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Preface

Teachers and administrators across the United States struggle to maintain safe, civil, and community- and achievement-oriented schools. Disciplinary actions (such as school suspensions) and security measures (such as school resource officers/security guards and security cameras) are some approaches commonly used in schools to try to improve school climate and safety. Another approach is to improve the socioemotional skills of students and educators to foster a more positive school climate and build positive relationships among all individuals in schools.

The purpose of this project was to implement a social and emotional learning (SEL) program in a school district and evaluate its effects on school climate and safety throughout the district. Jackson Public School District, in Jackson, Mississippi, partnered with the Tools for Life® Corporation to implement its SEL curriculum in randomly selected elementary and middle schools in the district in the 2016–2017 and 2017–2018 school years. The RAND Corporation served as evaluators for the project, documenting the implementation of Tools for Life and its costs, and assessing the program’s impact on school climate and safety. This study represents the first district-wide randomized controlled trial of the Tools for Life program.

This report is the technical appendix accompanying the main research report, Social and Emotional Learning, School Climate, and School Safety: A Randomized Controlled Trial Evaluation of Tools for Life® in Elementary and Middle Schools, which is available at www.rand.org/t/RR4285.

This study was undertaken by two divisions of the RAND Corporation: RAND Education and Labor and RAND Social and Economic Well-Being.

RAND Education and Labor conducts research on early childhood through postsecondary education programs, workforce development, and programs and policies affecting workers, entrepreneurship, and financial literacy and decisionmaking. For more information, email educationandlabor@rand.org. RAND Social and Economic Well-Being seeks to actively improve the health and social and economic well-being of populations and communities throughout the world. This research was conducted under the Justice Policy Program within RAND Social and Economic Well-Being. The program focuses on such topics as access to justice, policing, corrections, drug policy, and court system reform, as well as other policy concerns pertaining to public safety and criminal and civil justice. For more information, email justicepolicy@rand.org.

This research was generously supported by a grant in 2015 from the National Institute of Justice (2015-CK-BX-0005) as part of its Comprehensive School Safety Initiative.

More information about RAND can be found at www.rand.org. Questions about this report should be directed to the lead author Gabriella C. Gonzalez at ggonzal@rand.org.
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Appendix A. Randomization Process to Select Treatment and Control Schools

Study Sample Definition

Schools served as the unit of randomization. Before randomization was conducted, JPSD administrators decided that two schools should be excluded from the study because they served specialized populations or had specialized courses of study. Three additional schools were removed from the study and given priority access to the intervention. This left a total of 46 of the 51 schools.

Randomization Process

To maintain an equal representation of elementary schools and middle schools in the treatment and control groups, we first stratified on grade band and then conducted the randomization separately within each grade band. Within each grade band, every school had a 50 percent chance of being assigned to the treatment or control group.

We performed the randomization using a random number generator in R and assigned schools to experimental conditions based on this random number. After conducting randomization, we shared a spreadsheet showing each school’s assigned experimental condition with JPSD administrators. Assigned experimental conditions were not shared with students, teachers, or families. Following randomization, the district decided that an additional school that had been randomized to the control group should be given priority access to the program. We agreed to exclude this school from the study. Therefore, the final study sample contained 45 schools, with 22 control schools and 23 treatment schools.

Sample Recruitment and Retention

After randomization was conducted, we distributed consent forms to all students enrolled in the participating schools. Active parental consent was required for students to participate in the data-collection activities associated with the study. Despite repeated efforts, however, we encountered significant difficulties in securing parental consent forms. Consent forms were returned for approximately 30 percent of the eligible students in the district. Specifically, there were 11,793 students enrolled in study schools at the start of the experiment. 2,941 students consented to participate in data-collection activities (including student surveys and district administrative data release). The remaining students either did not return consent forms or returned consent forms indicating that their parents or guardians did not wish to have their children participate in data-collection activities.
We performed a series of analyses to investigate the extent to which those who consented to any data-collection activities were different than nonconsenters. The objective of these analyses was to determine the extent to which the study sample is representative of the students in the district overall. Any systematic differences between consenting and nonconsenting students threatens to undermine the external validity of the study results—that is, if the consenting students are different from other students in some way, it is not clear whether the treatment estimates are broadly applicable to all students in the district or applicable only to the subset of students that provided consent to participate. Analyses showed some substantial differences between those who consented and those who did not. Using baseline characteristics collected from the prior academic year, we investigated the standardized mean differences between those students who consented to participate in study activities and those who did not. Following What Works Clearinghouse guidelines, we take any standardized mean difference between groups greater in magnitude than one quarter of a standard deviation (0.250) to indicate a substantial difference. Specifically, those who did not consent were more likely to have discipline issues and higher absenteeism (Table A.1).

Table A.1. Baseline Equivalence of Consenting and Nonconsenting Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N Consenters/Nonconsenters</th>
<th>Nonconsenters</th>
<th>Consenters</th>
<th>Standardized Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and language arts</td>
<td>–0.574</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>–0.209</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>–0.693</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>–0.323</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Authors’ analysis of JPSD administrative data (academic year 2015–2016). Standardized Assessment scores are from JPSD administrative data (academic year 2016–2017). NOTE: Difference is the standardized mean difference based on the pooled standard deviation.

Study Sample

Table A.2 shows the characteristics of students in the experiment by treatment group. Although randomization should make the treatment and control groups equivalent at baseline,
non-consent after randomization could result in treatment and control groups that are no longer randomly equivalent to one another, particularly if non-consent is systematically different across the experimental conditions. In this way, systematic differences between consenters in the treatment and control groups threatens to undermine the internal validity of the study results: if the treatment students are systematically different from the control students, it is not clear whether the treatment estimates are attributable to the TFL program or to pre-existing differences. Analyses showed no significant differences between consenters across treatment and control groups on observable characteristics, and all standardized mean differences are smaller in magnitude than 0.25.

Table A.2. Baseline Equivalence of Treatment and Control participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAP Reading and Language Arts</td>
<td>−0.107</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>−0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAP Mathematics</td>
<td>−0.193</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>−0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Emotional Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Health</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>3.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>3.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: authors’ analysis of JPSD administrative data (academic year 2015–2016).
NOTE: Difference is the standardized mean difference based on the pooled standard deviation.
Attrition

In this section, we describe the impact of attrition on our inferences about the effects of TFL participation. Broadly speaking, attrition refers to the proportion of randomly assigned individuals for whom there are no observed outcome data. Attrition can be caused by many factors, including study dropout, transferring out of the study schools, student absenteeism, and inconsistent or missing data. In fact, the issues with retention described in the previous section represent a form of attrition, because the students were randomly assigned prior to providing consent for participation in the study. In the remainder of this section, we discuss attrition for each data collection time point (spring 2017, fall 2017, and spring 2018) and for each outcome.

Spring 2017

Attrition rates for spring 2017 outcomes ranged between 77 percent and 87 percent and are displayed in Figure A.1.
Tables A.3 and A.4 show the standardized mean differences in baseline characteristics for each student-level outcome. These analyses showed significant differences in achievement and attendance, though all of the standardized mean differences are smaller in magnitude than 0.25.

**Table A.3. Assessment of Treatment-Control Group Balance After Attrition: Spring 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Emotional Health</th>
<th>SEL</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>–0.052</td>
<td>–0.047</td>
<td>–0.045</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>–0.045</td>
<td>–0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>–0.028</td>
<td>–0.028</td>
<td>–0.027</td>
<td>–0.027</td>
<td>–0.027</td>
<td>–0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>–0.077</td>
<td>–0.076</td>
<td>–0.078</td>
<td>–0.078</td>
<td>–0.078</td>
<td>–0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Assessments</th>
<th>RLA</th>
<th>SEL</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td>0.186**</td>
<td>0.186**</td>
<td>0.187**</td>
<td>0.182**</td>
<td>0.189**</td>
<td>0.188**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0.195**</td>
<td>0.195**</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>0.196**</td>
<td>0.209**</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.211**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: authors’ analysis of JPSD administrative data (academic year 2015–2016).
NOTE: Difference is the standardized mean difference based on the pooled standard deviation. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.
Table A.4. Assessment of Treatment-Control Group Balance After Attrition: Spring 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>MAAP RLA</th>
<th>MAAP Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>−0.028</td>
<td>−0.009</td>
<td>−0.037</td>
<td>−0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>−0.012</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>−0.098</td>
<td>−0.078</td>
<td>−0.129**</td>
<td>−0.129**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>0.145**</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>0.123*</td>
<td>0.130*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: authors’ analysis of JPSD administrative data (academic year 2015–2016).
NOTE: Difference is the standardized mean difference based on the pooled standard deviation. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.
Fall 2017

Attrition rates for fall 2017 outcomes were all approximately 87 percent and are displayed in Figure A.2.

