A Case for Coherence
Fulfilling California's Community Schools Promise

Authors

Joel Knudson
American Institutes for Research

Hayin Kimner
Community Schools Learning Exchange

About the California Collaborative on District Reform

The California Collaborative on District Reform was formed in 2006 to join researchers, practitioners, policymakers, and funders in ongoing, evidence-based dialogue to improve instruction and student learning for all students in California's urban school systems.

Introduction

With students, families, and the education systems that serve them still reeling from the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, community schools offer a promising approach to address urgent and persistent whole-child needs and their impact on teaching and learning. A $3 billion state investment in the California Community Schools Partnership Program (CCSPP) provides resources that can promote the transformation of education and child-serving systems. The potential for progress is enormous, but so are the prospects for unintended consequences of well-meaning—yet superficial and fragmented—school improvement efforts.

Last month, the California State Board of Education approved 265 grant recipients to design and implement community schools strategies. Meanwhile, the governor's proposed budget includes an additional $1.5 billion to support community schools moving forward. As these newly identified districts and their communities prepare to move forward—and as other districts consider applying for future funding—key insights from years of research and practical experience with improvement efforts in California can inform their efforts. In particular, California's pursuit of community schools strategies must go beyond removing obstacles to student success through "nonacademic" service delivery by embracing the opportunity for systems transformation. Local educators and their partners should view the CCSPP as an opportunity to strengthen a coherent, multisector approach across child-serving systems to collectively create equitable learning conditions and opportunities so that children can thrive. This brief outlines considerations for ensuring that the CCSPP achieves its potential.

Students and School Districts Have Been Strained to a Near Breaking Point

As the 2021–22 school year draws to a close, California educators, students, families, and communities continue to navigate a state of prolonged and volatile health emergency. Just as widespread access to vaccines for children helped create a sense of stability in schools, the spread of new COVID-19 variants compounded the challenge of ensuring safe and healthy learning opportunities for students and adults. Meanwhile, too many students continue to suffer from the lingering and ongoing effects of the pandemic, which has further exacerbated racial and socioeconomic inequities that have persisted for generations. The result is that students and the educators and school systems that serve them have been strained to the very limits of their capacity.

Student Healing and Progress Require Attention to Academic, Social, Emotional, and Mental Well-Being

Student experiences during the past 2 years reveal a host of challenges that stand in the way of their ability to thrive. Disruptions to the learning environment and to the human relational dimensions of teaching and learning during the pandemic interrupted academic progress for many students. Early analyses found that students exhibited less growth in mathematics and English language arts during the pandemic than they had in prior years. Although the data revealed unfinished learning as a problem across student groups, the gaps were more pronounced for Black and Hispanic students, English learners, and students from low-income families.[1]

Perhaps more important than stalled academic learning is the frayed social, emotional, and mental well-being that students have endured. Anxiety grew from threats to health and safety for students and family members, especially during the many months when details about the virus were still emerging and vaccines were not yet available. At the same time, economic distress added new sources of worry and forced many students to contribute to their family's financial stability by working while also adjusting to the new normal of virtual schooling. In cases where hardship forced students into multifamily living situations, the concentration of people in shared spaces compounded disruptions to the home learning environment.

In the scramble to respond to school closures and transition to distance learning, there was an increased recognition that schools often were well positioned to provide the resources needed to assess and address students' and families' basic needs. Although districts and schools mobilized around the technical logistics of laptop and meal distribution, the in-person relationships with caring

adult staff and peers that often were key sources of student support were crippled. Remote learning and social distancing took away opportunities for peer interaction. Moreover, the loss of the school environment robbed students of a sense of community and belonging that was vital to their overall well-being. As one Garden Grove USD high school student explained,

> For many students like me, school was a gateway to a different world. It was to kind of just get out of our home sometimes, to get away from family problems—because those things happen—to get away maybe from grief.

Another student added,

> Some kids didn't really have anything to go to because a lot of kids from our school come from low-income families, broken families, hard situations . . . .. They didn't have the support systems they might have had at school. Like, I know a lot of teachers can be very impactful in their lives. They could have someone to look up to, but because we didn't have this for almost 2 years, kids kind of stopped seeing the point of that, stopped seeing the point of school.

