

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Arizona



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

By FFY 2025, targeted Public Education Agencies (PEAs) will increase the performance of SSIP students with disabilities in grade 3 on the English Language Arts (ELA) state assessment from 9.58% to 12.23%.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

A cohort of PEAs that meets the state criteria for participation in SSIP is followed for three years and included in the SiMR data.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/01/SSIP%20Logic%20Model%20and%20Theory%20of%20Action%20-%20FINAL.pdf>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020 | 9.58% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target>= = | 10.11% | 10.64% | 11.17% | 11.70% | 12.23% |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| The number of grade 3 students with disabilities within SSIP cohort PEAs, receiving a score of Proficient or Highly Proficient, on the ELA component of the state assessment. | The number of grade 3 students with disabilities within SSIP cohort PEAs, receiving a score of Minimally proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, or Highly Proficient, on the ELA component of the state assessment. | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 98 | 892 | 9.58% | 10.11% | 10.99% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

State ELA assessment data for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grade 3, specific to the SSIP-cohort, from Arizona's data systems

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

From a list of all grade 3 SWD that have a score on the state ELA assessment in the data systems, the data of students who are associated with a District of Residence Identification (DOR ID) corresponding with PEAs in years 1–3 of SSIP at the time of assessment administration is disaggregated and compiled. Within the compiled list of students, the number of students testing as proficient is added to the students testing as highly proficient, and the resulting number is divided into the total number of SWD receiving any score on the ELA state assessment to calculate the proficiency for SSIP.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

At the beginning of SY 2021–2022, the SSIP aligned with the state initiative, Move On When Reading (MOWR). Amongst other collaborative benefits, the alignment allowed the SSIP to begin collecting reliable literacy screener data in grades 1, 2, and 3. While the legislation supporting this data collection did apply to SY 2021–2022, it did not apply to all PEAs beyond that school year. Beginning in SY 2022–2023, new MOWR legislation mandated all PEAs in Arizona to submit literacy screener data in grades K–3 for fall, winter, and spring submission periods yearly. While this legislative change does not mandate that all PEAs report SWD, which would enable the comparison to SSIP-PEA SWD, it will allow the SEA SSIP Team to continue the comparison to all student groups for SSIP and non-SSIP PEAs beyond the SY 2021–2022 data collection period. Analyzing the fluctuations in proficiency for these available groups should further provide context for progress toward the SiMR. In the first year of collection, the only context for comparison is a positive change in the gap between SWD and all student groups within SSIP PEAs and between all student groups within and outside of SSIP PEAs during SY 2021–2022. However, the SEA SSIP Team will have the first opportunity to collect directly comparable progress toward the SiMR when the data from two consecutive spring submission periods have been collected for SSIP-PEA SWD at the end of SY 2022–2023.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/01/SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan%20-%20FINAL.pdf>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

Within the section for Data Reliability, the SEA SSIP Team has included two Evaluation Questions to those that existed previously. The new questions are as follows: 'How does literacy screener data, in comparison to state testing data, help to contextualize progress toward the SiMR and help to drive decisions toward providing additional support?' and 'How does SSIP subgroup data help to contextualize progress toward the SiMR and help to drive decisions toward providing additional support?' "October 1 Data" was added under Data Sources.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

Due to statutory changes and MOWR alignment, the literacy screener data will now be available for two consecutive years at the end of SY 2022–2023. It was recently determined that subgroup data analysis utilizing October 1 Child Count is valuable in providing additional PEA support. Both data sources will help to inform the connection between activity and student outcomes, as defined in the FFY 2021 section for infrastructure improvements.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Activity Form Structure - Success Gaps Rubric & Action Plan (SGR & AP):

A focus for ongoing infrastructure improvements in the past year has been on monitoring the fidelity of implementing core SSIP activities. In accordance with the SSIP Evaluation Plan for data reliability and as a result of ongoing feedback and analysis, it was evident that, although the SGR & AP has shown significant growth in framework fidelity, more could be done to improve the process where PEA SSIP Teams used their self-assessment of organizational, evidence-based practices to target indicators for initiatives and systemic improvement. Expanding narrative form fields was not only an opportunity to address PEA feedback, but it also allowed PEA SSIP Teams more room to explore and document the details of self-assessment and initiative structures and more opportunity for reviewers to assess framework fidelity properly. In turn, this will provide for implementation fidelity as PEA SSIP Teams revisit the document as a guide through the evolution of levels of implementation and initiative progress.

An additional improvement to SGR & AP framework fidelity came from SEA SSIP Team members that use the Fidelity Feedback Guide (FFG) to review the SGR & AP documentation. Previously, when PEA SSIP Teams would complete the evidence section of each SGR indicator, they were guided to either mark a checkbox to indicate that a particular evidence-based practice was currently in practice or accompany any unchecked boxes with a narrative to explore the missing evidence in the Notes section of that indicator. After activity submission, an SEA SSIP Team member would review the SGR & AP with the FFG for feedback to PEA SSIP Teams.

Where reviewers recorded whether it was evident that PEA SSIP Teams considered all evidence-based practices toward marking their level of implementation, it was not clear as to whether a blank checkbox meant that the PEA SSIP Team was indicating that the practice was not currently in place and had forgotten to explore that practice in the Notes section or if the PEA SSIP Team had missed the consideration of that practice before marking their level of implementation.

During School Year (SY) 2022–2023, the replacement of evidence checkboxes with Y/N boxes made reviewing the document for framework fidelity more reliable. As SEA SSIP Teams provide feedback to PEA SSIP Teams, this more reliable feedback can be used to improve fidelity at both the framework and implementation levels.

Activity Support Structure - The SGR & AP and the Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Walkthrough Process:

Enhancements to professional development and technical support in SY 2022–2023 also provide for implementation fidelity. For example, improved support videos help PEA SSIP Teams through their SGR & AP fall submissions this year. Because only 8% of respondents to the SY 2021–2022 SSIP Survey reported going to the website and using the 20-minute overview video to inform their process, video links to shorter videos have been placed within the document to bolster the directions for both the self-assessment and action initiative process.

The most dynamic enhancement to activity support during this reporting period occurred at the beginning of SY 2022–2023 for PEAs transitioning from Year 1 to Year 2 in the SSIP.

Year 2 PEAs add to their focus of using Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) in the SGR & AP for systemic improvement at the organizational level with the EBP Classroom Walkthrough activity. For this activity, SEA SSIP Teams collaborate with PEA SSIP Teams toward the systemic improvement of classroom walkthrough systems and classroom EBPs in their learning community.

However, since COVID-19 school closures in the Spring of 2020, and with very few exceptions, PEAs did not allow campus visitation through SY 2021–2022. This meant that the SEA SSIP Team could no longer support implementation fidelity by conducting classroom walkthroughs with PEA SSIP teams nor provide any related onsite support. Through this period, SEA SSIP Teams could only provide activity support virtually through collaboration before and after classroom walkthroughs. In SY 2022–2023, as PEAs again allowed for campus visitation, the SEA SSIP Team was able to reinstitute a system of activity support that provided greater implementation fidelity and included onsite support.

To begin SY 2022–2023, each SSIP PEA participating in Year 2, completed the Classroom Systems Walkthrough Survey, providing data on the existing walkthrough systems in their learning community. The survey contained questions and rating scales designed to collect information about the PEA's current structure and implementation of its walkthrough systems. Survey responses were assigned weighted point values, and a rubric was used to determine a differentiated level of support.

The most robust level of EBP Walkthroughs activity support included an onsite collaborative presentation and classroom walkthroughs with PEA SSIP Teams, and PEAs with survey results in the lowest tier were provided this level of activity support. PEAs with survey results showing moderate and strong walkthrough systems already in place were also encouraged to take advantage of our onsite collaborative presentation with classroom walkthroughs. However, they were also provided additional choices. PEAs with moderate walkthrough systems already in place were also offered the choice of a virtual collaborative presentation with subsequent classroom walkthroughs. In contrast, PEAs with robust walkthrough systems already in place were provided the third choice of the PEA SSIP Team reviewing the presentation and other support materials independently, with support as-needed, throughout the walkthrough process. Subsequently, a trend analysis of the EBP Walkthrough Tool data, along with EBP Survey results at the end of SSIP Year 2, will help to determine if the system of differentiated support also aligned with the fidelity of implementation and activity outcomes.

