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This document evaluates overall program success for the 2010-11 academic year in terms of both student outcomes and staff perceptions of curriculum effectiveness.
INTRODUCTION

During the 2010-11 academic year, Ivymount School’s Multiple Learning Needs (MLN) Lower School program added a classroom to better meet the needs of more intellectually capable students on the autism spectrum. The classroom paired a more challenging academic curriculum aligned with the Maryland State Curriculum and designed for students performing at or near grade level, with an intensive social learning curriculum, executive function supports, and evidence-based instructional practices designed to support student learning.

The implementation of so many new curriculum components at one time placed significant demands upon instructional staff, while raising expectations for student performance. The purpose of this document is to evaluate overall program success in terms of both student outcomes and staff perceptions of curriculum effectiveness.

METHODS

Participants

All six students assigned to the classroom during the 2010-11 academic year were included in the program evaluation. The students were diagnosed with autism spectrum disorders and between the ages of 8 and 9 years old. Instructors and parents of the six students participated in beginning- and end-of-year interviews regarding student performance. A total of 12 administrators and instructional staff serving students in the classroom participated in mid-year interviews regarding perceptions of curriculum effectiveness and additional training/support needs.

Data Collection

Data collection included:

- informal classroom observations;
- review of students’ beginning- and end-of-year academic and nonacademic test scores, including Saxon Math scores, running records, Student Functional Assessments, and Social Language Development Tests;¹
- beginning- and end-of-year interviews with staff and parents regarding students’ nonacademic performance, including social skills, emotional awareness/regulation, problem solving, self-advocacy, behavior, flexibility, and organizational skills; and
- interviews with staff regarding perceptions of curriculum effectiveness including Saxon Math, Balanced Literacy, science, social studies, social cognition, executive function supports, and evidence-based instructional practices.

Analysis

Saxon Math, running records, Student Functional Assessments, and Social Language Development Test scores were averaged across students, and annual growth assessed. Transcripts of interviews with staff and parents were analyzed using WEFT QDA, a software program designed for the organization and

¹ The Social Language Development Test was only administered once at the beginning of the 2010-11 academic year.
thematic analysis of qualitative data. Both test scores and qualitative findings are reported in the program evaluation section of this document.

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The following section describes the four major components of the classroom’s curriculum for the 2010-11 year: academic curriculum, social learning curriculum, executive function supports, and evidence-based instructional practices:

**Academic Curriculum**

The Maryland State Curriculum and the local school system curriculum provided the framework for the classroom academic programs. The curriculum was made accessible to diverse learners through differentiation, modification, and accommodations in content and materials. Students’ individualized education programs (IEPs) determined the level of support and modifications necessary to provide access for the student to the general education curriculum of the local school system.

- **Saxon Math**, a highly systematic, evidence-based program, was used for math instruction. Saxon Math continually reviews and builds upon previously learned skills.
- **A Balanced Literacy** model which includes read aloud, word work, and guided or shared reading, provided the evidence-based framework for reading instruction. Using a Balanced Literacy framework, the pace of instruction was based on student performance and allowed for flexible groupings based on instructional level. Instruction during the 2010-11 year focused particularly on increasing students’ comprehension skills.
- **Science and Social Studies** units were developed based on the local school system curriculum with content support from the grade level curriculum guides.

**Social Learning Curriculum**

The Social Learning Program was developed collaboratively by the teaching and therapy staff to ensure continuity, and was based—in part—on the work of Michelle Garcia-Winner. Students learned skills that were taught in the form of discrete structured lessons, and consistent opportunities were provided for practice and generalization. The systematic program addressed routine social skills (instrumental skills) needed to navigate daily environments as well as the hidden rules for navigating social settings and situations. Relationship skills were targeted by working with students on the skills needed to participate in game play and develop friendships. Interaction skills included the skills needed to participate in conversation by attending to others and maintaining topics. Emotion regulation focused on the ability to identify and regulate emotional states.

**Executive Function Supports**

Executive function supports included both a weekly “Cooperative Learning” curriculum that focused on building students’ organizational and time-management skills, as well as embedded supports throughout the program such as transition checklists.