These factors were amplified for students who have been historically underserved in public school systems. Rates of infection, job loss, and other effects of the pandemic were more severe in low-income families and among Latinos and African Americans. To be clear, COVID-19 did not create the disparities in opportunity among students. However, inequality in schools and our communities has become impossible to ignore.

Educators and Education Systems Are Overwhelmed

With these challenges, districts and the educators who run them are overwhelmed and burned out. Teachers and administrators carry the mounting and unrelenting mental and emotional loads that have accompanied 2 years of pandemic-related

adjustments.[2] The disruptions to personal and professional stability and efficacy only skyrocketed during the spike of the Omicron variant in early 2022, which forced administrators in some school systems to teach classes simply to cover widespread teacher absences. Even as vaccinations and changing public health mandates slowly allowed for some version of "normality," the work of educators remains far from the stable predictability that can foster ideal levels of strategic planning and activity. Thus, even with the availability of new financial resources through COVID-19 relief funds and new state investments in California, it is difficult for local leaders to ensure that efforts to support students are aligned, mutually reinforcing, and sustainable beyond the expiration of onetime funding streams. Staffing shortages, meanwhile, challenge districts' abilities to take advantage of new dollars when they struggle to fill existing positions, let alone roles that can enable the success of new programs.

Community Schools May Offer a Way to Frame a Path Forward

Schools and districts need to develop stronger systems and capacity to facilitate access to effective services and opportunities that support positive youth development. Community school strategies represent promising approaches to coordinating available resources in service of student learning and well-being. Beyond coordinated support services, however, the new state funding opportunity conceives of community schools as a vehicle to provide a coherent approach to actualizing differentiated, inclusive, and equitable teaching and learning. In the slow recovery from the COVID-19 crisis, this whole-child approach also can offer a comprehensive way to help ensure that students and their families can secure essential services, and students are supported to learn. Moreover, at a time when teachers are exhausted by the pandemic experience, community schools can help make schools more supportive spaces for educators.

Community Schools, Then and Now

Related in large part to available state and federal funding, community schools have recently attracted a great deal of attention, yet with the wide variety of conceptual models and variations that have been employed in recent years, shared understanding of what the term entails remains elusive. Indeed, conceptions of community schools have evolved in response to the changing realities of student learning conditions and the institutions that create them.[3] The lessons learned from decades of implementing community schools—as well as certain programmatic features that often are part of community schools—can help inform the path forward.[4]

Earlier iterations of community schools often focused on noneducational responses to a student's external environment.[5] By securing and delivering student support services and addressing barriers to learning, schools looked to outside resources (e.g., expanded learning partners, student and family services, health providers) to fortify stressed systems of public education. Concepts of cross-sector "collaboration" and "seamless integration" sought to better connect child-serving fields by opening the doors to the school to allow services to come in. Rarely, however, did this effort extend to opening the doors to classrooms and considering what whole-child approaches required of instructional pedagogy or how the organization and leadership of schools themselves might change.

Although there was value in bringing much-needed resources to school campuses, these efforts to coordinate supports often paid insufficient attention to how the actual organizational systems and professional norms of schooling—for example, classroom instruction and school governance or the practices of other youth-serving organizations and institutions—also would need to change. Without attending to how those foundational habits and practices contributed to disparate outcomes for students, meaningful, measurable, and scalable change was difficult to achieve. Instead, programs and interventions—even those that had some positive impact—largely coexisted within an unchanged system and "tinkered" around the edges of reform.[6]

Today's opportunities to implement community school strategies to support student learning must start in a place that promotes system transformation: not only addressing external environmental barriers to school success but also concurrently examining and reforming the underlying internal classroom, school, and district behaviors that hinder student-centered collaboration, partnership, and teaching. For long stretches in the history of American public schooling, schools have been organized to prioritize hierarchy and efficiency—that is, students and their families are passive actors, and the adults around them work in isolation according to their own interests, disciplines, professional languages, and customs. Effective community schools intentionally disrupt those norms and strengthen a coherent, multisector approach to whole-child teaching and learning.

