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Summary of Phase III

Phase III, Year 2 has been a year of tremendous learning with expansion of the developing infrastructure and more access to data to inform the work. In Phase III, Year 1 the State recognized the need to name the system being created as a result of the work of the SSIP. The name, iSocial (improving Social-emotional Outcomes through Complementary Infrastructure development and Leadership), reflected the critical nature of sustainable, complementary infrastructure at the state and local level to support the implementation, with fidelity, of the Pyramid Model framework. iSocial is the system that scales up and sustains the work of the SSIP long term, regardless of what initiatives (i.e. SSIP and SPDG) are in place (Appendix I: iSocial Visual).

In October 2017, New Hampshire Department of Education was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). The New Hampshire SPDG, integrated with the SSIP, supports improved social emotional outcomes for infants, toddlers and preschool children, including children with disabilities. The SPDG has a focus on infusing the evidence-based practices into IHEs, developing a website resource for the state, and building the infrastructure to support the trainers, coaches, teams and practitioners with the implementation of the Pyramid Model framework. Through the SPDG, iSocial will partner with five community collaboratives to implement the Pyramid Model at the local level.

Along with the current SPDG staff, key personnel for the SSIP drive iSocial to ensure both the SSIP and the SPDG are meeting their goals and moving us towards a bigger, sustainable system.

Each of the districts participating in the SSIP had at least one site implementing the Pyramid Model Framework and their leadership teams remained strong. For the first time, there were validated New Hampshire administrators of the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool: TPOT™ (Brookes Publishing) who conducted the assessment in the implementation sites. The New Hampshire-based cadre of process coaches (supporting local teams) and Practice-based coaches (using the Practice-based coaching model with practitioners) grew and became more skilled. The data system, still under development as new needs were identified, yielded reports and information to inform both the state and local teams. Feedback loops cut across all levels of the system and flowed bi-directionally, ensuring that communication and sharing of challenges and successes were ongoing and immediate. The iSocial Expanded Core Team and the Process coaches worked with Beth Steenwyk, an expert in implementation science, to deepen capacity to support the local teams with sustaining this work over time.

iSocial Theory of action, including the SiMR

As described in the Phase III, Year 1 report, the New Hampshire iSocial Theory of Action (ToA) (Appendix II: Theory of Action) uses logical “If-Then” statements to reflect how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies will increase the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in districts and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) for children with disabilities. The SiMR that New Hampshire strives for states that: “Preschool children with disabilities in the identified subset of districts will substantially increase their rate of growth in the area of improved social-emotional skills (including social relationships) by the time they turned six years of age or exit the program.”

The Theory of Action (ToA) developed in Phase I served was foundational for the work of the State Systemic Improvement Plan. For the Phase III, Year 1 submission, the ToA was simplified for clarity
and to reflect development. There were no additional changes made for Phase III, Year 2 reporting period. Based on this ToA, the State engaged in coherent improvement strategies designed to build an infrastructure to support implementation of the Pyramid Model. The need to develop complementary infrastructure at the state and local level articulated in the ToA continues to be essential in creating a system that thrives statewide and is vital at all levels.

### Coherent improvement strategies

In Phase III, Year 2, New Hampshire continued to invest in infrastructure development to support implementation of iSocial. An internal Core Team comprised of key staff from both the SSIP and SPDG oversaw the day-to-day operation of iSocial, using data and feedback from stakeholders at all levels to expand and implement the iSocial system. An Expanded Core Team comprised of the internal Core Team as well as leads from key initiatives (PTAN and Race2K) met frequently to plan for the State Leadership Team meetings and actively engaged in a plan/do/study/act cycle to assess the development of Practice-based and process coach cohorts. These cohorts serve as the potential pool of future New Hampshire Master Cadre coaches and trainers. The State Leadership Team checked in to be sure members were still available to serve on the group, expanded to include key representatives for the SPDG, and reviewed membership to identify any missing stakeholders or key advisors.

The State also increased capacity for data analysis and evaluation. The Data Team continued to refine and enhance the data system, especially with respect to reporting. The evaluators began working with the internal Core Team to identify remaining data collection tools and measures, refine the evaluation questions and plans, develop data dashboards, support data-based decision making, and conduct analyses.

New Hampshire maintained fiscal support for the state infrastructure, enhancing the professional development and technical assistance system and expanding implementation of the practices to more classrooms within the participating districts. With the SPDG award, additional state staff joined in the iSocial work. Fiscal support for local teams also continued, driven by their action plans.

Engagement of stakeholders at all levels, with attention to habits, elements, and depth of interaction continued to be a cornerstone of iSocial and was embedded in implementation and evaluation. The feedback loops established previously intentionally promoted authentic coalescing around the work at hand.

### Evidence-based practices implemented to date

#### Implementation of the Pyramid Model Framework

In Phase III, Year 2 iSocial continued to focus on the base of the Pyramid (Effective Workforce; Systems and policies promote and sustain the use of evidence-based practices) and Tier 1 (Universal) and Tier 2 (Targeted). This was done through training and coaching around nurturing and responsive relationships and high quality supportive environments as well as a focus on the local leadership teams. In addition, a Tier 3 (Intensive) Prevent-Teach-Reinforce for Young Children training was provided.

Twelve of the fourteen iSocial districts (five single districts and one School Administrative Unit comprised of seven districts) entered the second year of implementation of the Pyramid Model at the
local level. Two of the fourteen iSocial districts began their first year of Pyramid Model implementation. A detailed update on district implementation, including information about expansion, is in the Implementing Planned Activities with Fidelity: Update on participating iSocial districts section of this report.

**Pyramid Model Framework: National Partners**

The Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence in Infants and Young Children is a conceptual framework that was developed by two national, federally funded research and training centers (CSEFEL and TACSEI). These centers are no longer funded, but the work has continued through the Pyramid Model Consortium. The Consortium’s mission is to promote the high fidelity use of the Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence in Infants and Young Children. The Consortium has been an invaluable resource during Phase III and will be a key partner in the SPDG. The State looks forward to accessing the resources and technical assistance from the new federally funded National Center for Pyramid Model Innovation (NCPMI).

**Connecting with other initiatives**

iSocial has continued coordination and collaboration with other Pyramid Model initiatives in New Hampshire, which enhances the opportunities for scale-up and sustainability. For example, Project LAUNCH (a Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA] funded early childhood initiative) jointly sponsored Readiness trainings with iSocial and provided support to iSocial with training facilitators for Positive Solutions for Families. SAMHSA-funded initiatives within the Office of Student Wellness such as Fast Forward 2020, Safe Schools/Healthy Students and Project AWARE have early childhood elements and include support of PBIS in some cases, thus providing a smooth transition from early childhood to school age. The iSocial State Coordinator co-leads the statewide Pyramid Model State Leadership Team and through iSocial and provided fiscal supports for the meeting facilitation and coordination. This statewide work is informed by the experiences and systems developed through iSocial. By leveraging iSocial, there is increased capacity to move the cross-sector statewide system forward at a faster pace than would otherwise be possible.
Overview of evaluation activities, measures and outcomes

During year two of Phase III, the Evaluation team -- with the assistance of a newly secured External Evaluator -- sought to deepen and expand the work of the evaluation. Building upon the strong evaluation framework established in Phase II, the team outlined an Analysis Framework which synthesized the evaluation questions and incorporated clear performance measures. This new Analysis Framework offered a simplified, accessible format for coordinating data analysis and reporting into meaningful information that would inform decision making and progress monitoring at all levels of iSocial implementation. Leveraging this new framework, the Data Team created a series of new reports in the iSocial data system that would automatically analyze and render key data to system users based on their system permissions and role with iSocial implementation. Additionally, the Data Team expanded the availability of data collection tools through the iSocial data system, increasing the system’s capacity to collect, manage, analyze, and disseminate data related to iSocial.

Changes to implementation and improvement strategies

The theme of adjustment and growth is woven throughout iSocial, as described throughout this document. The core implementation and improvement strategies identified in earlier phases of the SSIP continue to be the foundation of the work, with course corrections driven by data and results as the work moves ahead. One of the changes to implementation was the adjustment to the State Leadership Team structure and membership as SSIP aligned with the SPDG. The iSocial data system continued to be expanded and enhanced to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, the integration of tools within the system and ready access to reports for the end-user. A significant change was the shift from using out-of-state Practice-based coaches contracted through the Pyramid Model Consortium to the New Hampshire cohort of coaches who are being trained and coached to fidelity.

Implementation Progress & Stakeholder Involvement

Description of implementation progress

Building upon the work done in previous phases of the SSIP, New Hampshire purposefully engaged in improvement strategies driven by the Theory of Action (Appendix II: Theory of Action). These strategies were intentionally designed to move us towards the desired result for preschool children. These strategies are visually presented in the iSocial Logic Model (Appendix III: NH Logic Model) and are described in detail throughout this report. The attached timeline (Appendix IV: iSocial Timeline) provides an overview of the sequence of implementation of the strategies.

In Phase II, New Hampshire identified four key improvement strategies to enhance its state infrastructure in order to support local implementation of evidence-based practices. In Phase III, Year 1 a fifth area was included. These five areas remained vital to the work during Phase III, Year 2. The following graphic illustrates the coherent improvement strategies.
Implementing planned activities with fidelity

The section below describes the planned activities specific to these key improvement strategies that were accomplished and key milestones that have been met along the intended timeline. It also provides detail on how each activity contributes to the State's capacity to better support districts with implementation and scale-up of evidence-based practices to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. These activities are directly tied to the intended outputs found in the iSocial Logic Model (Appendix III: NH Logic Model). Additional details on these outputs and the resulting outcomes are in the Progress on Outcomes section.

Expand and Refine State Leadership Team

The State Leadership Team, comprised of the Expanded Core Team with Key Advisors, continued to meet throughout the second year of Phase III. Upon receipt of the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), the membership was expanded to include the SPDG coordinator, representatives from higher education, and other key stakeholders at various levels. The internal Core Team included state staff integral to SSIP and the SPDG. The Expanded Core Team included the internal Core Team members as well as project leads who were instrumental to implementation of the Theory of Action. Since the challenges to implementation have both technical and adaptive aspects, changes to the group’s structure and membership were also identified consistent with Implementation Science and Leading by Convening. More information on this team is provided in the Stakeholder Involvement section.

