

# Task Order 23: Study of School Climate Transformation Grants

## **Draft 1: OMB Clearance Request, Part A**

Prepared for  
U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy  
Development  
Policy and Program Studies Service

June 21, 2016

# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Introduction.....	1
Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission.....	2
Justification (Part A).....	2
A1. Circumstances Making Collection of Information Necessary.....	2
A2. Use of Information.....	5
A3. Use of Improved Technology to Reduce Burden.....	6
A4. Efforts to Avoid Duplication of Effort.....	6
A5. Efforts to Minimize Burden on Small Businesses and Other Small Entities.....	6
A6. Consequences of Not Collecting the Data.....	6
A7. Special Circumstances Causing Particular Anomalies in Data Collection.....	6
A8. Federal Register Announcement and Consultation.....	6
A9. Payment or Gift to Respondents.....	7
A10. Assurance of Confidentiality.....	7
A11. Sensitive Questions.....	8
A12. Estimated Response Burden.....	8
A13. Estimate of Annualized Cost for Data Collection Activities.....	9
A14. Estimate of Annualized Cost to Federal Government.....	9
A15. Reasons for Changes in Estimated Burden.....	10
A16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication.....	10
A17. Display of Expiration Date for OMB Approval.....	10
A18. Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions.....	10
Reference.....	11

## Introduction

The Policy and Program Studies Service (PPSS), of the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, requests Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearance for data collection activities associated with the *Study of School Climate Transformation Grants*.

This study examines how state departments of education and school districts that have received multiple federal grants related to improving school safety and access to mental health care coordinate the activities across those grants. The School Climate Transformation Grants, awarded by the U.S. Department of Education, aim to improve school safety by supporting schools in implementing an evidence-based, multi-tiered system of behavioral support. A second set of grants—Project Advancing Wellness and Resilience in Education (Project AWARE), awarded by the Department of Health and Human Services—aims to increase access to mental health services by training adults to notice signs of behavioral health distress and intervene appropriately. A third set of grants, from the U.S. Department of Justice (School Justice Collaboration grants), supports courts’ collaboration with schools to implement diversion and similar programs to minimize juvenile detention. The study will explore the nature of coordination across grants, the perceived value of coordination, and challenges and lessons learned.

Clearance is requested for the interview component of the study. The study will gather extant data, but this will consist of data that the grantees already have reported to the Department of Education, and which Department staff will share with the contractor. This submission also includes the clearance request for the interview protocols that will be used for data collection.

This package contains two major sections:

1. Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission
  - Justification (Part A)
  - Description of Statistical Methods (Part B)
2. Appendix A – Interview protocols  
Appendix B – Consent form (common across interview respondents)  
Appendix C – Notification letters

## Authorizing Legislation

The SCTG program is authorized under 20 U.S.C. 7131; the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2014, Title III of Division H of P.L. 113-76.

NITT-AWARE-LEA grants are authorized under Section 520A of the Public Health Service Act, as amended. This announcement addresses Healthy People 2020 Mental Health and Mental Disorders Topic Area HP 2020-MHMD.

The School Justice Collaboration Program is authorized pursuant to paragraph (3)(D) under the Juvenile Justice heading in the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2014, P.L. 113-76, 128 Stat. 5, 64–65.

## Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission

### Justification (Part A)

#### A1. Circumstances Making Collection of Information Necessary

##### *Study Overview*

In response to gun violence tragedies in schools in the United States, President Obama announced the Now Is the Time initiative (White House, 2013). The initiative has four main goals, two of which are directly relevant to this study: (1) making schools safer and more nurturing, and (2) increasing access to mental health services so that students and young adults receive treatment for mental health issues.

The Now Is the Time initiative articulated mandates to be carried out by multiple federal agencies, including creating safer schools, ensuring that students with signs of mental illness are referred to treatment, and sharing best practices in school discipline. By working in a collaborative manner across child- and youth-serving systems (education, mental health, juvenile justice), stakeholders can establish a shared vision and reduce redundancy and fragmentation (Hodges, Nesman, & Hernandez, 1999; Osher, 2002). Educators and service providers within the areas of mental health and juvenile justice can develop a shared work plan and can share information and accountability as they work together to achieve their goals. The following section provides a more detailed description of how each of these grant programs addresses the goals of the Now Is the Time initiative to develop safe learning environments and promote mental health among students.

