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# Executive Summary

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) Wraparound Zones (WAZ) Initiative is designed to create coordinated district systems that allow schools to proactively and systematically address students’ non-academic needs. The four WAZ priority improvement areas include:

* **Climate and Culture:** Each participating school creates a climate and culture that promotes mental health and positive social, emotional, and intellectual growth for students resulting in a new standard of practice understood and practiced by every member of the school community.
* **Identification of Student Needs and Efforts to Address Them:** Each participating school implements a proactive system of identifying student needs in key academic and non-academic areas leading to both universal supports and targeted interventions.
* **Community Coalitions:** Each participating school integrates a range of resources to tailor the student services from both within the school and the larger community. The range of services includes prevention, enrichment, early intervention, and intensive/crisis response services.
* **District Systems of Support:** Each participating district develops district-level systems to support the communication, collaboration, evaluation, and continuous improvement of the WAZ initiative.

The American Institutes for Research (AIR)[[1]](#footnote-1) is evaluating how well the WAZ initiative achieves these goals. AIR’s research will assess progress on planning, implementation, outcomes, sustainability, and replication related to the initiative’s four priority improvement areas.

This first evaluation report focuses on the six WAZ school districts during the 2011–12 school year: five school districts that received a WAZ implementation grant (Fall River Public Schools, Holyoke Public Schools, Lawrence Public Schools, Springfield Public Schools, and Worcester Public Schools); as well as Lynn Public Schools, which received a 2011–12 planning grant to prepare for WAZ implementation in the 2012–13 school year. Lynn did not have WAZ school coordinators in place, but AIR interviewed school social workers as the closest proxies to school coordinators. In addition, within Holyoke, one school (Morgan Elementary) was in a planning phase during 2011–12 and did not have a school coordinator in place.

**Findings**

The three sets of evaluation findings reflect important contextual and baseline information to synthesize at this early stage of the evaluation and WAZ implementation, including:

* Similarities and differences across the WAZ implementation plans (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester);
* School conditions from the perspective of students, including results of AIR’s Conditions for Learning (CFL) survey from Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, and Lynn, as well as results from a district-administered survey in Springfield; and
* Strengths, challenges, recommendations, and lessons learned from interviews of 6 district coordinators or their proxies (all districts), 20 school wraparound coordinators (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester), and 4 school social workers (Lynn) who were the most similar to coordinators as respondents. In this analysis, the Lynn social workers are included as “coordinators” in the reporting to present a cohesive analysis of the interviews of all of the individuals with similar responsibilities regardless of their titles at the time of data collection.

The data suggest that: (1) districts have developed comprehensive wraparound plans to address the four priority improvement areas of the grant (related to climate and culture, identification of and efforts to address student needs, community coalitions, and district systems of support); (2) across districts and schools, there are strengths, but also needs for improvement, in school climate and culture in particular in the area of safety and respect; and (3) despite being in different stages of implementation there are some strengths, challenges, and experiences that are common across most districts and schools.

1. ***WAZ Implementation Plans***

AIR’s review of each district’s WAZ plan found a number of common components that provide important evidence of WAZ planning. Lynn was excluded here because it received a planning grant for the 2011–12 school year. The most common 2011–12 WAZ plan components included:

(1) Collecting staff/student surveys of school climate (Fall River, Lawrence, Springfield,

Worcester)

(2) Implementing behavior planning or a behavior curriculum (Fall River, Holyoke,

Lawrence, Springfield)

(3) Assessing student needs (Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester)

(4) Instituting standard methods for coordinating services (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence,

Worcester)

(5) Identifying new partners (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Worcester)

(6) Identifying community resources and services (Fall River, Lawrence, Springfield,

Worcester)

(7) Establishing district leadership teams (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield)

(8) Providing professional development (Fall River, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester)

AIR’s review of the implementation plans found that they align with the seven infrastructure elements of the school-based wraparound approach that the WAZ initiative is supporting, Figure 1 displays these seven elements. No linear or circular development of these elements is implied. Rather, successful implementation of the WAZ Initiative will require simultaneous development of each of these elements.

Related literature provides a basis and rationale for these seven elements. To begin with, *shared vision and goals* creates common ground and understanding, and should drive all efforts to implement a school-based wraparound approach (Bazelon, 2006; Goldman & Intriligator, 1990). Effective interventions cannot be achieved in isolation; therefore, *resource mapping* is needed to comprehensively identify and strategically connect with available resources (Woodruff et al., 1999). Third, *data* are needed to help build a successful wraparound approach—data help to understand areas of need and strength, make quality improvements, and assess impact (Bazelon; Skiba, Polsgrove, & Nasstrom, 1996). Furthermore, *committed leadership* as well as formal *structures, policies, and procedures* are needed at all system levels for successful implementation (Bazelon). Sixth, *collaboration with community stakeholders* is also central to successfully implementing a wraparound approach to broaden access to available resources and link with organizations with missions and goals that align with the wraparound approach (Bazelon; Bruner, 1991; Woodruff et al.). Lastly, *technical assistance* facilitates improved implementation of the approach and related services (Bazelon; Magrab, Young, & Waddell, 1985).

**Figure 1: Wraparound Zones Initiative Infrastructure Elements**

The implementation plans, however, were missing clear strategies to market and communicate WAZ to internal and external stakeholders including its vision and goals. Such a communication strategy is important to building momentum and expanding buy-in and understanding of the initiative’s values among stakeholders (e.g., fostering family and community partnerships, addressing issues at all three tiers, clarifying school and staff roles). This strategy could be developed as part of either the climate and culture or the community coalition component—and could be connected with additional components (e.g., aligning WAZ with other district initiatives).

1. ***Student School Climate Surveys***

As part of AIR’s efforts to assess current conditions in the WAZ schools, AIR collected new or available extant school climate data. This included administration of AIR’s Conditions for Learning Survey in those four districts that chose to participate in it: Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, and Lynn. Springfield was already administering the Harris Interactive School Poll and hence those data were used in this analysis. Worcester had administered its own student survey but those data were not available on an individual school or grade-level basis to allow for analysis in this report.

For the four districts with CFL survey results (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lynn), the following are key areas of need for improving the climate and culture of the WAZ schools.

* **In all schools:** Students reported concerns about physical safety and respect from their peers in schools (e.g., bullying, teasing).
* **Grades 2–4:** Students reported concerns about their relationships with adults in their schools (i.e., not feeling listened to, cared about, and treated fairly).
* **Grades 5–12:** Students reported concerns about their peers’ social and problem solving skills.

In Springfield, which used the Harris Interactive School Poll, large majorities of students had concerns about student behavior and gossip in most of the WAZ schools. Student reported that they tended to feel safe at school and while walking to and from school, but that they had some concern about other students being nice to them.

1. ***District and School Coordinator Feedback***

AIR’s analysis of the district and school coordinator interviews focused on themes related to challenges, strengths, lessons learned, and recommendations.

***Challenges***

Key **challenges** were associated primarily with the integration of WAZ into the current school and district systems as well as existing barriers that schools and districts have continued to experience. Challenges included:

* *Challenge 1: Maintaining a focus on the WAZ initiative*. All schools, particularly schools identified by ESE as level 4 (persistently underperforming), have multiple ongoing initiatives, programs, and commitments. Introducing WAZ into these schools and integrating wraparound into existing systems amidst these other competing demands has been challenging.
* *Challenge 2: Clarifying the WAZ coordinator roles*.Most schools have support staff such as guidance counselors and adjustment counselors. With the exception of Springfield, many school coordinators in WAZ districts reported a lack of clarity about exactly how their positions differed from these other positions in the school. Challenges included: occasional tensions between school coordinators and other groups with seemingly similar roles; uncertainty on the part of the school coordinators regarding expectations for their roles, and confusion among school staff about how to best engage WAZ school coordinators.
* *Challenge 3: District-level support***.** Although most school coordinators indicated that there is general buy-in for the WAZ initiative at the district level, other than district wraparound coordinators they reported varying, and in some cases low, levels of involvement, knowledge, and guidance from district administrators and school-level guidance on implementation.
* *Challenge 4: Limited school and district resources*.All WAZ schools serve students with high needs and as a result, the need for student services and supports is also great. Limited resources to address the varying needs of all students were a challenge reported across the WAZ districts. This included: lack of human resources (e.g., not enough Spanish-speaking therapists, long wait lists for services), space (e.g., not enough physical space to hold counseling sessions within the school), funding, and a lack of transportation.
* *Challenge 5: Reaching and engaging parents*. Coordinators reported having difficulty with parental involvement in schools and services. These challenges were reportedly related to a number of issues including: lack of parent trust in the school system, language barriers, lack of parent transportation to/from home and school, and family prioritization of more immediate concerns such as housing and jobs.
* *Challenge 6: Defining and formalizing relationships with community partners*. Most schools had preexisting partnerships with community organizations, but struggled with defining and formalizing these relationships as well as relationships with new community agencies to develop sustainable partnerships. Additional challenges included: finding a balance between strengthening existing partnerships and forming new ones; having enough time to develop partnerships; reaching a common understanding between schools and community agencies about what a partnership means; and expanding school openness to incorporating outside agencies into existing school structures.

***Strengths***

Coordinators also reported a number of **strengths**. Key strengths were associated primarily with leadership support including ESE’s support, which includes technical assistance through the School and Main Institute. In addition, it is important to note that coordinators spoke knowledgably and passionately about the WAZ work, including its goals and prospective impact on students and families. Strengths included:

* *Strength 1: Ongoing support and advocacy of the district coordinators for the school coordinators*. School coordinators often spoke favorably about their district coordinators, reporting that they: (1) provided and supported guidance around WAZ implementation, (2) were responsive to school coordinator questions and needs, (3) provided supervision of school coordinator work, and (4) facilitated districtwide meetings with school coordinators.
* *Strength 2: Ongoing support and buy-in from school leaders*. These reports suggested school leaders were: (1) committed to focusing on the whole child, (2) had a strong vision for their school and the wraparound initiative, and (3) protected school coordinator time to ensure that their work remained focused on WAZ activities.
* *Strength 3: Commitment of community organizations*. Coordinators agreed that establishing sustainable community partnerships was a key part of their role and all are working to strengthen these partnerships. Coordinators reported that most community organizations are committed to the initiative and willing to become actively involved.

In addition to strengths and challenges, district and school coordinators also shared important lessons learned and subsequent recommendations based on their experiences during year 1 of the WAZ initiative. Important lessons learned, which could be helpful for replication of wraparound approaches in the current WAZ districts and other districts as well, included:

* *School and district coordinators need full-time positions.* Given the comprehensive nature of the WAZ initiative and the effort needed to put systems in place that effectively meet the needs of students, being able to devote a full-time position to the WAZ coordinator work was considered important.
* *Building buy-in among school staff is critical*. Coordinators stressed the importance of building the knowledge and buy-in of teachers and support staff (e.g., guidance counselors and adjustment counselors).
* *Implementing wraparound components takes more time (i.e., more months) than expected*. Coordinators acknowledged that the implementation of this initiative is complex and involves ongoing planning and patience. As a result, timelines needed to be adjusted.
* *It would be helpful to include school coordinators in the planning process as early as possible*. Most school coordinators were hired at the beginning of the school year following WAZ grant award and were not involved in the initial planning or writing of their districts’ WAZ grant proposals. They reported, though, that being involved early on would have been beneficial in terms of clarifying their roles and identifying clear goals and objectives for the initiative.

Given their experiences to date, some coordinators made the following recommendations that reflect the aforementioned challenges and lessons learned.

* *Clarify the school coordinator role*. The reported advantages of clarifying the school coordinator role included: being able to accurately describe the role to other school staff so that they utilize the school coordinator appropriately; reducing the likelihood that the school coordinator will be called on to become involved in tasks not related to their WAZ coordinator position; and establishing school coordinators’ own understanding of the work to allow them to better integrate their skills and past experiences into the WAZ coordinator role.
* *District and school coordinators should learn as much as they can, early on, about their schools, students, and community.* School and district coordinators started their positions with varying levels of experience working in schools and in their communities. Some coordinators described how helpful it was to learn as much as they can about the students and families that they serve, including their strengths and the challenges that they face. Coordinators noted that an important part of this process includes learning about available resources and identifying individuals and organizations that can help meet students’ needs. Coordinators recommended that any new school coordinators utilize these strategies to support success in their WAZ work.
* *Provide visible district and school leader support from the beginning of the initiative*. This was considered necessary so that WAZ is not viewed as just another school reform initiative that will leave when ESE funding ends, but rather as a change in practice that districts and schools will sustain.
* *Ensure WAZ goals are clear from the onset of the work*. This includes an understanding that the initiative is focused on systems building and not just delivering direct services to students and families. Clarifying goals may also require a discussion about how the school coordinator role aligns with the goals and objectives of school.
* *Leverage existing resources and strengths*. Although some WAZ initiative components were new to most districts and schools, all schools and districts appeared to have a foundation on which to build this initiative (e.g., human resources, community connections). School coordinators recommended that schools use these resources as a springboard for developing the initiative within schools.
* *Develop a coordinated system to gather and organize data at the onset of the WAZ work*. Some coordinators recommended implementing data collection systems early on, to organize the large amounts of data that will be gathered as part of the WAZ initiative. These systems should be coordinated with other district data collection efforts. Some coordinators suggested that districts utilize the expertise of the district data team/specialists to develop a WAZ data collection system and ensure the system provides easy access to school-level data.
* *Develop and implement consistent wraparound procedures across schools*. Although each school is unique in terms of its strengths, needs, and challenges, some coordinators recommended consistent (districtwide) expectations and procedures for certain activities (in particular, documentation of WAZ activities, including information that districts can use for measuring WAZ success, and data collection protocols). This would include consistent forms and processes for documenting WAZ activities.

**AIR Recommendations**

Based on these findings, AIR identified 12 recommendations to inform WAZ planning and implementation in current districts, **as well as other districts/schools looking to implement a WAZ approach**. The following recommendations reflect the four WAZ priority improvement areas: (1) school climate and culture, (2) identification of and efforts to address student needs, (3) community coalitions, and (4) district systems of support. The recommendations are also organized by the seven elements of the WAZ initiative previously discussed in Figure 1: (1) vision and goals, (2) resource mapping, (3) data, (4) leadership, (5) practices and protocols, (6) community stakeholders, and (7) technical assistance. In addition, where appropriate, anticipated ESE WAZ-related technical assistance planned for the 2012–13 school year is highlighted if it pertains to a recommendation.

**These recommendations were shared with ESE during the summer of 2012 to inform its efforts for the current school year. Hence, some of these recommendations have already been addressed (e.g., through ESE technical assistance) and efforts to attend to the recommendations are ongoing.**

Creating sustainable district services and systems of support is instrumental to the WAZ initiative. Regardless of the stage of WAZ implementation, districts should consider the following recommendations to sustain services and systems. These recommendations are intended for both currently funded districts, as well as new districts/schools that are part of the 2012–13 WAZ cohort. Table 1 lists each of the recommendations, with checkmarks indicating which priority improvement area(s) they address.

As ESE and districts continue to assess their progress across these elements and the overall WAZ initiative, it is important to consider the rate of progress within the context of systems change. **Evidence-based programs related to social and emotional supports usually need 12 to 18 months of implementation before systems see measureable progress with individual students or classroom environments. District-wide initiatives that involve broader systemic changes usually need between three and five years of implementation to realize their anticipated goals.**

**Table 1: AIR Recommendation, by WAZ Priority Improvement Area**

| **Recommendation** | **Climate and Culture** | **Identification of and Efforts to Address Student Needs** | **Community Coalitions** | **District Systems of Support** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Vision, Goals, Roles | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 2: School-Driven Resource Mapping |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 3: School Climate Data | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 4: Planning for Changes in Programs or Strategies |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 5: District Guidance and Leadership |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 6: Stakeholder Knowledge and Buy-In |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 7: School-Based Teams |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 8: Standard Protocols and Timely Data Collection |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 9: Early Involvement of Community Agencies |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 10: Community Partner, Communication, and Coalition Roles |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 11: Family Engagement | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 12: Technical Assistance to Districts and Schools | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

#### Vision and Goals

**Recommendation 1: Clarity of Wraparound Vision, Goals, and Roles**

**Districts should develop and maintain a WAZ visionand integrate this into existing systems. Wraparound goals should be made clear early in the planning process, prior to implementation. School coordinator roles should be clearly defined and communicated, with school leadership consistently knowledgeable of these roles.**

To provide clarity for school coordinators and the other staff in each school, as well as develop WAZ infrastructure AIR recommends the following specific activities:

* Districts should develop written position descriptions for school coordinators that describe the role and responsibilities of these positions.
* ESE should consider providing districts with proposed activities for the full-time school and district coordinator positions as well as help districts clarify roles as needed. In addition, district administrators should provide principals with guidance on how the position can and cannot be modified to fit the needs of each school.
* Principals should share position descriptions or communicate the role and responsibilities of the school coordinators to all staff in their schools. Most schools have counselors, social workers, or other staff positions that might already be helping to address students’ non-academic needs.
* Districts should facilitate conversations between staff in existing school positions and new WAZ coordinator positions to clarify each person’s role on the team and discuss how all will collaborate. School coordinator roles in similar initiatives usually focus on building capacity of school staff; developing data systems; and implementing processes and protocols and systems necessary to support the goals of the initiative. The role typically does not include direct service to students. Districts will need to support principals in establishing and communicating the roles and responsibilities of the WAZ coordinators versus, for example, that of an adjustment counselor.

**Sample School Staff/Community Activity:**

* The principal or their designee should gather a group of school staff that can contribute to defining and differentiating the role of the school wraparound coordinator from other staff who also help to address students’ non-academic needs. For example, counselors, social workers, school psychologists, as well as school leadership including the principal, should attend this meeting. Typically, a school administrator facilititates this activity.
* Distribute a draft job description of a wraparound coordinator’s role to each participant and provide instructions to annotate the description with examples of the types of activities this position would entail.
* Once each participant has completed annotating one copy of the job description, ask them to lay their copies face down on the table, mix the copies up and circulate them around the room. Ask each person to take a new, now annotated copy of the job description (not their own) to review and to revise from their own perspective.
* Once participants have completed their second round of annotations, open the floor to discussion and facilitate concensus on an interim draft.
* At a later date after the position description is finalized and shared with school staff, select three or four school staff to review the description and ask “Who in the school is responsible for these activities?” This will assist in understanding where there may be potential confusion and how the role description may need to be clarified with school staff.
* Based on this feedback, the principal or their designee should revise the description as needed and then share and discuss the revised position description with school staff.

|  |
| --- |
| **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**: Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

#### Resource Mapping

**Recommendation 2: School-Driven Resource Mapping**

**As a school-driven process, resource mapping should occur at three levels: (1) within schools, (2) between schools and partner organizations, and (3) between schools and other organizations within the broader community (e.g., Boys or Girls Club, family support organizations).** It is helpful to first develop an inventory of existing programs and resources, compile existing information on the evidence of program effectiveness, identify gaps or duplication in programs, review school survey data (see Recommendation 5) and incident data, and then identify areas that need to be addressed and that could use resources more efficiently. Where a similar process has already been done in schools, AIR recommends they use an organizing approach to this resource mapping process which uses the three-tiered intervention framework. Teams consider what they have in place at the universal level (for all students); what they have in place at the targeted level (for some students); and then at the intensive level (for a few students). An important aspect of this process is identifying what data are being collected, how it is being collected, and how teams or individuals are using that data. This will lead to more efficient use of time and the streamline the data collection process.

AIR suggests an enhanced resource mapping process in current and future WAZ schools that examines available services not only in schools, but those provided by partner organizations. This can reveal untapped resources or potential new partners. It will be essential to include key system partners and agency representatives in this process. This process can begin more broadly, focusing on the larger community, the district or can begin at the school level. AIR recommends the latter since three of the four WAZ priority improvement areas address the school level.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resource:** AIR recommends the following Safe Schools Healthy Students resource mapping tool. <http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/project-directors/tools/resource-mapping-tool>  **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session:** Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

#### Data

**Recommendation 3: Analysis of School Climate Data**

**Districts and schools should review data on school climate provided by students, school staff, and parents and integrate their input into the resource mapping process (see Recommendation 4).** School climate survey results, for example, provide a range of valuable information on student perceptions of their schools. As already begun at the peer learning exchange on April 12, 2012, AIR recommends that districts and schools continue to review their CFL student survey data (and other available school climate data), analyzing not only by school and by grade-level but also by student subgroups (e.g., English Language Learner status) where available. It is important to embed input on school climate in the resource mapping process. By matching needs to existing resources, school based teams can identify gaps in the system or infrastructure.

Despite being in different stages of WAZ implementation there are some strengths, challenges, and experiences that are common across most districts and schools. For the four districts with conditions for learning survey results (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lynn), the following are key recommendations for improving the climate and culture of WAZ schools. The districts should integrate specific efforts to address these conditions into their WAZ plans and implementation efforts.

* **In all schools:** Enhance student experiences of physical safety and respect from their peers in schools (e.g., reduce bullying, teasing)
* **Grades 2–4**: Enhance adult-student relationships so that students feel more listened to, cared about, and treated fairly by the adults in their schools
* **Grades 5–12**: Enhance students’ social and problem solving skills

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources**: AIR recommends several resources for school climate survey data analysis that school personnel overseeing survey administration and data teams could use to identify programmatic interventions based on best practices. For example, teams could use student survey data to understand how students feel emotionally or physically safe as well as staff survey data to understand staff perceptions of school climate. The team can then take the data to the appropriate school staff to develop a plan and actions to respond and address areas of need.  Bullying Prevention   * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, School Climate Webinar Series on Bullying Prevention (this includes many citations for resources): <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=16>   Enhancing Relationships   * Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) *Safe and Sound: An Educational Leader’s Guide to Evidence-Based Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Programs*: <http://casel.org/publications/safe-and-sound-an-educational-leaders-guide-to-evidence-based-sel-programs/> * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, School Climate Webinar Series on Enhancing Peer-to-Peer Relationships to Strengthen School Climate: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=1538> * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, School Climate Webinar Series on Establishing Supportive Relationships between Teachers, Staff, Students, and Families: http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=12   School Climate Survey Data Analysis and Identifying Interventions   * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, Survey Webinar Series on Analysis of Survey Data: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=17> * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, Implementation Webinar Series on Using Data to Identify Programmatic Interventions: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=1502>   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session:** Behavior Management and Student Engagement |

**Recommendation 4: Planning for Changes in Programs or Strategies Based on Data**

Using resource mapping and school climate results, districts and schools need to plan for changes in programs or strategies that will improve outcomes for students. **Districts and schools should review their current WAZ plans, within the context of a “school climate framework” and in relation to their data and revise plans so they address identified areas of need and build on strengths.** Districts may need to add and implement new evidence-based programs, strategies or approaches to the WAZ plans.

There are various models that frame positive school climate and culture, but the most recent work from the U.S. Department of Education approaches school climate from three major areas that are directly relevant to the WAZ priority areas related to culture and climate:

* **Engagement**: This is all about relationships, adult to adult, adult to student, and student to student.
* **Safety**: This includes both emotional and physical safety.
* **Environment**: This includes physical, academic and disciplinary environment, and overall wellness.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources:** There are many effective programs that address these three areas. AIR recommends the following resources for a listing of programs to consider:   * [Child Trends Life Course Interventions to Nurture Kids Successfully (LINKS)](http://www.childtrends.org/links/) provides updated trend data with the latest national estimates for all child-related indicators, as well as a searchable database of evidence-based programs. Users can search by indicators (e.g., health and safety, child care and education, behaviors) and subcategories within those interest areas (e.g., bullying) or by criteria (e.g., population, program characteristics, outcomes). When searching for indicators, users can find background information; trend data; state, local, and international estimates of child related indicators; and related evidence-based programs (<http://www.childtrends.org/links/>). * [Promote Prevent](http://www.promoteprevent.org/), the website of the National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention is another resource for states, districts, and schools interested in researching and implementing evidence-based programs. The National Center offers an array of products and services that enable schools and communities to plan, implement, evaluate, and sustain activities that foster resilience, promote mental health, and prevent youth violence and mental and behavioral disorders (http://www.promoteprevent.org/). * [SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP)](http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/) is a searchable online registry of more than 175 interventions that support mental health promotion, substance abuse prevention, and mental health and substance abuse treatment. Although it is not an exhaustive list of interventions, it is a valuable resource for the field of prevention. It has specific information on programs related to school climate, safety and improving the school environment (http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/).   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session:** Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Plans and Follow-up |

#### Leadership

**Recommendation 5: District Guidance and Leadership**

**District leaders should provide direct guidance and explicit support for the initiative’s planning and implementation, once vision and goals are established.**

**Planning:** District WAZ coordinators should support principals in shaping wraparound to meet the specific needs of their schools. This needs to be intentional from the beginning of the initiative by providing opportunities to discuss WAZ in district-wide open meetings or forums for all stakeholders. Initial meetings would provide an overview of the WAZ initiative, anticipated outcomes, and what it means specifically for each school. Representative stakeholders would have an opportunity to assess “whats in this for us (me)”; ask questions, identify barriers, and begin to envision the potential impact for them; and assist principals and wraparound coordinators in anticipating areas that will need to be addressed and included in the routine communications with stakeholders.

**Implementation:** The focus of district leadership should shift during implementation and should include routine communication with all stakeholders, for example, by providing updates on progress in WAZ schools using a bi-monthly or quarterly email; supporting a district-level “learning community” for WAZ staff and support personnel to meet in person and focus on strategies to address gaps and barriers; and ensuring opportunities for school staff to review and discuss their data with key decision makers for the community.

In addition, there should be a process that holds school leadership accountable to the superintendent’s office for implementing WAZ strategies, including a routine report on priorities and progress in schools. The superintendent, in turn, should update the district’s school board using this progress report.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resource:**   * *Leading and Communicating: A Guide for Watershed Partnerships* http://www.ctic.purdue.edu/media/files/Leading%20and%20Communicating.pdf   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**:Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

**Recommendation 6: Enhanced Stakeholder Knowledge and Buy-In**

**Districts should ensure that all district/school staff are knowledgeable of all aspects of their district’s WAZ plan, which may require professional development or staff meeting time. In addition, districts should communicate a clear vision, goals, and progress to facilitate stakeholder (teachers, support staff, principals, parents, community agencies and providers) buy-in for the initiative’s direction and its theory of action.** Different stakeholders need to know how this relates to their work and improves outcomes for students and schools. This can be as simple as including the vision or goals as a “footer banner” on district/school websites or in district/school newsletters; on a banner posted at school entrances; or as part of discussions at staff meetings. For example, buy-in can be facilitated by gathering information about how the initiative is impacting stakeholders’ goals, whether these relate to academic achievement or family stability, and communicating this information to stakeholders. It is important to keep all stakeholders, including community partner organizations, informed and connected on an ongoing basis by communicating about initiative-related successes/progress and evidence of improved outcomes for students and schools. In addition, as part of community groups or coalitions, partner representatives could share with school staff examples of the initiative’s benefits and describe how the WAZ strategies integrate with and further their organizational goals. This can further build knowledge, buy-in, and collaboration and lead to a common understanding of the district vision. This can also help community partners as well as district/school staff see “what’s in it for them.”

|  |
| --- |
| **Resource:**   * The White House Council for Community Solutions *Community Collaboratives Toolbox* ([http://www.serve.gov/new-images/council/pdf/CommunityCollaborativeToolkit\_all %20\_materials.pdf](http://www.serve.gov/new-images/council/pdf/CommunityCollaborativeToolkit_all%20%20_materials.pdf)) is a guide to collaborative “life stages” that can assist community collaborative in succeeding across their life cycle–from planning and development, through roll-out and course-correcting, and on to deciding its next steps.   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**:Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

**Recommendation 7: School-Based Teams/Workgroups**

**Districts should support a team or workgroup—many times composed of existing school climate teams, positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) teams, or multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) teams—within each school with clear responsibilities to meet their school-wide goals related to developing a proactive system of identifying needs and providing supports.** There are two functions that are needed here: one addresses school-wide supports and the other addresses individual supports. Both are necessary. If the process and structure is developed to address the individual needs of students within a wraparound planning context without being embedded in a broader system of supports, it is less likely to be sustained over time.

