# Learning from the New York City Community Schools Initiative

William R. Johnston Senior Data Strategist, LAUSD

LAERI Research & Policy Seminar - 2/5/21

#### Agenda

- Introduction to the NYC Community Schools Initiative
- Implementation study design and results
- Impact study design and results
- Lessons learned for Los Angeles context



Beginning in 2015-2016, the Community School Initiative (NYC-CS) represented a \$100 million investment in 130 schools

 94 schools were also **Renewal Schools**, a key strategy for rapid academic improvement in struggling schools

NYC-CS grew to 227 schools by fall 2017, and 267 by fall 2020

NYC-CS schools serve some of the most disadvantaged communities in New York City



### What is a community school?

- Community schools is an umbrella term describing schools that provide varied services to address the comprehensive needs of students, families, and communities, through collaboration with community agencies and local government.
- Community schools were originally designed to target underresourced neighborhoods with support by creating local partnerships, promoting family engagement, and offering robust extracurricular activities and extended-day supports.
- A goal of the community schools strategy is to build strong ties among key stakeholders through the establishment of inclusive, collaborative climates that value and expand families' social capital.
- At least 5,000 community schools exist in the U.S. as of 2020.

#### What is a community school?

Four core features:

- 1. Integrated student supports
- 2. Expanded learning time and opportunities
- 3. Family and community engagement
- 4. Collaborative leadership and practices

## NYC-CS Theory of Change

#### If the office of community schools provides...



Resulting in improved...

Then community schools develop their capacity in...

SOURCE: Adapted from the New York City Community Schools Strategic Plan (New York City Community Schools, undated) and authors' correspondence with the New York City OCS.

NOTE: CSD = Community School director.

## Project Timeline

	Transition year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
	(2014–2015)	(2015–2016)	(2016–2017)	(2017–2018)
Pre-trend period (2009–2010 through 2013–2014)	<ul> <li>NYC-CS announced and launched as part of AIDP grant</li> <li>45 schools selected to partner with CBOs for NYC-CS</li> <li>Gradual onboarding of NYC-CS schools, including partnerships with lead CBOs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>94 Renewal Schools begin receiving NYC-CS supports</li> <li>First full year of NYC-CS</li> <li>RAND Study Year 1</li> <li>RAND implementation data collection</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Second full year of NYC-CS</li> <li>RAND Study Year 2</li> <li>RAND implementation data collection</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Third full year of NYC-CS</li> <li>RAND Study Year 3</li> <li>RAND implementation report published in fall 2017</li> </ul>

# Implementation Study



#### Developing Community Schools at Scale

Implementation of the New York City Community Schools Initiative

William R. Johnston, Celia J. Gomez, Lisa Sontag-Padilla, Lea Xenakis, Brent Anderson



#### Implementation Study

#### Three Goals:

- 1. Describe the extent to which the key components of the community schools model are being **implemented as intended** across the sample of schools that were involved in NYC-CS since its inception.
- 2. Understand the extent to which schools were able to **develop capacity** in four core domains:
  - continuous improvement, coordination, connectedness and collaboration.
- 3. Analyze some of the factors that were associated with observed variation in implementation across the schools.

#### Data Sources

#### 1. School leader survey

- Sample: principals and Community School Directors

#### 2. Complementary mental health survey

 Sample: members of the School Support Team (e.g. school psychologist, guidance counselor, social worker, mental health provider, etc.)

#### 3. Site visits and school leader interviews

- Sample: stratified random sample of 62 schools

#### 4. Document review

- Sample: all Community Schools

### Implementation Findings

- <u>Collaborative leadership</u>
  - All schools had established partnerships with lead CBOs and hired CSDs by the 2016–2017 school year, with most school leaders indicating that the programming being provided by CBOs was aligned with their vision for schools' needs.
- Family and community empowerment
  - Surveyed principals and CSDs said they felt that the transformation into a community school increased participation among family members, and 81 percent of respondents reported families being more present in the school as a result of the NYC-CS.
- Expanded learning time
  - More than 90 percent of community schools were offering expanded learning time programming after school by the 2015–2016 school year, an increase from 59 percent the prior year.
- Integrated student supports
  - More than 80 percent of community schools implemented a three-tiered mental health service model in the 2016–2017 school year, up from approximately 50 percent in 2014– 2015.

