

Full-Service Schools: Policy Review and Recommendations

Ricky Campbell-Allen, Melissa Pena Aekta Shah, Rebekka Sullender, Rebecca Zazove

Harvard Graduate School of Education

November, 2009

In today's U.S. system of public education, an unfortunate gap between achievement and opportunity persists between low-income and all other students. At the base of the issue is the fact that schools and students do not exist in vacuums; they live and work in an unequal world with unequal services and opportunities which lead to a disparity among incoming students' school readiness. Richard Rothstein (2004), former New York Times columnist states "the gap in average [academic] achievement can probably not be narrowed substantially as long as the United States maintains such vast differences in socioeconomic conditions" (pg. 129).

Full-service schools¹ address the multiple factors that heavily impact student achievement by incorporating services at the school site to provide academic and non-academic supports students need to succeed. As defined by the Coalition for Community Schools, a community school is:

both a place and a set of partnerships between the school and other community resources. It's integrated focus on academics, services, supports and opportunities, leads to improved student learning, stronger families and healthier communities. Schools become centers of the community and are open to everyone—all day, every day, evenings and weekends." (Coalition for Community Schools website, www.communityschools.org)

In this model of schooling, the alignment of existing programs, funds, and agencies capitalizes on the available funding, human capital, and other resources for a more efficient use of powerful yet underutilized services (physical health, mental health, dental, etc.). In short, the 'one-stop-shop' of full-service schools improves access to vital services to the people most at need.

This paper will detail the vast history, contemporary politics, current policy, and examples of real-world practice of full-service schools. After careful exploration of all of these important aspects, we provide specific recommendations emphasizing the need for strong vertical alignment of funding streams and governance and lateral coordination of services at local, district, state, and federal levels, as well as stress the need for more data and research on this important area of educational policy.

¹ The terms full-service, community, and full-service community schools appear almost interchangeably in literature and policy. Thus, we also use these terms interchangeably throughout this paper.

The Underlying Social Problem

Research shows that families living in poverty deal with more stressors and demonstrate unique characteristics compared to the average middle-class family (Rothstein, 2009). The first major social class difference is in *childrearing*. Children in middle class families experience broader vocabularies by the time they enter school. Working class families tend to have fewer conversations with their babies and are less likely to read aloud to their young children as a means to start conversation and develop critical thinking skills (Rothstein, 2009). The second key social class difference is in *children's health*. Children living in low income areas are more likely to suffer from problems related to physical health, vision, hearing, oral health, and nutrition. Additionally, higher rates of environmental health issues such as lead exposure and asthma are present in these impoverished communities (2009). Furthermore, parents in low-income circumstances often have trouble attaining and utilizing health care, insurance, and/or government aid. While a child suffering from a single factor, such as asthma, may not be at a significant academic disadvantage, children suffering from an accumulation of these issues, as is often the case of children in low-income areas, experience drastic impediments to their school readiness.

The Solution

Community schools can respond to these increasing social needs in low-income students. Community schools aim to coordinate services that meet the divergent supplemental needs of students and thus free teachers to focus on the instructional core, which is directly connected to improved student achievement (Dryfoos & Quinn, 2005). The strength of the community school model is the coordinated integration of services that dynamically addresses the myriad needs of students from low-income backgrounds. This lateral coordination of services directly strikes at the bureaucratic and categorical silos that oversee various aspects of social welfare. The community school model also calls for a vertical alignment of funding streams whereby government agencies pool funds targeted at children into a collective pot allowing service provision to be responsive to student needs.

History of the Full-Service Movement: 1900s - Present

The Progressive Era

During the early part of the 1800s, education was left to the family and community. However, by the beginning of the 1900s, an influx of immigration, urbanization, and industrialization shifted public schools to own the burden of educating and socializing children. (Benson, Harkavy, Johenek & Puckett, 2009) Children living in poverty were predominately from immigrant families who struggled to attain the necessary social services to thrive. Jane Addams (1860-1935), the second woman to win a Nobel Prize, was the founder of the U.S. Settlement House Movement, based off of an English model, which brought health and educational services to working, immigrant neighborhoods in Chicago (Benson, et al., 2009; Wikipedia website, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jane_Addams). Addams believed that social ills were interconnected and that they must be approached holistically. In 1889 she established the Hull House in Chicago, which offered college extension classes, social clubs, literary offerings, ethnic festivals, art exhibits, recreational activities, kindergarten, visiting nurses, and legal services. These houses were often centers for labor union meetings, public forums, social science research, and meeting centers for peoples advocating for social change (Benson, et al., 2009). While many settlement houses originated in people's homes, schools became the obvious choice as the movement expanded. During this time, John Dewey also embraced the importance of community schooling. In his 1902 speech "The School as Social Centre," Dewey argued that urbanization and immigration had placed huge demands on social systems and that it was the community's role to organize to attain the services they needed (Rogers, n.d.). In the course of the 1920s, the progressive movement came to a close as conservatism took hold and many communities abandoned their social reform agendas notably, the public focus on community schools. The full-service school movement had been seeded, as such Dewey and Addams have thus been considered by many, as the founders of the full-service school movement (Benson, et al., 2009).

The Great Depression Era

During the Great Depression, community schools saw increased support. Schools were seen as a large financial investment and citizens wanted to see their dollars go to good use. Thus, school facilities

were appropriated for multiple purposes including leisure activities, adult health and counseling services, and parent education. This activity required schools to stay open beyond the normal school day (Benson, et al., 2009). In 1934, an East Harlem Italian immigrant by the name of Leonard Cavello established Benjamin Franklin High School, an all-boys school focused on preparing students for leadership and civic participation. Unlike the other community schools of this era, Benjamin Franklin High School used the school community committees to address social problems like poor housing, sanitation, and inter-group relations (Johanek, 1995). This was the first model that made the school "the coordinator" of social services.