**School-wide Teams:** This team (or teams) should initially focus on developing a continuum of services (what’s missing, based on their resource mapping process) and gradually shifting their focus to continuous quality improvement (CQI) over time. This CQI role should include reviewing school-wide data and group student data (i.e., race/ethnicity, grade level, and English language learners), making recommendations to address need areas, enhancing outcomes, and reviewing impacts of recommendations on services. These teams should routinely meet one to two times monthly.

The goal here is to build capacity of a school-based team to routinely review their school data and make recommendations to school leadership who follow through with implementation, for “course” corrections throughout the school year. This supports the “school-wide” climate and culture. As schools develop more service options, “less restrictive” program options (those that require less time out of the classroom or general education placement) will be more likely to address students’ needs, therefore maximizing instructional time. This is exactly the overall goal of the WAZ initiataive.

**Individual Teams:** Most schools already have groups of staff who meet on a regular basis (weekly or bi-weekly) to review the needs of individual students and make recommendations for actions to take to address those needs. For enhanced development of teams that review individual data, it is also essential that districts and schools provide ongoing support and development for these teams to increase their ability to review behavioral and academic data, make recommendations for interventions, monitor intervention implementation, and then modify services/approaches as needed.

One example of an effective support model is to include a clinician from a community-based organization as a member of the student intervention team. For example, this clinician might  participate on the team reviews for approximately one hour (per week, bi-weekly or monthly depending on resources available for support), during which time the team reviews information on students who are experiencing social, emotional or behavioral issues. The clinician’s participation also supports ongoing capacity-building of school team members. In addition school psychologists and other school-based clinicians who regularly participate in these teams also may play key roles in supporting the team’s development based on their individual expertise and depending on their availability to do so.

If a school does not have an existing relationship with a community-based clinician or agency, those relationships can be developed, and many times with little or no additional costs to the school or district. As part of the overall partnership and collaboration resource mapping, usually community-based clinicians are identified as resources within those partner organizations. A school team member is designated as a lead to contact the partner agency, and discuss the potential role for a clinician. Discussion includes:

* **Who**—Clinicians with experience working with schools and with children and youth within the targeted age-range.
* **What**—Clinicians serve in a consultant capacity as part of school-based teams on a routine basis to provide guidance, suggest possible strategies or programs, suggest additional resources available outside of the school’s role, and make linkages back to the partner agency regarding the types of needs that are being seen in the community. Many times clinicians also serve a valuable support role by providing helpful strategies and information directly to teachers, staff, and families during individual student meetings.
* **Where**—Meetings held at community school(s).
* **When**—Weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly meetings, as well as brief follow-up discussions among members of the school-based teams after these meetings.
* **How**—Clinicians are employees of a community-based agency; their time is either covered by the agency, by a negotiated fee structure between the school district and the agency, or through Medicaid dollars (in some states). Districts and agencies usually develop a memorandum of agreement/understanding (MOA/MOU) addressing the role of clinicians, as well as the legal issues involved in sharing student information.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources:** The following two Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center webinars provide best practice for school climate teams.   * School Climate Teams I: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=24> * School Climate Teams II: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=89>   In addition, the National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention provides tools to facilitate information sharing.   * Memorandums of Understanding and Sharing Information: <http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/nis/implementing-information-sharing-policies-and-protocols>   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance sessions**: (1) Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up and (2) Family Engagement Strategies |

#### Practices and Protocols

**Recommendation 8: Standard Protocols and Timely Data Collection and Review**

**Districts should develop consistent wraparound procedures to apply to schools (e.g., referral processes, forms) and should develop data systems to organize data as early as possible in the implementation of the WAZ initiative. District and school WAZ coordinators are integral to this effort.** Ideally data systems should be put in place in the first six months to maximize the availability of data to inform CQI efforts. Wherever possible, districts should try to avoid duplication of data collection and entry to maximize efficiency of school staff time. Data is one of the categories that should be addressed as part of the resource mapping.

It will be important to include someone who understands district management information systems (MIS), as well as the capacity or limitations of those systems. Many districts have invested in an MIS that can provide access to more timely data collections and summaries for review. AIR has seen districts use structured work sessions involving the service providers, district and school leadership, and information technology support personnel. The goals of these sessions include problem solving, brainstorming possible solutions, and establishing a plan for refining the MIS. These districts have used existing systems, such as PBIS data collection systems, for this purpose. In addition, districts have used facilitated sessions with that same group to focus on what data needs to be collected, how it will be collected, who will collect (record) it, when it will be collected, and who will review and analyze it. This leads to established protocols and training that can be consistent across schools within the district. These data and analyses are then shared with stakeholders to review, assess, and inform future practice.

#### Community Stakeholders

**Recommendation 9: Early Involvement of Community Agencies**

When schools are establishing a system of identifying student needs, they have to simultaneously develop strategies and select interventions that respond to identified student needs. There are two levels of strategies and interventions: school-wide and individual. Schools alone cannot address all these needs. As schools build supports and interventions, they will need community partners.

Establishing community partnerships is a key aspect of the WAZ initiative, as connections to external agencies can increase school capacity to meet the non-academic needs of students and their families. WAZ schools have already established informal relationships with various community agencies. Coordinators also noted that many of these agencies are interested in becoming (or are already) involved in the WAZ initiative, which is a valuable asset to leverage. However, formalizing and managing these relationships has been challenging.

**AIR recommends that districts include potential key community partners from the earliest stages of the initiative’s planning and implementation.** This can promote buy-in among community agencies and allow agencies to participate in a dialogue to determine how they can best streamline services to effectively meet students’ needs. This opportunity may also allow stakeholders (districts, schools, agencies) to begin thinking about potential barriers to reaching students (such as confidentiality, transportation, eligibility requirements, waiting lists, funding, and coordination) and identifying ways to address these barriers. These discussions should include conversations about what a “partnership” is and how the collaboration would be beneficial for all involved.

There are examples of national initiatives that have focused on partnerships among schools, mental health, and other social service agencies and community providers, such as Safe Schools Healthy Students, systems of care, and school-based behavioral health models. They apply proven, successful strategies to develop those partnerships and increase capacity and resources available in schools for students with social, emotional, and behavioral needs. The school and community coaliton can address issues related to waitlists for services and expand capacity to meet student needs.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources:**   * Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, *The Role of Education in a System of Care: Effectively Serving Children with Emotional or Behavioral Disorders*: <http://cecp.air.org/promisingpractices/1998monographs/vol3.pdf>. * Center for School Mental Health and OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports, *Development of an Interconnected Systems Framework for School Mental Health*: [http://csmh.umaryland.edu/Resources/OtherResources/ SMHPBISFramework.pdf](http://csmh.umaryland.edu/Resources/OtherResources/%20SMHPBISFramework.pdf). * Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiative: <http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/project-resource-guide/section-1-introduction-sshs-vision>. |

**Recommendation 10: Community Partner, Communication, and Coalition Roles**

Community coalitions can play an important role in identifying gaps within or across different community agency partners. When community coalitions are functioning well, they can take the resource review (resource mapping activity, Recommendation #2, to another level by assessing each agency’s strengths and needs on a 365 day/24/7 basis. This process assists in identifying options and resources available in the community after school, during evenings, and in the summer. This process also identifies supports that may be available for families or primary care providers. **AIR recommends that districts in partnership with other agencies (partners) develop routine protocols and structures for reviewing the service continuum in their community; reviewing data from multiple child- and youth-serving systems (such as child welfare, juvenile justice); and assessing, on a routine basis, student/family outcomes and needs as they emerge.**

Available community agencies and resources vary across districts. Districts may be challenged by where to start and who the primary partner agencies should be. We suggest districts begin with those partner agencies that are the most likely to provide resources and services that address the gaps identified in the resource mapping. These may include a community mental health center, an independent clinical provider, local pediatricians, or afterschool program providers, such as the YMCA or Boys Club. These identified agency partners should be invited to participate in the community coalition and the broader resource mapping process.

Collaboration can benefit a greater number of students through the more comprehensive “map” of the community’s needs (see Recommendation 2). After creating a common vision (for a broader community group), districts and community coalitions should facilitate the development of a common language that defines outcomes, specific to the districts and the agencies as it relates to *this* initiative.

Community coalitions also play an important role in building infrastructure and support that will sustain successful initiatives. Many coalitions have seen the benefit of forming sub-committees or workgroups to specifically address different tasks such as evaluation, communications and marketing and sustainability. **AIR recommends that the coalitions examine the role they have in leading sustainability planning and building support early in the initiative. It will be helpful for community coalitions to build capacity for marketing their successful outcomes from the initiative.** There is a synergy that builds when these community teams have access to data, learn what is working and not working, and find an effective way to market that message to the broader community.

A summary of the various roles AIR has identified for coalitions includes: creating a community-wide vision and common language, developing a plan for addressing the community gaps/needs identified in the broader resource mapping process, infrastructure (integrating key aspects of the initiative into policies, protocols, forms, and data collection systems for all partner agencies), being knowledgeable about the data and outcomes, and marketing successful outcomes. These can contribute to sustainability. The responsibility for the ongoing coordination of the coalition activities has been successfully shared by a variety of district staff and community agency representatives in similar initiatives. One example of this consists of co-facilitators, one district and one agency representative, who rotate the responsibilities across years.

In addition, it is important that districts and schools not only develop formal coalitions, but also **maintain open communication with community partners and other organizations (that do not serve on the coalition) that can help those districts and schools meet the service needs of the student population**. This includes afterschool programs, day care settings, sports or recreation programs, child welfare, and law enforcement. Routine communications and sharing of school data is an important function within these partnerships. More professional development for school and district coordinators as well as school support staff on fostering and formalizing partnerships might also help to address the challenge of providing more interventions and services within the school and community environment.

**AIR recommends that schools consider a more formal mechanism for including these community partners in the overall resource mapping process, such as partner updates via emails, or newsletters; monthly meetings of coalition members and agency personnel to review progress or periodic retreats for review and planning.** More formal agreements can be established through memoranda of agreement or understanding (MOA/ MOU) that establish these roles and working relationships. In AIR’s experience, many districts have also been successful in forming a universal MOA/MOU between all child- and youth-serving systems (e.g., child welfare, juvenile justice) to inhibit information sharing barriers.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resource:**   * *3 Bold Steps for School Community Change: A Toolkit for Community Leaders* is based on lessons learned from the Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiative and examines how partnerships can work effectively together to create safe and healthy communities (<http://toolkit.promoteprevent.org>).   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**: Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

**Recommendation 11: Family Engagement**

Districts identified family engagement as an area of focus from the beginning of the WAZ initiative. **They are strongly encouraged to continue to focus on parent/family engagement and identify areas where they can enhance opportunities for parents and families to partner with schools.** Districts could have a parent representative as a partner on the community coalition to share a family perspective. There are many excellent resources that focus on family engagement and partnerships. Related resources include the following.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources:**   * Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, *Learning from Families: Identifying Service Strategies for Success*: <http://cecp.air.org/Florida_Monograph.pdf> * National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education: <http://www.ncpie.org> * U.S. Department of Education, *Engaging Parents in Education: Lessons from Five Parental Information and Resource Centers*: <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/comm/parents/parentinvolve/engagingparents.pdf>   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**: Family Engagement Strategies |

#### Technical Assistance and Training

**Recommendation 12: Technical Assistance to Districts and Schools**

**ESE should focus technical assistance peer learning exchanges on issues that are of value to all districts attending these sessions**. If the content of a peer learning exchange is relevant to only a few districts, only those districts should be required to attend. Surveys of technical assistance session participants could be used to identify their priority interests or phase of implementation. The WAZ technical assistance provider should continue to use collected feedback from participants and consult with ESE to inform future technical assistance supports and continue to individualize technical assistance to meet district- specific needs at the local level.

In addition, **ESE should balance the need for technical assistance with the need for coordinators to be in their schools to carry out their WAZ work**. ESE might want to consider holding whole-group technical assistance sessions less frequently, and instead offer districts more one-on-one support on an as-needed basis. Online learning communities, or web-based events, could also help minimize time away from schools. This could provide a “connection” for school staff between in-person meetings, and enhance the utility of face-to-face time when it happens. Furthermore, web-based events could expand the reach of content and the number of school participants, especially if archived and available “on-demand.”

ESE should also provide practical, more hands-on training about developing sustainable partnerships. ESE could provide examples of effective partnerships as case studies for coordinators who could discuss the strengths each partner brought to the collaboration; describe their roles, intended outcomes and actual outcomes of the partnerships. Coordinators could then learn from these examples and apply these lessons to their own schools and districts. In addition, ESE should help districts define the term “partnership” so that coordinators understand how there is a difference between a working relationship with an organization that provides services and a formal partnership. ESE should also provide assistance to coordinators on methods/tools for formalizing partnerships (e.g., memoranda of agreement).

**Next Steps**

The report’s findings can help ESE, school districts, schools, and other stakeholders understand current progress and conditions that may influence WAZ planning and implementation. The current report is the first in a series of reports designed to provide evaluation findings and recommendations that can inform WAZ planning and implementation in a formative manner. The analyses in this report focus on a subset of the data to provide contextual and baseline information, which will be a foundation for subsequent analysis and findings.

# I. Intoduction

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) Wraparound Zones (WAZ) Initiative is designed to create coordinated district systems that allow schools to proactively and systematically address students’ non-academic needs. The four WAZ priority improvement areas include:

* **Climate and Culture:** Each participating school creates a climate and culture that promotes mental health and positive social, emotional, and intellectual growth for students resulting in a new standard of practice understood and practiced by every member of the school community.
* **Identification of Student Needs and Efforts to Address Them:** Each participating school implements a proactive system of identifying student needs in key academic and non-academic areas leading to both universal supports and targeted interventions.
* **Community Coalitions:** Each participating school integrates a range of resources to tailor the student services from both within the school and the larger community. The range of services includes prevention, enrichment, early intervention, and intensive/crisis response services.
* **District Systems of Support:** Each participating district develops district-level systems to support the communication, collaboration, evaluation, and continuous improvement of the WAZ initiative.

The American Institutes for Research (AIR)[[2]](#footnote-2) is evaluating how well the WAZ initiative achieves these goals. AIR’s research will assess progress on planning, implementation, outcomes, sustainability, and replication related to the initiative’s four priority improvement areas.

This first evaluation report focuses on the six WAZ school districts during the 2011–12 school year: five school districts that received a WAZ implementation grant (Fall River Public Schools, Holyoke Public Schools, Lawrence Public Schools, Springfield Public Schools, and Worcester Public Schools); as well as Lynn Public Schools, which received a 2011–12 planning grant to prepare for WAZ implementation in the 2012–13 school year. Lynn did not have WAZ school coordinators in place, but AIR interviewed school social workers as the closest proxies to school coordinators. In addition, within Holyoke, one school (Morgan Elementary) was in a planning phase during 2011–12 and did not have a school coordinator in place.

AIR’s survey and interview data collection was concentrated in February to April 2012. This report includes three sets of evaluation findings that reflect important contextual and baseline information to synthesize at this early stage of the evaluation and WAZ implementation, including:

* Similarities and differences across the WAZ implementation plans (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester);
* School conditions from the perspective of students, including results of AIR’s Conditions for Learning (CFL) survey from Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, and Lynn, as well as results from a district-administered survey in Springfield; and
* Strengths, challenges, recommendations, and lessons learned from interviews of 6 district coordinators or their proxies (all districts), 20 school wraparound coordinators (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester)[[3]](#footnote-3), and 4 school social workers (Lynn) who were the most similar to coordinators as respondents. In this analysis, the Lynn social workers are included as “coordinators” in the reporting to present a cohesive analysis of the interviews of all of the individuals with similar responsibilities regardless of their titles at the time of data collection.

Over AIR’s three-year evaluation, periodic reports will assess different aspects of WAZ planning, implementation, outcomes, sustainability, and replication. The reports will build on each other, using previously reported findings to contextualize and support future findings and recommendations. Evaluation reports and other formative feedback will provide an opportunity for ESE, districts, schools, and other WAZ stakeholders to make changes and improvements over the course of the grant period. The final report will provide ESE an opportunity to reflect on the initiative; its long-term implementation; and the changes in school, district, and community practice as a result of the WAZ funding.

This report focuses on the student survey and coordinator interview data. The first section of this report describes the methods and data used to develop findings, which are organized by the four sets of research questions guiding the evaluation: *conditions and support; evidence of wraparound planning and implementation, outcomes, sustainability, and replication*.The second section addresses key findings obtained from the three data sources (WAZ plans, student school climate surveys, district, and school coordinator interviews). This report focuses on current conditions and supports, but includes some findings related to sustainability. Next, 12 AIR recommendations are presented, including suggested resources. The report concludes with a short summary followed by nine appendices:

(A) A crosswalk of research questions by data source;

(B) A list of current WAZ planning and implementation districts and schools;

(C) A sample interview protocol;

(D) A review of implementation plans;

(E, F, G, H) CFL survey results for Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, and Lynn; and

(I) Harris Interactive School Poll results for Springfield.

# II. Methods

To answer the evaluation questions (included in Appendix A), AIR is applying a mixed-methods research approach that incorporates both qualitative andquantitative methods. The qualitative methods include thematic analysis of document review, interview, focus group, and technical assistance observation data. These qualitative methods will help to answer important descriptive questions of *how* and *why*, as well as to understand the current context and conditions of districts and schools. The quantitative methods include the quasi-experimental analysis of extant data, as well as descriptive analysis of student and staff survey data.

This first report includes findings from three data sources: (1) review of WAZ plans, (2) interviews of district and school coordinators, and (3) student climate surveys. The WAZ school districts include five (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield, and Worcester) that received ESE funding to implement WAZ during the 2011–12 school year, as well as one school district (Lynn) that received ESE funding to plan for WAZ implementation in the 2012–13 school year. Appendix B lists the 21 implementation and 5 planning schools across these districts from which AIR gathered data. The following table shows the number of schools in each of these districts, by implementation and planning status.

# Table 1: Districts and Schools, by WAZ Implementation and Planning Status

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School District** | **Number of Schools Implementing WAZ in 2011–12** | **Number of Schools Planning for WAZ Implementation in 2012–13** |
| Fall River | 3 | - |
| Holyoke | 2 | 1 |
| Lawrence | 3 | - |
| Lynn | - | 4 |
| Springfield | 6 | - |
| Worcester | 7 | - |
| **Total** | **21** | **5** |

Note: The number of schools planning for WAZ implementation includes only those that received ESE funding to carry out WAZ planning during the 2011–12 school year.

## *Review of WAZ Plans*

AIR reviewed the district WAZ implementation plans to identify similarities and differences. The WAZ plans provide evidence of intended strategies and practices for WAZ implementation. The WAZ plans include descriptions of strategies for each of the aforementioned priority improvement areas. The plans provide important baseline information on WAZ initiatives, but not all wraparound-related activities are listed in the WAZ plans. Some wraparound activities were already underway in districts and schools at the start of the WAZ initiative and districts and schools did not use WAZ resources to fund these activities.

## *District and School Coordinator Interview Data*

AIR conducted interviews with WAZ district and school coordinators, key district administrators, principals in non-level 4 schools,[[4]](#footnote-4) and key community partners in five of the six school districts. AIR used semi-structured interview protocols, designed to last approximately 45 minutes. Appendix C includes a sample protocol, used for the school coordinator interviews. The protocols were guided by the research questions and helped obtain key information, such as district and school conditions (e.g., capacity-related needs and assets). The protocols also included common questions across all participants to facilitate a systematic analysis of this information.

This report presents findings from the coordinator interviews,[[5]](#footnote-5) and because districts each have a small number of coordinators, to protect confidentiality of evaluation participants AIR is not including any district-specific interview findings**.** AIR used NVIVO qualitative analysis software to code the interviews. As agreed upon with ESE, this report focuses on specific constructs from the coordinator interviews: challenges and concerns, strengths (e.g., supportive conditions), recommendations, and lessons learned. AIR will include additional findings in the next evaluation report.

## *Student Survey Data*

AIR also compiled and analyzed data from student school climate surveys. These data included existing student surveys conducted by Springfield (Harris Interactive School Poll) during the 2010–11 school year, as well as AIR’s CFL survey administered in the remaining four WAZ school districts (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lynn) in February 2012. The CFL survey is designed to help districts and schools monitor students’ opinions about their schools, including their schools’ climate, perceived levels of student support, levels of challenge, and perceptions about students’ social and emotional learning skills. Results are shown as the percentage of students whose responses fall into the excellent, adequate, and needs improvement categories. Results are also shown for subgroups of students (grade level, gender, race/ethnicity, English Language Learner and disability status). Results are not reported for subgroups that have fewer than 10 students.

**Comparative statements in the report can be generalized only to the population of students who completed the survey and should not be used to make inferences about the full population of students at the schools in cases where response rates are not near 100%.**

### Conditions for Learning Survey Scales

The following information provides a description of each of the four survey scales as well as a description of each of the “needs improvement,” “adequate,” and “excellent” categories within these scales. Optimal conditions are present for students who rate their schools “excellent.” The “needs improvement” and “adequate” categories indicate a need for improved conditions, substantially for the former category.

* The **Challenge scale** measures how much students report that teachers and other adults in their school encourage them to think, work hard, do their best, and connect what they are learning in school to life outside of it. A challenging curriculum, presented in a way that is relevant to students, will promote student achievement.
  + **Needs Improvement:** Students indicate that their teachers and other adults in their school expect few students to perform at a high level. Students rate their classes as often boring and disconnected from their lives outside the classroom. Students indicate that teachers do not expect them to work hard or attend every class.
  + **Adequate:** Students indicate that their teachers and other adults in their school expect most students to put in a high level of effort and be engaged in their course work. They rate some classes as interesting, challenging, and relevant, but other classes as routine and boring.
  + **Excellent:** Students indicate that their teachers and other adults in their school expect all students to invest a high level of effort and be engaged in their course work. Students rate most classes as interesting, challenging, and relevant.
* The **Peer** **Social Emotional Climate scale** measures students’ perception of their peers’ social and problem-solving skills. Developing students’ social and emotional skills improves their grades, attendance, behavior, and attitudes toward school. Students with good social and emotional skills are less likely to drop out of school.
  + **Needs Improvement:** Students do not rate their peers as socially skilled. They report that other students do not care about doing well in school. Students have trouble resolving conflicts and solving problems. They think it is OK to cheat. They often give up when their school work is difficult.
  + **Adequate:** Students indicate that some students in the school have good social skills, want to do well in school, and work well in teams. These students sometimes resolve conflicts peacefully and solve problems creatively. They may give up when their school work is difficult.
  + **Excellent:** Students indicate that most students in the school have good social skills, want to do well in school, and work well in teams. These students resolve conflicts peacefully, solve problems creatively, and think cheating is wrong. They do their best, even when their school work is difficult.
* The **Safe and Respectful Climate scale** measures how students assess the physical and emotional safety of their schools. Students who attend safe schools are more likely to be academically engaged and are less likely to exhibit problem behaviors such as drug use or violence. Students are less likely to drop out of safe schools.
  + **Needs Improvement:** Students rate their schools as physically unsafe because there are regular problems with fights, thefts, or vandalism. Students report their schools are emotionally unsafe because they are often teased, picked on, or bullied. They may stay at home because they do not feel safe at school.
  + **Adequate:** Students indicate they are physically safe most of the time, but there may be occasional fights, thefts, or vandalism. Students report they are emotionally safe most of the time, but may occasionally experience bullying or harassment by other students.
  + **Excellent:** Students indicate they are physically safe in their school’s classrooms, hallways, and bathrooms, and outside around their school. Students report they are emotionally safe because students treat each other with respect, get along well together, and look out for each other.
* The **Student Support scale** measures how much students report they are listened to, cared about, and helped by teachers and other adults in the school. Strong relationships between teachers and students lead to higher academic achievement, even for students who have previously done poorly in school or come from disadvantaged backgrounds.
  + **Needs Improvement:** Students report that most teachers and other adults in the school do not listen to them, care about them, or treat them fairly. Students indicate that it is hard to get extra help when needed.
  + **Adequate:** Students report that their teachers and other adults in the school sometimes listen to them, care about them, and treat them fairly. Students indicate that teachers sometimes provide extra help when it is needed.
  + **Excellent:** Students report that most of their teachers and other adults in the school listen to them, care about them, and treat them fairly. Students indicate that teachers notice when they are having trouble and readily provide extra help when it is needed.

Although reviewing item-level results may be helpful to illustrate survey findings, the CFL survey data should be analyzed only at the scale level (not at the item level). The survey scales reliably measure challenge, peer social and problem-solving skills, safety and respect, and student support. Individual survey items, however, contain relatively more measurement error and so do not measure these conditions as reliably.[[6]](#footnote-6) In addition, when measuring any attribute, the indicators should reflect a representative sample of behaviors from the domain. For example, the CFL Safe and Respectful Climate scale includes questions about whether students are bullied, are teased or picked on, feel safe outside around their school, and whether most students treat each other with respect. If schools and teachers focus change on behaviors defined by specific items, they risk a form of unintentional “teaching to the test.” This would allow schools to show growth with respect to the scale even though the underlying attribute may not have changed. With these important considerations in mind, this report presents key survey findings at the scale level.

### Conditions for Learning Survey Self-Regulation Items[[7]](#footnote-7)

Studies of childhood temperament consistently identify three major dimensions of personality including effortful control (also called self-regulation), which is characterized by the ability to self-regulate behavior, emotions, and attention. Self-regulation appears to be developmentally related to two adult dimensions of personality, agreeableness and conscientiousness, and research examining the relationship between childhood self-regulation and the development of social behavior patterns and academic achievement appear to support this. AIR has developed survey items aspects of self-regulation (e.g., conscientiousness, control of one’s attention) that contribute to both academic achievement and pro-social behavior. School districts participating in the CFL survey were given an option to include the self-regulation items as part of the survey. Three of the districts—Fall River, Holyoke, Lynn—opted to include the self-regulation items as part of the survey. These results are included in the CFL appendices for each of these districts. The next section presents findings, beginning with conditions and supports.

# III. Findings

This section is organized around two sets of research questions: (1) conditions and supports and (2) sustainability/replication. Findings related to each of these sets of research questions are described, drawing upon the aforementioned data sources (wraparound plans, CFL and other district student survey data, and district and school coordinator interviews).

## *Conditions and Supports*

The first set of research questions focuses on the conditions and supports available to districts and schools that are planning for and implementing WAZ. Specifically, the overarching research question is:

*What are the district, school, and other* ***conditions (e.g., school climate and culture) and supports*** *that**are in place at the beginning of the WAZ grants, and how are they* ***facilitating or impeding planning and implementation****?*

This report integrates information on conditions and supports from three data sources: WAZ plans, student climate surveys, and interviews of district and school wraparound coordinators.

### A1. District Wraparound Plans

AIR’s review of each district’s WAZ plan found a number of common components that provide important evidence of WAZ planning. These data address the first evaluation question (A1): “What practices do the WAZ plans include?” This section reports on the commonalities of the implementation plans. It is intended to provide an overview of key plan components, which could be helpful to Lynn and any future districts that engage in a planning year for WAZ implementation. Furthermore, a basic starting place for an evaluation includes defining what will be evaluated. It is important to also note that although the plans provide important baseline information on WAZ initiatives, not all WAZ strategies are listed in the WAZ plans because some strategies were already underway in districts and schools at the start of the initiative. Table 2 summarizes the plan components. Appendix C also includes more detail on plan components for each district, including unique components. Lynn was excluded here because it received a planning grant for the 2011–12 school year.

The most common 2011–12 WAZ plan components included:

**(1) Collecting staff/student surveys of school climate** (Fall River, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester),

**(2) Implementing behavior planning or a behavior curriculum** (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield),

**(3) Assessing student needs** (Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester),

**(4) Instituting standard methods for coordinating services** (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Worcester),

**(5) Identifying new partners** (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Worcester),

**(6) Identifying community resources and services** (Fall River, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester),

**(7) Establishing district leadership teams** (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield), and

**(8) Providing professional development** (Fall River, Lawrence, Springfield, Worcester).

Other commonalities include the following.

