U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)

OMB No.

Check only one box per Program Office instructions.
[X] Annual Performance Report   [   ] Final Performance Report

General Information

1. PR/Award #: S184F140033

2. Grantee NCES ID#: 09

(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 characters.)   *(See instructions. Up to 12 characters.)*

3 Project Title: Connecticut's School Climate Transformation Grant: Implementing Multi-Tiered Behavioral Supports to improve the social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes of all students

(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)

4. Grantee Name *(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.):* Connecticut State Department of Education

5. Grantee Address *(See instructions.)* 450 Columbus Blvd

Hartford, CT 06103-1841

6. Project Director *(See instructions.)* Name: Kimberly Traverso   Title: Education Consultant

Ph #: (860) 807- 2057 Ext: (   )   Fax #: (860) 713-7051

Email Address: kimberly.traverso@ct.gov

Reporting Period Information *(See instructions.)*

7. Reporting Period: From: 10/01/2016   To: 05/31/2017

Budget Expenditures *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)*

8. Budget Expenditures

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds *(Match/Cost Share)*
a. Previous Budget Period	$674,485.73	$71,845.00
b. Current Budget Period	$391,029.46	$32,649.24
c. Entire Project Period *(For Final Performance Reports only)*		

Indirect Cost Information *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)*

9. Indirect Costs

    a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? X Yes ___No

    b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government? X Yes ___No

    c. If yes, provide the following information:

        Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 07/ 01/2016   To: 06/30/2017 (mm/dd/yyyy)

        Approving Federal agency: X ED ___Other *(Please specify):* _____

        Type of Rate *(For Final Performance Reports Only):* ___ Provisional ___ Final ___ Other *(Please specify):* _____

    d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:

        X Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?

        ___ Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) *(See instructions.)*

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached? ___Yes ___ No X N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification *(See instructions.)*

11. Performance Measures Status

    a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? X Yes ___ No

    b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? _____/_____/_____ (mm/dd/yyyy)

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Ellen Cohn   Title: Deputy Commissioner

Name of Authorized Representative:

_Ellen E. Cohn_____   Date: 07 / 06 / 17

Signature:

PR/Award # (11 characters): __S184F140033_____

(See Instructions)

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): <u>S184F140033</u>

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

A. Actual Expenditures for Reporting Period (October 1, 2016-May 31, 2017)
$391,029.46

B. Provide explanation if you are NOT expending funds at the expected rate.
None

C. Describe any changes to your budget that affected your ability to achieve your approved project activities and/or project objectives.
    None.

D. Describe any significant changes to your budget resulting from modifications of project activities.
    None.

E. Do you expect to have any unexpended funds at the end of the current budget period? (Explain why, provide an estimate, and indicate how you plan to use the unexpended funds (carryover) in the next budget period.)
    No.

F. Describe any anticipated changes in your budget for the next budget period that require prior approval from the Department.
    None.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Executive Summary

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # (11 characters): <u>S184F140033</u>

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) continues, through the Connecticut School Climate Transformation Grant (CT SCTG) (CFDA 84.148F), to support local education agencies (LEAs) establishing a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) through the use of the selected multi-tiered behavioral framework (MTBF) schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports (SWPBIS). Accomplishments have been made across all three goals of the grant: (1) establishing a high-quality cadre of endorsed professional trainers (n=20) available to support the implementation of SWPBIS across the state; (2a) conducting a statewide assessment of the implementation fidelity of SWPBIS in schools (n=300) to inform further PD and training needs; (2b) establishing a small cadre of schools implementing SWPBIS with high fidelity (n=6) through job-embedded training and technical assistance (TA); and (3) aligning CSDE efforts and resources around the SWPBIS framework. Particular highlights are noted below across each of the goals of the grant.

Goal 1: Build the CSDE's capacity for supporting the sustained and broad-scale implementation of an MTBF.

- Together with the Center for Behavioral and Education Research (CBER) at the University of Connecticut (UConn), the CSDE recruited participants from LEAs, the regional educational service centers (RESCs) and the State Education Resource Center (SERC). The participants in the training of trainers (TOT) engage in a rigorous experience designed to increase the number and quality of available trainers to provide technical assistance and coaching on the implementation and sustainability of the MTBF in Connecticut. A combination of performance tasks and the use of standardized curricular materials, evaluated by the TOT coordinators, leads to endorsement. Four members of the initial training cohort of experienced trainers have been endorsed. Additional endorsement decisions will be made in September 2017 toward the goal of 20 endorsed CT trainers.

Goal 2: Enhance LEA capacity for implementation and sustaining an MTBF by providing training and TA to LEAs.

- Following the broad implementation of Tier I in 2016-2017, the three schools in Cohort A achieved fidelity of implementation as measured by the SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI). The planning and partial implementation of Tier II was the focus of the onsite support.
- A statewide competitive recruitment and evaluation process resulted in the identification of the second cohort of three schools for the three-year SWPBIS training and TA model in June 2016. Each school received customized support on establishing universal/Tier I systems. In this first year, two of the schools were able to plan and implement partial roll-outs that established fidelity of implementation at Tier I.
- Continued recruitment efforts in support of the TFI technical assistance visits established communication with nearly 300 schools previously trained in PBIS, resulting in an additional 58 TFIs.

Goal 3: Coordinate CSDE efforts with appropriate federal, state and local resources in order to align statewide improvement efforts focused on school climate.