Increase Capacity for Data Analysis and Evaluation

Data and Evaluation infrastructure activities focused on building state capacity to collect, manage and use data based on the outlined evaluation framework (Appendix III: NH Logic Model) and to support state and district data-driven improvement and implementation. Activities during year two of Phase III coalesced around three key infrastructure components--analysis framework, data system development, and support for data-based decision making.
External Evaluator

The Center for Behavioral Health Innovation at Antioch University New England joined the SSIP as the External Evaluator in July 2017. Antioch will support data collection, analysis, and dissemination for both the SSIP and SPDG as well as provide TA support to both the state and local leadership teams regarding understanding data and using data for decision making.

Analysis Framework

With support from the External Evaluator, the Evaluation Team reorganized and simplified the existing evaluation questions to make them more holistic, meaningful, and accessible to stakeholders. This new framework incorporated clear performance measures against which ongoing progress could be monitored. Additional information is detailed in the Alignment with the Theory of Action: Evaluation Questions & Analysis Framework section of this report.

Data system

The development of the data system has not been as expedient as hoped. Nonetheless, the Data Team launched the iSocial data system with all iSocial participants in May 2017. The Data Team continued to enhance system capacity and expand the scope of data managed within the system throughout Phase III, Year 2. A list of data collection tools, including those already integrated into the system can be found in Appendix V: Data Source.

This expanding pool of data in the system, combined with the newly drafted Analysis Framework, allowed the Data Team to initiate the development of more sophisticated, dynamic reports which responded to key evaluation questions and analyzed data across data sources and time. The Data Team also leveraged the system’s permissions-based infrastructure to provide users with reports tailored to their role in iSocial implementation, so that practice-based coaches could view the TPOT™ scores for their coachees while local and state leadership teams were presented with scores for their districts and statewide respectively. This enhanced reporting capacity dramatically expanded access to data for all iSocial participants.

In concert with this expanded access, the Expanded Core Team and Evaluation Team offered TA to both the Process Coaches and local leadership teams regarding data collection integrity, understanding iSocial data, and data meeting protocols. This TA was provided through Process Coach Team Meetings as well as both virtual and face-to-face statewide iSocial Collaborative Meetings.

Expand Fiscal Support

Support to Participating Districts

The NHDOE Bureau of Special Education continued to allocate funds to support district activities directly related to participation in the iSocial process with the intention of building local capacity. Each participating district was notified that up to $10,000 was available from July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018 to support activities directly related to their Action Plans. These grant applications were reviewed by the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education to ensure that funds were allocated for allowable activities. These funds supported staff participation in local leadership teams, the development and subsequent implementation of Action Plans, and substitutes so staff could participate in trainings and coaching opportunities.
Support to State Initiatives

1. The NHDOE continued to fund the Preschool Technical Assistance Network aka PTAN (SERESC) and the Race2K initiative (NH Coalition for Citizens with Disabilities dba The Parent Information Center) to support Preschool Special Education goals and activities, including iSocial.

In Phase III, Year 2, iSocial elevated the coaching expertise and fidelity to the Practice-based coaching model to fill the gap identified in Phase III, Year 1. PTAN, with the iSocial Core team, established criteria for Practice-based coaches and released an application for potential coaches. Applications were reviewed and candidates selected based on established criteria. Coaches then completed the 2 day training and validation process. Once the coaches were validated, PTAN contracted with them to serve as Practice-based coaches and to administer the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool: TPOT™ (Brookes Publishing). It is from this pool of coaches that iSocial anticipates generating a Master Cadre of Practice-based coaches and TPOT™ administrators.

Race2K engaged the process coaches in their action planning and infrastructure development work with local leadership teams. To bolster this in Phase III, Year 2, Race2K contracted with Beth Steenwyk to conduct Implementation Science training for process coaches and local leadership teams. Beth is recognized as a national expert in systems design and effective implementation practices education and human services contexts. Beth provided consultative support, technical assistance and training to 6 (six) state education agencies, a State Community Mental Health Improvement Grant and select national organizations. Over the course of the year, Beth facilitated multiple meetings with the process coaches to explore their role and function and the gradual release model (see Enhance Professional Development: Training and Technical Assistance section below).

2. The NHDOE funded an external Evaluator to support the implementation of the evaluation plan throughout the life of the SSIP and to support the new SPDG.

3. Funding for the Distinguished Educator position (funded in Phase II) was re-instituted in Phase III, Year 2. This position supports 80% FTE of a Early Childhood Special Educator to work with the State on iSocial and other related activities. This person researches other states implementation of the Pyramid Model, provides a Preschool Special Educator perspective on state teams, and helps create products for iSocial.

These fiscal supports from the State to districts and to support State initiatives promoted many of the expected outputs: building local teams, supporting local administrators understanding of factors that impact social-emotional outcomes and the cost-benefit of quality supports and services, the establishment of the cadre of coaches, trained staff, promotion of fidelity standards and family engagement

Enhance Professional Development: Training and Technical Assistance

iSocial infuses professional development to support all levels of the system, paying particular attention to the ebb and flow needed to meet diverse and changing needs (Appendix VI: Training and TA Calendar). As noted in Phase III, Year 1, iSocial adopted the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) definitions of training and technical assistance (coaching and consultation) to support a common framework for discussing the work (http://www.naeyc.org/GlossaryTraining_TA.pdf).

Professional development encompasses education, training, and technical assistance.
Training is a learning experience, or series of experiences, specific to an area of inquiry and related set of skills or dispositions, delivered by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills. A planned sequence of training sessions comprises a training program.

Technical Assistance (TA) is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills to develop or strengthen processes, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients. Mentoring, coaching, consultation, PD advising, and peer-to-peer TA are strategies that may be discrete processes or used as part of education and/or training programs.

Coaching is defined as a relationship-based process led by an expert with specialized and adult learning knowledge and skills, who often serves in a different professional role than the recipient(s). Coaching is designed to build capacity for specific professional dispositions, skills, and behaviors and is focused on goal-setting and achievement for an individual or group.

○ For practitioners, iSocial specifically uses the Practice-based coaching model. Practice-Based Coaching (PBC) is a professional development strategy that uses a cyclical process. This process supports teachers’ use of effective teaching practices that lead to positive outcomes for children. PBC occurs in the context of collaborative partnerships.

Trainings were targeted to specific audiences and, when possible, were opened to additional participants. For 2017-2018, New Hampshire continued to rely on the expert trainers from the Pyramid Model Consortium to conduct the trainings for practitioners and to train and validate Practice-based coaches and TPOT™ Administrators. It is anticipated that work will begin in Phase III, Year 3 to generate qualified New Hampshire based trainers. The Consortium has created online training modules that may be used in conjunction with New Hampshire trainers to ensure consistency of the content of the trainings.

In order to hone the skills of the Practice-based coaches, the Consortium and the PTAN Coordinator supported the cohort of coaches through a Professional Learning Community that met nine times over the course of the year. This served as a way for coaches to share experiences, grapple with questions, receive national TA, and deepen understanding of the practices. A key learning this year was the distinction between an expert consultant model (which was more familiar to the coaches) versus a Practice-based coaching model. In the consultant model, the coach observes and then provides expert advice on changes that could be made in the classroom. In the Practice-based coaching model, the coach engages in a collaborative coaching partnership with the practitioner on a 2 week cycle, developing shared goals and action planning, focused observation, reflection and feedback. The transition from consultation to Practice-based coaching proved challenging; one member of the original cohort who balked at changing frames left by mutual agreement. The cohort of Practice-based coaches were also validated as TPOT™ administrators. Based on their feedback after administering the TPOT™s last fall, New Hampshire is working with the Pyramid Model Consortium to develop a TPOT™ II training that will deepen skills in the administration of the tool and the use of the data for coaching action plans.

In the summer of 2017, iSocial offered other trainings for practitioners including Module 1 Promoting Children's Success: Building Relationships and Creating Supportive Environments and Module 2 Social-Emotional Teaching Strategies. In the fall of 2017, iSocial sponsored a Prevent Teach Reinforce for Young Children (PTR-YC) training. PTR-YC is a model of intervention for young children with the most persistent and severe challenging behaviors, based on the well-
established procedures of positive behavior support. Once practitioners completed the Module 1 Promotion and Prevention training, a coach was assigned to work with them. Practice-based coaches were available for up to 8 hours per month for each site and observed in the classroom on the 2 week coaching cycle. This was the recommended dosage of coaching from the Pyramid Model Consortium.

The iSocial Learning Collaborative continued to meet to support the local teams. As part of the iSocial Learning Collaborative, face-to-face and virtual meetings were held throughout the year. These included opportunities for role-alike groups to learn from each other, mechanisms for feedback loops from locals to the state and from the state to the locals, problem solving, learning how to use a data-protocol for data based decision making, and a Leadership Academy.

Through the Race2K contract, the Process coaches continued to support the local leadership teams in maintaining consistent meeting schedules and appropriate membership, and to sustain Action Planning and implementation of iSocial at the local level.

Technical assistance for the Process Coaches continued with monthly Process Coach meetings. These meetings offered an opportunity for coaches to update the state about the local leadership teams progress, problem-solve challenges, and ensure necessary data and actions were occurring locally.

Process coaches embarked in a year-long exploration of the application of implementation science to their work with local leadership teams and to sustainability of evidence-based practices over time. This began with a two-day training with Beth Steenwyk, an expert in implementation science. Over the course of the year, these coaches met with Beth virtually four additional times to deepen understanding of the function and role of the process coach. A major focus of this learning was on the key factors for sustainability of the evidence-based practices program wide over time as identified in the “Sustainability White Paper,” Iowa Department of Education (July 26, 2015). These factors are: 1) Administrative Support; 2) Consistent Implementation Approach; 3) Effective Teams; 4) Frequent Data Sharing with School Staff; 5) High quality Professional Learning; and 6) Access to Coaching.