1. **School Climate Transformation Grants (SCTGs).** This program, administered by the Department’s Office of Safe and Healthy Students, is intended to provide support to school districts implementing an evidence-based, multi-tiered system of support behavioral framework. This program also supports states that aim to develop, enhance, and expand these frameworks statewide. All grantees are required to develop or enhance existing evidence-based behavioral frameworks to achieve goals including (but not limited to) increased school safety, decreased disciplinary actions, and improved learning environments.

*At the school district level,* the goals of the program are to connect children, youth, and families to appropriate services and supports; improve conditions for learning and behavioral outcomes for school-aged youth; and increase awareness of and the ability to respond to mental health issues among school-age youth.

*At the state level,* the goals are to develop, enhance, or expand statewide systems of support for and technical assistance to school districts and schools implementing an evidence-based, multi-

tiered behavioral framework for improving behavioral outcomes and learning conditions for all students.

In September 2014, the Department awarded five-year SCTG grants to 71 school districts and 12 states. Fiscal year 2014 awards totaled \$36 million for school districts and \$7 million for states, and the maximum annual grant amount for both state and district grantees was \$750,000 per year for up to five years (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Applicants received additional competitive preference points from the Department if they included plans to coordinate their SCTG program with any other existing or newly funded federal program, including but not limited to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)-funded Project Advancing Wellness and Resilience in Education (Project AWARE) and the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ's) School Justice Collaboration Program.

2. **Project Advancing Wellness and Resilience in Education (Project AWARE).** This grant program, administered by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, provides training in Youth Mental Health First Aid (YMHFA) to teachers and other adults who regularly interact with students. The YMHFA training is a mental health literacy program that introduces participants to the risk factors and observable symptoms of mental health problems in adolescents and teaches adults how to help youth in crisis or experiencing mental health or substance use issues. The training uses role playing and simulations to demonstrate how to assess a mental health crisis and connect young people to professional, peer, social, and self-help care. The goal of YMHFA is to train adults to recognize young people in need of help and ensure young people are referred to appropriate mental health services.

Funding at the *school district level* is used to train teachers, counselors, and other school personnel (e.g., administrators, school bus drivers, cafeteria workers, playground attendants, athletic coaches and trainers), emergency responders (e.g., police, firefighters), parents, caregivers, and other youth-serving adults in YMHFA. Funding at the *state level* is used to build and expand districts' capacities in a similar way (e.g., increase awareness of mental health issues among school-aged youth; provide training for school personnel and other adults who interact with school-aged youth to detect and respond to mental health issues).

In addition, through Project AWARE, states are tasked with developing a comprehensive, coordinated, and integrated program for advancing wellness and resilience in educational settings for school-aged youth. These strategies include facilitating a closer relationship between state policy and district implementation of policies and programs. States also support the development and coordination of integrated systems to create safe and respectful environments for learning and promote the behavioral health of school-aged children and youth. In addition, states are expected to build their cross-system capacity to effectively use the growing body of knowledge from prevention and implementation science to support expanded adoption of effective school safety and school mental health approaches. Last, the grant is to be used to build cross-system capacity (coordinate and integrate across service systems, including education, mental health, juvenile justice, and law enforcement) for comprehensive approaches at the state and community levels.

In September 2014, HHS awarded two-year Project AWARE grants to 100 school districts and 20 states. Fiscal year 2014 awards totaled \$34 million for states and \$9 million for school

districts. The maximum annual grant amount was \$1.95 million per state grantee, \$50,000 per school district grantee, and \$125,000 per community grantee (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Every Project AWARE applicant was required by HHS to apply for an SCTG grant and was encouraged to apply for the DOJ Keeping Kids in School and Out of Court grant.