**Evidence-Based Instructional Practices**

All members of the classroom team received training in evidence-based instructional practices, which were used throughout the program. These practices included reinforcement, prompting, visual schedules, classroom and individual behavior systems, and a common classroom vocabulary.
PROGRAM EVALUATION PART I: STUDENT OUTCOMES

This section describes findings related to student outcomes, both academic and non-academic, for the 2010-11 school year.

Assessment of Students’ Academic Progress

**Saxon Math** Each student completed approximately one half of a grade-level using the Saxon Math curriculum. Student levels at the beginning of the year ranged from mid-2\(^{nd}\) grade to mid-3\(^{rd}\) grade, and at the end of the year ranged from beginning of 3\(^{rd}\) grade to end of 3\(^{rd}\) grade. In terms of Saxon Math test scores, students averaged 80.8 % accuracy, with a range of 63.6% for the lowest performing student to 97.5% for the highest performing student.

**Balanced Literacy** Each student advanced one reading level based on running record measures conducted at the beginning and end of the academic year. Student levels at the beginning of the year ranged from end of 1\(^{st}\) grade to end of 2\(^{nd}\) grade, and at the end of the year ranged from beginning of 2\(^{nd}\) grade to beginning of 3\(^{rd}\) grade year.\(^2\)

In terms of **decoding** skills, students averaged 95.3% accuracy at the beginning of the year, with a range of 90.5% for the lowest performing student to 100% for the highest performing student. At the end of the year, students averaged 95.8% accuracy, with a range of 80.5% for the lowest performing student to 100% for the two highest performing students.

In terms of **comprehension** skills, students averaged 60% accuracy at the beginning of the year, with a range of 38% for the lowest performing student to 71% for the highest performing student. At the end of the year, students averaged 45.3%, with a range of 20% for the lowest performing student to 72% for the highest performing student. The fact that students’ scores were strong in terms of decoding, but significantly weaker in terms of comprehension, indicates that comprehension remains a significant challenge for students in this class.

Assessment of Students’ Non-Academic Progress

**Student Functional Assessment (SFA)** Adapted versions of the Student Functional Assessments (SFAs) were administered at the beginning and end of the year for each student, and growth was observed in a number of areas (although the tool is diagnostic in nature, and not designed to capture incremental year-to-year changes). All assessments were done by the head teacher in order to increase reliability. Although results should be interpreted with caution, student scores increased an average of 2 points (from 13.3 to 15.3 out of a possible 20) in the area of behavior regulation; an average of 1.3 points (from 14 to 15.3 out of a possible 20) in the area of task behavior and completion, and an average of 1.3 points (from 20.5 to 21.8 out of a possible 25) in the area compliance with adult directives and school rules. Growth of less than 1 point (out of a possible 20) was observed in the areas of following social conventions and positive interactions.

**Social Language Development Test** Social Language Development Tests were administered to all students, but the tests were not formally scored because the test was designed for students with more sophisticated language skills. In spite of this limitation, however, instructors noted that student responses demonstrated mastery of vocabulary/concepts from the social cognition curriculum (e.g.,

---

\(^2\) Students may have been able to decode at higher levels, but instructors did not permit students to advance to the next reading level until their comprehension skills had “caught up.”
how to handle conflict or frustration, how to express empathy, and/or how to employ strategies like taking turns or compromising).

**Instructor and Parent Interviews** Instructors and parents participated in beginning- and end-of-year interviews assessing each student’s performance in terms of nonacademic domains. These domains were deliberately chosen to align with the classroom curriculum. Overall, instructors and parents observed growth in all areas for almost all students, with particularly significant growth in the area of social skills. In the words of one parent, “I’ve seen more growth in the last year than I’ve seen in the last three years, and I really think curriculum had something to do with it.” The following section summarizes key findings by domain.

**Social Skills:** Both instructors and parents noted the most significant student growth in this domain. According to instructors, all six students experienced challenges in the area of social skills at the beginning of the year, and all six demonstrated progress in this area by the end of the year. According to parents, all six students experienced challenges in this area, and five demonstrated significant progress.

Specific areas of growth observed by instructors for one or more students included:

- improved listening skills and ability to make related comments;
- decreased need for adult facilitation;
- improved willingness to make comments/ask questions during unstructured social time;
- ability to play and/or comment independently during structured and/or unstructured interactions; and
- some generalization of social thinking curriculum to play time.