A community schools approach is grounded by the science of learning and development[7] and recognizes that young people (and adults) learn best when they feel known, understood, supported, and engaged.[8] By building from the knowledge and assets of students and their families, community schools prioritize relationships and collaboration across a community to foster high-quality, nurturing, and equitable learning environments. Community schools engage students by providing meaningful, community-connected learning opportunities[9] while also embedding integrated care and services that leverage resources across interdependent child- and family-serving systems so that young people are recognized, valued, and supported. School reform strategies such as inclusive practices, community and culturally responsive teaching, linguistically sustaining practices, integrated social-emotional

learning, multitiered systems of support, restorative justice, and linked learning should not be seen as competing efforts. Rather, they are critical and interconnected components of a community schools approach to teaching and learning.

How Community Schools Can Help Address the Challenges Facing School Systems

A growing understanding of the various institutional and social factors that shape student learning opportunities—informed, for example, by advances in the science of learning and development and greater awareness of disparities among students during the COVID-19 pandemic—has sparked an interest in tackling the deep-seated problems and institutional dissonance that exist within and across school systems and their respective child- and youth-serving advocates. However, that interest has been translated into myriad programs, grants, initiatives, templates, and trainings. The resulting "alphabet soup" of education equity-minded reforms does little to support districts and schools in investing in focused change efforts, and unintentionally may exacerbate the disparities in attention span, resources, capacity, and outcomes that exist between those districts and communities with means and those without.[10]

It is no surprise, then, that advocates and decision makers in early childcare education, health and human services, and justice communities see that collaboration with K–12 systems is harder than it seems. Moreover, education leaders and their potential partners often find that integration of services for prevention and early intervention is near impossible given the demands and implementation priorities placed on educators and school leaders, plus the sometimes-unintentional policy barriers that can stymie effective partnerships. For example, differences in accountability structures, funding streams, organizational cultures, and communication styles across student- and family-serving

organizations can complicate attempts to align supports and work effectively together.[11]

A transformational approach to community schools values the individual ingredients in the state's alphabet soup of education reform priorities but posits that no single solution, framework, or intervention will achieve success by itself. Furthermore, the most powerful interventions must fundamentally support high-quality teaching and learning in classrooms within the complexity of school systems that are tied to the community in which they sit. There is a need to understand and guide change processes that can cultivate a cross-sector readiness for transformation that not only includes but also looks beyond securing resources that support a whole-child approach to teaching and learning.

Mindsets and Approaches That Are Vital to Effective Community Schools

Insights from meetings of the California Collaborative on District Reform have repeatedly emphasized several key factors that are vital to the effectiveness of any state policy effort. The November 2021 meeting highlighted the application of these dynamics to the work of community schools.

Connect Community Schools Work to Student Learning Outcomes

Fundamentally, community school strategies are about student success, and learning contexts and opportunities reflect what we know from the science of learning and development. Thus, it is essential that all community school partners understand their contribution toward improved student learning. Effective community schools often provide multiple supports for overall well-being that help students and families feel loved and experience a sense of belonging that can enhance engagement in their school. Emphases on social justice can help

highlight and address barriers to success for students who are historically underserved and empower them to develop a sense of agency in their learning environment. Such an approach to building community schools is necessary and may be instrumental to ensure academic success, particularly for those students who have been most marginalized and underserved by the educational system. However, they are insufficient to prepare students to thrive after high school in college, the community, and life. If the goal is to impact academic outcomes, it is important to explicitly name the role of teaching in community schools. As Marty Blank and Jane Quinn reflected on more than 20 years of community schools development, "good student support systems cannot compensate for a weak core instructional program that is not responsive to individual student development and learning needs (including social, emotional, and cognitive)."[12] The work of all partners therefore needs to align with the opportunities and expectations for academic learning.[13]

Start Where You Are

Community schools work is developmental and takes time to initiate and embed into the work of school systems and their partners. The prospect of new financial resources made available through the CCSPP might prompt applicants to design their efforts according to the requirements of an external grant program. Instead, district leaders should define their first steps according to their existing strengths and the places in which the district has leverage to improve. For example, many community-based, expanded learning partners—once just seen as providing out-of-school time care and nonacademic "enrichment"—were invaluable learning supports for students and families during the pandemic.[14] In Oakland USD, expanded learning professionals were part of developing the reopening plans for schools, including a toolkit to support school site teams, principals, and full-service community school coordinators to understand

collectively the priorities and needs of each school and how they might redesign services. These conversations informed the development of an integrated learning delivery model through which expanded learning providers partnered with teachers during the virtual school day. This experience helped strengthen a collaborative approach to more intentionally leveraging learning opportunities and staff to best serve students.