#### Notable Challenges

- <u>CBO partnerships</u>
  - trust was reportedly slow to build between school and CBO staff, due in part to high staff turnover among the school and/or CBO staff
  - approximately 50% of schools noted that school and/or staff turnover was an implementation challenge

#### • Real-time data use

- difficulty integrating multiple data systems, preventing schools from providing immediate reports and in some cases schools needed to use multiple systems in order to review a student's complete profile
- difficulty learning and using a new technology and experienced pushback from staff members, who prefer to use the processes they are more familiar with

#### <u>Mental Health Services</u>

- **funding cycle** is not aligned with the school year, and many schools received funding for mental health programs and services late
- communication challenges also hindered smooth collaboration with CBO partners providing mental health services

#### **Notable Successes**

3 most commonly selected "**major successes**" from school leader survey

- 1. Intentional focus on students' emotional and behavioral well-being by the school team (55%)
- 2. Improved school culture and sense of connectedness among students (50%)
- 3. Development of a strong vision and action plan to thrive as a community school (45%)

#### Capacity Development

#### If the office of community schools provides...

#### **Operations** and administrative support to schools (e.g., budgets, coordination of partnerships)

Infrastructure and technical assistance to provide resources and sharing of best practices for schools and CBOs

Holistic tools and resources using real-time data for strategic decisionmaking

New programs and initiatives to complement ongoing efforts to create healthy and thriving learning communities

Organizing strategies for schools and CBOs that focus efforts around student success

#### Then community schools develop their capacity in...

Continuous improvement through ongoing collection and analysis of data to assess needs and guide decisions.

*Coordination* across programs and agencies to ensure equitable delivery of the right services to the right students at the right time.

Connectedness among adults and students that fosters a sense of community among all stakeholders and encourages resilient academic and personal behaviors among students.

Collaboration that strengthens school and CBO partnerships and supports families' voices in school engagement and student learning.

Collaborative leadership

#### School climate and Student outcomes culture Attendance Shared responsibility Educational for student success attainment Student connectedness Academic performance to adults and peers Disciplinary Incidents Family empowerment opportunities Mediated by... School climate and culture More advantaged students More transfers in • Fewer transfers out And institute core evidence-based features, including... Family and community Expanded learning time Wellness and integrated student supports Hands-on learning Mental health experiences

Resulting in improved...

and practice empowerment CBO partnerships and CSDs Family nights Data-informed planning Family leadership CBO cofacilitation of Reproductive health and interventions training programs before, during, Vision screenings Specialized programs Interagency and and after school Success mentoring public-private partnerships (adult ed. classes, Vulnerable youth services Summer programming (homelessness, immigration, Assets and needs home visits) relationship violence assessment

SOURCE: Adapted from the New York City Community Schools Strategic Plan (New York City Community Schools, undated) and authors' correspondence with the New York City OCS.

NOTE: CSD = Community School director.

#### **Continuous Improvement**

(Cronbach alpha = 0.80)	
Survey Item	PCA Weight
Our Community School Team uses the New Visions Data Sorter to assess progress against benchmarks and goals for individual students.	0.51
Our Community School Team uses the New Visions Data sorter to assess progress against benchmarks for the whole school.	0.49
Our Community School Team uses data to determine whether our services and programs are meeting the needs of the student body.	0.46
Our Community School has clear, data-driven benchmarks that guide continuous improvement across school and CBO.	0.43
The Principal and Community School Team both attend the weekly data meeting.	0.33

#### Coordination

(Cronbach alpha = .780)								
Survey Item	PCA Weight							
Teachers are aware of the services that are available to students through the lead CBO partner.	0.41							
Teachers successfully interact with staff from our lead CBO partner.	0.41							
All community partners and CBOs (in and outside of school building) meet monthly with the Community School Director to coordinate and assign services across students in building.	0.40							
Teachers and staff in our school are aware that the Tier 1 (universal), Tier 2 (selective), and Tier 3 (targeted) mental health programs and services exist.	0.38							
There is a communication and student referral system implemented among school and CBO staff.	0.37							
Community School programs are available during the summer.	0.32							
Expanded learning time is available to meet students' needs before and/or after school.	0.25							
Our Community School's expanded learning time (ELT) programs use rigorous, standards based curricula.	0.23							

#### Connectedness

(Cronbach alpha = $0.76$ )	
Survey Item	PCA Weight
As a result of our Community School partnerships and programs, our school has a more positive and welcoming environment that is conducive to learning.	0.46
We have a culture of connectedness and belonging for staff, students and families.	0.42
Our school and CBO developed a shared and strategy for addressing social, emotional and behavioral problems.	0.41
Students are aware of school-based mental health services provided by the partner CBO.	0.39
Students who are at risk of being chronically absent are quickly identified (i.e., within 12 weeks of initial absence).	0.34
Families are receptive to opportunities for their children to participate in school-based programs and services that support their social, emotional and behavioral needs.	0.33
Students at risk of being chronically absent are quickly assigned a Success Mentor (i.e., within 12 weeks of initial absence).	0.27