* Three components related to **identifying and addressing student needs**:
  + Instituting referral mechanisms (Fall River, Lawrence, Springfield)
  + Implementing case management systems (Fall River, Lawrence, Worcester)
  + Assessing resources or service providers available to address student needs (Fall River, Lawrence, Worcester)
* Two components related to **community coalitions**:
  + Formalizing partnerships (Holyoke, Lawrence, Worcester)
  + Creating or expanding the responsibilities of an advisory board (Fall River, Springfield)
* Three components related to developing **district systems of support**:
  + Collecting and analyzing data on who is served and how (Fall River, Worcester)
  + Monitoring the initiative (Lawrence, Worcester)
  + Aligning WAZ with other district initiatives (Holyoke, Lawrence)

AIR’s review of the implementation plans found that they align with the seven infrastructure elements of the school-based wraparound approach that the WAZ initiative is supporting, Figure 1 displays these seven elements. No linear or circular development of these elements is implied. Rather, successful implementation of the WAZ Initiatve will require simultaneous development of each of these elements.

Related literature provides a basis and rationale for these seven elements. To begin with, *shared vision and goals* creates common ground and understanding, and should drive all efforts to implement a school-based wraparound approach (Bazelon, 2006; Goldman & Intriligator, 1990). Effective interventions cannot be achieved in isolation; therefore, *resource mapping* is needed to comprehensively identify and strategically connect with available resources (Woodruff et al., 1999). Third, *data* are needed to help build a successful wraparound approach—data help to understand areas of need and strength, make quality improvements, and assess impact (Bazelon; Skiba, Polsgrove, & Nasstrom, 1996). Furthermore, *committed leadership* as well as formal *structures, policies, and procedures* are needed at all system levels for successful implementation (Bazelon). Sixth, *collaboration with community stakeholders* is also central to successfully implementing a wraparound approach to broaden access to available resources and link with organizations with missions and goals that align with the wraparound approach (Bazelon; Bruner, 1991; Woodruff et al.). Lastly, *technical assistance* facilitates improved implementation of the approach and related services (Bazelon; Magrab, Young, & Waddell, 1985).

# Figure 1: Wraparound Zones Initiative Infrastructure Elements

The implementation plans, however, were missing clear strategies to market and communicate WAZ to internal and external stakeholders including its vision and goals. Such a communication strategy is important to building momentum and expanding buy-in and understanding of the initiative’s values among stakeholders (e.g., fostering family and community partnerships, addressing issues at all three tiers, clarifying school and staff roles). This strategy could be developed as part of either the climate and culture or the community coalition component—and could be connected with additional components (e.g., aligning WAZ with other district initiatives).

# Table 2: Common 2011–12 Wraparound Implementation Strategies, by Wraparound Zones Initiative Priority Improvement Area and School District

|  | Fall River | Holyoke | Lawrence | Springfield | Worcester |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Climate and Culture | | | | | |
| Survey of school climate | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Behavior planning or curriculum | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |
| Identify and Address Student Needs | | | | | |
| Assess student needs |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Establish referral mechanism | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |
| Implement case management system | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| Assess resources or service providers to meet student support needs | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| Community Coalitions | | | | | |
| Identify community resources and services | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Establish standard methods for coordinating services | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| Identify new partners | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| Formalize partnerships |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| Create or expand the responsibilities of an advisory board | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  |
| District Systems of Support | | | | | |
| Establish WAZ district leadership team | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |
| Provide professional development for coordinators or other school personnel to implement wraparound | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Collect and analyze data on who is served and how | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| Monitor initiative |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| Align WAZ with other district initiatives |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |

### A2. Student Perspectives on School Climate

Four school districts—Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, and Lynn—administered AIR’s student CFL survey to more than 5,000 students, including versions in English and Spanish. In addition, Springfield administered a different student survey to collect similar data on student perceptions of school climate. This section begins with the AIR survey results and then summarizes findings from AIR’s review of the Springfield a survey results.[[8]](#footnote-8) These data provide important information on the current school climate in the WAZ schools. School climate may influence WAZ planning and implementation at the school level (research question A13), outcomes related to improved school climate (research questions C10 and C12), and relationships between early evidence of change and improved school climate (research question C14).

Table 3 displays the response rate, by grade level, school district, and school. The response rate is calculated by comparing the number of used surveys to the number of surveys initially assigned to students at each school. Each teacher received additional survey instruments not assigned to specific students so that students not listed in the rosters AIR received ahead of survey administration could complete the survey. If teachers used any of these unassigned surveys during the administration (i.e., for new students), and all or most students in the pre-identification file completed the survey as well, response rates could exceed 100%.

Overall, CFL survey response rates were high (see Table 3). Response rates were over 70% in all schools and 91% or greater in all but four schools. This strong response rate in most schools increases the representativeness of the findings and the likelihood that responses reflect perceptions and experiences of the full student population in each school.

# Table 3: Conditions for Learning Survey School Response Rates

| **District** | **School Name** | **Response Rate** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fall River | Carlton M. Viveiros Elementary School | 91% |
| John J. Doran Elementary School | 91% |
| Matthew J. Kuss Middle School | 92% |
| Holyoke | Kelly Elementary School | 85% |
| Morgan Elementary School | 94% |
| William R. Peck Full Service Community School | 84% |
| Lawrence | Arlington Elementary School | 94% |
| Arlington Middle School | 92% |
| Humanities & Leadership Development High School | 71% |
| Lynn | Cobbet Elementary School | 102% |
| Connery Elementary School | 95% |
| E.J. Harrington School | 101% |
| Thurgood Marshall Middle School | 74% |

#### District Key Findings

This section presents key findings from the the four districts participating in the CFL survey. Following this are district-level findings, including results from the Springfield school climate survey. Detailed survey results for all districts are presented in Appendices E–I. These results include data by subgroup. For the four districts with CFL survey results (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lynn), the following are key areas of need for improving the climate and culture of the WAZ schools.

* **In all schools:** Students reported concerns about physical safety and respect from their peers in schools (e.g., bullying, teasing).
* **Grades 2–4**: Students reported concerns about their relationships with adults in their schools (i.e., not feeling listened to, cared about, and treated fairly).
* **Grades 5–12**: Students reported concerns about their peers’ social and problem solving skills.

The district-specific results that follow break out the CFL findings by school for each district that administered the CFL. In each section, potential strengths—the scale(s) with the largest percentage of students reporting their school was “excellent”—are first highlighted. Then, conditions needing improvement are identified, focusing on the scale with the highest percentage of students indicating each school “needs improvement.” This can help prioritize WAZ efforts by focusing on areas with the greatest concern. Additional needs are included if at least 20% of students reported that their school “needs improvement” on another scale(s). **Given this reporting approach, it is possible for a CFL scale to be reported as both a strength and as a need.** While this may seem counterintuitive, different groups of students may experience school conditions in different ways and some may, for example, report that a school is safe whereas others indicate they do not feel safe at all. It is important to build on strengths while also addressing these areas of need so that all students experience “excellent” learning conditions.

As a reminder, “excellent” student ratings are intended to reflect optimal learning conditions. “Adequate” ratings indicate instances when students report concerns in their schools some of the time. The appendices at the end of the report provide tables with detailed CFL data, including data by student subgroup (e.g., grade, race/ethnicity) and self-regulation item results.

##### **Fall River Conditions for Learning Survey Results**

The following are key findings from the Fall River CFL survey administration in the three schools implementing WAZ during the 2011–12 school year (see also Figures 2–5 and Appendix E, which includes item-level self-regulation results). The findings show that improving emotional and physical safety should be a priority in these schools. In addition, for grade 5 at Doran Elementary and Viveiros Elementary as well as for all grades at Kuss Middle, WAZ efforts should address improving students’ social and problem-solving skills.

Doran Elementary, Grades 2–5

***Strengths***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** Almost half (45%) of students in grades 2–4 rated emotional and physical safety “excellent,” suggesting they feel emotionally and physically safe.
* **Challenge.** Students across grade levels–44% in grades 2–4 and 40% in grade 5– indicated that Challenge is “excellent” at Doran Elementary, suggesting that these students consider *most classes* interesting and relevant and think their teachers and other adults in the school *expect all students* to put in a high level of effort, for example.
* **Student Support.** In addition, two fifths (40%) of students in grades 2–4 indicated that the support they receive from teachers and other adults in the school is also “excellent.”

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** Almost one quarter of students (24%) in grades 2–4 and one quarter (25%) in grade 5 reported that they *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* in the school. In addition, almost one third of students (31%) in grades 2–4 and more than half of students in grade 5 (58%) indicated that safety and respect is “adequate,” suggesting that these students feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.
* **Student Support.** In addition, 23% of students in grades 2–4 reported that *most teachers and other adults* in Doran Elementary do not listen to them, care about them, or treat them fairly. More than another third of students (37%) in these grades indicated that this support is “adequate,” suggesting that these students feel unsupported *sometimes*.
* **Peer Social Emotional Climate.** In grade 5, 21% of students at Doran Elementary reported that *their peers lack social and problem-solving skills* and another 54% of students indicated that *some* *students* need to improve these skills because, for example, their peers do not want to do well in school, do not work well in teams, or have trouble resolving conflicts.

Viveiros Elementary, Grades 2–5

***Strengths***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** In grades 2–4, 40% of students rated emotional and physical safety “excellent” at Viveiros Elementary.

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** Almost one third of students (30%) in grades 2–4 and more than one third (38%) in grade 5 reported that they *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* in the school (i.e., that the school “needs improvement”). In addition, almost another third of students (30%) in grades 2–4 and more than half of students in grade 5 (53%) indicated that safety and respect is “adequate,” which suggests that these students feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.
* **Challenge.** In addition, 29% of students in grades 2–4 reported that Viveiros Elementary “needs improvement” because, for example, classes are *often* boring and teachers do no expect them to work hard. More than another third (39%) of students in these grades indicated that challenge is “adequate,” which suggests that these students think *some classes* are routine and boring, for example.
* **Peer Social Emotional Climate.** In grade 5, 28% of students reported that *their peers lack social and problem-solving skills* at Viveiros Elementary and another 55% of students in grade 5 indicated that *some students* need to improve these skills because, for example, their peers do not want to do well in school, do not work well in teams, or have trouble resolving conflicts.

Kuss Middle, Grades 6–8

***Strengths***

* Challenge had the highest percentage (18%) of students indicating the school was “excellent.”

***Needs***

* **Peer Social Emotional Climate.** More than one in three students (38%) reported that *their peers lack social and problem-solving skills* at Kuss Middle (i.e., that Peer Social Emotional Climate “needs improvement”). Almost another half of students (49%) indicated that *some* *students* need to improve these skills because, for example, their peers do not want to do well in school, do not work well in teams, or have trouble resolving conflicts.
* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** In addition, one third of students (33%) reported that Kuss Middle “needs improvement” in safety and respect, which suggests that these students feel *emotionally/physically unsafe* because of regular problems with fights or bullying, for example. More than half of students (51%) rated this aspect of the school’s climate as “adequate,” suggesting that they feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes*.

# Figure 2: Fall River Challenge Results, by School[[9]](#footnote-9)

# Figure 3: Fall River Peer Social Emotional Climate Results, by School

# Figure 4: Fall River Safe and Respectful Climate Results, by School

# Figure 5: Fall River Student Support Results, by School

#### Holyoke Conditions for Learning Survey Results

The following are key findings from the Holyoke CFL survey administration in the three schools implementing WAZ (or planning for future implementation) during the 2011–12 school year (see also Figures 6–9 and Appendix F, which includes item-level self-regulation results). The findings show that improving emotional and physical safety should be a key priority in these schools across all grades.

Kelly Elementary, Grades 2–8

***Strengths***

* **Challenge.** In grades 2–4, 40% of students rated the school “excellent” in Challenge, which suggests that these students consider *most classes* interesting and relevant and think their teachers and other adults in the school expect *all students* to put in a high level of effort, for example.

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** Almost one third (29%) of students in grades 2–4 and 32% of students in grades 5–8 at Kelly Elementary reported that they *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* in the school. In addition, more than one third of students (36%) in grades 2–4 and half (50%) of students in grades 5–8 indicated that safety and respect is “adequate,” suggesting that these students feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.
* **Peer Social Emotional Climate.** At least one in four students in grades 5–8 at Kelly Elementary (26%) indicated their school also “needs improvement” because *their peers lack social and problem-solving skills* (e.g., because they cannot resolve conflicts and solve problems easily).

Morgan Elementary, Grades 2–8

***Strengths***

* Across the scales, Safe and Respectful Climate had the highest percentage (38%) of students indicating the school was “excellent” in grades 2–4 and Peer Social Emotional Climate had the highest percentage (26%) of students reporting the school was “excellent” in grades 5–8.

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** More than one third (37%) of students in grades 2–4 and 26% of students in grades 5–8 at Morgan Elementary reported that they *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* in the school. In addition, 25% of students in grades 2–4 and 59% in grades 5–8 indicated that safety and respect is “adequate,” suggesting that these students feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.
* **Student Support.** One quarter (25%) of students in grades 2–4 reported that *most* *teachers* do not listen to them, care about them, or treat them fairly and it is hard to get help when needed. Almost half (48%) of students indicated that this support is “adequate,” suggesting that these students *sometimes do not feel supported*.

Peck Full Service Community, Grades 2–8

***Strengths***

* Challenge had the highest percentage (35%) of students indicating the school was “excellent” in grades 2–4.

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** Almost one half (48%) of students in grades 2–4 and 38% in grades 5–8 at Peck Full Service Community indicated that they *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* in the school. In addition, almost one third (32%) of students in grades 2–4 and 48% in grades 5–8 reported that safety and respect is “adequate,” suggesting that these students feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.
* **Challenge.** At least one in four students in grades 2–4 at Peck Full Service Community (28%) indicated their school “needs improvement” because they consider *most classes* boring and disconnected to their lives outside of the classroom and think their teachers and other adults in the school *expect few students* to perform at a high level, for example.
* **Student Support.** In grades 2–4, 31% of students reported that Student Support “needs improvement” because *most* *teachers* do not listen to them, care about them, or treat them fairly and it is hard to get help when needed. Another 44% indicated that this support is “adequate.”

# Figure 6: Holyoke Challenge Results, by School

# Figure 7: Holyoke, Peer Social Emotional Climate Results, by School

# Figure 8: Holyoke Safe and Respectful Climate Results, by School

# Figure 9: Holyoke Student Support Results, by School

#### Lawrence Conditions for Learning Survey Results

The following are key findings from the Lawrence CFL survey administration for the three schools implementing WAZ during the 2011–12 school year (see also Figures 10–13 and Appendix G, which includes item-level self-regulation results). In all three schools, students tended to have favorable ratings of how teachers and other adults in their school encourage them to work hard and do their best. These findings also suggest that at the elementary and middle school levels, emotional and physical safety needs the most improvement. In addition, in the high school, most students do not rate their peers as socially skilled and this concern is far greater than issues related to the other CFL scales.

Arlington Elementary, Grades 2–4

***Strengths***

* Challenge had the highest percentage (36%) of students indicating the school was “excellent” at Arlington Elementary.

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** This CFL scale showed the greatest need for improvement at Arlington Elementary because nearly half of students (46%) reported they *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* and almost another third (32%) indicated that they feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.

Arlington Middle, Grades 5 –8

***Strengths***

* Challenge had the highest percentage (23%) of students indicating the school was “excellent” at Arlington Middle.

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** Like Arlington Elementary,safety and respect was the greatest area of need across the four scales, with 33% of students reporting the school “needs improvement” in this area. More than half (52%) of students indicated that physical and emotional safety was “adequate” because they *sometimes* feel unsafe and disrespected.

Humanities and Leadership Development (HLD) High School, Grades 9–12

***Strengths***

* **Challenge.** Almost half of students (45%) rated the HLD High School “excellent” on this scale. This suggests that these students consider *most classes* interesting and relevant and think their teachers and other adults in the school expect all students to put in a high level of effort, for example.

***Needs***

* **Peer Social Emotional Climate.** Almost two thirds (64%) of students reported that *their peers lack social and problem-solving skills* at HLD High School because, for example, their peers have trouble resolving conflicts and solving problems. Another 16% of students in this school indicated that *some students* lack good social skills. In contrast, on the other CFL scales (Challenge, Safe and Respectful Climate Student Support), only 5% or 6% of students rated HLD High School “needs improvement.”

# Figure 10: Lawrence Challenge Results, by School

# Figure 11: Lawrence Peer Social Emotional Climate Results, by School

# Figure 12: Lawrence Safe and Respectful Climate Results, by School

# Figure 13: Lawrence Student Support Results, by School

#### Lynn Conditions for Learning Survey Results

The following are key findings from the Lynn CFL survey administration in the four schools participating in WAZ planning only during the 2011–12 school year (see also Figures 14–17 and Appendix H, which includes item-level self-regulation results). The findings suggest that improving emotional and physical safety should be a priority in these schools, but Harrington Elementary (grades 2–5) and Connery Elementary (grades 2–4) have especially positive conditions. These schools can further expand their areas of strength through their WAZ strategies. This could potentially inform climate-related strategies in other WAZ schools as well (in particular those in Lynn).

Cobbett Elementary, Grades 2–5

***Strengths***

* Across the scales, Safe and Respectful Climate had the highest percentage (29%) of students indicating the school was “excellent” in grades 2–4 and Peer Social Emotional Climate had the highest percentage (24%) of students indicating the school was “excellent” in grade 5 at Cobbett Elementary.

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** In grades 2–5 at Cobbett Elementary, safety and respect was the greatest concern. The percentage of students reporting the school “needs improvement” on this scale was 38% in grades 2–4 and 37% in grade 5, suggesting these students *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* in the school. In addition, almost one third of students (32%) in grades 2–4 and more than half of students in grade 5 (52%) indicated that safety and respect is “adequate,” which suggests that these students feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* at Cobbet Elementary because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.
* **Challenge, Student Support:** At least one in four students indicated that Cobbett Elementary also “needs improvement” in two additional areas for grades 2–4: Challenge (31%) and Student Support (27%).

Connery Elementary, Grades 2–5

***Strengths***

* A number of strengths were evident, with at least 40% of students rating Connery Elementary “excellent” on all four CFL scales for grades 2–4:
  + **Safe and Respectful Climate** (47%),
  + **Student Support** (45%),
  + **Challenge** (43%), and
  + **Peer Social Emotional Climate**(40%).

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** In grades 2–5 at Connery Elementary, emotional and physical safety was the greatest concern. The percentage of students reporting the school “needs improvement” on this scale was 24% in grades 2–4 and 17% in grade 5, suggesting these students *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* in the school. In addition, 29% of students in grades 2–4 and more than half (59%) of students in grade 5 indicated that safety and respect is “adequate,” suggesting that these students feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* at Connery Elementary because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.

Harrington Elementary, Grades 2–5

***Strengths***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** Half of students (50%) in grades 2–4 and 44% in grade 5 at Harrington Elementary indicated the school is “excellent” in emotional and physical safety.
* **Peer Social Emotional Climate.** In addition, 45% of students rated their peers’ social and problem-solving skills “excellent.”

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** In grades 2–5 at Harrington Elementary, emotional and physical safety was the greatest concern. The percentage of students reporting the school “needs improvement” on this scale was 22% in grades 2–4 and 13% in grade 5, suggesting these students *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* in the school. In addition, 28% of students in grades 2–4 and 44% of students in grade 5 indicated that safety and respect is “adequate,” suggesting that these students feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* at Harrington Elementary because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.

Marshall Middle, Grades 6–8

***Strengths***

* Across the scales, Safe and Respectful Climate had the highest percentage (29%) of students indicating Marshall Middle was “excellent.”

***Needs***

* **Safe and Respectful Climate.** Like the elementary schools, emotional/physical safety was the greatest area of need across the four scales, with 22% of students reporting the school “needs improvement” because they *feel emotionally/physically unsafe* at Marshall Middle. Amother half of students indicated they feel unsafe and disrespected *sometimes* because ofoccasional problems with bullying, fights, or vandalism, for example.
* **Peer Social Emotional Climate.** In addition, more than 1 in 5 students (21%) reported that the school “needs improvement” because *most* of their peers lack social and problem-solving skills (e.g., because they cannot resolve conflicts and solve problems easily). Another 3 in 5 students (59%) rated their peers’ social and problem-solving skills as “adequate” because *some students* do not resolve conflicts peacefully and *some* students do not work well in teams and have good social skills.

# Figure 14: Lynn Challenge Results, by School

# Figure 15: Lynn Peer Social Emotional Climate Results, by School

# Figure 16: Lynn Safe and Respectful Climate Results, by School

# Figure 17: Lynn Student Support Results, by School

#### Springfield Harris Interactive School Poll Results

Appendix I includes item-level results from the Harris Interactive School Poll that Springfield conducted during the 2010–11 school year. The results show a number of strengths, including students feeling challenged, safe, and supported. In addition, more than 80% of students rated their principal “excellent” in three schools and their school counselor “excellent” in six schools. The following related findings are organized by CFL survey scale (challenge, peer social emotional climate, safe and respectful climate, student support).

* **Challenge**. Students in some schools were concerned about whether homework was interesting, but students in the schools tended to feel that their main teacher wanted them to learn. Examples of findings include:

***Strength***

* + *Does your main teacher help you want to learn?* Across the WAZ schools, on average 7% of students (the same as the district average) were concerned about teachers helping them want to learn. The percentage of students reporting this problem ranged from a low of 2% (Brightwood) to 13% (Elias Brookings) across the WAZ schools

***Need***

* + *Does your main teacher give interesting homework?* Across the WAZ schools, on average 35% of students (the district average was 37%) were concerned about their homework being interesting. The percentage of students reporting this problem was greatest at White Street (43%) and Elias Brookings (42%) across the WAZ schools.
* **Peer Social Emotional Climate**. Large majorities of students had concerns about student behavior and gossip in most of the WAZ schools

***Needs***

* + *Are students well-behaved in school?* Across the WAZ schools, on average 56% of students (the district average was 47%) were concerned about student behavior. The percentage of students reporting this problem was greatest at Brightwood (77%). German Gerena, Homer Street, and White Street had from 59% to 62% of students reporting this as a problem.
  + *Is gossip a serious problem at school?* Across the WAZ schools, on average69% of students (the district average was 62%) were concerned about gossip. The percentage of students reporting this problem was greatest at Brightwood (79%). Elias Brookings, German Gerena, Homer Street, and White Street had from 68% to 74% of students reporting this as a problem.
* **Safe and Respectful Climate**. Student responses to three questions that address this topic suggest that they tended to feel safe at school and while walking to and from school, but that they had some concern about other students being nice to them

***Strengths***

* + *Do you feel safe while in school?* Across the WAZ schools, on average 13% of students (same as the district average) were concerned about safety while in school. The percentage of students reporting this problem ranged from a low of 7% (Zanetti) to a high of 18% (Brightwood, White Street) across the WAZ schools
  + *Do you feel safe while walking to and from school?* Across the WAZ schools, on average 18% of students (same as the district average) were concerned about safety while walking to and from school. The percentage of students reporting this problem ranged from a low of 13% (Zanetti) to a high of 21% (Brightwood, Homer Street) across the WAZ schools.

***Need***

* + *Are most other students nice to you?* Across the WAZ schools, on average 31% of students (the district average was 25%) were concerned about other students being nice to them. The percentage of students reporting this problem was greatest at German Gerena (35%), White Street (35%), and Elias Brookings (33%) across the WAZ schools.
* **Student Support**. Student responses to two questions suggest that students feel liked by their teachers, but there is some concern about the fairness of school rules in a few schools.

***Strength***

* + *My main teacher likes me.* Across the WAZ schools, on average 8% of students (the district average was 9%) were concerned about their main teacher liking them. The percentage of students reporting this problem ranged from a low of 1% (Montessori) to a high of 15% (Elias Brookings) across the WAZ schools.

***Need***

* + *Are the rules at your school fair?* Across the WAZ schools, on average 23% of students (the district average was 24%) were concerned about school rules being fair. The percentage of students reporting this problem was greatest at German Gerena (33%) and Elias Brookings (29%) across the WAZ schools.

### A3. District and School Coordinator Perspectives and Experiences

This section summarizes key findings from interviews with school and district coordinators in Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Springfield, and Worcester. Lynn (the planning district) did not have WAZ coordinators in place, but findings from the district coordinator and school social worker interviews are included. This section focuses on strengths, support and resources, challenges, lessons learned, and recommendations—all from the perspective of district and school coordinators (or their proxies). Future reports will explore other findings from these stakeholders as well as interviews of key district leaders involved in WAZ planning and implementation, principals, and external partner agencies. The analyses of these interviews will be presented in future reports. As discussed with ESE, this section is intended to provide a “snapshot” of findings from AIR’s initial analysis of the coordinator interviews. This section identifies factors at the district and school levels that contribute to WAZ planning and implementation, from the perspectives of coordinators (addressing research questions A12–A16).

#### Strengths and Challenges

Coordinators across districts reported the following as primary factors that serve as strengths and (or) challenges in their planning and implementation of wraparound in their districts. This section includes information from school coordinator interviews. Strengths and challenges are included if at least two coordinators mentioned them, to avoid reporting a single person’s perspective.

##### **Maintaining the WAZ Vision**

**Strengths:** Coordinators expressed strong commitment to WAZ and its goals. Coordinators spoke knowledgably and passionately about the WAZ work, including its goals and its prospective impact on students and families.

**Challenges:** All schools, particularly schools identified by ESE as level 4 (persistently underperforming), have multiple ongoing initiatives, programs, and commitments. Introducing WAZ into these schools and integrating wraparound into existing systems, while also maintaining the initiative’s vision, is considered a challenge. Coordinators reported that the initiative’s success depends on ensuring that all school staff have a clear understanding of WAZ and buy into it.

##### **Clarity about the School Coordinator Role**

**Strengths:** In one district, school coordinators were clear in describing their roles and responsibilities. In this district, coordinators felt confident in their ability to support teachers and other staff in addressing student needs.

**Challenges:** Most schools have support staff such as guidance counselors and adjustment counselors. Many school coordinators in WAZ districts reported a lack of clarity about exactly how their positions differed from those of guidance and adjustment counselors, contributing to challenges including: occasional tensions between school coordinators and other groups with seemingly similar roles; uncertainty on the part of the school coordinator regarding expectations for their roles, and confusion among school staff about how to best use WAZ school coordinators. Some coordinators shared concerns about school leaders’ understanding of their roles. Other coordinators also acknowledged a need for more communication with principals about expectations for the school coordinator role, including how it is defined and described to other school staff. Although some acknowledged that the WAZ coordinator position is evolving, a clear description about the role and related responsibilities is needed.

##### **District-Level Support**

**Strengths:** Participants identified district coordinators as the primary source of support at the district level. District coordinators serve as important links between the school coordinators and other district leaders, and as advocates for school coordinators. School coordinators often spoke favorably about their district coordinators and reported that they: provided and supported guidance around WAZ implementation, were responsive to school coordinator questions and needs, provided supervision of school coordinator work, and facilitated districtwide meetings with school coordinators. Most school coordinators also reported buy-in from other district staff for the WAZ-related efforts.

**Challenges:** Although most school coordinators indicated that there is district-level buy-in for the WAZ initiative, they reported that the level of involvement, knowledge, and guidance among district administrators (other than the district wraparound coordinators) varied and was low in some cases. Some districts followed a top-down approach (the WAZ initiative being driven by the district) and other districts had a bottom-up approach (the WAZ initiative being driven by the schools). Although there was no consensus on which approach was “better,” some coordinators reported wanting to have more explicit district leadership support or guidance around implementation at the school level.

##### **Systems to Organize Data**

**Strengths:** Coordinators across districts reported collecting, or plans to collect, data on student needs and their WAZ activities.

**Challenges:** Coordinators reported that they could benefit from a more coordinated data management process to help gather and organize the data that is collected within the schools.

##### **School Leadership Support**

**Strengths:** Coordinators agreed that the support and buy-in of school leadership is critical to the initiative’s success at each school. The majority of coordinators reported having such support, indicating that it facilitates their implementation of WAZ. Comments about school leadership were generally positive with coordinators reporting that school leaders: were committed to focusing on the whole child, had a strong vision for their school and the wraparound initiative, and protected the school coordinator’s time to ensure that their work focuses on WAZ activities.

**Challenges:** As previously described under “clarity about school coordinator role,” some coordinators reported there was inadequate clarity about their roles among school leadership.

##### **Limited Resources to Address Student Needs**

**Strengths:** Coordinators described efforts to expand non-academic efforts for students and families through expanded community partnerships (see next finding).