Figure A.2. Fall 2017 Attrition Rates
Table A.5 shows the standardized mean differences in baseline characteristics for each student-level outcome. These analyses showed significant differences in attendance, though all of the standardized mean differences are smaller in magnitude than 0.25.

**Table A.5. Assessment of Treatment-Control Group Balance After Attrition: Fall 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Emotional Health</th>
<th>SEL</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>–0.054</td>
<td>–0.049</td>
<td>–0.062</td>
<td>–0.060</td>
<td>–0.061</td>
<td>–0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>–0.05</td>
<td>–0.042</td>
<td>–0.042</td>
<td>–0.042</td>
<td>–0.043</td>
<td>–0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>–0.045</td>
<td>–0.057</td>
<td>–0.055</td>
<td>–0.055</td>
<td>–0.054</td>
<td>–0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>–0.007</td>
<td>–0.009</td>
<td>–0.003</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>–0.006</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>–0.005</td>
<td>–0.003</td>
<td>–0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>0.179**</td>
<td>0.191**</td>
<td>0.184**</td>
<td>0.183**</td>
<td>0.196**</td>
<td>0.189**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SOURCE: authors’ analysis of JPSD administrative data (academic year 2015–2016).*  
*NOTE: Difference is the standardized mean difference based on the pooled standard deviation. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.*
Spring 2018

Attrition rates for Spring 2018 outcomes were all approximately 79 percent and 88 percent, and are displayed in Figure A.3.

Figure A.3. Spring 2018 Attrition Rates
Table A.6 and A.7 show the standardized mean differences in baseline characteristics for each student-level outcome. These analyses showed significant differences in attendance, though all of the standardized mean differences are smaller in magnitude than 0.25.

**Table A.6. Assessment of Treatment-Control Group Balance After Attrition: Spring 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotional Health</th>
<th>SEL</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>−0.020</td>
<td>−0.041</td>
<td>−0.021</td>
<td>−0.016</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>−0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>−0.074</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>−0.070</td>
<td>−0.073</td>
<td>−0.071</td>
<td>−0.075</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>−0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td>−0.086</td>
<td>−0.074</td>
<td>−0.100</td>
<td>−0.084</td>
<td>−0.030</td>
<td>−0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>−0.032</td>
<td>−0.012</td>
<td>−0.047</td>
<td>−0.033</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>−0.033</td>
<td>−0.037</td>
<td>−0.041</td>
<td>−0.064</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>−0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>0.151*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
<td>0.154*</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>0.178**</td>
<td>0.155*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: authors' analysis of JPSD administrative data (academic year 2015–2016).  
NOTE: Difference is the standardized mean difference based on the pooled standard deviation.  * p < 0.05,  ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.
### Table A.7. Assessment of Treatment-Control Group Balance After Attrition: Spring 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>–0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>–0.078</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>–0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>0.182**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** authors’ analysis of JPSD administrative data (academic year 2015–2016).  
**NOTE:** Difference is the standardized mean difference based on the pooled standard deviation. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.
Appendix B. Student Survey Items (Fall 2017)

Welcome!

1) Please enter your project ID into the box below and click “Next” if you would like to participate in this survey.*

This is your student ID given to you from your teacher’s roster.
________________________________________________

2) What grade are you in?
( ) 3
( ) 4
( ) 5
( ) 6
( ) 7
( ) 8

3) How much do you agree with each sentence about your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I worry about crime and violence in this school.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students at this school are often teased or picked on.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students at this school are often threatened or bullied.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) How safe do you feel in each place listed below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Location</th>
<th>Not safe</th>
<th>Somewhat safe</th>
<th>Mostly safe</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallways of the school</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms of the school</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the school</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling between home and school</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your classes</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) How much do you agree with each sentence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My teachers treat me with respect.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students trust teachers in this school.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teachers always keep their promises.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teachers stop students who are hurting or bullying others.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my teachers tell me not to do something, I know they have a good reason.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe and comfortable with my teachers at this school.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teachers always listen to students’ ideas.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am feeling unsafe at school, I know an adult I can go to for help.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How much do you agree with each sentence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can always find a way to help people end arguments.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I listen carefully to what other people say to me.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m good at working with other students.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m good at helping other people.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone asks me right now, I can describe how I am feeling.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) How much do you agree with each sentence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know what I do well, and I know what areas I need to work on.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for help from my teachers or others when I need it.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I control myself when I am frustrated, angry, or disappointed.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can tell when someone is getting angry or upset before they say anything.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I make a decision, I think about what might happen afterwards.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to disagree without starting a fight or an argument.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) How much do you agree with each sentence about your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students in my school like to put others down.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most students in my school help each other learn.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most students in my school don’t get along together very well. |   |   |   |   
---|---|---|---
14) Since the beginning of the school year, have you learned about...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to be a good listener</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to talk about your feelings</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to talk about feelings that other people have</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to show other people what you are feeling</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the things you say or do can make other people feel</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to calm yourself down when you are upset</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you can do if something makes you feel bad</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do if you don’t get along with another person</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to help people end arguments</td>
<td>(  )</td>
<td>(  )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15) Since the beginning of the school year, have you learned about the following...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk it out when you don’t get along with your friends or classmates.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk away from situations that might get you into trouble.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share and take turns with others.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore when people are being silly or saying mean things.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologize when you do something wrong or hurt someone’s feelings.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise if you don’t agree with someone. You can meet in the middle to find an idea that works for everyone.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use chance to help make a fair decision. For example, you can flip a coin or play rock, paper, scissors to decide who gets to go first when playing a game.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for help when you need another person to help solve a problem.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think before you act.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16) Have you seen this picture in your school?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know

17) Did your teacher teach a lesson about this picture?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know
18) Have you seen this picture in your school?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don't know

19) Did your teacher teach a lesson about this picture?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know
20) Have you seen this picture in your school?
( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know

21) Did your teacher teach a lesson about this picture?
( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know
22) Have you seen this picture in your school?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know

23) Did your teacher teach a lesson about this picture?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know
24) Have you seen this picture in your school?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know

25) Did your teacher teach a lesson about this picture?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know
26) Have you seen this picture in your school?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know

27) Did your teacher teach a lesson about this picture?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don’t know
28) Have you seen this picture in your school?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don't know

29) Did your teacher teach a lesson about this picture?

( ) No
( ) Yes
( ) I don't know
30) Have you seen this picture in your school?

( ) No  
( ) Yes  
( ) I don’t know

31) Did your teacher teach a lesson about this picture?

( ) No  
( ) Yes  
( ) I don’t know
32) Since the beginning of the school year, how often have you heard announcements about...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice since the beginning of the school year</th>
<th>Once or twice a month</th>
<th>Once or twice a week</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to be a good listener</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to talk about your feelings</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to talk about feelings that other people have</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to show other people what you are feeling</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the things you say or do can make other people feel</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to calm yourself down when you are upset</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you can do if something makes you feel bad</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do if you don’t get along with another person</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to help people end arguments</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the beginning of the school year, how often have you heard announcements about solving problems by...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice since the beginning of the school year</th>
<th>Once or twice a month</th>
<th>Once or twice a week</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking it out when you don’t get along with your friends or classmates.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking away from situations that might get you into trouble.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing and taking turns with others.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring when people are being silly or saying mean things.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologizing when you do something wrong or hurt someone’s feelings.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising if you don’t agree with someone. You can meet in the middle to find an idea that works for everyone.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using chance to help make a fair decision. For example, you can flip a coin or play rock, paper, scissors to decide who</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gets to go first when playing a game.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for help when you need another person to help solve a problem.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking before you act.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You!
Appendix C. Technical Appendix for Implementation Study of Six Focal Schools

This appendix provides details on methods related to the implementation study of six focal schools. It details our study design, focal schools, and the site visits conducted in spring 2017, fall 2017, and spring 2018. We present information about the number of data-collection activities and participants by role. We also include coding and data analysis procedures, as well as an acknowledgement of methodological limitations.