#### Collaboration

(Cronbach alpha = $0.847$ )	
Survey Item	PCA Weight
The principal and Community School Director (CSD) have established a trusting relationship.	0.300
School and CBO staff attend trainings together.	0.290
The Principal, members of the School Leadership Team and CSD worked together to create the RSCEP (Renewal School Comprehensive Educational Plan) or Community School Work Plan (for AIDP schools).	0.240
The Principal, CSD, and School Leadership Team collaborated in creating the Community School budget.	0.240
The CSD and CBO staff have a visible presence throughout the school day.	0.290
CBO services align with our school's vision, priorities and procedures.	0.330
Universal, selective and targeted mental health programs and services are provided collaboratively by CBO staff, guidance counselors, social workers, teachers, and/or other school or district staff.	0.220
Teachers view the efforts of community partners as supporting their work as educators.	0.310
Our Community School has implemented systems for communication with families on a weekly basis (or more frequently) around student attendance, achievement, and behavior.	0.240
As a result of our CS partnerships and programs, families come to the school more frequently.	0.220
Administrators, teachers, parents, family members, CBO staff and community partners trust each other.	0.310
Families have input in planning for services related to child and family mental health needs.	0.250
Families have a say in decisions and plans related to school improvement.	0.290

#### Capacity Development



**Core Capacity** 

## Structural Characteristics & Capacity Development

	Grade Level		Co-l	Location Sta	Renewal Status		
	ES / MS	Secondary	Co-located w/ CS	Co-located w/ non-CS	Not co- located	Non- Renewal	Renewal
Continuous Improvement	0.116	-0.160	0.050	-0.060	0.352	-0.529	0.233*
Coordination	0.093	-0.120	0.232	-0.193	0.843	-0.341	0.109
Connectedness	0.049	-0.064	-0.351	0.211	-0.602	-0.073	0.030
Collaboration	0.075	-0.109	-0.172	0.086	-0.148	0.048	-0.020

Mean Capacity Index Scores, by Structural Characteristics

## Cultural Characteristics & Capacity Development

Association Between Capacity Index Scores and Cultural Characteristics

	Continuous Improvement	Coordination	Connectedness	Collaboration
Trust	-0.347	0.735*	0.101	0.522~
Effective School Leadership	-0.202	0.525*	0.178	0.455*
Strong Family-Community Ties	-0.101	0.422	-0.071	0.250

# Impact Study



WILLIAM R. JOHNSTON, JOHN ENGBERG, ISAAC M. OPPER, LISA SONTAG-PADILLA, LEA XENAKIS

# Illustrating the Promise of Community Schools

An Assessment of the Impact of the New York City Community Schools Initiative



Sponsored by the New York City Mayor's Office for Economic Opportunity

#### Research Questions

- 1. What is the impact of the NYC Community Schools Initiative on outcomes related to attendance, educational attainment, academic achievement, student behavior, and school climate and culture?
- 2. To what extent are the overall impacts of NYC-CS being observed among key subgroups of students within schools?
- 3. To what extent are there differences in program impact related to school characteristics such as programmatic implementation, grade configuration, principal experience, and the residential dispersion of students?

## Sample

- Treatment group consisted of first two groups of schools that joined the NYC-CS
  - 45 schools receiving Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention (AIDP) grant
    - these schools were gradually onboarded as community schools during the 2014–2015 school year
  - 94 additional schools that were also designated as Renewal Schools
    - Renewal Schools were onboarded as community schools in fall 2015
    - 11 of the 45 in the initial cohort of AIDP schools were also Renewal Schools
- Of these, 113 schools were matched and used in analysis
  - 72 elementary and middle schools
  - 41 high schools

#### Outcome Measures

	Data Source	Notes
Chronic absenteeism	Administrative data	
On-time grade progression	Administrative data	
Credits earned	Administrative data	High school only
Math and ELA test scores	Administrative data	Grades 3-8 only
Disciplinary incidents	Administrative data	
Teacher shared responsibility for student success	NYCSS – teacher module	No data prior to 2015
Student connectedness to adults and classmates	NYCSS – student module	No data prior to 2015
Opportunities for parent empowerment	NYCSS – parent module	No data prior to 2015

## Methodology

**The goal:** create an "apples-to-apples" comparison so that we can confidently isolate the impact of the NYC-CS on student outcomes.

**The challenge:** schools were not randomly chosen to be in the NYC-CS, and in fact most were included because of difficulties in attaining achievement and attendance goals.

Comparison schools will be systematically higher-performing along many measures of student achievement and attendance.

**The solution:** create a matched comparison group of near "statistical twins" based on numerous pre-program variables

We also use a difference-in-difference strategy that accounts for any remaining preprogram differences between treatment and comparison schools

#### Understanding pre-program trends

#### Figure 4.1

Average Outcomes of Non-Community Schools, Community Schools, and Matched Comparison Schools over Time: Elementary and Middle Schools



NOTE: Dashed vertical lines indicate that 2014–2015 is considered a transition year. Vertical scale for "Chronically absent" and "On-time progression" is the proportion of students in those categories, averaged over schools. The vertical scale for "Average test score" is standardized test score, averaged over schools. The vertical scale for "Disciplinary incidents per student" is the number of incidents, averaged over schools.