Specific areas of growth observed by families for one or more students included:

- increased motivation to seek out social engagement;
- increased willingness to initiate;
- improved reciprocity; and
- improved social boundaries.

Ongoing challenges included:

- ability to maintain conversations only if they relate to a preferred topic;
- ability to ask questions, paired with a failure to listen to answers; and
- need for adult facilitation when socializing with peers.

**Emotional Awareness/Regulation:** This was another area where instructors and parents noted significant growth. According to instructors, all six students experienced challenges in the area of emotional awareness and/or regulation at the beginning of the academic year, and by the end of the year, all six demonstrated progress in this area. According to parents, all six students experienced challenges in this area, and five demonstrated at least minor progress.

Specific areas of growth observed by instructors for one or more students included:

- familiarity with self-regulating strategies such as social stories, taking a deep breath, going for a walk, and/or taking a break;
- familiarity with classroom vocabulary for handling frustration (e.g., “Superflex,” “Mean Jean”);
- independent use of social stories; and
• improved ability to handle frustration and/or prevent outbursts.

Specific areas of growth observed by parents for one or more students included:

• improved ability to articulate own emotions; and
• increased ability to distinguish between “big problem/little problem.”

Ongoing challenges related primarily to difficulties with emotion regulation.

Problem Solving: Although more significant according to instructors than parents, this was also an area of considerable growth. According to instructors, at the beginning of the year, all six students experienced challenges in the area of problem solving, and by the end of the year, all six demonstrated progress in this area. According to parents, five students experienced challenges in this area, and all five demonstrated at least minor progress.

Specific areas of growth observed by instructors for one or more students included:

• ability to use problem solving strategies for calming down;
• academic problem solving using visual supports in classroom;
• attempting independent problem-solving before requesting help;
• improved ability to handle teasing; and
• improved use of functional communication for requesting.

Specific areas of growth observed by parents for one or more students included:

• use of strategies from the social thinking curriculum such as “Superflex,” “big problem/little problem,” and coping tools such as “stop, breathe, and think”;
• ability to ask for help rather than using aggression; and
• ability to think through consequences and outcomes.

Ongoing challenges included:

• meltdowns resulting from more complex problems, including social problems; and
• inability to let go of problems once they have been “talked through.”

Self-Advocacy: According to instructors, at the beginning of the year five students experienced challenges in the area of self-advocacy, and by the end of the year, five had demonstrated progress in this area. According to parents, four students experienced challenges in this area, and five demonstrated progress.

Specific areas of growth observed by instructors for one or more students included:

• improved choice-making; and
• increased assertiveness in asking for help.

Specific areas of growth observed by parents for one or more students included:

• increased assertiveness in terms of expressing opinions.

Ongoing challenges included:

• social appropriateness when advocating for needs/preferences.
**Behavior:** According to instructors, four students experienced challenges in the area of behavior at the beginning of the year, and by the end of the year, four had demonstrated progress in this area. According to parents, all six students demonstrated challenges in this area, and four demonstrated progress.

Specific areas of growth observed by instructors for one or more students included

- decreased frequency and intensity of meltdowns.

Specific areas of growth observed by parents included:

- decreased outbursts;
- improved responsiveness to redirection; and
- responsiveness to school interventions such as “Superflex.”

Ongoing challenges related primarily to two students who demonstrated worse behaviors by the end of the year.

**Flexibility:** According to instructors, at the beginning of the year five students experienced challenges in terms of flexibility, and by the end of the year, five had demonstrated progress in this area. According to parents, five students experienced challenges in this area, and three demonstrated at least minimal progress.

Specific areas of growth observed by instructors for one or more students included:

- familiarity with and ability to apply concepts such as “brain in the group,” “rock brain,” “stuck/unstuck,” little problem/big problem,” and “Superflex”; and
- responsiveness to social stories.

Specific areas of growth observed by parents for one or more students included:

- increased flexibility; and
- higher levels of success during situations where parents are able to prepare for breaks in routine.

Ongoing challenges included:

- inconsistency;
- difficulties with major changes in plan and/or transitions from preferred to non-preferred activities.

**Organizational Skills:** Again, instructors observed more growth in this area than parents did. According to instructors, all six students experienced challenges in the area of social skills at the beginning of the year, and by the end of the year, five demonstrated progress in this area. According to parents, three students experienced challenges in this area, and three demonstrated at least minimal progress.