- The CT SCTG and the CT Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sponsored a one-day family engagement conference in October 2016 to support family engagement targets in both projects. The session featured a local speaker on engaging fathers and national speakers from The Home Visiting Project as strategies for increasing parental engagement. This cross-project event was coordinated by representatives from the CSDE Bureau of Special Education (n=1), Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=3), and SERC (n=4) to serve the schools in Cohort A (n=3) and LEAs (n=4) involved in these projects.
- A group of leaders from CSDE, CBER, the RESCs, and SERC formed the PBIS Collaborative to guide SWPBIS training and implementation across Connecticut. The group has worked diligently to draft a comprehensive strategic plan centered on the implementation blueprint that will assist in guiding the work of the group over the next five years. Members of the Collaborative have opened discussions on aligning statewide evaluation efforts as well as potential changes to the CT PBIS Model Schools Project to increase visibility of SWPBIS across the state. This project recognized schools for successfully implementing schoolwide systematic fidelity for SWPBIS.
- The CT SCTG Management Team continued to support the first cohort of schools selected and began support for the second cohort of three schools selected for participation. The support network included SERC consultants (n=6) along with consultants from the Turnaround Office (n=2) of the CSDE.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # (11 characters): <u>S184F140033</u>

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective **[ ]** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Project Objective 1: To expand the cadre of high-quality trainers in the state who can deliver effective, meaningful support to schools and districts in implementing an evidence-based, multi-tiered behavioral framework. (Goal 1)

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
By the conclusion of the grant period, 20 Connecticut trainers will complete the Training of Trainers (TOT) series and receive endorsement.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		20	/		4	/	

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Standards and expectations for individuals completing the TOT series will be developed, refined as needed, and used periodically to determine trainer readiness and maintain quality.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information):

Goal 1 of the Connecticut School Climate Transformation Grant (CT SCTG) is to build the state's capacity to support local education agencies' (LEAs') sustained and broad-scale implementation of a multi-tiered behavioral framework (MTBF). Two primary strategies are being implemented to meet this goal: 1) a TOT model (Project Objective 1, as described below) and 2) a statewide needs assessment of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) implementation using the School-wide PBIS (SWPBIS) Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) (Project Objective 2, as described under Status Chart 2).

The Center for Behavioral Education and Research (CBER) at the University of Connecticut (UConn) serves as the coordinating agency and contract partner for the New England PBIS Training of Trainers (NEPBIS TOT). The current TOT model has two cohorts of experienced trainers, two cohorts of new trainers and ongoing recruitment efforts scheduled to begin in September 2017. It is expected that completion takes two years. Individual adjustments to the timeline based on participant need (e.g., job change or parental leave) are managed on an individual basis.

Applications have been received from 32 Connecticut participants to date. All Applications were reviewed using the TOT Scoring Rubric (attached in Section C). Applications for the Cohort C - New Trainers are now being accepted and are being reviewed on a rolling basis beginning as of mid-June 2017 for matriculation in September 2017. The CT SCTG Management Team anticipates that at the conclusion of the grant period (2019), there will be 20 endorsed trainers from Connecticut as well as several endorsed trainers from a variety of regional partners. The NEPBIS TOT model for endorsement has positioned Connecticut as a national leader in the preparation and ongoing support for SWPBIS trainers.

Performance Measure 1.a: This indicator measures the number of Connecticut trainers who complete the TOT series and receive endorsement. Progress toward the five-year target will be reported annually.

As is noted in Table 1.a, the progress toward endorsement is noted below for each of the cohorts.

Table 1.a: Training of Trainers Cohort Progress

CT SCTG COHORTS				
49 Applicants between Spring 2015 and Spring 2016 Recruitments 32 from Connecticut				
EXPERIENCED		NEW		
16 Connecticut: 12		33 Connecticut: 20		
Cohort A *Started Fall 2015*	Cohort B *Started Fall 2016*	Cohort A *Started Fall 2015*	Cohort B *Started Fall 2016*	Cohort C *Anticipated Start Fall 2017*
8 Connecticut: 7	8 Connecticut: 5	14 Connecticut: 9	16 Connecticut: 9	3 *(deferred start from previous acceptance)* Connecticut: 2
Withdrawn without completion: 0 Connecticut: 0	Withdrawn without completion: 1 Connecticut: 1	Withdrawn without completion: 5 Connecticut: 5	Withdrawn without completion: 1 Connecticut: 1	N/A
Endorsed to date: 5 Connecticut: 4	Anticipated Endorsement by 9/1/17: 4 Connecticut: 3	Anticipated Endorsement by 9/1/17: 5 Connecticut: 2	Scheduled Endorsement Date: 9/1/18	Scheduled Endorsement Date: 9/1/19

The 2016-17 TOT schedule included a combination of training events, supported training activities and participation in the ongoing PBIS network of support.
- Training commenced with the Experienced Trainer Summit on September 7, 2016. At this event, six Connecticut Experienced Trainers participated in an overview of the year, including the scope and sequence for TOT activities, expectations for task completion and an overview of the revisions to the NEPBIS materials.
- The first onsite training couplet was held on the UConn campus on September 13-14, 2016. Cohort B - New Trainers (Connecticut: n=9) attended both days of training, Cohort A - New Trainers (Connecticut: n=5) attended the second of the two dates; and Cohort B - Experienced Trainers (Connecticut: n=5) attended the first of the two days. Training comprised a combination of content review/learning, self-reflection, planning, and the opportunity to present and receive peer feedback each day.
- Twenty-eight new and experienced trainers (Connecticut and Regional Partners) attended the annual May Institute Conference in Norwood, MA, on Wednesday, November 9, 2016, to discuss how trainers use discipline data to identify and address exclusionary discipline practices..
- The second onsite training couplet was held on the UConn campus on January 11-12, 2017 with Cohort B - New Trainers (Connecticut: n=8); Cohort A - New Trainers (Connecticut: n=4); and Cohort B - Experienced Trainers (Connecticut: n=4). The structure of the two days mirrored the September dates.
- Thirty new and experienced trainers (Connecticut and Regional Partners) attended the Northeast PBIS Leadership Forum in Mystic, CT on Thursday, May 18, 2017. Those in Cohort A (both new and experienced: n= 12) met with Dr. George Sugai to hear about national trends, while those in Cohort B (new and experienced: n=18) discussed their use of the Direct Observation of Training Quality (DOT-Q) on speakers from the morning sessions.
- The final on-site training couplet was held June 7-8, 2017 with Cohort B - New Trainers (Connecticut: n=8); Cohort A - New Trainers (Connecticut: n=4); and Cohort B - Experienced Trainers (Connecticut: n=4). The structure again mirrored the September and January dates.