#### Understanding pre-program trends, cont'd

#### Figure 4.2

Average Outcomes of Non-Community Schools, Community Schools, and Matched Comparison Schools over Time: High Schools



NOTE: Dashed vertical lines indicate that 2014–2015 is considered a transition year. Vertical scale for "Chronically absent" and "Graduated" is the proportion of students in those categories, averaged over schools. The vertical scale for "Credits accumulated" is the number of credits earned per year, averaged over schools. The vertical scale for "Disciplinary incidents per student" is the number of incidents, averaged over schools.

Figure 4.3

Difference Between Community Schools and Matched Comparison Schools: Elementary and Middle Schools



NOTE: Vertical axis reflects the difference in outcome between community schools and non-community schools, normalized so that the difference in 2014 is equal to zero. Dashed vertical lines indicate that 2014–2015 is considered a transition year. Solid bars represent 95-percent confidence intervals. The vertical scale for "Chronically absent" and "On-time progression" is the proportion of students in those categories, averaged over schools. The vertical scale for "Average test score" is standardized test score, averaged over schools. The vertical scale for "Disciplinary incidents per student" is the number of incidents, averaged over schools.

#### Table 4.3 Average Impact of NYC-CS on Elementary and Middle Schools

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Math Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	0.0123**	0.0345	-0.00225	-0.0707**	1.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108)	(0.00596)	(0.0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1.695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	2017	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0364	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	2.164*	0.0901
		(0.0110)	(0.00479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.0407)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.131***	0.0539	-0.111***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	N/A	(0.0385)	(0.0396)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average effect	-0.0734***	0.0117**	0.0657**	0.0108	-0.0995***	5.976***	1.036	-0.132
		(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0316)	(0.0314)	(0.0349)	(1.809)	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010-2014	2010–2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010–2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	341	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

NOTES: The coefficients shown are the result of a weighted difference-in-difference specification. Administrative outcomes include data from the 2010 school year to the 2018 school year. Math and ELA test scores are measured in student standard deviation units, and the number of disciplinary incidents is measured per student per year. \* p < 0.10; \*\* p < 0.05; \*\*\* p < 0.01.

Table 4.3 Average Impact of	f NYC-CS a	on Elementary ar	nd Middle Scho	ools					
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Math Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	).0123**	0.0345	-0.00225	-0.0707**	1.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108)	(0.00596)	(0.0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1.695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	20 7	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0364	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	2.164*	0.0901
		(0.0110)	(0.)0479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.0407)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.131***	0.0539	-0.111***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	J/A	(0.0385)	(0.0396)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average effect	-0.0734***	0.0 <mark>117**</mark>	0.0657**	0.0108	-0.0995***	5.976***	1.036	-0.132
		(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0316)	(0.0314)	(0.0349)	(1.809)	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010-2014	2010–2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	341	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

Table 4.3 Average Impact of NYC-CS on Elementary and Middle Scrools

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Math Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	0.0123**	.0345	-0.00225	-0.0707**	1.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108	(0.00596)	(0 0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1.695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	2017	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0364	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	2.164*	0.0901
		(0.011))	(0.00479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.0407)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.13 <mark>1</mark> ***	0.0539	-0.111***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	N/A	(0.0385)	(0.0396)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average effect	-0.0734***	0.0117**	0.0657**	0.0108	-0.0995***	5.976***	1.036	-0.132
		(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0316)	(0.0314)	(0.0349)	(1.809)	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010–2014	2010-2014	2010–2014	2010-2014	2010–2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elenientary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	341	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

Table 4.3 Average Impact of	f NYC-CS oi	n Elementary a	nd Middle Scho	ols					
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Math Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	0.0123**	0.0345	-0.00225	-0.0707**	1.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108)	(0.00596)	(0.0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1.695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	2017	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0364	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	2.164*	0.0901
		(0.0110)	(0.00479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.0407)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.131***	0.0539	-0.111***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	N/A	(0.0385)	(0.03:6)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average effect	-0.0734***	0.0117**	0.0657**	0.0108	-0.0995***	5.976***	1.036	-0.132
		(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0316)	(0.03 4)	(0.0349)	(1.809)	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010–2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2010-2014	2010–2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	841	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

NOTES: The coefficients shown are the result of a weighted difference-in-difference specification. Administrative outcomes include data from the 2010 school year to the 2018 school year. Math and ELA test scores are measured in student standard deviation units, and the number of disciplinary incidents is measured per student per year. \* p < 0.10; \*\* p < 0.05; \*\*\* p < 0.01.

