuses on pre-post change, cases were omitted from inferential analyses if both a pre- and post-survey were not available. With this stipulation, 19 grantees (100 percent of CCSPP ESSER Cohort grantees) and 136 schools (66 percent of CCSPP ESSER Cohort schools) were eligible for inclusion in the analytic sample. However, not every grantee and school answered every survey question. Thus, WestEd conducted a three-phase sensitivity analysis to understand the extent of missing data for partial responses and the impact of missing data on the pattern of results.

The first phase used all data, regardless of the number of missing items. The second phase limited the sample to respondents who answered at least 80 percent of survey items and used mean imputation to impute missing values. The third phase limited the sample to respondents who answered at least 80 percent of the survey items and 80 percent of the items within a given scale and used mean imputation to impute missing values. Next, WestEd conducted paired samples *t*-tests for each community school pillar at the grantee and school level for the analytic sample created through each phase of the sensitivity analysis. Significant findings and effect sizes of each pillar were similar at each phase of the sensitivity analysis. Due to the consistency in findings, we opted to retain all cases with pre-post data for the analyses. This resulted in a final analytic sample of 19 grantees and 136 schools.

Given that some responses have missing data at the pre- or post-survey, sample sizes varied for each item-level paired samples *t*-test at the school level, as a response for a given item at both time points was required to be included in the analysis for the respective item. For example, sample sizes for significant items within each scale ranged from 75–135 schools in the Integrated Support Services scale, 106–133 schools in the Family and Community Engagement scale, 120–136 schools in the Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators scale, and 112–133 schools in the Extended Learning Time and Opportunities scale. Sample sizes for significant items with *Yes* or *No* response options ranged from 92-130 schools.

Analysis and Reporting

First, WestEd conducted descriptive analyses (e.g., the calculation of frequencies and means) to examine the distribution of the data. Next, WestEd developed scale scores for each community school pillar, calculated as the average (mean) of all items belonging to the corresponding scale, followed by a paired samples *t*-test for each scale. A paired samples *t*-test is appropriate for samples where the respondent provides data at both time points. In addition, WestEd calculated effect sizes to determine the magnitude of the change that occurred during the grant period. Effect sizes are a practical, standardized way to measure and interpret change over time (Lakins 2013). In accordance with the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), *What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook, Version 5.0*, both significance values and effect sizes should be interpreted to determine the influence of a particular program (IES 2022). In this report, *p*-values less than 0.05 are interpreted as statistically significant. In addition, we refer to effect sizes as small ($d = 0.20$), medium ($d = 0.50$), and large ($d = 0.80$; Lakins 2013). Items with a dichotomous *Yes* or *No* response options were analyzed using McNemar's chi-square statistic for paired samples (Cummings and McKnight 2004). Effects sizes were not calculated for items with dichotomous outcomes are they are intended for interpreting mean differences rather than proportions.

WestEd then conducted post-hoc analyses of each scale that was statistically significant and/or yielded a medium-to-large effect size. This included calculating summary statistics (e.g., means and frequencies) and paired samples *t*-tests for each item that comprised a scale. These post-hoc analyses allowed for further investigation into each scale to determine which individual items underwent the greatest growth between the two time points. These analyses were conducted separately for the Grantee and School Surveys.

Additionally, open-ended responses underwent a content analysis to identify key themes and exemplary quotes shared by survey respondents to explain CCSPP

implementation, strengths, and needs moving forward from the perspective of those directly involved.

Findings

The following section presents findings from the CCSPP ESSER Cohort's Grantee and School Surveys. This section begins with an overview of how the CCSPP ESSER Cohort grantees and school sites focused their efforts during the grant period. Next, findings highlighting changes from the beginning to the end of the grant are organized by the Four Pillars of Community Schools incorporated in the RFA (CDE 2020): Integrated Support Services, Family and Community Engagement, Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators, and Extended Learning Time and Opportunities. In many cases, statistically significant changes and/or medium effect sizes were observed only at the school level. Thus, much of this section focuses on findings observed from the School Survey. A complete list of Grantee and School Survey items, including the distribution of all responses to each item can be found in the Appendix. This section concludes with an overview of grantee and school site perceptions of their strengths, as well as additional supports and resources they believe are needed to continue moving their community school efforts forward.

Grant Areas of Focus

Although the CCSPP ESSER Cohort surveys do not provide a complete picture of the activities supported by grant funds, grantees and school sites highlighted their primary areas of focus for the grant via an open-ended survey item.

Grantee Level

Across grantees, five common areas of emphasis for their CCSPP ESSER grant surfaced:

- Cultivating a deeper understanding of what it means to be a community school
- Initiating and strengthening school-community partnerships
- Coordinating services for students and families
- Building capacity
- Addressing the impact of COVID-19 on students, staff, and families

Cultivating a Deeper Understanding of Community Schools

Grantees reported activities to increase their overall understanding of what it means to be a community school. Some did this through conducting site-based meetings or monthly network meetings for staff and partners. Others did this through one-on-one

work with principals to strengthen their commitment and belief in the value of community schools, with the goal of initiating a ripple effect throughout the community.

> *[Our primary focus has been] supporting sites in building a deeper understanding of the transformational aspects of being a community school and how to move beyond transactional work related to the 4 pillars.*
>
> *-Grantee*

Initiating and Strengthening School–Community Partnerships

Grantees described using grant resources to build bridges between schools and community partners to meet the varied needs of students and families. One grantee explained this process as "reassessing the needs of the school communities, refining our action items to best support those needs, and implementing the actions in a responsive, sustainable manner … includ[ing] … ongoing collaboration with sites and community partners." Activities to build and strengthen partnerships focused on cultivating paid and no-cost partnerships and developing memorandums of understanding (MOUs), particularly those focused on supports related to COVID-19, behavioral health, school climate, and attendance.

Coordinating Services for Students and Families

Related, almost all grantees discussed building out a coordinated service delivery system. In developing a continuum of services for children, families, and community members, some grantees focused on initiating a structured COST. Others sought to ensure student and family access to safe, supportive, and equitable educational and social–emotional programs by opening up and connecting with existing community resource centers and student support centers. Strategies to support coordinated service delivery included integration with existing initiatives (e.g., multi-tiered systems of support [MTSS]), adding support staff (e.g., mental health counselors), and the use of wraparound services. One grantee provided a useful example of using grant funds to open and operate campus wellness centers, build referral pathways tailored to each site, expand access to mental health and wellness services and supports, and develop partnerships with community agencies.

Building Capacity

Though less common, several grantees reported investing time and energy into providing professional development opportunities for school sites, consortium members, and staff. Professional development topics included strategies to improve attendance and behavioral and mental health outcomes. Others sought to train school sites on providing culturally responsive, trauma-informed and healing-centered services and interventions.

Addressing COVID-19's Impact on Students, Staff, and Families

Lastly, several grantees emphasized COVID-19's impact on their staff, students, and families and their focus on navigating the multiple phases of the pandemic as their greatest area of focus. In moving from remote learning to in-person learning and having to adapt to changing health guidelines and community organization closures, grantees used CCSPP ESSER funds to focus on the evolving needs of students and families.

School Level

According to survey responses, school sites supported by CCSPP ESSER funds focused on providing various types of support for students, families, and the larger school community.

Student Supports

Surveyed schools focused on integrating community supports at their school sites, specifically supports that address growing student mental health needs, prioritize social–emotional needs, and provide behavioral supports in alignment with Positive Behavioral Intervention Systems (PBIS). Example supports made possible with grant funds include expanded and enriched learning opportunities, such as yoga and self-defense, and supports to mitigate COVID-19-related learning loss, such as those focused on academics and attendance.

Family Supports

School sites dedicated resources to engaging parents, establishing partnerships to secure sustainable services that meet families' basic needs, and providing social emotional supports for families in the aftermath of COVID-19's onset. School sites focused on securing sustainable services like obtaining referrals for medical and mental health supports; operating free stores for items like hygiene products, clothing, and food; and providing housing and rental assistance.

[Our school focused on] getting our families from … a place where they are trying to survive to where they are thriving via wraparound services and intentional family-geared programming.

-School

School Staff Supports

Many school sites described prioritizing the formation and implementation of systems for staff development and professional learning. The focus of staff development and professional learning tended to center on two topics: (1) addressing the well-being of staff and teachers given the difficulties they faced in supporting students and families during the pandemic, and (2) providing staff with the knowledge and skills needed to conduct and use needs and assets assessments.