Data Structures - Organizing Internal and External Data for Analysis:

Another focus for ongoing infrastructure improvements has been collecting and analyzing data to engage stakeholders, guide process decisions, and inform progress toward the SiMR. Often, this process not only means collecting data internally but also incorporating external data that affects activity and student outcomes. The most concrete example of improving the data infrastructure can be seen through the alignment with Move On When Reading (MOWR).

Through a web portal, PEAs report grades K–3 literacy screener proficiency data for the all-students group to MOWR three times each year. Because a web portal has yet to become available for SSIP data collection, the SEA SSIP Team created the Literacy Screener Reporting (LSR) Form and modeled the format to the MOWR display portal. PEAs report grades 1–3 literacy screener proficiency data for the SWD group to SSIP on the LSR form three times each year.

However, when the SEA SSIP Team receives MOWR data spreadsheets that are generated from the web portal, the format of the data in the spreadsheet is different than what is displayed in the web portal. To streamline the data integration in SY 2022–2023, the SEA SSIP Team has aligned the format of the SSIP data spreadsheet to the MOWR reports rather than the format of the MOWR web portal. Rather than analyzing the data separately and comparing the results, new data can be incorporated into a common data table to analyze literacy outcomes.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Activity Form Structure - Success Gaps Rubric & Action Plan (SGR & AP):

In concert with PEA feedback, it became apparent that while there were obvious benefits to creating an SGR & AP activity form that allows for documentation on a single document throughout a PEA's time in SSIP, the possibility of adding up to five updates to an initial narrative for an SGR indicator Notes section would strain the limits of the available space for PEAs to document rich and cohesive narratives. Since providing additional form fields, several PEA SSIP Teams in Years 2–3 SSIP PEAs have expressed an appreciation for the improvement effort through correspondence and during meetings. As this form revision has only gone through one update period for Cohorts 4–5, the sustainability of this improvement effort will be most vividly apparent when Cohort 6 is in Year 3 of SSIP.

While PEAs have not reported an issue with changing the SGR & AP checkboxes to Y/N boxes for the accountability of fidelity, SEA SSIP Team specialists have reported confidence in completing the Fidelity Feedback Guide (FFG) with more reliability due to this improvement effort. The Y/N boxes were expected to increase the fidelity percentage on the FFG, and the FFG indicates a 6% increase in SY 2022–2023 fidelity compared to the previous year. Therefore, the change appears to be a contributing factor toward increasing fidelity. According to the SSIP Theory of Action, this data would also support the connection between activity fidelity and positive student outcomes. However, more time will be needed to see if the fidelity continues to increase or stabilizes at a high level and sustains this improvement effort.

Activity Support Structure - The SGR & AP and the Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Walkthrough Process:

According to the SY 2022–2023 SSIP Survey, by providing the SGR & AP support videos as shorter videos that are targeted to the process and linked within the form directions, about 1 in every 4 PEAs reported finding this form of support useful to the process this year. Contrasting with the previous year, when the video was much longer and referenced as a resource that was available from the SSIP website, fewer than 1 in 10 PEAs reported finding the support videos useful. Therefore, providing the video format for support seems to have provided for the sustainability of systems improvement. This is especially notable because while all PEAs in Years 1–3 complete the survey, the support video is most highly targeted for use by Year 1 SSIP PEAs that have yet to complete the activity for the first time.

After providing a differentiated level of EBP Walkthrough Process support for the first time in SY 2022–2023, both personal feedback and feedback through the EBP Survey have shown very positive short-term outcomes for this system improvement effort. Over 85% of PEA SSIP Teams characterized the presentation itself, the knowledge and support of the SEA SSIP Team members, and the activity materials as mostly to highly supportive. Despite issues with timely survey completion and scheduling meetings, 100% of respondents reported finding the communication through the process supportive. After the support, 87.5% of PEA SSIP Teams reported finding the process between slightly challenging and not challenging at all, and most PEA SSIP Teams reported choosing to use the walkthrough activity for expanded rollout. Providing differentiated support will allow the SEA SSIP Team the capacity to scale up support efforts. By continuing a high level of support for classroom walkthrough systems and classroom EBPs, the

activity is expected to support positive student outcomes and achievement of the SSIP SiMR.

Data Structures - Organizing Internal and External Data for Analysis:

Although the SEA SSIP Team has only experienced the realignment of SSIP data collection structures to MOWR data reports for the Fall SY 2022–2023 literacy data submission, it is apparent that this infrastructure change will save a significant amount of time. The time-savings from no longer manually transferring data between the MOWR display portal and the spreadsheet, and the extra time spent on reliability checks between tables and through comparative analysis, can be put toward using the data. These activities include scaling up the data infrastructure by building a data dashboard, providing more robust outcome data to stakeholders, and using the data to inform more support opportunities for SSIP PEAs.

After the infrastructure change and with available data, the SEA SSIP Team has been able to look at data from the first year of collection of the SSIP Literacy Screener Reporting Form, in conjunction with MOWR data, to analyze initial trends.

At the fall submission of SY 2021–2022, grade 1 SWD in SSIP PEAs reported an average benchmark proficiency of 19.2% on literacy screeners, while the All-Student group in SSIP PEAs reported an average proficiency of 31.6%. This is a gap of 12.4% to begin the year between these two groups. At the spring submission of SY 2021–2022, the average proficiency of SWD in SSIP PEAs went up by 7.2% to 26.4%. The average proficiency of all students went up by 14.0% to 45.6%. This is a gap of 19.2% to end the year between these two groups. Therefore, the gap between SWD and all students in SSIP PEAs increased during grade 1 by 6.8% in SY 2021–22.

At the fall submission of SY 2021–2022, grade 2 SWD in SSIP PEAs reported an average benchmark proficiency of 15.9% on literacy screeners, while the All-Student group in SSIP PEAs reported an average proficiency of 38.3%. This is a gap of 22.4% to begin the year between these two groups. At the spring submission of SY 2021–2022, the average proficiency of SWD in SSIP PEAs went up by 5.6% to 21.5%. The average proficiency of all students went up by 10.9% to 49.2%. This is a gap of 27.7% to end the year between these two groups. Therefore, the gap between SWD and all students in SSIP PEAs increased during grade 2 by 5.3% in SY 2021–2022.

At the Fall submission of SY 2021–2022, grade 3 SWD in SSIP PEAs reported an average benchmark proficiency of 15.4% on literacy screeners, while the All-Student group in SSIP PEAs reported an average proficiency of 47.5%. This is a gap of 32.1% to begin the year between these two groups. At the spring submission of SY 2021–2022, the average proficiency of SWD in SSIP PEAs went up by 3.1% to 18.5%. The average proficiency of all students in SSIP PEAs increased during grade 3 by 1.6% in SY 2021–2022.

In analyzing the two trends, the initial data shows that while the grades progress with an increasing gap between SWD and all student groups in SSIP PEAs in SY 2021–2022, it does so at a decreasing rate:

SSIP Grade 1
Fall Gap: 12.4%
Spring Gap: 19.2%
Gap Increase: 6.8%

SSIP Grade 2
Fall Gap: 22.4%
Spring Gap: 27.7%
Gap Increase: 5.3%

SSIP Grade 3
Fall Gap: 32.1%
Spring Gap: 33.7%
Gap Increase: 1.6%

While data is not available for comparison to a non-SSIP SWD group or to see if the trend might continue toward gap reduction beyond grade 3, the available data provides a good baseline for analyzing ongoing trends through future submissions. After the fall submission of SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team will be able to use two full years of data to examine further ongoing trends with grade levels, student cohorts, and through summer periods. This data helps to support the SEA SSIP Team's decision to align with MOWR and adjust the SiMR to Grade 3 to begin SY 2021–2022, which also shifted the focus of systemic improvement toward K–3.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

Disseminating Data - Activity and Student Outcome Presentations:

While activity and outcome data is shared with stakeholders when it becomes available, four accountability PowerPoint presentations that ranged from 10-16 slides in length were posted to the SSIP website for a more comprehensive review of SY 2021–2022 activity and student outcomes at the end of the year. The first presentation provided an overview of SSIP in SY 2021–2022. This included visual and narrative summaries of process revisions from stakeholder feedback, such as the implications of MOWR alignment and activity document improvements as well as data from both the SSIP and EBP Surveys. The second presentation used several forms of graphic representation to illustrate literacy outcomes for state and screener assessments and provide trend analysis by grade and cohort. The third and fourth presentations connected the activity process to activity outcomes for the SGR & AP and the EBP Walkthrough activities, respectively.