Post World War II Era

Following World War II the focus on community schools continued, but broadened as the lens was shifted to wider education reform. In Flint, Michigan community school pioneer Charles Mott argued that schools should be open for use by the public when not being used during the regular school day (Benson, et al., 2009). Mott and educator Frank Manely worked together to fund the creation of a series of community schools for youth recreation and school-linked health and social services (2009). Jane Quinn (J. Quinn, personal communication, November 19, 2009) suggests that among the most pivotal factors in the growth of the community school movement were the, "substantial investments by the Mott Foundation in community education, community school and after-school [initiatives]." Between 1930 and 1960, the federal role in providing child services became apparent as support professionals like school psychologists, school nurses, and social workers officially became part of the public school system (Seright, 2007).

The Great Society Spurs Growth

In the late 1960's President Johnson's Great Society initiatives paved the way for expanded social policies by focusing the country on its less fortunate and historically disenfranchised citizenry. The most seminal education policy of the Johnson Administration was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which grew the federal government's role in education and provided for supplemental education programming for schools serving the country's neediest students (Wikipedia

website, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Society). The Great Society initiatives of this administration had a direct impact on the growth of community schools in the late 1960s and early 1970s, "By the late 1960s these commitments framed the way many citizens, social reformers, and politicians thought about education generally, and community education in particular" (Rogers, n.d, p. 59).

In 1965 the federal department of Health and Human Services created Head Start in order to promote school readiness by addressing the educational, health, nutritional, and social needs of children (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services website: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/about/index.html#mission>). This was a tacit acknowledgement by the government that schools alone are not enough to address the underlying problem of social poverty. Head Start heralded the federal government's intervention into school preparation.

Education reform during and beyond this time was impacted by James Coleman's "Equality of Educational Opportunity" report, popularly referred to as The Coleman Report. The publication announced that external environments including the home, neighborhood, and peer networks have a greater impact on a student's academic performance than schools (Traub, 2000). This may have set the stage for the passage of federal legislation in 1974 and later in 1978 of the Community Schools Act (PL 93-381) and the Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act, both of which funded the national development of community schools and made way for state governments to legislate the creation of community schools (Seright, J., 2007; 100 Years, www.web.utk.edu/~fss/minutes/history.doc).

State Initiatives Spring Up

Throughout the late 1980s and 1990s, state-based initiatives grew to support community schools. Various initiatives, borne out of innovation and a need to respond to the needs of the urban poor, sprung up independent of one another (Dryfoos, 2005). Joy Dryfoos, a researcher and key player in the movement since 1983 remarked about this time, "it seemed to me that a "revolution" was actually taking place before our eyes" (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002, pg. 2).

In 1987, New Jersey launched the School-Based Youth Services Program, the first major

statewide initiative that provided grants to community agencies to link education to health, human and employment services (Princeton University website, <http://www.princeton.edu/~cbli/profiles/sbysp.html>). The purpose of the program was to integrate a range of services in one central location at, or near, schools and prioritize “communities with extensive teenage problems” (Warren & Fancsali, 2000). The vision was a “one-stop shop” that removed the bureaucratic barriers that young people faced in accessing needed social services (2000). In 1998, the initiative was operationalized in 29 communities across the state, at least one in every county (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002). One year later, it was expanded to include another 15 programs.

Shortly after the developments in New Jersey, a similar concept was legislated in Florida. In 1990, the Florida legislature passed the Full-Service School Act which targeted students in high risk of needing medical and social services (Reynolds, 1994 & Dryfoos, 2002). Similar to New Jersey’s School-Based Youth Services Program, Florida called for an integration of multiple services in a convenient location and required that the state education and health departments collaborate to develop full-service schools. (Borman, Cahill & Cotner, 2007; Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002). Additionally, the state set-up Interagency Work Groups that brought together multiple state agencies to explore ways to support and trouble-shoot issues that arose from implementation of the Act (Reynolds, 1994). In the initial grant year, \$6.1 million dollars was allocated to 32 districts across Florida (1994) providing a combination of nutritional services, basic medical services, aid to dependent children, parenting skills, counseling for abused children, counseling for children at high risk for delinquent behavior and their parents, and adult education (Online Sunshine: Official Internet Site of the Florida Legislature website, <http://www.leg.state.fl.us>).

California later followed suit with one of the largest school-linked service initiatives in the country, targeting low-income schools and schools with high concentrations of students with limited-English-proficiency (Halfon, et al., 2001). In 1991, the Healthy Start Support Services for Children Act established grants for schools to create “learning supports” for children, families, and communities, specifically setting out to ensure that children received the necessary physical, emotional, and educational

supports for optimal learning (2001). Another goal of the initiative was to foster a lateral coordination of service delivery to children and families among schools and local agencies (2001).

In 1993, Missouri embarked on the Caring Communities Initiative, a partnership between private entities and a group of state agencies. The initiative was developed after the success of an innovative 1989 pilot project that sought to address out-of-school issues which impacted student learning (National Association of State Boards of Education, 1999) by forming local community partnerships with social service agencies as well as health and mental health providers (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002). The pilot program was a collaborative effort between four Missouri state agencies: education, health, mental health, and social services. Once enacted by executive order, the Caring Communities Initiative was under the governance of the Family Investment Trust (FIT), which served as the vehicle for shared decision-making between the four state agencies and private-sector partners (Phelps County Community Partnership, 2000). In 1995, FIT presented the state's first pooled budget with monies from all participating state agencies in support of the Caring Communities initiative (National Association of State Boards of Education, 1999).

Unifying a Movement: National Nonprofit Momentum

In the mid 1990s, several non-profit entities entered the political arena around full-service schools. Serving as advocacy, coalition-building, and central sources of information, the most prominent of these entities have been the Coalition for Community Schools (CCS), Communities In Schools (CIS), Schools of the 21st Century (an initiative of Yale University), the National Community Education Association (NCEA), and the Children's Aid Society (CAS).

Children's Aid Society: Taking the Lead in New York City

Throughout the 1980s, Children's Aid Society (CAS) worked with the New York City Board of Education to provide contracted medical, mental health, and dental services at local schools. Over the course of time, the agency recognized the growing needs of the community and the failure of schools to meet those needs. This prompted CAS to consider how they could maximize their services to address the social barriers to student learning and how to develop meaningful partnerships with schools in order to

undertake this work (Dryfoos, Quinn, & Barkin, 2005). In response to a fragmented social service system, CAS sought to integrate services, “We saw the many benefits that could come from clustering services and education in one place... a school that would fuse the best elements of a high-quality educational institution, a health clinic, a community center, and a social service organization” (Dryfoos, et al., 2005, p.9). In 1987, CAS began work with the NYC Board of Education to plan the first of their “settlement house in a school” models in Washington Heights. Three years later, the Board of Education passed a resolution to formalize their partnership with CAS. Intermediate School 218, the first CAS community school, opened its doors in 1992.