Study Design

Our study of the focal schools drew on an embedded, single-case design (Yin, 2017). With this design, we recognized the primary unit of interest as the district (JPSD); we sought to understand how TFL was implemented in this single district by attending to selected subunits (i.e., the six schools) within the district. The schools provided opportunities for extended analysis and helped to enhance insights into the single district (Yin, 2017).

Focal Schools

The sample on which the findings in this report is based consists of six schools—four elementary and two middle. Two of the elementary schools and one middle school were part of the initial treatment group, meaning they implemented TFL beginning in the 2016–2017 school year. The other two elementary and one middle schools were in the control group; they received delayed treatment and began implementing TFL in 2017–2018. See Table C.1 for an overview of these schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>Level (Grades)</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>% African-American</th>
<th>% Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary (K–5)</td>
<td>~350</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elementary (K–5)</td>
<td>~470</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middle (6–8)</td>
<td>~630</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elementary (K–5)</td>
<td>~380</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elementary (K–5)</td>
<td>~480</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Middle (6–8)</td>
<td>~530</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers are approximate to protect confidentiality of the schools.

Focal School Selection

To select the focal schools, we first reviewed JPSD’s data on elementary (n = 34) and middle (n = 12) schools to determine variables that were likely to influence implementation and show
some variability across schools. We identified two primary variables on which we stratified the schools: total enrollment and in-school suspension (ISS) rates for males. Upon omitting schools with unique characteristics that would make findings less generalizable to other JPS schools (i.e., rural and magnet schools), we had 32 elementary and 10 eligible schools to sample from. Given the low incidence or middle schools with lower enrollment and lower ISS rates \( (n = 1) \), and middle schools with higher enrollment and higher ISS \( (n = 2) \), we opted to sample only from schools with high enrollment and low ISS, and low enrollment and high ISS.

We entered eligible school names into numbered lists (i.e., one list for elementary schools with higher enrollment and low ISS that were treatment schools, another list for such control schools; one list for elementary schools with low enrollment and high ISS that were treatment schools, another list for such control school; and four similar lists for eligible middle schools). Then, we used a random number generator to generate a number from each list, until we had 12 focal schools, composed of eight elementary (four treatment and four control) and four middle (two treatment and two control) schools. We also selected backup schools in case JPSD leaders were aware of a reason why a school would be a poor choice for a focal school (e.g., knowledge of planned leave of the principal). We presented the focal school selection to JPSD in May 2016 and received approval to proceed.

Subsequently, in early 2017, because of change in data-collection arrangement and reduction in capacity, we reduced the number of focal schools to the six schools presented in Table C.1. We randomly selected among the six pairs of treatment and matched control schools (i.e., matched on level, enrollment, and ISS rate).

**Site Visit Planning**

In spring 2017, fall 2017, and spring 2018, a two-person trained data collection team conducted site visits at each of the six schools to conduct interviews and focus groups. In spring 2017 and fall 2017, each site visit was planned for about two days. In spring 2018, because of extenuating circumstances affecting one of our data collectors’ availability, we compressed the site visit to about one day each; all interviews and focus groups as described below still took place.

To coordinate the spring 2017 and fall 2017 site visits, we emailed principals with tentative site visit dates and a reminder of the data collection we would conduct. Upon receiving approval, we drafted a site-specific data-collection agenda, taking into consideration the school schedule, and vetted it with the principal or lead TFL implementer, adjusting as needed. We sent the finalized schedule to the principal or lead implementer. This plan was enacted whenever possible, but, on occasion, because of unforeseen events at the schools, data collectors had to rearrange or improvise the schedule on site.
Data Collector Training and Support

To support a systematic data-collection effort, we developed a comprehensive site visit guidebook. The guidebook began with an overview of the TFL program, including components that are probed in the interview protocols and that interviewees are likely to reference and the research study. Then, it presented what data collectors needed to know and do to prepare for the visits, what their responsibilities were during the site visits, and details related to preparing and submitting collected data after the visits (including examples of high-quality detailed notes/transcriptions). Moreover, the guidebook featured chapters on how to conduct semistructured interview and focus groups, including when and how to probe participants for additional relevant details. Finally, the guidebook contained the data-collection protocols to use.

The project team reviewed the guidebook with data collectors during a training session prior to each round of site visits. This included training the data collectors on the nuances of questions on the protocols (e.g., essential versus optional questions, intent of key questions, good probes to use) and anticipating misunderstandings or challenges to using the protocols.

Site Visit Data Collection

Below, we present some details of the data collection procedures. Table C.2 summarizes the data collection we completed in spring 2017, fall 2017, and spring 2018.

Interviews

Each site visit consisted of a 45–60-minute semistructured interview with a school leader/administrator (i.e., principal or assistant principal) and 45–60-minute interviews with designated lead TFL implementers or their counterparts in control schools (i.e., elementary school counselors and middle school social studies teachers). We set up these interviews ahead of time during a mutually agreeable time. We sent email invitations and reminders. Participation was voluntary, and participants could decline to respond to any question. One data collector conducted the interviews and audio-recorded them to allow for the generation of transcription and detailed notes for analysis. Protocols addressed topics including perceptions of school climate and students’ SEL needs, response to the program, and facilitators and challenges to implementation. See Appendix B for full protocols.

Focus Groups

Each site visit also included a 60-minute focus group with about 6–10 staff members. We held focus groups with elementary staff after school; at middle schools, we held them during the school day and selected among staff that had planning period during the chosen time. We selected staff to represent a range of characteristics (e.g., instructional and non-instructional, gender, grade, subject) to allow us to capture a spectrum of perspectives. In general, we invited
one teacher from each grade/subject (excluding those already accounted for as a key implemener), the school’s office manager, interventionist, librarian, and elective teacher (e.g., music, art, physical education). We sent email invitations and reminders to individual teachers. When it was not possible to convene a focus group, the research staff conducted individual interviews with available teachers.

Prior to the start of each focus group, we assigned participants numbers for identification purposes. Each staff participant filled out an information sheet that asked them background questions such as their job category, gender, race/ethnicity, and years of experience at the school. As with the interviews, participation in focus groups was voluntary and participants could decline to respond to any question. Typically, one data collector facilitated the focus group and one took notes and assisted with logistics. We audio-recorded focus groups and subsequently generated transcription and detailed notes for analysis. Protocols addressed similar topics as the interviews. See Appendix D for staff focus group protocols, including the participant information sheet.

Observations of Districtwide Tools for Life Events

In addition to the site visits to the focal schools, researchers on the project team also observed and took field notes during training sessions for school leaders and/or staff, year-end conferences jointly held by JPDS and TFL, and a bring-and-brag session at which designees from implementing schools across the district (not just the focal schools) shared examples of how they integrated the program into their schools and classrooms.

Table C.2. Summary of Data-Collection Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Procedure/Respondent Role</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
<th>Total Number of Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Visit Interviews</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School leader</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead implementer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visit Focus Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation (Districtwide)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School leader and staff training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring-and-brag session</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This table shows the number of data-collection procedures completed; the number of participants may be larger. For example, each focus group consisted of multiple participants.
Coding

After each round of data collection, analysts took detailed notes from the interviews and focus group recordings and uploaded them to Dedoose 8.0.42 (2016), a cloud-base qualitative analysis software, for coding and analysis. We began by applying descriptor codes to each document. These codes identified the focal school, role of the participants, and the data collection cycle (i.e., spring 2017, fall 2017, or spring 2018). These descriptors allowed us to search documents with ease and to compare responses among participants as needed.