In addition to posting the presentations to the website and informing stakeholders, each PEA in Cohorts 3 and 4 received presentations that included additional individualized data slides. Since Cohort 3 had just completed its third and final year in SSIP, each PEA received an SGR & AP presentation that included activity outcomes for level of implementation and initiatives specific to their Cohort and learning community. Since Cohort 4 had just completed its second year in SSIP, each PEA received an EBP Walkthroughs presentation that included activity outcomes for overall and quadrant growth specific to their Cohort and learning community. Although there has been limited feedback from providing the presentations thus far, because the dissemination of data is of sound accountability practice and the data can be very useful to inform activities going forward, SSIP will more actively solicit feedback after providing the presentations at the culmination of SY 2022–2023 to ensure that the process and format of dissemination are of optimal usefulness to PEA SSIP Teams.

Activity Support Structure - Funding Initiatives through the SSIP Contract:

When PEAs in Year 1 complete their Fall SGR & AP submission, they can enter an SSIP Contract to support SSIP initiatives with reimbursement for aligned expenditures. However, before expenditures can be made, the PEA must provide the SEA with a statement of planned expenditures that can later be referenced for the maintenance of alignment. As planned expenditures were on a separate document, PEA and SEA SSIP Teams would need to

keep track of both documents and their alignment over three years in SSIP.

In SY 2022–2023, SSIP accommodated for the financing structure of integrating the Contract Eligibility and Allowable Expenses (CEAE) into the SGR & AP. Now, as initiatives evolve, PEAs can manage their alignment within a single document. While initial feedback has been positive from stakeholders within and outside the SEA, as the process has yet to reach the first PEA submission of invoices, a substantive body of feedback and analysis of outcomes will be forthcoming and should be available to begin SY 2023–2024.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Activity Form Structure - Success Gaps Rubric & Action Plan (SGR & AP):

The SEA SSIP Team will monitor the integration of expanded narrative fields and Y/N boxes of the SGR & AP in the future, but from the progress and feedback of their inclusion so far, no further changes to these improvements are expected.

Activity Support Structure - The SGR & AP and the Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Walkthrough Process:

While data showed that more PEAs used the videos and found them supportive in completing the activity in SY 2022–2023 than the previous year, more activity guidance can be provided in for Year 1 PEAs in SY 2023–2024. SSIP survey narratives included the request for the SEA SSIP Team to provide more examples of how a completed SGR & AP might look. As the videos provided these examples, and as the 16 Year 1 SSIP PEAs in Cohort 6 comprise 46% of all SSIP PEAs, it is possible that providing a different format for the guidance may yield a supportive-response rate that is closer to what would be all Year 1 SSIP PEAs finding the resources helpful toward activity completion. Therefore, the SEA SSIP Team will provide a document form of activity guidance with screenshots to pair with the video format. The SSIP Team will then use the SSIP Survey to see if the combination of formats improves feedback data.

Although the differentiated support that the SEA SSIP Team provided in SY 2022–2023 was an improvement that provided positive outcomes, there will be improvements to the setup process next year. Rather than waiting to collect data from the Walkthrough Systems Survey at the beginning of the year for Year 2 SSIP PEAs, the SEA SSIP Team provided this survey to Year 1 SSIP PEAs in December of this school year. The SEA SSIP Team will then be able to analyze the data before Year 2, allowing for a more digestible timeline of communication and scheduling with Cohort 6 at the beginning of SY 2023–2024. This will be especially necessary, as Cohort 6 has five more PEAs than Cohort 5.

Data Structures - Organizing Internal and External Data for Analysis:

Even though manual data transfer by the SEA SSIP Team from the SSIP Literacy Screener Reporting Forms to a data spreadsheet will be a part of the data collection process for the foreseeable future, the SEA SSIP Team will continue to explore the possibility of PEA access to a web portal for data entry and running reports in the future. After the analysis of preliminary data through the current structure, the SEA SSIP Team hopes to see that the alignment with MOWR and the shift in focus toward the foundational grades of literacy development results in a moderation and reversal of the increasing gap between the SSIP SWD and all student groups on literacy screener data. At the end of SY 2022–2023, the SEA SSIP Team will compare two years of this shift in focus, with two full years of literacy screener data and compare that to the Grade 3 SiMR. In addition, the SEA SSIP Team will continue collecting updated data, such as the October 1 Child Count, for inclusion in the creation of a data dashboard. The dashboard will allow the SEA SSIP Team to examine the movement of subgroup data in conjunction with student outcomes, as referenced in the SSIP Evaluation Plan.

Disseminating Data - Activity and Student Outcome Presentations:

While accountability practices would guide the SEA SSIP Team to continue providing stakeholders with activity and student outcome presentations both on the website and directly to stakeholders, the team will differentiate the SSIP Survey for Year 3 PEAs, to collect responses as to whether they reviewed the EBP Walkthrough presentations from the end of Year 2, and how they may have found it helpful toward informing their practices. This year, the presentations will also include the two-year data from the screeners and any available and relevant subgroup data. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates the presentations to yield more long-term commitment to the SSIP process when gains are seen by individual PEAs.

Activity Support Structure - Funding Initiatives through the SSIP Contract:

At the beginning of SY 2022–2023, because the CEAE form was not available before the completion of the SGR & AP, the form had to be provided to PEAs as a stand-alone document for the alignment to Action Plan initiatives and the approval of Planned Expenditures. Then, as CEAE forms were submitted and approved, the SEA SSIP Team could integrate the CEAE documents into each PEA's SGR & AP. Beginning at the SY 2022–2023 Spring submission, these PEA SSIP Teams will be able to manage the alignment between Planned Expenditures and Action Plan initiatives within the SGR & AP. Beginning at the SY 2023–2024 Fall submission, all Year 1 PEAs will have the CEAE document integrated into the SGR & AP to begin the year, fully streamlining the process. The SEA SSIP Team will create a guidance document for the process, will post the guidance document on the SSIP website, and include a link to the document within the directions of the CEAE.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

-The Success Gaps Rubric & Action Plan:

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/07/SSIP%20Success%20Gaps%20Rubric%20and%20Action%20Plan.doc>

PEA SSIP Teams collaborate through 15 indicators, divided into five indicator groups. For each indicator, team members record evidence for practices in the learning community, decide upon current levels of implementation, and pursue initiatives to address needs.

--Indicator Group 1: Data-Based Decision Making

--- Decisions about curriculum, instructional programs, academic/behavioral supports, and school improvement are based on data.

--Indicator Group 2: Cultural Responsiveness

--- Culturally responsive instructional interventions and teaching strategies are used throughout the school or district.

--Indicator Group 3: Core Instructional Program

--- A consistent, well-articulated curriculum is in place and is implemented with fidelity, evidence-based practices, and differentiation.

--Indicator Group 4: Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring

--- Universal screening is used to identify needs for early intervention or targeted supports.

--Indicator Group 5: Interventions and Supports

--- Evidence-based behavioral interventions and supports are multi-tiered and implemented with fidelity.

-The EBP Diagnostic Walkthrough Process: <https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/07/SSIP%20EBP%20Walkthrough%20Tool.doc>

PEA SSIP Teams use the EBP Walkthrough Tool, a collection of 104 classroom, evidence-based practices divided into four quadrants, to record observed practices. The data can then be used to not only celebrate instances where instructors exhibited an EBP but also to provide opportunities to

further improve practices through such activities as peer observation and targeted professional development.

--Quadrant 1: Inclusive Learning Environment

---Classrooms exhibit an inclusive learning environment that is student-centered and engaging.

--Quadrant 2: Instructional Practices

---Classroom instruction is evidence-based, engaging, and responsive.

--Quadrant 3: Student Interactions

---Student interactions are collaborative and support learning objectives.

--Quadrant 4: Student Engagement

---Students are engaged in meaningful activities that support learning objectives.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Indicator Group 1 of the SGR focuses on data-based decision-making. This includes making decisions about the school curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavior supports, and school improvement initiatives, based on data. It also includes the use of screener and benchmark assessments, making decisions with subgroups in mind, and evidence of use from the administrative to classroom levels for the benefit of student outcomes.

Indicator Group 2 of the SGR focuses on cultural responsiveness. This includes celebrating diversity with professional development and during gatherings as well as supporting linguistic accessibility diversity with families in all correspondence and interactions.

Indicator Group 3 of the SGR focuses on implementing a well-articulated curriculum. This includes ensuring both horizontal and vertical alignment, flexible grouping, instructional technology, differentiated instruction with accommodations and modifications, providing for student learning styles and interests, instructional collaboration, professional development of curriculum and practices, implementation with fidelity, and informing families about the core curriculum and how it is differentiated for their student.