**Challenges:** All WAZ schools serve students with high needs and as a result, the need for student services and supports is also great. Limited resources to address the varying needs of all students were a challenge reported across the districts. This included: lack of human resources (e.g., not enough Spanish-speaking therapists, long wait lists for services), space (e.g., not enough physical space to hold counseling sessions within the school), and limited funding. Lack of transportation for families and students was also a significant challenge. Specifically, even when services were available, many families were unable to access these services because they did not have the means of traveling to the different agencies. There were also needs for more teacher training on identifying and addressing students’ nonacademic issues.

##### **Community Partnerships**

**Strengths:** Coordinators agreed that establishing sustainable community partnerships was a key part of their role and all are working to strengthen these partnerships. Coordinators reported that most community organizations are committed to the initiative and willing to become actively involved (in some cases community agency eagerness exceeds district or school capacity to engage them, such that one district has needed to limit how many agencies interact with each WAZ school). Coordinators tended to view the role of outside organizations as critical given that these organizations serve as the primary mechanisms through which schools can meet the social-emotional needs of their students.

**Challenges:**Most coordinators considered developing sustainable partnerships with community organizations a challenge. In most cases they reported preexisting partnerships, but continued to struggle with defining and formalizing both these relationships as well as relationships with new community agencies to develop sustainable partnerships. Challenges included: finding a balance between strengthening existing partnerships and forming new ones; having enough time to develop partnerships; reaching a common understanding between schools and community agencies about what a partnership means; and expanding school openness to incorporating outside agencies into existing school structures. Coordinators reported a need for more support with cultivating partnerships with community organizations.

##### **Parent and Family Engagement**

**Strengths:** Coordinators tended to discuss family engagement as an important component of the WAZ initiative.

**Challenges:** Coordinators reported difficulties reaching and engaging parents. These challenges were reportedly related to a number of issues including: lack of parent trust in the school system, language barriers, lack of parent transportation to/from home and school, and family prioritization of more immediate concerns such as housing and jobs. Coordinators across districts described activities and plans to help address this challenge.

##### **Technical Assistance and ESE Support**

**Strengths:** One aspect of the technical assistance/peer learning sessions that coordinators found most useful was the opportunity to meet with other districts and learn about how these districts were implementing the WAZ initiative. Coordinators also reported that the School and Main Institute staff and ESE Wraparound Zone Coordinator were responsive to their questions and needs and provided valuable guidance when needed. In addition, there seemed to be an awareness that, similar to other aspects of the initiative, the technical assistance component was a work in progress. As one coordinator noted,“The work is evolving, I can see them getting more structure, more clarity.”

**Challenges:** Concerns about the peer learning exchange TA sessions related primarily to the TA provider’s ability to tailor sessions to meet each district’s unique needs. District contexts varied and each district was at a different phase of implementation, thus there have been instances where coordinators reported that some technical assistance sessions were less useful because they did not align with where their school or district was in the process of wraparound implementation. Coordinators also noted that sometimes the information presented was “abstract” or “vague” and they would like more practical information such as best practices or specific examples or models of how to implement certain aspects of WAZ, as well as more concrete information about how ESE WAZ goals align with district and school improvement goals. Some coordinators noted that the February 2012 peer learning exchange was a good example of a session that provided more specific guidance. Finally, a few coordinators noted that these sessions took them away from the work that needed to be done within their districts and schools.

#### Lessons Learned

The following are lessons learned that two or more coordinators identified, based on their experience with the WAZ initiative.

##### **Implementing Wraparound Takes More Time Than Expected**

Coordinators acknowledged that the implementation of the WAZ initiative is complex and involves ongoing planning and patience. As a result, timelines needed to be adjusted. Coordinators reported the need to understand that all WAZ efforts cannot be accomplished at once. As one coordinator stated, “I don’t think we fully comprehended how complex this was going to be, pulling this all together. So, the complexity of it can’t be underestimated. Plan early and often.” Another stated, “Don’t rush….it's an evolution.” Additional comments about this lesson learned included:

* It will take time (i.e., more months) to get things done (often longer than expected).
* Even though most districts and schools are technically in the implementation phase, there is still a fair amount of planning that needs to happen, and trying to plan and implement simultaneously can be challenging.
* District and school staff need to build in time to plan for various initiatives/activities from the beginning of the grant.

##### **School and District Coordinators Need Full-Time Positions**

Several coordinators noted that given the comprehensive nature of the initiative’s goals, as well as the effort needed to put systems in place to effectively address the needs of students, having a full-time school and district coordinator was very important. The district and school coordinators have needed to commit all of their available time to WAZ implementation (and some noted that being a full-time coordinator has been important to carrying out the WAZ coordinator work). In addition, these roles need to be clearly defined.

##### **Importance of Building School Team Support and Buy-In for Wraparound**

Coordinators also stressed that the support and buy-in of district and school leaders as well as school support staff (e.g., guidance counselors and adjustment counselors) were important for helping to move the WAZ work forward. This involved:

* Establishing rapport and developing a sense of trust among school coordinators, school administrators, and support staff.
* Creating ongoing communication between school coordinators and other school staff.
* Ensuring that all school staff understand and are in agreement about roles as well as goals and anticipated outcomes of the initiative.
* Promoting the notion that all staff have something to gain from adopting the district’s WAZ model.

##### **It Would Be Helpful to Include School Coordinators in the Planning Process as Early as Possible**

Most school coordinators were hired at the beginning of the school year and were not involved in the initial planning or writing of their districts’ WAZ grants. They reported, though, that being involved early on would have been beneficial in terms of clarifying their roles and identifying clear goals and objectives for the initiative. Some participants recommended more involvement of school coordinators in higher-level planning and meetings (e.g., meetings with principal and district administrators) about the WAZ initiative.

#### Coordinator Recommendations

The following recommendations were provided by at least two of the school and district coordinators interviewed. As might be expected, there is overlap with the aforementioned strengths, challenges, and lessons learned (e.g., recommendations address identified needs to carry out the WAZ plans).

##### **Provide Visible District and School Leadership Support from the Grant’s Beginning**

Coordinators acknowledged that support from school and district administrators has been important. Although in some instances greater WAZ-related support from district and school leadership is needed, coordinators shared many examples about what they think is working well and should be continued or expanded. Coordinators noted that this support needs to be visible from the very beginning of the initiative so that WAZ is not viewed as just another school reform initiative that will leave when ESE funding ends, but rather will be sustained and continue to benefit districts and schools. They also noted it is important that district and school leaders visibly support for the school coordinator position. WAZ coordinators shared a number of examples of how they are supported by their leaders:

* Coordinators are kept informed about school- and district-level decisions through meetings with their district coordinator and school leaders
* Leaders respond to coordinators’ questions and requests
* Leaders are receptive to coordinators’ ideas/suggestions
* There is ongoing communication between coordinators and district/school leaders regarding WAZ progress and related needs
* District coordinators serve as an advocate for addressing the needs of school coordinators
* Principals ensure that school coordinator time is reserved for WAZ-related activities only

##### **Clarify Wraparound Goals Early On**

Some coordinators noted the importance of ensuring that the overarching goals of the WAZ initiative are clear from the beginning at the district and school levels. Although each district and school has goals that are unique to their population, coordinators emphasized the importance of understanding that this initiative is focused on systems building and not just delivering direct services to students and families.

At the school level, coordinators recommended that school administrators not only be made aware of what the school coordinator’s role is, but that this role align with the goals and objectives of school leaders and support staff. This would require ongoing communication between school coordinators and school leaders. One respondent recommended that the school coordinators sit down with the school leadership team and co-establish goals.

##### **Clarify the School Coordinator Role**

Another recommendation included clarifing the roles and responsibilities of school coordinators. In some districts this position is new to schools, but seemed to overlap with other existing school positions (i.e., guidance counselors, adjustment counselors). In addition, in some schools current staff (e.g., social workers) with existing responsibilities will take on this coordinator role. Reported advantages of clarifying the WAZ coordinator role early on include:

* Being able to accurately describe the role to other school staff so that they utilize the school coordinator appropriately.
* Reducing the likelihood that the school coordinator will be called on to become involved in tasks not related to their WAZ coordinator position.
* Enablishing school coordinators’ own understanding of the work to allow them to better integrate their skills and past experiences into the WAZ coordinator role.

##### **Leverage Existing Strengths and Resources**

Although some WAZ initiative components were new to most districts and schools, all schools and districts appeared to have a foundation on which to build this initiative (e.g., human resources, community connections). School coordinators recommended that schools use these resources as a springboard for developing the initiative within schools. A couple of staff specifically mentioned that starting with a needs assessment or resource mapping was important to establishing the most efficient and effective WAZ plan.

##### **District and School Coordinators Should Learn as Much as They Can, Early on, About Their Schools, Students, and Communities**

School and district coordinators started their positions with varying levels of experience working in schools and in their communities. Some coordinators described how helpful it was to learn as much as they can about the students and families that they serve, including their strengths and the challenges that they face. Coordinators noted that an important part of this process includes learning about available resources and identifying individuals and organizations that can help meet students’ needs. Coordinators recommended that any new school coordinators utilize these strategies to support success in their WAZ work. As one school coordinator described, having this knowledge allows the process to be more proactive instead of reactive.

##### **Develop a Coordinated System to Organize Data at the Onset of the Grant**

Some coordinators recommended implementing data collection systems early on, to organize the large amounts of data that will be gathered as part of the WAZ initiative. These systems should be coordinated with other district data collection efforts. Coordinators did not share many specific suggestions on what they thought would be most useful for them in terms of organizing the data and who should be responsible for creating these systems. Some coorindators suggested utilizing the expertise of the district data team/specialists to develop a WAZ data collection system and ensuring the system provides easy access to school-level data.

##### **Develop Consistent District Procedures to Apply to Schools**

Although each school is unique in terms of its strengths, needs, and challenges, some coordinators recommended consistent (districtwide) expectations and procedures for certain activities (in particular, documentation of WAZ activities, including information that districts can use for measuring WAZ success, and data collection protocols). This would include consistent forms and processes for documenting WAZ activities.

## *Sustainability and Replication*

The final set of research questions focuses on evidence of WAZ sustainability and replication within the six districts. This set focuses on the following overarching question:

*Are WAZ sustainable at the district and school levels, and what supports or hinders (or will support/hinder)* ***sustainability and replication*** *in other districts and schools?*

Although it is early to identify evidence of sustainability, interview data revealed that some school and district coordinators are already thinking beyond daily implementation and considering how their current work can sustain WAZ strategies. Some coordinators also spoke explicitly about sustainability. For example, one school coordinator reported that a goal for the school’s wraparound initiative includes “Figuring out a way to prioritize the vision and create sustainability for the model.” Furthermore, as noted many coordinators acknowledged the importance of understanding that the WAZ initiative is focused on systems building and not just delivering direct services to students and families. This focus on systems building is a significant strength. Such early recognition and articulation in the implementatation process of both sustainability and system building indicates that some sites are making good progress toward these early indicators of progress. Early and clear school and district focus on building systems and sustainability can enhance the likelihood of sustaining WAZ strategies.

Another school coordinator made the connection between the coordinator role and sustainability, stating that “My role has really developed around knowing that in three years this role is scheduled to end. So everything I’m doing is to ensure that it can be supported and that it can continue on.” Yet, another coordinator commented on the link between building coalitions and continuing the work after the grant ended, “We’re on a path to building these new coalitions. We do that because we need to sustain the work after the state is gone.” It is expected that as schools and districts move into year two of the grant, there will be more focused discussions on sustainability and potentially expanding WAZ to additional schools.

# IV. AIR Recommendations

Based on these findings, AIR identified 12 recommendations to inform WAZ planning and implementation in current districts, **as well as other districts/schools looking to implement a WAZ approach**. The following recommendations reflect the four WAZ priority improvement areas: (1) school climate and culture, (2) identification of and efforts to address student needs, (3) community coalitions, and (4) district systems of support. The recommendations are also organized by the seven elements of the WAZ initiative previously discussed in Figure 1: (1) vision and goals, (2) resource mapping, (3) data, (4) leadership, (5) practices and protocols, (6) community stakeholders, and (7) technical assistance. In addition, where appropriate, anticipated ESE WAZ-related technical assistance planned for the 2012–13 school year is highlighted if it pertains to a recommendation.

**These recommendations were shared with ESE during the summer of 2012 to inform its efforts for the current school year. Hence, some of these recommendations have already been addressed (e.g., through ESE technical assistance) and efforts to attend to the recommendations are ongoing.** AIR proposes that for future evaluation reports, AIR convene a small stakeholders group (by phone or in person to coincide with a WAZ peer learning exchange) with representatives from ESE, districts, and schools to review and co-interpret findings and discuss draft recommendations. This could occur after ESE has reviewed the draft report. Joining AIR’s expertise with the experiences and perspectives of districts and schools will help produce meaningful recommendations grounded in not only best practice, but also local contexts.

Creating sustainable district services and systems of support is instrumental to the WAZ initiative. Regardless of the stage of WAZ implementation, districts should consider the following recommendations to sustain services and systems. These recommendations are intended for both currently funded districts, as well as new districts/schools that are part of the 2012–13 WAZ cohort. Table 4 lists each of the recommendations, with checkmarks indicating which priority improvement area(s) they address.

As ESE and districts continue to assess their progress across these elements and the overall WAZ initiative, it is important to consider the rate of progress within the context of systems change. **Evidence-based programs related to social and emotional supports usually need 12 to 18 months of implementation before systems see measureable progress with individual students or classroom environments. District-wide initiatives that involve broader systemic changes usually need between three and five years of implementation to realize their anticipated goals.**

# Table 4: AIR Recommendation, by WAZ Priority Improvement Area

| **Recommendation** | **Climate and Culture** | **Identification of and Efforts to Address Student Needs** | **Community Coalitions** | **District Systems of Support** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Vision, Goals, Roles | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 2: School-Driven Resource Mapping |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 3: School Climate Data | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 4: Planning for Changes in Programs or Strategies |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 5: District Guidance and Leadership |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 6: Stakeholder Knowledge and Buy-In |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 7: School-Based Teams |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 8: Standard Protocols and Timely Data Collection |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 9: Early Involvement of Community Agencies |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 10: Community Partner, Communication, and Coalition Roles |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 11: Family Engagement | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 12: Technical Assistance to Districts and Schools | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

#### Vision and Goals

**Recommendation 1: Clarity of Wraparound Vision, Goals, and Roles**

**Districts should develop and maintain a WAZ visionand integrate this into existing systems. Wraparound goals should be made clear early in the planning process, prior to implementation. School coordinator roles should be clearly defined and communicated, with school leadership consistently knowledgeable of these roles.**

To provide clarity for school coordinators and the other staff in each school, as well as develop WAZ infrastructure AIR recommends the following specific activities:

* Districts should develop written position descriptions for school coordinators that describe the role and responsibilities of these positions.
* ESE should consider providing districts with proposed activities for the full-time school and district coordinator positions as well as help districts clarify roles as needed. In addition, district administrators should provide principals with guidance on how the position can and cannot be modified to fit the needs of each school.
* Principals should share position descriptions or communicate the role and responsibilities of the school coordinators to all staff in their schools. Most schools have counselors, social workers, or other staff positions that might already be helping to address students’ non-academic needs.
* Districts should facilitate conversations between staff in existing school positions and new WAZ coordinator positions to clarify each person’s role on the team and discuss how all will collaborate. School coordinator roles in similar initiatives usually focus on building capacity of school staff; developing data systems; and implementing processes and protocols and systems necessary to support the goals of the initiative. The role typically does not include direct service to students. Districts will need to support principals in establishing and communicating the roles and responsibilities of the WAZ coordinators versus, for example, that of an adjustment counselor.

**Sample School Staff/Community Activity:**

* The principal or their designee should gather a group of school staff that can contribute to defining and differentiating the role of the school wraparound coordinator from other staff who also help to address students’ non-academic needs. For example, counselors, social workers, school psychologists, as well as school leadership including the principal, should attend this meeting. Typically, a school administrator facilititates this activity.
* Distribute a draft job description of a wraparound coordinator’s role to each participant and provide instructions to annotate the description with examples of the types of activities this position would entail.
* Once each participant has completed annotating one copy of the job description, ask them to lay their copies face down on the table, mix the copies up and circulate them around the room. Ask each person to take a new, now annotated copy of the job description (not their own) to review and to revise from their own perspective.
* Once participants have completed their second round of annotations, open the floor to discussion and facilitate concensus on an interim draft.
* At a later date after the position description is finalized and shared with school staff, select three or four school staff to review the description and ask “Who in the school is responsible for these activities?” This will assist in understanding where there may be potential confusion and how the role description may need to be clarified with school staff.
* Based on this feedback, the principal or their designee should revise the description as needed and then share and discuss the revised position description with school staff.

|  |
| --- |
| **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**: Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

#### Resource Mapping

**Recommendation 2: School-Driven Resource Mapping**

**As a school-driven process, resource mapping should occur at three levels: (1) within schools, (2) between schools and partner organizations, and (3) between schools and other organizations within the broader community (e.g., Boys or Girls Club, family support organizations).** It is helpful to first develop an inventory of existing programs and resources, compile existing information on the evidence of program effectiveness, identify gaps or duplication in programs, review school survey data (see Recommendation 5) and incident data, and then identify areas that need to be addressed and that could use resources more efficiently. Where a similar process has already been done in schools, AIR recommends they use an organizing approach to this resource mapping process which uses the three-tiered intervention framework. Teams consider what they have in place at the universal level (for all students); what they have in place at the targeted level (for some students); and then at the intensive level (for a few students). An important aspect of this process is identifying what data are being collected, how it is being collected, and how teams or individuals are using that data. This will lead to more efficient use of time and the streamline the data collection process.

AIR suggests an enhanced resource mapping process in current and future WAZ schools that examines available services not only in schools, but those provided by partner organizations. This can reveal untapped resources or potential new partners. It will be essential to include key system partners and agency representatives in this process. This process can begin more broadly, focusing on the larger community, the district or can begin at the school level. AIR recommends the latter since three of the four WAZ priority improvement areas address the school level.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resource:** AIR recommends the following Safe Schools Healthy Students resource mapping tool. <http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/project-directors/tools/resource-mapping-tool>  **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session:** Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

#### Data

**Recommendation 3: Analysis of School Climate Data**

**Districts and schools should review data on school climate provided by students, school staff, and parents and integrate their input into the resource mapping process (see Recommendation 4).** School climate survey results, for example, provide a range of valuable information on student perceptions of their schools. As already begun at the peer learning exchange on April 12, 2012, AIR recommends that districts and schools continue to review their CFL student survey data (and other available school climate data), analyzing not only by school and by grade-level but also by student subgroups (e.g., English Language Learner status) where available. It is important to embed input on school climate in the resource mapping process. By matching needs to existing resources, school based teams can identify gaps in the system or infrastructure.

Despite being in different stages of WAZ implementation there are some strengths, challenges, and experiences that are common across most districts and schools. For the four districts with conditions for learning survey results (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lynn), the following are key recommendations for improving the climate and culture of WAZ schools. The districts should integrate specific efforts to address these conditions into their WAZ plans and implementation efforts.

* **In all schools:** Enhance student experiences of physical safety and respect from their peers in schools (e.g., reduce bullying, teasing)
* **Grades 2–4**: Enhance adult-student relationships so that students feel more listened to, cared about, and treated fairly by the adults in their schools
* **Grades 5–12**: Enhance students’ social and problem solving skills

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources**: AIR recommends several resources for school climate survey data analysis that school personnel overseeing survey administration and data teams could use to identify programmatic interventions based on best practices. For example, teams could use student survey data to understand how students feel emotionally or physically safe as well as staff survey data to understand staff perceptions of school climate. The team can then take the data to the appropriate school staff to develop a plan and actions to respond and address areas of need.  Bullying Prevention   * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, School Climate Webinar Series on Bullying Prevention (this includes many citations for resources): <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=16>   Enhancing Relationships   * Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) *Safe and Sound: An Educational Leader’s Guide to Evidence-Based Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Programs*: <http://casel.org/publications/safe-and-sound-an-educational-leaders-guide-to-evidence-based-sel-programs/> * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, School Climate Webinar Series on Enhancing Peer-to-Peer Relationships to Strengthen School Climate: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=1538> * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, School Climate Webinar Series on Establishing Supportive Relationships between Teachers, Staff, Students, and Families: http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=12   School Climate Survey Data Analysis and Identifying Interventions   * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, Survey Webinar Series on Analysis of Survey Data: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=17> * Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center, Implementation Webinar Series on Using Data to Identify Programmatic Interventions: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=1502>   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session:** Behavior Management and Student Engagement |

**Recommendation 4: Planning for Changes in Programs or Strategies Based on Data**

Using resource mapping and school climate results, districts and schools need to plan for changes in programs or strategies that will improve outcomes for students. **Districts and schools should review their current WAZ plans, within the context of a “school climate framework” and in relation to their data and revise plans so they address identified areas of need and build on strengths.** Districts may need to add and implement new evidence-based programs, strategies or approaches to the WAZ plans.

There are various models that frame positive school climate and culture, but the most recent work from the U.S. Department of Education approaches school climate from three major areas that are directly relevant to the WAZ priority areas related to culture and climate:

* **Engagement**: This is all about relationships, adult to adult, adult to student, and student to student.
* **Safety**: This includes both emotional and physical safety.
* **Environment**: This includes physical, academic and disciplinary environment, and overall wellness.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources:** There are many effective programs that address these three areas. AIR recommends the following resources for a listing of programs to consider:   * [Child Trends Life Course Interventions to Nurture Kids Successfully (LINKS)](http://www.childtrends.org/links/) provides updated trend data with the latest national estimates for all child-related indicators, as well as a searchable database of evidence-based programs. Users can search by indicators (e.g., health and safety, child care and education, behaviors) and subcategories within those interest areas (e.g., bullying) or by criteria (e.g., population, program characteristics, outcomes). When searching for indicators, users can find background information; trend data; state, local, and international estimates of child related indicators; and related evidence-based programs (<http://www.childtrends.org/links/>). * [Promote Prevent](http://www.promoteprevent.org/), the website of the National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention is another resource for states, districts, and schools interested in researching and implementing evidence-based programs. The National Center offers an array of products and services that enable schools and communities to plan, implement, evaluate, and sustain activities that foster resilience, promote mental health, and prevent youth violence and mental and behavioral disorders (http://www.promoteprevent.org/). * [SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP)](http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/) is a searchable online registry of more than 175 interventions that support mental health promotion, substance abuse prevention, and mental health and substance abuse treatment. Although it is not an exhaustive list of interventions, it is a valuable resource for the field of prevention. It has specific information on programs related to school climate, safety and improving the school environment (http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/).   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session:** Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Plans and Follow-up |

#### Leadership

**Recommendation 5: District Guidance and Leadership**

**District leaders should provide direct guidance and explicit support for the initiative’s planning and implementation, once vision and goals are established.**

**Planning:** District WAZ coordinators should support principals in shaping wraparound to meet the specific needs of their schools. This needs to be intentional from the beginning of the initiative by providing opportunities to discuss WAZ in district-wide open meetings or forums for all stakeholders. Initial meetings would provide an overview of the WAZ initiative, anticipated outcomes, and what it means specifically for each school. Representative stakeholders would have an opportunity to assess “whats in this for us (me)”; ask questions, identify barriers, and begin to envision the potential impact for them; and assist principals and wraparound coordinators in anticipating areas that will need to be addressed and included in the routine communications with stakeholders.

**Implementation:** The focus of district leadership should shift during implementation and should include routine communication with all stakeholders, for example, by providing updates on progress in WAZ schools using a bi-monthly or quarterly email; supporting a district-level “learning community” for WAZ staff and support personnel to meet in person and focus on strategies to address gaps and barriers; and ensuring opportunities for school staff to review and discuss their data with key decision makers for the community.

In addition, there should be a process that holds school leadership accountable to the superintendent’s office for implementing WAZ strategies, including a routine report on priorities and progress in schools. The superintendent, in turn, should update the district’s school board using this progress report.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resource:**   * *Leading and Communicating: A Guide for Watershed Partnerships* http://www.ctic.purdue.edu/media/files/Leading%20and%20Communicating.pdf   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**:Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

**Recommendation 6: Enhanced Stakeholder Knowledge and Buy-In**

**Districts should ensure that all district/school staff are knowledgeable of all aspects of their district’s WAZ plan, which may require professional development or staff meeting time. In addition, districts should communicate a clear vision, goals, and progress to facilitate stakeholder (teachers, support staff, principals, parents, community agencies and providers) buy-in for the initiative’s direction and its theory of action.** Different stakeholders need to know how this relates to their work and improves outcomes for students and schools. This can be as simple as including the vision or goals as a “footer banner” on district/school websites or in district/school newsletters; on a banner posted at school entrances; or as part of discussions at staff meetings. For example, buy-in can be facilitated by gathering information about how the initiative is impacting stakeholders’ goals, whether these relate to academic achievement or family stability, and communicating this information to stakeholders. It is important to keep all stakeholders, including community partner organizations, informed and connected on an ongoing basis by communicating about initiative-related successes/progress and evidence of improved outcomes for students and schools. In addition, as part of community groups or coalitions, partner representatives could share with school staff examples of the initiative’s benefits and describe how the WAZ strategies integrate with and further their organizational goals. This can further build knowledge, buy-in, and collaboration and lead to a common understanding of the district vision. This can also help community partners as well as district/school staff see “what’s in it for them.”

|  |
| --- |
| **Resource:**   * The White House Council for Community Solutions *Community Collaboratives Toolbox* ([http://www.serve.gov/new-images/council/pdf/CommunityCollaborativeToolkit\_all %20\_materials.pdf](http://www.serve.gov/new-images/council/pdf/CommunityCollaborativeToolkit_all%20%20_materials.pdf)) is a guide to collaborative “life stages” that can assist community collaborative in succeeding across their life cycle–from planning and development, through roll-out and course-correcting, and on to deciding its next steps.   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**:Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

**Recommendation 7: School-Based Teams/Workgroups**

**Districts should support a team or workgroup—many times composed of existing school climate teams, positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) teams, or multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) teams—within each school with clear responsibilities to meet their school-wide goals related to developing a proactive system of identifying needs and providing supports.** There are two functions that are needed here: one addresses school-wide supports and the other addresses individual supports. Both are necessary. If the process and structure is developed to address the individual needs of students within a wraparound planning context without being embedded in a broader system of supports, it is less likely to be sustained over time.

**School-wide Teams:** This team (or teams) should initially focus on developing a continuum of services (what’s missing, based on their resource mapping process) and gradually shifting their focus to continuous quality improvement (CQI) over time. This CQI role should include reviewing school-wide data and group student data (i.e., race/ethnicity, grade level, and English language learners), making recommendations to address need areas, enhancing outcomes, and reviewing impacts of recommendations on services. These teams should routinely meet one to two times monthly.

The goal here is to build capacity of a school-based team to routinely review their school data and make recommendations to school leadership who follow through with implementation, for “course” corrections throughout the school year. This supports the “school-wide” climate and culture. As schools develop more service options, “less restrictive” program options (those that require less time out of the classroom or general education placement) will be more likely to address students’ needs, therefore maximizing instructional time. This is exactly the overall goal of the WAZ initiataive.

**Individual Teams:** Most schools already have groups of staff who meet on a regular basis (weekly or bi-weekly) to review the needs of individual students and make recommendations for actions to take to address those needs. For enhanced development of teams that review individual data, it is also essential that districts and schools provide ongoing support and development for these teams to increase their ability to review behavioral and academic data, make recommendations for interventions, monitor intervention implementation, and then modify services/approaches as needed.

One example of an effective support model is to include a clinician from a community-based organization as a member of the student intervention team. For example, this clinician might  participate on the team reviews for approximately one hour (per week, bi-weekly or monthly depending on resources available for support), during which time the team reviews information on students who are experiencing social, emotional or behavioral issues. The clinician’s participation also supports ongoing capacity-building of school team members. In addition school psychologists and other school-based clinicians who regularly participate in these teams also may play key roles in supporting the team’s development based on their individual expertise and depending on their availability to do so.

