

LEVERAGING ESSA: POLICY OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOLS STRATEGIES





Leveraging ESSA: Policy Opportunities for Community Schools Strategies

The passage of the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) includes important accountability provisions that advance the principle that student success and school quality are measured by more than just academic test scores. Rather, a comprehensive approach to school improvement requires intentional investment in a whole-child, whole-school effort, where students, educators, families, and community partners work together to ensure excellent and equitable outcomes for all students.

ESSA recognizes that achieving excellence in American education depends on providing access to opportunity for all children, and that increasing inequality – driven by external social, economic and community factors traditionally viewed as outside of the domain of schools -- have a significant influence on student outcomes and the persistent achievement gap. To that end, ESSA provides an important opportunity for state and district leaders to rethink strategies that recognize that communities are vital partners and resources in that effort.

A community school strategy makes explicit that in order to significantly improve the academic and developmental outcomes of children, schools must work with community partners – e.g. families, community and faith-based organizations, local government, institutes of higher learning, public agencies, law enforcement, United Ways and others – to ensure that all students have an equitable opportunity to succeed in school. The community school strategy provides an intentional structure for partnerships that promote access to resources and supports, strengthens and sustains relationships between schools, family and community engagement, and enhances opportunities for shared leadership and decision-making.

While the rationale behind a comprehensive approach to student learning is simple, actual implementation requires a transformational shift in the way that schools function (and all of the adults within and around them), and in the way that community partners interact with schools.

SEA's developing their ESSA accountability and implementation plans should consider how the various areas of their plans can provide a foundational policy infrastructure and systems development to support and encourage community school strategies that are infused within every aspect of the teaching, learning, leading and improvement of schools.

The community school model has three distinct features:

- Boost academic achievement through educational, social and emotional support, offering programs and services that remove barriers and provide enhanced opportunities
- Comprehensive support of the health and wellness of children and their families through medical support, counseling services, and youth and community development programs
- Parental and community engagement, including an active role in decision-making through shared leadership

Various partner organizations and an on-site resource coordinator bring these many elements together to create an optimal learning environment and a strong, vibrant community.



What Is In This Brief?

Goals for Student Achievement and High School Graduation Rates	4
Accountability Indicators and N-size	5
Report Cards and Data Reporting	6
English Learners – Identification and Assessment	7
Schools Identified for Comprehensive and Targeted Reform Interventions, Supports, and Timelines	8
School Improvement Funding	9
Standards	10
Educator Equity	11
Teacher and Leader Evaluation Systems and Supports	12
Early Childhood Education	13
At-Risk Students	14
Rural Schools	15
Mitigating the Effects of Poverty	16
Stakeholder and Family Engagement	17

The following analysis describes some of the major provisions of ESSA and how they might provide a framework for a comprehensive, and system-wide approach to supporting community school strategies. This includes incorporating non-academic measures of school quality and student success, prioritizing coordination of efforts, recommending structures for family and community engagement with schools and school planning and creating a system of school improvement strategies that weaves together classroom changes with integrated student supports that address barriers to academic success.

State educational agencies (SEAs), local education agencies (LEAs), and stakeholders should consider these areas as opportunities to reexamine, refine, and strengthen systems, staffing, and practices that are foundational to a community school strategy.



Goals for Student Achievement and High School Graduation Rates

What Does ESSA Say?

Under ESSA, states must set long-term goals with measurements of interim progress for student achievement in English Language Arts (ELA) and math (as measured by proficiency); high school graduation rates; and English language proficiency (ELP). The goals and interim progress measures must take into account the improvement to make significant progress in closing proficiency and graduation rate gaps.

States must also set a long-term goal for 4-year high school graduation rates with measurements of interim progress. In addition, states may set goals for extended-year high school graduation rates, but those goals must be higher than the 4-year graduation rate goal.

What Does this Mean for CS?

An SEA's goals for student achievement and high school graduation rates should be seen as benchmark indicators of a broader set of desired student outcomes. For instance, is the primary objective to prepare students for successful futures in which they are educated, self-sufficient, safe and healthy? Are these objectives part of a broader continuum including early education, school-readiness, and postsecondary success? How do these goals and standards align to postsecondary admission requirements and skills needed for success? What kinds of resources, supports and opportunities are needed in order to reach these goals?