Specific areas of growth observed by instructors for one or more students included:

- ability to use organizational placemats and pencil box tool for organizing;
- improved ability to manage papers;
- reduced levels of organizational prompting required; and
- ability to use “brain in the group” in order to remain engaged.
Specific areas of growth observed by parents for one or more students included:

- reduced need for prompting;
- responsiveness to routine; and
- improved time management (e.g., willingness to participate in organizing evening schedule).

Ongoing challenges included:

- need for task analysis and sequencing; and
- need for high levels of adult assistance and/or prompting.

**PROGRAM EVALUATION PART II:
STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF CURRICULUM EFFECTIVENESS AND TRAINING/SUPPORT NEEDS**

This section describes findings related to staff perceptions of curriculum effectiveness, as well as training/support needs in order for staff to better implement various components of the curriculum.

Based on their roles/responsibilities in overseeing/implementing curriculum, different groups of staff were asked to respond to questions about different curricula (e.g., Saxon Math and/or the social cognition curriculum). Fonda Lowe, Program Director, identified which staff should respond to which groups of questions, and the number of administrators and instructional staff responding to each group of questions is noted below.

**Saxon Math**

**Curriculum Effectiveness**  Of the five administrators and instructional staff who evaluated the Saxon Math program, all reported that the curriculum was “very effective.” Although one interviewee noted that students were unable to complete a full grade level in a single year, others reported that the Saxon Math program was a “good match” for students in the classroom and that Saxon Math tests underestimated students’ skill levels.

**Modifications and Accommodation** Modifications to the curriculum included providing additional instruction and opportunities for practice, individualized pacing, and small groups. Accommodations to the curriculum included checklists for multi-stepped problem solving, calculators, hands-on manipulatives, and highlighting of key words/phrases in word problems. None of the interviewees felt that accommodations compromised the integrity of the curriculum.

**Training and Support Needs**  All five interviewees reported that instructional staff had received adequate training and supports to implement the Saxon Math program effectively. Several noted that while implementation was strong, instructional staff lacked the time necessary to become more familiar with the program’s accompanying materials, and that support from Dale Frengal, Curriculum Specialist, had been critical to the program’s success.

**Balanced Literacy**

**Curriculum Effectiveness**  Of the six staff who evaluated the Balanced Literacy framework, four reported that the curriculum was “very effective,” and two (both administrators) reported that it was only “somewhat effective.” The main reason given for lack of effectiveness was the need for a stronger emphasis on comprehension.
Accommodations No specific accommodations to the Balanced Literacy framework were identified, and no one felt that accommodations compromised the integrity of the program. Again, one interviewee expressed concern that testing underestimated students’ skill levels, and another noted that Balanced Literacy was weak in the area of writing.

Training and Support Needs Four interviewees reported that instructional staff had received adequate training and support to implement the Balanced Literacy framework effectively, and a fifth (an administrator) reported that they had not. The main reason given for lack of adequate training was the fact that all staff had not been trained sufficiently in all areas, thereby allowing for “interchangeable players.” Others mentioned that support from Frengal and Margie Glanz, Reading Specialist, had been critical to the program’s success.

Science

Curriculum Effectiveness Of the six staff who evaluated the science curriculum, four reported that the curriculum was “very effective,” and two (one administrator and one instructional staff member) reported that it was only “somewhat effective.” Interviewees mentioned that instruction was strong and test scores were good, and that instructional staff had done an excellent job of incorporating standards into instruction and identifying appropriate materials. One interviewee suggested breaking the class into two groups in future.

Modifications Curriculum modifications were primarily related to breadth and depth: Instructional staff reduced the scope of what was covered, and simplified concepts. However, one instructional staff member reported that she used the Maryland state 4th grade science book to guide instruction, and did not make any modifications to the indicators.

Social Studies

Curriculum Effectiveness Of the five staff who evaluated the effectiveness of the social studies curriculum, four reported that it was “very effective,” and one (an administrator) reported that it was only “somewhat effective.” Interviewees commented that both instruction and test scores were strong, and that there was not as much pressure on staff in this area because social studies is not a part of the state assessment, but that there was need for higher quality and student-level appropriate materials/resources.