Over the three rounds of data collection, two qualitative analysts who were involved in data collection worked with one qualitative researcher to perform the standard procedures of multiple readings and iterative coding of the detailed notes. Coding entailed preliminary topic coding followed by thematic coding (Creswell and Poth, 2017; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2015). The initial set of topic codes (and subcodes) reflected the questions in the interview and focus group protocols. Such codes included, for example, the background and context of the school and respondent, perceptions of key TFL program components, implementation supports, and factors affecting implementation. We allowed for the addition of emergent codes as necessary, especially during thematic coding (Miles and Huberman, 1994). When relevant, we applied multiple codes to an excerpt.

To help ensure the quality of our coding process, the qualitative analysis team met to train on the coding scheme, generated code definitions, and convened to discuss and resolve ambiguities and discrepancies as needed.

Data Analysis

One qualitative analyst, who had conducted site visits and performed coding, performed most of the data analysis, guided by a qualitative researcher. Data analysis procedures were guided by analytical questions that were keyed to our primary questions of interest: What did educators know about TFL how did they implement the program, and what did they think about its impact and effectiveness?

Analysis of interview and focus group notes involved running multiple relevant queries on substantive codes of interest to answer analytical questions that correspond to the primary questions. We identified codes to use for queries a priori, but broadened as necessary given initial query results. We generated matrices to display the coded data and facilitate analysis (Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, 2013). Subsequently, the analyst generated analytical memos to summarize findings—themes and patterns—arising from the queries. Observation notes were synthesized and scanned for themes.

For the most part in this report, we present findings from analyses of focal schools data from all three rounds of site visits together. Moreover, we analyzed the control schools’ data from the second year (2017–2018), when they received the TFL program, with the treatment school data
since those data also spoke to implementation. In general, we report themes for which there was convergence across informants within each school and among schools.

We allowed for findings where respondents themselves observed and reported differences (i.e., in implementation or perceptions of TFL) that they attributed to school characteristics (e.g., elementary versus middle school) or program implementation; however, because of the small sample size and confound with contextual events, such as principal and staff turnovers, we believe that any inferences we attempted to make from subgroup analyses would have been problematic. We did explore differences between groups (e.g., control and treatment schools, elementary and middle schools) and across years (i.e., first versus second year of implementation for treatment schools); however, we report these findings only if there was clear consensus among interviewees and among schools in the subgroup (e.g., all control schools, all elementary schools), and, even then, we caution readers against over-interpreting the findings. Similarly, where notable, we report differences among informants (e.g., school leaders versus teachers).

To help ensure the integrity of our findings, we engaged in established qualitative research procedures. The project team met on a regular basis, including after each round of data collection to debrief and discuss emergent patterns or themes of note within and across schools. These meetings also provided opportunities to check for and address underlying assumptions or biases that analysts might hold (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). We sought confirmatory and disconfirming evidence and triangulated data across sources and time.
Appendix D. Data Collection Protocols for Implementation Analysis

This appendix includes the interview and focus group protocols used for the implementation data collection summarized in Chapter Three.

For the implementation analysis protocols, we provide the group interview protocol for JPSD TFL coaches and JPSD district staff. In this appendix, we include the spring 2018 protocols, which include questions asking stakeholders to reflect on sustainability, facilitators, and hindrances to implementation of TFL.

For the protocols used in the focal schools, we provide the individual interview protocol for school leaders/administrators and TFL lead implementers, as well as their counterparts in control schools. Then, we present the focus group protocol used with school staff, in both the treatment and control focal schools. We revised the protocols slightly between waves of data collection (i.e., spring 2017, fall 2017, and spring 2018). For example, in the final wave, we posed summative questions about respondents’ views of TFL and also asked about plans for sustaining the program. For parsimony, we have included only the spring 2017 protocols in this appendix.

Implementation Analysis Protocols

*Oral Introductory Script for Interviews with Key Stakeholders (Spring 2018)*

Thank you for participating in this interview about your experiences with TFL implementation in the district. My name is [insert name]. I am a researcher the RAND Corporation, an independent non-profit research institute, which is conducting a study to evaluate the implementation of a school safety and climate program in Jackson Public Schools. This study is funded by a grant from the National Institute of Justice of the Department of Justice.

We are using this an opportunity to formally document the thoughts and experiences of those involved with the TFL implementation. So, please don’t worry about for example, repeating something you’ve already said to me at an earlier point in the project or to another member of the RAND team. We are also conducting similar interviews with others in the district to gain insight into the context in the district and state as it relates to school climate, school safety, and social and emotional learning and instruction.
Before we start, I want to make sure you understand that this is a research study, your participation is your choice, and you can stop at any time or skip any questions that you’d like. Most of the questions ask about the school in general, and not about you specifically. Our study team will keep what you say confidential. We will not identify you personally or attribute anything you say today to you personally. Only the research team will have this information and we will not share that with anyone at this school or at Jackson Public Schools.

I estimate our conversation today will last about an hour. I will be jotting some notes so I can remember what you say.

In addition, I would like to audio-record today’s discussion to check the accuracy of our notes. Your names will not be recorded in my notes and the audio-recording will be destroyed as soon as the study team has completed fact checking.

Is this okay with you? [If participant nods or says “yes”, start recording]

Do you have any questions before we begin? [Pause for questions and answer.]

If you have any questions later, please don’t hesitate to contact me and I can answer your questions or put you in touch with the study leader at RAND. [Provide the following contact information: Gabriella Gonzalez, 412-683-2300 x4426, ggonzal@rand.org].

Do you agree to participate? [If YES, continue. If NO, stop interview and thank them for their time.]

JPSD TFL Implementation Coaches Group Interview Protocol (Spring 2018)

Introduction

1. Please identify your role and responsibilities within JPS.
   a. How long have you been in this position?

2. Because I spoke with those of you on board at this time last year, I’d like to focus now on implementation this year.

3. Please describe your role/responsibility with respect to Tools for Life program implementation.
   a. What specific activities were you involved in in the introduction of Tools for Life to control schools? How?
b. What specific activities were you involved in in the continuation of Tools for Life at veteran schools? How?

c. How often did you visit schools or provide implementation support to the schools/staff?
   i. Probe on treatment vs. control

d. What questions were the staff asking? What supports were they requesting?
   i. Probe on treatment vs. control

Tools for Life Implementation this year (2017-18)

4. Could you describe how Tools for Life was framed for principals and teachers going into this past school year?
   **Control schools:**
   a. How it was framed with respect to school priorities (PBIS Tier 1 programs, etc.)?
   b. To what extent were the implementation plan and the expectations for implementation clear for the implementing staff (i.e., counselors and SS teachers in MS)? For all other staff?
   c. How do various people know what is required of them and what implementation supports are available?
   d. What did you do differently in the control schools relative to introduction to treatment schools the year before?

   **Treatment schools:**
   e. How it was framed with respect to school priorities (PBIS Tier 1 programs, etc.)?
   f. To what extent were the implementation plan and the expectations for implementation clear for the implementing staff (i.e., counselors and SS teachers in MS)? For all other staff?
   g. How do various people know what is required of them and what implementation supports are available?

5. What do you think about how Tools for Life was introduced to control schools?
   a. What went well? (Prompt responses about training for teachers, integrating lessons into classroom, teacher/staff/school administrator/parent/student responses to the program)
   b. What did not go so well? (Prompt responses about training for teachers, integrating lessons into classroom, teacher/staff/school administrator/parent/student responses to the program)

6. What do you think about how Tools for Life was continued in treatment schools?
   a. What went well? (Prompt responses about training for teachers, integrating lessons into classroom, teacher/staff/school administrator/parent/student responses to the program?)
   b. What did not go so well? (Prompt responses about training for teachers, integrating lessons into classroom, teacher/staff/school administrator/parent/student responses to the program)
7. To what extent do you think the schools are implementing the Tools for Life program as intended? Explain. Probe on treatment vs. control schools.

Looking back on entire project

Now I’d like you to reflect on the entire project.

8. How receptive do you think schools in the district have been to the Tools for Life program? Why is that? Any examples you can share?
   a. How about district administrators?
   b. School administrators?
   c. Teachers and staff?
   d. Students?
   e. Their parents?

9. What factors do you think helped with the introduction and/or implementation of Tools for Life in the district?

10. What were some of the major challenges to introducing and/or implementing Tools for Life in the district? (Probe on specific challenges.)
    a. How did you address or overcome these challenges?
    b. What supports might help you to do so?

