

Item Number	Received Inquiries	Generated Response
1	<p>Did CSDE identify an evaluator in its federal funding proposal? If yes, why is the evaluation being put out to bid and is that evaluator eligible to bid on this opportunity? If no, did CSDE engage an external consultant to develop the evaluation section of its federal proposal? Is that consultant eligible to bid on this opportunity?</p> <p>In reading the US Department of Education's SCTG application, I noticed that grantees were required to name their evaluator at the time of application for funding. Did the CSDE do this, and if so, is the evaluator that was named allowed to compete in this bidding process? And, are you able to give out the name of that evaluator?</p>	<p>The CSDE did not identify an evaluator in its federal funding proposal. Per guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, state agencies were to not identify a specific vendor for the purposes of project evaluation through their application. In response to this guidance, the CSDE did not engage an external consultant. Further, the USDOE's general administrative regulations (EDGAR) state that all procurements using Federal funds must be conducted in a manner that will allow for fair and open competition and in accordance with applicable laws and regulations for your state. As such and per Section II (page 6) of the State of Connecticut's Office of Policy and Management Procurement standards, a "competitive procurement" is the purchase or acquisition of services by a State agency through an open and fair process, where all responsible sources have an equal opportunity to pursue, and possibly be selected for, a contract to provide the agency with the desired services. This process has been designed to foster an impartial and comprehensive evaluation of multiple proposals, thus eliminating improprieties, favoritism, and unethical practices.</p> <p>Further, using a "Request for Proposal" (RFP) process, the CSDE has publicly communicated appropriate information in regards to this opportunity, will evaluate and rate according to the agency's predetermined criteria, and select the proposal that best meets the interests of the State.</p> <p>This opportunity has been established as an open and transparent process to identify the highest quality independent evaluator for this project. All interested parties may submit their written proposals in response to the CSDE's solicitation by January 6, 2015.</p> <p>Further details around Connecticut's procurement process and requirements may be found at the following website:  <a href="http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/PSA_POS_Procurement_Standards_5-22-14.pdf">http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/PSA_POS_Procurement_Standards_5-22-14.pdf</a></p>

2	How much funding did CSDE budget for evaluation in each of the five years?	The CSDE has budgeted the following for the purposes of project evaluation within each year of this opportunity: Year 1: \$30,000; Year 2: \$30,000; Year 3: \$30,000; Year 4: \$40,000; and Year 5: \$40,000 for a total allotment of \$170,000.00 across the 5-years of this project.
3	It would be helpful to see the federal proposal and any reviewer comments, particularly the evaluation section. Can this be provided for bidders?	<p>Reviewer comments have not yet been received by the CSDE; therefore, these comments cannot be shared at this time.</p> <p>The CSDE’s federal proposal has been posted for review to the following state department website: <a href="http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp">http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp</a>.</p> <p>In addition, the broad evaluation questions the State defined in its application package have been provided here for review:</p> <p>(a) What evidence is there that implementation at the State Education Agency (SEA) level is sufficient to successfully support Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through all phases of School Climate Transformation Grant (SCTG) project implementation?</p> <p>(b) How has the SCTG affected the SEA’s capacity for supporting the sustained and broad-scale implementation of an MTBF by LEAs statewide?</p> <p>(c) What evidence is there that participating LEAs have been able to adopt and install core components of the SCTG project?</p> <p>(d) How has the SCTG affected LEAs’ capacity to implement and sustain a multi-tiered behavioral framework (i.e., fidelity and sustainability of Tiers 1, 2, and 3)?</p> <p>(e) What evidence is there that the SEA has coordinated its SCTG efforts with the appropriate federal, state, and local resources?</p> <p>(f) How have these efforts enhanced the overall statewide implementation fidelity and sustainability of the MTBFs?)</p>
4	Have there been any substantial changes to the implementation plan	No substantial changes have been made to the implementation plan from what was