Coalition for Community Schools

In 1998, leaders from initiatives across the country came together to form The Coalition for Community Schools (CCS) (Dryfoos, 2005). CCS was housed within the Washington D.C. based Institute for Educational Leadership and staffed by Martin Blank who later became the Director of CCS (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002). The Coalition is an alliance of national, state, and local organizations in education K-16, youth development, community planning and development, family support, health and human services, government and philanthropy as well as national, state and local community school networks (Coalition for Community Schools website, <http://www.communityschools.org>). A unifying force for the community school movement, the Coalition set out to build public awareness and support of the community school concept and serve as a clearinghouse of successful programs, practices, and policies across the nation. With over 170 members of the alliance, Coalition for Community Schools leads the effort to gain further legislative support for the development of community schools across the country and recently has developed recommended performance metrics for full-service community schools. Additionally, the CCS have been solicited to advise the U.S. Department of Education.

Scaling the Community School Model: Chicago Public Schools

In 2001, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) established the Office of After School and Community School Programs and began the largest community school effort in the nation (Chicago Public Schools Community Schools

Initiative, [http://communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/CPS%20Community%20Schools%20Initiative%20summary%208%2007%20\(2\).pdf](http://communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/CPS%20Community%20Schools%20Initiative%20summary%208%2007%20(2).pdf)). The initiative, headed by former CEO of Chicago Public Schools, Arne Duncan, set out to have at least 100 schools converted into community schools within 5 years. Programs are offered before and after school to provide both academic and social supports to students and the community (Chicago Public Schools Community Schools Initiative, http://www.communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/introduction_to_cps_community_schools.1.09.pdf). Funding and advocacy for this ambitious CPS effort is provided through public and private partnerships that span business, foundations, and non-profit organizations (Whalen, 2007). As of fiscal year 2009, Chicago Public Schools boasts 150 community schools, a quarter of all CPS schools, with 50 lead non-profits and 400 additional community partnerships (Chicago Public Schools website, http://www.cps.edu/Programs/Before_and_after_school/ExtendedLearningOpportunities/Pages/CommunitySchoolPrograms.aspx). With Arne Duncan launched to the helm of the U.S. Department of Education, there now exists an opportunity to catapult the community schools movement into the limelight of contemporary politics.

Contemporary Politics

Politically, the timing is right for federally-driven sea change in education policy in the United States; with the trend towards the increase of federal control over education since Reagan-era policies and the current financial devastation of local district and state budgets, the focus in education politics has shifted decisively to the national stage. The legacy of No Child Left Behind has shone a spotlight on the epidemic of failing schools in low-income areas and it has created a system-wide sense of urgency, from the grassroots level to the Oval Office, for effective education reform. Consequently, a deep and emotional philosophical debate around education spending has emerged around two distinct strategies for the future of education in low-income communities. The Education Equality Project and The Broader Bolder Approach have emerged as two influential coalition-building and lobbying forces around these camps.

The Education Equality Project vs. The Broader Bolder Approach

The Education Equality Project holds an unwavering focus on increasing achievement in schools while The Broader Bolder Approach values the need to develop community-wide, cross-systemic support for the work of schools. The project is defined by a 'single-minded' and urgent focus on the replication and implementation of 'effective schools' in low-income areas on a national level (Education Equality Project www.educationequalityproject.org). The Education Equality Project seeks to eliminate the achievement gap between low-income students of color and white students with a singular focus on the creation of high-performing schools in low-income communities. The movement is supported by powerful politicians, superintendents, and school-leaders such as: Michele Rhee (Chancellor, Washington DC Public Schools), Arlene Ackerman (Superintendent, Philadelphia), Joel Klein (Chancellor, NYC Public Schools), and Eric Schwarz (CEO, Citizen Schools) who would stand to benefit greatly from an influx of funding focused solely on schools. (Education Equality Project, www.educationequalityproject.org)

In contrast, supporters of The Broader Bolder Approach are mainly researchers, social scientists, and notable representatives across the sectors of health, social services, and community organizations. The movement adheres to a belief that only long-term, incremental action will truly close the achievement gap at a systemic level. The approach focuses on issues of health care access, social services, and supplemental learning opportunities as an addition to the creation of more effective schools in low-income communities. Key signatories of The Broader Bolder Approach's position statement include Richard Rothstein of the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), Julian Bond (NAACP), Linda Darling-Hammond (Stanford University), and James Comer MD (Harvard Medical School) (Broader Bolder, www.bolderapproach.org).

Notably, U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan has shown support for both groups in signing both position statements. His recent speeches and current policy proposals coming out of the U.S. Department of Education show a dual focus on academic achievement and high expectations in low-performing schools, with the need for more full-service community supports around and in schools. Duncan's strategy appears to bridge the need for both immediate short-term fixes within the current siloed

structure, while building into policy the necessary incentives for a long-term, cross-agency and inter-departmental approach to education in low-income communities.

Looking to the Future

Based on past and current rhetoric, both Secretary of Education Duncan and President Barack Obama appear to be important political sources of power for the full-service school movement. With his history in grassroots organizing and local action, President Obama has a record of embracing community models of schooling for high-poverty areas. Place-based schooling was one of the platforms on which Obama ran his Presidential campaign, "If poverty is a disease that infects an entire community in the form of unemployment and violence, failing schools, and broken homes, then we can't just treat those symptoms in isolation" (Obama, July 2007). Secretary Duncan too has roots in full-service support for schools. From his early days trailblazing the after-school programming in Chicago Public Schools (CPS) with his mother and siblings, to the growth of community schools in CPS during his tenure as CEO, Duncan's philosophy of education has been shaped to highlight the need for a full-service approach to schooling. Importantly, both leaders have spoken to the necessity of a vertical alignment of policies and funding as a means to promote the lateral coordination of system-wide agencies in the implementation of such a vision, "The unfortunate truth is that out-of-school time initiatives still tend to rely on a patchwork of independent city agencies and non-profits. Not enough of the initiatives are high-quality programs—or have the data to demonstrate that they work" (Arne Duncan -"The Promise of Promise Neighborhoods" given at HCZ Conference, November 10, 2009).