Implementation Support

11. Did you receive any additional training this year from the Tools for Life team provide in terms of coach training? (Probe for how much training was provided)
    a. What is your perception of the training provided to the coaches and the district in general?

12. What did the Tools for Life team provide in terms of continuous support his past year? (Probe for how often they provided support)
    a. How do you engage with the TFL consultants? Who did you meet with (e.g., Pat)? How often? What was the substance of the meetings?
    b. What is your perception of the continuous support they provided? (Probe for the extent to which they were available to answer questions and problem solve, the general quality of relationships / communication with Tools for Life team)

13. Overall, how did you feel about the level of support Tools for Life provided? What, if any, additional support would you have liked?
14. How did you engage with JPSD leadership about Tools for Life implementation?
   a. Who did you meet with? How often? What was the substance of the meetings?
   b. Overall, how did you feel about the level of support your district provided for the
      implementation of Tools for Life? What, if any, additional support would you have
      liked?

Sustainability

15. How, if at all, has sustainability of Tools for Life been discussed? (Probe for specifics)
16. Has a sustainability plan been developed? What does it look like? Where is it documented?
17. What factors do you think will promote the sustainability of Tools for Life in the district?
18. What factors do you think will be challenges to sustaining Tools for Life?

Perceptions of Tools for Life Impact

19. What changes, if any, have you seen in the district that you think could be attributed to
    introduction of the Tools for Life program? (Probe on climate, classroom management,
    student interpersonal skills, disciplinary actions, attendance).
       a. What makes you say so? [Probe for what they are tracking on]

20. What changes, if any, do you think should be made to the Tools for Life program?

21. At this point in time, would you recommend the Tools for Life program to other school
    districts? Why or why not?

TFL Consultants Group Interview Protocol (Spring 2018)

Introduction

1. Please identify your role and responsibilities within TFL.
   a. How long have you been in this position?

2. Please describe your role/responsibility with respect to Tools for Life program
   implementation.
   a. What specific activities were you involved in in the introduction of Tools for Life? How?
b. How often did you visit schools or provide implementation support to the schools/staff? Implementation coaches? Others?

c. What questions were the staff asking? The implementation coaches? What supports were they requesting? Others?

Tools for Life Implementation

3. What is your understanding of the vision and goals of the Tools for Life program? What needs does Tools for Life address/fill in Jackson?
   a. What is the relationship between the Tools for Life program and other ongoing initiatives that address school climate and safety? [Probe for relationship to PBIS initiatives]
   b. Are there activities that are distinct to Tools for Life (as opposed to PBIS or other initiatives)? How are they used? What is their relationship to PBIS or other initiatives?

4. Could you describe how Tools for Life was introduced to principals and teachers?
   a. How it was framed with respect to school priorities (PBIS Tier 1 programs, etc.)?
   b. To what extent were the implementation plan and the expectations for implementation clear for the implementing staff (i.e., counselors and SS teachers in MS)? For all other staff? For implementation coaches?
   c. How do various people know what is required of them and what implementation supports are available? (Probe for any documentation, additional meetings, resources?)

5. What do you think about how Tools for Life was introduced into the district?
   a. What went well? (Prompt responses about training for teachers, integrating lessons into classroom, teacher/staff/school administrator/parent/student responses to the program)
   b. What did not go so well? (Prompt responses about training for teachers, integrating lessons into classroom, teacher/staff/school administrator/parent/student responses to the program)

6. To what extent do you think the schools are implementing the Tools for Life program as intended? Explain.

7. To date, how receptive do you think schools in the district have been to the Tools for Life program? Why is that? Any examples you can share?
   a. How about district administrators?
b. School administrators?
c. Teachers and staff?
d. Students?
e. Their parents?

8. What factors do you think helped with the introduction and/or implementation of Tools for Life in the district?

9. What were some challenges to introducing and/or implementing Tools for Life in the district? (Probe on specific challenges.)
   a. How did you address or overcome these challenges?
   b. What supports might help you to do so?

10. What, if anything, do you plan to do differently when introducing Tools for Life to the other half of the schools next year?
   a. Probe for details on implementation plan (planned trainings, scope and sequence, changes in tools used)

11. Is there anything you anticipate doing differently among the schools that have been implementing Tools for Life this past year?

Implementation Support

12. What did the Tools for Life team provide in terms of materials? What is your perception of the quality and usability of the materials?
   a. Were there lessons or topics that worked well? That were problematic?

13. What Tools for Life training did you receive? (Probe for how much training was provided)
   a. What is your perception of the training provided to you? The coaches? The district staff?

14. What did the Tools for Life team provide in terms of continuous support? (Probe for how often they provided support)
   a. How do you engage with the leaders/staff of TFL? Who did you meet with? How often? What was the substance of the meetings?
   b. What is your perception of the continuous support they provided? (Probe for the extent to which they were available to answer questions and problem solve, the general quality
15. Overall, how did you feel about the level of support Tools for Life provided? What, if any, additional support would you have liked?

16. How did you engage with JPS leadership about Tools for Life implementation?
   a. Who did you meet with? How often? What was the substance of the meetings?
   b. Overall, how did you feel about the level of support your district provided for the implementation of Tools for Life? What, if any, additional support would you have liked?

17. How did you engage with JPS coaches about Tools for Life implementation?
   a. Who did you meet with? How often? What was the substance of the meetings?

18. How did you engage with JPS staff about Tools for Life implementation?
   a. Who did you meet with (e.g., elementary counselors, librarians)? How often? What was the substance of the meetings?

Perceptions of Tools for Life Impact

19. What changes, if any, have you seen in the district that you think could be attributed to introduction of the Tools for Life program? (Probe on climate, classroom management, student interpersonal skills, disciplinary actions, attendance.)
   a. What makes you say so? [Probe for what they are tracking on]

20. What changes, if any, do you think should be made to the Tools for Life program?

21. At this point in time, would you recommend the Tools for Life program to other school districts? Why or why not?
   a. What characteristics do you think the districts should have? (Probe for a single champion, small district, cooperative board)
Thank you for participating in this interview about the climate and safety of your school [Note to interviewer - Add the following only for TFL schools, NOT control schools: and the introduction of the Tools for Life program]. Before we begin, I want to introduce myself. My name is [insert name]. I am a researcher the RAND Corporation, an independent non-profit research institute, which is conducting a study to evaluate the implementation of a school safety and climate program in Jackson Public Schools. This study is funded by a grant from the National Institute of Justice of the Department of Justice.

Before we start, I want to make sure you understand that this is a research study, your participation is your choice, and you can stop at any time or skip any questions that you’d like. Most of the questions ask about the school in general, and not about you specifically. Our study team will keep what you say confidential. We will incorporate your comments with several other sources of information—specifically, our structured observations of some school spaces, as well as comments made by teachers and parents in a series of focus groups that we are conducting—to create case studies of Tools for Life implementation in six Jackson schools. We will not identify the schools by name in any reports. And we will not identify you personally or attribute anything you say today to you personally. Only the research team will have this information and we will not share that with anyone at this school or at Jackson Public Schools.

I estimate our conversation today will last about an hour. I will be jotting some notes so I can remember what you say.

In addition, I would like to audio-record today’s discussion to check the accuracy of our notes. Your names will not be recorded in my notes and the audio-recording will be destroyed as soon as the study team has completed fact checking.

Is this okay with you? [If participant nods or says “yes”, start recording]

Do you have any questions before we begin? [Pause for questions and answer.]

If you have any questions later, please don’t hesitate to contact me and I can answer your questions or put you in touch with the study leader at RAND. [Provide the following contact information: Gabriella Gonzalez, 412-683-2300 x4426, ggonzal@rand.org].

Do you agree to participate? [If YES, continue. If NO, stop interview and thank them for their time.]

[INTERVIEWER: CHOOSE THE APPROPRIATE PROTOCOL TO CONTINUE:
Protocol for Control schools or Treatment schools]
School Administrator and TFL Lead Implementer Interview Protocol for Control Schools (2017)

Introduction

First, can you tell me a little about your career history?