	from what was proposed?	proposed.
<b>5</b>	How much flexibility is there to propose methods that differ from the evaluation section in the federal proposal?	<p>The evaluation section in the CSDE’s federal proposal specified the general structure and approach this project would require. While specific tools were mentioned (e.g., Tiered Fidelity Inventory), the specific timelines, outcome variables, and evaluation methodology were not; therefore, some flexibility in defining this specific process does exist.</p> <p>Objective measures of progress for each goal and objective will be established during the initial stages of implementation (Year 1 of the grant). In addition, data sources, indicators, and targets will be defined for all process and outcome objectives. While outcome evaluation data were not specifically identified, particular tools were mentioned as potential sources of information through the CSDE’s application. Outcome evaluation data will likely include data from multiple PBIS fidelity measures such as the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) and Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ); as well as referral, and suspension and expulsion data from the School-Wide Information System (SWIS).</p>
<b>6</b>	Will the evaluator be responsible for annual and final GPRA reporting as described on page 16 of the federal application packet?	Yes
<b>7</b>	Should the evaluation budget include funds for the evaluator to attend the annual meeting in Washington DC?	Yes, the evaluation budget should include funds for the evaluator to attend both an annual meeting in Washington D.C. as well as an annual meeting in Chicago, IL.
<b>8</b>	Can you identify the other states that are participating in this grant?	Eleven other states were awarded the School Climate Transformation Grant. Those states were: (a) Delaware Department of Education, (b) Florida Department of Education, (c) Hawaii Department of Education, (d) Iowa Department of Education, (e) Michigan Department of Education, (f) Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, (g) Montana Office of Public Instruction, (h) Nevada Department of Education, (i) Ohio Department of Education, (j) Virginia Department of Education, and (k) Wisconsin Department of Public Education. To view a full list

		of district award recipients of the School Climate Transformation grant opportunity, please visit <a href="http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-invests-more-70-million-improve-school-climate-and-keep-">http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-invests-more-70-million-improve-school-climate-and-keep-</a>
<b>9</b>	Do you plan to work with one or more of those states in any collaborative effort?	At this time, no formalized relationships have been established through this project. While it is not a requirement of this project to formally engage other states, it is our project's intent to collaborate and communicate our progress in an ongoing manner with other state recipients.
<b>10</b>	Do you plan to work with any university in any formal collaborative effort?	The Center for Behavioral Education Research (CBER) out of the University of Connecticut has been identified as one of the grant's contracted partners. CBER's work will focus on the review, development and delivery of our training of trainer's model as it relates to Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS). CBER's work will also focus on establishing an appropriate procedure to identify previously trained PBIS technical assistance providers from across CT, providing them with an opportunity to pursue further learning and application of critical PBIS content.
<b>11</b>	Do you expect to develop any universal templates or models for evaluation purposes in concert with other states?	Not at this time. A well-articulated, specific evaluation model will be required for the Annual Performance Report (APR) within this project and will be a primary responsibility of the grant evaluator.
<b>12</b>	Can you provide any further plan abstract elements on how you expect to unfold the project over the next years, with any milestones?	Please see the grant's <b>Management Plan</b> within CT's federal proposal, which can be found at <a href="http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp">http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp</a> . This plan outlines the general scope and timeline of the CT SCTG. Goals, objectives, and lead staff members are also identified.
<b>13</b>	Do you have a specific budget allocation established for the evaluator team?	See response to item 2 above.