The Process Coaches conducted an in-depth review of their role and function in relation to these factors and focused on what would gradual release of these functions to the local teams might look like. As noted in a slide Beth shared with the team: “The gradual release of responsibility model or GRR model is a particular style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process devolving responsibility within the learning process from the teacher to the eventual independence of the learner.”

Update on participating iSocial districts

The State contracted for the Practice-based coaches through the Preschool Technical Assistance Network (PTAN).

In Phase III, Year 1, one district requested a hiatus due to a sudden change in key staff; they were not actively participating in SSIP. In the spring of 2017, that district decided to opt out of SSIP altogether.

The fourteen (14) remaining districts, organized in eight (8) district teams based on the School Administrative Unit (SAU) structure, are referred to as District Leadership Teams or districts throughout this report. Each of these districts maintained active local District Leadership Teams supported by a state-assigned Process Coach. Their leadership teams completed the Benchmarks of Quality and continued implementation of their Action Plans. These districts collected and submitted
data. The iSocial Learning Collaboration provided opportunities for the districts to share information with each other and the State, as well as receive updates regarding the implementation of iSocial.

In the districts implementing the Pyramid Model through iSocial, practitioners who received coaching last year continued with coaching in Phase III, Year 2. The local leadership teams identified additional sites or classrooms for initial installation of the evidence-based practice, based on local capacity as well as access to coaches. While this often meant one or two practitioners or classrooms per district, multiple participants from the districts participated in Pyramid Model trainings. Local leadership teams also identified classrooms for administration of the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool: TPOT™ (Brookes Publishing). Within the 8 SAUs (14 districts), 12 classrooms served as implementation sites this year and the TPOT™ was administered in 26 classrooms. In Phase III, Year 1 only 6 classrooms had the TPOT™ administered and received Practice-based coaching.

The coaches conducted the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool: TPOT™ (Brookes Publishing) shortly after the Module 1 Promoting Social and Emotional Skills: The Pyramid Model training to establish how well teachers were implementing the 3-tiered Pyramid Model of practices that support children's social competence and prevent challenging behaviors. Many of the districts requested that the TPOT™ be administered in classrooms that were not being coached for additional information and insight into impact over time. Coaches and the site coordinated coaching at the recommended dosage of approximately 8 hours a month. This includes coaching prep time, observation, and feedback sessions. The second round of TPOT™ assessments are scheduled for May 2018.

The iSocial process helped one district build the infrastructure to support school personnel, families, and the community to address the social emotional needs of preschoolers with disabilities. This infrastructure included appropriate staffing patterns, reallocation of funds to ensure appropriate fiscal supports, curriculum redesign, program administration, and physical changes to the building to support social emotional growth and professional development for staff and families. As a result of this enhanced infrastructure, the district was able to increase access to regular early childhood programs for preschool children with disabilities.

In another district, iSocial resulted in community-wide support for full-day universal preschool. The local leadership team identified two relevant goals in their action plan: 1) the creation of a budget to fund district supported early childhood education programs and 2) a plan to deepen the community's understanding of and engagement in early childhood education. For two years the team worked to determine the feasibility and support for publicly supported preschool programming. At a recent School Meeting, the townspeople voted 191-68 by secret ballot to support a warrant article to get the full day universal access preschool program in place for the fall.

**Stakeholder involvement in iSocial implementation**

As mentioned earlier, the Theory of Action (Appendix II: Theory of Action) was framed as an “If-Then” statement. The critical element that supported movement through the Theory of Action was the active engagement of stakeholders at all levels. This allowed the system to be responsive and aware of progress and needed modifications. To this end, New Hampshire has conceptualized stakeholders into groups who are then organized into teams. Very similar to last year, the teams now have expanded to include the SPDG.
Stakeholder groups

iSocial stakeholders were defined as both internal and external parties who were interested in the shared goal of improving social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. The Theory of Action, based on the premise that if the State took certain actions there would be an effect across the levels, illustrated the interconnectedness and interdependence of all levels of stakeholders. As presented in the graphic below, actions taken by the core team rippled out all the way to the broader community.

In order to better understand the stakeholder groups, it is useful to understand the composition and responsibilities of these groups.

The internal Core Team was comprised of lead personnel from the NHDOE (iSocial Coordinator, the iSocial Evaluation Coordinator, and state SPDG staff). The Expanded Core Team included the internal Core Team members and project leads from key initiatives charged with oversight of critical components of iSocial (the District Process Coach Coordinator, the Professional Development Systems Coordinator and the Distinguished Educator). These players were at the heart of iSocial and were directly responsible for the implementation of the initiative. The Expanded Core Team responsibilities included:

- Convening Key Advisors and the iSocial Learning Collaborative
- Communicating with decision-makers
- Completing the Stages of Implementation Checklist
- Developing and implementing the iSocial Action Plan
- Reviewing and evaluating progress and challenges
- Making adjustments to iSocial as needed
- Ensuring resources are identified and secured for implementation

Key Advisors included state-level personnel such as the Part C coordinator and the Administrator for Child Development and Head Start Collaboration; local special education administrators; local practitioners; representative from Higher Education; a process coach; a practice-based coach; and
representatives from family organizations. These stakeholders were deeply engaged in state-level planning and development of iSocial. Key Advisors:

- Co-created messages about goals and strategy
- Gave advice and help the Expanded Core Team sense issues and adapt activities in a variety of contexts
- Brought their network information back to the Expanded Core Team
- Provide input and support decision-making on the implementation of the iSocial
- Help plan dissemination strategies
- Key Participants were directly involved in implementation at the local level. This group included District Leadership Team members, practitioners and families. Key Participants:
  - Planned and implemented iSocial at local level
  - Collected, reported and utilized data
  - Received training and coaching
  - Shared information across iSocial districts
  - Communicated challenges and successes to Expanded Core Team and Key Advisors

The Broad-based Community also had an interest in iSocial. This circle was filled with Practitioners, family members, and other agencies and organizations in the participating iSocial districts that were not directly involved in iSocial. Other districts that were not participating in iSocial and others invested in the Pyramid Model (Head Start, Project Launch, Pyramid Model Consortium State Leadership Team, Safe Schools, Healthy Students, Project Aware, etc.) were also included in this circle. The Broad-based Community members:

- Gained awareness of the importance of social-emotional learning
- Shared opportunities for training and coaching
- Promoted implementation of Pyramid Model in other areas
- Benefited from iSocial infrastructure and data systems

**Stakeholder Teams: Feedback Loops and Communication**

These stakeholder groups were organized into teams to facilitate the feedback loops and to structure communication. Each group had its own communication needs and each had a specific engagement focus and role. In order to ensure feedback loops were vibrant, iSocial had a multi-pronged communication and engagement strategy that supported the theory of action and logic model in every phase, including deliberate cross-fertilization between teams. Phase III strategy, roles, and activities were designed to build communication and advance engagement.

**State Leadership Team**

The State Leadership Team included the Expanded Core Team and Key Advisors. Membership targeted representatives across all stakeholder groups. Members of this team frequently sat on a variety of other iSocial teams to facilitate two-way communication. The team met every other month until the SPDG was awarded. At that point, the membership was updated and the group began meeting monthly in January 2018. The internal Core Team met weekly and the Expanded Core Team met at least monthly. The State Leadership Team engaged in planning, listened to feedback from all stakeholder groups and monitored implementation progress.

**Process Coach Team**
Process coaches met as a group on a monthly basis with the Process Coach Coordinator and the iSocial Coordinator. The iSocial Evaluation Coordinator attended as needed. These coaches provided updates on the status District Leadership Teams and local implementation of the iSocial. This was an opportunity for coaches to share key lessons learned across districts, ensure common messaging and explore potential tools and strategies to support their work with the districts. Conversely, the Process Coach Coordinator and other core team members used this gathering as a vehicle to provide training and technical assistance to the coaches and to observe progress. This was a very potent mechanism for the Expanded Core Team to learn what was happening on the ground and problem-solve adjustments and changes to iSocial.

**Practice-based Coach Team**

Practice-based coaches met periodically as a group with the coordinator to address technical aspects of these new positions. A Professional-learning community, led by the Pyramid Model Consortium, was established and met monthly to deepen coaching skills, build knowledge of the practices, share experiences and problem-solve challenges.

**iSocial Learning Collaborative**

The Expanded Core Team brought key participants together in a learning collaborative. The audience members were local leadership team members and/or practitioners. Process coaches also joined these events as needed. Face-to-face meetings happened 2-3 times per year with occasional web-based meetings. Based on feedback from the field, web-based role-alike virtual meetings were offered periodically. These events supported the identification of common challenges and strategies, promoted cross-team sharing and allowed the Core team to provide updates, check for understanding and make adjustments as needed.

**Local Leadership Teams**

Each participating district had an established Local Leadership Team. These teams included administrators, practitioners and others invested in implementation at the local level. One individual on the team was identified as the team’s Data Coordinator. These teams met on a regular schedule (about once a month) to complete data collection requirements (such as the Benchmarks of Quality), engage in Action Planning and to assess progress within iSocial.

**Habits, Elements and Depth of Interactions**

Using the Leading by Convening framework, iSocial decision-makers partnered with those who cared about the issues to inform the evolution and implementation of the SSIP. The following lays out the ways in which iSocial modeled *Habits of Interaction*, attended to the *Elements of Interaction*, and ensured *Depth of Interaction*.

As a set of connected teams, iSocial modeled *Habits of Interaction* by:

- Coalescing around issues
  - Learning from each level partnership what stakeholders know and need to know;
  - Striving to learn about beliefs and what each stakeholder is willing and able to do in support of the shared work in iSocial

- Ensuring Relevant Participation
  - Establishing roles for each level of partnership and processes to cross the roles and ensure meaningful participation

- Doing the Work Together
○ Established processes and staff positions in support of shared work and maintained regular interaction

iSocial intentionally focused on the *Elements of Interaction* by:

- Focusing on both technical and adaptive leadership and ensuring that operational decisions reflect intentional consideration of both
- Embedding solid technical leadership strategies in content work and implementation processes
- Focusing on adaptive leadership led to greater attention to stakeholder role, resulting in greater input from the stakeholder perspective
- Operational decisions reflect a value for family and practitioner wisdom

Stakeholders and partners deepened interaction in iSocial by:

- Recognizing the fluidity and varied levels of interaction
- Continuing to inform and disseminate information to others who care about the issue
- Engaging in open and dynamic communication
- Ensuring frequent and meaningful collaboration

**Data on Implementation and Outcomes**

**Evaluation and Analysis Plan**

During Phase II of iSocial implementation, the Evaluation Team outlined an evaluation framework, consisting of the evaluation purpose, logic model, and key evaluation questions (Appendix III: NH Logic Model). The evaluation was designed to assess the capacity of state and local infrastructure to support and sustain practices that promote positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) for preschoolers with disabilities. This framework reflected the theoretical progression from infrastructure to practice to outcomes outlined in the Theory of Action (TOA) as well as the emphasis on infrastructure as the primary driving force for change.