Cultivating Trusting Relationships

Throughout all the aforementioned areas of focus, community building and cultivating trusting relationships was a core theme. For example, schools described school staff and teachers making it a priority to check in with students daily, building a sense of team and belonging among the various community school interest holders, and nurturing positive relationships of trust and a culture of shared responsibility with staff and families. One school site aptly summed up this focus as "building relationships with students and parents … and being a trusting individual to [the] school community."

Areas of Growth Over the Grant Period

To understand outcomes associated with participating in the CCSPP ESSER Cohort, the evaluation examined pre-post survey data to identify areas of growth during the grant period related to each of the Four Pillars of Community Schools. Findings related to each pillar are described below and organized to highlight findings at the grantee level followed by the school level.

Integrated Support Services

Grantee Level

At the grantee level, the Integrated Support Services domain did not undergo a significant change between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 ($p = 0.56$) and a small, positive effect size of 0.14 was observed (see below). The average response to items in this domain stayed relatively constant between the two time points with most grantees' self-reporting engagement in activities, programs, and initiatives related to Integrated Support Services to a *Moderate Extent.*

Lead Grantee Agencies: Integrated Support Services Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.32	0.59
Fall 2022	3.42	0.53

P-value = 0.557, Effect size = 0.14

School Level

At the school level, Integrated Support Services underwent a statistically significant increase between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 ($p < 0.001$) with a small to medium, positive effect size ($d = 0.31$; see below). The average response to items in this domain increased by 0.14 points, with schools' self-ratings falling into the *Moderate Extent* category on average.

Schools: Integrated Support Services Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.34	0.43
Fall 2022	3.48	0.38

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.31

Across the Integrated Support Services domain, 14 of the 25 items significantly increased between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 (see below). Small-to-medium effect sizes were observed among these items, ranging from 0.18 to 0.40. Mean differences between the two time points for all significant items in this domain ranged from 0.10 to 0.47 points.

The largest changes included the extent to which students have access to *dental* (*p* < 0.001; *d* = 0.40), *legal* (*p* = 0.01; *d* = 0.32), and *medical services* (*p* < 0.001; *d* = 0.31) *if long-term school closures go into effect* (see below).

Integrated Support Services, School Sites: Averages of Statistically Significant Items Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

If long-term school closures go into effect again, please rate to what extent students will have access to ...

Medical Services

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.83	0.94
Fall 2022	3.20	0.94

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.31

Dental services

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.63	0.92
Fall 2022	3.09	0.97

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.40

Mobility/housing/homelessness services

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.92	0.98
Fall 2022	3.18	0.86

P-value = 0.02, Effect size = 0.23

Legal services

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.47	1.13
Fall 2022	2.85	1.05

P=value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.32

Attendance supports/dropout prevention

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.21	0.92
Fall 2022	3.46	0.70

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.23

Tutoring

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.10	0.96
Fall 2022	3.33	0.81

P-value = 0.03, Effect size = 0.20

An additional area where larger effects were observed was for the item assessing the extent to which s*tudents and families use our community schools' mental health services and supports* ($p < 0.001$; $d = 0.31$; see below).

***Please rate** to what extent your community school engages in the following planning and operations supports.*

Our school maintains a list of community partners and shares it with students, families, teachers, and staff.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.02	0.94
Fall 2022	3.31	0.89

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.24

Our school offers professional learning opportunities for staff and related partners to address students' needs related to the COVID-19 crisis.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.22	0.82
Fall 2022	3.39	0.76

P-value = 0.05, Effect size = 0.19

Students and families use our community schools' mental health services and supports.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.29	0.83
Fall 2022	3.58	0.71

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.31

All students have access to educational technology (e.g., hardware, software, connectivity) that aids interactions between students and their classroom instructors.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.81	0.43
Fall 2022	3.91	0.31

P-value = 0.02, Effect size = 0.20

Students from low-income families have access to educational technology that aids interactions between students and their classroom instructors.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.78	0.48
Fall 2022	3.89	0.32

P-value = 0.02, Effect size = 0.21

Students with disabilities have access to technology (e.g., assistive technology or adaptive equipment) that aids interactions with their teachers.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.77	0.55
Fall 2022	3.87	0.33

P-value = 0.04, Effect size = 0.19

Our educators have enough resources to assess students' progress and determine how to meet their indicated needs.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.34	0.78
Fall 2022	3.50	0.63

P-value = 0.04, Effect size = 0.18

Our community school implements a COST for students.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.30	1.00
Fall 2022	3.52	0.76

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.24

Analyses revealed a significant increase in the proportion of schools that put a contract in place for 10 of the 15 support services assessed (see below). For the services in which significant differences were identified, increases in executing contracts (i.e., responding *Yes*) with community partners and agencies between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 ranged from 7 to 21 percentage points across each type of service. The largest percentage point changes included contracts to provide family centers, medical services, and legal services. Executing contracts for early screening and intervention, dental services, mentoring, attendance support/dropout prevention, and transportation services did not undergo a significant change.

Schools: Contracts with Community Partners and Agencies: Frequencies of Statistically Significant Items between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Does your community school have contracts with community partners and agencies to provide the following supports?

Early childhood care/Education (e.g., childcare, Early Head Start, Head Start)

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	51	49
Fall 2022	62	38

P-value = 0.03

Medical

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	65	35
Fall 2022	81	19

P-value = 0.002

Mental health

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	87	13
Fall 2022	94	6

P-value = 0.03

Nutrition services

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	78	22
Fall 2022	87	13

P-value = 0.03

Social services

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	75	25
Fall 2022	84	16

P-value = 0.03

Mobility/housing/homelessness services

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	65	35
Fall 2022	78	22

P-value = 0.009

Family Centers

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	50	50
Fall 2022	71	29

P-value = <0.001

Crime prevention

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	39	61
Fall 2022	50	50

P-value = 0.03

Violence prevention/Trauma services

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	60	40
Fall 2022	70	30

P-value = 0.04

Legal services

Survey	Yes (%)	No (%)
Fall 2021	30	70
Fall 2022	48	52

P-value = 0.004

Family and Community Engagement

Grantee Level

At the grantee level, the Family and Community Engagement domain did not undergo a significant change between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 ($p = 0.78$), with an effect size close to zero ($d = $ -0.06; see below). The average response to items in this scale were consistent between the two time points with most grantees self-reporting engagement in activities, programs, and initiatives related to Family and Community Engagement to a *Moderate Extent*.

Lead Grantee Agencies: Family and Community Engagement Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.37	0.45
Fall 2022	3.34	0.48

P-value = 0.783, Effect size = -0.06

School Level

At the school level, Family and Community Engagement underwent a statistically significant increase between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 ($p <0.001$) with a small to medium, positive effect size of 0.28 (see below). The average response to items in this domain increased by 0.16 points, with self-ratings falling into the *Moderate Extent* category on average.

Schools: Family and Community Engagement Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.94	0.57
Fall 2022	3.10	0.54

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.28

Across the Family and Community Engagement domain, a significant increase was observed for 8 of the 14 items between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 (see below). Small-to-medium effect sizes were observed among these items, ranging from 0.18 to 0.46. Mean differences between the two time points for all significant items in this domain ranged from 0.17 to 0.44 points.

The largest differences included the extent to which the following supports are available to students and families: *Job search and preparation* ($p < 0.001$; $d = 0.46$), *Physical health* ($p < 0.001$; $d = 0.35$), *Reading and math skills* ($p < 0.001$; $d = 0.33$), and *Access to legal services* ($p < 0.001$; $d = 0.32$).

Family and Community Engagement, School Sites: Averages of Statistically Significant Items Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Please rate to what extent your community school engages in the following supports and services for students and families.

Our services and supports are culturally and linguistically responsive.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.41	0.70
Fall 2022	3.58	0.62

P-value = 0.02, Effect size = 0.22

Please rate to what extent your community school offers events that provide supports to students and families in the following areas.