Reaching consensus on definitions of student success and school quality – and their respective indicators and goals – are critical starting points in developing a comprehensive community school strategy that leverages the assets of families, community partners, and public sector agencies. As states develop their accountability plans, keep in mind that in order to receive Title I grants, ESSA requires SEAs to develop plans in consultation with specialized instructional support personnel, which should include school personnel, community partners, and agencies whose work intentionally supports student success and school quality (e.g. school counseling, out of school time and enrichment programs, health and mental health specialists, early education, post secondary).



Accountability Indicators and N-size

What Does ESSA Say?

ESSA requires states to use a multiple indicator accountability system that includes the performance of all students and each student subgroup for each indicator. States must set the minimum number of students from a subgroup needed for reporting and accountability purposes (N-size). The N-size must be the same for all subgroups and for all indicators.

The required accountability indicators for elementary, middle and high schools are:

- Achievement in ELA and math as measured by proficiency on statewide assessments
- English language proficiency rates
- At least 1 additional indicator of school quality or student success that allows for meaningful differentiation among school performance, can be disaggregated, and is valid, reliable, statewide, comparable (e.g., rates of school discipline, chronic absenteeism). This indicator must carry “substantial” weight. In the aggregate, these indicators must carry “much greater weight” than the indicator(s) of school quality or student success.
- High schools must also include their 4-year graduation rate (in addition, states may use an extended-year graduation rate).

NOTE: States may include more than one additional indicator of school quality or success so long as that indicator is measured for all students and subgroups.

What Does this Mean for CS?

N-size and the additional indicator are two major areas that can impact how accurately a state’s accountability system monitors their student subgroups as well as guides how the SEA, an LEA and schools allocate necessary resources to support a comprehensive approach to student success.

N-size is also related to how schools are identified as in need of targeted support for improvement: the “bottom performing 5% of schools,” and those where any subgroup is underperforming at the level of the lowest 5% on a particular indicator. How small or large the n-size is, will determine how sensitive the accountability system is for the state’s subgroups. If the n-size is set too high, states run the risk of overlooking the chronic equity gaps that face already marginalized groups of students.

The “additional indicator” also presents an innovative opportunity to track aspects of school quality and success that might not always be apparent by looking solely at academic proficiency. While academic achievement measures will still carry “higher weight” (in a formula determined by the SEA), an additional indicator that considers factors that impact student progress and proficiency rates could provide a clearer diagnostic tool to better understand the challenges facing schools and districts facing equity gaps. For instance, states might choose to include measures of school climate, safety, student engagement/attendance, and discover that disproportionality of those rates for particular subgroups correlate with disproportionate academic gains.

In tandem with academic indicators, such additional indicators are instrumental to developing and implementing school-wide and targeted strategies to remove barriers to learning, and provide clear direction and focus to community partnerships and supports, to work in collaboration with and build capacity of instructional staff.



Report Cards and Data Reporting

What Does ESSA Say?

ESSA requires state and district to produce annual report cards, that include readily accessible information on:

- Long-term goals and measures of interim progress for all students and subgroups, on all accountability indicators;
- Minimum number of students for subgroups (N-size);
- The system used to meaningfully differentiate among schools, and how schools are identified for additional Support & Improvement
- Performance on annual assessments disaggregated by: economic disadvantage; each major racial and ethnic group; gender; disability, English learner (EL) and migrant status; homeless; foster care; and military-connection.
- Educator Equity: professional qualifications of teachers overall and in high-poverty schools compared to low-poverty schools, including the percentage of teachers who are inexperienced, teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, or who are not teaching in the field they are certified;
- Measures of school quality, climate, and safety, which may include data reported as part of US ED's Office for Civil Rights Data Collection; and
- Early Childhood Data: percent of students enrolled in preschool programs.

What Does this Mean for CS?

Annual report cards, one part of a comprehensive accountability system, must not only reflect accurate and regularly updated information, but must be accessible in the language of the families of students. Investments in producing digestible information illustrates the SEAs recognition that families are indispensable partners and advocates in their child's education, and also reflects a commitment to transparency and accountability to all families.