**Alignment with the Theory of Action**

As identified in Phase III Year 1, the logic model served as the backbone for the evaluation plan, outlining the purpose and focus of the evaluation, the strategies and outputs, and the short, intermediate, and long term outcomes for which data will be collected. It reflects the various levels of implementation highlighted in the Theory of Action (Appendix II: Theory of Action) —the state, districts, practitioner/teachers, families, and students—and points to key data elements for each. Pivotal to the structure and stability of the evaluation, the logic model was developed as a dynamic document which reflected the deepening thought process and conversations that have occurred during this first year of implementation.

**Evaluation Questions & Analysis Framework**

During Phase II (Appendix III: NH Logic Model), the Evaluation Team identified evaluation questions which articulated the intent and meaning behind each element of the logic model, spelling out what the Evaluation Team wanted to earn from each output and outcome. These questions helped with identification of appropriate data collection tool and methods.
During the second year of Phase III, the Evaluation Team refined the analysis plan to be more holistic and accessible to stakeholders. This work resulted in the reorganization and consolidation of the analysis questions into a functional framework which highlighted the two primary evaluation foci: infrastructure and practice (Appendix VII: Analysis Framework). The plan also linked the questions back to the corresponding outputs and outcomes from the logic model and do the relevant data sources/performance measures.

**Data Collection Sources and Measures**

The Evaluation team was committed to ensuring that evaluation and data collection were integral to and supportive of iSocial implementation. As such, they selected data collection tools that could support planning and implementation as well as program evaluation functions. One example of this duality was the Leadership Team Action Plans. At its heart, the action plan was developed as a dynamic, functional tool that guides implementation efforts at both the state and local level. However, it is also a rich source of evaluation data regarding implementation priorities, timelines, resources, and barriers. Building upon this, the Evaluation Team added a field to the Action Plan Template that linked each action step with its associated infrastructure component.

The full list of data collection tools along with their associated timelines, sources, and methods of collection is included in the Data Source document (Appendix V: Data Source). These measures are aligned with the analysis questions and mapped to logic model, demonstrating how the data relates to the overall framework of the evaluation.

During the course of implementation, the need for additional measures in key areas were identified by the iSocial Learning Collaborative and the Process Coach team. Based on this feedback, the Evaluation Team has begun work on identifying and developing measures to assess practice-based coaching fidelity as well as infrastructure sustainability at the local leadership level.

**Baseline Data for Key Measures**

As outlined in the newly refined Analysis Framework (Appendix VII: Analysis Framework) the two key components of iSocial implementation are infrastructure development and high fidelity implementation of the Pyramid Model. The evaluation identifies key measures for each of these areas that support ongoing progress monitoring. Below is a summary of the baseline data for these key measures. Throughout, the State described how these data were used to drive decision making and quality improvement.

**Infrastructure**

**Stages of Implementation Checklist**

The State Leadership Team completed the Stages of Implementation checklist to assess implementation progress. Baseline data, collected in July 2017, indicated progress was consistent with Installation as identified by the Stages of Implementation Checklist. Forty two percent (42%) of the 45 indicators correlated with this stage were ranked by the State Leadership Team as being in place, another 42% as partially in place, and 7% as not in place. Strength was exhibited in core infrastructure components, such as establishment of a state leadership team (7 of 9 in place) and system supports and infrastructure (3 of 3 in place). Development continued in the areas of the data system, evaluation and monitoring (2 of 6 in place and 4 of 6 partially in place) as well as and
coaching infrastructure (2 of 11 in place, 7 of 11 partially in place). Development of a communication plan surfaced as an important need to be addressed; only 3 of 6 indicators were ranked as partially in place.

**Action Plans**

Baseline for the State Action Plan was established in March 2017 with the initial draft of the plan. The plan included four goals related to state level infrastructure, professional development and TA, coaching infrastructure, and evaluation and data. Identified action steps related to the establishment and solidification of a State Leadership Team, contracting with national TA experts related to the Pyramid Model (Pyramid Model Consortium) to support training and practice-based coaching, as well as establishing a data collection and evaluation framework. (Outputs, 2, 3, 5, 6)

Baseline for local action plans was established in fall 2016. Goals varied by local team and included embedding their preschool programs into the community; implementing school-based option for preschool; expanding social-emotional skills for kindergarten readiness; and increasing staff capacity, resources, and/or curriculum to promote social-emotional learning. Many of these action plans shared areas of focus including six (6) local action plans which outlined action steps related to professional development and training related to the evidence-based practice and three (3) local action plans which contained action steps relevant to systemic family engagement. (Outputs 6, 7, 8)

**Data Use Survey**

The Data Use Survey was completed by State Leadership Team Members and district personnel from each participating district representing the following roles: a Regular Education Administrator, Special Education Administrator, Practitioner, and District Data Coordinator. Respondents provided the following baseline data in November 2016.

- 86% indicated that they had sufficient professional development or training to analyze data and use data for decision-making
- 81% indicated that they were able to ask specific questions and concretely identify the data and data source that would answer those questions
- 24% of district respondents indicated they did not know who to reach out to for more information about data tools or systems
- 24% of district respondents indicated they did not have someone who answers their questions about data

**Pyramid Model Implementation**

**Benchmarks of Quality**

The Early Childhood Program-Wide Pyramid Model Benchmarks of Quality was designed to help programs evaluate their progress toward implementing the Teaching Pyramid Model with fidelity program-wide.

The chart below shows baseline Benchmark of Quality (BoQ) scores from 2016-2017. The highest rated items were for creating procedures for responding to challenging behavior, establishing leadership teams, implementing the PM, and staff buy-in. Lowest rated were monitoring implementation and outcomes, family involvement, establishing and teaching program-wide expectations, and professional development and support.
TPOT™

The Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool was used to assess fidelity implementation of the Pyramid Model in classrooms for children who are 2-5 years old.

The figure below shows baseline TPOT™ scores for practitioners in Fall 2016 and Fall 2017. The pattern of scores is similar from year to year, with items that are more specific to Pyramid Model practices and social emotional learning (e.g., teaching behavior expectations, problem solving, social skills) scoring relatively low, and items that load on more traditional classroom management skills (e.g., providing directions, promoting engagement, supportive conversations, collaborative teaming) scoring relatively high. Although the pattern of scores is almost identical across cohorts, TPOT™ scores are almost universally higher in Fall 2018 than Fall 2017. This suggests that the influence of SSIP activities initiated in 2017 may have reached beyond those practitioners who received coaching that year to those who were not. (Short Term Outcome 6; Intermediate Outcome 6)
Family Engagement Survey

The Family Engagement Survey captured parent perceptions of Pyramid Model family engagement practices. Baseline data was collected in May 2017 from families of students in classrooms implementing the Pyramid Model and where practitioners were receiving coaching. A total of 44 surveys were received across all implementing classrooms.

The dashboard below provides baseline data from the family survey collected in May 2017. The survey asks families to rate the degree to which practitioners have 1) connected with them (top chart) and 2) supported them in implementing Pyramid Model practices in the home (bottom chart) on a five-point Likert scale (1=Strongly disagree; 5=Strongly Agree). Families report at least agreement on all of the engagement items. In terms of basic connection with practitioners, families are particularly positive about communication routines and pathways. Rated slightly lower are opportunities to visit classrooms and connecting on a personal level. Families’ ratings of the support provided by practitioners in using Pyramid Model practices beyond the classroom were positive and highly similar, with little variability between items.
Families feel engaged by practitioners

Connecting with Families

- Offered opportunities to visit classroom
- Teacher connects to learn about our family
- Communication includes celebrations of child’s accomplishments
- Regular reports from teacher child’s classroom
- My child’s teacher knows the best way to contact me
- I receive communication periodically from my child’s school

Supporting family use of Pyramid Model

- Teacher provides info about community resources
- Teacher provides info on community resources to support challenging behavior
- Teacher provides support & strategies to use at home for challenging behaviors
- Teacher provides me with info on importance of social emotional development
- Teacher provides practical strategies to use during daily routines to support SEL
- If necessary, teacher involves me in developing plans for child’s challenging behaviors at school
- Teacher provides me strategies to use during daily routines to support positive behavior
- When I’m concerned, teacher helps determine if my child needs more intensive support.
Data Collection Timelines

To support the integration of data and process, data collection has been carefully timed to align with the natural development of implementation cycles. During 2017-18, the following data collection activities occurred, as they do each year, at the times most relevant for implementation and ongoing planning.

Annually, during the fall, Leadership Teams regroup to assess progress and engage in planning activities, completing either the Implementation Checklist or Benchmarks of Quality, which are then used to inform the action plans. Implementation activities occur throughout the year, as reflected in the coaching and training logs. Practice fidelity measures, family surveys, coaching feedback and Leadership Team Surveys, which reflect on progress, close out the year feeding the next cycle of learning and doing. A full list of data sources and collection timeline can be found in Appendix V: Data Source.

As data became available, the evaluators examined variation by district, coach, and/or practitioner (as relevant), to help detect and understand bright spots as well as to target improvement efforts where they are most needed. Likewise, the evaluators looked at all data in relation to established targets and benchmarks to help gauge progress and target quality improvement efforts. Finally, the evaluators examined covariation between coaching and fidelity data, as well as fidelity and family experience data, as a test of the hypothesized link between these constructs.

