

APPLICATION COVER SHEET- ONLINE
Alternatives to Suspension Grant Award Opportunity
Points Possible: 100 POINTS

Complete this form electronically by filling in the form fields. The individual(s) with legal authority must sign electronically.

PROJECT INFORMATION	
Starting Date: July 1, 2009	AMOUNT REQUESTED: \$ <u>19,756</u> [Round to the nearest dollar]
Ending Date: June 30, 2010	Funding Source and Year: Special Education Grants to States, IDEA Part B- 611, CFDA 84.027A
	Up to: \$20,000 per award
APPLICANT INFORMATION	
School District /Organization or Agency: <u>Grants and Research Office of Intermediate District 287 & Northeast Metro 916</u>	ISD#: <u>287 & 916</u>
Address: <u>1820 Xenium Lane North Plymouth, MN 55441</u>	Telephone: <u>763-559-3535</u> Fax: <u>763-550-7199</u> Email: <u>jcholmberg@district287.org</u>
LEGALLY BINDING	
IDENTIFIED OFFICIAL WITH AUTHORITY Name and Title: <u>Sandy Lewandowski, Superintendent</u>	PERSON WITH LEGAL AUTHORITY TO SIGN LEGAL DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE DISTRICT/ORGANIZATION/AGENCY
PROVIDE THE NAME AND TITLE OF THE MAIN PERSON WITH LEGAL AUTHORITY TO SIGN LEGAL DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT/ORGANIZATION/AGENCY	BY ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE, YOU ARE GRANTING APPROVAL TO SUBMIT APPLICATION AND AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ASSURANCES AND REQUIREMENTS AS STATED IN THIS GRANT OPPORTUNITY.
Name and Title: <u>Sandy Lewandowski, Superintendent</u> PERSON WITH LEGAL AUTHORITY TO SIGN LEGAL DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE ORGANIZATION/AGENCY	IF 2 ND SIGNER IS REQUIRED BY YOUR ORGANIZATION/AGENCY - BY ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE, YOU ARE GRANTING APPROVAL TO SUBMIT APPLICATION AND AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ASSURANCES AND REQUIREMENTS AS STATED IN THIS GRANT OPPORTUNITY.
ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE/PERMISSIONS REQUIRED	
CONTACTS	
NAME & TITLE OF PROGRAM CONTACT REPRESENTATIVE: <u>Jane Holmberg, Ed.D., Executive Director of Teaching & Learning</u> Address: <u>1820 Xenium Lane North, Plymouth MN 55441</u>	Telephone: <u>763-550-7152</u> Fax: <u>763-5507199</u> Email: <u>jcholmberg@district287.org</u>
SCHOOL DISTRICT OR AGENCY ACCOUNTANT: <u>Phyllis Vit</u> Address: <u>1820 Xenium Lane North, Plymouth MN 55441</u>	Telephone: <u>763-550-7242</u> Fax: <u>763-550-7199</u> Email: <u>PMVit@district287.org</u>

AGREEMENT TO COMPLY WITH ASSURANCES FORM - ONLINE

Complete this form electronically by filling in the form fields. The individual(s) with legal authority must sign.

In regard to potential funding of an award, the following clauses are stated in their entirety in the application materials section titled ASSURANCES. For the purpose of this form, said clauses are referenced only by their clause number and heading hereafter in this Agreement to Comply with Assurances form.

The applicant/awardee must comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations and provisions stated therein and herein in the performance of the award should grant funds be awarded.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. SURVIVAL OF TERMS | 11. ANTITRUST |
| 2. USE OF FUNDS | 12. GOVERNING LAW, JURISDICTION AND VENUE |
| 3. EQUIPMENT | 13. LOBBYING* |
| 4. FINANCIAL & ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS | 14. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS* |
| 5. LIABILITY | 15. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (Awardees Other Than Individuals)* |
| 6. OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS | 16. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (Awardees Who Are Individuals)* |
| 7. PUBLICITY | 17. TRANSFERABILITY |
| 8. GOVERNMENT DATA PRACTICES | 18. TIME |
| 9. DATA DISCLOSURE | 19. OTHER PROVISIONS |
| 10. WORKER'S COMPENSATION | |

Regarding clauses 13, 14, 15 and 16:

These provisions are required when the award involves federal funds. Applicants shall refer to the regulations cited to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 34 CFR Part 82, "New Restrictions on Lobbying,"; 34 CFR Part 84, Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants) and 34 CFR Part 85 Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Non-procurement) and the certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Minnesota Department of Education determines the award.