Reading and math skills

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.66	1.05
Fall 2022	3.06	0.99

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.33

Digital literacy

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.62	1.00
Fall 2022	2.85	0.94

P-value = 0.04, Effect size = 0.18

Job search and preparation services

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	1.90	0.89
Fall 2022	2.33	1.05

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.46

Access to legal services

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	1.86	1.06
Fall 2022	2.17	1.03

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.32

Language supports

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.93	1.07
Fall 2022	3.18	0.90

P-value = 0.02, Effect size = 0.21

Social and emotional skills

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.09	0.92
Fall 2022	3.35	0.87

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.24

Physical health

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.63	1.03
Fall 2022	3.06	0.86

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.35

Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators

Grantee Level

Growth in Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 did not reach statistical significance ($p = 0.07$) among grantees. However, a medium effect size of 0.44 was observed for this domain (see below). In addition, the average response to items in this domain increased by 0.28 points. Thus, item-level post-hoc analyses were conducted.

Lead Grantee Agencies: Collaborative Leadership Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.15	0.54
Fall 2022	3.43	0.40

P-value = 0.071, Effect size = 0.44

Across the Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators domain, 2 of the 12 items underwent a significant increase between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 (see below). Overall, grantees self-reported improvements for the following activities to build capacity for planning and operations across school sites: *Facilitating regularly scheduled meetings (at least monthly) with Community School Leadership Teams, including developing agendas and recording meeting minutes* ($p = 0.02$; $d = 0.62$), and *Offering support for the development of memoranda of understanding and data sharing agreements between districts and schools and their partners* ($p = 0.03$; $d = 0.56$). Both items had effect sizes over 0.50, with mean differences between the two time points ranging from 0.48 to 0.68 points.

Collaborative Leadership and Practices, Lead Grantee Agencies: Averages of Statistically Significant Items Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Please rate to what extent your grantee agency offers the following services to build capacity for planning and operations across school sites.

Facilitating regularly scheduled meetings (at least monthly) with Community School Leadership Teams, including developing agendas and recording meeting minutes.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.63	1.16
Fall 2022	3.32	0.75

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.62

Support for the development of memoranda of understanding and data sharing agreements between districts/schools and their partners.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.16	0.90
Fall 2022	3.63	0.50

P-value = 0.02, Effect size = 0.56

School Level

At the school level, the Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators domain underwent a statistically significant increase between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 ($p < 0.001$) with a small to medium, positive effect size ($d = 0.37$; see below). The average response to items in this domain increased by 0.21 points, with average self-ratings falling into the *Moderate Extent* category.

Schools: Collaborative Leadership Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.14	0.55
Fall 2022	3.35	0.48

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.37

Across the Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators domain, 12 of the 19 items underwent a significant increase between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 (see below). Small-to-medium effect sizes were observed among these items, ranging from 0.18 to 0.39. Items with the largest changes with effect sizes upwards of 0.40 included the extent to which schools engage in the following activities to support collaborative leadership practices: *Our school works with health professionals,*

governmental agencies, community service organizations, and/or other entities to improve student outcomes (p <0.001; d = 0.39); *Our school and partners engage in data collection, sharing, and analysis for continuous program improvement* (p < 0.001; d = 0.38); *An assessment of school and community strengths and needs is conducted regularly to identify areas of success and areas needing growth* (p < 0.001; d = 0.38); *Our school brings together school staff and partners to support capacity building (e.g., professional learning)* (p < 0.001; d = 0.37). Mean differences between the two time points for all significant items in this domain ranged from 0.17 to 0.47 points.

Collaborative Leadership and Practices, School Sites: Averages of Statistically Significant Items Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Please rate to what extent the following statements reflect your community school practices.

Our school works with health professionals, governmental agencies, community service organizations, and/or other entities to improve student outcomes.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.26	0.82
Fall 2022	3.59	0.56

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.39

Our school brings together school staff and partners to support capacity building (e.g., professional learning).

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.27	0.72
Fall 2022	3.59	0.61

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.37

Our school coordinates with state and local agencies to prevent, prepare for, and respond to COVID-19.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.53	0.74
Fall 2022	3.71	0.56

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.24

Our Community School Leadership Team includes the principal, teachers and school staff, school health and mental health professionals, parents and guardians, students, and community partners.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.11	1.05
Fall 2022	3.45	0.79

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.28

Our school and partners engage in data collection, sharing, and analysis for continuous program improvement.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.89	0.98
Fall 2022	3.32	0.73

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.38

Our community school initiatives, services, and programs align with our Local Control Accountability Plan's (LCAP) implementation, monitoring tools, and metrics.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.49	0.80
Fall 2022	3.67	0.57

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.23

An assessment of school and community strengths and needs is conducted regularly to identify areas of success and areas needing growth.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.04	0.98
Fall 2022	3.41	0.76

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.38

To respond to the COVID-19 crisis, our school has a shared vision of goals, desired results, and indicators of progress.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.28	0.85
Fall 2022	3.45	0.78

P-value = 0.05, Effect size = 0.18

Our Community School Leadership Team has effectively created a Community School Action Plan.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.73	1.22
Fall 2022	3.21	0.99

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.35

Our Community School Leadership Team effectively monitors and prioritizes action steps and needs.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.91	1.14
Fall 2022	3.33	0.88

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.32

Our Community School Leadership Team meets regularly (at least monthly), develops meeting agendas, and disseminates meeting notes.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.15	1.07
Fall 2022	3.40	0.91

P-value = 0.03, Effect size = 0.20

Parents and guardians regularly participate in our Community School Leadership Team meetings.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.29	1.12
Fall 2022	2.67	1.00

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.30

Extended Learning Time and Opportunities

Grantee Level

At the grantee level, the Extended Learning Time and Opportunities domain did not undergo a significant change between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 ($p = 0.27$), and a small, positive effect size was observed ($d = 0.26$; see below). The average response to items in this domain increased by 0.18 points, remaining relatively constant between the two time points with grantees reporting that they engaged in activities, programs, and initiatives related to Extended Learning Time and Opportunities to a *Moderate Extent* on average*.*

Lead Grantee Agencies: Extended Learning Time and Opportunities Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.07	0.78
Fall 2022	3.25	0.68

P-value = 0.270, Effect size = 0.26

School Level

At the school level, Extended Learning Time and Opportunities underwent a statistically significant increase between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 ($p < 0.001$) with a medium, positive effect size of 0.53 (see below). The average response to items in this domain increased by 0.31 points, with average self-ratings falling into the *Moderate Extent* category.

Schools: Extended Learning Time and Opportunities Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.91	0.60
Fall 2022	3.22	0.49

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.53

Across the Extended Learning Time and Opportunities domain, 8 of the 11 items underwent a significant increase between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 (see the tables below Small-to-medium effect sizes were observed among these items, ranging from 0.25 to 0.54. Mean differences between the two time points for all significant items in this domain ranged from 0.26 to 0.70 points.

The largest changes included the extent to which schools offered students *Summer and/or weekend learning programs* ($p < 0.001$; $d = 0.54$) and *Supplemental afterschool programs* ($p < 0.001$; $d = 0.50$). In addition, the item, *School-day learning and expanded learning time programs and activities are well-coordinated*, emerged as a top area of growth among school leaders ($p < 0.001$, $d = 0.44$).

Extended Learning Time and Opportunities, School Sites: Averages of Statistically Significant Items Between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Please rate to what extent your community school offers students the following enrichment and developmental activities.

Mentoring

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.79	1.09
Fall 2022	3.05	1.04

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.25

Arts integration

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.78	0.99
Fall 2022	3.14	0.81

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.35

Job training, job shadowing, internships, apprenticeships, and/or service-learning opportunities

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	1.95	1.06
Fall 2022	2.21	1.16

P-value = 0.01, Effect size = 0.26

Summer and/or weekend learning opportunities and programs

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.46	1.13
Fall 2022	3.15	0.96

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.54

Supplemental afterschool programs

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.98	0.98
Fall 2022	3.50	0.78

P-value - <0.001, Effect size = 0.50

Extended Learning Time and Opportunities, School Sites: Averages of Statistically Significant Items between Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

Please rate to what extent your community school engages in the following supports and services for students and families.

School-day learning and expanded learning time programs and activities are well-coordinated.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.20	0.89
Fall 2022	3.59	0.57

P-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.44

Our educators use project-based learning strategies that connect to real world experiences.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	2.92	0.89
Fall 2022	3.18	0.84

P-value = 0.002, Effect size = 0.36

Our educators have enough resources to plan, coordinate, and execute expanded learning time activities.