Modifications Curriculum modifications were primarily related to breadth and depth. For example, interviewees noted that instruction did not cover all indicators, and tests were very fact-focused as opposed to inferential.
Social Cognition

**Curriculum Effectiveness** Of the ten staff who evaluated the effectiveness of the social cognition curriculum, five reported that it was “very effective,” and five reported that it was only “somewhat effective.” Strengths mentioned by one or more interviewees included the combination of discrete instruction with embedded use of social cognition concepts/vocabulary throughout the day, as well as students’ high levels of investment in the program as evidenced by their adoption of social cognition vocabulary. Ongoing issues mentioned by one or more interviewees included lack of whole team buy-in, lack of generalization of curriculum (with the exception of one or two key concepts), and challenges of meeting the needs of students with more severe perspective taking challenges.

**Shift to “Social Thinking”** Six staff reported that the shift from social skills to social thinking was “very helpful,” and four reported that it was “somewhat helpful.” Benefits of the shift mentioned by several interviewees included providing a framework for teaching/understanding the underlying “why” of social interaction. Concerns related to the shift included the need for greater balance between teaching discrete social skills and teaching the meaning of social interaction, and the challenge of providing adequate professional development for implementing a curriculum that is considerably more complex and layered than a traditional social skills curriculum.

**Modifications** Because Garcia-Winner’s social cognition curriculum is designed for students with less severe cognitive impairments, instructional staff reported making significant modifications for students in the classroom. These included modifying language content; breaking lessons down into smaller parts; and translating what was primarily a collection of worksheets into games, role playing exercises, behavior modeling, and social stories and scripts. According to one interviewee, Garcia-Winner provided “more of a framework than a curriculum” (mainly the cast of characters, or “Unthinkables”), and according to another, staff independently came up with 90-95% of the material used in class.

**Training and Support Needs** Eight interviewees reported that instructional staff had received adequate training and support to implement the social cognition curriculum effectively, and only one (an administrator) reported that they had not. Many interviewees mentioned the importance of attending trainings by Garcia-Winner and the in-house workshop by Monica Adler Werner, Director of the Model Asperger Program, as well as receiving ongoing support from Lynn Cannon, Social Thinking Curriculum Consultant, and Bess Willman, Speech Language Therapist. A few interviewees mentioned the need for Cannon to meet with the entire classroom team (as opposed to only the lead teacher and related service providers), as well as for all staff to participate in trainings to increase familiarity with social cognition language and concepts as well as staff buy-in.

**Executive Function Supports**

**Effectiveness** Of the eight staff who evaluated the effectiveness of executive function supports, two reported that they were “very effective,” five that they were “somewhat effective,” and one (a member of the instructional staff) that they were “somewhat ineffective.” The benefits of current executive function supports included helping students be more focused and organized. Concerns raised related primarily to the need for a more systematic approach to executive supports, lack of classroom time regularly devoted to Cooperative Learning (which competes with the weekly slot for Health), and lack of follow-through to support students’ generalization of executive function skills.


**Accommodations** Curriculum accommodations included checklists for organizing back packs, pencil boxes, and desks; steps for checking in and out; visual supports; prompting; and role playing scenarios.

**Training and Support Needs** Three interviewees reported that instructional staff received adequate training and support to effectively implement executive function supports, and five reported that they did not. Related comments pertained to the lack of a systematic curriculum and guidance; need for training of entire classroom staff in terms of underlying theory and techniques for embedding executive function supports throughout the curriculum; and the need for something geared toward students with more significant cognitive impairments. Several staff mentioned that they were looking forward to Cannon’s development of an appropriate executive function curriculum for use in coming years.

**Evidence-based Instructional Practices**

**Use of Specific Practices** Interviewees were asked to provide examples of when and how they used the following specific evidence-based instructional practices, as well as how these practices supported instruction in the classroom:

Reinforcement: Interviewees said that reinforcement is used “constantly” to keep students engaged and motivated, in the form of classroom point sheets, bonus point systems, and student token boards that provide reinforcement for positive classroom behaviors. One interviewee (an administrator) expressed concern that some instructional staff use reinforcement more frequently/consistently than others.

Prompting: Interviewees reported using a wide range of prompting modalities (with verbal being the last resort), as well as prompt fading, to support students’ increased independence. One interviewee (an administrator) expressed concern that instructional staff vary in how adept they are at using different prompting modalities, and that some would benefit from instruction in prompt fading and in decreasing verbal prompts.