The title of the application award opportunity: **Alternatives to Suspension**

The applicant shall list the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with this specific award opportunity.

South Education Center
7450 Penn Ave South
Richfield, MN 55423 - Hennepin County

East View Academy - Capitol View Center
70 West County Road B-2
Little Canada, MN 55117- Ramsey County

Shady Oak Education Center
6754 Shady Oak Road
Eden Prairie, MN 55344 - Hennepin County

Metro Heights Academy
3989 Central Ave. N.E.
Columbia Heights, MN 55421- Hennepin County

Place of Performance/ Street Address

Check if there are (additional) workplaces on file that are not identified above.

By signing this form, I/we Grants and Research Office (GRO) of Intermediate Dist. 287 & Northeast Metro 916 the applicant, acknowledge that I have read the assurances in their entirety as stated within the application materials and shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations and provisions stated therein and herein in the performance of this award opportunity should the organization be awarded funds and become a grantee. I/we hereby assure and agree to comply with all conditions and submit required documents and certifications as required.

For the purpose of electronic submission the ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE agreement replaces the ink signature. You must still submit this form.

Sandy Lewandowski, Superintendent

[Type Name and Title of Identified Official with Authority To Sign
Must bear same signature as on the Application Cover Sheet

APPLICATION BUDGET SUMMARY - ONLINE

Alternatives to Suspension Grant Opportunity

Points Possible for Budget Narrative and Summary Combined 10

This budget summary and budget narrative must align. Possible points are for both forms combined. The budget narrative must provide detailed explanations for each budget expense category. For assistance see the Application Instructions 'Budget Narrative' and the Budget Line Item Descriptions / Categories information.

DIVISION NAME: Special Education Policy			
GRANTEE/FISCAL AGENT NAME <u>Intermediate District 287</u>			
PROJECT NAME: <u>Alternatives to Suspension</u>			
OBJECT CODE	BUDGET LINE ITEM CATEGORIES	MDE AMOUNT OF FUNDS REQUESTED	REVENUE INCOME, IF APPLICABLE
100	SALARIES AND WAGES (including subpay if not contracted out) – not to exceed 10% for administrative costs	<u>800</u>	_____
200	FRINGE BENEFITS	<u>112</u>	_____
300	PURCHASED SERVICES – Series * see note below	<u>12,700</u>	_____
	CONSULTANT/CONTRACTED SERVICES <u>8000</u>		
	COMMUNICATIONS (Phone, Internet, Postage/Parcel & Purchased Printing)		

	STAFF TRAVEL – Instate _____		

	WORKSHOP & CONFERENCE EXPENSES - Meals, Meeting Room Costs, Lodging for Participants (master bill), AV equipment <u>4700</u>		
	OPERATING LEASE OR RENTALS (If not included in indirect cost) _____		
396 & 397	PAYMENTS TO SCHOOLS - for Agreements to Purchase Licensed Staff Time <u>4412</u>		
	PURCHASED SERVICES - Other (Identify in detail in the Budget Narrative)		

400	SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS - Series	<u>1000</u>	_____
	SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS - Non-Instructional _____		
	SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS – Instructional <u>1000</u>		
800	OTHER EXPENDITURES (Identify in detail in Budget Narrative section)	_____	_____

DIRECT	TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	<u>19,024</u>	_____

INDIRECT	TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS - Schools use current approved restricted rates. Nonprofits, Ed districts, Education Cooperatives use a maximum of 8%. Please identify INDIRECT Rate used 5.01% and if this is federal funds, indirect must only be calculated on the first \$25,000 of each sub-award/ sub-contract.	<u>732</u>	_____
TOTAL	TOTAL (should include direct and indirect cost)	<u>\$ 19,756</u>	\$ _____
NOTE::	Indirect must only be calculated on the first \$25,000 of each sub-award/ sub-contract, for federally funded projects using approved restricted indirect cost rate. If selected, a budget revision request must be submitted for any budget line item changes that exceed the amount defined in the Official Grant Award Notification. Some unallowable expenditure(s) are: gifts, entertainment, gift certificates, amusement, alcohol, etc., or to pay for vendor exhibits. *Grants made exclusively for the purpose of supporting conferences are not allowed reimbursement for indirect costs.		