In particular, SEAs must include information on chronic absenteeism (including both excused and unexcused absences) as part of their SEA and LEA report cards. Additional data available to SEAs and LEAs might include information on youth outcomes, student perceptions of climate/safety, or other areas available through 21st CCLC evaluations.

Such data serves as the backbone to strong and effective, evidence-based strategies, programs and partnerships. Community school partners can be instrumental in working with SEAs on determining the types of data included in report cards, as well as how to support regular information sharing and feedback processes to help families and school partners digest the data and understand how the information can be used to assess and support a student's individual progress, or identifying priority areas for improvement at the school.



English Learners – Identification and Assessment



What Does ESSA Say?

The move of English Learner accountability from Title III to Title I, while it did not significantly change the general requirements states were expected to fulfill for ELs, it does add more weight to how states respond and how they will be held accountable.

ESSA requires that states:

- Include English proficiency as an indicator in their accountability systems;
- Annually assess and report English proficiency, and students who have not attained English proficiency within 5 years of identification as an EL;
- Clarify a standardized process for classifying ELs and re-designating students as English proficient; and disaggregate ELs with a disability from ELs in general.

In addition, states have two options regarding timing for testing ELs:

- Include test scores after they have been in the country 1 year (consistent with current law); OR
- Refrain from counting EL test scores in a school's rating in their first year, but require ELs to take both math and ELA assessments and publicly report the results.



What Does this Mean for CS?

Identification, assessment and accountability for English Learners is crucial for understanding how schools are serving ELs. And, having high expectations for students AND schools is an important aspect to ensure that EL progress is not simply “reported out,” but serves as actionable information. While reaching English proficiency varies by individual, the goal of 5 years proficiency is a reasonable number and benchmark to assess the ability of schools to respond to ELs’ learning needs.



Schools Identified for Comprehensive and Targeted Reform Interventions, Supports, and Timelines

What Does ESSA Say?

At least once every 3 years, the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools, and all high school with a graduation rate at or below 67%, will be identified by the SEA as Comprehensive Support & Improvement – schools must demonstrate improvement within 4 years or face additional action. SEAs must also annually identify schools in need of Targeted Support & Improvement – those schools with a subgroup of students who are consistently underperforming based on the indicators in the state accountability system

Districts have the responsibility of developing improvement plans for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement schools which must:

- be informed by all of the accountability indicators;
- be evidence-based;
- be based on a school-level needs assessment;
- be approved by the school, district, and state;
- be monitored and periodically reviewed by the state; and
- identify resource inequities to be addressed.

Targeted Support and Improvement schools may face additional action for continued underperformance as determined by the district.

What Does this Mean for CS?

ESSA frames school identification not just in terms of punitive measures or failure, but in terms of continuous improvement and support, thereby recognizing that schools facing challenges need time, resources, partners and expertise to address and confront their challenges. A community school strategy should be a core component of LEA school improvement plans and plans for transforming low-performing schools, closing gaps for subgroups and improving academic outcomes for all students.

To that end, school-level needs assessment should consider a comprehensive range of variables and indicators including school climate and safety, student and teacher engagement, family satisfaction and engagement, health and wellness, and resource assets and inequities. Such information is instrumental to understanding and responding to the root causes of outcome disparities.

Similar to a comprehensive and integrated needs assessment and resource analysis, resulting strategies and interventions included in a school improvement plan, however, should be equally comprehensive and integrated. That is, piecemeal or narrowly focused approaches to school reform will not be effective unless they are explicitly aligned to the broader school system and infrastructure – including instructional pedagogy, curricular standards and proficiency goals, data systems, and instructional and non instructional supports (e.g. health and wellness strategies that don't consider classroom climate). Family engagement, engaging the community in planning for school improvement, aligning resources to remove non-academic barriers to success and providing out-of-school time programs linked to classroom learning and enrichment are integral to sustained school improvement efforts.



School Improvement Funding

What Does ESSA Say?

States must use 7% of Title I allocations for school improvement activities. States will determine if these funds are distributed by formula or competitive grants. LEAs can also consolidate and use Title I and other federal, state, and local funds for schoolwide Title I programs in schools where at least 40% of students are from low-income families.