Indicator Group 4 of the SGR focuses on incorporating tools for universal screening and progress monitoring. This includes using universal screeners and progress monitoring tools for both academics and behavior, using benchmark assessments, and informing families about results.

Indicator Group 5 of the SGR focuses on practices involving interventions and supports. This includes a proactive and restorative, district-level discipline policy implemented responsively and with fidelity. It includes employing a multi-tiered system of supports for both academics and behaviors, guidance by screeners and diagnostic tools, and interventions that are continually monitored for progress by teachers who are trained to use resources and to operate with cultural sensitivity and fidelity within this system of supports. It also includes continually informing families about how their student fits within this system of supports.

Quadrant 1 of the EBP Tool focuses on classroom practices involving an inclusive learning environment. These include the display of measurable learning outcomes, classroom expectations, and word/sound walls that students can use toward learning goals, a classroom library that provides choices and reading accessibility, the use of manipulatives for connections to abstract concepts and relevance, and effective transitions between activities.

Quadrant 2 of the EBP Tool focuses on instructional classroom practices. These include "I Do" practices involving frontloading, adequate response wait times, and explicit-systematic explanations that incorporate a variety of learning modalities and fosters engagement. It includes "We Do" practices that involve scaffolding, providing immediate and specific feedback, informal formative assessment that is responsive prior to independent practice, and a variety of problem-solving methods. It includes "You Do" practices for responsive independent practice that include coaching, monitoring, and time for mastery. It also provides lesson closure that reviews learning targets and learning assessment.

Quadrant 3 of the EBP Tool focuses on student interaction in the classroom. This includes students engaging in various collaborative learning expressions, text activities, goal setting and planning, and higher-order learning modalities. It also has the ability for students to make choices and present learning in various ways.

Quadrant 4 of the EBP Tool focuses on student engagement in the classroom. This includes students involved in activities with real-world relevance that are targeted to the zone of proximal development, are considerate of strength and needs, involve self-regulation, and allow for a high degree of student-lead communication. Quadrant 4 also includes differentiated activities with accommodations and modifications to content and process.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Focusing on data-based decision-making allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. This is not only done with data for general education but also for subgroups such as English language learners and special education students. It is only by the juxtaposition of both the aggregated and disaggregated data that administrators and teachers can make the most appropriate decisions, from curriculum to intervention and from the masses to the individual. Comprehensively and specifically using data to inform decisions is foundational for providing outcomes.

Focusing on cultural responsiveness allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. As an individual's outcomes are a product of their learning, learning is a product of experiences, and culture is a critical component of a student's experiences. It is essential to respect the cultural similarities and differences of all members of the learning community. Cultural diversity within and amongst people is a crucial component of how they have learned and will continue to learn. Respecting this diversity allows students and stakeholders to feel appreciated, to buy into the learning community, and to be motivated to learn within it. It can also be used as a filter to understand perspective, which is the window to understanding what an individual needs to learn and develop. Beyond the inherent nature of language's importance in accessing learning, culture is also important. As it is essential to understand the learning needs of a student with disabilities, it is imperative to understand that individual's perspective and learning components, including how culture has guided and continues to guide the process of learning.

Focusing on implementing a well-articulated curriculum allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. When the learning community develops a curriculum that accounts for the variety of learning components and equips the curriculum with tools that meet the variety of ways in which students learn, teachers can flexibly use that comprehensive framework to deliver that instruction with evidence-based practices to meet the needs of learners in general and as individuals. The tools for differentiating the curriculum are essential for students with disabilities to provide access to the curriculum.

Focusing on the incorporation of universal screening and progress monitoring allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning communities

appropriately. By screening at several points through the year, members of the learning community have reliable data for growth and the development of foundational learning skills. The resulting data can then be used for comparison to prior learning and other groups/subgroups for the development of learning targets and toward the categorization and initial application of learning groups. Then after diagnostic and refinement where needed, the learning plan and progress can be monitored to make adjustments that provide for developmental precision and the highest potential for positive outcomes. This includes screening and monitoring for behavioral development as a factor for learning access and their outcomes.

Focusing on interventions and supports allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. After reliable data is used to determine a student's needs, it is vitally important for the progression of learning to meet the more specific and involved needs with a structure and learning plan to meet those needs. While this may mean that a zone for optimal learning can be found within a small group structure, it may also mean that the zone for optimal learning can only be met through an individualized learning structure and plan. Meeting student needs includes having interventions and supports for behavioral development as a factor for learning access and their resulting outcomes.

Focusing on having an inclusive classroom learning environment allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classrooms appropriately. Much like respecting cultural diversity, an inclusive learning environment provides students the ability to feel appreciated, buy into the learning community, and be motivated to learn within it. It can also provide a support structure that offers learning accessibility and paves the way for improved outcomes.

Focusing on instructional classroom practices allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classroom appropriately. At the center of pedagogy, effective instructional practices include an intimate knowledge of subject matter, learning tools, and of students, from the individual members of the group to the dynamics of the group itself. Further, effective instructional practices involve a nuanced plan to meet these needs and a skillful implementation of scaffolding that also requires constant monitoring of feedback and adjustment throughout the process toward skill independence. Particular attention has to be paid to this arena of practices because of how multi-faceted, interconnected, and critical these practices are for positive student outcomes.

Focusing on student interactions allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classrooms appropriately. When students experience a variety of ways to interact with the learning process, content, materials, and with others, they can make cognitive connections and experience development to a greater degree. They also have more opportunities to make choices, take ownership of their learning, and experience drive toward positive outcomes.

Focusing on student engagement allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classroom appropriately. In connection with interactions, engagement also includes the identification of strengths and needs, and the skillful use of differentiation to meet those needs. Targeting these individual facets of learning will provide positive outcomes for individuals.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The Success Gaps Rubric & Action Plan (SGR & AP) - Activity EBPs:

The SEA Team has been using two primary avenues to monitor SGR & AP activity process and assess framework fidelity. After the fall submission of SY 2020–2021, the SGR & AP activity documentation was audited for the 11 most overlooked evidence-based practices. Where levels of implementation depended upon evidence-based practices such as the implementation of curriculum with fidelity, PEA SSIP teams addressed these practices in evidence narratives 34.1% of the time, on average. This was the driving force behind significant formatting revisions that included targeted evidence prompts before providing a level of implementation in SY 2021–2022, and more refining format revisions, such as changing evidence checkboxes to Y/N boxes in SY 2022–2023. While the significant format revisions resulted in PEA SSIP Teams addressing these 11 specific practices at an average of almost 80% in SY 2021–2022, the refining format revisions have resulted in PEA SSIP Teams addressing these practices at an average of 87.8% in SY 2022–2023.

The SGR & AP: Activity Process: SY 2021–2022 SGR & AP revisions also came with a companion document for providing PEA SSIP Teams feedback on framework fidelity, with the SGR & AP Fidelity Feedback Guide (FFG). After the initial Year 1 Fall submission, SEA SSIP Team Specialists use the FFG to review the SGR & AP for such elements as Rubric evidence being addressed, levels of implementation being provided, Action initiatives aligning to Rubric needs, and that PEAs target the unimplemented practices from the Rubric evidence within their targeted initiatives. In SY 2022–2023, the fall SGR & AP submission is up 6% to 94.2%.

The SGR & AP: Activity Outcomes: For an indication of not only fidelity of implementation and practice change, but also for the goal of systemic improvement and student outcomes as outlined in the SSIP Theory of Action, the SEA SSIP Team reviews growth in SGR levels of implementation for Cohorts that have completed three years in SSIP. For Cohort 3, this meant that the 12 PEAs pursued 36 AP initiatives across all five indicator groups and grew an average of 92% toward one full level of implementation.

The most targeted indicator group of the SGR for Cohort 3 was the Core Instructional Program group, comprising half of all Cohort 3 initiatives and growing an average of one full level of implementation during the three years in SSIP. For Cohort 3, it meant that almost every PEA that began SSIP in the Planning to Partially Implemented stages of a well-articulated curriculum, instruction based on research-based practices, and differentiated instruction reported either Full or Exemplary implementation before concluding SSIP. This connection between targeted initiatives and indicator growth would support fidelity of implementation, practice change, and systemic improvement.