If a school does not have an existing relationship with a community-based clinician or agency, those relationships can be developed, and many times with little or no additional costs to the school or district. As part of the overall partnership and collaboration resource mapping, usually community-based clinicians are identified as resources within those partner organizations. A school team member is designated as a lead to contact the partner agency, and discuss the potential role for a clinician. Discussion includes:

* **Who**—Clinicians with experience working with schools and with children and youth within the targeted age-range.
* **What**—Clinicians serve in a consultant capacity as part of school-based teams on a routine basis to provide guidance, suggest possible strategies or programs, suggest additional resources available outside of the school’s role, and make linkages back to the partner agency regarding the types of needs that are being seen in the community. Many times clinicians also serve a valuable support role by providing helpful strategies and information directly to teachers, staff, and families during individual student meetings.
* **Where**—Meetings held at community school(s).
* **When**—Weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly meetings, as well as brief follow-up discussions among members of the school-based teams after these meetings.
* **How**—Clinicians are employees of a community-based agency; their time is either covered by the agency, by a negotiated fee structure between the school district and the agency, or through Medicaid dollars (in some states). Districts and agencies usually develop a memorandum of agreement/understanding (MOA/MOU) addressing the role of clinicians, as well as the legal issues involved in sharing student information.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources:** The following two Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center webinars provide best practice for school climate teams.   * School Climate Teams I: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=24> * School Climate Teams II: <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov/index.php?id=9&eid=89>   In addition, the National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention provides tools to facilitate information sharing.   * Memorandums of Understanding and Sharing Information: <http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/nis/implementing-information-sharing-policies-and-protocols>   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance sessions**: (1) Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up and (2) Family Engagement Strategies |

#### Practices and Protocols

**Recommendation 8: Standard Protocols and Timely Data Collection and Review**

**Districts should develop consistent wraparound procedures to apply to schools (e.g., referral processes, forms) and should develop data systems to organize data as early as possible in the implementation of the WAZ initiative. District and school WAZ coordinators are integral to this effort.** Ideally data systems should be put in place in the first six months to maximize the availability of data to inform CQI efforts. Wherever possible, districts should try to avoid duplication of data collection and entry to maximize efficiency of school staff time. Data is one of the categories that should be addressed as part of the resource mapping.

It will be important to include someone who understands district management information systems (MIS), as well as the capacity or limitations of those systems. Many districts have invested in an MIS that can provide access to more timely data collections and summaries for review. AIR has seen districts use structured work sessions involving the service providers, district and school leadership, and information technology support personnel. The goals of these sessions include problem solving, brainstorming possible solutions, and establishing a plan for refining the MIS. These districts have used existing systems, such as PBIS data collection systems, for this purpose. In addition, districts have used facilitated sessions with that same group to focus on what data needs to be collected, how it will be collected, who will collect (record) it, when it will be collected, and who will review and analyze it. This leads to established protocols and training that can be consistent across schools within the district. These data and analyses are then shared with stakeholders to review, assess, and inform future practice.

#### Community Stakeholders

**Recommendation 9: Early Involvement of Community Agencies**

When schools are establishing a system of identifying student needs, they have to simultaneously develop strategies and select interventions that respond to identified student needs. There are two levels of strategies and interventions: school-wide and individual. Schools alone cannot address all these needs. As schools build supports and interventions, they will need community partners.

Establishing community partnerships is a key aspect of the WAZ initiative, as connections to external agencies can increase school capacity to meet the non-academic needs of students and their families. WAZ schools have already established informal relationships with various community agencies. Coordinators also noted that many of these agencies are interested in becoming (or are already) involved in the WAZ initiative, which is a valuable asset to leverage. However, formalizing and managing these relationships has been challenging.

**AIR recommends that districts include potential key community partners from the earliest stages of the initiative’s planning and implementation.** This can promote buy-in among community agencies and allow agencies to participate in a dialogue to determine how they can best streamline services to effectively meet students’ needs. This opportunity may also allow stakeholders (districts, schools, agencies) to begin thinking about potential barriers to reaching students (such as confidentiality, transportation, eligibility requirements, waiting lists, funding, and coordination) and identifying ways to address these barriers. These discussions should include conversations about what a “partnership” is and how the collaboration would be beneficial for all involved.

There are examples of national initiatives that have focused on partnerships among schools, mental health, and other social service agencies and community providers, such as Safe Schools Healthy Students, systems of care, and school-based behavioral health models. They apply proven, successful strategies to develop those partnerships and increase capacity and resources available in schools for students with social, emotional, and behavioral needs. The school and community coaliton can address issues related to waitlists for services and expand capacity to meet student needs.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources:**   * Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, *The Role of Education in a System of Care: Effectively Serving Children with Emotional or Behavioral Disorders*: <http://cecp.air.org/promisingpractices/1998monographs/vol3.pdf>. * Center for School Mental Health and OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports, *Development of an Interconnected Systems Framework for School Mental Health*: [http://csmh.umaryland.edu/Resources/OtherResources/ SMHPBISFramework.pdf](http://csmh.umaryland.edu/Resources/OtherResources/%20SMHPBISFramework.pdf). * Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiative: <http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/project-resource-guide/section-1-introduction-sshs-vision>. |

**Recommendation 10: Community Partner, Communication, and Coalition Roles**

Community coalitions can play an important role in identifying gaps within or across different community agency partners. When community coalitions are functioning well, they can take the resource review (resource mapping activity, Recommendation #2, to another level by assessing each agency’s strengths and needs on a 365 day/24/7 basis. This process assists in identifying options and resources available in the community after school, during evenings, and in the summer. This process also identifies supports that may be available for families or primary care providers. **AIR recommends that districts in partnership with other agencies (partners) develop routine protocols and structures for reviewing the service continuum in their community; reviewing data from multiple child- and youth-serving systems (such as child welfare, juvenile justice); and assessing, on a routine basis, student/family outcomes and needs as they emerge.**

Available community agencies and resources vary across districts. Districts may be challenged by where to start and who the primary partner agencies should be. We suggest districts begin with those partner agencies that are the most likely to provide resources and services that address the gaps identified in the resource mapping. These may include a community mental health center, an independent clinical provider, local pediatricians, or afterschool program providers, such as the YMCA or Boys Club. These identified agency partners should be invited to participate in the community coalition and the broader resource mapping process.

Collaboration can benefit a greater number of students through the more comprehensive “map” of the community’s needs (see Recommendation 2). After creating a common vision (for a broader community group), districts and community coalitions should facilitate the development of a common language that defines outcomes, specific to the districts and the agencies as it relates to *this* initiative.

Community coalitions also play an important role in building infrastructure and support that will sustain successful initiatives. Many coalitions have seen the benefit of forming sub-committees or workgroups to specifically address different tasks such as evaluation, communications and marketing and sustainability. **AIR recommends that the coalitions examine the role they have in leading sustainability planning and building support early in the initiative. It will be helpful for community coalitions to build capacity for marketing their successful outcomes from the initiative.** There is a synergy that builds when these community teams have access to data, learn what is working and not working, and find an effective way to market that message to the broader community.

A summary of the various roles AIR has identified for coalitions includes: creating a community-wide vision and common language, developing a plan for addressing the community gaps/needs identified in the broader resource mapping process, infrastructure (integrating key aspects of the initiative into policies, protocols, forms, and data collection systems for all partner agencies), being knowledgeable about the data and outcomes, and marketing successful outcomes. These can contribute to sustainability. The responsibility for the ongoing coordination of the coalition activities has been successfully shared by a variety of district staff and community agency representatives in similar initiatives. One example of this consists of co-facilitators, one district and one agency representative, who rotate the responsibilities across years.

In addition, it is important that districts and schools not only develop formal coalitions, but also **maintain open communication with community partners and other organizations (that do not serve on the coalition) that can help those districts and schools meet the service needs of the student population**. This includes afterschool programs, day care settings, sports or recreation programs, child welfare, and law enforcement. Routine communications and sharing of school data is an important function within these partnerships. More professional development for school and district coordinators as well as school support staff on fostering and formalizing partnerships might also help to address the challenge of providing more interventions and services within the school and community environment.

**AIR recommends that schools consider a more formal mechanism for including these community partners in the overall resource mapping process, such as partner updates via emails, or newsletters; monthly meetings of coalition members and agency personnel to review progress or periodic retreats for review and planning.** More formal agreements can be established through memoranda of agreement or understanding (MOA/ MOU) that establish these roles and working relationships. In AIR’s experience, many districts have also been successful in forming a universal MOA/MOU between all child- and youth-serving systems (e.g., child welfare, juvenile justice) to inhibit information sharing barriers.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resource:**   * *3 Bold Steps for School Community Change: A Toolkit for Community Leaders* is based on lessons learned from the Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiative and examines how partnerships can work effectively together to create safe and healthy communities (<http://toolkit.promoteprevent.org>).   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**: Creating Effective Communication Protocols, Planning, and Follow-up |

**Recommendation 11: Family Engagement**

Districts identified family engagement as an area of focus from the beginning of the WAZ initiative. **They are strongly encouraged to continue to focus on parent/family engagement and identify areas where they can enhance opportunities for parents and families to partner with schools.** Districts could have a parent representative as a partner on the community coalition to share a family perspective. There are many excellent resources that focus on family engagement and partnerships. Related resources include the following.

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources:**   * Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, *Learning from Families: Identifying Service Strategies for Success*: <http://cecp.air.org/Florida_Monograph.pdf> * National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education: <http://www.ncpie.org> * U.S. Department of Education, *Engaging Parents in Education: Lessons from Five Parental Information and Resource Centers*: <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/comm/parents/parentinvolve/engagingparents.pdf>   **Related upcoming ESE technical assistance session**: Family Engagement Strategies |

#### Technical Assistance and Training

**Recommendation 12: Technical Assistance to Districts and Schools**

**ESE should focus technical assistance peer learning exchanges on issues that are of value to all districts attending these sessions**. If the content of a peer learning exchange is relevant to only a few districts, only those districts should be required to attend. Surveys of technical assistance session participants could be used to identify their priority interests or phase of implementation. The WAZ technical assistance provider should continue to use collected feedback from participants and consult with ESE to inform future technical assistance supports and continue to individualize technical assistance to meet district- specific needs at the local level.

In addition, **ESE should balance the need for technical assistance with the need for coordinators to be in their schools to carry out their WAZ work**. ESE might want to consider holding whole-group technical assistance sessions less frequently, and instead offer districts more one-on-one support on an as-needed basis. Online learning communities, or web-based events, could also help minimize time away from schools. This could provide a “connection” for school staff between in-person meetings, and enhance the utility of face-to-face time when it happens. Furthermore, web-based events could expand the reach of content and the number of school participants, especially if archived and available “on-demand.”

ESE should also provide practical, more hands-on training about developing sustainable partnerships. ESE could provide examples of effective partnerships as case studies for coordinators who could discuss the strengths each partner brought to the collaboration; describe their roles, intended outcomes and actual outcomes of the partnerships. Coordinators could then learn from these examples and apply these lessons to their own schools and districts. In addition, ESE should help districts define the term “partnership” so that coordinators understand how there is a difference between a working relationship with an organization that provides services and a formal partnership. ESE should also provide assistance to coordinators on methods/tools for formalizing partnerships (e.g., memoranda of agreement).

# V. Conclusion

This report’s findings can help ESE, school districts, schools, and other stakeholders understand current progress and conditions that may influence WAZ planning, implementation, sustainability, and replication. The current report is the first in a series of reports designed to provide evaluation findings and recommendations. In this report AIR focused its analysis on a subset of the data to provide contextual and baseline information, which will be a foundation for subsequent analysis and findings.

The data presented in this report suggest that: (1) districts have developed comprehensive wraparound plans to address the four priority improvement areas of the grant (related to climate and culture, identification of and efforts to address student needs, community coalitions, and district systems of support); (2) across districts and schools, there are strengths, but also needs for improvement, in school climate and culture in particular in the area of safety and respect; and (3) despite being in different stages of implementation there are some strengths, challenges, and experiences that are common across most districts and schools. The report also provides recommendations from school and district coordinators as well as AIR that can help with planning Year 2 WAZ activities. These recommendations are intended to highlight key areas of need and opportunity to enhance school conditions and supports for wraparound, and are not exhaustive. The 12 AIR recommendations, which reflect the four WAZ priority improvement areas and address reported findings, include the following:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Vision, goals, roles |
| 1. School-driven resource mapping |
| 1. School climate data |
| 1. Planning for changes in programs or strategies |
| 1. District guidance and leadership |
| 1. Stakeholder knowledge and buy-In |
| 1. School-based teams |
| 1. Standard protocols and timely data collection |
| 1. Early involvement of community agencies |
| 1. Community partner, communication, and coalition roles |
| 1. Family engagement |
| 1. Technical assistance to districts and schools |

Creating sustainable district services and systems of support is instrumental to the WAZ initiative. Regardless of the stage of implementation, districts should consider these 12 recommendations to address identified challenges, build on strengths, and foster sustainable services and systems. These recommendations are intended for both currently funded districts, as well as new districts/schools that are part of the 2012–13 WAZ cohort. As noted, evidence-based programs related to social and emotional supports usually need 12 to 18 months of implementation before systems see measureable progress with individual students or classroom environments. District-wide initiatives that involve broader systemic changes usually need between three and five years of implementation to realize their anticipated goals.

AIR’s evaluation efforts are ongoing. Future reports will provide additional analyses of the stakeholder interview data, including data from interviews of principals, district leaders, and external partners. AIR will discuss and confirm with ESE the content of future reports, which will include findings from a staff survey of school climate in six of the districts (Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lynn, Worcester) and data from the Springfield City Connects staff survey. AIR looks forward to producing meaningful results and recommendations that can effectively support district and school WAZ-related planning, implementation, sustainability, and replication.
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# Appendix A: Research Questions, by Data Source

| **Research Questions** | **Data Sources** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Document Reviews** | **Stakeholder Interviews** | **Teacher Focus Groups** | **Observations of Technical Assistance** | **Extant Data Analysis** | **Student Survey** | **School Staff Survey** | |
| ***Research Question Set A:******Conditions and Supports.*** What are the district, school, and other **conditions (e.g., school climate and culture) and supports** thatare in place at the beginning of the WAZ grants, and how are they **facilitating or impeding planning and implementation**? | | | | | | | | |
| A1. What ***practices*** do the WAZ plans include? | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| A2. What ***initial assessment*** occurred at the district and school levels to inform planning and implementation? Were assets, capacities, and other resources assessed? What are students’ needs in the implementing schools, and to what extent are the WAZ plans a good fit for these needs? | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | |
| A3. What ***policies/protocols*** are currently in place at the state, district, and school levels that support the WAZ initiative? | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | |
| A4. What is the ***current awareness and understanding of WAZ and its theory of action*** among district and school staff, as well as community partners? For example, do stakeholders understand the connection between mental health and learning? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ | |
| A5. How does the ***ESE*** support districts and schools in WAZ planning and implementation (e.g., planning grants, support, guidance, monitoring functions)? |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  | |
| A6. What types of ***external technical assistance***do ***WAZ grantees request*** ***or need*** to support WAZ planning/implementation? What types of technical assistance needs have ESE and the WAZ technical assistance provider, School and Main Institute (SMI), identified for the districts and schools? |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  | |
| A7. What types of support does the ***WAZ technical assistance provider*** (SMI) provide to districts and schools in planning for and implementing the WAZ? What other WAZ-related technical assistance support do districts/schools receive? Does the technical assistance align with identified technical assistance needs of districts/schools? How does it facilitate planning and implementation? | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  | |
| A8. What is the role of the ***District Wraparound Coordinator*** in each district and to what extent are there similarities and differences in their roles across districts? What are their initial skills and experiences relative to WAZ and working in districts and schools? How are these coordinators securing resources, engaging stakeholders and the interagency coalition, communicating and collaborating within the district office as well as schools and service providers, and coordinating activities to ensure successful WAZ implementation? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | |
| A9. What is the role of the ***School Wraparound Coordinator*** in each school and to what extent are there similarities and differences in their roles across schools? What are their initial skills and experiences relative to WAZ and working in districts and schools? How are these coordinators ensuring that the appropriate resources and community services are deployed at the school level to promote positive school climate and the implementation of universal and targeted student supports? How are these coordinators interacting with the interagency coalitions and families? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | |
| A10. What roles do ***interagency coalitions and community partners*** have in WAZ planning and implementation? How are the ***interagency coalitions*** bringing together and facilitating coordination of the appropriate community partners to provide services in WAZ schools? What, if any, challenges do the interagency coalitions and community partners experience in supporting WAZ planning and implementation? | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  | |
| A11. How have ***families*** been involved in planning and early implementation of WAZ supports? What has supported or impeded their engagement? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ | |
| A12. ***At the district level***, what other factors contribute to WAZ planning and implementation? What is district leadership’s role (i.e., superintendent and other key leaders) and how is it best characterized (including its quality)? Others? Which resources are most necessary to support planning and implementation? What is the ***initial quality and strength of leadership and advocacy*** for the WAZ in districts? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  | |
| A13. ***At the school level***, what other factors contribute to WAZ planning and implementation? What is school leadership’s role and how is it best characterized (including its quality)? Staff’s role? Others? Which resources are most necessary to support planning and implementation? What is the ***initial quality and strength of leadership and advocacy*** for the WAZ in schools? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ | |
| A14. Which ***conditions/supports*** are most important to facilitating planning and implementation? Why and how so? |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | |
| A15. What are ***barriers*** to WAZ planning and implementation (in particular for the District and School Wraparound Coordinators)? |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | |
| A16. What are key ***lessons learned*** as the WAZ in each district were/are planned and plans are revisited? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  | |
| ***Research Question Set B: Early Evidence of Change*.** How are districts and schools progressing on **early indicators of WAZ planning and implementation**? | | | | | | | | |
| B1. How have ***policies/procedures*** changed to support WAZ implementation? | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| B2. How much ***professional development*** and ***external technical assistance*** are ***WAZ grantees receiving***, and in what areas (topics) are they receiving technical assistance? |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| B3. What types of ***systems for student support*** are WAZ schools implementing, or planning to implement as a result of the WAZ initiative and their plans? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| B4. How are WAZ grantees ***using (or planning to use) data to screen and monitor student progress*** as a result of the WAZ initiative and their plans? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| B5. How are the roles of ***community providers*** changing over the course of planning and implementation? Are they used more strategically and do they act more strategically? What types of services are they providing differently? How often are they meeting? | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| B6. How is the ***intersection of district and school factors*** contributing to or hindering WAZ planning and implementation? How are the roles of district and school leadership changing over the course of planning and implementation? In what ways are the roles or quality of leadership at the district and school levels seemingly contributing to or hindering WAZ planning and implementation? How so? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| B7. Are there any state-level or ESE-related factors (e.g., state practices, policies, procedures) that are contributing to or impeding district and school progress toward WAZ implementation? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| B8. Are districts and schools ***implementing WAZ with fidelity***, based on their plans? If not, what are the changes and why have the changes occurred? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| B9. What are key ***lessons learned*** as the WAZ in each district are implemented? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| ***Research Question Set C: Outcomes*.** What are the **outcomes** associated with WAZ implementation? | | | | | | | | |
| After receiving a WAZ implementation grant, is there evidence of: |  | | | | | | |
| C1. Greater ***knowledge of WAZ and its theory of action*** among district and school staff as well as community partners? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| C2. Increased ***interagency collaboration***? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| C3. Improved ***practices, policies, and procedures*** for the delivery of student supports? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| C4. Greater ***coordination of service delivery*** for students and their families? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| C5. Improved ***systems for assessment and monitoring of student progress and well-being***? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| C6. Increased ***use of programmatic evaluation data for continuous quality improvement***? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| C7. Greater ***financial efficiency*** (e.g., alignment of resources)? Likelihood of financial sustainability? | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| C8. Increased ***family involvement*** in the delivery of supports to students? How are they involved? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| C9. Greater ***leadership and advocacy*** for the WAZ in districts and schools? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| C10. ***Enhanced capacity for delivering student support systems*** to: |  | | | | | | |
| * Increase ***school and district staff knowledge*** of the functions and resources necessary to maintain WAZ supports? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| * Promote ***positive school climate*,** implement ***proactive systems for identifying student needs*,**and provide ***universal and targeted supports***, over the long termat the school level? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| * Increase key ***community partner involvement in long-term relationships*** with WAZ schools? How are they involved? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| C11. ***Barriers/challenges*** that inhibit the development of any of the above, C1-C10? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| C12. Do stakeholders in WAZ schools experience ***improved perceptions of school climate*** after WAZ implementation? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| C13. What **student outcomes** are associated with WAZ implementation? Specifically, compared to non-WAZ schools and controlling for selected background characteristics, do WAZ schools experience: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Improved ***academic outcomes***? |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| * Improved ***attendance rates***? |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| * Improved ***promotion rates***? |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| * Improved ***graduation rates***? |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| * Lower ***dropout rates***? |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| * Lower ***suspension rates***? |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| * Fewer ***incidents of violence***? |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| C14. In what ways is early evidence of change (Research Question Set B) ***associated with these outcomes***? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| C15. What are key ***lessons learned*** from our analysis of outcomes associated with the WAZ in each district? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| ***Research Question Set D: Sustainability/Replication*.** Are WAZ sustainable at the district and school levels, and what supports or hinders (or will support/hinder) **sustainability and replication** in other districts and schools? | | | | | | | | |
| D1. Do districts and schools have ***WAZ sustainability plans***? At what point in WAZ planning/ implementation does sustainability planning begin? Do sustainability plans address the ***major challenges*** that individual schools/districts have experienced? | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| D2. What do key stakeholders identify as the ***biggest challenges to sustaining*** the WAZ supports after the *Race to the Top* funding has ended? In what ways have schools/districts prepared for these challenges? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| D3. What ***resources from ESE*** support, or are needed to support, districts and schools in the implementation of integrated, comprehensive systems for student support, after WAZ funding ends? What should ESE do to ***support expansion*** of WAZ to other districts after *Race to the Top* funding ends? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| D4. What aspects of WAZ do key ***stakeholders believe are sustainable***? Is there evidence that ***non-WAZ schools in WAZ districts are implementing*** wraparound services during the program funding period? For example, in what ways are non-WAZ schools, in WAZ grantee districts, beginning to implement stronger student support delivery systems, focused on non-academic needs? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| D5. What plans, funding, and infrastructure are present to continue ***interagency collaborations*** after WAZ funding ends? |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| D6. In what ways are ***families*** participating in development of district and school WAZ sustainability plans? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| D7. What plans, funding, and infrastructure are present to ensure that the ***responsibilities and functions performed by the District and School Wraparound Coordinators*** continue after WAZ funding ends? | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| D8. What plans, funding, and infrastructure are present to ensure that ***professional development and technical assistance*** related to the delivery of integrated comprehensive student supports continue after WAZ funding ends? To ensure ***knowledge of WAZ*** is sustained? | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  |
| D9. How will the ***quality and strength of leadership and advocacy*** for WAZ be sustained? | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| D10. What ***continuous quality improvement*** ***strategies*** are districts and schools implementing and planning to continue to sustain WAZ? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| D11. How have ***barriers to WAZ planning, implementation, and sustainability/replication*** changed over time? How have districts and schools ***responded to these changing barriers***? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| D12. What are key ***lessons learned*** relative to WAZ replication and sustainability planning? |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |

# Appendix B: 2010–11 Wraparound Zones Initiative Districts and Schools

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **School** | **Grade Level** |
| Fall River | Carlton M. Viveiros Elementary School | K-5 |
| Fall River | John J. Doran Elementary School | PK-6 |
| Fall River | Matthew J. Kuss Middle School | 6-8 |
| Holyoke | Kelly Elementary School\* | K-8 |
| Holyoke | Morgan Elementary School | K-8 |
| Holyoke | William R. Peck School | K-8 |
| Lawrence | Arlington Elementary School | K-4 |
| Lawrence | Arlington Middle School | 5-8 |
| Lawrence | Humanities & Leadership Development High School | 9-12 |
| Lynn | Cobbet Elementary\* | K-5 |
| Lynn | E.J. Harrington School\* | PK-5 |
| Lynn | Thurgood Marshall Middle School\* | 6-8 |
| Lynn | William P. Connery\* | K-5 |
| Springfield | Alfred G Zanetti School | PK-8 |
| Springfield | Brightwood School | K-5 |
| Springfield | Elias Brookings School | PK-5 |
| Springfield | Gerena School | PK-5 |
| Springfield | Homer Street School | K-5 |
| Springfield | White Street | K-5 |
| Worcester | Chandler Elementary Community School | PK-6 |
| Worcester | Chandler Magnet | PK-6 |
| Worcester | Goddard Elementary | PK-6 |
| Worcester | Robert H. Goddard Academy | K-12 |
| Worcester | School University Park Campus School | 7-12 |
| Worcester | Union Hill School | PK-6 |
| Worcester | Woodland Academy | PK-6 |

\* Received a Year 1 WAZ planning grant—plans to apply for Year 2 implementation

# Appendix C: Sample Interview Protocol

|  |
| --- |
| Personal Information/Background *I’d like to start by asking a couple of questions about your role and background.* |
| 1. First, I’d like to ask about your background. How long have you been working in this school? In this school district? Can you briefly describe your work—whether with the school or not—prior to becoming a School Wraparound Coordinator[[10]](#footnote-10)? What previous skills and experiences do you have that makes this work a good fit for you? When and how did you first become involved with the wraparound initiative? (ask about planning if not mentioned) |
| 1. What are your current coordinator responsibilities? Do you have responsibilities outside of this role? If so, can you briefly describe these and what percentage of your time you spend on these responsibilities? |
| School/District Context |
| 1. I realize that every school is unique in terms of its context, staff, students, and community. What do you think are your school’s key strengths? Critical areas of need? In terms of: *[Be sure to get information on both strengths and weaknesses]*    1. School climate and culture    2. Delivery of non-academic supports related to students’ physical, mental, and social-emotional health    3. School staff    4. Students    5. The larger community (SES, community issues that may negatively impact students’ physical, social and emotional development)    6. Have these key strengths or critical areas of need changed since the planning/implementation of wraparound? |
| Wraparound Zones Initiative |
| 1. What role, if any, did you school have in applying for the wraparound grant? |
| 1. Would you describe the wraparound strategies as new to the school, or do you believe they build on your school’s existing efforts to support students?    1. If new, how do you see wraparound connecting to existing improvement efforts? In what ways is it aligned?    2. If wraparound builds on existing efforts, how? (Probe: existing policies, partnerships) |
| 1. Can you briefly describe the current status of wraparound planning/implementation at your school?   Probes:   * 1. Are any key aspects of wraparound still being planned?   2. Have you begun to implement a wraparound process? If currently implementing, when did implementation begin? What features are currently being implemented? |
| 1. At this moment, what are your greatest priorities for planning/implementing the wraparound initiative in the district?  * Can you describe what you think are the most important features of the wraparound initiative being [planned/ implemented] in this district? Why? * What school and student outcomes are you expecting will result from implementing wraparound in your district? (*Interviewer should note if respondent mentions any of the key goals of the Wraparound initiative: to promote a positive school climate, implement proactive systems for identifying student needs, and provide universal and targeted supports*) Listen for:   + Student academic outcomes   + Student socio-emotional outcomes   + Student engagement   + School climate   + Engaging in community partnerships   + Building school capacity |
| Wraparound Planning |
| 1. (Ask only if interviewee was involved in planning) Can you tell us about your school’s wraparound planning process? Who was involved? (probe about key district and school roles)   What existing challenges were raised during the planning process? What existing strengths or supports were built into the planning for the school’s wraparound efforts? |
| 1. Was there an initial assessment of student needs and/or capacities and resources for the wraparound initiative? If yes, how was this assessment conducted (formal/informal)? What did it include? Are there ongoing efforts to assess student needs?    * Does the district help schools use data to determine student needs? How?    * What types of student data are examined (e.g., MCAS, academic assessments, etc.)?    * How frequently are student data examined to determine needs?    * In what ways if any has this process changed as a result of wraparound? |
| 1. *[For districts that are in the* ***planning phase: FOR LYNN ONLY****]* How will the school’s Wraparound Initiative meet the needs of students in your school? 2. **Student Supports** - What supports or services do you plan to have available for students? When? Which students will receive these supports (e.g., all students, a subgroup of students)? When? *Note: Refer to student needs identified earlier]?* 3. **Identifying Student Needs -** Is there a system in place? Assessments used? Specific data collection tools or database? 4. **Staffing** - Are there plans to hire new staff? Or will staff have new roles due to the initiative? 5. **School Climate** – Are any strategies being planned to address school climate |
| Wraparound Implementation *Now AIR would like to learn more about how the Wraparound Zone Initiative is being implemented in your school [Note to Interviewer: With districts that are still planning, be sure to only refer to planning in the following set of questions.]* |
| 1. Could you describe this school’s process for connecting students with supports (i.e., from how students are identified for services to deciding what services the students should receive to connecting students with the appropriate service providers and follow-up )? |
| 1. Could you describe your communications or interactions with other staff about wraparound?  * With whom do you communicate/interact (at your school, from the district, which community-based service providers? * How often do you discuss wraparound and what types of topics do you discuss? |
| 1. How are families involved in wraparound services?  * How do you communicate with parents/families about wraparound? * Have there been any challenges or successes that you would like to share about parent involvement related to wraparound? |
| 1. Who else from the school is involved in wraparound implementation? How so? |
| 1. Can you describe the role of any external partners (e.g., community-based service providers, consultants), who are involved in the implementation of wraparound in this school?  * Did these partnerships exist prior to the wraparound initiative or are they new? * How were these partnerships established? Did you play a role in the establishment of these partnerships? * How do you interact with these partners? * *[for implementation districts}* How do these partners support implementation? * Are there other agencies or organizations with which you would like to partner? Why? |
| 1. Is there a formal district coalition that brings together agencies providing non-academic support services to students in this school? If yes, can you describe this coalition for us?  * How has the coalition been involved in providing services to students? * Have there been any challenges associated with the coalition? * How do you interact with the coalition? |
| Wraparound Supports |
| 1. What resources (e.g., data systems, having a district or school coordinator in place) have been most necessary to support the planning/implementation of the wraparound process in your school? Please describe any resources or support that you still need. |
| 1. Do you receive or have you received support in planning/implementation of the wraparound initiative? If yes, please describe this support from:    1. School and Main    2. ESE?    3. Outside consultants    4. How helpful is/was this support? How so? |
| 1. Have you requested any professional development or external technical assistance for the planning or implementation of the wraparound initiative for your school? If yes,  * Can you describe the type of professional development/technical assistance requested? * Has this need been addressed? How so? |
| 1. What do you see as the primary role of the District Wraparound Coordinator? Do you feel supported by the District Wraparound Coordinator in your role as school coordinator? Why or why not? |
| 1. How would you describe the quality and strength of *district* leadership related to wraparound?  * Do you feel there is buy-in from district leadership? Why or why not? * Do you feel supported by district leadership in your role as coordinator? Why or why not? |
| 1. How would you describe the quality and strength of *school* leadership for this initiative?  * Do you feel there is buy-in from school leadership? Why or why not? * Do you feel supported by school leadership in your role as coordinator? Why or why not? |
| 1. How would you characterize the level of staff knowledge about the wraparound initiative? |
| 1. How would you characterize the level of school staff buy-in for this initiative? To what do you attribute the current level of buy-in? |
| 1. Have you received any support in developing collaborative partnerships with organizations that provide wraparound services to students in your school? If yes, from whom have you received this support? |
| 1. Are there any current policies or protocols that are hindering implementation of wraparound-related efforts? If yes, can you describe them? |
| Closing |
| 1. Are there any lessons that you have learned as you have planned and/or begun implementation? If you could provide advice to another coordinator trying to implement a wraparound initiative in their school what would you tell them? |
| 1. Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience or your school’s wraparound initiative that I have not already asked about? |