Survey	Mean	SD
Fall 2021	3.08	0.90
Fall 2022	3.39	0.66

p-value = <0.001, Effect size = 0.36

Perceived Strengths

In addition to the survey items asking grantees and schools to rate the extent to which various practices were in place, the post-survey also included an open-ended item asking respondents to reflect on their biggest strengths in supporting their community schools.

Grantee Level

In general, grantees responded that their biggest strengths were very aligned with the areas of focus for their grant as described earlier in this report. These strengths tended to fall into the following categories:

- Supporting staff and the larger school community to increase "the collective community school IQ" about what it means to be a community school.

- Building and expanding partnerships, particularly related to expanded learning, health services, whole-person care, and wraparound services.

- Coordinating services for students and families with several grantees specifically highlighting their robust mental health supports, such as increasing the number of quality behavioral and social–emotional student supports offered.

- Providing training and professional development to staff, including Community School Managers, Family Liaisons, and Case Managers on varied topics such as culturally responsive practices.

- Using a relationship-centered approach to meet people where they were at, especially during parent engagement initiatives.

- Creating a full-time Community School Coordinator position to engage in collaborative leadership, share decision-making, and build the trust needed to identify needs in the community.

- Developing a culture of continuous improvement grounded in data.

Additionally, numerous grantees explained that the community schools model served as a strength when navigating the COVID-19 pandemic. The practices and partnerships in place allowed them to be responsive to changing family and school needs, and the model was conducive to the coordination of critical services like testing and vaccines, food, and technology.

School Level

At the school level, several types of strengths emerged through survey responses. First, school sites took pride in their ability to create school environments that "embrace talking about mental health." Some did this by increasing their mental health clinician staff and others by building up and integrating mental health services and student social–emotional supports. Second, schools described strengths related to family engagement, including more purposeful efforts to solicit parent and family input to create tailored services and programs.

> *[Our school's biggest strength was to] amplify parent and student voices and encourage families to see themselves as active agents and regain their power… help them feel heard and take up space in their communities.*
>
> *-School*

Third, schools described strengths in collaborating with community organizations to provide students and families more directly with access to services. This required intentional efforts to build rapport with families, elevate student voice, and deepen trust to ensure the supports available meet the needs of those they intend to serve.

> *[Our school's biggest strength was] building the support network of sustainable resources and services for our school community within our school site while integrating a network of community relationships, resources, services, and partnerships.*
>
> *-School*

Finally, school sites referenced their strong collaborative leadership as an irreplaceable asset. One recurring theme was leadership teams' consistency in showing up and following through. Often, this dedication came from teachers and staff who had been a part of the community for years and maintained institutional knowledge of students, families, and school culture. Additionally, diversity in leadership was mentioned as a strength for a subset of schools that enabled schools to better connect with and represent the population they serve.

Additional Supports and Resources Needed

At the post-survey, grantees and schools were asked to describe additional supports and resources needed to continue supporting their community schools. Responses to this item shed light on the various supports that may be valuable to ensure continued momentum for the CCSPP ESSER Cohort and future CCSPP cohorts.

Grantee Level

Grantees consistently asked for sustained, flexible, long-term funding to maintain partnerships and programs and expand critical supports. They indicated that funding would promote equitable and sustainable practices, maintain the execution of newly created Action Plans, and continue support for programming, partnerships, and capacity-building. Flexibility of funding was described as of particular importance for rural grantees as they reported that having flexibility would allow them to be more efficient and deliver resources in a more equitable manner. Ultimately, grantees believed that stable funding would give them the ability to continue "having the space to collaborate, share learning and challenges, and be in the community as [they] navigate this work," and it would allow them to "explore sustainability models beyond CCSPP."

The funding we received has been what's truly helped us launch many of these programs and practices. Without that funding, sites wouldn't have been able to build these partnerships or explore effective new tools and strategies. In order to sustain these partnerships and practices, sites will need to find creative ways to continue funding the initiatives that were most successful.

-Grantee

Although the need for ongoing funding was described specifically, grantees also provided some detail about the ways they would use future funding if it were to become available. According to grantees, flexible and sustained funding could be used for the following:

- Development and continued operation of comprehensive wellness centers

- Partnership development and maintenance

- Collaboration across LEAs and COEs (communities of practice)

- Hiring and retaining staff

- Professional development

- Community needs and assets assessments

Aside from requests related to funding, grantees also asked for support in developing processes to ensure continuous improvement and create better alignment with other initiatives and requirements. Continuous improvement support includes things like a districtwide tool to help schools maximize resources strategically or a single data system to capture all components of implementation. Requests for support aligning community schools with existing initiatives focused on alignment with Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) and School Plans for Student Achievement (SPSAs), as well as MTSS and PBIS models.

School Level

Schools provided very consistent responses when asked about their needs moving forward. Requests for additional supports centered on the following:

- Funding and contracts

- Staff training and hiring

- Ensuring equitable access to healthcare services

- Family and community

Funding and Contracts

Similar to what was shared by grantees, the most common request was for continued funding with no expiration date. With this, school sites believed they could maintain and expand programs, including basic needs pantries and wellness centers. They could hire key staff like community schools specialists, educational community workers, mental health Counselors, outreach consultants, or the various support staff and mentor roles that help provide sustainable programming to students on campus. Continued funding would also support implementation of new partnerships. Schools also requested less restrictions on implementation and operation when using CCSPP funds.

Our schools need more state funding. The state of California has one of the world's best economies, yet we are still ranked relatively low in how we fund public education. With more money, we would be able to offer staff more competitive pay, hire more folks to provide the critical programs we need, and we would be able to enhance our existing programs. Our students and families deserve more. Community schools should also be well-funded schools.

-School

Related to contracts, some school sites requested support formalizing relationships with community-based organizations. They asked for a more streamlined MOU process to get funding and resources to students and families more easily, budgeting support, and a change in how the state funds education, more generally.

Staff Training and Hiring

School sites requested support in providing professional development for staff on topics like PBIS, anti-racism, restorative practices, and social–emotional instruction. They also asked for support and coaching for teachers around SEL and trauma-informed teaching. Additionally, school sites requested support developing the capacity of newly formed MTSS teams and in recruiting and retaining more qualified community school staff such as full-time nurses, psychiatric social workers, and pupil services and attendance counselors.

[Our school needs] training … [for] campus leadership on how not to view the Community Schools model as an add-on … but … rather a shift in the foundation of the school. It is not enough to just have a Community School Site Coordinator. The entire campus, district, and city must believe in the model … [and] it will take time for all to understand the amazing impact Community Schools can make when fully integrated to the foundation of our schools and community.

-School

Ensuring Equitable Access to Healthcare Services

Several school sites expressed the need to better understand the current landscape of Medi-Cal reimbursement so they can build out, sustain, and expand student support services. Schools also requested support in hiring quality mental health counselors who reflect the school's demographics to ensure all students receive the mental health supports that best meet their needs.

Family and Community

In the aftermath of COVID-19, many gaps in services widened, and school sites needed more supports to meet families' basic life needs. Schools requested support to increase case management services, assist with transitional supports and mental health needs, connect families to social services, and provide timely support to meet the high demand of basic family needs. Resources like clothing, hygiene products, food, and transportation like bus passes and gas cards continue to be in high demand.

Beyond support for families basic needs, school sites indicated needing additional resources to support parent education, engagement, and empowerment. Schools indicated that this support would provide parents with opportunities to assume leadership roles and have a voice in school policies and programs, overcome language barriers, and support their children academically. Schools hope to strengthen their ability to maintain effective and consistent parental involvement in school meetings, initiatives, programs, and activities. Schools also spoke to the realities of their student population and specific needs, including daycare for parenting minors or additional 1:1 tutoring services. They also requested the resources necessary for creating engaging and enriching hands-on real-world experiences for students.

Lastly, school sites requested additional resources to implement aspects of their community school. Physical space was repeatedly mentioned as one such resource—space for community partners to collaborate, support staff to work, parents to obtain much-needed resources, school sites to host workshops and other support services, and students to have better access to technology and safe spaces on difficult days.

Conclusions

The CCSPP ESSER Cohort received funding to support the expansion and sustainment of existing community schools; coordination and provision of support services for students and families; and delivery of training and support for staff to better integrate student supports into schools, with a particular emphasis on addressing needs related to the COVID-19 pandemic. This report summarizes findings from pre-post surveys of grantees and schools administered in Fall 2021 and Fall 2022.