The SSIP Survey: SGR & AP Activity Outcomes: Data to support fidelity of implementation and practice change also came from the SSIP Survey, an anonymous survey sent mid-year to all 35 PEAs in Years 1-3 in SSIP. In SY 2022–2023, when asked how the PEA SSIP Team would rate the outcomes of the Action Plan, every respondent reported at least some level of effectiveness from SGR & AP initiatives, while over 67.85% reported experiencing outcomes that were characterized as mostly or highly effective. When asked to expand the response, 82.6% of responses cited systemic improvement elements, such as collaborative planning with stakeholders, data-driven decision-making, improved support systems, and structures for planning and pursuing goals. 43.5% made a connection to outcomes such as an improvement in classroom practices, the professional development of staff, and student achievement.

The Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Walkthrough Process - SiMR Alignment: The SEA SSIP Team monitors the activity process and assesses framework fidelity by looking at the alignment between the intended process elements connected to the SSIP SiMR and the actual process elements recorded on the EBP Walkthrough Tool. Guidance for these elements is provided before implementation through correspondence, within supporting resources, and during collaboration. In SY 2022–2023, the elements include walkthroughs being conducted within K-3 classrooms with SWD and the walkthrough being conducted during literacy instruction. For the fidelity element of grade-level alignment to the SiMR, Cohort 4 submitted EBP Walkthrough Tools that aligned 73.3% of submission 1 and submission 2 in SY 2021–2022. This was with only virtual support being offered due to COVID-19 restrictions. With the added structure to support PEAs with the EBP Walkthrough Process in SY 2022–2023, Cohort 5 submitted EBP Walkthrough Tools that aligned 93.6% of the time for submission 1 and submission 2. For the fidelity element of subject focus alignment to the SiMR, 100% of Cohort 4 submission 1 and submission 2 walkthroughs were conducted during literacy instruction in SY 2021–2022, while 95.5% of submission

1 and submission 2 walkthroughs were conducted during literacy instruction by Cohort 5 in SY 2022–2023. Both Cohort 5 PEAs that accounted for this modest drop in fidelity for instructional alignment conducted classroom walkthroughs during literacy instruction for submission 1, but then each switched one classroom to math instruction for submission 2. This fidelity issue will initiate improved guidance between submission periods from now on.

The EBP Walkthrough Process - Data Reliability: To balance capacity and data reliability concerns, PEAs are required to submit at least two completed EBP Classroom Walkthrough Tools at each of the three submission periods during Year 2, and two or more of the Tools contain data from a consistent classroom throughout the three submissions. In SY 2021–2022, Cohort 4 submitted two or more consistent walkthrough tools 90.5% of the time, and Cohort 5 submitted two or more consistent walkthrough tools 89.5% of the time in SY 2022–2023. While this was a slight drop in classroom alignment between last year and this year, most instances were reported as either the teacher being unavailable due to illness or a scheduling conflict.

The EBP Walkthrough Process - EBP Walkthrough Activity Outcomes: At the completion of Year 2 in SSIP, the SEA SSIP Team reviews the growth in evidence-based classroom practices during the school year as both a representation of activity outcomes and an indication of implementation fidelity. Looking at the difference between EBP Tools from the first to the final submission of the school year, for EBP Tools from the same SiMR-aligned classroom, Cohort 4 added an average of five evidence-based practices to each classroom by the end of Year 2 in SY 2021–2022. In comparison, Cohort 3 added an average of two evidence-based practices to each classroom by the end of Year 2, the previous year. However, for context, Cohort 3 data is less reliable because it was collected in a year when COVID-19 concerns caused many classrooms to vacillate between virtual, hybrid, and onsite instruction.

The EBP Survey - EBP Walkthrough Activity Outcomes: Data to support fidelity of implementation and practice change also came from the EBP Survey, an anonymous survey sent after submission 2 to the 11 PEAs in Year 2 of SSIP. When asked about the level of support provided by the SEA SSIP Team to complete the EBP Walkthrough through collaboration and resources, 90.5% characterized the support as mostly to highly supportive. Then, when allowed to describe any positive activity outcomes that PEA SSIP Teams experienced in connection to the EBP Walkthrough Process, PEAs described integrating peer observations into the process, providing targeted professional development based on the data, expanding the process to include classrooms beyond what is needed for SSIP submission, and experiencing growth in evidence-based classroom practices.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The Success Gaps Rubric & Action Plan (SGR & AP): Yearly Targeted-Indicator Growth:

To monitor the progress of practice change and systemic improvement, the SEA SSIP Team looks at the growth of SGR implementation levels for indicators connected to AP initiatives after being implemented during the most recent one-year period. At the mid-year point of SY 2022–2023, this means looking at what PEA SSIP Teams are reporting for levels of implementation between the fall submission of SY 2021–2022 and the fall Submission of SY 2022–2023 for Cohorts 4 and 5. This data informs decisions, such as to continue using the evidence-based practices with the current level of support or to provide additional support to PEAs for improved progress and positive practice change.

Looking at the average difference of all 51 indicators that were targeted with initiatives by Cohorts 4 and 5 PEAs, 27 of the 51 indicators showed growth of at least one level of implementation between fall SGR submissions. However, looking at the cohorts separately, Cohort 4 reported only 8 of 25 indicators showing growth, while Cohort 5 reported 19 of 26 indicators showing growth.

Pertaining to initiatives that targeted Data-Based Decision Making indicator over the past year, one of three PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 4 reported growing one level of implementation. One of two PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 5 reported growing one level of implementation over the past year.

Pertaining to initiatives that targeted the Cultural Responsiveness indicator group over the past year, one of two PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 4 reported growing one level of implementation. Two of three PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 5 reported growing one level of implementation over the past year.

Pertaining to initiatives that targeted the Core Instructional Program indicator group over the past year, three of eleven PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 4 reported growing one level of implementation. Six of eight PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 5 reported growing at least one level of implementation over the past year, with two of those PEA SSIP Teams reporting growth of two levels over the past year.

Pertaining to initiatives that targeted the Universal Screening & Progress Monitoring indicator group over the past year, two of four PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 4 reported growing one level of implementation, with one of the Teams reporting two full levels of growth. Six of seven PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 5 reported growing at least one level of implementation over the past year, with two of those PEA SSIP Teams reporting growth of two levels over the past year.

Pertaining to initiatives that targeted the Interventions & Supports indicator group over the past year, one of five PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 4 reported growing one level of implementation. In contrast, four of six PEA SSIP Teams in Cohorts 5 reported growing one level of implementation over the past year.

While the data does indicate the level of progress that would substantiate continued use of these evidence-based practices, it also indicates significantly more moderate growth for Cohort 4 than Cohort 5. Therefore, the SSIP Team will continue to use this method of disaggregating the progress monitoring data by cohort to track the extent to which the growth difference is a product of different cohorts, or an indication of decelerated growth in targeted indicators between the first and second fall-to-fall submission periods.

The Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Walkthrough Tool: Growth in Classroom Practices by Quadrant:

To monitor the progress of practice change and systemic improvement, the SEA SSIP Team looks at the growth in practices on the EBP Walkthrough Tool between submission periods in accordance with the SSIP Evaluation Plan. At the mid-year point of SY 2022–2023, this means comparing the recorded practices between the first EBP Tool submission in October and the second EBP Tool submission in December and comparing SY 2022–2023 for Cohort 5 to that of Cohort 4 during the previous year. For notable context, Cohort 4 showed an overall average decrease within every quadrant between submission 1 and submission 2, only to show a net increase in every quadrant after submission 3 in March of last year.

Looking at Quadrant 1 for an Inclusive Learning Environment in SY 2022–2023, each observed classroom in Cohort 5 averages 12.3 EBPs for submission 1 and 12 EBPs for submission 2. While this shows a slight decrease between submissions for Cohort 5 this year, Cohort 4 only reported an average of 7.9 EBPs per classroom in Quadrant 1, for submission 2. This would mean that in SY 2022–2023, Cohort 5 classrooms are averaging 4.1 more EBPs per classroom than Cohort 4 classrooms were at the same time last year.

Looking at Quadrant 2 for Instructional Practices in SY 2022–2023, each observed classroom in Cohort 5 averages 11.0 EBPs for submission 1 and 11.6 EBPs for submission 2. This shows a slight increase in the average practices per classroom for this quadrant in SY 2022–2023. In contrast, while Cohort 4 began the year by reporting an average of 4.2 more EBPs per classroom in this quadrant, they experienced a drop of 2.6 EBPs per classroom by submission 2. Cohort 5 now has the same average EBPs per classroom that Cohort 4 had for the second submission the previous year.