Budget Narrative		2 PAGE MAX.
UFARS Code	Activity	Grant costs
100	Substitutes for 2 coaches for 2 days each x \$140/day (Intermediate District 287 schools)	560
100	Extended time for 1 coach to plan and analyze data for 8 hrs x \$30/hr (Intermediate District 287 schools)	240
100		
100		
200	Fringe benefits for substitutes (Intermediate District 287 schools)	78
200	Fringe benefits for coach time (Intermediate District 287 schools)	34
300	(391) payment to School Districts (Northeast Metro 916 schools) Substitutes for 2 coaches for 2 days each x \$140/day + benefits	638
300	(391) payment to School Districts (Northeast Metro 916 schools) Extended time for 1 coach to plan & analyze data: 8 hrs. x \$30/hr + benefits	274
300	(391) payment to School Districts (Northeast Metro 916 schools) Registration and travel expenses for 2 coaches for advanced 3-day training @ \$1750 each	3500
300	(366) Workshop fees and Travel (Intermediate District 287 schools) Registration and travel expenses for 2 coaches for advanced 3-day training @ \$1750 each	3500
300	(305) Fees for Service Workshop fees for Center for Collaborative Problem Solving Trainers (60 attendees x \$134 per person)	8000
400	(305) workshop Food and Materials Workshop refreshments and materials (60 attendees x \$20 each)	1200
400	Non-instructional Supplies 40 <i>Lost at School</i> texts for instructors who do not already have this resource x \$25 each	1000
800	Indirect costs @ 5.01%	732
Total		\$19,756

I. STATEMENT OF NEED (10 PTS)

Intermediate Districts 287 and Northeast Metro 916 provide specialized services to 25 member and affiliate school districts. Our unique mission is to provide programs and services that support members in meeting their most challenging educational needs. In service of this mission, the intermediate districts operate Area Learning Centers (ALCs) for students in grades 9 -12 at risk of not graduating from high school. The primary focus of our alternative to suspension program proposal is to decrease suspensions in four ALC sites by implementing the Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) Program. Two ALC sites are located in Intermediate 287 and two are in Northeast Metro 916.

Our ALC student population aligns with the populations of students most often suspended, according to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) statewide data analysis (Reistenberg, 2009) of the disciplinary incident reporting system. Nearly 80% of the students at our four identified sites are White, Non-Hispanic or Black, Non-Hispanic. Additionally, we have nearly 25% of the students in our ALCs identified as receiving special education services, a greater percentage of special education students than the state average. This percentage translates into a greater number of suspensions of special education students than in the general population, mirroring the statewide suspension statistics.

The very criteria that allow students to attend an ALC can be associated with common reasons for suspension. These criteria include difficulties with academics, mental health problems, physical or sexual abuse, homelessness, and exclusion or expulsion from school. Students who meet these criteria often lack support systems and exhibit poor judgment, poor social perception, and aggressive behaviors that trigger suspensions. Many have failed in their former high school programs, have tended to be suspended frequently, and some have been expelled.

Our needs assessment has included analysis not only of the demographics, but also of student achievement. Scores on statewide assessments illustrate that the achievement of these alternative education students is significantly below what would be expected given their cognitive ability. The results from the MCA II tests in April 2007 show 100% of students not proficient on statewide 11th grade math tests in our Metro Heights, East View, and South Education Center programs; 80% not proficient at Prairie Center Alternative.

Suspension data for our ALCs reveals disturbing trends. While students attend an ALC because it is a supportive environment where they can receive individual attention, they continue to be suspended for offenses such as fighting, verbal abuse, threats, intimidation, disruptive or disorderly conduct, and insubordination. At the Northeast Metro 916 Metro Heights site, with a population of 118 students, 30 incidents of suspension were recorded during the 2007-2008 school year. As of March, 2009, 24 students have been suspended at Metro Heights and 18 at East View. At Intermediate 287, the total number of suspensions in the ALC more than doubled in 2007-08 from the previous year, up from 22 to 49. And the trend is appearing to continue this year.