- 3. Keeping Kids in School and Out of Court.** This grant program is part of the DOJ's Local School Justice Collaboration Program and is administered by the DOJ's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. In alignment with the other two grant programs, the School Justice Collaboration Program aims to build, expand, and sustain capacity of local family courts to collaborate with school districts to make schools safer, increase awareness of mental health issues, connect children exhibiting behavioral health issues to needed services, and avoid unnecessary referrals from schools to juvenile justice and law enforcement agencies formally processing youth. In addition, funding is used to aid the development and implementation of systems for early identification of signs and symptoms of behavioral and mental health issues. For example, without early identification and intervention, trauma and exposure to violence can manifest as behaviors and issues that result in the application of exclusionary discipline or involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Grantees are to work collaboratively with law enforcement, schools, and other stakeholders in efforts to improve school climates; respond early and appropriately to student mental health and behavioral needs; use positive, alternative responses, such as diversion programs, restorative justice responses, and court-led problem-solving approaches to avoid referring students to law enforcement and juvenile justice; and facilitate a proactive and supportive school reentry process in those instances in which a youth is referred to the justice system. Efforts may include joint reviews of agencies' policies and practices; specialized training for prosecutors, school resource officers and other police officers, probation staff, and court personnel; cross-sector training with educators and mental and behavioral health practitioners and support for peer mentoring; use of diversion programs, court-led and court-based initiatives, and civil citation programs; and collaboration with schools to establish effective alternatives to formal juvenile justice processing, such as truancy panels and restorative justice programs (e.g., peer mediation and positive conflict resolution approaches). In addition, funding is to be used to strengthen multidisciplinary collaboration and joint decision making among schools, behavioral and mental health service providers, law enforcement, and juvenile justice agencies to provide a continuum of prevention and early intervention services that identify and proactively address student mental health and behavioral health issues and reduce inappropriate reliance on referrals to the justice system.

In September 2014, the DOJ awarded three-year Keeping Kids in School and Out of Court grants to four local juvenile and family courts that had partnerships with (a) a school district that had applied for both an SCTG program and a Project AWARE grant, and (b) local law enforcement. These four awards totaled approximately \$4 million, and the maximum annual grant amount was \$600,000 (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). DOJ did not fund any state-level grants.

To determine the influence of coordination of an SCTG program with Project AWARE or School Justice Collaboration Program efforts, this contractor will collect data from grantee representatives from nine state education offices and 28 school districts/cities, each of which has

an SCTG and also either a Project AWARE grant (nine states, 28 districts) or a School Justice Collaboration grant (one county). For each site, the contractor will interview up to four respondents, including (1) the grant's project director, (2) the person identified by the project director as being most closely involved in coordinating activities with the other grant at that site, and (3) one to two additional staff actively engaged in carrying out the work of the grant.

The data collection covered in this information collection is the administration of semi-structured interviews. The contractor will gather information that the grantees have reported to their sponsoring agencies; this information will be provided to the contractor directly from the Department. The purpose of gathering the extant data (from grantee applications and reports) is to allow the contractor to better understand the intended coordination of these multiple grants at the state and district level. The contractor will review all extant data relevant to each site prior to conducting interviews.

At the state level, coordination generally will focus on aligning training, technical assistance, and ongoing support activities with policy and supporting districts in implementing high-quality and well-coordinated evidence-based approaches. At the district level, coordination will focus on training and supporting staff to implement, monitor, and refine programming that currently exists in schools.

#### *Policy Background and Research Questions*

The combination and coordination of these three grant programs is intended to facilitate interagency partnerships and stimulate effective actions to address the issues of school climate, school safety, and student mental health. These goals are aligned with the purpose of the multi-tiered behavioral framework, which is the main focus of the SCTG program. Multi-tiered systems of support are a framework that requires collaboration among multiple parties to be successful. The focus of this evaluation, therefore, is to understand the nature of coordination as it occurs in sites that all are engaged in various stages of implementing these behavioral frameworks.