Importantly, this "place based" philosophy of schooling has begun to be taken up across departments within the federal government. This is evidenced in the cross-agency alliances that have been formed, for example, between Peter R. Orszag, Office of Management and Budget; Melody Barnes, Domestic Policy Council; Adolfo Carrion, Office of Urban Affairs; and Lawrence Summers, National Economic Council (Orszag, Barnes, Carrion & Summers, 2009). A recent White House policy memo suggests:

The Administration must break down Federal 'silos' and invest in such a way that encourages similar coordination at the local level. To make the Federal government a more effective and nimble partner, agencies also should pursue opportunities to engage State, local, and tribal governments, faith institutions, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and community members at-large as collaborators. Effective collaboration rests on developing shared agendas for action, strategies that are smart, success measures that make sense, and implementation focused on results. (Orszag, et al., 2009)

Additionally, Secretary Duncan has formed partnerships with Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Shaun Donovan and Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), Kathleen Sebelius (Duncan, November 10, 2009).

The desire for lateral collaboration between community organizations, services, and schools is also seen at local, school, and district levels. The Massachusetts-wide Full-Service Schools Roundtable (A. Weiss, personal communication, October 27, 2009) and Boston Public Schools DELTA program (J. Sproul, personal communication, October 27, 2009) are examples of localized forces that advocate to the need for federal funding to sustain the community collaboration work that has already begun on the ground level. Paul Reville, Massachusetts Secretary of Education, has stated, "(the) Federal Government should provide incentives to create opportunities for educators, broadly speaking, to get involved in providing services" (P. Reville, personal communication, November 4, 2009). This plea for policy-based incentivization from the federal Department of Education comes on the heels of the current economic crises which has left local and state banks empty; highlighting the urgency and importance of federally-initiated funding streams for education.

Indeed, the efforts and desires of local communities and the rhetoric of current politics appear to be supported by language in upcoming federal legislation including Race to the Top, I3, Full-Service Schools Act, Promising Neighborhoods, and the reauthorization of ESEA, illustrating the strong impact of the surrounding political climate on resulting education policy.

Policy Research

Policy Climate

The current policy climate surrounding the full-service school movement is quite multi-layered, lying at the nexus of education, youth development, community, health and human services and works across the government and non-profit sectors, at district, state, and federal levels. Given the historic development of isolated departments such as education and health in different executive agencies and departments, the disparate funding streams within the federal government have been challenges to the development of full-service community schools. In order to run effectively, full-service schools have faced a mighty challenge in capturing a diverse range of funding streams and navigating archaic legal barriers in forming effective partnerships with diverse service providers.

Breaking Down Silos

Currently, a primary aim of the Coalition for Community Schools (CSS) is to shape public and private sector policies to support community schools and help develop sustainable sources of funding. The group identifies the appointment and funding of a community school's coordinator, flexible funding, and a willingness to share resources (Blank, Melaville & Shah, 2003, pp. 61-63) as necessary factors in the development of full-service community schools; It is in this area that district, state, and federal policymakers can make a real difference. Martin Blank (2005), the Director of the CCS, states that any policy framework, “must demonstrate how to cross many different institutional boundaries and link state and federal funding streams into an inherently local endeavor” (p. 251). This is the largest hurdle for policymakers to overcome (A. Weiss & J. Sproul, personal communication, October 27, 2009).

Historically, resources within different governmental agencies at the district, state, and federal levels have been siloed, impeding the development of full-service community schools. As previously discussed, the federal government's development of ‘place-based’ policy signals a new level of commitment to cross-agency coordination at a federal level. Furthermore, the acknowledgement that, “change comes from the community level and often through partnerships; complex problems require flexible integrated solutions” (Orszag, Barnes, Carrion & Summers, 2009, p. 5), demonstrates an understanding of the bottom-up nature of reform by the administration. Full-service community schools

are an example of a flexible integrated solution to the complex problem of student achievement in low-income communities.

Vertical Alignment and Horizontal Coordination

There is a consensus in the full-service schools community around the need for the development of coordinating entities at each level of implementation (local, district, state and federal) whom help to facilitate the vertical alignment and horizontal coordination of resources and agencies.

With successes like the Harlem Children’s Zone² (HCZ), policy is currently being shaped by practice. Upcoming federal legislation entitled the “Promising Neighborhoods Initiative” aims to replicate Geoffrey Canada’s HCZ project in twenty cities across the nation. In order for this model to be both scalable and sustainable, HCZ and PolicyLink (2008) identify the need for a new federal governance structure and suggest the formation of an independent, autonomous agency with cross-agency advisors, similar to the existing Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) or the Missouri Caring Communities Initiative (p. 2) that will provide clear leadership, accountability, and ensure that the Promising Neighborhoods Initiative retains a comprehensive vision. In a revised version of this policy document (2009) they advocate that this agency reports directly to the U.S. Secretary of Education and have the federal department heads of Housing and Urban Development, Labor, Health and Human Services and the Environmental Protection Agency as members (Harlem Children’s Zone & PolicyLink, 2009).

At the state level, the CCS has advocated for the creation of State Community Learning and Development Councils (PolicyLink, 2009, p. 4) which would be facilitated by the Governor, include the Chief State School officer, and representatives of other state agencies to

develop changes in state level data systems, academic standards, and assessment frameworks, and also formulate the state professional development and capacity building strategy. State teams also would be charged with adjusting state funding practices to enable LEAs and their

² Harlem Children’s Zone is a community-based organization offering education, social-service and community-building programs to children and families in designated blocks of Harlem, NY

communities to better align state and federal programs. (Coalition for Community Schools, 2009, p. 2)

Nearly all models of community schools have a coordinating services position at either the school site or with a lead non-profit partner. There is a disparity of views on where this position should be housed, but there is consensus around the pivotal role this position plays at the service-level in ensuring the horizontal coordination of services and the leveraging of resources. The recent guidelines issued by the Department of Education for the use of Title I Funds state, “Title I, Part A ARRA funds might be used to hire a coordinator to facilitate the delivery of health, nutrition, and social services to the school’s students in partnership with local service providers” (Department of Education, 2009, p. 29). This is essential ‘glue money’ that allows schools to focus on teaching and uses a coordinator to pull together out-of-school supports and services to improve student school readiness.