Table 4.3 Average Impact of	f NYC-CS oi	n Elementary a	nd Middle Scho	pols	$\frown$				
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Mith Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	0.0123**	0.034	-0.00225	-0.0707**	1.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108)	(0.00596)	(0.0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1.695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	2017	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0354	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	2.164*	0.0901
		(0.0110)	(0.00479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.0407)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.13′***	0.0539	-0.11 <sup>,</sup> ***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	N/A	(0.0385)	(0.0396)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average	-0.0734***	0.0117**	0.0657**	0.0108	-0.0995***	5.976***	1.036	-0.132
	effect	(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0216)	(0.0314)	(0.0349)	(1.809)	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	341	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

#### Table 4.3

Average Impact of NYC-CS on Elementary and Middle Schools

g =		· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Math Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	0.0123**	0.0345	-0.00225	-0.0707**	.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108)	(0.00596)	(0.0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1 695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	2017	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0364	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	2.164*	0.0901
		(0.0110)	(0.00479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.0407)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.131***	0.0 39	-0.111***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	N/A	(0.0385)	(0.0396)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average	-0.0734***	0.0117**	0.0657**	0.0	-0.0995***	5.975***	1.036	-0.132
	effect	(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0316)	(0.0814)	(0.0349)	(1.809)	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010–2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	341	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

#### Table 4.3

Average Impact of NYC-CS on Elementary and Middle Schools

g =		· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Math Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	0.0123**	0.0345	-0.00225	-0.0707**	1.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108)	(0.00596)	(0.0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1.695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	2017	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0364	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	1.164*	0.0901
		(0.0110)	(0.00479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.04(7)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.131***	0.0539	-0.111***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	N/A	(0.0385)	(0.0396)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average	-0.0734***	0.0117**	0.0657**	0.0108	-0.0995***	5.976***	1.036	-0.132
	effect	(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0316)	(0.0314)	(0.0349)	(1.809)	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010–2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	341	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Math Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibilit	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	0.0123**	0.0345	-0.00225	-0.0707**	1.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108)	(0.00596)	(0.0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1.695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	2017	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0364	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	2.164*	0.0901
		(0.0110)	(0.00479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.0407)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.131***	0.0539	-0.111***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	N/A	(0.0385)	(0.0396)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average	-0.0734***	0.0117**	0.0657**	0.0108	-0.0995***	5.976***	1.036	-0.132
	effect	(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0316)	(0.0314)	(0.0349)	(1.809	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010–2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	341	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion On-Time Progression	Average Math Test Scores	Average ELA Test Scores	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect of	2016	-0.0545***	0.0123**	0.0345	-0.00225	-0.0707**	1.806	-0.220	-0.893
program		(0.0108)	(0.00596)	(0.0288)	(0.0281)	(0.0356)	(1.695)	(1.358)	(0.900)
	2017	-0.0804***	0.0110**	0.0364	-0.0166	-0.119***	7.370***	2.164*	0.0901
		(0.0110)	(0.00479)	(0.0374)	(0.0359)	(0.0407)	(2.271)	(1.259)	(0.888)
	2018	-0.0870***	N/A	0.131***	0.0539	-0.111***	9.274***	1.319	0.503
		(0.0120)	N/A	(0.0385)	(0.0396)	(0.0394)	(2.735)	(1.611)	(0.807)
	Average effect	-0.0734***	0.0117**	0.0657**	0.0108	-0.0995***	5.976***	1.036	-0.132
		(0.0101)	(0.00477)	(0.0316)	(0.0314)	(0.0349)	(1.809)	(1.134)	(0.747)
Base year		2010–2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle	Elementary and middle
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		341	341	341	341	341	341	167	341
Number of school-ye observations	ear	2,994	2,667	2,970	2,970	2,673	1,339	647	1,342

Figure 4.4

Difference Between Community Schools and Matched Comparison Schools: High Schools



NOTE: Vertical axis reflects the difference in outcome between community schools and non-community schools, normalized so that the difference in 2014 is equal to zero. Dashed vertical lines indicate that 2014–2015 is considered a transition year. Solid bars represent 95-percent confidence intervals. The vertical scale for "Chronically absent" and "Graduated" is the proportion of students in those categories, averaged over schools. The vertical scale for "Credits accumulated" is the number of credits earned per year, averaged over schools. The vertical scale for "Disciplinary incidents per student" is the number of students, averaged over schools.

#### Table 4.4

Average Impact of NYC-CS on High Schools

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
_		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion Graduated	Credits Accumulated	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect	2016	-0.0606***	0.0468**	1.265***	0.00944	-0.253	0.0713	1.619
school program		(0.0177)	(0.0258)	(0.253)	(0.0483)	(1.985)	(1.071)	(1.317)
	2017	-0.0940***	0.0278	1.206***	-0.0253	0.958	1.083	1.463
		(0.0216)	(0.0189)	(0.312)	(0.0584)	(2.501)	(1.176)	(1.331)
	2018	-0.0952***	0.0724**	1.346***	0.00439	-0.0279	0.673	1.246
		(0.0245)	(0.0289)	(0.304)	(0.0670)	(2.402)	(1.282)	(1.245)
	Average	-0.0828***	0.0487***	1.271***	-0.00377	0.225	0.601	1.451
	Lilect	(0.0191)	(0.0239)	(0.269)	(0.0464)	(1.915)	(1.035)	(1.110)
Base year(s)		2010-2014	2010-2014	2010–2014	2010-2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)	5	171	171	171	171	171	171	171
Number of school- observations	year	1,492	1,464	1,511	1,353	671	667	661

