

# U.S. Department of Education



## Performance Summary Report

**Fiscal Year 2017**

In Support of the

*National Drug Control Strategy*

**February 8, 2018**

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2017**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Transmittal Letter .....	1
Performance Summary Information.....	2
School Climate Transformation LEA Grants.....	3
Assertions .....	7
Criteria for Assertions .....	8



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

February 8, 2018

Terry Zobeck  
Executive Office of the President  
Office of National Drug Control Policy  
Washington, DC

Dear Terry:

As required by Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular *Accounting of Drug Control Funding and Performance Summary*, enclosed please find detailed information about performance-related measures for a key drug control program administered by the U.S. Department of Education, in accordance with the guidelines in the circular dated January 18, 2013. This information covers the School Safety National Activities program, which is the Drug Control Budget Decision Unit under which budgetary resources for the Department of Education (ED) are included in the *National Drug Control Budget*.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 ED awarded the first round of awards under the Safe and Supportive Schools (S3) grant program. No subsequent cohorts of S3 grants were awarded under the program. No performance information is included for S3 in this 2017 Performance Summary Report because the grants were closed in 2016, and the Department provided the final year of performance information on them in the 2016 Performance Summary Report. In previous reports, we also included an attestation letter from the ED Office of the Inspector General. Such a letter is not included along with this report as the total FY 2017 obligations for ED drug control programs was under the threshold for which this is required.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about the enclosed information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Esquith".

David Esquith  
Director, Office of Safe and Healthy Students

## **FY 2017 Performance Summary Information**

### School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants Program

In FY 2014 the Department made the first round of awards under the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency (LEA) Grants program to 71 school districts in 23 states, Washington, D.C., and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The funds are being used to develop, enhance, and expand systems of support for implementing evidence-based, multi-tiered behavioral frameworks for improving behavioral outcomes and learning conditions for students. The goals of the program are to connect children, youths, and families to appropriate services and supports; improve conditions for learning and behavioral outcomes for school-aged youths; and increase awareness of and the ability to respond to mental-health issues among school-aged youths.

The grants provide funding for up to five years, for a total of nearly \$180 million. Year four continuation awards were made to these grantees in FY 2017. Drug prevention is an allowable activity. Indeed, grantees are encouraged, as part of their local needs assessment, to measure student drug use along with other relevant issues and problems. This local needs assessment is also being used by grantees to help identify and select the most appropriate evidence-based practices. If the needs assessment indicates that drug abuse is an issue for students, drug abuse prevention should be addressed as part of implementation of a multi-tiered behavioral framework.

The Department has developed a variety of measures to assess the performance of the School Climate Transformation Grants, including (1) measures related to increasing the capacity of LEAs to implement a multi-tiered, decision-making framework to improve behavioral and learning outcomes and (2) measures to demonstrate the progress of LEAs in achieving these outcomes as evidenced by decreasing student disciplinary actions and increased student attendance. Among those measures, the two discussed below are the most directly related to the drug prevention function of this program.

**Measure 1:** The number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions, including those related to possession or use of drugs or alcohol.

**Table 1:**

Year	Number Target	Number Actual	Percentage Target	Percentage Actual
2014	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2015	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2016		524		51%
2017	540	698	53%	59%
2018	719		61%	

The Measure. ED established several GPRA performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants program. Two measures were related to addressing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy. This measure was one of the two selected for that purpose.

It is expected that grantees may show progress in meeting this measure due to an improved school climate that results in a decrease in actual student use of drugs or alcohol, and as a result these students do not face disciplinary action for such use. Alternatively, grantees may show progress because they change their disciplinary approach to student drug or alcohol use, employing approaches like providing appropriate interventions, counseling, or referrals to address the behavior, rather than relying on more punitive measures like suspensions and expulsions.

FY 2017 Performance Results. The number of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions, including those related to possession or use of drugs or alcohol, increased from 524 to 698 between 2016 and 2017. The target set for 2017 was 53 percent and this goal was exceeded. The actual number of schools reporting decreases was 59 percent. This indicates a promising trend that is supported and documented in correspondence and other evidence we receive from grantees.

FY 2018 Performance Target. FY 2018 performance targets reflect a 3 percent increase from FY 2017 actuals.

Methodology. These measures constitute the Department's indicators of success for the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants program. We advised applicants for a grant under this program to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for their proposed program. Each grantee is required to provide data about progress in meeting these measures in its annual performance and final report.

To receive funds after the initial year of a multiyear award, grantees must submit an annual continuation performance report that describes the progress the project has made toward meeting the predefined benchmarks and milestones. This performance report also provides program staff with data related to the GPRA measures established for the program.

Grantees are not required to collect and report to the Department disaggregated data corresponding to such suspensions and expulsions that are related to possession or use of alcohol or drugs only, but some grantees do and the Department encourages the remaining grantees to do so as well. Accordingly, beginning with the 2016 baseline data available for this performance measure, for grantees that provide the additional data the Department is reporting the number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of alcohol (only), and the number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of other drugs (only).

However in FY 2017 many more grantees collected and reported data for suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of alcohol and/or other drugs than they did separately for alcohol (only) or other drugs (only). So in this report, we have added an additional table below to report this composite information. This change was because many grantees began using specific software packages for collecting data that asked the question in the combined manner. We expect to report this "combined data" in the FY 2018 performance report as well. However, we will continue to encourage grantees to disaggregate this data so that we can report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of alcohol only, as well as an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of other drugs only.

NOTE: As grantees are not required to collect this data, nor do all grantees collect it, no targets are set.

Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of their knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report are true and correct and that the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and will not conduct further reviews unless data quality concerns arise.

The ED-funded Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports ([www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org)) is providing training and technical assistance to grantees on data collection.

**Table 2:** Number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of alcohol only (out of a total of 70 grantees, 31 reported these data for 2016, and 6 reported for 2017).

<b>FY2014 Actual</b>	<b>FY2015 Actual</b>	<b>FY2016 Actual</b>	<b>FY2017 Actual</b>
n/a	n/a	184 40%	17 41%

**Table 3:** Number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of other drugs only (out of a total of 70 grantees, 32 reported these data for 2016, and 8 reported for 2017).

<b>FY2014 Actual</b>	<b>FY2015 Actual</b>	<b>FY2016 Actual</b>	<b>FY2017 Actual</b>
n/a	n/a	204 41%	19 20%

**Table 4:** Number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of alcohol and/or other drugs (out of a total of 70 grantees, 21 reported these data in 2017).

<b>FY2014 Actual</b>	<b>FY2015 Actual</b>	<b>FY2016 Actual</b>	<b>FY2017 Actual</b>
n/a	n/a	n/a	201 46%

**Measure 2:** The number and percentage of schools annually that are implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework (MTBF) with fidelity.

**Table 5:**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number Target</b>	<b>Number Actual</b>	<b>Percentage Target</b>	<b>Percentage Actual</b>
<b>2014</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>2015</b>	n/a	512	n/a	45%
<b>2016</b>	589	584	52%	55%
<b>2017</b>	677	814	60%	65%
<b>2018</b>	936		69%	

The Measure. ED established several GPRA performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants program. Two measures were related to addressing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy. This measure was one of the two selected for that purpose.

Although schools have long attempted to address issues of student disruptive and problem behavior (including substance use, violence, and bullying), the vast majority of our Nation's schools have not implemented comprehensive, effective supports that address the full range of students' social, emotional, and behavioral needs. Research demonstrates that the implementation of an evidence-based, multi-tiered behavioral framework, such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), can help improve overall school climate and safety. A key aspect of this multi-tiered approach is providing differing levels of support and interventions to students based on their needs. Certain supports involve the whole school (e.g., consistent rules, consequences, and reinforcement of appropriate behavior), with more intensive supports for groups of students exhibiting at-risk behavior, and individualized services for students who continue to exhibit troubling behavior.

This second measure supports the drug prevention function of this program because a school that is implementing a multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity can be expected to be a school where any prevention program(s) – including drug prevention program(s) – selected for implementation is (1) an evidence-based program and (2) has an improved chance of being implemented more effectively. This measure is designed to inform whether the LEA School Climate Transformation Grants result in such increased capacity.

FY 2017 Performance Results. FY 2017 performance data were received and aggregated. The actuals for both number and percentage exceeded the targets on this measure in 2017.

FY 2018 Performance Targets. The FY 2018 performance targets for the number and percentage of schools annually that are implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity are set at 936 and 69 percent, respectively. The 2018 number target represents a 15 percent increase from the 2017 actual. The 2018 percentage target represents an annual increase of 15 percent from the 2015 baseline.

Methodology. These measures constitute the Department's indicators of success for the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants program. Consequently, we advised applicants for a grant under this program to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed program. Each grantee will be required to

provide, in its annual performance and final reports, data about its progress in meeting these measures.

To receive funds after the initial year of a multiyear award, grantees must submit an annual continuation performance report that describes the progress the project has made toward meeting the predefined benchmarks and milestones. This performance report also provides program staff with data related to the GPRA measures established for the program.

Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report were true and correct and that the report fully disclosed all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and will not conduct further reviews, unless data quality concerns arise. The ED-funded Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports ([www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org)) is providing training and technical assistance to grantees on data collection.

## **Assertions**

### Performance Reporting System

The Department of Education has a system in place to capture performance information accurately and that system was properly applied to generate the performance data in this report. In instances in which data are supplied by grantees as part of required periodic performance reports, the data that are supplied are accurately reflected in this report.

Data related to the drug control programs included in this Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2017 are recorded in the Department of Education's software for recording performance data and are an integral part of our budget and management processes.

### Explanations for Not Meeting Performance Targets

Not Applicable since FY 2017 performance exceeded all of the targets.

### Methodology for Establishing Performance Targets

The methodology described in the Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2017 to establish performance targets for the current year is reasonable given past performance and available resources.

## Performance Measures for Significant Drug Control Activities

The Department of Education has established at least one acceptable performance measure for the Drug Control Decision Unit identified in its Detailed Accounting of Fiscal Year 2017 Drug Control Funds.

### **Criteria for Assertions**

#### Data

No workload or participant data support the assertions provided in this report. Sources of quantitative data used in the report are well documented. These data are the most recently available and are identified by the year in which the data was collected.

#### Other Estimation Methods

No estimation methods other than professional judgment were used to make the required assertions. When professional judgment was used, the objectivity and strength of those judgments were explained and documented. Professional judgment was used to establish targets for programs until data from at least one grant cohort were available to provide additional information needed to set more accurate targets. We routinely re-evaluate targets set using professional judgment as additional information about actual performance on measures becomes available.

#### Reporting Systems

Reporting systems that support the above assertions are current, reliable, and an integral part of the Department of Education's budget and management processes. Data collected and reported for the measures discussed in this report are stored, or will be stored, in the Department of Education's MAX-PPI (Program Performance Information) system. Data from MAX-PPI are used in developing annual budget requests and justifications.