Legislation and Funding Streams

Funding streams currently available to full service community schools are minimal and exist within: Title I, Title V (after school learning), and a federally dedicated \$5 million, established in 2008, under reauthorization of ESEA called The Full-Service Community Schools program that is a part of the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE).

In 2001, House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer visited Children's Aid Society's IS 218 school in New York and subsequently co-authored the Full-Service Community Schools Act, which did not pass. However, another version of the Full-Service Community Schools Act is currently pending as a Senate Bill, put forth by Hoyer and Senator Ben Nelson in September 2009. This act will encourage the development of full-service community schools with an initial budget of \$200 million for 5 years. If passed, this Act will legitimize the role of full-service community schools within the educational landscape (J. Dryfoos, personal communication, October 3, 2009).

The CCS, a key player in promoting the cause of full-service community schools, has taken a two-pronged approach to influencing policy development at a federal level. Whilst they acknowledge the importance of specific legislation, such as the pending Full-Service Community Schools Act, 2009, as a

source of discrete funding for full-service schools, they have prioritized the embedding of full-service school friendly language and options into existing policy (M. Blank, personal communication, November 2009). This strategy attempts to capture multiple sources of funding and resources by making full-service schools eligible for a range of funding pool monies across various forms of legislation. It also seeks to embed the concept of full-service community schools in the fabric of legislation and create a common language around full-service schools.

The Context of the Stimulus Package

Under Obama's new education reform and stimulus package, there are increased opportunities for the development of full-service community schools. The Stimulus package consists primarily of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, which provides funding for the education programs, Race to the Top, Title 1 School Improvement Grants, and Investing in Innovation Fund among others. This stimulus law extends the federal government's control into local school affairs and is a key leverage point for federal leadership in education reform. The Race to the Top fund provides \$4.35 billion for states and the framework for the bulk of these funds is a highly competitive system for which states must apply. Secretary Duncan has repeatedly stressed that these funds are about reform, not the status quo (Arne Duncan, conference call with reporters, November 12, 2009). The guidelines require states to take a systematic reform approach to standards and assessment, effective teachers and leaders, data systems and struggling schools. States will be judged on their past track record with reforms and their capacity to enact reform.

Under the reauthorization of the ESEA in 2002, allowance for The Title I School Improvement Grants was made to provide states and districts the money they need to leverage change and turn around chronically underperforming schools. Under NCLB, Title 1 schools that do not meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets for five consecutive years are mandated to restructure. The recently released application guidelines require every state to identify the lowest five percent of its Title I schools and then the adoption of four strategies to reform schools: a Turnaround Model - with new leadership, 50 percent new staff, changed governance, more flexibility over budget and curriculum; a Restart Model where the

school is converted to a charter or contracted with a Education Management Organization; a Closure Model; or a Transformation Model that utilizes extended learning time, community-oriented supports, and family engagement. Full-Service schools sit within this Transformational Model.

The CCS successfully lobbied for the promotion of the transformational model (which includes provisions for Full-Service Community Schools) to the list of four options that a local education agency can take to school reform, from a previous position of only being an option if the other three options had failed. Amendments were also made to the Race to the Top application that incorporated the concept of horizontal coordination at school, district, and state levels and acknowledged that high needs students would benefit from opportunities and services, “that are beyond the capacity of a school itself to provide” (Department of Education, 2009, p.7). These changes along with other modifications show a growing role for full-service community schools in education reform and an acknowledgement of the importance of community, social, and health services in supporting student learning at school.

However, policy is only as good as the practice it produces. In order to understand full-service schools, we must investigate how they function in practice.

Full-Service Schools in Practice

In practice, full-service schools embody a rich and varied landscape of implementation and service provision. Nationwide, these schools differ widely in their governance structure, operational style, and coordination of services offered. For example, some schools are driven by a single schoolteacher in the school who may form partnerships with outside organizations and require constituents to travel to acquire services, while others have embedded full-service positions that coordinate required services from within the school. Despite this seemingly divergent administration, there indeed exists a common thread across this range that provides important information on the most essential elements for successful full-service school implementation: the necessity of lateral coordination and vertical alignment in order to effectively provide services for their students. An investigation of how these schools function reveals that clear communication and orchestration between services and partnerships at the school level, as well as supportive policies and regulations at a government level, are

essential in creating a school framework that can provide services to students' in need.

Lateral Coordination of Services: The Need for a Service Coordinator

The Director of Services at The Gardner Pilot Academy³ cites the joint work of her position, along with the schools' full-time student support coordinator, as integral for the success of their full-service school (L. Fogarty, personal communication, November 8, 2009). While the student support coordinator maintains a database of all the students and the services they each are receiving, the Director of Services provides a bridge between the individual students and the larger service providing partners and organizations. The efficacy of these two positions are supported with a school culture that constantly assesses students' needs, including formal and informal protocols for determining how to best serve each child. Regardless of school-wide efforts to identify and address needs, without these two strong coordinators in place, students would not be able to access the intricate and complicated web of services and providers would not be able to effectively communicate with the school and students it seeks to serve.

The individualization required to address students' specific needs is a complicated and nuanced process. The Gardner Pilot Academy has formal 'whole class meetings' with each teacher to go through and identify the specific needs of each student at the beginning of the year (L. Fogarty, personal communication, November 8, 2009). Likewise, Neighborhood House Charter School⁴ creates 'individualized learning programs' for each student (Neighborhood House Charter School, www.neighborhoodhousecharterschool.org), not only to individualize the academic instruction but also to identify and provide access to non-academic services and programs that can benefit the child.