1. How long have you been in this district?
2. How long have you been at this school in your current role?

School Safety and Climate

Now I’d like to discuss this school’s climate and safety:

3. How would you describe your role in improving the climate and safety of this school?

4. What aspects of school climate and school safety are you most concerned about addressing within your school? We are interested in issues related to emotional and psychological safety, as well as physical safety as it relates to conflicts among students (for example, students getting into fights with each other).
   a. Could you give me an example or two of the types of problems and issues you are talking about?
   b. Are there other aspects of school climate and school safety you are concerned about?

5. What policies and programs currently exist in your school for addressing the issues you mentioned related to emotional and psychological safety, and physical safety among students?
   a. Who are the major target audiences for these efforts? [Example target audiences could be all students, students with disciplinary problems, parents, etc.]
   b. How long have these policies/programs been in place?

6. To date, what has been successful in improving school climate and/or school safety in this school? Again, we are interested in emotional and psychological safety, and physical safety among students.
   a. How do you know this effort/program has been successful? That is, what information do you gather to evaluate success?
b. Do you feel that any of your school-wide prevention programs (like PBIS Tier 1 programs) have been successful? Why or why not?

c. What have you tried that has not worked for improving school climate and/or school safety in the district? How do you know?

7. What kind of support do you receive from the district for improving school climate and safety?

8. What additional steps do you think are needed to address the school climate and safety issues you told me about earlier?

School Administrator and TFL Lead Implementer Interview Protocol for Treatment Schools (2017)

Introduction

First, can you tell me a little about your career history?

1. How long have you been in this district?

2. How long have you been a principal at this school?

Implementation of TFL

3. Thus far, how is the process of implementing TFL into your school going?
   a. What has gone well?
      i. (Give participants a few seconds and if you get no responses, try this probe:) This can be any aspect that you think has gone well, like the Tools for Life training, the process of integrating lessons into the classroom, student responses.
      ii. (If participants focus on one area:) Are there any other areas that you think have gone well?
   b. What has not gone so well?
      i. (Give participants a few seconds and if you get no responses, try this probe:) This can be any aspect that you think has not gone so well, like the Tools for Life training, the process of integrating lessons into the classroom, student responses.
ii. *(If participants focus on one area:)* Are there any other areas that you think have not gone so well?

4. What factors do you think are facilitating the implementation of Tools for Life in your school?

5. What challenges have you encountered with respect to implementing Tools for Life in your school? (Probe on specific challenges.)
   a. How did you or do you plan to address or overcome these challenges?
   b. What supports helped or might help you address the challenges?

6. Do you think staff are implementing the Tools for Life lessons as intended? Why or why not?

7. If you could go back, would you do anything differently in terms of how you are implementing Tools for Life in your school?

8. What plans do you / does your school have for sustaining or “ramping up” implementation of the Tools for Life program for [the rest of the year/next year]?

**Response to TFL**

9. To date, how receptive do you think students in your school have been to the Tools for Life program? Why is that? Any examples you can share?
   a. How about their parents?
   b. Fellow administrators?
   c. Teachers and staff?

10. What changes, if any, do you feel like you have seen in your school as a result of the Tools for Life program?

11. What changes, if any, do you think should be made to the Tools for Life program?

12. At this point in time, would you recommend the Tools for Life program to other schools?
**Staff Focus Group Participant Information Sheet (2017)**

Please complete the following information about yourself. We will use this information to describe the characteristics of the people who participated today. DO NOT put your name on this sheet. Thank you!

1. Which job category best describes your role at this school?

- Administrator (for example, principal, vice principal)
- Elementary classroom teacher (for example, K-5 teacher)
- Middle school classroom teacher (for example, social studies teacher, math teacher)
- Certified staff (for example, music teacher, librarian)
- Counselor
- Classroom assistant
- Non-academic staff (for example, custodial, office, cafeteria)
- Other: ______________________

2. What grade(s) do you teach/support? (Check all that apply)

- K
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- Other: ______________________

3. How many years have you taught/worked at this school?

Write in: _______ years

4. How many years have you taught/worked in K-12 education?

Write in: _______ years

5. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

6. In what year were you born? ______

7. Are you of Hispanic, Latino/a, or of Spanish origin?

- Yes
- No, not of Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin

What is your race? (One or more categories may be selected)

- White
- Black/African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Other: ______________________

Do you have anything else to tell us that you didn’t get a chance to say? Please tell us or write it in the space below.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!
Oral Introductory Script for Staff Focus Group (2017)

Thank you for coming today and participating in this focus group about the climate and safety of your school. Before we begin, I want to introduce myself and the others working on this project. My name is [insert name] and this is [insert name]. We are researchers with the RAND Corporation, an independent non-profit research institute, which is conducting a study to evaluate the implementation of a school safety and climate program in Jackson Public Schools. This study is funded by a grant from the National Institute of Justice of the Department of Justice.

Today we want to hear from you about several topics.

[for use for Fall 2016 Control Schools] We’re interested in learning your thoughts on the climate and safety here at this school.

[for use for Spring 2017 Tools for Life Schools] We’re interested in learning your thoughts on the climate and safety here at this school, as well as the implementation of the Tools for Life program.

Before we start, I want to make sure you understand that this is a research study, your participation is your choice, you don’t have to answer any questions you do not wish to, and you can stop at any time. Many of the questions ask about the school in general, and not about you specifically. However, because this is a group discussion, please don’t say anything you wouldn’t want others to know and talk about. While our study team will keep what you say confidential—we will not share information about you with anyone—we cannot promise you that others in the group will do the same. We do ask that everyone please respect the confidentiality of other participants and not repeat what we discuss outside of this room. We will incorporate your comments with several other sources of information—specifically, our structured observations of school spaces, as well as comments made by school administrators in interviews and by parents in a series of focus groups that we are conducting—to create case studies of Tools for Life implementation in six Jackson schools. We will not identify the schools by name in any reports. And we will not identify you personally or attribute anything you say today to you personally. Only the research team will have this information and we will not share that with anyone at this school or at Jackson Public Schools.

We estimate our discussion today will last about an hour. We will be asking some questions and hope that each of you will share your thoughts and feelings. Please speak clearly and one at a time so that we can hear everyone. There are no right or wrong answers. You may not agree with what others say and they may not agree with you. That is okay. Because we have limited time, I may have to interrupt someone to move us to another topic.

We will be taking notes so we can remember what you say. We will also be audio-recording today’s discussion to check the accuracy of our notes. Your names will not be recorded in our notes and the audio-recording will be destroyed as soon as we have completed fact checking.
First, before we start our discussion, please complete a very brief participant info sheet that asks you for some basic information about yourself—please do not put your name on it.

Is this okay with everyone? [If participants nods or says “yes,” start recording. If one person says “no” then do not record]

Are there any questions?

For questions about the study, please contact the study leader at RAND: Gabriella Gonzalez, 412-683-2300 x4426, ggonzal@rand.org.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or need to report a research-related injury or concern, you can contact RAND’s Human Subjects Protection Committee toll-free at (866) 697-5620 or by emailing hspcinfo@rand.org. If possible, when you contact the Committee, please reference Study #2016-0157.

[FACILITATOR: CHOOSE THE APPROPRIATE PROTOCOL TO CONTINUE: Protocol for Control Schools or Treatment Schools]

Staff Focus Group Protocol for Control Schools (2017)

[Set up nameplates/tent cards to identify each participant by a number. Have everyone complete the “Focus Group Participant Info Sheet”, putting their number in the ID space.]

[Have everyone say their ID number and position/role in the school.]

Thank you. The focus of today’s discussion is this school’s climate and safety. When I talk about school climate and safety, I’m thinking of topics like how students treat each other and how students get along with their teachers.

School Safety and Climate

1. What aspects of school climate and school safety are you most concerned about within your school?
   a. Could you give me an example or two of the types of problems and issues you are talking about?

2. To your knowledge, what steps are school or district administrators taking to address these issues?
3. What steps, if any, are you personally currently taking to address these issues in your classroom and your school?

4. To date, what would you say has been working in terms of improving the climate and safety of your classroom and your school? Again, we are interested in emotional and psychological safety, and physical safety among students.
   a. What has not worked?
   b. What additional steps do you think are needed to address these issues?

5. What specific efforts would you like to see the district, and this school, put in place to improve or address school climate and school safety?