Looking at Quadrant 3 for Student Interactions in SY 2022–2023, each observed classroom in Cohort 5 averages 7.9 EBPs for submission 1 and 7.6 EBPs for submission 2. Although Cohort 4 also showed a decrease between submission 1 and submission 2 last year, the average EBPs per classroom in the quadrant began at an average of 9.2 EBPs, falling to 8.1 EBPs by submission 2. This would indicate that while the decrease in SY 2022–2023 was more modest, the Cohort 5 EBPs per classroom is behind Cohort 4 from the same time last year by an average of .5 EBPs.

Looking at Quadrant 4 for Student Engagement in SY 2022–23, each observed classroom in Cohort 5 averages 10.1 EBPs for submission 1 and 10.9 EBPs for submission 2. Compared to last year, while Cohort 4 began the year with an average of 10.7 EBPs per classroom by submission 1, the

average fell to 8.4 EBPs per classroom by submission 2. This would indicate that in SY 2022-23, Cohort 5 is an average of 2.5 EBPs per classroom ahead of where Cohort 4 was for the quadrant last year at the same time.

Average Classroom EBPs by EBP Tool Quadrant for Submission 2 (December):

Cohort 4 in SY 2021–2022

Quadrant 1: 7.9
Quadrant 2: 11.6
Quadrant 3: 8.1
Quadrant 4: 8.4

Cohort 5 in SY 2022–2023

Quadrant 1: 12.0
Quadrant 2: 11.6
Quadrant 3: 7.6
Quadrant 4: 10.9

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The Success Gaps Rubric & Action Plan (SGR & AP):

Despite all targeted indicator groups of evidence-based practices in the SGR & AP currently showing progress that exceeds one full level of implementation during SSIP, PEAs have reported modest progress for the Data-Based Decision Making indicator, as compared to other indicator Groups over the past three years. This relatively modest growth is occurring while the indicator is also showing a decreasing rate of being targeted with initiatives over this time. To bring awareness to this trend and toward the possibility of aligned initiatives, the SEA SSIP Team intends to disseminate this data, specifically targeting this indicator group in connection to the indicator group for Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring. The SEA SSIP Team will continue to collaborate with agency partners regarding opportunities for additional support and will continue to improve partnerships and look for professional development opportunities to support SSIP PEAs in practices for Data-Based Decision Making.

Although the evidence-based practices within the Cultural Responsiveness indicator group of the SGR & AP have shown improved progress over the past year, there has also been a significant increase in PEAs targeting these indicators with initiatives in SY 2022-23. In SY 2022-23, The SEA-SSIP Team will not only be looking for opportunities to support these PEA initiatives with professional development but also with funding. For example, six of the SY 2022–2023 initiatives to address Culturally Responsive practices come from 4 of the 16 PEAs in Cohort 6. Three of those four PEAs accepted the SSIP Contract, which can provide these PEAs with up to \$5,000 to support the initiatives for Cultural Responsiveness. The SEA SSIP Team will then begin tracking not only SGR levels of implementation connected to AP initiatives but also the subgroup of targeted indicators being supported by SSIP Contract funding, compared to those not being funded for this and other indicator groups. If the SEA SSIP Team can show a connection between funding and initiative support and the progress in levels of implementation, this can then be disseminated to PEAs for the anticipated outcome of more SSIP PEAs pursuing SSIP Contract funding.

While PEAs continue to heavily target the Core Instructional Program indicator group of the SGR with AP initiatives, and while Cohort 3 targeted this group with a 60% share of initiatives as compared to other indicator groups, Cohorts 5-6 have targeted this indicator group with around a 30% share of initiatives. Despite the indicator group continuing to show good progress for practice change, this shift will be monitored. If PEAs begin to show inadequate progress, the SEA SSIP Team will highlight the connection between the lack of progress to a reduction in initiatives and would subsequently anticipate more PEA SSIP Teams pursuing Core Instructional Program initiatives as a result.

The indicator group for Universal Screening & Progress Monitoring of the SGR & AP has shown an increase in being targeted over the past few years and offers the most progress of any initiative group over the past year. To further augment the momentum from MOWR initiatives that appear to have already paid dividends to levels of implementation reported on the SGR, the SEA SSIP Team will begin analyzing MOWR Literacy Plans to look for initiative alignment opportunities with SSIP Action Plans. Where alignment exists, the SEA SSIP Team will highlight these opportunities for PEAs to work within the capacity and allow initiatives to leverage one another for improved outcomes.

PEAs have increased initiatives targeting the Interventions & Supports indicator-group for each of the past four cohorts and are now being targeted to the same extent as Core Instructional Programs for Cohort 6. With the increase in targeted initiatives, there has also been an increase in progress for the level of implementation. The SEA SSIP Team will continue to ensure professional development is available to support the initiatives that target the indicator group for further improvement of activity outcomes.

The Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Walkthrough Process:

Regarding the evidence-based practices of the EBP Walkthrough Process, providing Year 2 PEAs with targeted support that includes onsite support in SY 2022–2023 has shown positive activity outcomes for implementation fidelity and progress to improve evidence-based classroom practices. The SEA SSIP Team will continue to pursue activity improvements, such as improving implementation fidelity by providing deliberate guidance to ensure PEAs conduct walkthroughs during literacy instruction. However, the PEA SSIP Team will continue to be aware of any revisions that would further stress the capacity of SSIP PEAs, especially during Year 2. While the EBP Survey respondents reported already feeling a high level of activity support in SY 2022–2023, 57.14% also reported going further than SSIP activity expectations for submission to include expanded rollout of walkthroughs, several also reported challenges to implementation that include staffing and time constraints. Therefore, the SEA SSIP Team will identify and look for opportunities to support PEAs with expanded rollout without scaling up the SSIP activity expectations. For example, for PEA SSIP Teams that can proceed with expanded rollout, the SEA-SSIP Team will add a section to the EBP Process Guide: After Walkthroughs document highlighting specific opportunities for EBP professional development and process-driven development data analysis. This addition should support activity outcomes without stressing capacity.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

There is reliable data to support SSIP activities being implemented with significant fidelity, as evidenced by the increasingly high level of fidelity data connected to the SGR & AP and EBP Walkthrough activities and supported by intentional survey questions and positive survey responses. There is reliable data to support SSIP activities yielding positive outcomes, as evidenced by the improvement in SGR levels of implementation and EBP Walkthrough Tool classroom practices. According to PEA SSIP Team survey responses, the feedback indicates that PEAs experience positive activity outcomes and a high level of support through the SSIP Process. Lastly and most importantly, this evidence for systemic improvement shows a connection to positive student outcomes, as evidenced by the SiMR data.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy input concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan, was reported to specific groups, such as special education directors and parents, during structured stakeholder sessions. Two one-hour sessions were included as part of ADE’s monthly director forums, and three one-hour sessions were coordinated with Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions and were shown how to access the public comment page if they would like to provide relevant feedback.

For SSIP, stakeholders include all people who are invested in the outcomes for students with disabilities in SSIP PEAs. Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, individuals with disabilities, teachers, administrators, parents and family members of students with disabilities, intra-agency partners, interagency partners, officials for homeless assistance, representatives for foster care and juvenile facility placement, and SEA specialists. Stakeholder input includes collaborative efforts toward documenting and implementing activities and providing feedback, whether collected formally or informally, through correspondence or verbal discourse. Feedback may be received in the body of an email, during meetings, or through survey results.

Other than SEAP, as described above, the stakeholder groups that contribute toward the outcomes for students with disabilities include:

PEA SSIP Teams:

PEA SSIP Teams are typically comprised of 4–6 members of learning community leadership, often including the special education director, principals, and assistant principals, instructional specialists and coaches, and teachers in both special and general education. These PEA SSIP Teams are the primary stakeholders involved with the SGR self-assessment, the AP documentation and implementation, and in conducting EBP walkthroughs to collect and develop classroom practices. They meet monthly and quarterly to review initiative goals, available resources to meet those goals, how to mitigate or circumvent barriers to goal progress, and to use progress monitoring data to fortify or revise plans toward goals.

PEA SSIP Learning Community Members:

As the implementation of initiatives from the SGR and AP activity depends on a variety of stakeholders within PEA learning communities, they are integral SSIP stakeholders. This group includes not only administrators, but also school leadership, instructional coaches and specialists, teachers, support staff, and families. School principals are a primary source of feedback for the EBP survey.