<p><b>14</b></p>	<p>Do you have time allocation guidelines or expectations of evaluator team member participation in project development and implementation versus evaluator activities per se?</p>	<p>Specific time allocation guidelines have not been specified within the CT SCTG application. The CT SCTG management team expects that the appropriately credentialed individuals have been identified and will commit a sufficient amount of focused effort on this project. Individual(s) identified to function in the grant evaluator capacity will be expected to assist in the development of the project’s evaluation process while also taking the lead on project evaluation implementation, data gathering, analysis, and report generating. Please also see the “Scope of Services” and “Product and/or Services Specifications Required for Proposal” sections (pages 5-7) within the posted RFP (RFP#14SDE0019-RFP).</p>
<p><b>13</b></p>	<p>Assuming that there is at least one LEA that got a grant under the grant program, will there be a collaborative effort with that district? Will the evaluator have any added role there?</p>	<p>Zero Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were awarded the school climate transformation grant-LEA opportunity in CT. To view a full list of awarded states and districts under this funding opportunity, please visit <a href="http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-invests-more-70-million-improve-school-climate-and-keep-">http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-invests-more-70-million-improve-school-climate-and-keep-</a></p>
<p><b>14</b></p>	<p>Are there other grants such as SAMHSA, AWARE, School Emergency Management, etc. that will have a bearing on the SCTG SEA activities and evaluator’s role?</p>	<p>Goal number three of the CT SCTG has been established to coordinate efforts with appropriate federal, state and local resources. Please see Appendix A within CT’s federal application (posted at <a href="http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp">http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp</a>) for identified corresponding projects, legislation, and activities the CT SCTG will work to align with across the five years of this project. Note that this crosswalk document entitled “CT SCTG alignment to pre-existing efforts” is not meant to be an exhaustive list of alignment opportunities; however, were identified during the application process.</p>
<p><b>15</b></p>	<p>Please make available an electronic copy of CT’s SCTG grant application.</p>	<p>See response to item 3 above.</p>
<p><b>16</b></p>	<p>Please list the level of grant funds allocated to the evaluation activities for each year of the grant.</p>	<p>See response to item 2 above.</p>

17	Please list the level of other funds allocated to the evaluation activities for each year of the grant.	Zero additional CSDE funds have been allocated specifically for evaluation activities under this project.
18	To what extent can the goals, objectives, and performance measures of the grant application be adjusted now and/or during implementation (as other circumstances arise).	See response to item 5 above.
19	Will the CTSDE project management team include a representative from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research & Evaluation or other experts from implementation partners? If yes, who and at what level of effort/commitment?	A specific education consultant from the CSDE's Bureau of Data Collection has not been identified as a standing member of the CT SCTG's management team; however, ongoing communication and collaboration with this and other relevant Bureaus will be encouraged. Regular management team meetings dates and times have been established and are currently convening. The two primary contracted partners within the CT SCTG (i.e., State Education Resource Center and the Center for Behavioral Education Research) actively participate in these meetings.
20	Does the PBIS Data Report and Summary contain the type of information expected from the evaluation activities?	The PBIS data report information significantly overlaps with both the type and level of outcome data that will be expected from the CT SCTG evaluator. Additional forms of evaluation data collection will also be required to comprehensively address and monitor the evaluation questions posed within the CT SCTG federal application (see response to item 3 above).
21	Do you expect the evaluator to offer sustainability recommendations for PBIS implementation and evaluation that integrate PowerSchool platforms in addition to the SWIS suite?	The CT SCTG management team expects the evaluator to provide informed recommendations as they pertain to statewide MTBF sustainability efforts. Recommendations should be based off-of reliable implementation data, regular progress monitoring of grant activities, and a thorough understanding of how sustainability efforts may find success within the context of our state. These recommendations may involve how data collection platforms, such as PowerSchool and SWIS suite, could be better aligned or integrated.