It is our goal to implement the CPS program, which is based on the premise that student behavior should be addressed in the school setting. This approach will lead to a reduction in suspensions that take students away from the very experiences they need in order to graduate and eventually begin post-secondary learning. Grant dollars will give us capacity to provide training and support for all staff (teachers, education assistants, administrators, and support staff) to implement the CPS model.

II. ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION PROGRAM (15 PTS)

Our proposal is to implement the Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) model, developed from the research of Dr. Ross Greene as an approach to reducing suspensions. This model is based on the underlying philosophy that students “do well if they can” and views discipline incidents as teachable opportunities. From the perspective of the CPS philosophy, school staff uncover the underlying causes of the maladaptive behavior and work with the student to develop the skills and strategies they are lacking to prevent similar behavior from recurring. Discipline incidents are viewed as a problem to be solved as opposed to an event requiring a consequence. This is a shift in the philosophy for most adults who think that students' poor behavior can only be addressed by giving consequences. There is an underlying belief in the CPS model that consequences are generally not effective and that students can and need to learn to change their response to their frustrations. Even more important, teachers need to be proactive in identifying situations which lead to maladaptive behavior and to develop a plan for responding to or preventing those situations.

The CPS approach has emerged as result of research identifying five categories of lagging thinking skills that lead to challenging behaviors (Greene, *Lost at School*, 2009). The categories are: (a) executive functioning skills, (b) language processing skills, (c) emotion regulation skills, (d) cognitive flexibility skills and (e) social skills. These are the skills that students attending ALCs need most. These students have a history of failure; they need to first learn the prerequisite thinking and social skills that will support them in learning academic skills. Our ALC programs must concentrate on skill building in areas that will enable students to address the behavioral challenges that keep them from staying in school.

The research base for CPS is extensive; being first used in medical facilities. CPS has been highly successful in reducing restraint and seclusion in in-patient facilities (Martin et. Al. 2008) and has recently been used in several schools throughout the country to reduce the use of detentions and suspensions.

The research supporting the positive outcomes achieved by CPS is understandable and fully described, has been conducted in a range of settings-families, school, in-patient psychiatric units, and juvenile detention facilities- and is published (or in press) in peer reviewed journals. These studies have been conducted using both experimental (randomized) and quasi-experimental designs. The effectiveness of CPS is being independently studied in multiple settings in North America and Europe. Among the most ambitious are a five year National Institute of Mental health- funded study at the Virginia Tech Child Study Center and a three-year study in the seven public schools in Sanford, Maine, funded by the Maine Juvenile Justice Advisory Group. Greene, pg.58, 2009

Where CPS is being used, staff employ CPS strategies that promote academic success, decrease inappropriate behaviors, and increase student engagement. Using this comprehensive, leveled intervention model, the interconnectedness of academic and behavioral challenges is evident. While examining student behaviors to identify triggers and unsolved problems, academic struggles are often identified and addressed. Undeveloped personal and academic skills frequently lead to poor behavioral choices. For example, one part of the model, the Pathways Inventory, is used to identify lagging thinking skills that may lead to challenging behavior; now these identified thinking skills can be developed.

The CPS program is designed to match problem behavior with the most effective intervention. It is congruent with the Response to Intervention (RtI) model as it involves a pyramid of interventions. Initial low level behavioral incidents are addressed by the staff member working with the student

through a problem solving discussion called "Plan B." These discussions are designed to determine the underlying causes of the behavior and develop a plan with the student for preventing the behavior in the future. This approach is especially important when working with high school students who should be functioning at higher levels of monitoring their own behavior. When possible the discussions are done proactively to prevent the behavior.

When the problem solving discussions with the student are not sufficient, staff members are also trained in how to diffuse highly agitated students using "Emergency Plan B" strategies. These strategies help to diffuse and de-escalate a crisis.

The next level of intervention is initiated for students that continue to demonstrate a pattern of behavioral issues that have not been resolved through individual Plan B interventions. To more thoroughly address the challenges facing these students, a meeting of all staff working with the student is conducted to evaluate what lagging skills and unsolved problems are leading to challenging behaviors and how staff can support the learning of these skills.