The TOT participants are from agencies and districts across Connecticut: Cohort A - Experienced Trainers included: consultants from the State Education Resource Center (SERC; n=1); Capitol Region Education Council (CREC; n=1); Cooperative Educational Services (CES; n=2); LEARN (n=1); and two district-based staff members (Bridgeport: n=1; Oxford: n=1). Cohort B - Experienced Trainers included: consultants from SERC (n=4). Cohort A - New Trainers included: a consultant from SERC (n=1); a doctoral student from UConn (n=1); a district-based school psychologist (West Hartford: n=1); and one independent trainer. Cohort B - New Trainers included: consultants from SERC (n=2); a consultant from EASTCONN (n=1); a doctoral student from UConn (n=1); district-based school staff (Enfield: n=1; Putnam: n=1; Stamford: n=1); and one independent consultant.

Four Connecticut trainers from Cohort A - Experienced Trainers are now endorsed. These trainers include: consultants from CES (n=2); a consultant from SERC (n=1); and district-based staff (Vernon: n=1). Additionally, an independent consultant employed by CREC but based in Massachusetts has also been endorsed (n=1).

Performance Measure 1.b: This measure reports on progress toward the readiness and quality standards for endorsement being constructed by CBER for trainers who are accepted into the TOT series. The specific skills and competencies are outlined in the Direct Observation of Training Quality (DOT-Q) (attached in Section C). The CBER coordinators and participants track progress toward the competencies using two key tools housed in a personalized *Dropbox* (see sample in Section C) created by CBER for each participant and aligned to the cohort expectations whether experienced or new.

The first tool is the Endorsement Tracker (see sample in Section C). This spreadsheet and corresponding folders are designed to capture the evidence that is reviewed holistically to arrive at the endorsement decision. Participants input dates of attendance for the following training commitments: on-campus training days, conference booster sessions, training observations (new only), and School-wide Information System (SWIS) Facilitator Certification. In addition, participants enter the dates when they upload materials to their folders including: homework, short- and long-form video uploads, and companion self-reflections. Lastly, the participants itemize "Other Materials" submitted for review, including de-identified data from fidelity measures completed as part of the training series, training evaluation summaries from those attending live sessions, and exemplars of work from teams being trained.

The second tool is the personalized DOT-Q Rubric (see sample in Section C) that is aligned to the expectations of the cohort. The DOT-Q is scored on either a 60- or 88-point scale depending on the presentation being reviewed. Over time, it is expected that each trainer demonstrates individualized growth and proficiency in each of the areas scored. Proficiency in a particular quality indicator is reached when the average of the top three scores reaches 3/4. Structured feedback also includes a narrative portion in addition to the numerical score which provided guidance on "things that went well" and "things to keep working on." Each participant is expected to upload a variety of training videos for review and scoring. The number required is aligned to the cohort track. An independent reviewer provides scores and narrative feedback for each video submitted. As noted in Table 1.b, the trainer scores showed growth for Cohort A and a higher range of performance for Cohort B in the baseline. Cohort A saw an increase in mean score of 14.44 points between the initial review in Spring 2016 and Spring 2017. In addition, the median for Cohort A increased 14.5 points from 47 to 61.5. The range of scores improved overall, moving up 15 points on the low end and 27 points at the top of the range; but the spread is wider, increasing from 39 points between the top and bottom to 51 points between the two. Cohort B has had a higher performance overall as compared to Cohort A, with a higher mean score (46.51 as compared to 44.36 in the first year) and a range of 28-73 as compared to 19-58.

Table 1.b: Summary of Direct Observation of Training Quality Video Feedback Summary Data by Cohort as of May 2017

Cohort *(Data is reported combining new and experienced trainers)*	Summary Date	Mean	Median	Range
A	Spring 2016*	44.36/88	47/88	19-58
A	Spring 2017	58.80/88	61.50/88	34-85
B	Spring 2017	46.51/88	45/88	28-73

Data repeated from APR 2016 to provide baseline for comparison of progress.

A variety of data has been collected to ascertain the effectiveness of the TOT model including: training evaluations (Summary in Section C); summary of participant focus groups (facilitated by external grant evaluation team) and published in August 2016 (See document in Section C). A survey of all participants by the external grant evaluation team is ongoing, and a summary report will be published in August 2017.

U.S. Department of Education

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # (11 characters): <u>S184F140033</u>

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2. Project Objective   **[ ]** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Project Objective 2: To accurately assess the current status of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) implementation in schools throughout the state in order to identify areas of strength and need. (Goal 1)

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of training and technical assistance (TA) events provided by the state education agency (SEA) School Climate Transformation Grant (SCTG) program to assist local education agencies (LEAs) in implementing a multi-tiered behavioral framework (MTBF). (Government Performance and Results Act [GPRA] Measure 1)	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		100	/		58	/	

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Updates on the findings of the statewide PBIS needs assessment will be provided to stakeholders at least annually in an effort to inform a more efficient deployment of professional development and TA focused on multi-tiered behavioral frameworks (MTBFs).	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		1	/		1	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information):

Project Objective 2 focuses on conducting a statewide needs assessment of SWPBIS implementation as part of the grant's first goal to build the state's capacity to support LEAs' sustained and broad-scale implementation of an MTBF. The selected tool for conducting the needs assessment is the SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) (see Section C), a 45-indicator tool developed by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Technical Assistance Center. The process, facilitated by a trained external consultant, asks teams to review the three tiers of intervention established in school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. The trained facilitators are from: the State Education Resource Center (SERC; n=17) or the school's local regional educational service center (RESC): Area Cooperative Educational Services (ACES; n=1); Capitol Region Education Council (CREC; n=1); Cooperative Educational Services (CES; n=2); EASTCONN (n=5); EdAdvance (n=1); and LEARN (n=1). During the 2016-2017 school year, three additional consultants (SERC: n=2; CREC: n=1) were trained in the facilitation of the TFI on behalf of the grant.