6. What kind of supports do you think you would need to address climate and safety in the classroom and your school?
   a. (Give participants a few seconds and if you get no responses, try this probe:) For example, is there anything that could be done differently in terms of disciplinary policies, curriculum resources, professional development, increasing parental involvement?

Closing

7. That’s all the questions I have for today. Is there anything else that anyone would like to say that we haven’t covered already?

[Thank participants, give them a chance to complete the last question on the “Focus Group Participant Info Sheet”, provide payments, and dismiss them. Linger a bit to answer any questions. Be sure to collect all “Focus Group Participant Info Sheets” to submit to RAND.]

Staff Focus Group Protocol for Treatment Schools (2017)
[Set up nameplates/tent cards to identify each participant by a number. Have everyone complete the “Focus Group Participant Info Sheet,” putting their number in the ID space.]
[Have everyone say their ID number and position/role in the school.]

Thank you. First, I’d like to discuss this school’s climate and safety. When I talk about school climate and safety, I’m thinking of topics like how students treat each other and how students get along with their teachers.
School Safety and Climate

1. What aspects of school climate and school safety are you most concerned about addressing within your school?
   a. Could you give me an example or two of the types of problems and issues you are talking about?

2. To your knowledge, what steps are school administrators taking to address these issues?

3. What steps, if any, are you personally currently taking to address these issues in your classroom or your school?

Implementation of Tools for Life

4. Now I’d like to ask you about the Tools for Life program that is being implemented in your school.
   a. Have you attended any Tools for Life training sessions?
      i. Which ones? *(Probes if needed: These are pretty far in the past now. There was a training for guidance counselors in the summer, as well as a teacher training session in the summer. There may have been others conducted informally at schools).*
      ii. What did you think of them?
   b. Have you looked at any Tools for Life materials or resources?
      i. Which ones?
      ii. What did you think of them?
      iii. If you’ve looked at or used a Tools for Life learning kit, how useful or not useful do you think the items will be?
   c. Have you taught or seen someone else model a Tools for Life lesson? What did you think of it?
      i. How easy or difficult was it (or do you think it is or will be) to follow the lesson plans provided as part of the Tools for Life program?
      ii. Did you or do you think you will supplement Tools for Life lessons with your own activities? Tell me more about that.

5. Thus far, how is the process of implementing Tools for Life into your school going?
   c. What has gone well?
      i. *(Give participants a few seconds and if you get no responses, try this probe:)*
      This can be any aspect that you think has gone well, like the Tools for Life training, the process of integrating lessons into the classroom, student responses.
      ii. *(If participants focus on one area:)* Are there any other areas that you think have gone well?
d. What has not gone so well?
   i. *(Give participants a few seconds and if you get no responses, try this probe:)*
   This can be any aspect that you think has not gone so well, like the Tools for Life training, the process of integrating lessons into the classroom, student responses.
   ii. *(If participants focus on one area:)* Are there any other areas that you think have not gone so well?

e. What kind of support did you receive in implementing Tools for Life? *(If needed, can use this probe: This support could have come from school administration, a Tools for Life implementation coach, or elsewhere.)*

6. What factors do you think supported the implementation of Tools for Life into your classroom?
   a. Into your school?

7. Have you or anyone you know encountered any challenges when using Tools for Life in the classroom?
   a. Can you give me some examples of challenges?
   b. How did or how are you/the individual working to overcome the challenges?
   c. What might help you/the individual to overcome the challenges?

**Response to Tools for Life**

8. How receptive do you think your students have been, or are going to be, of the Tools for Life program? Why is that?
   a. How about their parents?
   b. Administrators?
   c. Fellow teachers and staff?

9. What changes, if any, do you feel like you have seen in your classroom or will see as a result of the Tools for Life program?
   a. How about in your school?

10. What changes, if any, do you think should be made to the Tools for Life program?

11. At this point in time, would you recommend the Tools for Life program to other educators or schools?
Additional Questions, Time Permitting

12. How do you see Tools for Life in light of other programs that are currently in place to address school climate and safety?

13. How, if at all, are you tracking students’ growth and development in terms of the skills targeted by Tools for Life?

14. Moving forward would you do anything differently in terms of how you are using Tools for Life in your classroom or school?

15. If you had to give one piece of advice to teachers implementing Tools for Life, what would you tell them?

Closing

16. That’s all the questions I have for today. Is there anything else that anyone would like to say that we haven’t covered already?

[Thank participants, give them a chance to complete the last question on the “Focus Group Participant Info Sheet”, provide payments, and dismiss them. Linger a bit to answer any questions. Be sure to collect all “Focus Group Participant Info Sheets” to submit to RAND.]
Appendix E. Auxiliary Tables

This appendix provides additional information on student survey responses presented in Chapter Three (Table 3.1) and on student outcomes presented in Chapter Four (Table 4.8).

Table E.1. Student Responses on TFL Exposure, by School (Year 1), by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment School</th>
<th>Seen Poster N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Experienced Lesson Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Treatment*Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table E.2. Moderation Estimates on Social and Emotional, School Climate, Behavioral and Academic Outcomes After One Year, by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student level</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Treatment*Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Health</td>
<td>-0.079 (0.047)</td>
<td>-0.155*** (0.44)</td>
<td>0.086 (0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>-0.067 (0.048)</td>
<td>-0.041 (0.039)</td>
<td>0.035 (0.051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-0.341 (0.375)</td>
<td>-0.536 (0.372)</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>-0.060 (0.534)</td>
<td>0.338 (0.367)</td>
<td>-0.244 (0.426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>-0.461 (0.370)</td>
<td>-0.467 (0.305)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>-0.107 (0.386)</td>
<td>-0.660 (0.329)</td>
<td>0.224 (0.481)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.005)</td>
<td>0.004 (0.003)</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>0.023 (0.026)</td>
<td>0.057 (0.018)</td>
<td>0.027 (0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAP Math</td>
<td>0.027 (0.57)</td>
<td>-0.106* (0.042)</td>
<td>0.064 (0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAP RLA</td>
<td>-0.030 (0.068)</td>
<td>-0.034 (0.040)</td>
<td>0.031 (0.058)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Authors’ analysis of JPSD administrative data (academic years 2015–2016 and AY 2016–2017) and School Climate survey (academic year 2016–2017).

**NOTE:** * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.
Table E.3. Moderation Estimates on Social and Emotional, School Climate, Behavioral and Academic Outcomes After One Year, by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student level</th>
<th>Treatment Level</th>
<th>Treatment*Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Health</td>
<td>-0.078 (0.044)</td>
<td>-0.147 (0.080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>-0.072 (0.049)</td>
<td>-0.114 (0.088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-0.567 (0.350)</td>
<td>-2.792*** (0.637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>-0.241 (0.574)</td>
<td>-0.813 (1.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>-0.673 (0.378)</td>
<td>-2.013** (0.675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>-0.467 (0.388)</td>
<td>-2.119** (0.695)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>0.005 (0.005)</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>0.024 (0.028)</td>
<td>0.023 (0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAP Math</td>
<td>0.037 (0.061)</td>
<td>0.071 (0.107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAP RLA</td>
<td>-0.040 (0.074)</td>
<td>-0.038 (0.129)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

Table E.4. Moderation Estimates on Social and Emotional, School Climate, Behavioral and Academic Outcomes After One Year, by Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Level</th>
<th>Treatment Income</th>
<th>Treatment*Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Health</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.050 (0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>-0.038 (0.044)</td>
<td>-0.027 (0.051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-0.117 (0.332)</td>
<td>-0.292 (0.478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.507)</td>
<td>-0.180 (0.475)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>-0.269 (0.340)</td>
<td>0.249 (0.394)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>-0.083 (0.353)</td>
<td>-0.425 (0.428)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.005)</td>
<td>-0.007 (0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>0.033 (0.024)</td>
<td>0.016 (0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAP Math</td>
<td>0.062 (0.053)</td>
<td>-0.040 (0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAP RLA</td>
<td>-0.012 (0.065)</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.052)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.
Appendix F. Interview Protocols for Cost Analysis

This appendix contains protocols used for interviews to inform the cost analysis, summarized in Chapter Five. Interviews were conducted in person and over the phone between October 2017 and March 2018. Interviews were followed by an administrative data requests from RAND. Thus, the goal of the interviews was to get a sense of the full scope of the “ingredients” used to implement TFL in JPSD. The administrative data request then served as a means of obtaining specific cost data for these ingredients.