During this CPS meeting staff share examples of situations in which the student has exhibited challenging behavior and focus on a situational analysis of the factors that preceded the behavior. Staff members complete a Pathways Inventory, collecting their shared knowledge of the student. The Pathways Inventory helps staff identify triggers, unsolved problems, and lagging thinking skills that have contributed to the challenges facing the student. Finally, staff develop a plan for the student in which they prioritize which problems and skills will be addressed first, who will address them, and when the team will reconvene to measure progress and refine the plan. The plan is documented on a form maintained in the students' file.

Implementing the various levels of the program reinforces the sharing of strategies by staff members that have been used in working with the student, what the results of these previous interventions have been, and what might be next steps. Fidelity of implementation will be assured in three primary ways: (1) through colleagues supporting one another as the strategies become institutionalized and (2) through coaching and mentoring available from staff members who have received additional training and (3) through staff refining all student observation, incident, and suspension paperwork and requiring staff to consider and document potential lagging skills, triggers, and unsolved problems in the forms.

The evaluation plan for instituting CPS at our four identified sites includes analysis not only of the extent to which the training was effective, but also the extent to which the staff agrees that a true system has been implemented for reducing suspensions. This system has levels of training and support that ultimately will be reviewed against data indicating that a reduction of suspensions has occurred.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES (15 PTS)

The student discipline policies in both Intermediate District 287 and Northeast Metro 916 establish expectations for student conduct and actions that will be taken when students fail to adhere to the Code of Student Conduct.

The process that leads to suspension begins when an incident that violates the student code of conduct is observed or reported to a school district staff member. The first step is to investigate the incident. The program administrator, or administrator's designee, conducts as many interviews with those involved as needed to establish what happened. In consultation with the administrator's supervisor or school district's legal authority in certain cases, the administrator confirms that a suspension is warranted. An informal administrative conference takes place where the program administrator notifies the student of the grounds for the suspension and provides an explanation of the evidence. The student may present his/her version of the facts. A written notice is served to the student and to the legal guardian if a student is under 18 years of age. Upon a student's return to the program, a re-admission conference, complete with a re-admission plan, is conducted with the student and parent.

For students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) that are given a suspension of greater than five days a manifestation determination hearing is conducted by the administrator and the special education case manager to determine the relationship between the disability and the behavior in deciding whether the student will be suspended.

The Collaborative Problem Solving model (CPS) will improve academic performance and behavior competence. Through the CPS model, reducing challenging behaviors is accomplished by helping students and their adult caretakers learn to solve problems leading to challenging behavior in a collaborative, mutually satisfactory manner. According to CPS research, challenging behavior – whether it's screaming, swearing, biting, spitting, hitting, kicking, destroying property, or worse – is set in motion by lagging cognitive skills, especially in the domains of flexibility, frustration, tolerance, and problem solving. The CPS model teaches students the skills they need to deal with frustrations that often lead to inappropriate responses. Improved behavioral competence has a direct impact on academic performance (Green, 2008).

The CPS model improves professional competence. According to Green, 2008, high school teachers often receive little if any formal training in how to help students and parents understand the complexities of thinking and acting that lead to challenging behaviors. Teachers are often unskilled in how to help students learn the skills they need to move forward. Through the grant, teachers will obtain understandings, strategies, and receive mentoring to support students in making decisions that lead to more positive choices about their behavior.

The response to dealing with poor behavior in many schools relies on punitive measures. Students who misbehave are viewed as manipulative, attention-seeking, unmotivated, and/or coercive kids (Green, 2008). Poor behavioral choices that are viewed in this light are responded to with rigid, firm, consistent consequences that are imposed on students. For students with habitual behavior problems, consequences have not changed their behavior. In a program using the CPS model, conversations between students and staff are positive not punitive. Suspension is viewed as a failure of the system and of the adults running the program. Teachers are not looking to punish students for their behavior, but to help them make decisions leading to their continued participation in school. It is anticipated that school climate will improve with more proactive and effective measures being employed to prevent and respond to negative student behaviors. Students will learn what to expect from all program staff, allowing for calmer, safer, and more effective interactions and environment.