Summary of Findings

Areas of focus for the CCSPP ESSER grant at the grantee level were strongly aligned with the priorities outlined in the RFA. Grantees reported focusing their efforts on cultivating a deeper understanding of community schools, initiating and strengthening school–community partnerships, coordinating services for students and families, building capacity, and addressing the impact of COVID-19. Schools participating in the CCSPP ESSER Cohort focused on coordination and direct delivery of student, family, and school staff supports, and cultivating trusting relationships over the grant period.

Over the one-year period where pre-post change was assessed via the Grantee Survey and the School Survey, several notable improvements in community school practices were observed (see below). **Grantees showed meaningful improvement on practices relevant to the Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators pillar.** Increases in the extent to which grantees facilitated regular meetings with Community School Leadership Teams and offered support for the development of MOUs and data sharing agreements between districts and schools and their partners drove improvement for this pillar. The remaining pillars did not meaningfully change from the pre-survey to the post-survey at the grantee level. **At the school level, meaningful change over time was observed for all Four Pillars of Community Schools, with the largest improvement evident for the Extended Learning Time and Opportunities Pillar.** Numerous items across pillars demonstrated significant improvement.

Summary of Findings

Integrated Support Services

Respondent type	P-value	Effect size	Meaningful change
Grantee	0.557	0.14	No
School	<0.001	0.31	Yes

Family and Community Engagement

Respondent type	P-value	Effect size	Meaningful change
Grantee	0.783	-0.06	No
School	<0.001	0.28	Yes

Collaborative Leadership and Practices for Educators and Administrators

Respondent type	P-value	Effect size	Meaningful change
Grantee	0.071	0.44	Yes
School	<0.001	0.37	Yes

Extended Learning Time and Opportunities

Respondent type	P-value	Effect size	Meaningful change
Grantee	0.270	0.26	No
School	<0.001	0.53	Yes

When asked to describe their strengths, grantees and schools raised varied assets such as the ability to improve school culture, relationship building, coordination of services and collaboration with community partners; provision of professional development; family engagement; and ability to navigate the COVID-19 pandemic. The strengths highlighted by grantees and schools span the Four Pillars of Community Schools and are consistent with practices and strategies vital for strong community schools implementation.

Finally, grantees and schools discussed the needs they have moving forward. Grantees shared a consistent message—they need sustained, flexible, and long-term funding to

continue and expand this work. This funding could be used to develop and maintain partnerships, hire and retain staff; collaborate with others doing community schools work; develop and provide professional development; carryout needs and assets assessments in the community; and develop and operate comprehensive wellness centers. Schools echoed this need with requests for continued funding with no expiration date being the most common request. At the school level, funds were requested to maintain and expand current programs (e.g., wellness centers, food pantries), hire key staff, and support new partnerships. Other areas of need related to MOUs and contracts, staff training and hiring, understanding Medi-Cal reimbursement, and other resources to support the work (e.g., physical space).

Limitations

Several limitations to this study should be considered when interpreting the findings presented in this report. First, this evaluation relies on self-report data from grantee and school liaisons. Thus, an objective review of practices was not conducted, and it is possible responses may not reflect reality in all cases. However, this is a limitation of all research and evaluation projects that utilize surveys, and the use of surveys remains a valuable approach when other data collection strategies are not possible. Related, grantees and schools had autonomy to determine exactly who should complete the surveys. Instructions were provided asking grantees and schools to identify the most appropriate point of contact for the survey to mitigate that only one perspective was captured per survey, but whether this was effective to ensure only highly knowledgeable individuals completed the survey is unknown. Finally, some schools did not submit the pre-post surveys and some grantees and schools did not complete every item in the surveys. Although responses from all participants are ideal, the study achieved a 100 percent response rate for grantees and a high response rate from schools at both time points (pre-survey response rate = 73 percent; post-survey response rate = 69 percent). This evaluation did not include analyses of grantee or school characteristic data, thus examining the characteristics of those who did and did not respond is beyond the scope of this project. To account for partial responses, WestEd conducted several sensitivity analyses to ensure the findings presented in this report are not meaningfully impacted by partial responses. The consistency across these analyses suggests that missing data does not impact the patterns of findings presented.

Implications

The analysis of pre-post survey data assessing the practices of the CCSPP ESSER Cohort provides promising evidence about the outcomes associated with participation in CCSPP. The number, variety, and magnitude of improvements is especially impressive given the context of grant implementation. In particular, the grant was made available as

schools continued to grapple with the impacts of COVID-19 and deal with supporting students and families as they re-entered in-person instruction. The 2021–22 school year was a challenging year across the country as staff and students re-established norms and relationships, while continuing to navigate health and economic concerns. This context, coupled with the short time period between the pre- and post-surveys, makes these findings interesting and noteworthy.

It is important to note that most improvements were observed at the school level. This is not surprising, as the grant intended to change practices at schools. Based on school-level findings, it appears the grant was successful in this mission. However, the CDE may want to consider what supports and grant parameters would help shift practices at the grantee level, as strong coordination at the grantee level may play an important role in ensuring strong implementation at community schools. For example, schools requested further assistance with MOUs, budgeting, hiring, professional development, understanding of Medi-Cal, and increasing supports that may require community partners. All these things could be systematically addressed by grantees in ways that support all community school sites in their jurisdiction.

As the CDE moves forward in supporting future CCSPP cohorts, efforts to address the needs raised in the survey should be made. Additionally, the CDE should consider continuing evaluation efforts, especially those that go beyond use of standardized data (e.g., academic achievement, attendance, graduation rates), to capture areas of growth over time for grantees and participating school sites.

Appendix: Item-Level Survey Response Frequencies

This appendix provides pre-post data for each survey item in the form of frequencies, allowing an understanding of the percentage of respondents who selected *Not at All, Not Yet But Planning to*, *Small extent*, *Moderate extent*, *Large extent,* and *Don't Know* response options or *Yes*, *No*, *Not Yet But Planning to*, and *Don't Know* response options. Data presented in the following tables are inclusive of all survey respondents as opposed to the analytic sample for inferential analyses described previously. Thus, some respondents included in these tables may have only submitted a pre- or post-survey and were excluded from the inferential pre-post analyses described in the report. We have elected to share this frequency data for all respondents to provide the CDE with a complete snapshot of available data. These tables also provide insight into all items included in each community school pillars scale constructed for this study.

Grantee-Level Frequencies by Pillar

Lead Grantee Agencies: Distribution of Responses to Integrated Support Services Items

Note: For the tables in this section, N = 19.

Support for school sites to develop service contracts with community partners and agencies (e.g., early childhood care/education; early screening and intervention, medical, dental, mental health, attendance support).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0	5.3	10.5	36.8	47.4	0
Fall 2022	0	0	0.0	26.3	73.7	0.0

Professional learning opportunities and support for educators and staff on how to use technology to provide online instruction to students during long-term school building closures.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	78.9	10.5
Fall 2022	5.3	0.0	10.5	26.3	57.9	0.0

Professional learning opportunities and support for educators and staff on how to provide education services that meet the needs of students with disabilities during long-term school building closures.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	5.3	10.5	26.3	47.4	10.5
Fall 2022	10.5	5.3	10.5	47.4	26.3	0.0

Planning for and coordinating resources and staff to provide meal assistance for students during long-term school building closures.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	0.0	0.0	15.8	78.9	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	10.5	15.8	73.7	0.0

Planning for and coordinating resources and staff to provide mental health services and supports to students and families.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	5.3	21.1	73.7	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	5.3	21.1	73.7	0.0

Purchasing educational technology (including hardware, software, and connectivity) for students to aid interactions between students and their classroom teachers (including students from low-income families).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	10.5	0.0	5.3	15.8	63.2	5.3
Fall 2022	10.5	5.3	0.0	15.8	63.2	5.3

Purchasing educational technology for students with disabilities (e.g., assistive technology or adaptive equipment) to aid interactions between students and their classroom teachers.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	10.5	0.0	10.5	36.8	31.6	10.5
Fall 2022	10.5	0.0	15.8	15.8	57.9	0.0