As CEO and president of Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ), Geoffrey Canada has seen the importance and difficulty of this lateral coordination first-hand. He acknowledges the frustrations of working in a business that is not organized in a way where collaboration is natural, stressing how this collaboration often doesn't work unless both parties are clear what is in it for them (HCZ Community

³ The Gardner Pilot Academy is a Boston Public Schools pilot school, serving 331 K1-5 students.

⁴ Neighborhood House Charter School is a publicly funded but independently managed charter school in Boston, serving 400 K1-8 students. www.neighborhoodhousecharterschool.org

Partners Discussion notes, October 23, 2009). HCZ, in its extensive model that provides programs for students from ‘cradle to college,’ proves that collaboration across various services can work in practice.⁵

A full-time service coordinator position in a full-service school must focus on how the school and service provider benefit from the partnership in order to foster cooperation and collaboration. The initial development and formation of school-service partnerships can be facilitated by connecting to previously existing service providers via an outside organization, as seen with Communities in Schools of Chicago⁶, or by the school themselves reaching out, as seen with Neighborhood House Charter School and The Gardner Pilot Academy. Once these partnerships are in place, however, it is the responsibility of the services coordinator to ensure the implementation and integration of these services to address students’ needs.

Vertical Alignment of Policy and Funding: A Necessity for Full-Service Schools to Thrive

At the local or district level, policies can be created which acknowledge the service coordinator position as an essential and powerful role in the school, as the new guidelines for Title I funds allow. The Gardner Pilot Academy has seen success due to a strong, “link between the coordinator of services and the administration. If the coordinator isn’t heard at the administrative level, if there isn’t a ‘connect,’ they will get burnt-out” (L. Fogarty, personal communication, November 8, 2009). Canada cites the public school system as, “the biggest system that got in the way of Harlem Children’s Zone success,” (HCZ Community Partners Discussion notes, October 23, 2009) due to its rigid accountability system and much too-late interventions. Educational initiatives that allow schools to provide early intervention and access to additional services can assist these powerful school models to thrive.

In addition to creating new policies, small adjustments to existing policies could allow for full-service schools to better serve their populations. After becoming an officially licensed day-care provider

⁵ Due to Harlem Children’s Zone’s community organization emphasis (rather than school-site services) and its formation of novel services and programs (rather than partnerships with existing providers), it is not a model of what we can do on a systemic level for full-service community schools, but rather is an example of how collaboration of services can work in practice.

⁶ Communities in Schools of Chicago is an organization that connects Chicago students and their families with free programs and services that address students’ unmet needs.

by the Department of Early Education and Care, The Neighborhood House Charter School's after-school program had to cease services for their K-1 students due to a frustrating detail that stipulated that children age four and below would not be eligible for the care (E. Rounds, personal communication, November 12, 2009). Money and human capital had to be redistributed to create a new supplemental program comprised of two teachers willing to work paid overtime in order to serve these young students. If vertical alignment across the levels of operation were stronger, legislation could address the implementation issues discovered at the school level.

Funding, or lack thereof, is the most widely cited challenge in the implementation of a full-service school model. The leveraging of private funding is often a key element to providing expensive services for students. HCZ has consciously established sources of private funding (65-70% of the Zone is privately funded) knowing that low-income communities are often the most vulnerable to economic swings, and long-term projects such as those addressing the social inequities of our communities by providing services at a school site need to plan for recessions (HCZ Community Partners Discussion notes, October 23, 2009). Similarly addressing the constant need for funds, The Gardner Pilot Academy actively seeks outside funding on a regular basis, and in an ironic twist had to let go of their fundraising position last year due to budget cuts (L. Fogarty, personal communication, November 8, 2009). In more creative fundraising efforts, The Neighborhood House Charter School raises its \$13,500 per year per student cost through money and in-kind donations, school store merchandise sales, and other community fundraising efforts (Neighborhood House Charter School website, www.neighborhoodhousecharterschool.org). Grants and donations are never guaranteed, however, and thus governmental funds could provide more stability and potential for growth for these important school models.

As seen by examples of full-service schools in day-to-day practice, successful implementation of these models relies on strong vertical alignment (connection between policies and initiatives at various levels of governance) and lateral coordination in the form of a service coordinator at each school.

Policy Analysis and Recommendations

Recommendations

In accordance with recommendations made by the Coalition for Community Schools, Policy Link, Harlem Children's Zone, and among other key stakeholders and local actors, we advocate first to the need for vertical alignment of funding streams and policy initiatives and lateral coordination of key agencies and services (at school, district, and state and federal levels) in order to effectively implement full-service school models.

Second, full-service community schools are a priority for low-income areas. By increasing accessibility to full-services (health, social services, extended learning programs, etc), we seek to equalize opportunities for educational attainment between low-income and higher income students who historically have access to the aforementioned services.

Finally, we stress the importance of expanding the data and research on the effectiveness of full-service community schools and their outcomes. Performance indicators, such as those the Coalition for Community Schools has developed (mentioned in the History: 1960s-Present section) , are important to incorporate as we assess the efficacy of these programs.

We make the following recommendations at each level of governance to support the growth of full community service schools:

Federal Level.

- Embed language supporting full-service schools models in all areas of long term federal educational policy, notably the upcoming renewal of ESEA
- Provide incentives to state and local level agencies which support alignment of full services
- Require state-based data collection and evaluation of full-service community schools in order to receive continued funding
- Pass specific legislation in support of Full-Service Community Schools as a means to garner more public attention and to provide seed-money for more examples of such schools in practice

State Level.

- Establish an inter-agency (Public Health, Housing, Education, Social Services) body to

coordinate funding streams and enforce policy

- Develop data collection and evaluation systems to measure the multiple factors that affect school readiness (obesity, mental health, asthma, depression rates, etc.)
- Develop waivers to eliminate existing legal barriers to the integration of programs and funds
- Ensure continued funding and support for Full-Service School Coordinator positions

District Level.

- Act as brokers between nonprofit, community based organizations and schools
- Support and supervise Full-Service School Coordinators at each school
- Capacity development of Full-Service School Coordinators

School Level.