The long-term purpose of the needs assessment is to drive decision-making with respect to SWPBIS training and implementation coaching to ensure sustainable practices. Members of the CT SCTG Management Team reviewed the data from the TFIs already conducted and noted several features where facilitators often made recommendations for implementation improvement. A series of booster sessions were developed (see Section C) to address those features: Tier I - Classroom Procedures (1.8); Feedback and Acknowledgement (1.9); Tier II - Screening (2.3); and Tier III - Screening (3.3). Moving forward, analysis of aggregated data from all TFIs will provide information regarding the status of SWPBIS implementation.

Performance Measure 2.a (GPRA Measure 1): During the 2016-2017 school year, 58 SWPBIS TFIs were conducted in schools across the state (See list in Section C). The schools were located in 23 districts, with more than half (53.4%; n=31) of the schools located in an Alliance District (the 30 lowest performing districts statewide). In addition, nearly a quarter of the schools (20.6%; n=12) were in schools in either Category 4 or Category 5 (schools identified based on their scores of the CSDE

Accountability Index and further designated as either Focus or Turnaround Schools) and 1 of the schools was designated as a Commissioner's Network School (a designation that indicates the school's self-selection into a turnaround process for 3-5 years). The schools were predominantly elementary schools (n=20), followed by P/K-8 schools (n=14), high schools (n=11), middle schools (n=8), and five schools classified as other (i.e., alternative or non-traditional grade alignments). All TFI data were entered into the online PBIS Assessment platform during the onsite visits. Each TFI visit included a building walkthrough (30-45 minutes), TFI administration and action-planning (90-120 minutes) and a wrap-up session (15-30 minutes). In addition to the action plan and instant feedback generated by the PBIS Assessment platform, each school received a customized feedback report outlining fidelity scores for each of the three tiers, commendations, recommendations for improving areas of needs, and a list of available statewide resources (e.g., consultants specializing in PBIS training and TA) for schools seeking further assistance. Reports were prepared by the consultant who facilitated the TFI (see Section C for a sample report). During the 58 completed TFIs, more than 327 school personnel received TA during the CT SCTG's second year of SWPBIS TFI implementation. Additionally, the process of executing TFIs in Connecticut was highlighted in a poster presentation at the National PBIS Leadership Forum in Chicago, IL, in October 2016 (see Section C for a copy of the poster).

Recruitment efforts have included: multiple direct email appeals to school principals and district/school-based PBIS coaches; outreach via the CSDE Bureau of Special Education Bureau Bulletin publication; a presentation at the CSDE Bureau of Special Education annual Back to School event; direct appeals by partner agencies (RESCs) to schools with whom they have worked; presentations and flyer distribution at SERC-sponsored events; and networking within the consultants at the CSDE, including the Bureau of Special Education (n=4), the Turnaround Office (n=2), and the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=4). 38.1% (n=158) of eligible schools in the state have participated in the TFI process over the course of the two-year implementation as a result of the outreach efforts.

Even with consistent recruitment efforts, the Management Team was challenged in meeting the target of 100 TFIs due to competing priorities at the school and district level. Many schools and districts have reported moving away from SWPBIS and toward other school social and emotional approaches and provided examples of "RULER," "social thinking curricula," and "restorative practices," even though these approaches and SWPBIS are not mutually exclusive. Recruitment messaging has consistently reinforced that the SWPBIS framework for decision-making would ensure that these approaches are aligned to efforts already in place. Schools noted that allocating the time and personnel necessary to administer the TFI effectively is difficult; i.e., coverage for members of the school team to participate in the facilitation meeting and access to students and staff members to respond to the walkthrough interview questions. In isolated cases, arrangements have been made with schools to conduct the walkthrough portions on school days and then to return to the school to conduct the team meeting during a professional learning day to mitigate the need for substitute coverage. Recent recruitment efforts have expanded from identifying only "SWPBIS" to including Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) language.

Performance Measure 2.b: A summary report of the CT SCTG's first-year assessment of the status of SWPBIS implementation was published in September 2016. Using the online PBIS Evaluation platform, the external evaluation team gathered and analyzed the data for reporting purposes. The report provided: a) an overview of the SCTG TFI rollout (e.g., purpose, long-term plan); b) the demographics of aggregated TFI visits (e.g., number of schools and districts, location and school type, SWPBIS training history); c) a summary of the TFI results (e.g., scale, sub-scale, item analyses); and d) differences in TFI results by various school characteristics (e.g., Alliance/Non-Alliance, grade-level, year of training) (see Section C for a copy).

The external evaluation team will publish a report in August 2017 that will aggregate the data from the 158 total TFIs conducted on behalf of the CT SCTG over the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years as designed in the evaluation plan. A preliminary snapshot of these data was developed by the CT SCTG Management Team and presented as a poster session at the New England PBIS (NEPBIS) Network Leadership Forum in Mystic, CT, on May 18-19, 2017 (see Section C for a copy of the poster).

PR/Award # (11 characters): <u>S184F140033</u>

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

3. Project Objective   **[ ]** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Project Objective 3: To establish six model/demonstration sites as exemplars of PBIS implementation through site-based professional learning and TA. (Goal 2)

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of training and TA events provided by the SEA SCTG program to assist LEAs in implementing an MTBF. (GPRA Measure 1)	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		54			56.5		

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number and percentage of LEAs provided training or TA by the SEA SCTG program that report an improvement in knowledge and understanding of the implementation of an MTBF. (GPRA Measure 2)	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6/6	100%		3/6	50%

3.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number and percentage of LEAs provided training or TA by the SEA SCTG program that implement an MTBF. (GPRA Measure 3)	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			3/6	50%		5/6	83.3%

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information):

Goal 2 of the CT SCTG is to enhance LEAs' capacity for implementing and sustaining an MTBF by providing training and technical assistance (TA) to the selected schools. In June 2016, the second cohort of schools was selected to participate in the CT SCTG: John C. Mead School (grades PK-6) in Ansonia, Franklin H. Mayberry School (grades PK-6) in East Hartford, and Westside Middle School Academy (grades 6-8) in Danbury. All six schools now receiving support are from Alliance Districts (the 30 lowest-performing school districts in the state as designated by the CSDE).