Professional learning opportunities and support for educators and staff to implement coordinated strategies for student supports (e.g., multi-tiered system of support, coordination of services team).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	10.5	10.5	21.1	57.9	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	15.8	26.3	57.9	0.0

Professional learning opportunities for educators and staff on approaches to a restorative restart to school (e.g., whole child approaches to advance student well-being).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	10.5	15.8	68.4	5.3
Fall 2022	5.3	0.0	10.5	21.1	63.2	0.0

Professional learning opportunities and supports for educators and staff to develop a shared vision for what students should know and be able to do.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	10.5	5.3	0.0	42.1	42.1	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	10.5	52.6	36.8	0.0

Professional learning opportunities for educators and staff to build equitable, safe, and supportive learning environments.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	5.3	0.0	31.6	63.2	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	5.3	31.6	63.2	0.0

Professional learning opportunities for educators to assess students' progress and determine how to meet their indicated needs.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	10.5	36.8	47.4	5.3
Fall 2022	5.3	0.0	10.5	31.6	47.4	5.3

Maintains a list of community partners and encourages/facilitates the sharing of that list with students, teachers, and staff.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	10.5	5.3	26.3	57.9	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	10.5	21.1	68.4	0.0

Coordinate efforts and resources for school staff, parents/guardians, partners, and/or other entities to support program sustainability.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	15.8	10.5	42.1	31.6	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	10.5	31.6	57.9	0.0

Professional learning opportunities for school staff to address students' needs related to the COVID-19 crisis.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	10.5	10.5	26.3	52.6	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	5.3	47.4	47.4	0.0

Lead Grantee Agencies: Distribution of Responses to Family and Community Engagement Items

Note: For the tables in this section, N = 19.

Professional learning opportunities for educators and staff on building trusting and inclusive relationships with families and community partners.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	5.3	10.5	31.6	52.6	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	5.3	42.1	52.6	0.0

Professional learning opportunities and support for educators, staff, counselors, and/or community partners on conducting virtual or in-person home visits.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	15.8	21.1	10.5	42.1	5.3
Fall 2022	10.5	5.3	10.5	42.1	31.6	0.0

Stipends and support for educators and staff to implement family events (e.g., reading and math skills, digital literacy, job search, access to legal services, etc.).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	5.3	15.8	26.3	36.8	10.5
Fall 2022	0.0	15.8	26.3	31.6	15.8	10.5

Professional learning opportunities and supports for educators and staff to work with families and community partners to address student needs related to COVID-19.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.1	47.4	10.5
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.8	63.2	0.0

Professional learning opportunities for educators on distance learning supports to build and strengthen connectedness among staff, students, families, and community partners.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	5.3	36.8	47.4	10.5
Fall 2022	5.3	0.0	5.3	36.8	52.6	0.0

Our services and supports are culturally and linguistically responsive.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.4	52.6	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	10.5	26.3	63.2	0.0

Our grantee agency works to support and actively identify and address bias-based beliefs, practices, and policies that keep students of different backgrounds and races from achieving equitable outcomes.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.3	73.7	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	10.5	42.1	47.4	0.0

Our grantee agency assists in recruiting community partners to support/enhance student academics and whole child activities in collaboration with school staff.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	5.3	26.3	68.4	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.1	78.9	0.0

Lead Grantee Agencies: Distribution of Responses to Collaborative Leadership Items

Note: For the tables in this section, N ranged from 18–19.

Our grantee agency provides professional learning on equity of voice and co-developing decision-making structures with stakeholders, including staff, students, families, and community members.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	15.8	15.8	42.1	26.3	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	15.8	47.4	36.8	0.0

Our grantee agency works with health professionals, government agencies, community service organizations, and/or other entities to improve student outcomes.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	89.5	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	94.7	0.0

Our grantee agency provides peer-learning opportunities for staff across CCSPP sites to share effective strategies with each other.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	5.3	15.8	31.6	47.4	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	5.6	5.6	33.3	55.6	0.0

Guidance for school staff on data collection and sharing procedures, and/or data analysis for continuous program improvement.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	5.3	5.3	36.8	52.6	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	5.6	44.4	50.0.0	0.0

Support for school leadership teams to create, implement, and monitor their Community School Improvement/Action Plan.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	15.8	10.5	36.8	36.8	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	5.3	10.5	36.8	47.4	0.0

Coordinating access to data sources and systems needed to monitor progress.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	15.8	52.6	31.6	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	5.3	36.8	57.9	0.0

Providing supports to regularly conduct a strength and needs assessment of schools and the community.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	10.5	15.8	36.8	36.8	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	15.8	47.4	36.8	0.0

Support for school staff to develop a shared vision of goals, desired results, and indicators of progress.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	5.3	5.3	36.8	47.4	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	15.8	47.4	36.8	0.0

Facilitating regularly scheduled meetings (at least monthly) with Community School Leadership Teams, including developing agendas and recording meeting minutes.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	21.1	10.5	36.8	26.3	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	15.8	36.8	47.4	0.0

Coordinate response efforts between school sites and state and local agencies to prevent, prepare for, and respond to COVID-19.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	5.3	21.1	73.7	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	5.3	10.5	84.2	0.0

Professional learning opportunities for educators and staff to effectively engage students, families, and community members in leadership roles.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	5.3	15.8	52.6	15.8	5.3
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	15.8	47.4	36.8	0.0

Support for the development of memoranda of understanding and data sharing agreements between districts/schools and their partners.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	5.3	0.0	52.6	36.8	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.8	63.2	0.0

Lead Grantee Agencies: Distribution of Responses to Extended Learning Time and Opportunities Items

Note: For the tables in this section, N = 19.

Professional learning opportunities for educators to expand and enrich curriculum through deeper learning strategies (e.g., project-based learning).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	10.5	5.3	5.3	52.6	21.1	5.3
Fall 2022	0.0	10.5	5.3	52.6	26.3	5.3

Stipends and support for educators and staff to implement expanded learning opportunities for students (e.g., mentoring, arts integration, job training).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	0.0	26.3	26.3	36.8	5.3
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	15.8	26.3	47.4	10.5

Stipends and support to better align expanded learning time programs with school-day instruction.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	10.5	0.0	10.5	42.1	26.3	10.5
Fall 2022	10.5	0.0	15.8	31.6	36.8	5.3

Coordinating resources and staff to implement enrichment/learning programs before and/or after school across school sites.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	0.0	15.8	31.6	42.1	5.3
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	10.5	36.8	52.6	0.0

Coordinating resources and staff to implement summer and/or weekend learning programs across school sites.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.3	0.0	15.8	42.1	26.3	10.5
Fall 2022	0.0	5.3	10.5	36.8	47.4	0.0

Purchasing or developing evidence-based and/or standards-based curricula aligned with student-centered teaching and learning principles.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	10.5	0.0	10.5	10.5	68.4	0.0
Fall 2022	10.5	0.0	10.5	10.5	68.4	0.0

School-Level Frequencies by Pillar

Schools: Distribution of Responses to Integrated Support Services Items

Note: For the tables in this section, N ranged from 141–147

Our school maintains a list of community partners and shares it with students, families, teachers, and staff.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	1.4	6.1	19.7	34.7	36.7	1.4
Fall 2022	3.5	3.5	7.7	34.3	51.0	0.0

Our school offers professional learning opportunities for staff and related partners to address students' needs related to the COVID-19 crisis.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.7	0.7	14.3	39.5	40.8	2.0
Fall 2022	1.4	0.7	11.2	33.6	49.7	3.5

Students and families use our community schools' mental health services and supports.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	2.1	16.7	28.5	51.4	0.7
Fall 2022	1.4	0.7	6.3	25.9	65.0	0.7

All students have access to educational technology (e.g., hardware, software, and connectivity) that aids interactions between students and their classroom instructors.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	1.4	15.9	82.1	0.7
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	0.7	9.1	90.2	0.0

Students from low-income families have access to educational technology that aids interactions between students and their classroom instructors.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	2.8	15.9	80.0	1.4
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.6	86.7	0.7

Students with disabilities have access to technology (e.g., assistive technology or adaptive equipment) that aids interactions with their teachers.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	6.2	11.7	79.3	2.8
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.6	83.9	3.5

Our educators have access to approaches for a restorative restart to school (e.g., extra time for whole child approaches to advance student well-being).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	11.0	33.1	49.0	6.9
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	12.7	31.0	50.0	6.3