- Full Service-School Coordinator to work with school administration, specifically school principal, as a primary partner
- Full-Service School Coordinator located at the school site for coordination of services
- Services delivered at school site (preferred)

Alternative Approaches

Critics argue that full-service schools are a political and monetary distraction to school reform efforts focused on teaching and learning, and schools would best be improved with focus on its instructional core. This mindset is best illustrated in the Education Equality movement (detailed in the Politics section) that focuses reform solely on aspects that directly impact academic achievement of students. From their perspective, outside inequalities can be overcome with a ‘no excuse’ philosophy to providing excellent education. To be clear, we are not arguing against addressing school reform from within the school (i.e., improving instruction or teacher preparation) – but rather we are illuminating that these reforms cannot, and will not, be enough for all of our students in need without addressing the factors outside the school (Zazove, 2009). We make the argument that *both* excellent instruction and outside services are necessary for sustainable public-school solutions on a system-wide level. By improving the overall health of the community and the child we can effectively address the cumulative

factors that influence school readiness and affect a child's ability to learn. In fact, "because children's needs in these areas are being met through the services provided at [full-service schools], and because teachers have the luxury of giving many students more individualized attention during the after-school program, they can focus exclusively on teaching during their classroom time" (Quinn and Dryfoos, 2009).

Another argument against full-service schools addresses the difficulties in coordinating across various agencies. Throughout our paper we have acknowledged this concern, and thus stress the crucial importance of service coordinator positions or agencies at all levels of governance (see Policy and Practice sections).

Moreover, critics complain of the excessive time and money a full-service schools approach would take before substantial student achievement gains are seen. They stress the need for immediate solutions that will aid students in schools today. We argue that in order to produce sustainable change, a long-term view is essential. The last twenty years of school-only educational reform fads have not dented the achievement gap, as such a switch in focus to a more comprehensive solution is necessary. Indeed this will cost money, however we advocate for consolidation of monies that are already allocated to various agencies, services, and programs - essentially improving the efficiency of social service financing. The time and money required for this model may be substantial but it is not impossible, and will provide more long-term benefit due to a more efficient use of limited money and resources.

A final criticism of the full-service school model is that it requires large government involvement, a push toward central control in a historically decentralized sector. We acknowledge this concern, however, given the historic trend towards centralized control in education and the grim reality of our current national financial situation, expedient support of public sector must likely stem from the federal system.

Forty years since the publication of the Coleman Report, the United States continues to struggle with the puzzle of schooling in low-income communities. Since the Reagan-era the federal government has played a growing role in the funding and policing of the public education system. The parade of federal legislation has provided an important and urgent diagnosis of the system's problems, but has

provided no cure. In the wake of these policies the Obama Administration has taken on the challenge of education reform in low-performing communities with momentous vigor and unprecedented financial resolve. One year into the Administration's tenure, the efforts of Secretary Duncan and President Obama have felled significant inter-agency walls and have forged key partnerships within the federal government. Advocacy groups like The Coalition of Community Schools and The Broader Bolder Approach have recently gained the ear of policymakers, while successful full-service school models in practice, notably the Harlem Children's Zone, have grabbed the national spotlight. In this unique moment we see significant alignment between key stakeholders, from district level practitioners to federal level leaders, on the specifics of policy in supporting, scaling, and sustaining full-services schools. Long-term systemic change in schooling is possible; the moment to end the history of inequity is now.

References

- 100 years of community schools*. (n.d.). Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from web.utk.edu/~fss/minutes/history.doc
- Benson, L., Harkavy, I., Johenek, M., & Puckett, J. (2009). The Enduring Appeal of Community Schools. *The American Educator*, vol. 33 (no. 2), pp 22-29, 47.
- Blank, M. J. (2005). Reaching out to create a movement. In J.G. Dryfoos, J. Quinn, & C. Barkin (Eds.), *Community schools in action* (pp. 243 – 258). New York: NY: Oxford University Press.
- Blank, M.J, Melaville, A., & Shah, B. P. (2003). Coalition of Community Schools. *Making the difference: research and practice in community schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.communityschools.org/CCSFullReport.pdf>
- Borman, K. M., Cahill, S. E., & Cotner, B. A. (2007). *The Praeger handbook of American high schools. volume 4* Praeger.
- Chicago Public Schools. *Community schools program*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from http://www.cps.edu/Programs/Before_and_after_school/ExtendedLearningOpportunities/Pages/CommunitySchoolPrograms.aspx
- Chicago Public Schools Community Schools Initiative. *Introduction to CPS community schools*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from http://www.communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/introduction_to_cps_community_schools.1.09.pdf
- Chicago Public Schools Community Schools Initiative. *The Chicago Public Schools (CPS) community schools initiative: Student and school outcomes*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from [http://communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/CPS%20Community%20Schools%20Initiative%20summary%208%2007%20\(2\).pdf](http://communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/CPS%20Community%20Schools%20Initiative%20summary%208%2007%20(2).pdf)

Chicago Public Schools website. (2009). Retrieved November 18, 2009, from www.cps.k12.il.us

Children's Aid Society. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from www.childrensaidsociety.org

Coalition for Community Schools. (2009, May 27). *Community schools race to the top of the class: a brief for governors, other state leaders & local education agencies*. Retrieved from November 18, 2009, from http://communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/CS_Race_to_the_Top_of_the_Class_Final.pdf

Communities in Schools of Chicago website. (n.d.) Retrieved from, www.chicagocis.org

Community School Partnerships. (2009). Retrieved November 18, 2009, from <http://communityschoolpartnerships.org/>

Dryfoos, J. (2008). Centers of Hope. *Educational Leadership*, 65(7), pp. 38-43.

Dryfoos, J. (2005). Full-service community schools: A strategy—not a program. *New directions for youth development*, 2005(107), 7-14.

Dryfoos, J. G., & Maguire, S. (2002). *Inside full-service community schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Dryfoos, J. G., & Quinn, J. (2005). *Community schools: A strategy for integrating youth development and school reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.

Dryfoos, J. G., Quinn, J., & Barkin, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Community schools in action: Lessons from a decade of practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duncan, A. (2009, November 10). *The promise of promise neighborhoods*. Harlem Children's Zone Conference, New York, NY.