States may use 3% of Title I allocations for “direct student services,” in consultation with districts, including:

- Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and other advanced coursework; career and technical education that leads to an industry-recognized credential;
- credit recovery programs;
- personalized learning; and
- transportation from Comprehensive Support & Improvement schools to higher performing schools.

What Does this Mean for CS?

Greater flexibility in Title I and Title IV allows districts and schools to use funding to expand the amount and quality of learning time, such as non-instructional supports (e.g. counseling and mental health programs, mentoring, behavioral supports), college and career readiness, teacher/staffing needs, and early learning programs). Title I, II and IV funds can also support services delivered by non-profit, public or for-profit partners, providing an important opportunity to leverage partnerships, resources, and professional expertise of local CBOs, institutes of higher learning, and capacity-building experts.

While funding to support programmatic interventions are often considered high priorities, LEAs and schools implementing a community school strategy should consider the necessary infrastructure and staffing needed to ensure that implementation of the full array of programs are not piecemeal efforts, but an integral part of their school’s theory of change to improve instruction and academic outcomes. For example, this means that LEAs can allocate Title funds to develop community school infrastructure (e.g. data sharing systems, interdisciplinary work groups), staffing (e.g. resource or community school coordinator) and intervention strategies (e.g. capacity building for teachers around family engagement) that further develop new and enhance existing partnerships, create shared leadership structures, and increase access to services as identified by the needs assessment and resource analysis.

To encourage efficient use of funds, SEAs should consider incentives for LEAs to coordinate and integrate Title I services with other educational services at the LEA or individual school level, including services for English learners, children with disabilities, migratory children, and others. For instance, in allocating a portion of Title I funding



School Improvement Funding - continued

What Does ESSA Say?

What Does this Mean for CS?

to support a school site coordinator, the state, LEAs, and the school might be able well-positioned to leverage additional funding sources to match or contribute to staffing investments, e.g. placing Department of Human Services case workers in schools to streamline access to services and supports). In addition, SEAs and LEAs should keep in mind allocating resources to support continuous improvement efforts, including annual needs assessments, program and impact evaluations, joint and/or targeted professional learning opportunities, and regular stakeholder engagement and feedback cycles.

Standards

What Does ESSA Say?

States must demonstrate that their challenging academic standards are aligned with entry-level course requirements in the state's public system of higher education and the state's career and technical education standards.

What Does this Mean for CS?

Clear, explicit content standards are very important for supporting student progress towards desired outcomes, and establishing interim diagnostic tools for educators and other school personnel. As part of a community school strategy, aligning efforts to better support students and families includes an understanding of learning standards – especially important for partners in out-of-school time, family engagement, health and wellness staff. For instance, familiarity with Common Core standards can help enrichment partners design experiential and applied experiences that can complement school-day academics, while reinforcing “non-academic” soft skills (e.g. persistence, growth mindset) that are integral to 21st Century learning outcomes. Family engagement staff can help parents understand instructional learning goals



Educator Equity



What Does ESSA Say?

States no longer need to define and track Highly Qualified Teachers (HQTs), but states must develop, report and share plans describing how they will identify and address educator equity disparities that result in poor and minority students being taught by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other students.

States must collect and publicly report data on these disparities and describe the metrics used to determine the disparities. States must also report on, where available, the annual retention rates of effective and ineffective teachers, principals, and other school leaders. States may use federal professional development funds to increase access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and students of color.

Districts must describe how they will identify and address educator equity, and must have mechanisms to notify parents regarding the professional qualifications of their child's teacher.



What Does this Mean for CS?

Community school strategies are not just about removing barriers to learning for students, but about strengthening the conditions for high-quality teaching and learning. Often times, inequitable distribution of teachers, particularly in low-income and high-minority schools, is exacerbated by poor working conditions within those schools. This might include limited or inadequate professional development or support, unwelcoming or unhealthy school climates, challenging relationships with families and neighboring communities, inadequate non-instructional supports for students. Conducting a root-cause analysis to understand the challenges of educator equity can guide efforts to develop and strengthen partnerships with community organizations and institutes of higher learning, to ensure that educators have the supports they need to teach, and students have the supports they need to learn.



Teacher and Leader Evaluation Systems and Supports



What Does ESSA Say?