The good news is that many districts and schools already operate elements and principles of community schools without using the label. These practices often take the form of explicit and meaningful student voice and choice, parent engagement, and inclusive and consistent site leadership. Existing initiatives within many districts—for example, a Safe and Welcoming Schools effort in Garden Grove USD that seeks to create a safe and supportive environment for all students and families—are already consistent with a community schools approach.

There is more good news: Even more districts embraced key aspects of community schools work during the pandemic. On-site services that ranged from meal distribution to wellness centers to COVID-19 testing and vaccination gave students and families access to supports for their overall well-being. At the same time, expanded family engagement and access to tutoring services during periods of remote instruction created vehicles for learning outside the physical classroom space. Teachers who cultivated strong connections with their students were more readily able to pivot to distance learning by assessing technology (and other support) needs, creating opportunities for community-connected learning, and actively supporting families to be engaged in their student's learning.[15] The CCSPP and other state investments provide even more resources to sustain and extend these efforts. Moving forward, districts can build on these successes and other aspects of their current circumstances to foster community schools work. For example, facilities in districts with declining enrollment can become spaces to house services

for students and families and even generate income that helps sustain the work.

Whatever path a district or school designs for embarking on community schools work, building from a place of strength can smooth the journey forward and ensure its sustainability. Seeing community schools efforts as an opportunity to deepen and expand existing work and relationships enables educators to build from a place of familiarity and experience rather than embrace an entirely new mode of operation at a time when workloads are already overwhelming. Moreover, by leveraging strategies and cultures in which educators are already invested, districts can achieve stronger buy-in from educators within their systems as well as from outside partners.

Establish Coherence Around a Clear Vision

The work of a school system should center on a clear vision that reflects the priorities and realities of the district and its community.[16] For example, if the district's vision for student learning emphasizes social and emotional development alongside academics, then this integrated focus should be evident in curriculum and pedagogy, interaction patterns in classrooms and extracurricular activities, and community partnerships.

Nevertheless, a clear vision alone will not result in coherence. Active, intentional, and explicit coordination is critical for success. However, aspects of the current environment—coupled with past patterns of policymaking in the state—could undercut the potential for achieving and sustaining a coherent and responsive approach at the local level. A wave of separate funding streams, for example, each with specific requirements for achieving siloed programmatic goals, can lead to fragmentation and compliance-oriented responses rather than thoughtful integration of those goals and funds into the ongoing work of the district and its schools.[17] But if districts design their plans in

a way that fosters coherence and long-term commitment to systemic change, they can resist pressures to fragment their improvement efforts to align with specific funding streams or grant requirements rather than an overall district vision. District leaders can invest in long-term relationships rather than rush to meet surface-level, transactional commitments to grant requirements. Design and implementation decisions can help districts and their partners harness human capital and expertise rather than become overwhelmed by unmet capacity needs. Measures of success can honor system transformation and student experience rather than compliance with a set of programmatic requirements. These metrics can focus everyone's attention on the same key goals—to keep everyone in the community rowing in the same direction— rather than establish different expectations for different programs.

Sustain the Focus Across Time

Finally, improvement requires sustained and focused attention across time. This implies consistency of available funding to support the work, structures, and processes to embed it into the daily activities of staff and students, and— most important—avoiding the temptation to abandon a promising approach in favor of a newer, shinier program when student test scores do not skyrocket overnight.