Performance Measure 3.a (GPRA Measure 1)**:** During the 2016-2017 school year, approximately 56.5 days of TA were provided to the six participating cohort schools, exceeding the target of 54 days. All TA hours were entered into SERC's online database for tracking consultants' (n=7) support to schools and were then downloaded for analysis and reporting. The goal for Cohort A was to provide 7.5 days of TA to each school, including the annual TFI Administration II. The goal for Cohort B was to provide 10.5 days of TA, including the baseline and annual TFI Administration I (approximately half a day each), the welcoming walkthrough (approximately one day) and the remainder for customized SWPBIS TA. As shown in Table 3.a, the targeted number of days was provided to all but one of the six schools. The asterisk denoted 1.0 day of TA provided to the school by an internal team to complete the Welcoming Walkthrough. This training and technical assistance was provided by a former SERC employee who conducted the Welcoming Walkthroughs for Cohort A and now works for East Hartford Public Schools.

Table 3.a: Technical Assistance Days/Hours Provided to Cohort Schools (GPRA Measure 1)

LEA/School	Cohort	Days	Completed Days Count
Bridgeport Public Schools/ Wilbur L. Cross School	A	7.5	9 days
Middletown Public Schools/ Keigwin Middle School	A	7.5	8 days
Naugatuck Public Schools/ Naugatuck High School	A	7.5	8 days
Ansonia Public Schools/ John C. Mead School	B	10.5	9 days
Danbury Public Schools/ Westside Middle School Academy	B	10.5	12 days
East Hartford Public Schools/ Franklin H. Mayberry School	B	10.5	10.5* days

Performance Measure 3.b (GPRA Measure 2): In late April and early May 2017, the external evaluation team conducted an online survey of SWPBIS leadership team members at each cohort school. The brief survey was designed to gather team members' feedback and suggestions regarding the CT SCTG TA their school received during the 2016-2017 school year. The survey invite was e-mailed to 48 educators across the six schools. Overall, 89.6% (n=43) of educators responded to the survey, with response rates at or above 80.0% in each of the 6 cohort schools. Improvement in knowledge and understanding of the implementation of a MTBF (i.e., GPRA Measure 2) was assessed using a question from the online survey (see Table 3.b below). If at least 80.0% of educators from the school responded "Quite a Bit" or "To a Great Extent," the school was counted as reporting improved knowledge and understanding. The target was to have six of six (100%) schools report improved knowledge and understanding of the implementation of a MTBF. As shown in Table 3.b, this target was not met, with three of six (50.0%) schools meeting the 80% threshold. However, in general, educators from each school were still quite positive about the support they have received thus far from the CT SCTG (see Section C for the CT SCTG School Participant Survey Data Brief).

Table 3.b: Cohort District/School Satisfaction Survey - Question 2.d (GPRA Measure 2)

To what extent have the CT SCTG visits increased your knowledge and understanding of the implementation of a PBIS framework?	Cohort	n	Not at All	Very Little	Somewhat	Quite a Bit	To a Great Extent	Quite a Bit & To a Great Extent
Bridgeport Public Schools: Wilbur L. Cross School	A	5	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	80.0%	80.0%
Middletown Public Schools: Keigwin Middle School	A	7	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	57.2%
Naugatuck Public Schools: Naugatuck High School	A	8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Ansonia Public Schools: John C. Mead School	B	8	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	75.0%
Danbury Public Schools: Westside Middle School Academy	B	7	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	85.7%

East Hartford Public Schools: Franklin H. Mayberry School	B	8	12.5%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	50.0%	62.5%

Performance Measure 3.c (GPRA Measure 3): Implementation of an MTBF is being measured by a Tier I score of 70 percent on the TFI. The target for the 2016-2017 school year was for three of the six schools to meet the minimum score of 70% on the Tier I scale score of the SWPBIS TFI during the annual administration. Given the nature of training and implementation (i.e., planning for Tier I in year one and implementation of Tier I in year two of grant participation), it was expected that those schools would be in Cohort A (currently in year two of participation). All schools (n=3) in Cohort A met the target, as noted in Table 3.c.1; however, the overall goal was exceeded as two schools in Cohort B (n=3) met the minimum score of 70% as well, as noted in Table 3.c.2. These additional schools bring the total number of schools implementing an MTBF to five out of the six schools. John C. Mead School, the only school that did not reach 70% on the Tier I scale, did demonstrate progress toward the goal as evidenced by a 43% increase in the Tier I scale score, increasing from 17% at baseline to 60% at the annual administration, as noted in Table 3.c.2.

Table 3.c.1: Pre- and Post-TFI Data for Cohort A Schools (GPRA Measure 3)

LEA/School	Baseline TFI					Annual TFI Administration I					Annual TFI Administration II				
	Date	Overall	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Date	Overall	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Date	Overall	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III
Bridgeport Public Schools/ Wilbur L. Cross School	12/16/2015	61%	53%	73%	50%	10/18/2016	53%	53%	69%	41%	5/23/2017	82%	77%	88%	82%
Middletown Public Schools/ Keigwin Middle School	9/17/2015	42%	40%	30%	38%	5/4/2016	49%	63%	50%	35%	5/23/17	59%	80%	35%	59%
Naugatuck Public Schools/ Naugatuck High School	9/22/2015	12%	10%	23%	6%	5/24/2016	28%	43%	15%	24%	5/10/2017	52%	77%	35%	44%

Table 3.c.2: Pre- and Post-TFI Data for Cohort B Schools (GPRA Measure 3)

LEA/School	Baseline TFI					Annual TFI Administration I				
	Date	Overall	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Date	Overall	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III
Ansonia Public Schools/ John C. Mead School	9/21/2016	6%	17%	0%	0%	5/30/2017	40%	60%	0%	53%
Danbury Public Schools/ Westside Middle School Academy	9/22/2016	29%	33%	35%	21%	5/17/17	37%	73%	27%	12%
East Hartford Public Schools/ Franklin H. Mayberry School	3/30/2016	91%	93%	92%	88%	5/2/2017	58%	93%	42%	38%

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # (11 characters): <u>S184F140033</u>

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

4. Project Objective   **[ ]** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Project Objective 4: To improve school- and student-level outcomes with respect to school climate and student behavior in the six model/demonstration sites. (Goal 2)