All staff in the participating sites will receive training to understand and be able to implement CPS as a uniform response to student behavior. Students also will explicitly be taught the steps and staff expectations, as well as learn over time the elements of the model through using it in practice. Parents will receive information on the model at orientation and, like the students and staff, will learn more about CPS throughout the year as it becomes a common language among students, staff, and parents when frustration threatens to lead to inappropriate response. Intermediate school districts are uniquely positioned to sustain projects over the long term. We have center-based special education programs and mental health staff that can further support the CPS effort. We have access to staff with expertise in student behavior and we work across departments to support alternative and general education learners.

A key component for creating the impetus for change is having individuals who have the capacity to respond and help colleagues who are moving towards new behaviors. The following individuals, who make up the design team for this project, bring expertise, collaborative skills, and a commitment to change:

- Dr. Jane Holmberg, Executive Director of Teaching and Learning (287)
- Dr. Jessica Wiley, Director of Educational Services (916)
- Jonas Beugen, Principal of Area Learning Centers (916)
- Lea Dahl, Supervisor of Area Learning Centers (287)
- Dr. Antoinette Johns, Special Education Director (916)
- Laura Keller-Gautsch, Special Education Director (287)

We have a history of sustaining grant initiated projects; having most recently collaborated on a capacity building grant for our EBD programs which have been institutionalized over two years following the end of grant funding.

IV. WORK PLAN: PROJECT GOALS (4), ACTIVITIES, OUTCOMES AND ESTIMATED TIMELINES (30 PTS)

Grant dollars will be used to create a comprehensive program of support for reducing suspensions. There will be three levels of support activities; introduction to the model, implementing the strategies, and advanced work with the model. Four alternative learning sites will participate in the program; each of which is at a different level in terms of knowledge and understanding of the model ranging from staff members who are at an awareness level to those who have attended advanced trainings and have begun to implement the model.

The goals below are written to include all elements of SMART goals, with the understanding the “Measureable Outcome” related to each goal provides further important detail about how specifically the goal will be measured.

Goal #1: PLANNING	
By September 30, 2009, there will be evidence of sufficient planning to institute a comprehensive program of support for reducing suspensions at four Area Learning Center sites.	
Activity 1.1	Create a design team made of up of administration and staff to plan all activities for year.
Activity 1.2	Create an application for participation. Identify staff members who will participate in advanced training.
Activity 1.3	Identify trainers and dates for awareness and advanced training workshops from The Center for Collaborative Problem Solving or Think Kids program
Activity 1.4	Create an evaluation process for documenting staff efficacy in implementing CPS.
Activity 1.5	Design a data collection system for documenting suspensions, Plan B conversations, Emergency Plan B conversations and staff led collaborative problems solving sessions. Include a method for looking at the impact on attendance, graduation rates, and achievement.
Measureable Outcome: Specific dates and assigned accountable person/s for all separate activities under each of the four grant goals will be published.	
Estimated Timeline: July 2009- September 2009	
Goal #2: ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM	
By June 30, 2010, the oversight structure for the grant will have enabled achievement of all grant goals.	
Activity 2.1	Form an executive committee to oversee all activities and expenditures.
Activity 2.2	Ensure trainings and mentoring activities are carried out. Ensure that professional learning communities (PLCs) have been formed.
Activity 2.3	Complete all evaluation activities, including pre and post surveys, post workshop evaluations, comparison of suspension data from FY09 to FY10, review attendance, graduation rates and achievement data.
Measureable Outcome:	