Data System: Data Management and Analysis

In March 2017, the State launched the iSocial data system. This web-based software application was created by the Data Team, which consisted of key representatives from the Evaluation Team as well as a team of software developers from the NHDOE’s Office of Information Technology. The data
system, hosted on the NHDOE’s servers, was designed to be accessible to practitioners, coaches, and other iSocial participants through the Department’s MyNHDOE Single Sign-On portal.

During year two of Phase III, The Data Team expanded the iSocial data system to incorporate additional data collection tools and system reports, effectively making the data system the primary vehicle for data collection and analysis related to iSocial implementation and evaluation. The system is permissions-based, which means stakeholders have access to data collection tools and reports based on their role in iSocial implementation (e.g. practitioner, coach, leadership team member, etc.). In addition, the system is both rules-based and dynamic, allowing data collection tools to be made available during established reporting windows to only those individuals responsible for reporting the data. Combined with data quality rules built into the collection tools, the system is an efficient strategy for supporting data integrity and quality.

**Analysis Plan Framework**

As discussed in the Analysis with TOA: Evaluation Questions & Analysis Framework section, the Evaluation Team created a detailed analysis framework which synthesized and organized the evaluation questions into key categories for analyzing and interpreting the data. In addition to the two key focus areas of the evaluation outlined in both the logic model and the TOA—infrastructure and practice, the Analysis Framework identifies subcategories calling attention to measures related to infrastructure elements such as Governance, Leadership, & Alignment; Personnel & Workforce; and Data as well as elements of practice implementation such as Family Engagement and Practice/Instruction. This categorization established an accessible means for connecting, analyzing, and interpreting the data based on clearly defined performance measures that would serve as signposts for measuring systems change and progress towards outcomes (Appendix VII: Analysis Framework).

**Reports and Dissemination**

With these revised evaluation questions and performance measures, the Data Team constructed additional reports in the iSocial data system reflecting the framework and providing meaningful analysis of progress towards intended outcomes. The new reports capitalized on the availability of the first full year of data to provide time series analysis of progress as well as linking performance and impact data. These reports also leveraged the capacity of the data system to customize the presentation of data to different stakeholder (user) groups, providing a robust opportunity for stakeholders at all levels to examine systemic change and monitor progress.

One example of this was a new coaching report in the iSocial data system that provided a view into “What does coaching look like?” by analyzing both the content coaching logs as well as feedback from practitioners being coached. Individual coaches were given the opportunity to examine their own coaching activities in relation to the activities deemed most valuable by those receiving the coaching. Leadership Teams at the state and local level were provided the opportunity to examine the distribution of coaching time and activities across the year relation to practitioner perceptions, allowing them to explore areas of success as well as potential barriers such as scheduling and availability issues, coaches faithfulness to the coaching process, and where additional resources and supports may be needed to strengthen the coaching process.
2016-17 Statewide Practice-Based Coaching - Coaching Hours and Impact Report, generated from the iSocial data system

In addition to the analysis reports for stakeholders described above, raw data extract reports were developed in partnership with our external evaluators to create a vehicle for pulling data out of the system. This created additional flexibility for our evaluators to conduct intensive relational and statistical analysis and further mine the data in response to patterns observed. The results could then be shared with state and local leadership teams to inform ongoing progress and necessary course corrections, or with external stakeholders to keep them apprised of progress and opportunities to further support implementation.

**Progress and Modifications to the SSIP**

**Review of key data regarding progress**

With the availability of a full year of implementation data, the State Leadership Team began to implement a formal process for engaging with data to inform conversations about SSIP progress, discover opportunities for continued growth and development, and make decisions about scaling up or making adjustments to infrastructure in order to sustain the SSIP. In collaboration with the IDEA Data Center, the Expanded Core Team piloted a Data Meeting Protocol in May 2017. Both state and local leadership teams have used the protocol process on several occasions throughout Phase III Year 2 to explore SSIP evaluation data and guide decision making about next steps. The tool was particularly helpful in leading teams through a discovery process with the data. The teams found this particularly useful because, as one local team member noted, often data users jump directly from viewing the data into decision making, without taking the time to truly explore the implications and alternative interpretations of the data. Below are more detailed examples of how the state and local leadership teams actively used data from the evaluation to inform progress and results.

**TPOT™ – Practice Fidelity**
TPOT™ data is collected biannually, once in the fall to establish baseline and again in the spring to measure progress. The spring measure for the first year of implementation was completed in early May 2017. Shortly thereafter, the Expanded Core Team met to review this first year of data to address some key questions regarding practice fidelity and coaching infrastructure, including:

- How much time is it taking practitioners to get to fidelity? and
- What are the implications for the current coaching structure?

Local teams, facilitated by their process coaches, engaged in a similar process to explore the TPOT™ data to assess where they were in terms of practice implementation, additional professional development needs, and readiness for scale-up.

**Leadership Team Surveys – Professional Development Needs**

As the Core Team was constructing the professional development calendar for the year, the group reviewed the Leadership Team Surveys to ascertain which elements of the professional development infrastructure were successful and which posed barriers during the previous year. They also sought to identify the key content areas in which the local teams felt additional support was needed.

**Process Coach Feedback Surveys Process – Coaching Infrastructure**

The full State Leadership Team gathered in October 2017 to mine the process coach feedback survey data to explore the impact of the process coaching infrastructure, including which strategies had the most impact, where there might be opportunities to refine the support provided, and what additional supports the process coaches might need to in order to strengthen their ability to provide the strategies that teams identified as having the most impact.

**Practice-based Coaching Logs and Feedback Surveys – Practice-based Coaching Infrastructure**

In January 2018, the iSocial Collaborative met to review data regarding practice-based coaching, derived from the coaching logs and feedback surveys. Working with a modified version of the Data Meeting Protocol, participants explored the distribution of coaching hours over the course of the year and by activity. The group discussed the implications of this data for local teams as they selected the model of practice-based coaching was the best fit and identified what support they would need from the State to construct a self-sustaining infrastructure.

**Feedback Loops**

Feedback loops, as described in the Stakeholder Involvement section of this report, were built into the various stakeholder teams that drive iSocial. These feedback loops remained a critical source of data through the second year of Phase III. One of the primary feedback loops was via the process coaches. In addition to Process Coach Team meetings, where bi-directional communication between the State and local Leadership Teams was prominent, Process Coaches provided written feedback monthly regarding the professional development needs of both the local teams as well as the process coaches themselves. The Expanded Core Team utilized this data to inform professional development and TA supports offered throughout the year, including via Process Coach Team meetings and Collaborative meetings.

Additional work continues to formalize documentation and dissemination of other feedback loops within the system, including data collected through the Collaborative. However, through more informal processes, the Expanded Core Team utilized the data to inform conversations throughout the year regarding the structure and content of TA needed by the local teams as well as additional communication needed between different components of the system.
Changes to Baseline Data

Infrastructure

Stages of Implementation Checklist
The Stages of Implementation is an annual survey completed at the beginning of the implementation year. Due to delays with tool development, baseline for this data was established in July 2017. The next collection is scheduled to be completed in November 2018.

Action Plans
The following dashboard displays data from the Leadership Team action plans. The top chart depicts the percentage of all actions devoted to data and evaluation; fiscal; governance; quality standards; and professional development, technical assistance, and guidance issues (PD, TA, & Guidance). Clearly, most actions being planned/taken related to professional development. The bottom chart displays the percentage of actions that are not started; progressing better, worse, or as expected; or completed. Most actions are either completed or progressing as expected. A minority are not started or progressing worse than expected. Very few are progressing better than expected.

Data Use Survey
The Data Use Survey is implemented bi-annually at the beginning of the implementation year. Baseline for this data was established in November 2016. The next collection is scheduled to be completed in November 2018.
Evidence-based Practice/Pyramid Model Implementation

Benchmarks of Quality

The figure below displays Benchmark of Quality (BoQ) “critical element” scores in 2017 (wide, light green bar) and 2018 (skinny, dark bar). The highest scoring critical elements were procedures for responding to challenging behavior, establishing leadership teams, implementing the PM in classrooms, and staff buy-in. The lowest-scoring critical elements were monitoring implementation and outcomes, family involvement, and teaching program-wide expectations. Falling in the middle were development of program-wide expectations and professional development and support of staff.

BoQ scores increased from 2017 to 2018 across the board. The most dramatic gains were in staff buy-in and teaching and acknowledging the program-wide expectations. Large gains were also observed for monitoring implementation and outcomes, family involvement, program-wide expectations, professional development, and establishing leadership teams. Gains in classroom implementation of the Pyramid Model and procedures for responding to challenging behavior made negligible, although they were relatively high at baseline.

The general principle is to target the lowest scoring critical elements while maintaining -- or even enhancing, the highest scoring critical elements. The fact, however, that growth was evident for the even the lowest-scoring domains at baseline indicates that the SSIP coaching and professional development strategies and activities are working. Still, doubling down on supporting collection and use of data, family involvement, and teaching program-wide expectations makes sense, so they don’t hold back overall progress with PM implementation.
TPOT™

The figure below shows Fall (baseline) and Spring (follow-up) TPOT™ scores for practitioners who received coaching in 2017 relative to the fidelity threshold (80%). Clearly, implementation of Pyramid Model practices increased over the course of the year. The biggest gains were observed for the practices that were rated lowest at baseline and which tend to be most specific to the Pyramid Model and social emotional learning practices. At the end of one year of coaching, practitioners were approaching the fidelity threshold on most of the TPOT™ items. These gains are particularly impressive since coaching did not commence until November.

The figure below displays the Spring (follow-up) TPOT™ scores of practitioners who received coaching in 2017. The dashboard displays the overall TPOT™ score, the presence/absence of red flags, and whether the overall score exceeded the fidelity threshold for each practitioner. Three of five practitioners achieved fidelity after one year of coaching – they had no red flags and their average score exceeded the threshold. One practitioner had no red flags but her/his average score fell below the threshold, while two received red flags and failed to exceed the threshold. The total score of the latter two practitioners were lowest overall as well.
Family Engagement Survey

The Family Engagement Survey is implemented annually at the completion of the implementation year. Baseline for this data was established in May 2017. The next collection is scheduled to be completed in May 2018.

