

Data Related to the Concepts and Prototypes Developed by the UCLA Center

It should be noted that the work has developed over 45 years of research beginning at the UCLA Psychology Clinic School (later named the Fernald School) and in the Los Angeles Unified School District. This included early work on the prediction and prevention of reading problems, our 8 years working on dropout prevention, the involvement in designing and implementing one of the New American School models, and our integral role in the design and initial implementation of Hawaii's Comprehensive Student Support System. All of these were influential in shaping our systemic and policy thinking.

As we have developed the concepts and prototypes related to the four fundamental problems we focus on (see Frameworks for Systemic Transformation of Student and Learning Supports – <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/systemic/frameworkforsystemictransformation.pdf>), our work has continued to be informed by interactions with and data from state agencies, districts, and schools across the country.

(a) The first set of data on the *impact* of our focus on a unified, comprehensive, and systemic approach for addressing barriers to learning and teaching and re-engaging disconnected students is the number of state education agencies and districts that have begun to formally adopt the concepts and prototypes. The data here are:

- >States - Hawaii, Iowa,* Louisiana, Illinois, Ohio, Alabama
- >Districts - Gainesville City Schools (GA), Grant Parish (LA), Stillwater (MN), Tucson (AZ), La Crosse (WI)

*See the excerpt from the American Institute of Research evaluation of the Iowa Dept of Ed grant <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/wheresithappening/airiowa.pdf> .

Others states and districts are in discussion stages, and from what we can tell from communications and websites, others are proceeding using our online resources and those provided through our collaboration with Scholastic and the American Association of School Administrators. And, this applies to specific facets of our work, such as the focus on prototypes for reworking existing operational infrastructure at all levels and for school community collaboration. For example, here is a request we just received: “Would you be available to come to Thunder Bay, ON, Canada sometime between January and March 2013? The native high school/community service provider collaborative will be following the guidelines from your article on successful collaboratives when implementing their chosen intervention. There is some money in the budget for training, and we feel it would be beneficial to have you address the service collaborative members.”

(In addition to the above, another important bit of data related to the importance and influence of the work is that Scholastic and the American Association of School Administrators have reached out to adopt and support it. Other indicators are the growing number who are signing on to our District and State Collaborative Network for Developing Comprehensive Systems for Learning Support –

<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/network/network.html> and the endorsements by organizations such as the National Association of School Psychologists – [http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/whatsnew/announcement\(2-2-11\).pdf](http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/whatsnew/announcement(2-2-11).pdf) and the initiative for a *Broader Bolder Approach to Education* at the Economic Policy Institute at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/elaine-weiss/common-core_b_2427484.html .)

(b) The second set of data we are gathering is *formative evaluation benchmarks* that we use in monitoring and guiding development of the work at state education agencies and districts.

(c) As systems are sufficiently developed, *outcome data* will be gathered. The first set of such data are those gathered by EDC related to our work with Gainesville (see <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/casestudy.pdf>) Gainesville has been the first to develop sufficiently to make it worth investing in summative evaluation. As each gets to that stage, Scholastic will underwrite the data gathering and reporting. Our Center will be integrally involved in this.

(d) It may be useful to look at the following which were early statements we developed when asked about data relevant to our research and development efforts.:

>*Data Related to the Need for New Directions for School Improvement*
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/summit2002/data.pdf>

>*What's the Research-Base for Moving Toward a Comprehensive System of Learning Supports?*
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/summit2002/WhatstheEvidenceBase.pdf>

There, of course, are many formal publications (e.g., books, chapters, journal articles, policy research reports) related to our work – see <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/materials/resources.htm> .

Finally, it is clear that the need for evidence is pressing, but relevant data are especially complex when looking at new directions initiatives. As a result, the Catch 22 with policy makers is they want the evidence before acting, but without their action, new approaches don't get developed to the point of being able to gather meaningful effectiveness data.