Under ESSA, SEAs must distribute 95% of Title II allocations to LEAs and reserve no more than 3% for activities for principals or school leaders. 4% of Title II funds may be reserved for state activities. Title II funds can be used to support professional development/learning and leadership opportunities, including recruitment, induction, mentoring, and career pathways. SEAs can subgrant or partner with for-profits, non-profits, institutes of higher education, or tribal organization, so long as strategies are “evidence based.”



What Does this Mean for CS?

As part of a comprehensive approach to educator equity, technical assistance to strengthen and sustain high quality teacher and leader evaluation and support systems is an important Title II investment, but should NOT be used as a piecemeal funding strategy to fix “isolated” programming needs – e.g. focusing on pedagogical approaches, without considering broader school climate considerations. ESSA allows for a collaborative approach to teacher preparation and support, and principal leadership development. The state plan should include strategies for ensuring that teachers and principals have the training that they need to engage parents and the community as partners in their students’ education. Other areas for professional development to support school staff might include addressing student behavioral and mental health needs and chronic absenteeism, creating engaging opportunities for project-based community learning.

Principals, in particular, need to be prepared to lead and innovate, to maximize both the flexibility offered by ESSA and meet new expectations around nonacademic measures of success, positive conditions for learning, family and community engagement and a well-rounded education. The community school strategy provides a structure that principals can use to lead and facilitate a collaborative approach to school and student success. In order to be most effective, principals must be supported and prepared to engage authentically with families and the community, and play a proactive role in building healthy communities. For example, organizations like New Leaders for New Schools can work with SEAs and LEAs to identify strategies to include in leadership development plans, especially around developing principals’ capacities to build partnerships with and share decision-making with families and the community.



Early Childhood Education

What Does ESSA Say?

ESSA's provisions aim to promote:

- early learning coordination within communities;
- greater alignment with the early elementary grades; and
- early childhood education focused on capacity building for teachers, leaders, and other staff
- serving young children.

A new authorization has been created for a Preschool Development Grant (PDG) program:

Authorized at \$250M for FYs 2017-20, the PDG is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) jointly with US ED. Funds can be used to develop, update, or implement a plan to increase collaboration or coordination among existing early childhood programs and participation of children from low-income families in high quality early childhood programs. Secretaries of HHS and US ED are restricted from prescribing early learning development guidelines, standards, specific assessments, and specific measures or indicators of quality early learning and care.

What Does this Mean for CS?

While increased investment in early learning and specifically its connection to K-12 is important, it is critical to recognize the multiple influences and actors that carry the responsibility to ensure that young people have the opportunity to thrive in school. Community school strategies bring together community members, families, educators, leaders, and policymakers—to ensure high-quality early childhood care and education, support kindergarten readiness, and improve the quality and continuity of a child's experience, including access to essential supports and services from early childhood to K-12. The John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities and the Coalition for Community Schools write that there “is sufficient evidence that this kind of cross-sector collaboration is possible and well worth the effort, as it promotes coordination and learning among those who serve children and ultimately has the potential to promote youth development across a number of interdependent dimensions. Fostering coherence across the early childhood and elementary sectors is, therefore, a promising pathway for school improvement and a key building block for the improvement of more broadly defined youth and community outcomes.”

Successful community school strategies rely on local, state, and federal policy infrastructures and funding sources such as ESSA's preschool development grant and allowable expenditures of Title I funds, to create alignment and incentivize partnership and standards of quality across early education and K-12 stakeholders. This includes finding strategic opportunities within schools and districts, and county and state level policies, e.g. early education, local health and human services, workforce development, family and community organizations, philanthropy and K-12 leaders.



At-Risk Students

What Does ESSA Say?

HSGI is eliminated, but a new funding program, the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant, authorizes formula grants to states for three purposes: (1) provide students a well-rounded education; (2) improve school conditions; and (3) improve the use of technology to support digital literacy. These funds may be used to support dropout prevention and re-entry programs.

What Does this Mean for CS?