The final required report will provide evidence that all grant goals have been achieved.	
Estimated Timeline: July 2009 – June 30, 2010	
<p>Goal #3: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM</p> <p>By June 2010, three levels of support and training will have been provided in order to establish a comprehensive program of support for staff to reduce suspensions at four Area Learning Center sites.</p>	
Activity 3.1	Provide introductory activities for staff at an awareness level of the CPS model. These activities would include an all day workshop, with follow-up for professional learning community (PLC) conversations. Collect workshop evaluation data.
Activity 3.2	Provide advanced training from The Center for Collaborative Problem Solving for selected staff from the ALCs, who will then become coaches for activity 3.3. Conduct pre and post survey of staff confidence to share advanced strategies.
Activity 3.3	Provide implementation activities for all staff, including coaching from our ALC mentors who have received advanced training, and structured follow-up for professional learning communities (PLC).
<p>Measureable Outcome:</p> <p>Participants in training and coaching will report agreement that grant activities have provided a foundation for a comprehensive program of support for reducing suspensions.</p>	
Estimated Timeline: September 2009 – June 2010	
<p>Goal #4: EVALUATION OF PROJECT</p> <p>By June 2010, evaluation of the outcomes of the planning, administration, and implementation goals for the project will provide evidence that a comprehensive program of support for reducing suspensions at four Area Learning Center sites has been established.</p>	
Activity 4.1	Analyze the extent to which specific dates and accountable person/s for all separate activities under each of the four grant goals were identified by the required time.
Activity 4.2	Review the extent to which the final required report provides evidence that all grant goals have been achieved, including the information from participant evaluations and interviews.
Activity 4.3	Compare data of suspensions from FY10 to FY9. Review data on attendance, graduation rates and achievement.
Activity 4.5	Articulate base line data for Plan B conversations, Emergency Plan B conversations, and staff led collaborative problem solving sessions to be used for future comparisons.
Activity 4.6	Analyze the extent to which participants in training and coaching activities report agreement that the grant project has provided a foundation for a comprehensive program of support for reducing suspensions.
<p>Measureable Outcome:</p> <p>A final evaluation report will analyze the extent to which each of the outcomes related to the goals has been met.</p>	
Estimated Timeline: March 2010 – June 2010	

V. EVALUATION (15 PTS)

According to Michael Quinn Patton (1997), evaluation is the systematic collection of information about activities, characteristics and outcomes of programs. Results are used to reduce uncertainties, improve effectiveness and make decisions with regard to what programs are doing and affecting. Successful programs create change and build on a solid knowledge of what works and what needs to improve.

The evaluation plan for the CPS implementation will assess outcomes and indicators addressed in the proposal and will provide information related to the effectiveness of this project's strategies and activities in making progress toward outcomes.

The evaluation plan includes the most appropriate qualitative and quantitative data collection methods to track the projects progress toward the desired results.

Results from this project will be shared in a final report to the Minnesota Department of Education and through the member districts networks and advisories currently in operation in both intermediate districts. These include special education, curriculum, and Area Learning Center advisory committees and staff development networks.

Evaluation Plan

Goal	Measurable Outcome	Indicators	Evaluation Methods
1) By September 30, 2009, there will be evidence of sufficient planning to institute a comprehensive program of support for reducing suspensions at four ALC sites.	Specific dates and assigned accountable person/s for all separate activities under each of the four grant goals will be published.	Planning team and executive committee created Participating staff identified Workshops developed Data collection methods determined	Contracts for planning team and executive committee Applications completed Workshops confirmation forms Data collection formats
2) By June 30, 2010, the oversight structure for the grant will have enabled achievement of all grant goals.	The final required report will provide evidence that all grant goals have been achieved.	Workshops, mentoring, PLC activities are documented Suspension, attendance, graduation rates, and achievement data has been collected	Workshop attendance records Post workshop evaluations PLC structured conversations Data collection forms
3) By June 2010, three levels of support and training will have been provided in order to establish a comprehensive program of support for staff to reduce suspensions at four ALC sites.	Participants in training and coaching will report agreement that grant activities have provided a foundation for a comprehensive program of support for reducing suspensions.	Introductory, advanced, and implementation workshops conducted Mentoring activities in place	Workshop evaluations, pre and post coaching surveys, and mentor logs PLC conversations logs Records of Plan B, Emergency Plan B, and CPS sessions

<p>4) By June 2010, evaluation of the outcomes of the planning, administration, and implementation goals for the Project will provide evidence that a comprehensive program of support for reducing suspensions at four Area Learning Center sites has been established.</p>	<p>The final evaluation report will analyze the extent to which each of the outcomes related to the goals has been met.</p>	<p>Evaluative analysis related to participant satisfaction, and data collected regarding staff efficacy and suspensions conducted</p> <p>Information on student attendance, graduation rates and student achievement available.</p>	<p>Final report</p>
--	---	---	---------------------