The evaluation questions and sub-questions to be addressed in this study are as follows:

1. What does coordination between **SCTG** and **Project AWARE** grantees look like? What does coordination between **SCTG** and the **DOJ** grantee look like?
  - a. How did grantees conceptualize coordination in their application?
  - b. What strategies did grantees use to coordinate?
  - c. What mechanisms were put in place to manage collaboration? To effectively communicate?
  - d. Who were the personnel involved in implementing the coordination strategies?
  - e. How did grantees coordinate funding from multiple grants, if at all?
  - f. What was the role of the funding agencies in different grantees' funding strategies?
  - g. What plans did grantees develop to continue coordination after the grant's end?
  - h. Do grantees perceive a connection between coordination and sustainability?

2. What did grantees say about the value of coordination?
  - a. According to grantees, did coordination help to prompt any beneficial, long-term changes in the practices or structure of the organizations or agencies? If so, what were these changes?
  - b. How did coordination influence the implementation of interventions that were planned under the various grants?
  - c. Did coordination relate to the fidelity of multi-tiered system of support implementation?
  - d. According to grantees, what were the major advantages and disadvantages of coordination?
  - e. How did coordination influence the implementation of interventions that were planned under the various grants?
  - f. How did coordination affect respondents' perceptions of school outcomes, such as school climate, discipline practices, and relationships among staff and students?
3. What were the challenges and lessons learned?
  - a. How did the two grant programs' similarities and differences affect collaboration?
  - b. To what extent did grantees find the federal support for coordination helpful in implementing their projects?
  - c. What enhanced collaboration? What inhibited collaboration?
  - d. How did coordination implementation change from grantees' original plans in their applications?

## **A2. Use of Information**

The contractor will use the data collected to prepare a final report, along with a two-page Results in Brief (RIB). These documents will describe clearly how the data address the key study questions and will highlight key findings of interest to federal staff, policy-makers, educators, behavioral health professionals, justice and law enforcement personnel, and other relevant stakeholders. The report, as well as the RIB, will be written in a manner suitable for distribution to a broad audience of federal staff, policy-makers, educators, behavioral health professionals, and other relevant stakeholders. The document will be 508 compliant, should the Department decide to post it to its website.

The data collected through this study will be of immediate interest to and significance for federal staff, policy-makers and practitioners, as it will provide timely, detailed, and policy-relevant information about the coordination of multiple federally funded programs. The study will offer unique insight into the results of federal efforts to encourage state and local education agencies to apply for grants from multiple federal agencies. The data will provide information about the benefits and challenges of implementing multiple grants. This information will help the Department determine whether similar coordination across multiple agencies might produce successful outcomes. In addition, data regarding the lessons learned from the coordination of multiple grants will help state and district staff and practitioners who plan to implement multiple grant programs.



### **A3. Use of Improved Technology to Reduce Burden**

The recruitment and data collection plans for this project reflect sensitivity to issues of efficiency and respondent burden. The study team will use a variety of information technologies to maximize the efficiency and completeness of the information gathering for this study and to minimize the burden on respondents at the state and district levels:

- Interviews will be recorded and transcribed so that the interviewers will not need to ask respondents to repeat information or clarify terms or facts that can be checked against the grant materials shared by the federal officers. This will reduce the amount of time the participant is needed on the telephone.
- A combination of an online scheduling system and telephone calls will be used to schedule each participant's interview.
- The contractor will offer participants a choice of telephone or video conference for their interview—whichever they feel more comfortable with.

### **A4. Efforts to Avoid Duplication of Effort**

Whenever possible, the study team will use existing data from the grantee application and other extant data sources. This will facilitate a more robust interview as well as potentially reduce the number of questions asked, thus limiting respondent burden and minimizing duplication of data collection efforts and information.

### **A5. Efforts to Minimize Burden on Small Businesses and Other Small Entities**

No small businesses or other small entities will be involved in this project.