ESSA provides the opportunity to ensure that districts and schools recognize the relationship between academic proficiency and the enriching learning opportunities and environments that are available to students, e.g. afterschool programming linked to classroom learning and arts education, integrated wellness services, behavioral and disciplinary health, restorative practices and family/school relationships that foster positive conditions for learning. Schools and classroom teachers alone cannot meet all of these dimensions without the strong support and partnership of families, communities, and organizations.

Direction to provide students a “well-rounded education” (in contrast to a narrow focus on “core subjects”) includes a variety of programs and funding authority such as Arts in Education, Elementary and Secondary School Counseling, the Physical Education Program, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers. While such fund sources are important federal investments, it is critical for districts and schools to not just consider how to get “more resources,” but instead think strategically about what is needed and why, as part of an integrated approach to reducing achievement gaps and ensuring student success.

For instance, a comprehensive needs assessment might reveal that students and families have limited access to high quality, engaging out of school time activities that reinforce academic content or learning skills. Teachers, community partners and school personnel should work together to develop the programs and strategies that would enhance student learning (e.g. arts-based enrichment, STEAM, or action research), and then find the federal, state, or local fund sources and partnerships that could serve that need.

In addition, states should consider allocating some of the funds that the state will receive to support



At-Risk Students - Continued

What Does ESSA Say?

What Does this Mean for CS?

low-income students and schools to include funding for a coordination mechanism or staffing strategy to ensure access to enrichment programs and other supports.

Rural Schools

What Does ESSA Say?

Spending flexibility of SRSA- and RLIS-directed funds is expanded to best meet the needs of underperforming students and schools. These funds can be used to support teacher recruitment and retention, teacher professional development, increasing access to educational technology, family engagement, ELL support, as well as partnerships that increase access to student enrichment, during and after the school day.

What Does this Mean for CS?

Forty-one percent of rural students live in poverty yet rural communities are often overshadowed by larger school districts in terms of resource allocation. As a result, rural students receive nearly 18 percent less in funding for instructional support than the average public school student.

Urban and suburban community school efforts often recognize the benefit of leveraging and aligning diverse resources and partnerships to address the silo'd nature of education, health and social services, as well as create more efficient and effective networks to support a comprehensive approach to student success.

Rural communities stand to benefit greatly from a community schools approach, by enlisting valuable (and often scarce) community resources to collectively create a shared approach to high quality teaching and learning. For instance, transportation, housing, and teacher recruitment are particularly noteworthy obstacles to quality education opportunities in rural places. In rural communities, effective strategies benefit from the social capital and familiarity between residents, business communities, places of worship, and local organizations.



Mitigating the Effects of Poverty

What Does ESSA Say?

Title IV Funds include competitive grants for supportive programs, such as Full-Service Community Schools, Promise Neighborhoods and 21st Century Community Learning Centers. These grants are intended to expand equitable access to comprehensive student enrichment and supports, including integrated community partnerships and professional development for educators to work effectively with families and communities.

What Does this Mean for CS?

Low-income students and families struggle under a patchwork of disconnected systems and funding streams. Poverty and lack of education often limit their ability to self-advocate, leaving them caught between the hurdles and opportunities presented by, among others, early education, K – 12, labor and workplace, immigration, and criminal justice systems. Each system provides – or purports to provide – responsive solutions and services, yet few are coordinated and none are as effective as they could be.

While competitive grant programs within Title IV have often emphasized the importance of a whole-child approach to teaching and learning, these programs however, should not be seen as stand-alone investments, nor the extent to which ESSA can support a community schools approach to student success.

Rather, important opportunities to leverage existing systems and community networks to provide needed supports and services specifically directed to meet the needs of high poverty students and families – e.g. health and wellness, social services, immigration support. There are several opportunities throughout ESSA that can be used to leverage and support system-wide community school approaches to mitigating poverty, that extend far beyond the technical jurisdiction of schools and districts, and instead maximize the supports and resources across public health, workforce development, housing, philanthropy, and social services. In addition, ESSA specifically mentions that the services may be delivered by a nonprofit or for-profit external provider with experience in using evidence-based or other effective strategies to improve student achievement. This provision creates an opportunity to support a collaborative funding approach to support and for collaboration between the local



Mitigating the Effects of Poverty - Continued



What Does this Mean for CS?

health and education sectors.

Title I

Title I provides funding to SEAs to support LEAs with high numbers or percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards.