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of schools participating in the school cohort model that meet their school climate targets.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6/6	100%		4/6	66.7%

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of schools participating in the school cohort model that meet their family engagement targets.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			3/3	100%		3/3	100%

4.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of schools participating in the school cohort model that meet their student behavior targets.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6/6	100%		5/6	83.3%

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information):

Project Objective 4 is the second of two objectives that demonstrates that the CT SCTG is making progress toward its longer-term goal of enhancing LEAs' capacity for implementing and sustaining a MTBF (Goal 2). As outlined in Performance Measures 4.a-4.c below, targeted areas for data collection include school climate, family engagement and student behavior. While the information included in this report will focus on the use of data collected for evaluation purposes (i.e., the efficacy of the CT SCTG), it should be noted that school leadership teams (n=6) and their assigned technical assistance providers (TAPs; n=7) are also using these outcomes to drive action planning, for decision-making purposes and ongoing improvement efforts at the school level.

Performance Measure 4.a: During the 2016-2017 school year, schools in Cohort A (year 2 of grant participation; n=3) had different school climate goals than schools in Cohort B (year one of grant participation; n=3). In Cohort A, the goal was for the overall mean score on the Student School Climate Survey to increase from the previous year. In Cohort B, the goal was for each school to collect baseline school climate data from three stakeholder groups: students, families, and school personnel. Across the two cohorts, these school-level goals were met in four of the six schools (66.7%), falling below the grant target of six of six schools (100%). The goals were met in one of three (33.3%) schools in Cohort A and three of three (100%) schools in Cohort B.

<u>Cohort A</u>

The three schools in Cohort A conducted the Georgia Brief Student School Climate Inventory – CT Version at both pre- and post- administrations. (The CT Version refers to six questions that were added from the National School Climate Center Comprehensive School Climate Inventory). The survey includes 15-17 items (depending on

whether the elementary or middle/high school version is administered). All questions are answered on a 4-point scale, where 1=strongly disagree; 2=somewhat disagree; 3=somewhat agree; and 4=strongly agree. Across the three schools, the mean student score was relatively unchanged from pre- to post-administration, ranging from a decline of -0.09 to an increase of +0.07 (see Table 4.a.1).

Table 4.a.1: Change in Overall Mean Score on the Georgia Brief Student School Climate Inventory - Cohort A

LEA: School	Student Pre-Administration			Student Post-Administration			Change in Overall Mean Score
	Date	N	Score	Date	n	Score	
Bridgeport: Wilbur L. Cross School	Sept-Oct 2016	131	2.74	May 2017	168	2.67	-0.07
Middletown: Keigwin Middle School	Nov-Dec 2015	306	3.19	Jan-Feb 2017	278	3.10	-0.09
Naugatuck: Naugatuck High School	Jan-Feb 2016	639	2.72	Feb 2017	471	2.79	+0.07

Cohort B

All three schools conducted baseline school climate data from the required stakeholder groups (see Table 4.a.2). Two schools (John C. Mead School in Ansonia and Westside Middle School Academy in Danbury) used the suite of Georgia School Climate Surveys available on the PBIS Assessment Field Site. This included the Georgia Brief Student School Climate Inventory – CT Version (15-17 items); the Georgia Parent School Climate Survey (21 items); and the Georgia School Personnel Survey – CT Version (29 items). All questions were answered on a 4-point scale, where 1=strongly disagree; 2=somewhat disagree; 3=somewhat agree; and 4=strongly agree. The third school (Franklin H. Mayberry School in East Hartford) used a suite of surveys from Panorama Education that have been conducted district-wide for several years. These surveys are lengthier, covering between 10-15 subscales, and are mostly answered on a 5-point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree). Each subscale is then given a "% favorable rating," which translates to the average percentage of respondents to answer "agree" or "strongly agree" across the items in the subscale. For purposes of the CT SCTG, Mayberry's school climate goal will be based the surveys' Climate Subscale, which consists of 10 survey items for students, seven survey items for families, and eight survey items for staff personnel.

Table 4.a.2: Baseline School Climate Survey Administration - Cohort B

LEA: School	Student Pre-Administration			Parent Pre-Administration			Personnel Pre-Administration		
	Date	n	Score	Date	n	Score	Date	n	Score
Ansonia: John C. Mead School	Nov-Dec 2016	213	3.05	Nov-Dec 2016	25	3.34	Nov-Dec 2016	43	3.02
Danbury: Westside Middle School	Dec 2016	407	3.13	Oct-Nov 2016	200	3.41	Jan-March 2017	46	3.55
East Hartford: Franklin H. Mayberry School	Winter 2017	169	84%	Winter 2017	96	98%	Winter 2017	45	66%

Performance Measure 4.b: For the 2016-17 school year, only Cohort B schools had an end-of-year family engagement goal: to collect baseline family engagement data via the Welcoming Walkthrough. All three schools met this goal, meeting the grant target of three of three schools, or 100%.

Cohort B

The Welcoming Walkthrough, developed by CREC and the CSDE, is a three-hour collaborative data-collection process that is facilitated by an external consultant with participation from school staff, family and the community. On the day of the Walkthrough, participants are divided into four teams, and each team examines one dimension of the school's invitingness: 1) physical environment (24 indicators); 2) schoolwide practices and policies (30 indicators); 3) welcoming school staff (14 indicators); and 4) written materials (15 indicators). The teams rate the indicators according to a 4-point scale (1=no, 2=somewhat true, 3=mostly true, and 4=yes),

discuss areas of strength and concern, and prioritize their recommendations. Walkthrough participation information for each school, as well as aggregate scores for each dimension of the tool, are provided in Table 4.b.1.