Cautions about sustainability are especially important in this moment of transition to pandemic recovery. An influx of federal and state funds has provided districts with unprecedented resources to support improvement efforts. If used strategically, district leaders and their partners could leverage this funding to help build an infrastructure for high-quality community schools work, such as shared data systems and professional learning to support cross-sector, whole-child learning communities. However, if system leaders were to use onetime funds to create new positions and programs that they cannot support when such

funding sources expire, they could undermine community schools efforts by removing the very aspects of a system's approach that enabled its early success. Moreover, if state and district approaches to funding community schools promote a traditional mentality of securing funding to do the work on top of the regular work of schooling, rather than pursuing sustainability through rearranging approaches to funding and staffing, maintaining a commitment to community schools across time will be difficult. Fundamentally, questions about sustainability also underscore the critical importance of basic funding adequacy to support whole-child approaches to teaching and learning.[18]

Supports That Can Help Districts Build Capacity to Embrace Community Schools Work

Because a formal commitment to community schools represents unfamiliar territory for many districts, supports in several domains might enable districts to take advantage of a community schools approach. The statute for the CCSPP called for the creation of at least five regional technical assistance centers plus a state lead technical assistance center to articulate the content and process of technical assistance for planning and implementation grantees. Perspectives from Collaborative members suggest areas in which supports may be most important.

Community schools are a personnel-intensive approach to system transformation at a time when districts have limited personnel. In a productive community school, central office and school staff establish and maintain relationships with partner organizations and strengthen the voice and role of students and families in school. Community liaisons or community school coordinators can be instrumental in connecting and elevating these voices. Just as important is the role of a strong

principal who can champion community schools work, model and facilitate inclusive leadership, and guide the integration of efforts with a clear instructional vision. Moreover, if the work of student-serving organizations is to come together in a coherent way, the alignment of curricula and pedagogical approaches; data sharing, reflection, and planning; and communication may introduce additional demands for existing roles in a school system. However, districts are already struggling to fill existing roles[19] because COVID-19 exacerbated an already growing teacher shortage.[20] Recruitment, training, and retention of key staff are therefore areas in which districts are likely to need assistance.

Closely related to staffing are capacity needs at the school, district, and regional levels. School and system leaders have already been pushed far outside the areas of their professional expertise to navigate the many dynamics of COVID-19. Another key source of support is connecting districts to resources and expertise, based on local context (e.g., geography, demographics, urbanicity), resources (e.g., access to community organizations, hospitals, institutions of higher education), scale (e.g., small districts, larger districts that serve multiple municipal communities), and district philosophies of improvement (e.g., centralized districts that seek to achieve efficiency and coherence through a consistent districtwide approach, decentralized districts that grant greater autonomy to schools to address their own local needs). This can mean opportunities to leverage knowledge generated by those who have engaged in community schools work before.[21] It also can entail extending system capacity through effective partnerships with school, youth, and community transformation practitioners that are the lynchpin of an effective community school. Helping districts identify and broker new relationships that build student-serving human capital can be vital for successful planning and implementation.

Considerations for Policymakers

Details in the design and implementation of the CCSPP by the California Department of Education (CDE) will shape the degree to which local education leaders can take advantage of the state's community schools investment. However, aspects of the current environment—coupled with past patterns of policymaking in the state—could undercut the potential for achieving and sustaining a coherent and responsive approach at the local level. For instance:

- A wave of separate funding streams, each with specific requirements for achieving siloed programmatic goals, can lead to fragmentation and compliance-oriented responses rather than sustained investments in collaborative staffing infrastructure and systems (e.g., community school coordinators), or the thoughtful integration of those goals and funds into the ongoing work of a district and its schools.

- Investments in capacity building and implementation evaluation too often follow a piecemeal approach tied to a specific improvement strategy or a "toolkit" of resources and guides without sufficient commitment to alignment and integration to support a system and developmental process of transformation.

- The infusion of onetime funds with relatively short timelines for implementation can lead to shortsighted resource allocation decisions that encumber budgets down the road and diffuse attention in unproductive ways. This is particularly problematic in the current situation, in which staffing shortages make it difficult to fill needed positions despite the allocation of new funds, and short-term solutions undermine the development of relationships that are so critical to effective and sustained improvement.

- Increases in student-level academic outcomes reflect multiple inputs and contributing factors that often are not sufficiently captured by the state's accountability system. For example, baseline inputs and attributes of the school community, including percentages of highly qualified teachers,[22] rates of teacher[23] and principal retention;[24] consistency of strong district and school leadership;[25] and community health and well-being[26] have demonstrated correlation to student academic success. Thus, implementation of community school strategies alone will not result in increased academic achievement without explicit attention to these important inputs and leading indicators of school change.[27]

To support the mindsets and behaviors described in this brief, we offer the following considerations for the CDE to monitor and support community schools grant recipients.