Raising Special Kids (RSK):

RSK is Arizona’s parent training and information center. As a conduit to parents and their perspectives, the RSK group assists with soliciting feedback on SSIP activities and outcomes.

Special Education Directors:

Special education directors are the leaders of PEA SSIP Teams, are members of SEAP, are the principal source of feedback at the Special Education Check-In meetings, and are the primary respondents of the SSIP Survey. They also provide continuous communication through the progress of SSIP activities as the primary contact for the SEA at PEAs.

Literacy Initiatives Work Group (LIWG):

Meeting quarterly, the LIWG is an opportunity for literacy development stakeholders between special and general education within the SEA to come together and share progress on agency initiatives, progress toward outcomes, professional development status, and alignment opportunities. The group includes members from K–12 Academic Standards, Exceptional Student Services (ESS) Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS), Early Childhood Education, ESS Early Childhood, Assessment, ESS Program Support and Monitoring, and ESS Special Projects.

Move On When Reading (MOWR):

Arizona’s MOWR policy is designed to provide students with evidence-based, effective reading instruction in kindergarten through third grade to position them for success as they progress through school, college, and career. MOWR is supported by state legislation that explains the requirements for pupil promotion, early literacy instruction, and accountability for student achievement in reading. Operating within ADE/Academic Standards, the SEA-MOWR Team collects literacy screener data and literacy plans for Arizona students in grades K–3.

ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring (PSM):

Specialists in ESS/PSM are the primary contacts between the SEA and PEA, involving initiating, submitting, and progressing through SSIP activities. They are also a source of ongoing feedback through all forms of communication and from monthly PSM meetings.

ADE/ESS:

ADE/ESS holds monthly meetings to share information and progress and to collect feedback from other perspectives within the SEA. The ESS group includes PSM, Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS), Operations, Special Projects, Early Childhood Special Education, and Dispute Resolution. It also collaborates regularly with agency partners such as Assessment, Unique Populations, and K–12 Academic Standards.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The SEA collects informal feedback continuously while collaborating with PEAs. Through ESS/PSM Specialists and the ESS/SSIP Coordinator, the SEA communicates directly with PEA Special Education Directors and PEA SSIP Teams before each activity submission and throughout the year whenever questions arise. Directors and PEA SSIP Teams collaborate toward documenting and implementing SSIP activities. PEA SSIP Teams then engage their learning community to become active stakeholders toward goals and outcomes.

Feedback from PEA learning communities is communicated through PEA SSIP Teams and special education directors and is collected through meeting notes and written correspondence. The feedback is aggregated and categorized into a document for continuous improvement. This information is presented to agency leadership during collaboration to determine if feedback would provide for activity and student outcomes and is actionable. If both criteria are met, the feedback is put into practice depending on when it is actionable. The SEA collects formal feedback through the SSIP and EBP Survey in early December of each year and surveys after presentations to stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Check-In group, SEAP, and RSK. This feedback is then used toward continuous improvement efforts.

Interagency presentations are delivered quarterly to LIWG, SEA members within ESS, and PEA specialists within PSM. In addition to feedback toward activity improvements, collaboration within the SEA often includes opportunities to connect professional development with ongoing PEA initiatives from agency partners. PEAs are generally alerted to professional development opportunities from various SEA listserv emails but are specifically alerted when there is an opportunity to pair an expressed need from an action initiative with a professional development offering.

PEA SSIP Teams, Special Education Directors, and Learning Community Members: While special education directors are the primary contact for every communication between the SEA and PEA learning communities, PEA SSIP Teams are often included in the regular correspondence to discuss activity submission and progress. This collaborative structure is how key improvement efforts circulate from the SEA to PEA SSIP Teams and PEA learning communities and is the most consistent means of collecting feedback from PEA learning communities and PEA SSIP Teams for SSIP Improvements. Feedback is encouraged, recorded, shared with agency stakeholders, and continuously used toward SSIP improvement efforts. Annually, SSIP process and outcome information is disseminated to Special Education Directors and learning community members at the Director's Check-In and Special Education Check-In group. When presented with information that could be used toward strengthening the SSIP process, the group is polled about their experience and perspective. In conjunction with SSIP feedback, this helps to clarify the information and guide support in the SSIP Process.

SEAP: Annually, the SEA SSIP Team presents activity and student outcomes to SEAP. The SEA SSIP Team receives feedback on progress and process implementation through meeting and survey responses. Some examples of past feedback that has been collected and that has led to key SSIP improvements include the alignment with MOWR and setting six-year targets for progress toward the SiMR.

RSK: Annually, the RSK group allows the SEA SSIP Team to present activity and student outcomes to parents of students with disabilities and to solicit their feedback. In SY 2021–2022, to juxtapose the responses from PEA SSIP Teams on the four SGR indicators that pertain to family engagement, the SEA SSIP Team asked RSK attendees for their perspectives on the implementation of systems to inform and engage families. In SY 2022–2023, the SEA SSIP Team presented data showing that the average level of implementation for each of the four family engagement indicators has declined in the past two fall submission periods. This decline was accompanied by a significant increase in PEA SSIP Teams targeting each of these indicators with initiatives. The SEA SSIP Team then polled RSK attendees about their perspective on whether elements of family engagement were areas of strength or need for PEAs.

LIWG: In SY 2022–2023, the SEA SSIP Team has provided valuable support opportunities to PEA SSIP Teams through the collaboration that takes place at LIWG meetings. For example, the SEA SSIP Team has used updates from Academic Standards and Professional Learning and Sustainability on the progress of professional learning opportunities such as Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) to address the statewide K–5 literacy endorsement initiative, in discussions with PEA SSIP Teams regarding Action Plan initiative alignment for evidence-based classroom practices.

ESS, ESS Leads, PSM, and PSM Leads: At monthly meetings, intra-agency stakeholders for the positive outcomes of students with disabilities come together to discuss all facets of supporting PEAs toward student growth, including literacy outcomes. Especially significant, these groups include the primary contacts for regular communication with PEA learning communities. Feedback toward improvement efforts often involves the consideration of PEA capacity, regularity and form of communication, and PEA community needs and concerns. In addition, there is collaboration between ESS members and units whenever different perspectives and ideas can be found as valuable to the progress of activities. For example, as one of the ESS units that provides trainings, resources, and technical assistance for evidence-based practices, the SEA SSIP Team collaborates closely with the SEA PLS Team. Members from each team share data and feedback and use the information to help guide the support provided to Arizona schools.

SEA/ESS Directors and Leadership: In addition to the continuous collaboration within ESS, ESS Teams that hold the primary responsibility for federal reporting present their indicator data and a summary of reporting information to ESS Leadership. This leadership includes ESS Leads, Directors, the Deputy Associate Superintendent (State Director of Special Education), and the Associate Superintendent. The presentation and subsequent discussions include a review of the historical data, targets, present levels, and the indication of slippage. If there is an indication of slippage, there is a collaboration amongst group members about the steps that need to be taken to address the slippage and to prevent slippage in the future.

ESS Projects: Every year, the SEA SSIP Team coordinates with ESS Projects on the distribution and approval of SSIP Contracts to support funding of SSIP initiatives. As Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) Specialists are not only members of the SEA SSIP Team but also the primary contact between the SEA and PEA on all monitoring activities, ESS Projects has begun including PSM Specialists on all correspondences in SY 2022–2023. This has kept contacts up-to-date and provided additional opportunities for support. In addition, the engagement of this important stakeholder toward integrating the CEAE form into the SGR & AP has been a key improvement effort.

Move On When Reading (MOWR): In the second year of alignment with MOWR in SY 2022–2023, the SEA MOWR Team is including the SEA SSIP Team on correspondence regarding MOWR literacy plans for SSIP PEAs. This has allowed for opportunities to provide additional support. For example, SEA SSIP Team members have incorporated initiatives documented in MOWR literacy plans into collaborative discussions with PEA SSIP Teams during EBP Walkthrough activity support meetings to highlight initiative and activity alignment.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Special Education Check-In Group:

In SY 2021–2022, the SEA SSIP Team presented SSIP activity and student outcomes to stakeholders at the monthly Special Education Director's Check-In meeting. While sharing activity outcomes, the SEA SSIP Team relayed SSIP Survey data regarding collaboration between Special Education (SpEd) and General Education (GenEd) and polled the Check-In group about their experience regarding collaboration. 71% of respondents

characterized collaborating with GenEd as no more than occasionally when setting goals, planning instruction, and monitoring student progress. After being renamed the Special Education Professionals Check-In group for greater inclusivity, the SEA SSIP Team again presented to this group of stakeholders in SY 2022–2023. The SEA SSIP Team relayed polling response data from the previous year, and according to this year's SSIP Survey, PEA SSIP Teams reported a higher level of collaboration between SpEd and GenEd, as opposed to the survey reporting from last year. Then, a poll was delivered to collect responses on the Check-In group's collaboration experience between the previous year and this year. Respondents reported an average 10.4% increase in collaboration this year, as opposed to last year. While the highest increase was in collaboration pertaining to communicating with families, over 13% of respondents reported experiencing increased collaboration regarding the planning of instruction. While this trend in collaboration is positive, the level of collaboration between SpEd and GenEd would still be a concern, especially with activities centered around planning instruction. This continuing concern was reinforced by a participant who asked about professional development opportunities to improve collaboration between Special and General Education.