Shaping: Interviewees noted that shaping is not commonly used in this classroom, but that it is occasionally used to increase the complexity of students’ oral and written responses and/or the amount of time they are able to remain seated or on task.

Visual Schedules: Interviewees said that visual schedules are used “all day, every day” in the form of a daily classroom schedule posted on the board and located in students’ notebooks. These schedules help keep students calm and aware of what is coming next.

Classroom and Individual Behavior Systems: Interviewees reported that classroom and individual behavior systems, which reward students for positive behaviors at regular intervals, are consistently used to keep students motivated and available for learning.

Common Classroom Vocabulary: Interviewees noted that a common classroom vocabulary, particularly language from the social cognition curriculum (such as “Superflex” and “brain in the group”) is used routinely as a means of infusing nonacademic concepts throughout the school day.

**Training and Support** All five interviewees reported that instructional staff received adequate training and support to use evidence-based instructional practices. Several noted that training is stronger at the beginning of the year than during the middle and end of the year; and that while discrete, whole group trainings are generally of high quality, staff would benefit from more
individualized support and feedback on their implementation of various evidence-based instructional practices.

**Overall Curriculum Effectiveness**

Of the five interviewees who were asked to respond to questions about overall curriculum effectiveness, four reported that all the current components of the curriculum work together “very well,” and one (an administrator) reported that they worked together “pretty well.” Strengths of the current classroom curriculum included a shift from discrete/isolated instruction in social cognition and executive function skills to a more integrated approach, and the appropriateness of the current curriculum for meeting the needs of this particular group of students. In the words of one interviewee, “Everything going on is really good,” and in the words of another, “All the students seem to be making progress.”

Interviewees reported that the most critical challenges related to making sure all components of the curriculum work together in a seamless fashion included:

- scheduling time for all key elements of the curriculum;
- ensuring effective communication among all team members regarding curriculum;
- infusing nonacademic skills throughout the day;
- adequately supporting a more academically rigorous classroom environment;
- providing sufficient professional development opportunities for instructional staff;
- supporting instructional staff so they do not feel overwhelmed; and
- gathering necessary materials for science and social studies.

**Overview of Training and Support Received**

Interviewees reported that their training in various components of the curriculum primarily took the form of either formal trainings (e.g., conferences and large group PowerPoint presentations) or more informal individualized support such as observation/feedback. Several instructional staff emphasized how much they appreciated the support of Frengal and Cannon.

**SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on findings from staff and parent interviews, a number of key themes and recommendations were identified.

Key themes included the following:

- Administrators and instructional staff are generally very satisfied with the various curricula currently in place and feel that they are a “good fit” for students in this classroom.
- Overall, parents and instructional staff observed student growth in both academic and nonacademic areas – particularly the areas of math, social skills and emotional awareness/regulation.
- Students appear to be generalizing social cognition and executive function concepts and vocabulary to both home and school contexts, yet continue to face challenges in terms of applying these concepts when frustrated or upset.
- Lack of time to adequately address all components of the curriculum remains an ongoing challenge.
- Regular support from content/curriculum experts like Frengal, Cannon, Glanz and Willman plays a critical role in the success of the classroom.
Program recommendations included the following:

- Develop a more structured framework for teaching the executive function curriculum, and ensure that instructional staff members are familiar with and have bought into the underlying concepts.
- Provide more intensive comprehension instruction and/or adopt a supplementary reading comprehension curriculum.
- Continue to support adaptation of Garcia-Winner’s social cognition curriculum for use by students in this classroom (e.g., using Cannon as a consultant).
- Acquire a wider range of grade-level science and social studies materials/resources for use in the classroom.
- Increase communication with families about non-academic curriculum, so that parents can reinforce lessons at home.

Recommendations for training and support included provision of the following:

- student-specific support;
- regular observations followed by immediate follow-up discussion or on-the-spot training;
- additional support staff and/or support staff hours;
- training in specific areas such as executive function supports;
- formal trainings on curricula for entire classroom team (including assistant teachers, related service providers and one-to-one aides in order to ensure team-wide buy-in);
- differentiation of trainings based on roles; and
- additional training for new staff starting in the middle of the year.
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