Data to Support Changes to Implementation, Improvement Strategies, and Next Steps

Using the implementation cycles of plan-do-study-act, the State identified and implemented the improvement strategies, and then studied the data collected in the first year of Phase III implementation. This was used to inform data-driven decisions about next steps that resulted directly from these data.

Professional Development and TA

In reviewing data from the Leadership Team Feedback surveys, the TPOT™, the Data Use Survey, and feedback loops with both the Collaborative and the process coaches, the Expanded Core Team surfaced patterns regarding the content and format of professional development needs of local leadership team members and practitioners. A detailed description of the data is included in Appendix VIII: Professional Development and TA Data. Across collection methods, leadership teams were identifying needs, requesting resources, or demonstrating lower levels of proficiency (based on self or external observation) in similar areas. This data coalesced around three primary content areas:

- Additional training in the Pyramid Model, both Modules 1 and 2 to prepare additional staff for scale-up as well as in PTR-YC, the module addressing children with the most intensive behavioral needs;
- Support with using data and data-based decision making; and
- Implementation science.

Three practitioners surpass TPOT fidelity threshold by Spring 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>Overall TPOT score Spring 2017</th>
<th>Red Flags?</th>
<th>Fidelity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, based on the Leadership Team Feedback Surveys, the communication strategies that surfaced as the most valuable for local teams were the process coaches and Collaborative meetings.

Leveraging this data, the State Core Team put together a comprehensive training calendar with additional Pyramid Module Training, including Module 1, Module 2, and PTR-YC trainings. Collaborative meetings were structured to include dedicated time to explore reports in the iSocial data system and introduce resources, such as data use protocols, to support team capacity to understand, interpret, and use the data to support local decision making. Further efforts are planned in this area moving into next year and are outlined in Next Steps. The State team also engaged a consultant to work with the Process Coaches to deepen their understanding of implementation science and the role and function of a process coach in supporting a leadership team and ensuring that the elements of implementation science are being addressed through the work.

**TPOT™ Administration**

During Year 1 of Phase III, the TPOT™ was administered to only those practitioners in a program who would be receiving practice-based coaching. As the year progressed, the state Expanded Core Team learned through feedback data gathered through the iSocial Collaborative Meetings and Process Coaches, that implementing sites were strategically leveraging their practitioners receiving coaching to help inform the practice of other practitioners throughout their programs. This strategy often involved the practitioner who was receiving coaching sharing information regarding their coaching experience and lessons being learned with fellow practitioners either through meetings or collaborative activities. The Expanded Core Team quickly realized that while this was a wonderful strategy for diffusing the impact of coaching, it would alter baseline for those other practitioners and potentially mute the effect of implementation when those practitioners became more fully engaged in implementation through scale-up. So the Expanded Core Team decided moving into Year 2 of Phase 3, all practitioners in an implementing site would receive the TPOT™ whether or not they were selected to receive coaching. In this way, moving forward not only would the impact of coaching be able to be measured but also the impact of infusing the Pyramid Model into the culture and practice of the organization.

**Coaching Infrastructure**

Data regarding coaching has been particularly critical and informative moving into the second year of Phase III. Data collected regarding coaching hours, activities, and impact have fueled key leadership conversations regarding system capacity and structure, coach roles and functions, oversight and compensation, as well as sustainability. As a result of the data gathered through feedback surveys, coaching logs, and feedback loops (refer to Stakeholder Involvement: Feedback Loops and Communication), the Expanded Core Team is developing a document which clearly outlines the purpose and function of the process coaches based on implementation science. This document will be the underpinning for job descriptions and coaching agreements moving forward as well as lay the foundation for a sustainability self-assessment for leadership teams, guiding the gradual release process as teams move from being fully supported by a process coach to functioning independently and sustainably.

Similarly, data regarding this first year of implementing a NH cohort of practice-based coaches has been essential to the Leadership Team’s understanding of what it takes to do this work. Through feedback loops with local leadership teams and the coaching cohort, the Expanded Core Team surfaced the fundamental construct of consultant versus coach and how the professional skills and
competencies varies between each of these unique roles. The team developed a deeper understanding of the practice-based coaching model along with the hours and core activities that go into implementing this model with fidelity. The team also surfaced the need to incorporate additional measures and collect more data earlier in the coaching relationship to assess fidelity to the model as well as fit between the coach and practitioner.

This information will be used to inform both the continued implementation of the SSIP as well as the expansion through the SPDG through refining selection criteria for hiring coaches and language for coaching agreements, leadership strategies for oversight and management of the coaches, as well as refinements to the type of data collected from coaches and coachees. Additionally, through the expansion with the SPDG, NH will be incorporating a new short-term outcome related to fidelity implementation of the practice-based coaching model. This new data will be collected across both SPDG and SSIP participants and will be highly informative to measuring progress in implementing the coaching infrastructure.

Data Use and Data-Based Decision Making

In response to a pattern emerging from the Data Use Survey, Practice-based Coaching data, and feedback gathered through monthly Process Coach feedback (see Appendix VIII: Professional Development and TA Data), the External Core Team in collaboration with the Evaluation Team drafted a tiered framework of supports including professional development and TA. This framework, further detailed in the Next Steps section of this report, will target key audiences at various levels of participation within the SSIP to provide them targeted resources, skill development, and technical assistance. The intent is to build capacity for understanding SSIP and Pyramid Model data, methods and expectations for collection, supporting data quality and integrity, and for integrating and using data effectively to inform decision making relevant to their role.

Stakeholder Involvement in the iSocial Evaluation

The Evaluation Team and the Data Team were led by the iSocial Evaluation Coordinator, with support from the iSocial Implementation Coordinator. Technical assistance was provided through IDC. These two teams were crucial vehicles in bringing stakeholder voices to the table to inform decision-making and to assess the best ways to ensure that stakeholders had access to the needed information about data tools and processes, as well as evaluation results and findings.

The Evaluation Team, consisted of a core team (“worker bees”) and key advisors. This group met monthly through September 2017 and then quarterly thereafter, with the core group meeting at least once in between Evaluation Team meetings based on the identified tasks and work plan. Key advisors on the team included representatives from participating districts (administrators and practitioners), personnel from key initiatives and representatives from the Parent Information Center. Together this team explored critical issues and decisions related to the development and implementation of the iSocial evaluation. For example, the Evaluation Team engaged in in-depth discussions about measuring sustainability and developing an accessible analysis framework, as well as data dissemination strategies, including identifying key reports for the iSocial data system as well as the structure for sharing data and providing TA through the Collaborative.

To further support the work, the iSocial Data Team worked alongside the Evaluation Team and consisted of representatives from the Evaluation Team (including a parent representative) as well as a
core group of software developers. Their charge was to identify the means for collecting, analyzing, and sharing iSocial data. This group met quarterly, with weekly check-ins between the lead developer and Evaluation Coordinator, supporting continued development of the iSocial data system, described in greater detail in the **Implementing Planned Activities with Fidelity** section.

Additional roles and responsibilities of stakeholders were:

**State Stakeholders**
- Determine existing data availability
- Maximize existing data collection as much as possible to reduce data burden and to create a sustainable system
- Identify or develop data measures, data tools, and reports
- Collect and analyze data from stakeholders
- Respond to requests for data collection (e.g. state-level infrastructure including professional development and TA offerings, state leadership team, and data systems)

**District Stakeholders**
- Provide input into the state-level evaluation plan
- Respond to requests for data collection—To the extent possible, the evaluation drew from existing data collection sources (e.g. POMS) and data collected as part of implementing the evidence-based practice (e.g. fidelity measures). Some additional collection, such as surveys, were also necessary.
- Convey questions, concerns, and suggestions to the state through liaisons

With the launch of the iSocial data system and the first year of data collection coming to a close in May 2017, Phase III, Year 2 was the first year that the State was able to provide evaluation data back to the State and local teams in a complete, organized, and accessible manner. Local and State Leadership Teams, as well as other stakeholders including practitioners and coaches, were able to view evaluation data relevant to their role in implementation directly in the iSocial data system on demand. Local and State Leadership Team members received specialized TA and resources, in the form of a Data Use Protocol developed by IDC and discussion facilitation by their Process Coaches, the Evaluation Coordinator, and/or the external Evaluator, through their Process Coaches and the Evaluation Coordinator, to support the use of the evaluation data in their decision making at both their individual meetings as well as through iSocial Learning Collaborative.

Feedback loops were maintained through the Process Coaches, iSocial Learning Collaborative and state Core Team to gather feedback regarding the value of the data and it’s presentation, the strategies and supports provided for understanding, interpreting, and using the data, as well as requests for data system and/or evaluation reports to support further engagement with the evaluation and the resulting data. This feedback was shared with the Evaluation Team, through the Evaluation Coordinator, to inform continued development of data collection tools, data system reports, evaluation presentations, and TA infrastructure to support data collection and use.

**Data Quality Issues**

**Data Concerns**

The iSocial data system was released in March 2017. Since that time, the Data Team has continued to expand the system to incorporate existing data collection tools and additional system reports,
effectively making the data system the primary vehicle for data collection and analysis related to iSocial implementation. The development process, however, has not been as expedient as hoped. Some key data sources continue to be collected through paper-based or electronic means outside of the system. While the data system is permission-based, uses established data collection windows, and has built in rules and data checks to promote collection data integrity, it is hard to replicate the same level of rigor for data collected outside of the system. Substantial staff time and effort was invested into monitoring and cleaning these data to address concerns with completeness and consistency.

**Implications for Assessing Progress or Results**

In addition, the robust database and reporting system behind the iSocial data system creates considerable capacity for data compilation, analysis, and reporting. Data can be compared, synthesized, and extracted with relative ease. For data collected outside of the system, however, this same process requires significant manual labor.

The manual integration of data outside of the system created obstacles for both data analysis and efficient reporting. To minimize the challenges, the State worked collaboratively with the process coaches and process coach coordinator to support monitoring of data collection outside of the iSocial data system and clean data as needed. Additionally, the external evaluator has supported the integration of this data across sources, to support data analysis and reporting.