- SEAs must reserve 7% of their Title I funding to support comprehensive support and improvement in the lowest performing schools. SEAs can use this funding to support student engagement and promote healthy, safe and supportive school environments.
- LEAs can consolidate and use Title I and other federal, state and local funds for schoolwide Title I programs in schools where at least 40% of the students are from low-income families. Allowable uses of this funding include counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services, implementation of a tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervention services.
- LEAs must reserve 1% of their Title I funding to support parent and family engagement. LEAs can use this funding to support schools and nonprofit organizations to build family and school staff capacity to work in partnership; support programs to reach parents and family members at home; disseminate best practices on parent and family engagement; and collaborate with entities with a record of success in improving and increasing parent and family engagement.

Title IV

- ESSA preserves the original intent of 21st Century Community Learning Center grants to support lifelong, intergenerational learning to remove barriers to student achievement. Several states have used 21st CCLC funds to provide high-quality out-of-school time learning and enrichment experiences for students, but could consider opportunities to deepen those experiences to build capacity within schools around non-instructional skills, family engagement, and project based learning.
- ESSA consolidates 49 grant programs, some of which focused on student health, into a new grant program, Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants. SEAs and LEAs can use this to promote student health, increase access to well-rounded education and improve the use of technology. Any school district that receives more than \$30,000 through this grant program must conduct a needs assessment and use the funding to address the needs identified, including evidence-based drug and violence prevention programs; mental health services; programs that support a healthy, active lifestyle; and mentoring and school counseling for children at risk of academic failure, dropping out of school or delinquency.
- Title IV establishes funding for full-service Community Schools and Promise Neighborhoods. Funding for both programs supports 'pipeline services' defined as a continuum of coordinated supports, services and opportunities for children from birth through entry into and success



Mitigating the Effects of Poverty - Continued



What Does this Mean for CS?

in postsecondary education and career attainment. Both full-service Community Schools and Promise Neighborhoods present tremendous opportunities for collaboration.

DRAFT



Stakeholder and Family Engagement

What Does ESSA Say?

ESSA's frequent and consistent calls for stakeholder engagement marks a profound shift away from federal to local/state accountability, and encourages a new process of local democracy in public education and accountability.

What Does this Mean for CS?

We know that in communities with historically less voice, there is extraordinary urgency to change patterns of engagement. The success and sustainability of efforts to improve educational excellence and equity, particularly with regard to our most vulnerable students and communities, requires robust and thoughtful partnership between and among federal, state, and local governmental agencies and stakeholders, to address misconceptions, empower new voices, and ensure shared ownership for the reforms our schools need.

Community school strategies prioritize collaborative leadership, shared ownership and shared accountability. Accordingly, stakeholder engagement – including families, teachers, school staff, leadership, community partners, and students – is not a series of regular calendar events, but a key implementation standard that drives needs assessment, planning, coordination, assessment and evaluation, and continuous improvement.

This is especially relevant for schools identified for school improvement; cultivating trusting relationships and constructive working relationships between families, educators, school staff and community partners are instrumental to local Title I and Title IV planning processes – they bring assets and expertise to bear on the academic and non-academic measure, as well as the strategies that schools will adopt to respond to the needs of students.



DRAFT

? Questions to Consider



Additional Tools and Resources

Migration Policy Institute

Taking Stock of ESSA's Potential Impact on Immigrant and English-Learner Students | January 21, 2016
ESSA Implementation in States and School Districts: Perspectives from Education Leaders | February 2016

Latino Policy Forum

Foundations of Academic Success for Latinos and English Learners | August, 2016
Shaping Our Future: Building a Collective Latino K-12 Education Agenda | June 2012
Preparing All Teachers to Educate Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students | 2015

Council for Chief State School Officers

Critical Area Outline on English Learners | March 29, 2016
English Learners Considerations in ESSA | December 14, 2015
Major Provisions of ESSA related to the Education of English Learners | March 2016

American Federation of Teachers

ELL Fact Sheet | 2016

National Council of La Raza (NCLR)

Article & Webinar: What the Every Student Succeeds Act means for the Latino Community | February 10, 2016
ESSA Implications for Latinos and English Learners | April 26, 2016