Table 4.4 Average Impact	of NYC-CS o	on high Schools						
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
_		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion Graduated	Credits Accumulated	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect	2016	-0.0606***	0.0468**	1.265***	0.00944	-0.253	0.0713	1.619
school program		(0.0177)	(0 0258)	(0.253)	(0.0483)	(1.985)	(1.071)	(1.317)
	2017	-0.0940***	0.0278	1.206***	-0.0253	0.958	1.083	1.463
		(0.0216)	(0.0189)	(0.312)	(0.0584)	(2.501)	(1.176)	(1.331)
	20 8	-0.0952***	0.0724**	1.346***	0.00439	-0.0279	0.673	1.246
		(0.0245)	(0.0289)	(0.304)	(0.0670)	(2.402)	(1.282)	(1.245)
	Average	-0.0828***	0.0437***	1.271***	-0.00377	0.225	0.601	1.451
	Effect	(0.0191)	(0.)239)	(0.269)	(0.0464)	(1.915)	(1.035)	(1.110)
Base year(s)		2010–2014	20 0–2014	2010–2014	2010-2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)	s	171	171	171	171	171	171	171
Number of school- observations	-year	1,492	1,464	1,511	1,353	671	667	661

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion Graduated	Credits Accumulated	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect	2016	-0.0606***	0.0468**	1.265***	0.00944	-0.253	0.0713	1.619
school program		(0.0177)	(0.0258)	(0.253)	(0.0483)	(1.985)	(1.071)	(1.317)
	2017	-0.0940***	0.0278	1.206***	-0.0253	0.958	1.083	1.463
		(0.0215)	(0.0189)	(0.312)	(0.0584)	(2.501)	(1.176)	(1.331)
	2018	-0.0952***	0.0724**	1.:46***	0.00439	-0.0279	0.673	1.246
		(0.0245)	(0.0289)	((.304)	(0.0670)	(2.402)	(1.282)	(1.245)
	Average	-0.0828***	0.0487***	1.271***	-0.00377	0.225	0.601	1.451
	enect	(0.019)	(0.0239)	0.269)	(0.0464)	(1.915)	(1.035)	(1.110)
Base year(s)		2010–2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2010-2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools
Number of cluster (i.e., schools)	S	171	171	171	171	171	171	171
Number of school- observations	-year	1,492	1,464	1,511	1,353	671	667	661

Table 4.4 Average Impact	of NYC-CS o	on High Schools		$\frown$				
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion Graduated	Credits Accumulated	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect	2016	-0.0606***	0.0468**	1.265***	0.00944	-0.253	0.0713	1.619
school program		(0.0177)	(0.0258	(0.253)	(0.0483)	(1.985)	(1.071)	(1.317)
	2017	-0.0940***	0.0278	1.206***	-0.0253	0.958	1.083	1.463
		(0.0216)	(0.0189)	(0.312)	(0.0584)	(2.501)	(1.176)	(1.331)
	2018	-0.0952***	0.0724**	1.346***	0.00439	-0.0279	0.673	1.246
		(0.0245)	(0.0289)	(0.304)	(0 0670)	(2.402)	(1.282)	(1.245)
	Average	-0.0828***	0.0487***	1.271***	-0.00377	0.225	0.601	1.451
	Effect	(0.0191)	(0.0239)	(0.269)	((.0464)	(1.915)	(1.035)	(1.110)
Base year(s)		2010-2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		High schools	High schoo's	High schools	Hgh schools	High schools	High schools	High schools
Number of cluster (i.e., schools)	s	171	171	171	171	171	171	171
Number of school- observations	-year	1,492	1,464	1,511	1,353	671	667	661

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion Graduated	Credits Accumulated	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect	2016	-0.0606***	0.0468**	1.265***	0.00944	-0.253	0.0713	1.619
school program		(0.0177)	(0.0258)	(0.253)	(0.0483)	(1.985)	(1.071)	(1.317)
	2017	-0.0940***	0.0278	1.206***	-0.0253	0.958	1.083	1.463
		(0.0216)	(0.0189)	(0.312)	(0.0584)	(2.501)	(1.176)	(1.331)
	2018	-0.0952***	0.0724**	1.346***	0.00439	-0.0279	0.673	1.246
		(0.0245)	(0.0289)	(0.304)	(0.0670)	(2.402)	(1.282)	(1.245)
	Average	-0.0828***	0.0487***	1.271***	-0.00377	).225	0.601	1.451
	Effect	(0.0191)	(0.0239)	(0.269	(0.0464)	1.915)	(1.035)	(1.110)
Base year(s)		2010-2014	2010-2014	2010–2014	2010–2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		High schools	High schools	High schoos	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools
Number of cluster (i.e., schools)	s	171	171	171	171	171	171	171
Number of school- observations	-year	1,492	1,464	1,511	1,353	671	667	661