Table 4.b.1: Baseline Welcoming Walkthrough – Cohort B

LEA: School	Date	# of Participants		Aggregate Scores by Dimension			
		Staff	Students, Family, Community	Physical Environment	Practices & Policies	Welcoming Staff	Written Materials
Ansonia: John C. Mead School	Jan 1, 2017	2	11	56%	50%	85%	60%
Danbury: Westside Middle School	Nov 29, 2016	4	10	78%	63%	75%	56%
East Hartford: Franklin H. Mayberry School	Oct 31, 2016	4	7	82%	77%	80%	76%

Following the visits, the Welcoming Walkthrough consultant (n=1) developed summary reports. These reports were derived from the summary conversations with the teams assembled for the Walkthroughs and shared with the CT SCTG TAPs (n=5), CT SCTG Project Officer (n=1), and the school teams (n=3). The reports were reviewed by the TAPs with the school teams, including the set of indicators that were identified by the Welcoming Walkthrough participants as the targeted areas of focus for the remainder of the grant period (see Table 4.b.2 below). Scores for these indicators were calculated and post-targets were established, by section and overall (the overall pre-score and overall post-targets are provided in the table). These school-specific targets will be used to assess if the schools meet their family engagement goals at post-administration (i.e., the end of the third year of grant participation). The TAPs periodically checked in on progress toward addressing the indicators noted.

Table 4.b.2: Post-Welcoming Walkthrough Targets -Cohort B

LEA: School	Improvement Indicators by Dimension				Improvement Indicators	
	Physical Environment	Practices & Policies	Welcoming Staff	Written Materials	Overall Pre-Score	Overall Post-Target
Ansonia: John C. Mead School	1, 18, 21, 24	1, 2, 7, 15, 17, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29	2, 4, 9, 14	8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15	51.0%	75.0%
Danbury: Westside Middle School	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18	9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 28	6, 9, 14	3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14	56.0%	75.0%
East Hartford: Franklin H. Mayberry School	1, 5, 10, 22	15, 20, 24, 25, 26	3, 9, 10	11, 13, 14, 15	48.3%	62.5%

<u>Cohort A</u>

Although schools in Cohort A did not have end-of-year family engagement goals, each school team (n=3) was expected to be working on the indicators they identified for improvement during the 2015-2016 administration of the Welcoming Walkthrough. To support the schools in this process, each school was offered an opportunity to send a portion of their team to a one-day symposium on Family Engagement that featured sessions on home visiting and engaging fathers. The TAPs for each school also attended so that resources could be shared with the teams. One school, Naugatuck High School, sent representatives to the symposium.

Performance Measure 4.c: Schools in Cohort A (year 2 of grant participation) had different school behavior goals than schools in Cohort B (year one of grant participation). In Cohort A, each school's goal was to meet at least two of the following indicators: 1) fewer ODRs/100 students/school day than the national median; 2) fewer ISS/100 students that the national mean; 3) fewer OSS/100 students than the national mean; or 4) fewer than 5% of students with 6 or more referrals. In Cohort B, the goal was for each school to be trained in, and using, the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) platform. Across the two cohorts, these school-level goals were met in five of the six schools (83.3%), falling below the grant target of six of six schools (100%). The goals were met in two of three (66.6%) schools in Cohort A and three of three (100%) schools in Cohort B.

Cohort A

SWIS data for each of the indicators mentioned above are included in Table 4.c.1 for each of the Cohort A schools. The SWIS data from each school are for the 2016-2017 school year; however, because national comparison data have not yet been released by Educational and Community Supports (ECS) via the PBISApps platform (anticipated July 2017), the comparison data (i.e., national mean/median) for the first three indicators are from the 2015-2016 school year. The national mean was selected as the benchmark for comparison for the following reasons: 1) the use of data readily available in SWIS supports sustainable use of SWIS in each school for decision making and tracking progress over time; 2) the data are representative of similar schools (i.e., grade composition and size) from across the country using SWIS, and therefore employing the strategies of SWPBIS; and 3) the data is updated very quickly following the closing of school each year (on or just after July 1st annually), therefore readily available for school review, decision-making, and planning. As shown in the table, two of the three schools in Cohort A met the target.

Table 4.c.1: School Behavior Goals by SWIS Indicators - Cohort A

Indicator	Bridgeport: Wilbur L. Cross		Middletown: Keigwin Middle		Naugatuck: Naugatuck High	
	2016-17 Data	Indicator Met	2016-17 Data	Indicator Met	2016-17 Data	Indicator Met
Fewer ODRs/100 students/school day than the national median (0.28, 0.31, 0.33)	Use of SWIS has been sporadic therefore, data is not reliable.*		.497	-	.39	-
Fewer ISS/100 students than the national mean (4.01, 8.42, 7.40)			16.9	-	7.75	-
Fewer OSS/100 students than the national mean (5.16, 6.77, 6.76)			3.73	✓	5.08	✓
Fewer than 5% of students with 6 or more referrals			4%	✓	3%	✓
School Behavior Goal Met (Two or more indicators achieved)	NO		YES		YES	

Note: The 2015-2016 national mean/median data provide in the parentheses are listed in the following order: PK-8, 6-9, and 9-12. These data were used as comparative benchmarks for Cross (K-8), Keigwin (6), and Naugatuck (9-12), respectively.
*Additional training and problem solving with respect to the sustainable use of SWIS is ongoing with Wilbur L. Cross School.

Cohort B

All three Cohort B schools were trained in the SWIS platform during the 2016-2017 school year: Franklin H. Mayberry in East Hartford on September 28, 2016, John C. Mead School in Ansonia on October 3, 2016, and Westside Middle School Academy in Danbury on October 5, 2016. All three schools then used SWIS to track student behavior data for the remainder of the 2016-2017 school year. Baseline data for the SWIS indicators outlined above are provided in Table 4.c.2. Cohort B schools will be assessed against these indicators at the end of their 2nd year of grant participation (i.e., the end of the 2017-2018 school year).