Our educators have access to professional learning supports to create equitable, safe, and supportive learning environments.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	4.1	32.4	61.4	2.1
Fall 2022	0.0	0.7	2.8	25.2	69.9	1.4

Our educators have developed a shared vision for what students should know and be able to do.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	10.4	31.9	54.2	3.5
Fall 2022	0.7	2.1	2.8	37.8	54.5	2.1

Our educators have enough resources to assess students' progress and determine how to meet their indicated needs.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.1	0.0	11.1	32.6	48.6	5.6
Fall 2022	0.0	0.7	6.3	37.1	55.2	0.7

Our community school implements **positive behavioral interventions** for students during, before, and/or after the school day.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.7	8.3	22.8	67.6	0.7
Fall 2022	0.7	1.4	5.7	24.1	67.4	0.7

Our community school implements **restorative practices** for students during, before, and/or after the school day.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.8	0.0	11.7	33.8	50.3	1.4
Fall 2022	0.7	2.1	9.9	35.5	50.4	1.4

Our community school implements **trauma-informed instructional approaches and practices** for students during, before, and/or after the school day.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	2.8	16.6	35.9	41.4	2.8
Fall 2022	0.7	0.7	14.9	35.5	45.4	2.8

Our community school implements a **multi-tiered system of support (MTSS)** for students during, before, and/or after the school day.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.1	2.1	7.6	30.3	57.2	0.7
Fall 2022	0.0	2.8	7.1	26.2	61.7	2.1

Our community school implements **COST** for students during, before, and/or after the school day.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	8.3	1.4	7.6	22.8	51.0	9.0
Fall 2022	1.4	1.4	9.9	21.3	55.3	10.6

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **meals**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.7	0.7	10.3	85.5	2.8
Fall 2022	0.7	0.0	2.1	11.3	81.0	4.9

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **medical**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	11.7	0.0	15.9	27.6	20.0	24.8
Fall 2022	3.5	2.1	14.0	25.2	39.2	16.1

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **dental**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	13.1	0.7	18.6	29.0	12.4	26.2
Fall 2022	4.9	2.1	18.2	23.8	34.3	16.8

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **mental health**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	1.4	1.4	10.3	34.5	46.9	5.5
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	14.7	25.9	53.8	5.6

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **mobility/housing /homelessness services**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	9.0	0.7	15.2	33.8	24.8	16.6
Fall 2022	1.4	1.4	16.1	35.0	32.9	13.3

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **legal services**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	19.3	1.4	16.6	17.2	14.5	31.0
Fall 2022	10.5	2.8	21.7	20.3	22.4	22.4

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **attendance support/dropout prevention**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	5.5	1.4	13.8	32.4	44.1	2.8
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	12.6	28.0	55.2	4.2

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **technology for learning**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	3.4	17.2	79.3	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.7	2.1	10.5	85.3	1.4

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **educational services that meet the needs of students with disabilities**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	0.0	7.6	28.3	57.9	6.2
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	9.1	23.1	60.1	7.7

If long-term school closures go into effect again, students will have access to **tutoring**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	7.6	0.7	20.0	29	38.6	4.1
Fall 2022	0.7	1.4	15.6	28.4	46.1	7.8

Schools: Distribution of Responses to Items Assessing Contracts with Community Partners and Agencies related to Integrated Student Supports

Note. For the tables in this section, N ranged from 134-136. Items depicted in the tables below were not included in the Integrated Support Services scale because they have different response options than the other items included in the scale.

Early childhood care/Education (e.g., childcare, Early Head Start, Head Start)

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	42.2	35.6	7.4	14.8
Fall 2022	57.4	25.7	10.3	6.6

Early screening and intervention

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	58.5	20.7	8.9	11.9
Fall 2022	66.2	17.6	6.6	9.6

Medical

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	57.8	20.0	12.6	9.6
Fall 2022	71.1	11.9	7.4	9.6

Dental

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	61.9	13.4	14.9	9.7
Fall 2022	66.9	13.2	10.3	9.6

Mental health

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	84.6	3.7	8.8	2.9
Fall 2022	91.9	2.9	2.9	2.2

Nutrition services

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	72.1	13.2	7.4	7.4
Fall 2022	77.8	9.6	5.2	7.4

Social services

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	71.1	17.8	5.9	5.2
Fall 2022	80.0	8.9	7.4	3.7

Mentoring

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	65.9	15.6	14.1	4.4
Fall 2022	71.3	13.2	12.5	2.9

Mobility/housing/homelessness services

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	61.0	24.3	6.6	8.1
Fall 2022	71.3	15.4	6.6	6.6

Family Centers

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	46.7	28.9	14.8	9.6
Fall 2022	65.4	17.6	9.6	7.4

Crime prevention

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	33.8	38.2	6.6	21.3
Fall 2022	45.9	25.9	16.3	11.9

Violence prevention/trauma services

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	58.8	27.9	7.4	5.9
Fall 2022	65.9	14.8	13.3	5.9

Legal services

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	27.2	39.0	11.8	22.1
Fall 2022	43.4	30.9	12.5	13.2

Attendance support/dropout prevention

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	68.4	19.1	8.1	4.4
Fall 2022	76.5	12.5	9.6	1.5

Transportation services

Survey	% No	% Not yet but planning to	% Yes	% Don't know
Fall 2021	61.0	30.1	2.9	5.9
Fall 2022	68.4	19.9	6.6	5.1

Schools: Distribution of Responses to Family and Community Engagement Items

Note: For the tables in this section, N ranged from 141–149.

Teachers and staff have trusting and inclusive relationships with families and community partners.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	2.0	5.4	42.3	49.7	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	3.5	46.9	49.7	0.0

Our school works to actively identify and confront bias-based beliefs, practices, and policies that keep students of different backgrounds and races from achieving equitable outcomes.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	3.4	6.8	35.8	54.1	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.7	9.2	33.1	57.0	0.0

Our school offers distance learning supports that build and strengthen connectedness among teachers, students, and families.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	10.3	0.0	19.3	27.6	40.0	2.8
Fall 2022	17.6	0.7	19.0	24.6	35.2	2.8

Teachers, staff, counselors, and/or community partners conduct virtual or in-person home visits, as needed.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	3.4	2.1	24.1	29.0	39.3	2.1
Fall 2022	6.3	0.7	22.4	24.5	44.8	1.4

Our services and supports are culturally and linguistically responsive.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	1.4	6.2	39.3	50.3	2.1
Fall 2022	0.7	0.7	2.1	35.7	60.8	0.0

Our educators are working with families and community partners to address student needs related to COVID-19.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	0.7	12.5	34.0	49.3	2.8
Fall 2022	2.1	0.7	11.2	27.3	55.2	3.5

Our school offers events that provide supports to students and families related to **reading and math skills**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	9.7	6.9	22.8	29.0	24.8	6.9
Fall 2022	5.6	4.2	18.9	27.3	39.2	4.9

Our school offers events that provide supports to students and families related to **digital literacy**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	7.6	6.9	28.3	30.3	21.4	5.5
Fall 2022	7.0	4.2	23.8	37.8	24.5	2.8

Our school offers events that provide supports to students and families related to **job search and preparation services**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	31.7	5.5	26.9	19.3	4.8	11.7
Fall 2022	22.4	4.2	24.5	23.1	15.4	10.5

Our school offers events that provide supports to students and families related to **access to legal services**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	34.7	9.0	20.1	10.4	11.1	14.6
Fall 2022	24.5	4.9	32.9	14.0	14.0	9.8

Our school offers events that provide supports to students and families related to **language supports**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	7.0	7.0	19.6	25.2	35.7	5.6
Fall 2022	5.6	1.4	14.8	32.4	42.3	3.5

Our school offers events that provide supports to students and families related to **social and emotional skills**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	4.1	3.4	13.8	38.6	38.6	1.4
Fall 2022	2.8	3.5	8.5	31.0	53.5	0.7

Our school offers events that provide supports to students and families related to **physical health**.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	9.7	6.9	21.4	33.1	24.1	4.8
Fall 2022	5.0	1.4	16.3	41.8	31.9	3.5

Schools: Distribution of Responses to Collaborative Leadership and Practices Items

Note: For the tables in this section, N ranged from 140–120.