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		Proportion Chronically Absent	Proportion Graduated	Credits Accumulated	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	Teacher Responsibility	Student Connectedness to Adults	Family Empowerment Opportunities
Estimated effect	2016	-0.0606***	0.0468**	1.265***	0.00944	-0.253	0.0713	1.619
school program		(0.0177)	(0.0258)	(0.253)	(0.0483)	(1.985)	(1.071)	(1.317)
	2017	-0.0940***	0.0278	1.206***	-0.0253	0.958	1.083	1.463
		(0.0216)	(0.0189)	(0.312)	(0.0584)	(2.501)	(1.176)	(1.331)
	2018	-0.0952***	0.0724**	1.346***	0.00439	-0.0279	0.673	1.246
		(0.0245)	(0.0289)	(0.304)	(0.0670)	(2.402)	(1.282)	(1.245)
	Average	-0.0828***	0.0487***	1.271***	-0.00377	0.225	0.601	1.451
	Effect	(0.0191)	(0.0239)	(0.269)	(0.0464)	(1.915)	(1.035)	(1.110)
Base year(s)		2010-2014	2010-2014	2010-2014	2010–2014	2015	2015	2015
Schools included		High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools	High schools
Number of clusters (i.e., schools)		171	171	171	171	171	171	171
Number of school-year observations		1,492	1,464	1,511	1,353	671	667	661

## RQ2 – Effect on Student Subgroups, Elementary/Middle Schools

Outcome Measure	In poverty	In temporary housing	ELL	With disability	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic
Proportion Chronically Absent	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*
Proportion On-Time Progression	+*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	+*	+*	n.s.
Average Math Score	+*	n.s.	+*	+*	+*	+*	+*	+*
Average ELA Score	n.s	n.s.	+*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Number of Disciplinary Incidents	_*	_*	n.s.	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*

-\*: negative and statistically significant at p<0.05; +\*: positive and statistically significant at p<0.05; n.s.: not significant at p<0.05

## RQ2 – Effect on Student Subgroups, High Schools

Outcome Measure	In poverty	In temporary housing	ELL	Learning disability	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic
Proportion Chronically Absent	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*	_*
Proportion Graduated	+*	n.s.	n.s.	+*	+*	+*	+*	+*
Credits Accumulated	+*	+*	+*	+*	+*	+*	+*	+*
Number of Disciplinary Incidents	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

-\*: negative and statistically significant at p<0.05; +\*: positive and statistically significant at p<0.05; n.s.: not significant at p<0.05

## RQ3 – School-based Impact Heterogeneity

School characteristics for probing impact heterogeneity:

- Large vs small schools
  - Cutpoint at the median for ES/MS and HS, separately
- Highly zoned vs. lightly zoned schools
  - schools in the top half of the distribution (e.g. with more students living in the zone) are considered highly zoned schools and those in the bottom half are considered lightly zoned schools.
- Schools run by a new principal vs. schools run by an experienced principal
  - Cutpoint at the median number of years principals had worked at schools, as of the 2014-15 school year
- Renewal School status
- Implementation levels
  - 4 core capacity scores (Continuous improvement, coordination, collaboration, connectedness)
  - Mental health service implementation

#### RQ3 – School-based Impact Heterogeneity

- Overall, we find limited evidence of treatment effect heterogeneity based on school type
- Three situations where program impact varied by school type:
  - 1. NYC-CS was more effective in raising math scores and reducing disciplinary incidents in un-zoned schools compared to those that were highly or lowly zoned
  - 2. NYC-CS was more effective in improving levels of credit accumulation at high schools with newer principals
  - 3. Renewal Schools were more successful at reducing chronic absenteeism, increasing on-time grade progression (among elementary and middle schools) and increasing credit accumulation (among high schools) than non-Renewal NYC-CS schools

## RQ3 – Implementation and Impact Heterogeneity

- Two situations where program implementation was associated with differential program impact:
  - 1. Schools with collaboration levels above the median had stronger impact on student connectedness to adults
  - 2. Schools in the higher mental health implementation cluster were more effective at reducing chronic absenteeism compared to those in the lower implementation cluster
- Otherwise, we did not find any statistically significant differences in program impact based on implementation measures.