Table 4.c.2: 2016-2017 Baseline Data by SWIS Indicators - Cohort B

Indicator	Ansonia: John C. Mead School	Danbury: Westside Middle School	East Hartford: Franklin H. Mayberry School
ODRs/100 students/school day	.435	.20	.86
ISS/100 students	2.74	12.14	1.65
OSS/100 students	3.95	2.87	.275
% of students with 6 or more referrals	2.9%	1.2%	6.0%

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): <u>S184F140033</u>

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

---

5. Project Objective   **[ ]** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Project Objective 5: To build a system of collaboration across external and internal boundaries to integrate Connecticut initiatives and other policies and grants focused on positive school climate and safety efforts. (Goal 3)

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Interagency partnerships are strengthened and cross-functional expertise is leveraged in order to address, in a more comprehensive manner, statewide concerns around school climate, school safety and students' mental health needs.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

5.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Stakeholder groups are consistently and actively engaged in supporting the grant's programs and services, and in promoting the importance of MTBFs to the state's larger education reform efforts.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information):

Goal 3 of the CT SCTG is to coordinate SEA efforts with appropriate federal, state and local resources in order to align statewide improvement efforts focused on school climate. In order to achieve this goal and ensure that investments are efficiently leveraged, the project is coordinating its activities with other initiatives funded through various resources in the state and is utilizing both interagency partnerships (Performance Measure 5.a) and diverse stakeholder groups (Performance Measure 5.b) to support and promote the grant's work. Members of the CT SCTG Management Team are the critical drivers of this goal, working across their respective organizations and agencies to advance a commitment to Connecticut's SCTG. The core team, including the project director, assistant project director and project officer, includes staff from the CSDE, Bureau of Special Education (n=1) and Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=1), and SERC (n=1).

Performance Measure 5.a: This is a qualitative measure intended to capture the CSDE's progress in utilizing the grant's work to initiate, expand and strengthen interagency partnerships focused on school climate initiatives and policies. Progress under this measure has occurred along two parallel paths: the CT SCTG Alignment Meetings, including representatives from CSDE Bureau of Special Education (n=1), Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=1), Turnaround Office (n=2) and SERC (n=8); as well as the CSDE Annual School Climate Convening, including representatives from CSDE Bureau of Special Education (n=2), the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=4), and the Turnaround Office (n=5).

The CT SCTG Alignment Meetings are focused on aligning the support being provided by the CT SCTG with similar or complementary school climate, social/emotional, and health/mental health initiatives. Two meetings were held during the 2016-2017 school year. The meetings brought together staff from the CSDE and SERC that are working in the three districts represented in the second cohort of CT SCTG schools (i.e., Ansonia, Danbury, and East Hartford). The first took place on November 7, 2016 with attendance from the following Bureaus and agency: CSDE Bureau of Special Education (n=1), Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=1), Turnaround Office (n=2), and SERC (n=6). The second meeting was held on June 12, 2017 with attendance from the following Bureaus and agency: Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=1), Turnaround Office (n=1) and SERC (n=7).

When this approach was designed for use with Cohort A in school year 2015-2016, it represented a much larger group of cross-project alignment. In 2016-2017, the project alignment included only Alliance, meaning that only representatives from the CSDE's Turnaround Office (n=2) in addition to the CSDE representatives of the CT SCTG Management Team (n=2) and the technical assistance providers from SERC (n=6) were invited to participate. Given the smaller group size, the agenda was designed to provide the representatives from the CSDE Turnaround Office a brief overview of the entire grant project, and the more detailed information regarding the initial experiences of the technical assistance providers at each site (all had been in district at least two times prior to attending). Representatives from the CSDE Turnaround Office then shared feedback and potential levers of change that might support greater SWPBIS implementation. The overarching goal of this effort is to promote both short-term (i.e., on meeting days) and long-term (i.e., ongoing dialogue throughout the school year) coordination and collaboration.

With respect to the CSDE Annual School Climate convening, the CT SCTG Management Team decided, based on participant feedback, that in lieu of physically meeting to update the crosswalk, that the task of updating would be coordinated virtually among the staff members from the CSDE's Bureau of Special Education (n=2); Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=4), and the Turnaround Office (n=5). Updates to the document were solicited by the CSDE members of the CT SCTG Management Team from their colleagues and then compiled into the document by the CT SCTG Project Officer. The revised crosswalk document identifies the different supports currently being provided to LEAs across the state in the areas of school climate, social/emotional behavioral supports, MTSS, mental health, chronic disease, trauma-informed practices, and health (see Section C for the crosswalk document).

Performance Measure 5.b: This qualitative measure focuses on existing and emerging state levers of change in the form of two diverse stakeholder groups: the CT PBIS Collaborative and the Scientific Research-Based Intervention (SRBI) Advisory Council.

CT PBIS COLLABORATIVE

The CT PBIS Collaborative is a group of leaders in SWPBIS training and implementation from across Connecticut. Active participants during the 2016-2017 school year included consultants and representatives from the CSDE Bureau of Special Education (n=1), Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=1), SERC (n=4), the RESCs (CREC: n=1; EASTCONN: n=1); a representative from an Alliance District who had previously participated under another role (n=1); and CBER at UConn (n=4).

During the two in-person meetings (February 8, 2017 and May 3, 2017) held during the 2016-2017 school year, the group continued work on a draft of a five-year CT SWPBIS Strategic Plan. Attendance at February 8, 2017 meeting included the CSDE Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=1); SERC (n=3); the RESCs (CREC: n=1; EASTCONN: n=1); and CBER at UConn (n=4). Attendance at the May 3, 2017 meeting included: Bureau of Special Education (n=1); SERC (n=2); the RESCs (CREC: n=1; EASTCONN: n=1); a representative now employed in an Alliance District (n=1); and CBER at UConn (n=4).

A virtual work group meeting held via Web-Ex on June 22, 2017 included Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education (n=1), SERC (n=1); and CBER at UConn (n=2) to draft a statewide approach to school-based SWPBIS evaluation and explicitly linking that to the current recognition system (Model/Banner Sites).

SRBI ADVISORY COUNCIL

Establishing a SRBI Advisory Council (intended to provide oversight and leverage visibility, and support for the underlying principles of SRBI and MTBF related to student achievement) has been re-examined this year and redefined following the State Board of Education Five-Year Comprehensive Plan (see Section C for a copy). The CSDE has engaged cross-departmental teams to align the efforts around school climate, social/emotional behavioral supports, MTSS, mental health, chronic disease, trauma-informed practices, and health supports to the new Comprehensive Plan.