Duncan, A. (2009, November 12). Conference call with reporters (audio file). Retrieved from: <http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2009/11/11122009.html>

- Halfon, N., Sareen, H., Cuthbertson, B., Schneider, M. V., Shannon, M., & Franke, T. (2001). *The healthy start initiative in California: Final report*. CA: The UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities. Retrieved from http://hsfo.ucdavis.edu/sites/hsfo.ucdavis.edu/files/The_HS_Initiative.pdf
- Harlem Children's Zone. (2008). *The Harlem Children's Zone Project Model– Executive Summary*. Retrieved from http://www.hcz.org/images/executive_summary4.09.pdf
- Harlem Children's Zone. (2008). Retrieved from www.hcz.org
- Harlem Children's Zone Twitter Feed. (2009, November 9). Retrieved from, <http://twitter.com/policylink>
- Illinois System of Full Service Community Schools. Retrieved November 1, 2009, from, <http://www.fscs.k12.il.us/History/htm>
- Johanek, M. (1995). *The public purposes of public education: The evolution of community-centered schooling at Benjamin Franklin High School, 1934-1944*. Retrieved from <http://works.bepress.com/johanek/2/>
- Krysiak, B. H. (2001, August). Full-Service Community Schools; Jane Addams Meets John Dewey. *School Business Affairs*, 67(8), 4-8.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (1999). Missouri's caring communities. *State improvement initiatives*, 5(6), November 18, 2009. Retrieved from <http://nasbe.org/index.php/file-repository/func-finishdown/393/>
- Online Sunshine: Official Internet Site of Florida Legislature. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from <http://www.leg.state.fl.us>
- Obama, B. (2007, July 18). *Changing the odds for urban America*.

Orszag, R. D, Barnes, B., Carrion, A., & Summers, L. (n.d.) *Developing effective place-based policies for the FY 2011 budget M-09-28*. Retrieved November 9, 2009 from http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/memoranda_fy2009/m09-28.pdf

Phelps County Community Partnership. (2000). *Community profile*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from http://extension.missouri.edu/caringcommunities/plans/phelps/org_hist1.pdf

PolicyLink. (2009, October). Forging Equity and Excellence in Education: Integrating out of school learning into national education policy. *After the bell rings: learning outside of the classroom and its relationship to student achievement*. Symposium conducted at ETS, Washington, D.C.

Policy Link and Harlem Children's Zone. (2009). *Promise neighborhoods: Recommendations for a national children's Anti-Poverty Program inspired by the Harlem Children's Zone: Revised May 18, 2009*. Retrieved October 22, 2009 from, email provided by Harlem Children's Zone to author.

Princeton University. *School based youth services program*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from <http://www.princeton.edu/~cbli/profiles/sbysp.html>

Quinn, J. & Dryfoos, J. (2009, Summer). Freeing teachers to teach: Students in Full Service Community Schools are Ready to Learn. Retrieved on November 18, 2009 from https://aft.org/pubs-r-reports/american_educator/issues/summer2009/freeingteachers.pdf

Reville, P. (2009, November 4). Remarks at Public Schools and Public Housing Symposium, Cambridge, MA.

Reynolds, J. E. (1994). *Florida's full-service schools: A case study of three oversight committees*.

Retrieved from

http://www.eric.ed.gov:80/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/13/7a/98.pdf

Rogers, J. (n.d.). *Community schools: Lessons from the past and present*. Unpublished manuscript.

Rothstein, R. (2009, Summer). *Equalizing Opportunity: Dramatic differences in children's home life and health mean that schools can't do it alone*. *American Educator*, 33(2), 4-7

Seright, J. (2007). *A study comparing student achievement in a full-service school and a non-full-service school*. (Ed.D., The University of Oklahoma). , 145. . (3271220)

Traub, J. (2000, January 16). What no school can do. *New York Times Magazine*, Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/library/magazine/home/20000116mag-traub8.html>

The Broader Bolder Approach. (2008-2009). Retrieved November 18, 2009, from www.boldapproach.org

The Coalition of Community Schools. (n.d.) Retrieved from www.communityschools.org

The Education Equality Project website. (2009). Retrieved November 18, 2009, www.educationequalityproject.org

The Harlem Children's Zone Paradigm in Boston and Cambridge: Community Partners Discussion Notes. (2009). Phillips House Brooks Association

The Neighborhood House Charter School. (1995-2009). Retrieved from <http://www.neighborhoodhousecharterschool.org/>

U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Overview information: race to the top fund. Notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2010 (4000-01-U0)*. Retrieved from http://communityschools.org/CCSDocuments/notice_inviting_applications.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Using title I, part A ARRA funds for grants to local educational agencies to strengthen education, drive reform, and improve results for students*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/guidance/titlei-reform.pdf>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services website. Retrieved November 18, 2009, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/about/index.html#mission>

Warren, C., & Fancsali, C. (2000). *New Jersey school-based youth services program final report*. New York, NY: The Academy for Educational Development. Retrieved from <http://scs.aed.org/publications/newjerseyeval.pdf>

Whalen, S. P. (2007). *Three years into Chicago's community school initiative (CSI): Progress, challenges, and lessons learned* University of Illinois at Chicago. Retrieved from http://www.aypf.org/documents/CSI_ThreeYearStudy.pdf

Wikipedia, T. F. E. (2009). *Great society*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Great_Society&oldid=325612815

Wikipedia, T.F.E. (2009). *Jane Addams*. Retrieved November 11 2009 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jane_Addams

Zazove, R. (2009). *Disinfecting the wound* (Midterm essay, GSE A100 - Introduction to Educational Policy, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2009).

Personal Communications

The *Full Service Schools Wiki Group* (consisting of Ricky Campbell-Allen, Melissa Pena, Aekta Shah, Rebekka Sullender and Rebecca Zazove) collectively interviewed the following individuals during the period of October – November 2009:

Abby Weiss, Full Service Schools Roundtable

Ellie Rounds, Neighborhood House Charter School

Harry Spence, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Jane Quinn, Children's Aid Society

Jonathan Sproul, Boston Public Schools

Joy Dryfoos, Independent Consultant

Lauren Fogarty, The Gardner Pilot Academy

Richard Rothstein, Columbia Teacher's College

Will Dobbie, Harvard Kennedy School of Government