Staff, teachers, students, families, and community members have equity of voice and power in the school's leadership and decision-making structures.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.7	0.7	9.3	42.0	45.3	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	1.4	10.5	46.9	41.3	0.0

Parents/guardians play a leadership role at our school, working with school staff and partners as advocates to improve student outcomes.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.0	3.4	25.7	43.2	25.7	0.0
Fall 2022	2.1	0.7	23.2	48.6	25.4	0.0

Our school works with health professionals, governmental agencies, community service organizations, and/or other entities to improve student outcomes.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	2.0	15.3	36.0	46.0	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	3.5	34.3	62.2	0.0

Our school brings together school staff and partners to support capacity building (e.g., professional learning).

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	0.0	13.3	41.3	44.7	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	6.3	30.1	63.6	0.0

Our school coordinates with state and local agencies to prevent, prepare for, and respond to COVID-19.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	0.0	11.4	20.8	67.1	0.0
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	5.0	17.9	77.1	0.0

Our Community School Leadership Team includes the principal, teachers and school staff, school health and mental health professionals, parents/guardians, students, and community partners.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	11.6	8.8	29.9	48.3	0.7
Fall 2022	2.1	2.8	4.9	32.9	56.6	0.7

Memorandums of Understanding are in place that define agreements, including policies, procedures, services, and data sharing between our school and its partners.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	3.4	2.1	10.3	35.6	45.2	3.4
Fall 2022	1.4	4.2	6.3	30.8	52.4	4.9

Our school and partners engage in data collection, sharing, and analysis for continuous program improvement.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	3.4	7.5	16.3	38.8	33.3	0.7
Fall 2022	0.0	3.5	4.9	44.4	46.5	0.7

Our school has access to the data sources and systems needed to track our progress and identify successes and failures.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	1.4	8.8	38.8	48.3	2.0
Fall 2022	0.7	2.1	5.6	33.6	56.6	1.4

Our school has sufficient staff capacity and expertise to analyze and use data for decision-making.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.7	0.7	21.1	41.5	33.3	0.7
Fall 2022	1.4	2.1	14.8	40.1	41.5	0.0

Our community school initiatives, services, and programs align with our Local Control Accountability Plan's (LCAP) implementation, monitoring tools, and metrics.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	6.8	1.4	27.2	59.2	5.4
Fall 2022	0.0	0.7	2.1	23.8	67.1	6.3

An assessment of school and community strengths and needs is conducted regularly to identify areas of success and areas needing growth.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.0	6.8	15.6	32.7	38.8	4.1
Fall 2022	0.7	2.1	7.7	35.0	51.7	2.8

To respond to the COVID-19 crisis, our school has a shared vision of goals, desired results, and indicators of progress.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	4.8	0.7	8.9	35.6	46.6	3.4
Fall 2022	2.1	0.7	11.2	25.9	58.0	2.1

Our Community School Leadership Team has effectively created a Community School Action Plan.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	6.1	19.0	8.8	27.9	34.0	4.1
Fall 2022	4.2	6.3	4.9	32.2	43.4	9.1

Our Community School Leadership Team effectively monitors and prioritizes action steps and needs.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.7	16.4	8.2	31.5	36.3	4.8
Fall 2022	2.1	4.2	5.6	36.4	49.7	2.1

Our Community School Leadership Team meets regularly (at least monthly), develops meeting agendas, and disseminates meeting notes.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	1.4	11.0	11.6	21.9	50.7	3.4
Fall 2022	2.1	5.6	6.3	25.2	60.8	0.0

Parents/guardians regularly participate in our Community School Leadership Team meetings.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	11.0	18.5	26.0	21.2	19.2	4.1
Fall 2022	5.6	9.8	23.1	35.0	21.0	5.6

Our school offers planning time for staff (e.g., counselors, teachers), parents/guardians, partners, and other entities.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.7	4.8	13.7	26.7	50.0	4.1
Fall 2022	1.4	2.8	8.4	32.2	53.8	1.4

Our school offers planning time for educators and staff to build a shared vision, goals, desired results, and indicators of progress.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	2.0	8.2	32.0	56.5	1.4
Fall 2022	0.7	0.7	10.5	30.1	55.9	2.1

Schools: Distribution of Responses to Extended Learning Time and Opportunities Items

Note: For the tables in this section, N ranged from 142–145.

Our school offers planning time for educators and staff to implement enrichment/learning programs before and/or after school.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	3.4	4.8	16.6	31.0	42.1	2.1
Fall 2022	2.8	2.1	16.8	31.5	44.8	2.1

School-day learning and expanded learning time programs and activities are well-coordinated.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.8	3.4	11.0	33.8	47.6	1.4
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	4.2	34.3	60.8	0.7

Our educators use project-based learning strategies that connect to real world experiences.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	2.8	2.8	22.9	37.5	27.1	6.9
Fall 2022	2.1	1.4	13.3	39.2	37.1	7.0

Our educators have enough resources to plan, coordinate, and execute expanded learning time activities.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	3.5	1.4	19.7	31.0	38.7	5.6
Fall 2022	1.4	0.0	9.1	42.7	44.1	2.8

Our school offers students enrichment and developmental activities related to mentoring.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	9.0	6.9	24.8	23.4	33.8	2.1
Fall 2022	5.6	4.2	18.2	25.9	41.3	4.9

Our school offers students enrichment and developmental activities related to arts integration.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	6.9	4.2	24.3	33.3	27.1	4.2
Fall 2022	2.1	1.4	18.3	40.8	35.2	2.1

Our school offers students enrichment and developmental activities related to job training, job shadowing, internships, apprenticeships, and/or service-learning opportunities.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	35.9	6.9	23.4	13.1	11.0	9.7
Fall 2022	32.4	3.5	16.9	22.5	16.9	7.7

Our school offers students enrichment and developmental activities related to summer and/or weekend learning opportunities/programs.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	20.0	4.1	23.4	22.8	22.8	6.9
Fall 2022	7.0	2.1	11.3	35.9	41.5	2.1

Our school offers students enrichment and developmental activities related to supplemental afterschool programs.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	3.4	4.1	23.4	26.2	39.3	3.4
Fall 2022	1.4	2.8	7.0	27.5	59.9	1.1

Our educators use evidence-based and/or standards-based curricula aligned with student-centered teaching and learning principles before and after the school day.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	4.8	0.7	9.7	26.2	48.3	10.3
Fall 2022	0.7	2.1	11.9	28.0	49.0	8.4

Our educators use evidence-based and/or standards-based curricula aligned with student-centered teaching and learning principles during the school day.

Survey	% Not at all	% Not yet but planning to	% Small extent	% Moderate extent	% Large extent	% Don't know
Fall 2021	0.0	1.4	4.1	22.1	67.6	4.8
Fall 2022	0.0	0.0	2.8	24.5	69.2	3.5

References

California Department of Education. 2020. *California Community Schools Partnership Program: Request for Applications Funded by the Budget Act of 2020*. Sacramento: California Department of Education, Career and College Transition Division.

California Department of Education. 2022. *California Community Schools Framework*. Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Cummings, Peter., and McKnight, Barbara. 2004. "Analysis of Matched Cohort Data." *The Stata Journal* 4, no. 3: 274-281.

Institute for Educational Leadership. 2017. *Community School Standards. Coalition for Community Schools.* https://www.communityschools.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/03/Community-School-Standards-Updatesd2017.pdf

Johnston, W. R., Engberg, J., Opper, I. M., Sontag-Padilla, L., and Xenakis, L. 2022. *Illustrating the Promise of Community Schools: An Assessment of the New York City Community Schools Initiative*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Laken, Daniel. 2013. "Calculating and Reporting Effect Sizes to Facilitate Cumulative Science: A Practical Primer for T-tests and ANOVAs." *Frontiers in Psychology* 4.

Partnership for the Future of Learning. n.d. *Community Schools Playbook*. Washington, DC: Partnership for the Future of Learning. https://communityschools.futureforlearning.org/assets/downloads/community-schools-playbook.pdf

Tavakol, Mohsen., and Dennick, Reg. 2011. "Making Sense of Cronbach's Alpha." *International Journal of Medical Education* 2: 53-55.

What Works Clearinghouse. (2022). *What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook, Version 5.0.* U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE). https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/referenceresources/Final_WWC-HandbookVer5_0-0-508.pdf