What's on the Line
Grounding: The 5 W’s

1. What are Proposed Priorities?
2. Why does this matter?
3. Who can weigh in?
4. Where do you weigh in?
5. When will this occur?
Coalition’s General Comments

• Alignment with the Full-Service Community Schools Expansion Act (S. 385/H.R. 1241)
• The Importance of Deepening and Sustaining High-Quality Implementation, along with Scaling
• The Importance of Strong Technical Assistance and Capacity-Building
• Prioritizing Need
Digging in: Proposed Priorities

• Proposed Priority 1—Capacity Building and Development Grants
• Proposed Priority 2—Multi-Local Educational Agency Grants
• Proposed Priority 3—State Scaling Grants
• Proposed Priority 4—Participation in the National Evaluation
• Proposed Priority 5—Evidence-Based Integrated Student Supports

*Priorities can be categorized as absolute, competitive preference, or invitational
Proposed Priority 1

“Capacity Building and Development Grants. Projects that propose to conduct initial development and coordination activities that leverage the findings of their needs assessment to develop the infrastructure, activities, and partnerships to implement and sustain full-service community schools in two or more schools through extensive community engagement and gathering data on initial outcomes.”

- Support the focus on new/planning grants. Rename to “Planning grants”
- Recommend as 1 year grant
- Recommend competitive priority
- Clarify that a needs assessment would be done during, not before, the planning grant
Proposed Priority 2

“Multi-Local Educational Agency (LEA) Grants. Projects that propose to implement full-service community schools in two or more LEAs within the same state.”

✓ Do not support this proposed priority

✓ Rename: “Implementation Grants” & invite applicants to use the funding to implement two or more community schools within one system (e.g. district, city, or county) that commits to leverage this funding to expand and sustain this work

✓ Recommend this is for 5 years of funding

✓ Recommend competitive priority
CCS Recommended Additional Category

✓ Recommend adding a competitive priority, “Expansion Grants”
✓ Funding for 3 to 5 years and geared toward applicants who already operate one or more full-service community schools either funded by the Full-Service Community Schools federal program, or by another source of funding
✓ Funding would be used to deepen and expand their investment in full-service community schools both at the identified eligible school(s) and at the system level to increase the infrastructure, quality, and sustainability of their investment in a system of community schools
Proposed Priority 3

“FSCS State Scaling Grants. Projects in partnership with an SEA that propose to initiate, support, and expand full-service community schools in six or more LEAs across the state where there is a commitment to sustain the program beyond two years after the term of the grant.”

- Replace requirement of 6+ LEAs with % of LEAs in a state (at least 10%)
- Require the state applicant to prioritize districts by need
- Require states as a condition of eligibility to identify or establish a state steering committee
- 3-year grant
- Competitive priority
Proposed Priority 4

“Participation in the National Evaluation. Projects in which the applicant agrees to: (1) Carry out the FSCS grant in a manner consistent with a randomized controlled trial evaluation design developed by the Department and its national evaluator”

✓ Do not support
✓ Instead, we recommend that the Department add an external evaluation as a requirement for all grantees
Proposed Priority 5

“Evidence-Based Integrated Student Supports. Projects that propose adoption of an evidence-based model to provide integrated student supports in their implementation at one or more of the following tiers: (a) Demonstrates a rationale; (b) Promising evidence; (c) Moderate evidence; or (d) Strong evidence.”

✔Do not support

✔This is already addressed through requirement of 4 pillars, needs assessment, and selection criterion around plans grounded in evidence-based practices
Proposed Application Requirement

Projects must describe the pillars of full-service community schools that they have in place or how they will establish these pillars, or how they will implement these supports with partners, including community-based organization, and collaborating with school leadership and staff.

✓ We support this

✓ We urge ED to describe the 4 pillars thoroughly enough that they are understandable and accessible to applicants who may be new or newer to community schools.

✓ We also encourage ED to include examples of what strong implementation of these four pillars looks like, both separately and all together, so applicants can have an even clearer understanding of effective implementation of these pillars in action.
Additional Proposed Application Requirement

- We recommend adding a proposed requirement for a third-party evaluation to be conducted by each grantee
- Recommend that ED keep the parameters of this evaluation flexible enough to enable grantees to conduct the right evaluation for their stage of development.
- Recommend that ED require collection of both quantitative and qualitative data
- ED should leverage the CCS Community Schools Research Practice Network for support for high-quality research and evaluation
Proposed Definitions

• We support the Department’s proposed definitions of:
  • Pillars of Full-Service Community Schools
  • Broadly representative consortium, and
  • History of effectiveness
Proposed Selection Criteria

• Selection criterion a: “The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects relevant and evidence-based findings from existing literature, and includes a high-quality plan for project implementation integrating the four pillars of full-service community schools and the use of appropriate evaluation methods to ensure successful achievement of project objectives.”

✓We support
Proposed Selection Criteria

• Selection criterion b: “The extent to which the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives is brought to bear in the design and operation of the proposed project, including those of families, educators and staff, beneficiaries of services, school leadership, and community leadership.”

✓ We support
✓ Request that ED add children and youth in the list of specific constituencies it references
Proposed Selection Criteria

• Selection criterion c: “The extent to which the grantee has plans for a full-time coordinator at each school, includes a plan to sustain the position beyond the grant period, and a description of how this position will serve to integrate, coordinate, and deliver pipeline services at each school.”

✓ We support
✓ Strike “deliver pipeline services” and replace with “facilitate programs and partnerships”
✓ Add: “lead a comprehensive needs and assets assessment that includes students, school staff, families, community members, and partners.”
Proposed Selection Criteria

• Selection criterion d: “The extent to which the grantee has a consortium broadly representative of community stakeholders and needs”

✓ **We support**

✓ List out specific stakeholders, including nonprofit organizations, faith and community-based institutions, institutions of higher education, including teacher preparation programs, hospitals, museums, businesses, public housing agencies, and other community entities

✓ Amend language to ensure applicants new to the work are not penalized: “The extent to which the grantee has, or demonstrates a strong plan to have, a consortium broadly representative of community stakeholders and needs.”
Proposed Selection Criteria

• Selection criterion e: “The extent to which the applicant demonstrates a history of effectiveness.”

✓ We support
✓ Add “in working with youth, parents and families, school and district staff, and community members and partners” to specify the area of effectiveness
Proposed Selection Criteria: Additional

• We urge the Department to add a selection criterion for the level of need, whether based on level of poverty or concentrated poverty, and/or schools identified for improvement by the state
Next Steps: Our Coalition

1. Review the Proposed Priorities and the Coalition’s draft public comment letter
2. Send any feedback on the Coalition letter to Mary by Monday, January 31
3. Sign on to final Coalition letter next week
4. Submit any of your own (personal, org, or anonymous) comments by February 11
5. Continue, or begin, your preparation to apply for a grant
Next Steps: U.S. Department of Ed

1. **Review** the public comments submitted
2. **Release** the RFP for the grant, including final priorities and requirements, this spring
3. **Review** applications through a peer review process
4. **Notify** winners and distribute funding before Sept. 30
Q&A, Discussion, and Poll

1) Does the Coalition’s feedback resonate with you overall?

2) What questions or hesitations do you have about applying?
Register by January 31 for Early Bird Pricing!

https://bitly.com/CSxFE22
Questions? Reach out!

Mary Kingston Roche, Director of Policy
rochem@iel.org

Jose Munoz, Interim Director, IEL; Director, Coalition for Community Schools
munozj@iel.org

Tauheedah Jackson, Director of Place Based Strategy & Community School Initiatives
jacksont@iel.org