### **A6. Consequences of Not Collecting the Data**

The data to be collected through the semi-structured telephone interviews are needed to inform the U.S. Department of Education about the outcomes of its coordinated-grant strategy under the *Now is the Time* initiative. Although there are other federal evaluations of *Now Is the Time*, none are specifically focused on the question of how state and local education agencies work to coordinate multiple federal grants that are meant to complement each other. Results of this study can be used to inform future policy regarding additional evaluation points for applicants who apply for multiple grants, and can provide information to states and districts about methods and strategies for successful coordination.

### **A7. Special Circumstances Causing Particular Anomalies in Data Collection**

None of the special circumstances listed apply to this data collection.

### **A8. Federal Register Announcement and Consultation**

1. **Federal Register Announcement.** The Department published the 60 day Federal Register notice on May 19, 2016, Vol. 81, page 31,619. No public comments have been received to date.

2. **Consultations Outside the Agency.** A technical working group (TWG) will be consulted as part of this study and will provide review of the study design, survey instruments, and interview protocols. The first meeting will take place April 28, 2016. The study’s TWG members, listed in Exhibit 1, bring together expertise in research on nonacademic support, developing and evaluating safe and secure learning environments, school-based mental health, and development and evaluation of multi-tiered systems of support. A second TWG meeting will be scheduled in 2017 to seek feedback on the draft final report.

**Exhibit 1. Technical Working Group Members**

Name	Affiliation
<b>Andrea Alexander</b>	Education Specialist, Student Behavior and School Climate, Maryland State Department of Education
<b>Catherine Bradshaw</b>	Professor, Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development, University of Virginia
<b>Jeff Sprague</b>	Professor, Special Education and Clinical Services, University of Oregon
<b>Sharon Stephan</b>	Associate Professor, Psychiatry Co-Director, Center for School Mental Health, University of Maryland
<b>Mark Weist</b>	Professor, Department of Psychology Director, Clinical Community Program, University of South Carolina

**A9. Payment or Gift to Respondents**

No gifts or compensation will be provided to participants in this study.

**A10. Assurance of Confidentiality**

The study team is committed to maintaining the confidentiality and security of its records. The contractor’s project staff have extensive experience collecting information and maintaining the confidentiality, security, and integrity of interview data. All members of the study team have obtained their certification on the use of human participants in research. This training addresses the importance of the confidentiality assurances given to respondents and how to handle sensitive data. The team will seek and receive approval for this study from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at American Institutes for Research (AIR). The study will have oversight to ensure that all data collection complies with professional standards and government regulations designed to safeguard the rights of research participants.

The following data protection procedures will be in place:

- The study team will protect the identity of individuals from whom we collect data for the study to the extent possible (given the small number and size of some districts included in the study) and will use the information for evaluation purposes only. Respondents’ names will be used for data collection purposes only and will be disassociated from the data prior to analysis. As information is gathered from respondents or sites, each respondent will be assigned a unique identification number, which will be used in analysis files as well as printout listings on which data are displayed. This action disassociates participants’ names from the data and provides a coded pseudonym for use in analysis. Respondents’ unique

identification numbers or pseudonyms will be used for data linkage across sources (e.g., interview and extant data). Any identifiable information will be kept in secured locations, and identifiers will be destroyed as soon as they are no longer required. In addition, the study team will shred all interview transcripts, interview forms, and any other hard-copy documents containing identifiable data as soon as the need for the hard copies no longer exists.

- Prior to beginning interviews, a member of the study team will explain to each participant what will be discussed, how the data will be used and stored, and how confidentiality will be maintained. Participants will be informed that they can stop participating at any time. The study's goals, procedures, participation risks and benefits, and uses for the data will be detailed in a consent form (included in this clearance request) that will be provided to each participant during the interview scheduling process. The information will be reviewed and consent will be confirmed prior to beginning any interview.

Our consent information will contain the following statement: We will protect the confidentiality of the information you provide, to the extent provided by law. After we collect your responses, your name will be disassociated from the data. Pseudonyms will be used for each grantee. Your responses will be used to summarize findings in an aggregate manner (across groups of grantees), or will be used to provide examples of program implementation in a manner that does not associate responses with a specific individual. Although we will not identify you by name, readers familiar with your grant may be able to deduce your identity from the information shared. Participating institutions will be acknowledged in the final report, but they will not be identified in the text of any report.