22	Does CTSDE maintain a list of other MTBF or social and emotional learning curricula for which implementation may be underway in districts in CT?	Not at this time.
23	Is CTSDE interested in understanding the extent to which PBIS schools compare to other schools implementing non-PBIS MTBFs or other evidence-based strategies that affect school climate?	The CT SCTG management team is primarily concerned with monitoring how an evidence-based multi-tiered behavioral framework (MTBF) such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) may be implemented successfully within schools and districts. Comparing various implementation models of MTBFs is not of primary focus at this time. Instead, the CT SCTG will remain focused on the absolute priority under this funding opportunity which states “to develop, enhance, or expand statewide systems of support for... implementing an evidence, based, multi-tiered behavioral framework for improving behavioral outcomes and learning conditions for all students.”
24	The PBIS data report and summary (2011-2012) shows that primarily white students receive PBIS office visits yet significant racial/ethnic disparities exist in other CTSDE priority initiatives such as reducing chronic absenteeism, school suspension, and school expulsions, among others. Will grant implementation and evaluation activities address these types of disparities?	Yes. Grant implementation and evaluation activities will provide specific, targeted support to a select number of identified schools (n=6). Within goal 2 of this project, we will focus on improving school staff’s capacities to consistently provide systematic social/emotional/behavioral support to all students. See pages 6-9 of the CT SCTG federal application for further details ( <a href="http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp">http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp</a> ).
25	The UConn Neag School of Education center for Behavioral Education and Research serves as a PBIS grant implementation partner. To what extent does this role in implementation preclude them from consideration by CTSDE as a project	The UConn Neag School of Education’s Center for Behavioral Education Research (CBER) has been identified as a primary partner within this project (see item 10 above). As such, CBER will not be submitting an application to also serve as project evaluator.

	evaluator?	
<b>26</b>	What type of incentives exist for the approximate 315 Connecticut schools currently implementing the PBIS framework to participate in evaluation activities?	The CT SCTG management team is currently discussing the approach and methodology we will employ to incentivize and collaborate with the approximately 315 schools implementing the PBIS framework across our state.
<b>27</b>	Do definitions exist for terms used to frame grant objectives. For example, does CTSDE have existing standards for trained professionals to “deliver effective, meaningful support”?	No. Parameters and descriptions of such terms and phrases will be developed and communicated in an ongoing manner among the CT SCTG management team to ensure consistent expectations are established and preserved while carrying out grant trainings and related activities.
<b>28</b>	What does CTSDE consider as its primary “statewide improvement efforts focusing on school climate”? Prior identification of these efforts (and their implementation status) will improve analysis and recommendations to align PBIS with other existing MBTF and other school climate improvement initiatives.	A variety of statewide improvement efforts currently exist which focus on improving school climate (see Appendix A of CT’s federal proposal found at <a href="http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp">http://www.ct.gov/sde/rfp</a> ). Improvement efforts are ongoing and consequently range in their current implementation levels. The CT SCTG will align with current state efforts, working to maximize the use of awarded funds to improve the state’s capacity (trainer capacity and LEA capacity) to improve the implementation of evidence-based MTBFs.
<b>29</b>	What is the role and time commitment of the Project Coordinator in supporting evaluation activities?	The Project Coordinator will be responsible for working closely with the identified project evaluator. This will likely involve regular communication (e-mail, phone), in-person meetings, and structured feedback to reports produced by the project evaluator. The Project Coordinator holds a 1.0FTE within this project. The specific time required to collaborate with the project evaluator will be established promptly once the project evaluator has been identified. It is expected that this relationship will be a reciprocal one and will involve ample time to support evaluation activities in an ongoing manner.



<b>30</b>	Please provide an example of what it means to “synthesize a variety of outcome measures”? To what extent is this type of synthesis expected to supplement the PBIS primary unit of analysis of an “office discipline referral”? Are these additional outcome measures expected to provide insight about the support services or community referrals subsequent to an “office discipline referral”?	See response to item 5 above. A variety of assessment tools, monitoring instruments, and fidelity measures have been identified in CT’s federal application. A primary responsibility of the project’s evaluator will be to utilize an innovative approach, coupling the outcomes from these various evaluations with those metrics gathered from the school level as well (e.g., office discipline referrals). An eloquent synthesis of these data will greatly inform and assist in the development of the Annual Performance Report (APR) for this project as well as other evaluation reports that may be generated. In part, each of these metrics will provide a unique analysis of the CT SCTG’s efforts as they relate to our posed evaluation questions (see item 3 above). Subsequently, these additional outcome measures may provide additional insight and recommendations as they pertain to support services for students in schools.
-----------	--	--