# Appendix D: Massachusetts Wraparound Zones Initiative 2011–12 Implementation Strategies, by Initiative Priority Improvement Area and School District

| District | Climate and Culture | Identify and Address Student Needs | Community Coalitions | District Systems of Support |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fall River | * Implement social emotional learning or healthy behavior curricula: Responsive Classroom and Playworks (elementary schools) and Guided Discipline (middle school) * Conduct a school climate and culture survey (students, staff, and parents) to establish baseline and determine areas of need * Continue implementation of the middle school advisory program designed to develop positive and collaborative relationships between students and promote student connection to school | * Use existing CAT teams (Curriculum Accommodation Teams) as main referral, intervention, and case management team that fields teacher referrals, develops individualized student academic and social-emotional support plans, and tracks support * Develop/recast school-based Wellness Teams and use as main team responsible for WAZ implementation in the building and development of strategies that support overall needs of student body * Conduct resource mapping and needs assessment designed to identify existing resources and parent interests * Use findings of needs assessment to identify resource gaps and WAZ development priorities * Expand or develop activities, programs, or services designed to meet priority student and climate and culture needs | * Identify valuable community WAZ partners and appropriate level and types of engagement * Establish more routine methods for reviewing and coordinating resources * Leverage existing community coalitions and mobilize support for wraparound strategies * Develop a Community Wellness Team or coalition to advise the district on school-community collaboration and develop strong student/wrap strategies | * Provide professional development and coordination support for school-based WAZ implementation * Establish consistent systems, practices, and protocols across schools for core WAZ activities * Develop and maintain a community resource directory * Establish strong collaboration with FRPS parent engagement office and develop core WAZ activities for parents * Develop a Community Wellness Team |
| Holyoke | * School-wide teacher training and ongoing consultation on new Behavioral Responsive System (for both Peck and Morgan) * Establishment of the middle school CAT (Caring Adult Team) (Peck) * Establishment of school-wide intensive behavioral support program for targeted students (Peck) * Assess and make improvements to existing school-wide positive and responsive behavior management system (Morgan) * Establish comprehensive system to meet parents and family needs, including establishing a parent resource center, conducting a parent survey, hiring a family engagement coordinator, and offering family events (Morgan) * Establish meaningful roles for parents in school (Morgan) * Reconvene HUB family assistance team to provide communication and problem solving for students and families in crisis (Morgan) * Offer a variety of parent and family workshops (Morgan) | * Identify target families in Peck attendance zone * Arrange ongoing visits to families (Peck) * Establish relationships with local formal and informal early education and care providers (Peck) * Design, recruit for, and facilitate monthly readiness workshops March-August 2012 (Peck) * Conduct a needs and assets assessment (Morgan) * Identify community partners to provide programs and services that align with identified student needs (Morgan) * Create FSCS project manager position that includes structures and systems to support an ongoing cycle of needs and assets identification and responsive programming (Morgan) * Create a Family Access and Engagement Coordinator position | * Expansion of Peck FSCS Full Partnership to become district level FSCS partnership * Prepare for a district-wide FSCS feasibility study or planning process | * Implement a district-level community of practice as a learning community for the three FSCS * Identify issues benefiting from district action or district-level policy implications |
| Lawrence | * Survey staff, students and parents about climate and culture and analyze data to assess overall needs * Introduce or reintroduce PBS to each school * District team and consultant monitors and supports school-based PBS teams * Provide PD to staff and parents on key issues identified in survey data | * Establish school-based support teams to address overall wellness issues * Conduct annual social-emotional or behavioral or health screening for all students * Assess the interventions available at each school for addressing SHE needs and bolster options as needed * Implement a school-based case management system | * Expand the Agency Partnership Assistance Network * Formalize partnerships with the schools through an MOU * Create an electronic bulletin board where info on services can be shared * Create a consistent referral system for support services | * Establish district leadership team to spearhead and monitor implementation efforts * Review existing support systems for redundancy and needed revisions * Communicate changes in the support service access and delivery system and train school personnel on new approach * Review the current wellness programs for vertical alignment and fidelity of implementation |
| Springfield | * Employ City Connects model and ensure teachers are aware of practices * PBIS and/or Responsive Classroom * Administer OHI and use to create action plans | * Whole class reviews * Individual student review plans created by STAT teams (for students with intensive needs) * SSCs gather data on family needs and assist them with the referral process | * Identify community based resources (asset mapping) and gaps in services * Development of a Community Advisory Board | * Establish Committee for Student Support * Professional development and supervision for SSCs |
| Worcester | * Survey students, parents, and staff about school climate issues and needs * Develop systems within each school to aid the family support teams and strengthen support strategies * Provide PD to staff to address needs identified during the survey analysis * Each school brings in additional service providers as needed to meet needs | * Hire Wraparound Outreach Coordinators at each school * Develop common system of case management in alignment with the school’s student and family support team * Develop process of establishing the health-wellness needs of students and developing targeted intervention plans * Identify community partners to meet the needs of the students, families, and schools | * Identify existing community resources and map geographically * Formalize key partnerships through MOUs * Develop an ongoing plan to identify new community partners * Use the HMH Pinpoint System to facilitate a two-way system of communication between the schools and their partners | * Use district leadership to monitor the delivery and effectiveness of WAZ * Implement the HMH Pinpoint System * PD plan to support the implementation of the Pinpoint System * Use district leadership to develop a plan that identifies community based resources within the WAZ catchment area |

# Appendix E: Conditions for Learning Survey Results, Spring 2012, Fall River Public Schools

**Fall River, Grades 2–4: Carlton M. Viveiros Elementary (CMV) and John J. Doran Elementary (JJD)**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | Adequate | | Excellent | |
| CMV | JJD | CMV | JJD | CMV | JJD |
| Overall | 29 | 17 | 39 | 39 | 32 | 44 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | 41 | 33 | 36 | 42 | 23 | 25 |
| Hispanic | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 30 | 16 | 39 | 39 | 31 | 45 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 22 | 30 | 33 | 40 | 44 | 30 |
| Students with Disabilities | 32 | 19 | 37 | 35 | 32 | 45 |
| English Language Learners | 26 | 19 | 47 | 36 | 26 | 45 |
| Male | 33 | 19 | 35 | 38 | 32 | 44 |
| Female | 26 | 17 | 42 | 39 | 32 | 44 |
| Grade 2 | 19 | 8 | 36 | 33 | 45 | 59 |
| Grade 3 | 36 | 21 | 44 | 45 | 19 | 33 |
| Grade 4 | 37 | 26 | 34 | 37 | 29 | 37 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | Adequate | | Excellent | |
| CMV | JJD | CMV | JJD | CMV | JJD |
| Overall | 11 | 9 | 68 | 64 | 21 | 27 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | 9 | 17 | 82 | 67 | 9 | 17 |
| Hispanic | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 12 | 8 | 68 | 64 | 20 | 28 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 4 | 20 | 67 | 60 | 30 | 20 |
| Students with Disabilities | 5 | 6 | 67 | 58 | 28 | 35 |
| English Language Learners | 16 | 16 | 47 | 59 | 37 | 26 |
| Male | 8 | 11 | 67 | 62 | 24 | 27 |
| Female | 14 | 7 | 69 | 66 | 17 | 27 |
| Grade 2 | 5 | 3 | 68 | 59 | 27 | 39 |
| Grade 3 | 13 | 15 | 69 | 61 | 18 | 24 |
| Grade 4 | 17 | 10 | 69 | 74 | 14 | 16 |

See notes at the end of all elementary school tables.

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | Adequate | | Excellent | |
| CMV | JJD | CMV | JJD | CMV | JJD |
| Overall | 30 | 24 | 30 | 31 | 40 | 45 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | 41 | 17 | 32 | 42 | 27 | 42 |
| Hispanic | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 30 | 24 | 31 | 30 | 39 | 46 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 22 | 40 | 33 | 30 | 44 | 30 |
| Students with Disabilities | 26 | 23 | 26 | 29 | 47 | 48 |
| English Language Learners | 42 | 24 | 26 | 31 | 32 | 45 |
| Male | 31 | 24 | 27 | 30 | 43 | 47 |
| Female | 30 | 25 | 36 | 32 | 34 | 43 |
| Grade 2 | 24 | 20 | 36 | 31 | 40 | 49 |
| Grade 3 | 29 | 35 | 27 | 30 | 43 | 35 |
| Grade 4 | 41 | 18 | 28 | 32 | 31 | 50 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | Adequate | | Excellent | |
| CMV | JJD | CMV | JJD | CMV | JJD |
| Overall | 19 | 23 | 43 | 37 | 37 | 40 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | 27 | 33 | 36 | 33 | 36 | 33 |
| Hispanic | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 20 | 22 | 44 | 36 | 36 | 41 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 11 | 40 | 44 | 50 | 44 | 10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 21 | 35 | 49 | 29 | 30 | 35 |
| English Language Learners | 21 | 29 | 58 | 28 | 21 | 43 |
| Male | 19 | 26 | 48 | 36 | 33 | 39 |
| Female | 20 | 21 | 39 | 38 | 41 | 41 |
| Grade 2 | 19 | 16 | 43 | 33 | 39 | 51 |
| Grade 3 | 13 | 30 | 44 | 38 | 42 | 32 |
| Grade 4 | 30 | 24 | 43 | 40 | 27 | 35 |

‡ Reporting standards not met due to fewer than ten students completing the survey.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

***Fall River, Grades 2-4: Carlton M. Viveiros Elementary School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **No (%)** | **Sometimes (%)** | **Yes (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 37.8 | 44.4 | 16.9 | 0.9 |  | 331 |
| When I work toward a goal, it gets all my attention. | 9.7 | 33.2 | 55.9 | 1.2 |  | 331 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 19.6 | 43.2 | 36.0 | 0.9 | 1 | 331 |
| I get distracted easily. | 29.9 | 35.0 | 34.1 | 0.9 |  | 331 |
| I get started on my work right away. | 4.5 | 26.3 | 67.7 | 1.5 |  | 331 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 37.8 | 45.0 | 15.7 | 1.5 |  | 331 |
| I work hard. | 2.4 | 23.3 | 74.0 | 0.3 |  | 331 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 42.3 | 31.4 | 25.7 | 0.6 |  | 331 |
| I work carefully. | 4.2 | 33.8 | 60.7 | 1.2 |  | 331 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 47.1 | 29.6 | 21.8 | 1.2 | 1 | 331 |
| I can keep working even when I would rather not. | 10.9 | 19.3 | 68.3 | 1.5 |  | 331 |
| When things are hard to understand, I usually quit or leave. | 69.2 | 19.0 | 10.3 | 1.5 |  | 331 |
| I keep doing things I need to do even if I do not like them. | 9.7 | 20.5 | 65.6 | 4.2 |  | 331 |
| I find it hard to pay attention when I study. | 42.6 | 28.1 | 24.8 | 4.5 |  | 331 |
| I can be counted on. | 6.0 | 22.4 | 65.9 | 5.4 | 1 | 331 |
| I am easily distracted. | 30.2 | 38.4 | 26.6 | 4.8 |  | 331 |
| I have strong self-control. | 14.2 | 29.6 | 50.5 | 5.1 | 2 | 331 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 32.0 | 43.8 | 22.7 | 1.5 |  | 331 |
| I can stay away from things that are bad for me. | 10.6 | 19.3 | 68.6 | 1.5 |  | 331 |

***Fall River, Grades 2-4: John J. Doran School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **No (%)** | **Sometimes (%)** | **Yes (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 39.6 | 44.4 | 15.9 | - |  | 207 |
| When I work toward a goal, it gets all my attention. | 11.1 | 22.2 | 65.7 | 1.0 |  | 207 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 23.2 | 31.9 | 44.9 | - |  | 207 |
| I get distracted easily. | 30.9 | 35.7 | 32.9 | 0.5 |  | 207 |
| I get started on my work right away. | 7.2 | 32.9 | 59.9 | - |  | 207 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 37.7 | 45.9 | 15.9 | 0.5 |  | 207 |
| I work hard. | 1.9 | 28.0 | 70.0 | - |  | 207 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 51.7 | 28.5 | 19.8 | - |  | 207 |
| I work carefully. | 4.3 | 31.4 | 63.8 | 0.5 |  | 207 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 46.4 | 30.0 | 23.7 | - |  | 207 |
| I can keep working even when I would rather not. | 10.6 | 20.8 | 68.6 | - |  | 207 |
| When things are hard to understand, I usually quit or leave. | 74.9 | 16.4 | 8.2 | 0.5 |  | 207 |
| I keep doing things I need to do even if I do not like them. | 8.7 | 21.3 | 69.6 | 0.5 |  | 207 |
| I find it hard to pay attention when I study. | 39.6 | 31.9 | 27.5 | 1.0 |  | 207 |
| I can be counted on. | 5.3 | 20.3 | 73.4 | 1.0 |  | 207 |
| I am easily distracted. | 38.6 | 32.9 | 28.0 | 0.5 |  | 207 |
| I have strong self-control. | 14.5 | 34.3 | 51.2 | - |  | 207 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 35.3 | 39.1 | 25.1 | 0.5 |  | 207 |
| I can stay away from things that are bad for me. | 9.7 | 17.9 | 72.5 | - |  | 207 |

**Fall River: Grade 5 Carlton M. Viveiros Elementary (CMV), Grades 5–6 John J. Doran Elementary (JJD), and Grades 6–8 Matthew J. Kuss Middle School (MJK)**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| CMV | JJD | MJK | CMV | JJD | MJK | CMV | JJD | MJK |
| Overall | 6 | 6 | 8 | 63 | 54 | 75 | 31 | 40 | 18 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | 0 | ‡ | ‡ | 92 | ‡ | ‡ | 8 |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | 10 | ‡ | ‡ | 75 | ‡ | ‡ | 15 |
| Hispanic | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 8 | 4 | 8 | 65 | 50 | 74 | 28 | 46 | 18 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | 13 | ‡ | ‡ | 81 | ‡ | ‡ | 6 |
| Students with Disabilities | 5 | 7 | 6 | 57 | 79 | 77 | 38 | 14 | 17 |
| English Language Learners | ‡ | 8 | 6 | ‡ | 54 | 82 | ‡ | 38 | 12 |
| Male | 8 | 6 | 7 | 55 | 53 | 73 | 37 | 40 | 19 |
| Female | 4 | 6 | 8 | 72 | 53 | 75 | 23 | 42 | 16 |
| Grade 5 | 6 | 8 | ‡ | 64 | 46 | ‡ | 30 | 46 | ‡ |
| Grade 6 | ‡ | 3 | 13 | ‡ | 65 | 75 | ‡ | 32 | 12 |
| Grade 7 | ‡ | ‡ | 4 | ‡ | ‡ | 72 | ‡ | ‡ | 23 |
| Grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ | 7 | ‡ | ‡ | 77 | ‡ | ‡ | 17 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| CMV | JJD | MJK | CMV | JJD | MJK | CMV | JJD | MJK |
| Overall | 28 | 21 | 38 | 55 | 54 | 49 | 17 | 25 | 13 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | 42 | ‡ | ‡ | 33 | ‡ | ‡ | 25 |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | 48 | ‡ | ‡ | 43 | ‡ | ‡ | 10 |
| Hispanic | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 30 | 22 | 36 | 56 | 51 | 51 | 14 | 26 | 13 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | 38 | ‡ | ‡ | 44 | ‡ | ‡ | 19 |
| Students with Disabilities | 29 | 29 | 21 | 52 | 43 | 56 | 19 | 29 | 23 |
| English Language Learners | ‡ | 29 | 24 | ‡ | 46 | 53 | ‡ | 25 | 24 |
| Male | 27 | 17 | 37 | 57 | 53 | 49 | 16 | 30 | 14 |
| Female | 30 | 28 | 38 | 55 | 53 | 50 | 15 | 19 | 12 |
| Grade 5 | 28 | 8 | ‡ | 56 | 52 | ‡ | 16 | 40 | ‡ |
| Grade 6 | ‡ | 45 | 29 | ‡ | 55 | 52 | ‡ | 0 | 19 |
| Grade 7 | ‡ | ‡ | 39 | ‡ | ‡ | 46 | ‡ | ‡ | 14 |
| Grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ | 45 | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | ‡ | ‡ | 5 |

See notes at the end of all middle school tables.

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| CMV | JJD | MJK | CMV | JJD | MJK | CMV | JJD | MJK |
| Overall | 38 | 25 | 33 | 53 | 58 | 51 | 9 | 17 | 17 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | ‡ | ‡ | 42 | ‡ | ‡ | 8 |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | 35 | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | ‡ | ‡ | 15 |
| Hispanic | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 42 | 28 | 31 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 8 | 21 | 17 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | 25 | ‡ | ‡ | 56 | ‡ | ‡ | 19 |
| Students with Disabilities | 43 | 21 | 29 | 57 | 71 | 55 | 0 | 7 | 16 |
| English Language Learners | ‡ | 33 | 35 | ‡ | 50 | 53 | ‡ | 17 | 12 |
| Male | 35 | 23 | 27 | 57 | 57 | 52 | 8 | 19 | 21 |
| Female | 40 | 25 | 37 | 49 | 61 | 50 | 11 | 14 | 12 |
| Grade 5 | 38 | 21 | ‡ | 53 | 58 | ‡ | 9 | 21 | ‡ |
| Grade 6 | ‡ | 29 | 32 | ‡ | 61 | 49 | ‡ | 10 | 19 |
| Grade 7 | ‡ | ‡ | 30 | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | ‡ | ‡ | 20 |
| Grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ | 36 | ‡ | ‡ | 56 | ‡ | ‡ | 9 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| CMV | JJD | MJK | CMV | JJD | MJK | CMV | JJD | MJK |
| Overall | 9 | 6 | 12 | 68 | 73 | 77 | 22 | 21 | 11 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | 0 | ‡ | ‡ | 100 | ‡ | ‡ | 0 |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | 20 | ‡ | ‡ | 78 | ‡ | ‡ | 3 |
| Hispanic | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 9 | 6 | 12 | 70 | 75 | 76 | 22 | 19 | 12 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | 13 | ‡ | ‡ | 81 | ‡ | ‡ | 6 |
| Students with Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 7 | 62 | 79 | 76 | 38 | 21 | 17 |
| English Language Learners | ‡ | 13 | 6 | ‡ | 75 | 76 | ‡ | 13 | 18 |
| Male | 10 | 6 | 10 | 67 | 68 | 78 | 22 | 26 | 12 |
| Female | 9 | 6 | 15 | 70 | 81 | 75 | 21 | 14 | 10 |
| Grade 5 | 9 | 10 | ‡ | 69 | 60 | ‡ | 22 | 31 | ‡ |
| Grade 6 | ‡ | 0 | 10 | ‡ | 97 | 80 | ‡ | 3 | 10 |
| Grade 7 | ‡ | ‡ | 11 | ‡ | ‡ | 74 | ‡ | ‡ | 15 |
| Grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ | 16 | ‡ | ‡ | 75 | ‡ | ‡ | 8 |

‡ Reporting standards not met due to fewer than ten students completing the survey.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

***Fall River, Grade 5: Carlton M. Viveiros Elementary School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 27.0 | 26.0 | 25.0 | 15.0 | 7.0 |  | 100 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 6.0 | 9.0 | 46.0 | 29.0 | 10.0 |  | 100 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 12.0 | 14.0 | 38.0 | 26.0 | 10.0 |  | 100 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 18.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 14.0 | 10.0 |  | 100 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 7.0 | 17.0 | 32.0 | 33.0 | 11.0 |  | 100 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 36.0 | 29.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 9.0 |  | 100 |
| I work hard. | 2.0 | 5.0 | 38.0 | 46.0 | 9.0 |  | 100 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 24.0 | 19.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 10.0 | 1 | 100 |
| I work carefully. | 5.0 | 11.0 | 47.0 | 27.0 | 10.0 |  | 100 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 27.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 25.0 | 10.0 |  | 100 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 6.0 | 10.0 | 44.0 | 29.0 | 11.0 |  | 100 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 41.0 | 24.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 11.0 |  | 100 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 9.0 | 10.0 | 34.0 | 36.0 | 11.0 |  | 100 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 4.0 | 12.0 |  | 100 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 3.0 | 10.0 | 30.0 | 45.0 | 12.0 |  | 100 |
| I can be counted on. | 5.0 | 8.0 | 23.0 | 50.0 | 13.0 | 1 | 100 |
| I am easily distracted. | 23.0 | 23.0 | 20.0 | 22.0 | 12.0 |  | 100 |
| I have strong self-control. | 8.0 | 14.0 | 36.0 | 31.0 | 11.0 |  | 100 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 23.0 | 24.0 | 25.0 | 17.0 | 11.0 |  | 100 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 8.0 | 15.0 | 26.0 | 38.0 | 13.0 |  | 100 |

***Fall River, Grades 5-6: John J. Doran School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 23.3 | 22.2 | 37.8 | 8.9 | 7.8 |  | 90 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 2.2 | 16.7 | 45.6 | 30.0 | 4.4 | 1 | 90 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 18.9 | 18.9 | 34.4 | 24.4 | 3.3 |  | 90 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 18.9 | 33.3 | 27.8 | 14.4 | 5.6 |  | 90 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 4.4 | 18.9 | 43.3 | 25.6 | 7.8 |  | 90 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 26.7 | 32.2 | 27.8 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 1 | 90 |
| I work hard. | 2.2 | 6.7 | 34.4 | 48.9 | 7.8 |  | 90 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 25.6 | 18.9 | 23.3 | 25.6 | 6.7 |  | 90 |
| I work carefully. | 4.4 | 12.2 | 52.2 | 26.7 | 4.4 |  | 90 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 31.1 | 26.7 | 14.4 | 22.2 | 5.6 |  | 90 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 4.4 | 13.3 | 40.0 | 35.6 | 6.7 |  | 90 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 34.4 | 33.3 | 14.4 | 11.1 | 6.7 |  | 90 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 4.4 | 13.3 | 41.1 | 35.6 | 5.6 |  | 90 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 23.3 | 20.0 | 36.7 | 13.3 | 5.6 | 1 | 90 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 10.0 | 6.7 | 40.0 | 36.7 | 6.7 |  | 90 |
| I can be counted on. | 6.7 | 10.0 | 41.1 | 35.6 | 6.7 |  | 90 |
| I am easily distracted. | 14.4 | 32.2 | 28.9 | 17.8 | 6.7 |  | 90 |
| I have strong self-control. | 16.7 | 21.1 | 32.2 | 24.4 | 5.6 |  | 90 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 23.3 | 31.1 | 32.2 | 7.8 | 5.6 |  | 90 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 5.6 | 13.3 | 36.7 | 38.9 | 5.6 |  | 90 |

***Fall River, Grades 6-8: Matthew J. Kuss Middle School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 16.9 | 33.6 | 28.2% | 10.6 | 10.6 | 1 | 614 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 3.7 | 22.0 | 47.4 | 15.3 | 11.2 | 2 | 614 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 8.6 | 21.7 | 37.3 | 20.8 | 11.4 | 1 | 614 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 9.1 | 25.7 | 34.4 | 18.1 | 12.4 | 2 | 614 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 5.9 | 30.0 | 36.5 | 15.1 | 12.2 | 2 | 614 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 18.9 | 37.0 | 25.4 | 6.2 | 12.2 | 2 | 614 |
| I work hard. | 2.9 | 11.6 | 43.6 | 29.5 | 11.9 | 3 | 614 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 20.2 | 29.3 | 19.7 | 17.8 | 12.5 | 3 | 614 |
| I work carefully. | 2.0 | 15.1 | 54.6 | 15.0 | 12.9 | 3 | 614 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 27.2 | 27.7 | 19.1 | 13.0 | 12.9 | 1 | 614 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 2.8 | 18.7 | 47.1 | 17.6 | 13.7 | 1 | 614 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 20.8 | 39.3 | 19.1 | 6.7 | 14.0 | 1 | 614 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 3.9 | 18.6 | 46.9 | 16.6 | 13.4 | 4 | 614 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 11.7 | 27.9 | 31.6 | 15.3 | 13.4 | 1 | 614 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 4.6 | 16.1 | 40.7 | 23.9 | 14.3 | 2 | 614 |
| I can be counted on. | 2.1 | 6.0 | 46.7 | 29.6 | 15.1 | 2 | 614 |
| I am easily distracted. | 13.5 | 20.8 | 30.6 | 19.9 | 14.3 | 5 | 614 |
| I have strong self-control. | 7.2 | 18.4 | 38.1 | 21.3 | 14.2 | 5 | 614 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 14.0 | 28.5 | 29.8 | 13.0 | 14.5 | 1 | 614 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 6.5 | 16.0 | 33.6 | 29.8 | 14.0 | 1 | 614 |

# Appendix F: Conditions for Learning Survey Results, Spring 2012, Holyoke Public Schools

**Holyoke, Grades 2–4: Kelly Elementary School, Morgan Elementary School, and William R. Peck School**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck |
| Overall | 20 | 24 | 28 | 40 | 43 | 36 | 40 | 33 | 35 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 19 | 22 | 24 | 39 | 43 | 38 | 42 | 35 | 38 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | 80 | ‡ | ‡ | 20 | ‡ | ‡ | 0 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 19 | 39 | 28 | 44 | 34 | 44 | 37 | 26 | 28 |
| English Language Learners | 17 | 21 | 19 | 36 | 46 | 33 | 47 | 33 | 49 |
| Male | 17 | 25 | 36 | 38 | 45 | 38 | 45 | 29 | 26 |
| Female | 23 | 22 | 23 | 41 | 40 | 36 | 36 | 37 | 41 |
| Grade 2 | 24 | 29 | 35 | 42 | 38 | 29 | 34 | 33 | 36 |
| Grade 3 | 25 | 30 | 27 | 50 | 38 | 42 | 25 | 33 | 32 |
| Grade 4 | 10 | 11 | 21 | 25 | 54 | 42 | 65 | 35 | 37 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck |
| Overall | 11 | 10 | 9 | 64 | 61 | 69 | 25 | 28 | 22 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 11 | 10 | 9 | 64 | 62 | 68 | 25 | 28 | 23 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | 30 | ‡ | ‡ | 70 | ‡ | ‡ | 0 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 22 | 13 | 12 | 67 | 55 | 60 | 11 | 32 | 28 |
| English Language Learners | 12 | 10 | 3 | 70 | 67 | 69 | 18 | 23 | 29 |
| Male | 8 | 16 | 10 | 64 | 56 | 69 | 28 | 27 | 21 |
| Female | 14 | 6 | 9 | 64 | 66 | 69 | 22 | 28 | 22 |
| Grade 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 63 | 56 | 70 | 34 | 40 | 21 |
| Grade 3 | 8 | 23 | 12 | 73 | 60 | 62 | 19 | 18 | 27 |
| Grade 4 | 25 | 5 | 7 | 56 | 70 | 79 | 19 | 24 | 14 |

See notes at the end of all tables for grades 2–4.