**Plans for Improving Data Quality**

Migrating data collection from external paper and electronic tools to collection within the iSocial data system continues, with the integration of key collection tools including the Leadership Team Meeting logs and the Stages of Implementation Checklist scheduled to be released in April 2018. Further efforts are planned to refine the process coaching logs to increase consistency and ability to disaggregate by coaching activity; link process and practice-based coaching logs to invoicing; as well as digitize remaining tools, wherever possible, making use of software controls for standardizing data entry to promote consistency and integrity within collections. In addition, more frequent collection and review timelines will be implemented to more efficiently monitor and manage the burden of manual data cleaning.

**Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements**

**Progress on Outcomes--Infrastructure, Practice, & Fidelity**

Phase III, year 2 continued the focus on infrastructure development while also providing the first real opportunity to examine changes in classroom level practice implementation.

**Infrastructure Changes**

iSocial Data System

During Phase III, Year 2, we made significant progress in the goal of having reports accessible to state-level and district personnel (Short Term Outcome 2). Development of the iSocial data system
during Phase III, Year 2 focused on the expansion of data collection tools integrated into the system and the launch of robust reports. This allowed stakeholders at all levels of iSocial implementation, including practitioners, coaches, evaluators, and both the local and State Leadership Teams, to view and analyze data collected within the system. In all, seven (7) new data collection tools and nine (9) new reports were launched. Two (2) additional data collection tools are scheduled to be released following this report submission in April 2018. A list of data collection tools along with their methods of collection is included in Appendix V Data Source document.

Key milestones in this process were the integration of TPOT™ scores and practice-based coaching logs, which allowed participants to view changes in fidelity implementation over time and the relationship between coaching and practice implementation. Additionally, through the SPDG expansion, TA support for the data system was secured providing system users with a “Helpdesk” to call in the event of a question or challenge using the system.

**Coaching Infrastructure**

During year two of Phase III, NH made important strides in its efforts to establish a cadre of coaches to support implementation of the Pyramid Model (Output 5). The iSocial infrastructure in NH has has two levels of coaching infrastructure -- process coaches, which support local Leadership Teams to develop needed infrastructure and sustainability based on implementation science, and practice-based coaches, which support practitioner implementation of the Pyramid Model practices. In Phase III, Year 2, NH had eight (8) Process Coaches serving eight (8) local iSocial Leadership Teams (representing 14 districts) and nine (9) practice-based coaches supporting twelve (12) practitioners implementing the Pyramid Model.

**Process Coaching**

Process coaching infrastructure has been in place for the past 3 years and has established a stable flow, with coaches engaging in approximately 10-15 hours of coaching related activities per month as demonstrated by the chart below. Expected variations occur around holidays and school vacations, as well as winter weather due to challenges with scheduling and team availability.

The chart below displays the average amount of time logged by process coaches across time. Based on the data, process coaching time was generally highest toward the beginning of the school year, dropped off a bit until after the holidays when it increased again, and was, as expected, generally lowest during the summer. The very large inflection point in the fall of 2017 was due to some concentrated time spent with Beth Steenwyk, the consultant secured to support process coaches in their understanding of implementation science and their purpose and function with the local Leadership Teams (refer to Planned Activities section: Expand Fiscal Support: State Initiatives and Enhance Professional Development). The upsweep in January 2018 was associated with the convergence of several events, including a day-long Learning Collaborative meeting, a half-day Process Coach meeting, and a Zoom meeting with Beth Steenwyk.
Feedback from local Leadership Teams regarding process coaching derived from the annual Process Coach Feedback Survey indicate that coaching received during the 2016-17 year was deemed very valuable, with all responding teams indicating that their needs had been met by the coach. Support provided through resources shared with the team as well as for team building, reflection activities, and liaising with other administrators were identified as the most valuable, while support for action planning, goal setting, problem solving, and again, liaising with other administrators were identified as having the greatest impact.

**Practice-based Coaching**

Year 2 of Phase III implementation saw the establishment of a NH cohort of practice-based coaches. With this transition came a learning curve regarding what it takes to implement practice-based coaching with fidelity and the infrastructure needed to support that process. Early coaching logs exhibited a high level of variability in the data regarding the number of hours of coaching being attributed to each practitioner. Through extensive consultation and technical assistance with the Pyramid Model Consortium, the practice-based coaches have deepened their understanding of the flow of the model resulting in early signs of stabilization of the data. It is anticipated based on this new data and expertise from the Consortium that coaching hours will level out to an average of 5.5 hours per month of direct coaching activities per practitioner plus travel time.

In addition to the summary number of hours of coaching being received, the External Core Team as well as the local Leadership Teams have been examining the activities coaching have been engaging in to support practitioners. The dashboard below shows how practice-based coaches spent their time since SSIP began, including both the expert coaching from the Pyramid Model Consortium received in 2016-17 as well as from the NH Coach Cohort in 2017-18. The top chart displays the average amount of time spent on various preparation activities by year (left) and the total time spent overall (right). The bottom chart displays the same information not for preparation activities, but in terms of time coaches spent directly with practitioners. Overall, in terms of preparation activities, coaches spent the most time preparing for the meeting, scheduling, and research overall. In terms of time spent with practitioners, coaches spent the most time on observation, action planning, and reflection and feedback, showing strong fidelity to the core principles of the Practice-Based Coaching model. However, for both preparation and coaching activities, there is an interesting variation in time spent on the various activities by year. This variance is largely due to the transition from using contracted expert coaches from the Pyramid Model Consortium in 2016-17 to the newly developed NH-based cohort of practice-based coaches in 2017-18. With this transition in mind, it is important to note that the time spent interpreting data both in preparation and during coaching activities has dropped to
zero for the 2018 year as this may suggest a potential area of support needed for the new cohort of coaches.

### Governance, Leadership, & Alignment

Progress made in Phase III, Year 2 regarding improvements in governance and leadership infrastructure as well as alignment across initiatives addressed critical outputs and outcomes identified within the iSocial Logic Model. Central to this progress at both the state and local level were organizational and leadership drivers including data systems that promoted access and use of relevant data (Short Term Outcomes 1 & 2); well-established Leadership Teams (Output 3); administrator-level understanding of the factors that impact social emotional outcomes (Output 4); district governance, procedures, and fiscal support to promote social emotional outcomes (Short Term Outcome 5); and alignment across initiatives (Short Term Outcome 3, and Intermediate Outcome 1).

Additional progress at the state-level was noted for competency drivers related to mechanisms for ongoing training and support (Short Term Outcome 4).

Baseline data for the Stages of Implementation Checklist provides key data related to state-level progress on governance, leadership and alignment (see Baseline Data for Key Measures). This data, collected in July 2017, is consistent with implementation stage and indicates that the state has successfully addressed critical components related to the establishment of a state level leadership
team as well as system supports and infrastructure related to administrative structures for contracting and interagency agreements, staffing, and funding. Additional areas in which progress has been identified are data systems, evaluation, and monitoring; coaching infrastructure. Needs for continued development have been identified in the area of establishing a formalized communication plan with stakeholders.

At the local level, Benchmarks of Quality data indicates that local Leadership Teams have made considerable gains in key areas of governance, leadership, and alignment (see Baseline Data for Key Measures: Pyramid Model Implementation section). More than two-thirds of the districts made progress engaging staff buy-in, creating program-wide expectations, and monitoring implementation and outcomes while about half saw improvement in their leadership team structure. Less progress was exhibited in establishing procedures for responding to challenging behaviors, which is directly related to the third tier of the Pyramid or PTR-YC model.

Another area in which local teams are exhibiting progress is in the engagement of leadership. Based on local Leadership Team Meeting logs, administrators are the most consistent participants along with preschool teachers and data coordinators. Additional stakeholder representation includes related services personnel, preschool coordinators, practitioners with expertise in behavioral support, preschool teaching assistants and family members.

Local Leadership Teams have also indicated progress on aligning with other initiatives in their district or communities. On the Leadership Team Survey, all of the eight (8) participating districts indicated alignment with at least one other initiative while 88% indicating alignment with two (2) or more initiatives. Many of the teams identified aligning with the same or similar initiatives, including three (3) of the eight (8) indicating alignment with PBIS. Four (4) districts listed other social-emotional initiatives and three (3) of the eight (8) indicated they were aligned with family engagement initiatives in their area.

**Practice Changes & Fidelity**

**Practice Implementation**

Improving practice is a essential component of iSocial implementation and is monitored by the evaluation through all of its stages from promotion of Pyramid Model fidelity standards and measures (Output 7) to implementation of the Pyramid Model practices with fidelity (Intermediate Outcome 6).
As noted in the Changes to Baseline Data section, progress towards practice fidelity was noteworthy in 2016-17. Although practice-based coaching did not begin until November, practitioners implementing the Pyramid Model made significant gains across the key practice subscales. Particular gains were observed for the practices that were rated lowest at baseline and which tend to be most specific to the Pyramid Model and social emotional learning practices. At the end of one year of coaching, practitioners were approaching the fidelity threshold on most of the TPOT™ items. Three of six practitioners receiving coaching actually met or exceeded the fidelity threshold identified by the TPOT™ by the end of this first year.

Another indication of overall improvement towards practice fidelity was noted in the baseline TPOT™ data for 2018. While the pattern of scores almost identical to the previous cohort, the Fall 2018 scores were almost universally higher. Where the iSocial Collaborative and process coaches indicating that practitioners receiving coaching in 2016-17 were sharing information regarding their coaching experience with fellow practitioners not being coached, it seems likely that the influence of SSIP activities initiated in 2017 may have reached beyond those practitioners who received coaching that year to those who were not. (Short Term Outcome 6)

**Family Engagement**

The State Leadership Team identified Family Engagement as a critical strategy for implementing iSocial. As such, it is embedded and monitored through the evaluation based on both the opportunities provided for families to systematically engage in activities to support their child(ren)’s social emotional development (Output 8) as well as their level engagement in supporting improved social emotional outcomes for their children.