At the conclusion of the January 2023 Special Education Check-In Group Meeting, to pair with general guidance toward the ESS website and professional development opportunities, the Director of Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS) cited the Arizona Professional Learning Series (AzPLS) as a specific opportunity for collaborative development. AzPLS covers a series of modules that helps to create systems change and increase literacy achievement through collaborative team structures. The SEA SSIP Team shared survey results with PLS members, and PLS members shared data showing how prior PEA AzPLS Teams have reported improvements in collaboration between GenEd and SpEd, resulting from participation in AzPLS. PLS members then shared plans for AzPLS scale-up, including the official launching of an informational website and sharing information through the ESS Special Education Directors listserv in the Spring of 2023. AzPLS plans on sharing components of the Series at the IDEA Conference and is building capacity to begin a new Cohort for participation in the Fall of 2023. The SEA SSIP Team will look for initiative alignment and reach out to PEAs through the SSIP Process. The SEA SSIP Team will add a question to the SSIP Survey pertaining to the literacy screener reporting activity to collect more information. The question will focus on how SpEd uses the data to collaborate with GenEd toward setting goals and planning instruction.

Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS):

A concern arose when the SEA SSIP Team discovered and shared data showing that while the SGR & AP indicator group with the highest average level of implementation in SY 2021–2022 was Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring, the lowest average level came from Data-Based Decision Making. In conjunction with other data and feedback being shared, this divide between having systems in place to collect data and having systems in place to make data-driven decisions became a concern for supporting PEAs with data literacy.

The SEA SSIP Team will continue to follow the data relationship between assessment and data-driven decision-making. Cohort 6's first SGR & AP submission in SY 2022–2023 shows a considerably higher average level of implementation for Data-Based Decision Making relative to Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring, which is a positive development at the initial stages of monitoring the data. The SEA SSIP Team will continue to provide PEA SSIP Teams with information about support mechanisms when there is AP initiative alignment to needs, such as the components of data-driven decision making within AzPLS, and the online modules and webinars being provided about Data-Based Individualization by the National Center on Intensive Intervention. The SEA SSIP Team will add a question to the SSIP Survey pertaining to the literacy screener reporting activity to collect more information. The question will focus on how the PEA learning community uses the data to drive program and instructional decisions.

RSK:

From the RSK poll, there were over 1.5 times the number of responses for areas of need as there were for areas of strength. Of the strengths, although providing family language services garnered the most responses of any category by English language respondents, it did not receive any responses by Spanish language respondents, although Spanish language respondents were a small sample set. In comparison to the area of strength, the most lopsided areas of need was in the practice of informing families about supports and services, such as special education and intervention, with three times the number of responses for need than strength. In contrast, the most significant drop in implementation over the past three fall submission periods, and the lowest average of the four overall, was for practices of families feeling welcomed and engaged, pertaining to cultural responsiveness. Both RSK respondents and PEA SSIP Teams aligned with their perspective that providing improved practices for families to be informed and engaged has become a need. Since PEA SSIP Teams have also increased the targeting of these indicators with initiatives, from 8 initiatives in SY 2021–2022 Fall to 17 initiatives in SY 2022–2023 Fall, the trend in the level of implementation will continue to be tracked and reported in the future. Of RSK respondents indicating a need to be informed about supports and services, such as special education and intervention, ESS will be providing a presentation on facilitated IEPs to the RSK group. The presentation will continue to bring awareness to this option for parents toward collaborative and student-focused IEP Teams being equipped to make sound decisions in the development of IEPs. In addition, for use at a future meeting, a poll will be developed to target what part of the process of providing supports and services about which families feel a further need to be informed. For example, the SEA SSIP Team will ask the extent to which the need exists when receiving services, evaluation, and understanding child find, during the IEP process or during SpEd or intervention services.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Activity Support for Fidelity - Success Gaps Rubric & Action Plan (SGR & AP):

Referencing the SSIP Evaluation Plan for Data Reliability, the SEA SSIP Team intends to provide additional support for PEAs on completing SGR & AP submissions, to improve framework and implementation fidelity further. Preliminarily, the SEA SSIP Team will provide an overview of the SGR & AP process and support materials before PEAs begin Year 1 in SSIP.

After each submission of the SGR & AP, the SEA SSIP Team provides feedback to PEA SSIP Teams using the Fidelity Feedback Guide (FFG). Currently, however, the system offers more specific feedback for the initial completion in Year 1 and then more generalized feedback after that. After looking at the progression of feedback and subsequent submission, it has been determined that while most PEA SSIP Teams use the feedback toward subsequent activity completion with improved fidelity, some PEA SSIP Teams may need more support to show evidence of using the feedback. For SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team will provide PEAs with an FFG that includes more specific feedback for subsequent submissions, according to the most significant trends in missing fidelity elements and within the expectations that were provided on the initial SGR & AP submission. In addition, the SEA SSIP Team will track the connection between the FFG and improved fidelity and schedule SGR & AP meetings with PEA SSIP Teams in Year 2 that have not shown improvement in fidelity, according to the data. The fidelity issues will be reviewed, and subsequent fidelity data will be tracked.

Data Structures - Incorporating External Data Sources for Analysis and Display:

In addition to data that informs the connection between activity and student outcomes, the SSIP has begun collecting data from variables that could also influence outcomes for students in SSIP PEAs. This includes a structure for the yearly incorporation of October 1 Child Count data for disability by category and least restrictive environment designations. The data would also include variables such as race/ethnicity, English Language, income eligibility, geographic area, recruitment and retention survey results, and the incidence of PEAs that also carry a Targeted Support and Improvement

designation. The SEA SSIP Team will create a data dashboard to display the data, disseminate the information to internal stakeholders, and explore the usefulness of the data and display format.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

SGR & AP Support:

The SEA SSIP Team will revise the subsequent submission portions of the FFGs in February of 2023 and replace the existing sections before SGR & AP reminders go to PEA SSIP Teams at the beginning of March. Also, in February, and not contingent on the revised forms due to expectation maintenance, PEA SSIP Teams with ongoing fidelity issues will be contacted and scheduled for a brief review of fidelity data. Subsequent fidelity data will be collected in April of 2023 to assess the expected improvement of fidelity.

Data and Display:

The SEA SSIP Team anticipates being able to receive and analyze a reliable datasheet of FY23 October 1 data in February of 2023, begin building a data dashboard with the incorporation of other subgroup data in March 2023, and be able to present the data to internal stakeholders starting in April or May 2023. Through analysis and feedback, if any data is agreed upon as relevant to such activities as disseminating the information externally, strengthening stakeholder relationships, or revising process activities, the SEA SSIP Team would explore the possibility of pursuing these activities through the months of May–July and before the beginning of SY 2023–2024.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

SGR & AP Support:

The notable barrier to conducting the SGR & AP fidelity meetings will be the capacity of both SEA and PEA SSIP Teams. This barrier will be moderated by the fidelity meetings before the spring submission rather than before the fall submission. In addition, SEA SSIP Teams will only schedule a few of the PEA SSIP Teams with the lowest fidelity at first and then expand the process to include other teams if the process proves efficient and effective.

Data and Display:

The data project will produce a sizable amount of data to process. Barriers will include incorporating the data into a common format, organizing the data for substantive analysis, and creating a dashboard that provides for substantive analysis from various perspectives. It will be a challenge to isolate the variables that may have the greatest effect on practice change and student outcomes. It may also be a challenge to align activities and relationships that affect these variables. For example, suppose two different stakeholder groups have their own processes and evidence to support those processes. In that case, even if data shows that aligning those processes may provide for capacity concerns and leveraging outcomes, change may elicit resistance to alignment.