- **Develop a grant monitoring process that encourages and rewards focus, coherence, and alignment with existing efforts.** Metrics for evaluation should align with existing expectations for the Local Control Accountability Plan, as well as for emerging planning requirements for expanded learning opportunities, universal transitional kindergarten, and other aspects of California's P–12 education system. Moreover, metrics of successful student opportunities and outcomes in community schools should reflect the goals for the state's school system overall.

- **Align technical assistance efforts for community schools with other support systems.** Any supports provided for community schools through the five regional technical assistance centers should connect to the technical assistance provided through the statewide system of support, reinforcing the alignment of community school approaches with other improvement strategies. At the same time, we acknowledge that most school systems and state agencies do not have a deep experiential base with community schools to draw on. The state should therefore be expansive in the kinds of organizations that school leaders can turn to for expertise—including community-based organizations, higher education, and other districts, many of whom have been doing community schools work in California for decades.

- **Look for ways to remove barriers that prevent community schools from working effectively.** Successful collaboration across youth-serving organizations often requires data sharing, joint facility use, and fluid access to financial resources, yet bureaucratic obstacles frequently complicate district efforts to partner with others. For example, streamlining the bureaucratic processes for leasing school property can help district partners make use of facilities for students and families. And finding ways to facilitate shared data access and use between local housing authorities and districts can help ensure that student- and family-serving organizations have access to the information that will enable them to respond effectively to student needs. As CCSPP grantees embark on their work, the state should engage in a process of ongoing evidence collection and reflection to identify and remove barriers that emerge in the implementation process.

Conclusion

California is in the midst of a unique political and funding opportunity to fundamentally transform public education and ensure a whole-child, whole-community approach to effective teaching and learning. Although educators and youth-serving advocates have increasingly demanded resources and strategies that are part of a "community school strategy," there is an overwhelming sense of initiative overload and a confusing and incoherent array of supports. The risk is strong that new grant awards will unintentionally contribute to fragmentation and shortsighted actions driven by grant deadlines rather than the principles of effective relationship building and strategic planning. If districts can recognize and build on their existing strengths, carefully center their work on a clear vision, develop plans to sustain their efforts across time, and maintain a laser focus on improving opportunities and outcomes for youth, the opportunity for true system transformation could bear fruit for the youth who need it most.

References

Bradley, D., Naftzger, N., Mitrano, S., Sorenson, I., & Lenz, A. (2020). *Identifying key drivers of community schools: Lessons learned from the evaluation of the Chicago Community Schools Initiative.* American Institutes for Research. https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/Identifying-Key-Drivers-of-Effective-Community-Schools-Chicago-March-2021.pdf

Cardichon, J., Darling-Hammond, L., Yang, M., Scott, C., Shields, P. M., & Burns, D. (2020). *Inequitable opportunity to learn: Student access to certified and experienced teachers.* Learning Policy institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/CRDC_Teacher_Access_REPORT.pdf

Carver-Thomas, D., Burns, D., Leung, M., & Ondrasek, N. (2022). *Teacher shortages during the pandemic: How California districts are responding.* Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teacher_Shortages_During_Pandemic_REPORT.pdf

Carver-Thomas, D., Leung, M., & Burns, D. (2021). *California teachers and COVID-19: How the pandemic is impacting the teacher workforce.* Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/California_COVID_Teacher_Workforce_REPORT.pdf

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it.* Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teacher_Turnover_REPORT.pdf

Cohn, C. A. (2021, September). An impossible position: How the COVID-19 pandemic has shone an even bigger spotlight on superintendent leadership in America's public schools. *School Administrator.* http://my.aasa.org/AASA/Resources/SAMag/2021/Sep21/Cohn.aspx

Darling-Hammond, L., Furger, R., Shields, P. M., & Sutcher, L. (2016). *Addressing California's emerging teacher shortage: An analysis of sources and solutions.* Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/LPI-Report-AddressingCA_TeacherShortage.pdf

Davis, W., Chang, A., Zamora, K., & Dorning, C. (2021). Teachers thought 2021 would be better. Instead, some say it's their toughest year yet. *NPR.* https://www.npr.org/2021/12/23/1067077413/teachers-pandemic-school-classroom-return-to-in-person-learning

Detterman, R., Ventura, J., Rosenthal, L., & Berrick, K. (2019). *Unconditional education: Supporting schools to serve all students.* Oxford University Press.