The Family Engagement Survey was developed based on indicators in the two categories of the TPOT™ related to Family Engagement--Connecting with Families and Supporting Use of Pyramid Model at Home. The dashboard below illustrates by district the family engagement-related items from the TPOT™ in relation to similar items from the family engagement survey. Unfortunately, no family engagement survey data were available for three districts. The top chart shows items related to basic outreach to and connections with families from both measures, whereas the bottom chart shows items related to supporting use of Pyramid Model practices in the home. As illustrated in the charts, districts were in similar relative positions across both charts. It also appears that in general, as TPOT™ scores increased, so did the corresponding family engagement items, especially in terms of supporting use of the Pyramid Model at home. All of this comes with a small sample size caveat; when more of these data have accumulated, the iSocial evaluation team can more rigorously test this relationship through the use of scatterplots/correlation coefficients.
Measurable Improvements in the SiMR

The SiMR is the primary long term outcome (Long Term Outcome 1) identified by the evaluation and the ultimate goal for implementation of iSocial.

Baseline data for the SiMR was established in FFY 2013. At that time targets were set for subsequent years. This baseline data was based on the subset of the 15 districts participating in the SSIP during the first year. The measure for the baseline data was “of the children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A (positive social-emotional skills including social relationships), the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.”
The FFY 2016 data results were 81.3%. This data was based on the 14 districts that have remained in the SSIP. This exceeds the target of 73.71% and demonstrates progress from the baseline year of 10.17 percentage points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>71.13%</td>
<td>71.13%</td>
<td>73.71%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>71.13% (138/194)</td>
<td>85.30% (131/180)</td>
<td>72.80% (131/180)</td>
<td>81.3% (135/166)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SSIP Coordinator reached out to DaSY for additional analysis of these data. The following results were determined based on the Meaningful Differences calculator with a statistical significance with p<.10. First, districts targeted with SSIP improvement strategies showed statistically significant increases in the percentage of children who made greater than expected growth in their positive social emotional skills. Second, districts targeted with SSIP improvement strategies were statistically significantly lower than the statewide percentage in FFY 2013. As of FFY 2016, districts targeted with SSIP improvement strategies were not statistically different from the state-wide percentage.
Plans for Next Year
Implementation and evaluation activities, timelines and barriers

Positive Solutions for Families

PSF is the evidence-based, user friendly parent and caregiver series component of the Pyramid Model for Promoting the Social Emotional Competence in Young Children. The six-session series is designed to help professionals working with parents promote positive and effective parenting behaviors, which will in turn promote children's social and emotional development and address the challenging behavior and mental health needs of children.

In April 2018 the State will train facilitators for the Positive Solutions for Families (PSF) workshop series. This training is jointly funded by NH Department of Health & Human Services with funds under grant #1H79SM061289 from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), U.S.DHHS for Project LAUNCH and the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education with funding for Race2K. Those trained will agree to provide two trainings in their identified communities by June 30, 2019. Priority will be given to applicants from iSocial districts. Applications are due no later than the end of business Monday, March 26, 2018. The contract for this work is already in place and there are no anticipated barriers at this time.

Communication Plan

The State has identified the need to develop a comprehensive communication plan for iSocial. This plan will facilitate feedback loops, ensure information dissemination, and promote key messages and project findings statewide. Key strategies will include learning collaboratives, or cohorts of participants who meet on a regular basis and share insights and problem solve, as well as the development of the iSocial website. An identified web developer will be responsible for developing and maintaining the website which will serve as a universal hub for information regarding social emotional development, family engagement and other relevant topic areas. The site will house all resources, materials, and trainings developed under iSocial; provide a collaborative platform for iSocial participants to share resources, successes, strategies, and problem-solving across implementing communities; and provide for the dissemination of key messages, lessons-learned, and evaluation findings. The plan will be developed by summer 2018. Three factors impact the website development process. First, there are restrictions imposed by the Office of Information Technology to ensure cyber-safety and the website must be developed within those constraints. Second, the NHDOE is undergoing a major website redesign. Phase I of this process is the discovery and design portion that will be completed by June 30, 2018. The internal Core Team has reached out to the coordinator of the project with an offer to provide input to the design. Phase II will take the design and build the website to code, ensuring ADA compliance. It is not clear when the redesigned website will be in place but the hope is sometime later in 2018 or early in 2019. This would increase the potential for sustaining the website but may delay development. Finally, the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovation is developing a website that will be a repository for resources. The iSocial Coordinator reached out to the leads on the project to inquire what their site will offer and how iSocial can leverage that to meet the needs of the state.

Integration with the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)

The NHDOE Bureau of Special Education was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant which is integrated with the work of the SSIP. The SPDG provides additional resources and
framework to expand state capacity in the identified areas. The State continues to develop our shared understanding of what is strictly SSIP vs. SPDG for reporting requirements.

Develop Master Cadre of Practice-based Coaches and Trainers

Practice-based coaches have completed their first year of coaching. Six of the eight coaches are planning to continue next year and some of those coaches are willing to expand and work with additional practitioners. It is from this pool of coaches that the New Hampshire Master Cadre of practice-based coaches and trainers will be developed over the next couple of years as they demonstrate a high level of fidelity and expertise in the model and the practices. The Expanded Core Team, with the Pyramid Model Consortium, has begun researching what a fidelity tool might encompass. Districts have expressed interest in moving to a Group Practice-based Coaching model so iSocial is exploring what that might entail.

The Expanded Core Team will decide this spring whether the timing is right to send out the application for more coaches. That may be dependent on which community collaboratives apply for the SPDG and how much overlap there is with the SSIP districts. Also, districts are starting to identify staff who have been coached and are well-versed in the practices. iSocial is exploring training them as Practice-based coaches. This would build local capacity to maintain coaching once the state support has faded. The challenge is ensuring their fidelity and administrative support for this to become part of their job description.

Expand and scale-up implementation sites within the districts

Process coaches worked with District Leadership Teams to determine how many practitioners would be ready for coaching and how many additional TPOTs™ would be administered in 2018-2019. The Practice-based coaches then met to assess capacity to meet the need. At this time, it appears there are sufficient coaches to implement the increased numbers. The contract with PTAN ends June 30th 2018. The NHDOE Bureau of Special Education has secured funding and is working with districts to explore the most efficient method to fund the coaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase III, Year 1</th>
<th>Phase III, Year 2</th>
<th>Phase III, Year 3 (anticipated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners to be</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Practitioners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to have TPOT™ administered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TA Infrastructure to Support Data Integrity & Data-based Decision Making

When the Data Use Survey was collected in November 2016, the data surfaced a need amongst districts for additional supports regarding understanding and using data to support decision making. In response, the Expanded Core Team in conjunction with the Evaluation Team began to implement supports to address this need. Leveraging the process coach cohort, the teams worked to build understanding of the data collection tools and the resulting data as well as worked in collaboration...
with IDC to pilot a Data Meeting Protocol to support conversations about data within local Leadership Teams. As year two of Phase III progressed, data continued to emerge and it quickly became evident that this need was deeper than previously understood. A more comprehensive strategy for responding would be needed to support additional capacity needed around both data integrity and data-based decision making at various levels in the iSocial infrastructure.

In outlining this new TA infrastructure, careful consideration was given to organizational drivers across the continuum of iSocial implementation. The teams identified the nature of interactions with data at various levels of iSocial implementation and the need to tailor supports accordingly. Similarly, the teams recognized it was important to distill capacity into the infrastructure and not simply build individual capacity in order to promote sustainability. This would become particularly critical with the expansion through the SPDG as participating entities in community-based settings have a higher rate of staff turnover as compared to school districts.

The teams regrouped and outlined a plan for year three of Phase III that lays out the primary audiences and strategies for supporting quality and integrity of data collection, understanding of data, and use of data for decision making. The audiences include practice-based coaches, process coaches, data coordinators, and local leadership teams. The key strategies include training in iSocial data collection tools and the iSocial data system; protocols for understanding and using data; embedding decision support tools in the data system, including help documents, tool descriptions, and interpretation/thinking prompts; training and consultation to local team data coordinators to infuse knowledge and skills within Leadership Teams; and an online support community, particularly for local data coordinators. iSocial will build data based-decision making capacity in similar ways at the State Leadership Team level.

**Ongoing Evaluation Development**

Continued development for the evaluation will have two primary areas of focus--tool development and reporting. During year three of Phase III, the Data Team will continue work to integrate remaining iSocial data collection tools into the iSocial data system. This effort will streamline data collection as well as leverage the system’s capacity to promote standardization and oversight of data collection, ensuring that data is complete, accurate, and timely. System development continues to be ongoing with the Leadership Team Meeting Logs and Stages of Implementation Checklist scheduled to come online in April 2018. Additional work will continue with the Evaluation Team and the Process Coach Cohort, in consultation with Beth Steenwyk, to develop a new tool for assessing infrastructure sustainability at the local leadership level to support action planning as well as the process and timing for gradual release from process coaching. Work on this tool is ongoing, with anticipated completion before September 2018.

With the expansion through the SPDG, further tools will be identified and integrated into the system, further strengthening the overall availability and accessibility to participants implementing both the SSIP and the SPDG. Foundational efforts have begun on this effort with the External Evaluator and outreach to key stakeholders for the SPDG to engage their participation in the Evaluation Team. The expanded Evaluation Team, with this additional representation, will be coming together Summer 2018 to expedite this work.

In addition to the ongoing tool development, a primary focus of the Evaluation and Data Teams will be to formalize an annual reporting calendar and expand the availability and functionality of reports within the iSocial data system. The reporting calendar is scheduled to be completed during Summer 2018 and will provide a framework for ongoing data analysis and dissemination throughout the year.
The calendar will be a resource for the External Evaluator and Leadership Teams, outlining the key areas of data analysis that need to occur outside of the iSocial data system and timelines for presentation to the state and/or local Leadership Teams. New system reports in the iSocial data system will capitalize on the Analysis Framework to organize data around key evaluation questions and integrate data across sources and time periods to create dynamic and drillable data sets which Leadership Teams, coaches, and practitioners can mine to inform ongoing decisions about implementation.

**Additional Support and/or Technical Assistance Needs**

The State is grateful for the support and technical assistance provided by IDC, NCSI, DaSY and ECTA. The State anticipates continuing to reach out to them for assistance as we forge ahead. The new center, NCPMI, will also be a valuable resource that will be leveraged to enhance the work.

The State will continue to seek support from IDC to explore options for providing resources and technical assistance to leadership teams to support capacity for using data and findings from the evaluation in context of their local data.