- All electronic data will be protected using several methods. The contractor's internal networks are protected from unauthorized access by defense-in-depth best practices, which incorporate firewalls and intrusion detection and prevention systems. Access to computer systems is password protected, and network passwords must be changed on a regular basis and conform to the contractor's strong password policies. The networks also are configured so that each user has a tailored set of rights, granted by the network administrator, to files approved for access and stored on the local area network (LAN). Access to all electronic data files and workbooks associated with this study will be limited to members of the study team. Any file transfer required across computer systems will be performed through a secure file transfer protocol (FTP) link.

### **A11. Sensitive Questions**

This study will ask respondents about their experiences of collaboration, including the things that facilitate this or make it challenging. Respondents may end up sharing personal opinions about colleagues or superiors that may be unflattering or may damage their reputation or employability if disclosed outside the study. These questions are necessary because collaboration is inherently interpersonal, and understanding how educators, student support personnel, and other stakeholders address these interactions is a critical component of the study.

Although the study team may collect sensitive data, no direct identifiers will be stored alongside these data, and neither respondents nor individual grant sites will be named.

## A12. Estimated Response Burden

There are 28 school districts and nine state education agencies that have received awards from both the SCTG and Project AWARE programs. There is one school district that has grants from both the SCTG program and the School Justice Collaboration Program. Thus, the study team will collect data from a total of 38 sites. At each of these sites, for each grant, we will interview a maximum of four people:

- The project director
- One to two educators or service providers directly engaged in implementing the grant’s activities
- The staff person identified by the project director as most directly involved in coordinating activities with or collaborating with the other federal grant

Staff interviewed are expected to represent a range of positions and levels, such as training coordinators, student support team leaders (often a dean or assistant principal), case management team leaders (often a school social worker or counselor), and other teaching or support staff.

We anticipate each interview will last 45–60 minutes. Details for this burden estimate are provided in Exhibit 2. We anticipate that all data will be collected in November–December, 2016.

### Exhibit 2. Estimated Annual/Total Hour and Cost Burden of Study Data Collection

Year 1: Respondent Type	Maximum Number of Respondents	Responses Per Respondent	Total Number of Responses	Maximum Hours per Response, Including Recruitment/Scheduling	Total Burden Hours	Hourly Wage*	Total Respondent Cost
<b>SCTG</b>							
State education agency team (9 sites)	12	1	36	1.25	15	44.13	\$662
School district team (29 sites)	38.67	1	116	1.25	48.34	30.79	\$1,489
<b>Project AWARE</b>							
State education agency team (9 sites)	12	1	36	1.25	15	44.13	\$662
School district team (28 sites)	37.33	1	112	1.25	46.68	26.94	\$1,258
<b>School Justice Collaboration Program</b>							
Family court team (1 site)	1.33	1	4	1.25	1.68	44.00	\$74
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>101.33</b>		<b>268</b>		<b>380</b>		<b>\$4,145</b>

<b>Year 2: Respondent Type</b>	<b>Maximum Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Responses Per Respondent</b>	<b>Total Number of Responses</b>	<b>Maximum Hours per Response, Including Recruitment/Scheduling</b>	<b>Total Burden Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Wage*</b>	<b>Total Respondent Cost</b>
<b>SCTG</b>							
State education agency team (9 sites)	12	1	36	1.25	15	44.13	\$662
School district team (29 sites)	38.67	1	116	1.25	48.34	30.79	\$1,489
<b>Project AWARE</b>							
State education agency team (9 sites)	12	1	36	1.25	15	44.13	\$662
School district team (28 sites)	37.33	1	112	1.25	46.68	26.94	\$1,258
<b>School Justice Collaboration Program</b>							
Family court team (1 site)	1.33	1	4	1.25	1.68	44.00	\$74
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>101.33</b>		<b>268</b>		<b>380</b>		<b>\$4,145</b>