Dorn, E., Hancock, B., Sarakatsannis, J., & Viruleg, E. (2021). *COVID-19 and education: The lingering effects of unfinished learning.* McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/our-insights/covid-19-and-education-the-lingering-effects-of-unfinished-learning

Dryfoos, J. G. (1998). *A look at community schools in 1998.* National Center for Schools & Communities. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED423034.pdf

Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research.* The Wallace Foundation. https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/How-Principals-Affect-Students-and-Schools.pdf

Hahnel, C., Hough, H. J., & Willis, J. (2020). *Securing and protecting education funding in California.* Policy Analysis for California Education. https://edpolicyinca.org/publications/securing-and-protecting-education-funding-california

Ishimaru, A. M. (2019). *Just schools: Building equitable collaborations with families and communities.* Teachers College Press.

Johnston, W. R., Engberg, J., Opper, I. M., Sontag-Padilla, L., & Xenakis, L. (2020). *Illustrating the promise of community schools: An assessment of the impact of the New York City Community Schools Initiative.* RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3245.html

Kimner, H. (2020). *Community schools: A COVID-19 recovery strategy.* Policy Analysis for California Education. https://edpolicyinca.org/publications/community-schools

Kimner, H., Maysonet, L., & Winthrop, R. (2022). *Community schools and a critical moment in the fight against education inequality.* The Brookings Institution. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/education-plus-development/2022/03/08/community-schools-and-a-critical-moment-in-the-fight-against-education-inequality/

Kuhfeld, M., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., Ruzek, E., & Lewis, K. (2020). *Learning during COVID-19: Initial findings on students' reading and math achievement and growth.* NWEA Collaborative for Student Growth. https://www.nwea.org/content/uploads/2020/11/Collaborative-brief-Learning-during-COVID-19.NOV2020.pdf

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S. A., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning.* The Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, and The Wallace Foundation. https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/How-Leadership-Influences-Student-Learning.pdf

Levin, S., & Bradley, K. (2019). *Understanding and addressing principal turnover: A review of the research.* National Association of Secondary School Principals and Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/NASSP_LPI_Principal_Turnover_Research_Review_REPORT.pdf

Linked Learning Alliance & UCLA Center for Community Schooling. (2021). *Linked learning and community schools: Preparing all students for college, career, and civic life.* https://d985fra41m798.cloudfront.net/resources/LL_CommSchools.pdf?mtime=20210224142438

Loeb, S., Bryk, A., & Hanushek, E. (2008). Getting down to facts: School finance and governance in California. *Education Finance and Policy, 3*(1), 1–19.

Maier, A., Daniel, J., Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2017). *Community schools as an effective improvement strategy: A review of the evidence.* Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Community_Schools_Effective_REPORT.pdf

McLaughlin, M., Fehrer, K., & Leos-Urbel, J. (2020). *The way we do school: The making of Oakland's full-service community schools district.* Harvard Education Press.

O'Day, J., & Marsden, D. (2022). *Educational leadership in crisis: Reflections from a pandemic.* California Collaborative on District Reform. https://cacollaborative.org/sites/default/files/2022-01/CA_Collaborative_COVID_Leadership.pdf

Osher, D., Cantor, P., Berg, J., Steyer, L., & Rose, T. (2018). Drivers of human development: How relationships and context shape learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*(1), 6–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1398650

Pier, L., Hough, H., Christian, M., Bookman, N., Wilkenfeld, B., & Miller, R. (2021, January 25). *COVID-19 and the educational equity crisis: Evidence on learning loss from the CORE Data Collaborative* [Commentary]. Policy Analysis for California Education. https://edpolicyinca.org/newsroom/covid-19-and-educational-equity-crisis

Quinn, J., & Blank, M. J. (2020). Twenty years, ten lessons: Community schools as an equitable school improvement strategy. *Voices in Urban Education, 49*(2), 44–53. https://steinhardt.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/2020-10/Twenty%20Years%2C%20Ten%20Lessons.pdf

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.* Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A_Coming_Crisis_in_Teaching_REPORT.pdf