#### Limitations

- Selection bias
  - Designation to NYC-CS was based on achievement and attendance goals
  - Impossible to construct a comparison group of schools that was equivalent to participating schools at baseline
  - Impact estimates could be biased because of the unobserved differences between the community schools and the comparison schools
- Data
  - Reliance on NYCSS, which was not designed for evaluation of NYC-CS and not useable before 2014-15
  - Limited access to administrative data on student health, justice involvement and other aspects of students' lives would also expand our knowledge beyond the current study
- Duration
  - It is possible that the impact of an intervention that assists schools and students in a holistic fashion could change over time

#### Los Angeles Times

## Implications

- Tangible impact on a variety of student outcomes, when implemented across hundreds of schools
- **Resource demands** may represent a limiting factor in some contexts
- Managing partnerships with multiple agencies and CBOs was the hardest part for many principals, but these partnerships are also key for ensuring sustainability
- Patience is important—the program should not be expected to succeed in helping every student right away, particularly in high school

#### OPINION

 $\equiv$ 

Opinion: What LAUSD can learn from the New York City Community Schools Initiative



Liliana Villalpando teaches math in 2016 at Garfield High, an LAUSD "community school" that teams with agencies to be a hub of services for students, their families and the surrounding area. (Mark Boster)

By WILLIAM R. JOHNSTON

JAN. 28, 2020 8:30 AM Ŵ

When the Los Angeles Unified School District and its unionized teachers settled a weeklong strike a year ago, the deal included familiar items such as pay raises, (slightly) smaller classes and more nurses and counselors. Largely overlooked was another major item: a commitment by the district to transform 30 schools into "community schools" by the 2020-21 school year.

### <u>Thank you!</u>

Email: <a href="mailto:william.r.johnston@lausd.net">william.r.johnston@lausd.net</a>



# Supplemental Slides

## Implementation Findings, by Year

·	SY2014-15	SY2015-16	SY2016-17 <sup>a</sup>
Real-Time Data Use			
Use of the New Visions Data Sorter	18%	92%	82%
Expanded Learning Time			
Expanded Learning Time	59%	91%	81%
Expanded Learning Time on Weekends	51%	49%	43%
Family Engagement			
Hosting of Community School Team Meetings	35%	85%	86%
School Work Plan created with input from families	47%	80%	82%
Attendance Improvement Strategies			
Success Mentoring	41%	74%	78%
Data-driven meetings to discuss attendance trends	59%	84%	85%
Mental Health Programs and Services			
Tier 1 (Universal) Mental Health Services	55%	89%	85%
Tier 2 (Selective) Mental Health Services	51%	85%	82%
Tier 3 (Targeted) Mental Health Services	47%	82%	84%

Note: percentages are based on the respondents to the School Leader Survey who were employed at their school for at least two years prior to the 2016-2017 school year. (n=74). Thus, not all 118 schools are included here.

<sup>a</sup>Because the survey was administered in October 2016, respondents were asked to report on services their school planned to provide in the coming year. Nonetheless, there is a chance that some respondents may have interpreted the question as what has been provided already that year, which may explain the slight dip in service provision for Data Use, ELT, and Mental Health Programs and Services.

## Mental Health Programs and Services

Table 3.3. Percentage of Schools That Planned to Implement New or Enhanced Mental HealthPrograms, Services, or Structures for SYs 2015–2016 or 2016–2017

	SYs 2015–2016 or 2016–2017 Mental Health Work Plans (Percentage) ( <i>n</i> = 118)
Staff professional development	98.3
Student skill building	98.3
Family services	92.4
Crisis intervention	86.4
Clinic	71.2
Counseling and clinical mental health treatment	61.0
Mental health screening and assessments	57.6
Mental health awareness and communication	53.4
Case management	44.9
Community partnerships	40.7
Mental health team to coordinate programs/services	24.6

NOTE: Percentages based on review of mental health work plans.

## Methodology

- Create a matched comparison group that is similar along numerous dimensions:
  - baseline outcomes (attendance, academic achievement, and discipline)
  - demographic makeup
  - characteristics that determined treatment (whether they applied to AIDP and, if so, the score they received)

#### • Two complications:

- 1. Finding close matches on all 35 metrics for any given school is virtually impossible
- 2. Community schools were chosen because of their difficulties in attaining achievement and attendance goals, which suggests that comparison schools will be systematically different in these dimensions than community schools

### Addressing complication #1

- Composite measures created from the 35 baseline measures using principal component analysis (PCA)
- PCA creates composite measures that are weighted averages of the 35 base measures
- Community schools are matched to comparison schools based on the eight largest composites (those that explain the most variation across the 35 base measures)

### Addressing complication #2

• Difference-in-difference estimator:

$$Y_{st} = \alpha_t + \gamma_s + \sum_{k=2015}^{2018} \beta_k T_{stk} + \epsilon_{st}$$

- *Y*<sub>st</sub> is the outcome value for school *s* in year *t*.
- $\alpha_t$  are year fixed effects to account for any changes that affect both the community schools and the matched comparison schools similarly
- $\gamma_s$  are school fixed effects that adjust for differences across schools in the years prior to 2015
- $T_{stk}$  equals one if school *s* is a community school and the year *t* equals *k* 
  - $\beta_{2016}$  is the estimated effect of the NYC-CS in 2016
  - $\beta_{2017}$  is the estimated effect of the NYC-CS in 2017
  - $\beta_{2018}$  is the estimated effect of the NYC-CS in 2018
- KEY ASSUMPTION: pre-trends of outcome measures are similar between two groups