Tools for Life Staff

Opening Questions

Our main interest is to figure out what resources (or “ingredients”) were used to implement the TFL program at the sites included in the evaluation. Our intention is to identify all of the ingredients needed for successful replication.

Please describe how the program operates generally.

- What kinds of services are provided?
- Where are these services taking place?
- How do participants (schools, staff, students) become involved in the program?

We show that XX students and XX staff are being served at JPSD schools.

- Are there any other students or affiliates that we are not considering but might factor into the cost of your program?

a. Personnel

The questions listed below are intended to gather detailed data on personnel. We are interested in any personnel involved in the program—planning, implementing (i.e. actually delivering the services), supervising, volunteering.

[optional] Number of employees and their title

- For each full-time and part-time staff please provide
• What were the individuals’ qualifications? (e.g., degree, years of experience)
  o (If appropriate) Salary or dollar amount associated with hours
  o Are there indirect costs above and beyond salary (fringe, benefits, overhead)?
• How was he/she recruited?
• What training did he/she receive?
• Time charged to project since its inception
• Hours overtime

Subcontractors

[optional, pending data request of finance records] Please provide any documentation (e.g., MOUs or actual invoices) that specifies the following information (from beginning of their involvement to the present):
  • Staffing headcount, with job title information
  • Time charged for TFL-related activities
  • Cost

b. Facilities

What space is being utilized by the TFL program staff in Jackson?
  • How often is the space utilized?
  • About how large is the space?
  • Was the space exclusively devoted to the TFL program?
  • Did the space include any computers or other technology used by the program?

Are there dedicated spaces in the schools where TFL is being implemented?
  • How often is the space utilized?
  • About how large is the space?
  • Was the space exclusively devoted to the TFL program?
  • Did the space include any computers or other technology used by the program?

c. Equipment and Materials

Were there specific materials used in the service or in training?
  • How many of each were required?
  • Who provided these materials? Who paid?

Did the program require the use of computers?
• If so, how many computers were required, for how long, and how often?

Did the program receive any contributed donations of materials, supplies, or equipment?
• If so, what donated materials were used by the program?

Is there a difference between the materials used by the TFL schools compared to non-TFL schools?

Were there any costs associated with curriculum development for the TFL program in Jackson Public Schools?

d. Required Client Inputs

Can you think of any sort of contribution that is required of the students or their families?
• For example, are families expected to provide any sort of transportation, books, equipment, food, or other services above and beyond standard educational practices?

JPSD Staff

Opening Questions

Our main interest is to figure out what resources (or “ingredients”) were used by Jackson Public Schools in order to implement the TFL program at the sites included in the evaluation. Our intention is to identify all of the ingredients needed for successful replication.

Please describe how the program operates generally, from your perspective.
• What kinds of services are provided?
• Where are these services taking place?
• To what extent are JPS district personnel involved?

We show that XX students are being served at 50 schools.
• Are there any other students or affiliates that we are not considering but might factor into the cost of your program?
a. Personnel

The questions listed below are intended to gather detailed data on personnel. We are interested in any personnel involved in the program—planning, implementing (i.e. actually delivering the services), supervising, volunteering.

Can you describe the roles and responsibilities of JPS staff that are involved in the planning for the rollout of the TFL program?

[optional] Can you describe the roles and responsibilities of JPS staff that are involved in the implementation of the TFL program?

• For each full-time and part-time staff please provide
  • What were the individuals’ qualifications? (e.g., degree, years of experience)
    o (If appropriate) Salary or dollar amount associated with hours
    o Are there indirect costs above and beyond salary (fringe, benefits, overhead)?
  • How was he/she recruited?
  • What training did he/she receive?
  • Time charged to project since its inception
  • Hours overtime

Subcontractors

[optional, pending data request of finance records] Can you describe the roles and responsibilities of any subcontractors that are involved in the implementation of the TFL program?

• Please provide any documentation (e.g., MOUs or actual invoices) that specifies the following information (from beginning of their involvement to the present):
  o Staffing headcount, with job title information
  o Time charged for TFL-related activities
  o Cost

b. Facilities

What space is being utilized by the TFL program staff in Jackson?

• Training sites
• Conference sites—held at Cardozo Middle School
• Implementation coach/TFL consultant office space (not sure where)
  • Parent nights—presumably in individual school auditorium or gyms
• How often is the space utilized?
• About how large is the space?
• Was the space exclusively devoted to the TFL program?
• Did the space include any computers or other technology used by the program?

Are there dedicated spaces in the schools where TFL is being implemented?
• How often is the space utilized?
• About how large is the space?
• Was the space exclusively devoted to the TFL program?
• Did the space include any computers or other technology used by the program?

c. Equipment and Materials

Were there specific materials used in the service or in training?
• How many of each were required?
• Who provided these materials? Who paid?

Did the program require the use of computers?
• If so, how many computers were required, for how long, and how often?

Did the program receive any contributed donations of materials, supplies, or equipment?
• If so, what donated materials were used by the program?

Is there a difference between the materials used by the TFL schools compared to non-TFL schools?

Were there any costs associated with curriculum development for the TFL program in Jackson Public Schools?

d. Required Client Inputs

Can you think of any sort of contribution that is required of the students or their families?
• For example, are families expected to provide any sort of transportation, books, equipment, food, or other services above and beyond standard educational practices?
School Staff

Opening Questions

Our main interest is to figure out what resources (or “ingredients”) were used by Jackson Public Schools in order to implement the TFL program at the sites included in the evaluation.

Please describe how the program operates generally, from your perspective.

- What kind of programming is being provided via the TFL partnership?
- Where is this programming taking place?
- To what extent are school personnel involved?

We show that XX students are being served at your school.

- Are there any other students or affiliates that we are not considering but might factor into the cost of your program?

a. Personnel

The questions listed below are intended to gather detailed data on personnel. We are interested in any personnel involved in the program—planning, implementing (i.e. actually delivering the services), supervising, volunteering.

[optional] Can you describe the roles and responsibilities of your school staff that are involved in the implementation of the TFL program?

- For each full-time and part-time staff please provide
  - What were the individuals’ qualifications? (e.g., degree, years of experience)
    - (If appropriate) Salary or dollar amount associated with hours
    - Are there indirect costs above and beyond salary (fringe, benefits, overhead)?
  - How was he/she recruited?
  - What training did he/she receive?
  - Time charged to project since its inception
  - Hours overtime

Subcontractors

Can you describe the roles and responsibilities of any subcontractors that are involved in the implementation of the TFL program?

- Please provide any documentation (e.g., MOUs or actual invoices) that specifies the following information (from beginning of their involvement to the present):
Staffing headcount, with job title information
Time charged for TFL-related activities
Cost

b. Facilities

What space is being utilized by the TFL program staff in your school?
- Training sites
- Conference sites—held at Cardozo Middle School
- Implementation coach/TFL consultant office space (not sure where)
- Parent nights—presumably in individual school auditorium or gyms
  - How often is the space utilized?
  - About how large is the space?
  - Was the space exclusively devoted to the TFL program?
  - Did the space include any computers or other technology used by the program?

Are there dedicated spaces in the schools where TFL is being implemented?
- How often is the space utilized?
- About how large is the space?
- Was the space exclusively devoted to the TFL program?
- Did the space include any computers or other technology used by the program?

c. Equipment and Materials

Were there specific materials used in the service or in training?
- How many of each were required?
- Who provided these materials? Who paid?

Did the program require the use of computers?
- If so, how many computers were required, for how long, and how often?

Did the program receive any contributed donations of materials, supplies, or equipment?
- If so, what donated materials were used by the program?

Is there a difference between the materials used by your school now, compared to before you started using the TFL program?
- How does the TFL programming differ from the PBIS services that have already been in place?
Were there any costs associated with curriculum development for the TFL program in JPS?

d. Required Client Inputs

Can you think of any sort of contribution that is required of the students or their families?

- For example, are families expected to provide any sort of transportation, books, equipment, food, or other services above and beyond standard educational practices?