Vance, F., Wolforth, S., & Kimner, H. (2021). *Expanded learning partnerships: A foundation for rebuilding to support the whole child.* Policy Analysis for California Education. https://www.edpolicyinca.org/sites/default/files/2021-01/pb_vance_1_feb21.pdf

ENDNOTES

1   See, for example, Dorn et al. (2021), Kuhfeld et al. (2020), and Pier et al. (2021).

2   For example, Cohn (2021) and O'Day and Marsden (2022) explore the trauma that district leaders have experienced in leading school systems through the pandemic. Reports by organizations such as the Learning Policy Institute (e.g., Carver-Thomas et al., 2021) supplement accounts from media outlets such as NPR (e.g., Davis et al., 2021) and EdSource (e.g., https://edsource.org/podcast/teaching-during-a-covid-surge) that describe the challenges of teaching during COVID-19.

3   See Kimner et al. (2022).

4   See Maier at al. (2017).

5   The community schools movement in the United States has its historical roots in the early 1900s, with John Dewey's vision of schools as social centers and Jane Addams' focus on social work and providing a range of resources for those in need. Dryfoos (1998) described "full-service schools" as schools where health, mental health, and social service agencies have located their programs and offer health screening, psychological counseling, drug prevention, parent education, and other important services. Similarly, the Healthy Start Support Services for Children Act of 1991 (Senate Bill 620) intended to close the achievement gap by helping children and their family members gain access to an array of physical, emotional, and intellectual supports—in school, at home, and in the community—to support quality learning.

6   For example, the RAND implementation study of the New York City Department of Education's community schools posits a theory of change that does not specifically include instruction, pedagogy, or teaching as part of the community school treatment but hypothesizes changes in students' "readiness to learn" (Johnston et al., 2020).

7   See https://soldalliance.org/.

8   See Osher et al. (2018).

9   See Linked Learning Alliance and UCLA Center for Community Schooling (2021).

10 The seminal Getting Down to Facts studies of 2007 captured the dysfunction engendered by the proliferation of disparate state programs in California (Loeb et al., 2008). Although the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) sought to streamline funding in a way to foster coherence, a range of improvement approaches—and accompanying acronyms—that are growing in schools nationwide (e.g., multitiered systems of support [MTSS], response to intervention [RTI], positive behavior interventions and supports [PBIS], social and emotional learning [SEL], restorative justice [RJ]) and specific to California (e.g., LCFF, the Local Control Accountability Plan [LCAP], the California Healthy Kids Survey [CHKS]) can overwhelm district school systems that do not find ways to strategically connect their efforts in aligned service of student learning.

11 See McLaughlin et al. (2020).

12 See Quinn and Blank (2020).

13 See design principles for putting the science of learning and development into action at https://www.designprinciples.org/.

14 See Vance et al. (2021).

15 See Kimner (2020).

16 See, for example, Bradley et al. (2020).

17 For example, in addition to the CCSPP, California has dedicated new funding to initiatives that include expanded learning opportunities and the growth of the state's transitional kindergarten program to include all 4-year-olds. State requirements for planning and reporting that are specific to each funding stream can prompt districts to isolate rather than integrate these various improvement efforts.

18 See Hahnel et al. (2020).

19 See Carver-Thomas et al. (2022).

20 See, for example, Darling-Hammond et al. (2016) and Sutcher et al. (2016).

21 Some of this knowledge is captured in books such as Detterman et al. (2019) and McLaughlin et al. (2020). In addition, community schools implementation guidance draws from extensive school reform and improvement literatures that do not explicitly reference "community schools," such as Ishimaru (2019) and resources from organizations such as the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning and Turnaround for Children. Just as important might be opportunities to engage with experienced leaders in the field who can share insights based on their community schools work.

22 See Cardichon et al. (2020).

23 See Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2017).

24 See Levin and Bradley (2019).

25 See Grissom et al. (2021) and Leithwood et al. (2004).

26 See resources from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention about attention to the whole school, whole community, and whole child at https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/wscc/index.htm.

27 Research on long-standing community schools efforts in Oakland USD, for example, found that a long-term approach is important—yet insufficient on its own—to move the needle on key outcomes (McLaughlin et al., 2020).

CALIFORNIA**COLLABORATIVE**
on District Reform