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck |
| Overall | 29 | 37 | 48 | 36 | 25 | 32 | 35 | 38 | 20 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 29 | 39 | 47 | 37 | 25 | 32 | 34 | 36 | 20 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | 60 | ‡ | ‡ | 40 | ‡ | ‡ | 0 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 22 | 47 | 49 | 41 | 26 | 35 | 37 | 26 | 16 |
| English Language Learners | 24 | 39 | 47 | 36 | 23 | 33 | 40 | 38 | 20 |
| Male | 26 | 44 | 46 | 34 | 15 | 39 | 39 | 42 | 15 |
| Female | 31 | 31 | 49 | 39 | 34 | 28 | 30 | 34 | 23 |
| Grade 2 | 25 | 33 | 55 | 39 | 20 | 32 | 36 | 47 | 14 |
| Grade 3 | 29 | 50 | 45 | 40 | 25 | 32 | 31 | 25 | 23 |
| Grade 4 | 33 | 27 | 42 | 29 | 32 | 35 | 38 | 41 | 23 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck |
| Overall | 18 | 25 | 31 | 46 | 48 | 44 | 36 | 27 | 25 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 17 | 26 | 28 | 45 | 47 | 44 | 38 | 27 | 28 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | ‡ | ‡ | 0 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 30 | 34 | 44 | 44 | 47 | 44 | 26 | 18 | 12 |
| English Language Learners | 18 | 25 | 34 | 45 | 49 | 43 | 37 | 26 | 23 |
| Male | 21 | 22 | 46 | 46 | 44 | 39 | 33 | 35 | 15 |
| Female | 14 | 28 | 20 | 46 | 49 | 47 | 40 | 22 | 33 |
| Grade 2 | 24 | 31 | 32 | 59 | 47 | 44 | 17 | 22 | 24 |
| Grade 3 | 17 | 30 | 28 | 48 | 53 | 50 | 35 | 18 | 22 |
| Grade 4 | 10 | 14 | 33 | 27 | 41 | 35 | 63 | 46 | 33 |

‡ Reporting standards not met due to fewer than ten students completing the survey.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

***Holyoke, Grades 2-4: Morgan Elementary School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **No (%)** | **Sometimes (%)** | **Yes (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 41.9 | 36.3 | 21.8 | - |  | 124 |
| When I work toward a goal, it gets all my attention. | 12.1 | 25.8 | 60.5 | 1.6 |  | 124 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 16.9 | 37.1 | 45.2 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I get distracted easily. | 29.0 | 33.1 | 36.3 | 1.6 |  | 124 |
| I get started on my work right away. | 6.5 | 33.9 | 58.1 | 1.6 |  | 124 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 25.0 | 44.4 | 29.0 | 1.6 |  | 124 |
| I work hard. | 3.2 | 25.8 | 70.2 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 37.9 | 30.6 | 30.6 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I work carefully. | 4.0 | 25.0 | 70.2 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 33.9 | 26.6 | 37.9 | 1.6 |  | 124 |
| I can keep working even when I would rather not. | 13.7 | 26.6 | 58.9 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| When things are hard to understand, I usually quit or leave. | 58.1 | 25.8 | 15.3 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I keep doing things I need to do even if I do not like them. | 12.1 | 25.0 | 62.1 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I find it hard to pay attention when I study. | 35.5 | 35.5 | 28.2 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I can be counted on. | 8.9 | 25.8 | 62.9 | 2.4 |  | 124 |
| I am easily distracted. | 27.4 | 37.9 | 33.9 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I have strong self-control. | 21.8 | 29.0 | 47.6 | 1.6 |  | 124 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 27.4 | 39.5 | 32.3 | 0.8 |  | 124 |
| I can stay away from things that are bad for me. | 11.3 | 16.1 | 71.8 | 0.8 |  | 124 |

***Holyoke, Grades 2-4: William R. Peck School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **No (%)** | **Sometimes (%)** | **Yes (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 42.8 | 39.3 | 16.8 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| When I work toward a goal, it gets all my attention. | 11.6 | 29.5 | 57.8 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 23.7 | 32.9 | 41.6 | 1.7 |  | 173 |
| I get distracted easily. | 27.2 | 39.3 | 32.4 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| I get started on my work right away. | 5.8 | 28.3 | 64.7 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 38.2 | 39.9 | 20.8 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| I work hard. | 2.3 | 22.5 | 74.0 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 45.1 | 26.6 | 26.6 | 1.7 |  | 173 |
| I work carefully. | 5.8 | 26.0 | 67.1 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 40.5 | 29.5 | 28.3 | 1.2 | 1 | 173 |
| I can keep working even when I would rather not. | 14.5 | 23.1 | 61.3 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| When things are hard to understand, I usually quit or leave. | 63.0 | 19.7 | 16.2 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| I keep doing things I need to do even if I do not like them. | 16.8 | 20.2 | 61.8 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| I find it hard to pay attention when I study. | 31.8 | 32.4 | 33.5 | 1.7 | 1 | 173 |
| I can be counted on. | 14.5 | 18.5 | 64.7 | 1.7 | 1 | 173 |
| I am easily distracted. | 35.3 | 34.1 | 28.3 | 1.7 | 1 | 173 |
| I have strong self-control. | 18.5 | 24.3 | 56.1 | 1.2 |  | 173 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 34.7 | 41.0 | 24.3 | - |  | 173 |
| I can stay away from things that are bad for me. | 9.8 | 11.6 | 78.6 | - |  | 173 |

***Holyoke, Grades 2-4: Kelly Elementary School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **No (%)** | **Sometimes (%)** | **Yes (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 34.8 | 55.3 | 8.7 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| When I work toward a goal, it gets all my attention. | 11.2 | 20.5 | 67.1 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 19.3 | 37.9 | 41.0 | 1.9 |  | 161 |
| I get distracted easily. | 27.3 | 32.3 | 39.1 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| I get started on my work right away. | 7.5 | 34.2 | 57.1 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 37.9 | 43.5 | 17.4 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| I work hard. | 2.5 | 23.0 | 73.3 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 40.4 | 34.2 | 23.0 | 2.5 |  | 161 |
| I work carefully. | 5.6 | 38.5 | 54.0 | 1.9 |  | 161 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 37.9 | 27.3 | 32.9 | 1.9 |  | 161 |
| I can keep working even when I would rather not. | 9.9 | 30.4 | 57.8 | 1.9 |  | 161 |
| When things are hard to understand, I usually quit or leave. | 75.8 | 14.3 | 7.5 | 1.9 | 1 | 161 |
| I keep doing things I need to do even if I do not like them. | 14.9 | 23.6 | 60.2 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| I find it hard to pay attention when I study. | 26.7 | 37.3 | 34.8 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| I can be counted on. | 6.8 | 30.4 | 59.6 | 3.1 |  | 161 |
| I am easily distracted. | 31.7 | 27.3 | 39.1 | 1.9 |  | 161 |
| I have strong self-control. | 18.0 | 30.4 | 50.3 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 26.7 | 43.5 | 28.6 | 1.2 |  | 161 |
| I can stay away from things that are bad for me. | 13.0 | 11.8 | 73.9 | 1.2 |  | 161 |

**Holyoke, Grades 5–8: Kelly Elementary School, Morgan Elementary School, and William R. Peck School**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck |
| Overall | 8 | 5 | 8 | 79 | 74 | 76 | 13 | 21 | 16 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 9 | 6 | 8 | 79 | 74 | 76 | 12 | 20 | 16 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | 17 | ‡ | ‡ | 67 | ‡ | ‡ | 17 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 12 | 8 | 9 | 71 | 69 | 76 | 17 | 22 | 15 |
| English Language Learners | 14 | 11 | 7 | 70 | 74 | 76 | 16 | 15 | 17 |
| Male | 8 | 6 | 8 | 80 | 73 | 74 | 12 | 21 | 18 |
| Female | 9 | 4 | 8 | 78 | 76 | 79 | 14 | 19 | 13 |
| Grade 5 | 17 | 4 | 7 | 74 | 64 | 76 | 9 | 32 | 16 |
| Grade 6 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 16 | 17 | 16 |
| Grade 7 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 81 | 83 | 81 | 15 | 8 | 13 |
| Grade 8 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 87 | 79 | 71 | 10 | 21 | 18 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck |
| Overall | 26 | 24 | 23 | 58 | 51 | 59 | 17 | 26 | 17 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 26 | 23 | 23 | 57 | 51 | 59 | 17 | 25 | 18 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | 33 | ‡ | ‡ | 58 | ‡ | ‡ | 8 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 17 | 19 | 14 | 61 | 56 | 64 | 22 | 25 | 22 |
| English Language Learners | 17 | 11 | 15 | 61 | 54 | 61 | 22 | 34 | 25 |
| Male | 22 | 21 | 27 | 59 | 45 | 57 | 20 | 34 | 16 |
| Female | 31 | 28 | 20 | 56 | 57 | 62 | 13 | 15 | 18 |
| Grade 5 | 49 | 26 | 22 | 43 | 47 | 52 | 9 | 28 | 25 |
| Grade 6 | 8 | 11 | 21 | 66 | 50 | 60 | 26 | 39 | 19 |
| Grade 7 | 23 | 19 | 25 | 58 | 64 | 62 | 19 | 17 | 13 |
| Grade 8 | 33 | 39 | 26 | 59 | 42 | 63 | 8 | 18 | 11 |

See notes at the end of all tables for grades 5–8.

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck |
| Overall | 32 | 26 | 38 | 50 | 59 | 48 | 18 | 16 | 15 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 31 | 25 | 38 | 49 | 57 | 48 | 20 | 18 | 14 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | 17 | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | ‡ | ‡ | 33 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 29 | 25 | 44 | 54 | 64 | 42 | 17 | 11 | 14 |
| English Language Learners | 33 | 18 | 43 | 47 | 62 | 48 | 20 | 20 | 9 |
| Male | 29 | 18 | 30 | 49 | 64 | 52 | 22 | 19 | 18 |
| Female | 34 | 35 | 46 | 51 | 53 | 43 | 15 | 13 | 11 |
| Grade 5 | 43 | 34 | 43 | 46 | 51 | 46 | 11 | 15 | 10 |
| Grade 6 | 28 | 22 | 40 | 38 | 58 | 49 | 34 | 19 | 11 |
| Grade 7 | 21 | 28 | 38 | 63 | 58 | 49 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Grade 8 | 38 | 16 | 29 | 54 | 68 | 47 | 8 | 16 | 24 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck | Kelly | Morgan | Peck |
| Overall | 6 | 6 | 8 | 86 | 78 | 79 | 8 | 17 | 13 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 6 | 6 | 7 | 87 | 79 | 80 | 7 | 15 | 13 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | 17 | ‡ | ‡ | 58 | ‡ | ‡ | 25 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 5 | 0 | 8 | 80 | 81 | 87 | 15 | 19 | 5 |
| English Language Learners | 5 | 8 | 6 | 87 | 79 | 85 | 8 | 13 | 9 |
| Male | 5 | 7 | 8 | 84 | 76 | 78 | 11 | 16 | 13 |
| Female | 6 | 4 | 9 | 89 | 79 | 79 | 5 | 17 | 12 |
| Grade 5 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 83 | 68 | 85 | 11 | 32 | 10 |
| Grade 6 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 84 | 81 | 81 | 8 | 11 | 16 |
| Grade 7 | 6 | 17 | 13 | 88 | 78 | 76 | 6 | 6 | 10 |
| Grade 8 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 90 | 87 | 73 | 8 | 13 | 15 |

‡ Reporting standards not met due to fewer than ten students completing the survey.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

***Holyoke, Grades 5-8: Morgan Elementary School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 18.1 | 26.3 | 35.6 | 16.3 | 3.8 |  | 160 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 5.6 | 28.1 | 41.9 | 20.6 | 3.8 |  | 160 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 6.3 | 22.5 | 41.9 | 23.8 | 5.0 | 1 | 160 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 10.0 | 28.8 | 36.9 | 16.9 | 6.9 | 1 | 160 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 5.6 | 22.5 | 51.9 | 15.6 | 3.8 | 1 | 160 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 16.9 | 31.9 | 38.1 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 1 | 160 |
| I work hard. | 2.5 | 10.6 | 53.8 | 29.4 | 3.8 |  | 160 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 23.1 | 30.6 | 23.1 | 18.1 | 5.0 |  | 160 |
| I work carefully. | 3.1 | 15.6 | 60.6 | 16.9 | 3.8 |  | 160 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 28.8 | 28.1 | 24.4 | 15.6 | 3.1 |  | 160 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 6.9 | 16.9 | 54.4 | 17.5 | 4.4 |  | 160 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 20.0 | 44.4 | 16.9 | 14.4 | 4.4 |  | 160 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 6.3 | 22.5 | 48.1 | 18.8 | 3.8 | 1 | 160 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 9.4 | 28.1 | 40.0 | 18.1 | 4.4 |  | 160 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 8.1 | 21.3 | 46.9 | 20.6 | 3.1 |  | 160 |
| I can be counted on. | 2.5 | 12.5 | 55.6 | 23.8 | 5.6 |  | 160 |
| I am easily distracted. | 15.6 | 25.6 | 36.9 | 18.8 | 3.1 |  | 160 |
| I have strong self-control. | 11.3 | 20.0 | 43.1 | 21.3 | 4.4 |  | 160 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 14.4 | 22.5 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 3.1 |  | 160 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 8.8 | 15.6 | 43.1 | 28.8 | 3.8 |  | 160 |

***Holyoke, Grades 5-8: William R. Peck School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 17.2 | 34.0 | 35.1 | 10.1 | 3.7 |  | 268 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 6.0 | 22.8 | 42.2 | 24.6 | 4.1 | 1 | 268 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 7.5 | 29.1 | 37.3 | 21.6 | 4.1 | 1 | 268 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 13.4 | 32.5 | 30.2 | 17.5 | 5.6 | 2 | 268 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 7.5 | 26.1 | 41.4 | 19.4 | 4.9 | 2 | 268 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 17.5 | 31.3 | 33.6 | 11.6 | 5.2 | 2 | 268 |
| I work hard. | 7.5 | 9.0 | 44.0 | 34.3 | 4.9 | 1 | 268 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 16.0 | 31.0 | 26.9 | 21.6 | 4.5 |  | 268 |
| I work carefully. | 3.7 | 17.9 | 53.0 | 20.5 | 4.5 | 1 | 268 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 20.1 | 29.5 | 26.5 | 16.4 | 6.7 | 2 | 268 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 10.1 | 25.4 | 44.4 | 14.9 | 5.2 |  | 268 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 19.8 | 37.7 | 24.3 | 12.7 | 5.2 | 1 | 268 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 6.7 | 16.4 | 51.9 | 20.1 | 4.9 |  | 268 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 11.6 | 26.5 | 39.9 | 16.4 | 5.6 |  | 268 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 6.0 | 17.2 | 48.1 | 23.1 | 5.6 |  | 268 |
| I can be counted on. | 5.6 | 14.6 | 46.6 | 28.0 | 4.9 | 1 | 268 |
| I am easily distracted. | 19.4 | 23.1 | 34.0 | 17.5 | 5.6 | 1 | 268 |
| I have strong self-control. | 10.1 | 26.1 | 33.6 | 24.3 | 5.2 | 2 | 268 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 16.8 | 33.6 | 31.3 | 13.4 | 4.9 |  | 268 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 11.2 | 20.1 | 34.3 | 29.9 | 4.5 |  | 268 |

***Holyoke, Grades 5-8: Kelly Elementary School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 20.8 | 30.3 | 36.0 | 6.2 | 6.7 |  | 178 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 5.1 | 21.9 | 48.3 | 16.9 | 7.3 | 1 | 178 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 11.8 | 27.0 | 36.5 | 18.0 | 6.7 |  | 178 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 14.0 | 24.7 | 38.8 | 14.0 | 8.4 |  | 178 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 5.6 | 30.3 | 39.3 | 17.4 | 7.3 |  | 178 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 19.1 | 32.0 | 33.1 | 8.4 | 7.3 |  | 178 |
| I work hard. | 2.2 | 14.6 | 48.9 | 27.5 | 5.6 | 2 | 178 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 20.2 | 33.7 | 22.5 | 16.9 | 6.7 |  | 178 |
| I work carefully. | 1.7 | 20.2 | 51.1 | 20.8 | 5.6 | 1 | 178 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 27.0 | 27.0 | 24.2 | 14.6 | 7.3 |  | 178 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 8.4 | 21.3 | 47.8 | 14.6 | 7.9 |  | 178 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 24.2 | 36.5 | 25.3 | 7.3 | 6.7 |  | 178 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 4.5 | 19.7 | 51.1 | 19.1 | 5.6 |  | 178 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 12.4 | 28.1 | 39.9 | 12.4 | 7.3 |  | 178 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 6.2 | 21.3 | 43.8 | 21.3 | 7.3 |  | 178 |
| I can be counted on. | 3.9 | 13.5 | 44.9 | 27.5 | 9.6 | 1 | 178 |
| I am easily distracted. | 16.9 | 25.8 | 29.8 | 21.3 | 5.6 | 1 | 178 |
| I have strong self-control. | 10.1 | 23.0 | 37.6 | 20.8 | 7.3 | 2 | 178 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 18.0 | 19.1 | 38.2 | 15.2 | 9.0 | 1 | 178 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 9.6 | 16.9 | 37.1 | 30.3 | 6.2 |  | 178 |

# Appendix G: Conditions for Learning Survey Results, Spring 2012, Lawrence Public Schools

**Lawrence, Grades 2–4: Arlington Elementary School**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 19 | 44 | 36 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 18 | 46 | 36 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 32 | 36 | 32 |
| Students with Disabilities | 25 | 39 | 35 |
| English Language Learners | 15 | 43 | 42 |
| Male | 21 | 42 | 37 |
| Female | 17 | 47 | 36 |
| Grade 2 | 19 | 39 | 42 |
| Grade 3 | 14 | 52 | 34 |
| Grade 4 | 23 | 43 | 34 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 12 | 66 | 22 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 11 | 68 | 21 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 14 | 50 | 36 |
| Students with Disabilities | 8 | 57 | 35 |
| English Language Learners | 9 | 68 | 23 |
| Male | 13 | 62 | 25 |
| Female | 10 | 70 | 20 |
| Grade 2 | 5 | 70 | 25 |
| Grade 3 | 9 | 61 | 30 |
| Grade 4 | 21 | 66 | 13 |

See notes at the end of all elementary school tables.

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 46 | 32 | 21 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 46 | 32 | 22 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 50 | 36 | 14 |
| Students with Disabilities | 49 | 35 | 16 |
| English Language Learners | 44 | 39 | 17 |
| Male | 41 | 35 | 23 |
| Female | 52 | 30 | 18 |
| Grade 2 | 45 | 36 | 19 |
| Grade 3 | 49 | 32 | 20 |
| Grade 4 | 45 | 31 | 23 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 22 | 45 | 33 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 22 | 44 | 34 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 18 | 59 | 23 |
| Students with Disabilities | 31 | 39 | 29 |
| English Language Learners | 21 | 53 | 27 |
| Male | 27 | 44 | 29 |
| Female | 16 | 45 | 38 |
| Grade 2 | 22 | 53 | 24 |
| Grade 3 | 20 | 38 | 42 |
| Grade 4 | 23 | 43 | 34 |

‡ Reporting standards not met due to fewer than ten students completing the survey.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

**Lawrence, Grades 5–8: Arlington Middle School**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 6 | 71 | 23 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 6 | 72 | 22 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 14 | 74 | 12 |
| English Language Learners | 8 | 66 | 27 |
| Male | 8 | 70 | 23 |
| Female | 5 | 72 | 23 |
| Grade 5 | 6 | 69 | 25 |
| Grade 6 | 2 | 66 | 31 |
| Grade 7 | 6 | 77 | 17 |
| Grade 8 | 9 | 70 | 20 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 29 | 55 | 16 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 28 | 56 | 15 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 18 | 65 | 17 |
| English Language Learners | 17 | 59 | 24 |
| Male | 26 | 54 | 21 |
| Female | 32 | 57 | 11 |
| Grade 5 | 31 | 43 | 26 |
| Grade 6 | 17 | 59 | 23 |
| Grade 7 | 34 | 56 | 10 |
| Grade 8 | 30 | 61 | 8 |

See notes at the end of all middle school tables.

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 33 | 52 | 14 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 33 | 53 | 14 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 39 | 48 | 12 |
| English Language Learners | 41 | 53 | 6 |
| Male | 28 | 51 | 22 |
| Female | 38 | 54 | 8 |
| Grade 5 | 40 | 51 | 9 |
| Grade 6 | 23 | 60 | 16 |
| Grade 7 | 33 | 50 | 16 |
| Grade 8 | 34 | 51 | 16 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 4 | 83 | 13 |
| Asian | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 5 | 84 | 12 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 3 | 88 | 9 |
| English Language Learners | 3 | 81 | 16 |
| Male | 6 | 81 | 14 |
| Female | 4 | 85 | 11 |
| Grade 5 | 3 | 83 | 14 |
| Grade 6 | 0 | 85 | 15 |
| Grade 7 | 9 | 82 | 9 |
| Grade 8 | 5 | 84 | 11 |

‡ Reporting standards not met due to fewer than ten students completing the survey.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

**Lawrence, Grades 9–12: Humanities & Leadership Development High School**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 5 | 50 | 45 |
| Asian | 0 | 36 | 64 |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 5 | 52 | 43 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 7 | 57 | 36 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 0 | 20 | 80 |
| Students with Disabilities | 11 | 63 | 27 |
| English Language Learners | 4 | 46 | 50 |
| Male | 7 | 49 | 44 |
| Female | 2 | 53 | 45 |
| Grade 9 | 5 | 58 | 37 |
| Grade 10 | 5 | 58 | 36 |
| Grade 11 | 5 | 46 | 49 |
| Grade 12 | 4 | 38 | 58 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 64 | 16 | 20 |
| Asian | 64 | 9 | 27 |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 63 | 17 | 20 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 64 | 21 | 14 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 70 | 0 | 30 |
| Students with Disabilities | 48 | 28 | 23 |
| English Language Learners | 50 | 21 | 29 |
| Male | 58 | 20 | 22 |
| Female | 71 | 11 | 18 |
| Grade 9 | 62 | 20 | 18 |
| Grade 10 | 64 | 18 | 19 |
| Grade 11 | 72 | 9 | 20 |
| Grade 12 | 57 | 18 | 25 |

See notes at the end of all high school tables.

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 5 | 71 | 24 |
| Asian | 9 | 55 | 36 |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 4 | 73 | 23 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 14 | 50 | 36 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 20 | 60 | 20 |
| Students with Disabilities | 6 | 73 | 20 |
| English Language Learners | 17 | 67 | 17 |
| Male | 4 | 68 | 28 |
| Female | 8 | 75 | 18 |
| Grade 9 | 8 | 71 | 21 |
| Grade 10 | 5 | 77 | 18 |
| Grade 11 | 2 | 79 | 19 |
| Grade 12 | 5 | 56 | 39 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | Adequate | Excellent |
| Overall | 6 | 70 | 23 |
| Asian | 0 | 91 | 9 |
| Black | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Hispanic | 7 | 70 | 23 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 0 | 79 | 21 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | 10 | 60 | 30 |
| Students with Disabilities | 8 | 81 | 11 |
| English Language Learners | 4 | 63 | 33 |
| Male | 7 | 72 | 21 |
| Female | 6 | 68 | 26 |
| Grade 9 | 9 | 75 | 16 |
| Grade 10 | 12 | 73 | 15 |
| Grade 11 | 4 | 72 | 25 |
| Grade 12 | 0 | 61 | 39 |

‡ Reporting standards not met due to fewer than ten students completing the survey.

NOTE: Details may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

# Appendix H: Conditions for Learning Survey Results, Spring 2012, Lynn Public Schools

**Lynn, Grades 2–4: Cobbet Elementary, Connery Elementary, and E.J. Harrington School**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Cobbet | Connery | Harrington | Cobbet | Connery | Harrington | Cobbet | Connery | Harrington |
| Overall | 31 | 20 | 20 | 45 | 37 | 41 | 24 | 43 | 39 |
| Asian | 41 | 30 | 21 | 35 | 39 | 43 | 24 | 30 | 36 |
| Black | 33 | 22 | 19 | 42 | 39 | 56 | 26 | 39 | 26 |
| Hispanic | 25 | 17 | 19 | 49 | 38 | 39 | 26 | 45 | 42 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 52 | ‡ | 30 | 35 | ‡ | 30 | 13 | ‡ | 41 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 31 | 23 | 21 | 43 | 31 | 32 | 26 | 46 | 46 |
| English Language Learners | 32 | 23 | 19 | 48 | 32 | 41 | 20 | 45 | 40 |
| Male | 35 | 21 | 20 | 40 | 35 | 42 | 25 | 43 | 37 |
| Female | 27 | 18 | 20 | 49 | 41 | 38 | 24 | 41 | 42 |
| Grade 2 | 38 | 20 | 25 | 49 | 26 | 41 | 13 | 55 | 34 |
| Grade 3 | 19 | 25 | 23 | 47 | 48 | 32 | 35 | 27 | 45 |
| Grade 4 | 33 | 14 | 11 | 37 | 42 | 50 | 30 | 44 | 39 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Cobbet | Connery | Harrington | Cobbet | Connery | Harrington | Cobbet | Connery | Harrington |
| Overall | 10 | 7 | 8 | 68 | 53 | 62 | 22 | 40 | 31 |
| Asian | 4 | 9 | 0 | 72 | 58 | 64 | 24 | 33 | 36 |
| Black | 19 | 4 | 15 | 51 | 65 | 67 | 30 | 30 | 19 |
| Hispanic | 12 | 7 | 6 | 70 | 51 | 61 | 18 | 42 | 33 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 4 | ‡ | 15 | 74 | ‡ | 63 | 22 | ‡ | 22 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 6 | 8 | 18 | 66 | 38 | 64 | 29 | 54 | 18 |
| English Language Learners | 7 | 5 | 7 | 71 | 54 | 61 | 22 | 42 | 32 |
| Male | 12 | 9 | 8 | 70 | 50 | 61 | 17 | 42 | 31 |
| Female | 10 | 6 | 8 | 65 | 56 | 63 | 25 | 38 | 29 |
| Grade 2 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 69 | 43 | 57 | 24 | 52 | 38 |
| Grade 3 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 60 | 56 | 72 | 33 | 38 | 16 |
| Grade 4 | 21 | 11 | 5 | 72 | 61 | 56 | 8 | 28 | 39 |

See notes at the end of all tables for grades 2–4.