<b>Year 3: Respondent Type</b>	<b>Maximum Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Responses Per Respondent</b>	<b>Total Number of Responses</b>	<b>Maximum Hours per Response, Including Recruitment/Scheduling</b>	<b>Total Burden Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Wage*</b>	<b>Total Respondent Cost</b>
<b>SCTG</b>							
State education agency team (9 sites)	12	1	36	1.25	15	44.13	\$662
School district team (29 sites)	38.67	1	116	1.25	48.34	30.79	\$1,489
<b>Project AWARE</b>							
State education agency team (9 sites)	12	1	36	1.25	15	44.13	\$662
School district team (28 sites)	37.33	1	112	1.25	46.68	26.94	\$1,258
<b>School Justice Collaboration Program</b>							
Family court team (1 site)	1.33	1	4	1.25	1.68	44.00	\$74
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>101.33</b>		<b>268</b>		<b>380</b>		<b>\$4,145</b>

\*Wage information was collected from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (www.bls.gov) by role, using mean national wages. Wages for state education agency staff were assigned based on the role “education administrators, elementary and secondary.” SCTG district staff were assigned the wage for an “instructional coordinator.” Project AWARE school district team staff were assigned the wage for school counselors. School Justice Collaboration Program staff were assigned the mean national wage for “administrative law judges, adjudicators, and hearing officers.”

**A13. Estimate of Annualized Cost for Data Collection Activities**

There are no additional annualized costs for data collection activities associated with this data collection beyond the total hour burden estimated in item A12. All data collection is expected to occur during a roughly two-month period during Year 2 of this study.

**A14. Estimate of Annualized Cost to Federal Government**

The estimated cost to the federal government for the Task Order 23 interviews, including development of the study plan and data collection instruments as well as data collection, data analysis, and report preparation, is \$499,874 for the two years of the study, or approximately \$249,937 per year.

**A15. Reasons for Changes in Estimated Burden**

This is a new data collection.

**A16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication**

Findings from the study will be reported to the Department by the contractor in a final report, along with a short summary report called Results in Brief. The final report is expected to be cleared for release by September 2017. This final report will be available on AIR’s and ED’s website and disseminated through ED’s public communication channels and directly to all participants in the study. AIR may also disseminate overall study findings through AIR’s external contacts (AIR News e-mail is sent to more than 30,000 contacts) and the AIR Policy Center.

The proposed timeline for data collection and reporting activities is described in detail below and shown in Exhibit 3.

**Exhibit 3. Timeline for Data Collection Activities and Reporting**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
Draft interview protocols	February 2016
Revise interview protocols	March 2016
TWG meeting to review protocols	April 2016
Submit OMB package and revisions	April 2016
Work with PPSS/OSHS to identify potential participants	August 2016
Conduct interviews	November–December 2016
Code extant data	December 2016
Code interview transcripts	January 2017

Activity	Time Frame
Preliminary summary	February 2017
Draft of final report and Results in Brief	March 2017
Second TWG meeting	July 2017
Revised final report and Results in Brief	September 2017

Note. PPSS = Policy and Program Studies Service; OSHS = Office of Safe Healthy Students; TWG = technical working group; OMB = Office of Management and Budget

### **A17. Display of Expiration Date for OMB Approval**

All data collection instruments will display the OMB approval expiration date.

### **A18. Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions**

No exceptions to the certification statement identified in Item 19, “Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions,” of OMB Form 83-I are requested.

## **References**

- Hodges, S., Nesman, T., & Hernandez, M. (1999). *Promising practices: Building collaboration in systems of care*. Systems of Care: Promising Practices in Children’s Mental Health, 1998 Series, Volume VI. Washington, DC: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, American Institutes for Research.
- Osher, D. (2002). Creating comprehensive and collaborative systems. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 11, 91–99.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Request for Task Order. Task Order 23, Evaluation of the School Climate Transformation Grant Program*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development.
- White House. (2013). *Now Is the Time: The President’s plan to protect our children and our communities by reducing gun violence*. Washington DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://wh.gov/now-is-the-time>.