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Cobbet | Connery | Harrington | Cobbet | Connery | Harrington | Cobbet | Connery | Harrington |
| Overall | 38 | 24 | 22 | 32 | 29 | 28 | 29 | 47 | 50 |
| Asian | 33 | 18 | 7 | 46 | 48 | 29 | 22 | 33 | 64 |
| Black | 51 | 39 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 22 | 23 | 35 | 52 |
| Hispanic | 37 | 24 | 22 | 30 | 26 | 28 | 33 | 50 | 50 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 43 | ‡ | 30 | 30 | ‡ | 22 | 26 | ‡ | 48 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 37 | 15 | 29 | 29 | 54 | 29 | 34 | 31 | 43 |
| English Language Learners | 37 | 23 | 23 | 34 | 29 | 26 | 29 | 48 | 51 |
| Male | 39 | 26 | 26 | 33 | 31 | 25 | 28 | 43 | 49 |
| Female | 38 | 21 | 18 | 32 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 50 | 53 |
| Grade 2 | 39 | 17 | 26 | 33 | 31 | 21 | 28 | 51 | 53 |
| Grade 3 | 37 | 29 | 24 | 31 | 29 | 35 | 31 | 43 | 40 |
| Grade 4 | 38 | 27 | 16 | 33 | 28 | 22 | 29 | 45 | 63 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | Adequate | | | Excellent | | |
| Cobbet | Connery | Harrington | Cobbet | Connery | Harrington | Cobbet | Connery | Harrington |
| Overall | 27 | 11 | 15 | 47 | 43 | 47 | 25 | 45 | 37 |
| Asian | 30 | 15 | 0 | 54 | 58 | 43 | 15 | 27 | 57 |
| Black | 35 | 26 | 15 | 51 | 26 | 63 | 14 | 48 | 22 |
| Hispanic | 24 | 9 | 16 | 46 | 43 | 47 | 30 | 48 | 37 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | 30 | ‡ | 15 | 39 | ‡ | 37 | 30 | ‡ | 48 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 31 | 0 | 21 | 40 | 38 | 39 | 29 | 62 | 39 |
| English Language Learners | 30 | 12 | 15 | 49 | 41 | 52 | 22 | 47 | 33 |
| Male | 34 | 14 | 18 | 43 | 40 | 47 | 23 | 46 | 36 |
| Female | 19 | 8 | 12 | 52 | 47 | 48 | 29 | 45 | 40 |
| Grade 2 | 35 | 8 | 18 | 50 | 43 | 58 | 15 | 49 | 24 |
| Grade 3 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 42 | 44 | 44 | 43 | 39 | 39 |
| Grade 4 | 27 | 10 | 8 | 49 | 42 | 39 | 24 | 48 | 53 |

‡ Reporting standards not met due to fewer than ten students completing the survey.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

***Lynn, Grades 2-4, Cobbet Elementary, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **No (%)** | **Sometimes (%)** | **Yes (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 40.2 | 43.9 | 14.1 | 1.8 |  | 326 |
| When I work toward a goal, it gets all my attention. | 16.0 | 29.1 | 54.3 | 0.6 |  | 326 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 25.5 | 42.6 | 31.3 | 0.6 |  | 326 |
| I get distracted easily. | 33.4 | 32.2 | 33.7 | 0.3 | 1 | 326 |
| I get started on my work right away. | 5.8 | 30.1 | 63.5 | 0.3 | 1 | 326 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 42.3 | 41.4 | 14.4 | 1.8 |  | 326 |
| I work hard. | 4.9 | 25.5 | 69.3 | 0.3 |  | 326 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 42.9 | 33.7 | 23.0 | 0.3 |  | 326 |
| I work carefully. | 3.7 | 36.5 | 58.6 | 1.2 |  | 326 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 46.3 | 27.6 | 25.5 | 0.6 |  | 326 |
| I can keep working even when I would rather not. | 12.3 | 25.2 | 62.3 | 0.3 |  | 326 |
| When things are hard to understand, I usually quit or leave. | 73.0 | 17.8 | 8.9 | 0.3 |  | 326 |
| I keep doing things I need to do even if I do not like them. | 12.0 | 28.2 | 58.9 | 0.9 |  | 326 |
| I find it hard to pay attention when I study. | 32.8 | 31.6 | 34.0 | 1.5 |  | 326 |
| I can be counted on. | 7.4 | 26.4 | 65.3 | 0.9 |  | 326 |
| I am easily distracted. | 41.1 | 33.1 | 24.8 | 0.9 |  | 326 |
| I have strong self-control. | 15.0 | 30.4 | 54.3 | 0.3 |  | 326 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 32.8 | 44.2 | 21.8 | 1.2 |  | 326 |
| I can stay away from things that are bad for me. | 7.4 | 12.9 | 78.5 | 1.2 |  | 326 |

***Lynn, Grades 2-4: William P. Connery Elementary, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **No (%)** | **Sometimes (%)** | **Yes (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 48.3 | 42.0 | 9.2 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| When I work toward a goal, it gets all my attention. | 8.8 | 20.2 | 70.6 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 31.1 | 42.0 | 26.1 | 0.8 |  | 238 |
| I get distracted easily. | 39.1 | 38.2 | 21.8 | 0.8 |  | 238 |
| I get started on my work right away. | 2.9 | 25.6 | 71.0 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 51.3 | 34.5 | 13.0 | 1.3 |  | 238 |
| I work hard. | 0.8 | 23.5 | 74.8 | 0.8 |  | 238 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 51.3 | 37.8 | 10.1 | 0.8 |  | 238 |
| I work carefully. | 1.7 | 28.6 | 69.3 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 47.9 | 31.5 | 20.2 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I can keep working even when I would rather not. | 6.3 | 21.8 | 71.4 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| When things are hard to understand, I usually quit or leave. | 81.1 | 12.6 | 5.9 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I keep doing things I need to do even if I do not like them. | 7.1 | 17.6 | 74.8 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I find it hard to pay attention when I study. | 45.0 | 33.6 | 20.6 | 0.8 |  | 238 |
| I can be counted on. | 4.2 | 21.8 | 72.7 | 1.3 |  | 238 |
| I am easily distracted. | 52.1 | 30.7 | 16.8 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I have strong self-control. | 13.4 | 27.7 | 58.4 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 44.5 | 39.5 | 14.3 | 1.7 |  | 238 |
| I can stay away from things that are bad for me. | 5.9 | 10.9 | 82.4 | 0.8 |  | 238 |

***Lynn, Grades 2-4, E.J. Harrington School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **No (%)** | **Sometimes (%)** | **Yes (%)** | **Omit (%)** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 42.9 | 40.3 | 16.8 | - |  | 238 |
| When I work toward a goal, it gets all my attention. | 10.9 | 26.9 | 61.8 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 25.6 | 37.4 | 37.0 | - |  | 238 |
| I get distracted easily. | 33.2 | 37.4 | 29.4 | - |  | 238 |
| I get started on my work right away. | 5.5 | 26.5 | 68.1 | - |  | 238 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 39.1 | 48.3 | 12.2 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I work hard. | 1.7 | 23.9 | 74.4 | - |  | 238 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 51.7 | 26.9 | 21.4 | - |  | 238 |
| I work carefully. | 3.4 | 34.5 | 62.2 | - |  | 238 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 50.4 | 27.3 | 21.8 | - | 1 | 238 |
| I can keep working even when I would rather not. | 9.7 | 22.7 | 67.2 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| When things are hard to understand, I usually quit or leave. | 76.1 | 16.0 | 7.6 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I keep doing things I need to do even if I do not like them. | 10.9 | 23.5 | 65.5 | - |  | 238 |
| I find it hard to pay attention when I study. | 40.3 | 36.1 | 23.5 | - |  | 238 |
| I can be counted on. | 6.7 | 21.4 | 71.4 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I am easily distracted. | 39.1 | 32.8 | 27.7 | 0.4 |  | 238 |
| I have strong self-control. | 14.7 | 29.4 | 55.9 | - |  | 238 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 31.9 | 41.6 | 26.5 | - |  | 238 |
| I can stay away from things that are bad for me. | 5.5 | 10.1 | 84.0 | 0.4 |  | 238 |

**Lynn: Grade 5 Cobbet Elementary, Grade 5 Connery School, Grade 5 E.J. Harrington School (EJH), and Grades 6–8 Thurgood Marshall Middle School**

***Challenge***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | | Adequate | | | | Excellent | | | |
| Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall | Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall | Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall |
| Overall | 11 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 82 | 77 | 73 | 78 | 7 | 11 | 24 | 12 |
| Asian | ‡ | 0 | ‡ | 12 | ‡ | 87 | ‡ | 86 | ‡ | 13 | ‡ | 2 |
| Black | 8 | ‡ | ‡ | 10 | 92 | ‡ | ‡ | 74 | 0 | ‡ | ‡ | 17 |
| Hispanic | 9 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 84 | 78 | 71 | 78 | 7 | 12 | 27 | 11 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 12 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 74 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 13 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 13 | 18 | ‡ | 13 | 88 | 65 | ‡ | 74 | 0 | 18 | ‡ | 13 |
| English Language Learners | 6 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 91 | 83 | 59 | 70 | 3 | 11 | 41 | 12 |
| Male | 8 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 85 | 76 | 67 | 79 | 6 | 9 | 28 | 11 |
| Female | 15 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 79 | 79 | 82 | 76 | 5 | 13 | 18 | 12 |
| Grade 5 | 11 | 11 | 3 | ‡ | 83 | 77 | 74 | ‡ | 6 | 11 | 23 | ‡ |
| Grade 6 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 12 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 78 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 11 |
| Grade 7 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 10 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 79 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 11 |
| Grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 10 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 76 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 14 |

***Peer Social Emotional Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | | Adequate | | | | Excellent | | | |
| Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall | Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall | Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall |
| Overall | 16 | 10 | 6 | 21 | 60 | 63 | 49 | 59 | 24 | 27 | 45 | 20 |
| Asian | ‡ | 7 | ‡ | 14 | ‡ | 67 | ‡ | 69 | ‡ | 27 | ‡ | 17 |
| Black | 0 | ‡ | ‡ | 25 | 58 | ‡ | ‡ | 55 | 42 | ‡ | ‡ | 20 |
| Hispanic | 17 | 10 | 3 | 17 | 57 | 56 | 47 | 63 | 26 | 34 | 49 | 20 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 34 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 45 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 21 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 6 | 12 | ‡ | 19 | 56 | 65 | ‡ | 50 | 38 | 24 | ‡ | 31 |
| English Language Learners | 13 | 6 | 3 | 17 | 56 | 56 | 38 | 63 | 31 | 39 | 59 | 20 |
| Male | 19 | 9 | 5 | 16 | 46 | 61 | 53 | 61 | 35 | 30 | 42 | 23 |
| Female | 13 | 11 | 9 | 25 | 74 | 66 | 44 | 58 | 13 | 24 | 47 | 17 |
| Grade 5 | 16 | 10 | 6 | ‡ | 59 | 63 | 49 | ‡ | 25 | 27 | 44 | ‡ |
| Grade 6 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 20 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 60 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 20 |
| Grade 7 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 18 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 59 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 23 |
| Grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 25 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 59 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 17 |

***Safe and Respectful Climate***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | | Adequate | | | | Excellent | | | |
| Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall | Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall | Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall |
| Overall | 37 | 17 | 13 | 22 | 52 | 59 | 44 | 50 | 11 | 24 | 44 | 29 |
| Asian | ‡ | 27 | ‡ | 17 | ‡ | 47 | ‡ | 60 | ‡ | 27 | ‡ | 22 |
| Black | 42 | ‡ | ‡ | 24 | 42 | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | 17 | ‡ | ‡ | 26 |
| Hispanic | 29 | 12 | 10 | 21 | 57 | 61 | 42 | 49 | 14 | 27 | 47 | 30 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 21 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 50 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 29 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 31 | 29 | ‡ | 28 | 63 | 71 | ‡ | 45 | 6 | 0 | ‡ | 28 |
| English Language Learners | 31 | 22 | 24 | 27 | 53 | 56 | 41 | 46 | 16 | 22 | 34 | 27 |
| Male | 40 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 52 | 70 | 51 | 49 | 8 | 24 | 37 | 35 |
| Female | 33 | 26 | 15 | 27 | 51 | 50 | 35 | 51 | 15 | 24 | 50 | 22 |
| Grade 5 | 37 | 17 | 13 | ‡ | 52 | 59 | 44 | ‡ | 11 | 24 | 43 | ‡ |
| Grade 6 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 27 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 48 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 25 |
| Grade 7 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 17 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 49 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 35 |
| Grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 21 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 53 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 26 |

***Student Support***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Needs Improvement | | | | Adequate | | | | Excellent | | | |
| Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall | Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall | Cobbet | Connery | EJH | Marshall |
| Overall | 9 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 87 | 83 | 73 | 83 | 0 | 11 | 24 | 8 |
| Asian | ‡ | 7 | ‡ | 5 | ‡ | 87 | ‡ | 93 | ‡ | 7 | ‡ | 2 |
| Black | 17 | ‡ | ‡ | 13 | 83 | ‡ | ‡ | 74 | 0 | ‡ | ‡ | 13 |
| Hispanic | 9 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 86 | 83 | 75 | 84 | 5 | 15 | 24 | 8 |
| Native American | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| White | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 8 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 83 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 9 |
| Multiracial and Undeclared | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Students with Disabilities | 25 | 0 | ‡ | 7 | 69 | 94 | ‡ | 86 | 6 | 6 | ‡ | 8 |
| English Language Learners | 3 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 88 | 72 | 62 | 84 | 9 | 22 | 34 | 8 |
| Male | 6 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 90 | 79 | 79 | 86 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 5 |
| Female | 13 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 82 | 87 | 68 | 80 | 5 | 11 | 29 | 11 |
| Grade 5 | 9 | 6 | 3 | ‡ | 86 | 83 | 74 | ‡ | 5 | 11 | 23 | ‡ |
| Grade 6 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 9 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 86 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 6 |
| Grade 7 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 8 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 83 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 9 |
| Grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 10 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 80 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | 10 |

***Lynn, Grade 5, Cobbet Elementary, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 31.2 | 32.3 | 23.7 | 5.4 | 7.5 |  | 93 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 8.6 | 23.7 | 47.3 | 11.8 | 8.6 |  | 93 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 14.0 | 28.0 | 38.7 | 11.8 | 7.5 |  | 93 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 23.7 | 35.5 | 22.6 | 7.5 | 10.8 |  | 93 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 3.2 | 25.8 | 46.2 | 16.1 | 8.6 |  | 93 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 28.0 | 37.6 | 19.4 | 6.5 | 8.6 |  | 93 |
| I work hard. | - | 8.6 | 48.4 | 34.4 | 8.6 |  | 93 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 24.7 | 37.6 | 22.6 | 5.4 | 9.7 |  | 93 |
| I work carefully. | 2.2 | 15.1 | 55.9 | 19.4 | 7.5 |  | 93 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 26.9 | 31.2 | 23.7 | 7.5 | 9.7 | 1 | 93 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 7.5 | 21.5 | 44.1 | 15.1 | 11.8 |  | 93 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 29.0 | 39.8 | 15.1 | 5.4 | 10.8 |  | 93 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 5.4 | 17.2 | 48.4 | 17.2 | 11.8 |  | 93 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 9.7 | 36.6 | 29.0 | 12.9 | 10.8 | 1 | 93 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 6.5 | 15.1 | 50.5 | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 93 |
| I can be counted on. | 7.5 | 11.8 | 50.5 | 15.1 | 15.1 |  | 93 |
| I am easily distracted. | 21.5 | 33.3 | 22.6 | 9.7 | 12.9 |  | 93 |
| I have strong self-control. | 5.4 | 17.2 | 45.2 | 18.3 | 12.9 | 1 | 93 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 24.7 | 30.1 | 21.5 | 8.6 | 15.1 |  | 93 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 9.7 | 14.0 | 31.2 | 32.3 | 12.9 |  | 93 |

***Lynn, Grade 5, William P. Connery Elementary, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 17.8 | 42.5 | 27.4 | 2.7 | 9.6 |  | 73 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 1.4 | 17.8 | 54.8 | 15.1 | 11.0 |  | 73 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 4.1 | 34.2 | 39.7 | 13.7 | 8.2 |  | 73 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 8.2 | 41.1 | 27.4 | 11.0 | 12.3 |  | 73 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 4.1 | 27.4 | 45.2 | 13.7 | 9.6 |  | 73 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 16.4 | 28.8 | 38.4 | 6.8 | 9.6 |  | 73 |
| I work hard. | 1.4 | 19.2 | 42.5 | 27.4 | 9.6 |  | 73 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 21.9 | 41.1 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 13.7 |  | 73 |
| I work carefully. | 1.4 | 6.8 | 67.1 | 15.1 | 9.6 |  | 73 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 34.2 | 37.0 | 13.7 | 4.1 | 11.0 |  | 73 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 2.7 | 11.0 | 54.8 | 17.8 | 13.7 |  | 73 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 16.4 | 63.0 | 8.2 | 1.4 | 11.0 |  | 73 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 1.4 | 11.0 | 58.9 | 19.2 | 9.6 |  | 73 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 17.8 | 35.6 | 30.1 | 5.5 | 11.0 |  | 73 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 4.1 | 15.1 | 54.8 | 11.0 | 15.1 |  | 73 |
| I can be counted on. | 2.7 | 6.8 | 56.2 | 20.5 | 12.3 | 1 | 73 |
| I am easily distracted. | 17.8 | 37.0 | 24.7 | 9.6 | 11.0 |  | 73 |
| I have strong self-control. | 5.5 | 12.3 | 57.5 | 15.1 | 9.6 |  | 73 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 15.1 | 45.2 | 20.5 | 8.2 | 11.0 |  | 73 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 6.8 | 15.1 | 38.4 | 28.8 | 11.0 |  | 73 |

***Lynn, Grade 5, E.J. Harrington School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 25.3 | 40.5 | 20.3 | 6.3 | 7.6 |  | 79 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 5.1 | 15.2 | 44.3 | 27.8 | 7.6 |  | 79 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 17.7 | 19.0 | 41.8 | 11.4 | 10.1 |  | 79 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 25.3 | 41.8 | 11.4 | 7.6 | 12.7 | 1 | 79 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 2.5 | 24.1 | 38.0 | 26.6 | 7.6 | 1 | 79 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 34.2 | 29.1 | 12.7 | 17.7 | 6.3 |  | 79 |
| I work hard. | 3.8 | 3.8 | 25.3 | 60.8 | 6.3 |  | 79 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 35.4 | 26.6 | 13.9 | 10.1 | 13.9 |  | 79 |
| I work carefully. | - | 7.6 | 45.6 | 39.2 | 7.6 |  | 79 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 41.8 | 25.3 | 11.4 | 13.9 | 7.6 |  | 79 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 3.8 | 12.7 | 40.5 | 24.1 | 19.0 |  | 79 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 41.8 | 27.8 | 15.2 | 3.8 | 11.4 |  | 79 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 5.1 | 12.7 | 39.2 | 30.4 | 12.7 |  | 79 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 21.5 | 39.2 | 22.8 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 1 | 79 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 2.5 | 12.7 | 40.5 | 30.4 | 13.9 |  | 79 |
| I can be counted on. | 1.3 | 5.1 | 30.4 | 49.4 | 13.9 |  | 79 |
| I am easily distracted. | 24.1 | 40.5 | 17.7 | 8.9 | 7.6 | 1 | 79 |
| I have strong self-control. | 7.6 | 10.1 | 27.8 | 41.8 | 12.7 |  | 79 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 27.8 | 38.0 | 19.0 | 6.3 | 8.9 |  | 79 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 3.8 | 5.1 | 27.8 | 50.6 | 12.7 |  | 79 |

***Lynn, Grades 6-8, Thurgood Marshall Middle School, Self-Regulation Items and Responses***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | **Strongly Disagree (%)** | **Disagree (%)** | **Agree (%)** | **Strongly Agree (%)** | **Omit** | **Multiple Marks** | **Total** |
| I often act without thinking. | 17.8 | 43.8 | 26.7 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 2 | 787 |
| When I work toward something, it gets all my attention. | 4.1 | 21.7 | 54.3 | 12.5 | 7.1 | 3 | 787 |
| Little problems or distractions throw me off course. | 11.6 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 10.8 | 6.0 | 2 | 787 |
| I get sidetracked easily. | 13.6 | 40.4 | 28.5 | 8.8 | 8.4 | 3 | 787 |
| I get started on tasks right away. | 4.8 | 26.8 | 47.8 | 13.0 | 7.2 | 3 | 787 |
| Most of the time I do not pay attention to what I am doing. | 19.9 | 44.1 | 24.4 | 4.2 | 6.9 | 4 | 787 |
| I work hard. | 2.4 | 7.8 | 53.4 | 29.4 | 6.9 | 2 | 787 |
| I lose my temper easily. | 21.0 | 38.1 | 21.2 | 11.7 | 7.9 | 1 | 787 |
| I work carefully. | 1.9 | 12.1 | 61.6 | 17.3 | 6.9 | 2 | 787 |
| I often have trouble controlling my temper. | 26.4 | 38.8 | 18.0 | 9.3 | 7.0 | 4 | 787 |
| I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it. | 4.1 | 18.0 | 56.0 | 12.1 | 9.8 |  | 787 |
| When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. | 21.1 | 46.8 | 18.9 | 3.6 | 9.4 | 2 | 787 |
| I keep focused on tasks I need to do even if I do not like them. | 3.8 | 16.6 | 57.3 | 13.5 | 8.5 | 2 | 787 |
| I find it hard to focus when I study. | 11.8 | 36.0 | 33.5 | 10.0 | 8.6 |  | 787 |
| I set high standards for myself. | 4.1 | 17.2 | 48.8 | 18.9 | 11.1 |  | 787 |
| I can be counted on. | 3.4 | 8.5 | 55.5 | 23.4 | 8.8 | 3 | 787 |
| I am easily distracted. | 16.1 | 36.0 | 28.3 | 10.4 | 8.4 | 6 | 787 |
| I have strong self-control. | 6.0 | 15.2 | 48.2 | 20.8 | 9.1 | 5 | 787 |
| I have trouble concentrating. | 16.1 | 43.3 | 24.1 | 6.9 | 9.3 | 2 | 787 |
| I can avoid things that are bad for me. | 7.4 | 12.5 | 40.0 | 31.5 | 8.1 | 4 | 787 |

# Appendix I: Harris Interactive School Poll Results, 2010–11 School Year, Springfield Public Schools

| **Percent Reporting Problems in Select Areas** | **Brightwood** | **Elias Brookings** | **German Gerena** | **Homer Street** | **White Street** | **Zanetti Montessori** | **WAZ School Average** | **District Average** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School Atmosphere** | | | | | | | | |
| Do you feel safe while in school? | 18 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 18 | 7 | 13 | 13 |
| Do you feel safe walking to and from school? | 21 | 19 | 18 | 21 | 18 | 13 | 18 | 18 |
| Are students well-behaved in school? | 77 | 49 | 59 | 60 | 62 | 27 | 56 | 47 |
| Do students help each other with school work? | 21 | 17 | 27 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 19 | 20 |
| Are the rules at your school fair? | 9 | 29 | 33 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 24 |
| Is gossip a serious problem at school? | 79 | 68 | 70 | 73 | 74 | 47 | 69 | 62 |
| Are most other students nice to you? | 27 | 33 | 35 | 32 | 35 | 22 | 31 | 25 |
| **Equipment & Facilities Issues** | | | | | | | | |
| Are school buildings and grounds clean and in good condition? | 56 | 36 | 58 | 37 | 55 | 31 | 46 | 29 |
| Are school bathrooms clean? | 74 | 72 | 81 | 80 | 82 | 81 | 78 | 70 |
| **The School Bus** | | | | | | | | |
| Is your bus driver helpful and friendly? | 20 | 13 | 30 | 25 | 12 | 34 | 22 | 30 |
| Do you feel safe riding on your bus? | 20 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 15 | 19 | 22 |
| Are students well-behaved on your bus? | 33 | 58 | 63 | 72 | 67 | 62 | 59 | 63 |
| **Computer Technology** | | | | | | | | |
| Do school computers meet your needs? | 7 | 16 | 34 | 53 | 39 | 9 | 26 | 26 |
| Are you given enough instruction on how to use the computers at school? | 2 | 14 | 13 | 44 | 25 | 10 | 18 | 19 |
| **Main Teacher – Does your teacher….** | | | | | | | | |
| Make class fun? | 9 | 31 | 11 | 23 | 24 | 12 | 18 | 21 |
| Ask you to answer questions in class? | 0 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| Tell you how you are doing? | 7 | 24 | 10 | 8 | 15 | 9 | 12 | 12 |
| Help you want to learn? | 2 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| Help you outside of class time? | 27 | 51 | 50 | 46 | 52 | 57 | 47 | 44 |
| Give interesting homework? | 20 | 42 | 35 | 37 | 43 | 37 | 36 | 37 |
| Like some kids more than others? | 27 | 39 | 40 | 36 | 29 | 23 | 32 | 35 |
| Like you? | 5 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 1 | 8 | 9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Percent Rating Staff “Excellent”** | **Brightwood** | **Elias Brookings** | **German Gerena** | **Homer Street** | **White Street** | **Zanetti Montessori** | **WAZ School Average** | **District Average** |
| Art Teacher | 69 | 72 | 78 | 68 | 48 | 90 | 71 | 76 |
| Cafeteria Staff | 53 | 67 | 61 | 62 | 52 | 46 | 57 | 59 |
| Custodians | 82 | 81 | 66 | 78 | 72 | 65 | 74 | 73 |
| Gym Teacher | 74 | 78 | 97 | 95 | 78 | 58 | 80 | 81 |
| Library Staff | 79 | 52 | 88 | 68 | 77 | 64 | 71 | 72 |
| Math Teacher | 86 | 72 | 66 | 75 | 78 | 85 | 77 | 81 |
| Music Teacher | 55 | 58 | 58 | 32 | 19 | 85 | 51 | 70 |
| Principal | 95 | 94 | 79 | 88 | 53 | 42 | 75 | 77 |
| Reading Teacher | 90 | 68 | 86 | 81 | 72 | 76 | 79 | 79 |
| School Counselor | 88 | 86 | 78 | 95 | 81 | 81 | 85 | 82 |
| School Nurse | 59 | 89 | 67 | 72 | 90 | 63 | 73 | 74 |
| School Secretaries | 88 | 81 | 79 | 87 | 71 | 85 | 82 | 77 |

1. AIR (www.air.org) is a behavioral and social science research organization founded in 1946. AIR carries out its work with strict independence, objectivity, and non-partisanship. AIR’s mission is to conduct and apply the best behavioral and social science research and evaluation to improve peoples’ lives, with a special emphasis on the disadvantaged. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. AIR (www.air.org) is a behavioral and social science research organization founded in 1946. AIR carries out its work with strict independence, objectivity, and non-partisanship. AIR’s mission is to conduct and apply the best behavioral and social science research and evaluation to improve peoples’ lives, with a special emphasis on the disadvantaged. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Of the 20 school coordinators, two were from one school in Springfield. The Viveiros school coordinator in Fall River was not interviewed and Homer School in Springfield did not have a coordinator at the time of our interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. To minimize burden on principals in level 4 schools given the SchoolWorks monitoring visits, rather than conducting interviews while on site, AIR carried out phone interviews in late April and May. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The findings do include information gathered from interviews with the school social workers in Lynn, which did not have coordinators because it was in a WAZ planning year in 2011–12. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Any indicator of an attribute (e.g., physical safety) consists of some true score plus error, so survey items are less precise than survey scales. Survey scales are designed to reduce this error overall. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Parts of this section are extracted from an unpublished literature review conducted by AIR Psychometrics Director Stephan Ahadi. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. School climate data for Worcester will be available in summer 2012; AIR will plan to include related findings in future reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In this and subsequent figures with CFL student survey findings, results are shown for the percentage of students reporting each school “needs improvement,” is “adequate,” or is “excellent on each scale. Schools administered age-appropriate versions of the CFL survey for grades 2–4 and 5–8. Hence, where applicable, schools like Viveiros Elementary and Doran Elementary are displayed twice if the schools have both elementary and middle school grades. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. AIR modified “school wraparound coordinator” using the appropriate terminology for the district (e.g., Student Support Coordinator in Fall River; Full Service Coordinator in Holyoke; Intensive Case Manager in Lawrence; School Site Coordinator in Springfield, Wraparound Outreach Coordinator in Worcester). In Lynn, social workers are the school coordinator equivalent for 2011–12. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)