

State:

Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool

Overview

The focus of Phase II is on building State capacity to support local educational agencies (LEAs) with the implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs) that will lead to measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SIMR) for children with disabilities. Phase II builds on the data and infrastructure analyses, coherent improvement strategies, and the theory of action developed in Phase I. The Plan developed in Phase II includes the activities, steps, and resources required to implement the coherent improvement strategies, with attention to the research on evidence-based practices and implementation, timelines for implementation and measures needed to evaluate implementation, and impact on the SIMR(s) for children with disabilities.

The Part B SSIP Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool is based on the three components described in Phase II of the Measurement Table under Indicator 17 (Part B). Those components are 1) Infrastructure Development; 2) Support for LEA Implementation of EBPs; and 3) Evaluation. Phase II builds on the five components developed in Phase I.¹ Phase II must be submitted by April 1, 2016 as part of the FFY 2014 SPP/APR. *The Phase II components are in addition to Phase I content (including any updates).*

Using the Tool

The main purpose of the guidance and review tool is to support the following activities:

- 1) OSEP, States, stakeholders, and technical assistance (TA) partners will engage in dialogue around components of the Phase II SSIP as they apply to the State's improvement efforts focusing on the State Educational Agency's (SEA's) capacity to support LEAs in implementing IDEA and improving outcomes for children and youth with disabilities;
- 2) OSEP will review the Plans that the States submit on April 1, 2016 as part of the FFY 2014 SPP/APR to ascertain a State's progress in its improvement efforts; and
- 3) OSEP, States, stakeholders, and TA partners will determine TA and support needs of States.

Guidance and Review Worksheet

| Phase II Component # 1: Infrastructure Development |
|--|
| Component #1 Elements |
| <p>1(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support LEAs to implement and scale up EBPs to improve the SIMR for children with disabilities.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the specific improvement activities that the State will use to improve the State infrastructure and how will those activities improve the State's ability to support LEAs?• As informed by the analysis in Phase I, how will the changes in State infrastructure support LEAs in implementing the coherent improvement strategies and activities in a sustainable manner? |

¹ The components in Phase I of the SSIP are 1) Data Analysis, 2) Infrastructure Analysis, 3) SIMR, 4) Coherent Improvement Strategies, and 5) Theory of Action.

State:

1(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives in the State, including general and special education, which impact children with disabilities.

Questions to consider:

- What are the current improvement plans and initiatives in the State, including general and special education, that impact children with disabilities?
- What are the specific steps the State has taken to further align current statewide initiatives and improvement plans that impact children with disabilities?
- How is the State aligning and leveraging the current improvement plans across the State Educational Agency (SEA), including general and special education, and how will this work specifically impact children with disabilities?

1(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.

Questions to consider:

- Who makes up the team that will identify the infrastructure changes critical to implementation of the Plan?
- What resources will be needed to achieve the expected outcomes?
- What are the timelines to complete changes to the infrastructure and build capacity within the State to better support the LEAs' programs?

1(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the SEA , as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Questions to consider:

- In an effort to better support LEAs, how does the SSIP promote collaboration within the SEA and among other State agencies to improve the State's infrastructure?
- What mechanisms will the State use to involve multiple offices and/or other State agencies in the improvement of the State's infrastructure?
- How will stakeholders be involved in the infrastructure development?

Discussion and Review Notes:

Phase II Component #2: Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs):

Component #2 Elements

2(a) Specify how the State will support LEAs in implementing the EBPs that will result in changes in LEA, school, and provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for children with disabilities.

Questions to consider:

- Did the State describe the evidence used to select EBPs that will be implemented?
- How did the State consider the LEA needs and the best fit for the coherent improvement strategies and EBPs?
- How did the State assess the readiness and capacity for implementation within LEAs, schools, and with personnel/providers?
- What implementation drivers are needed to effect change in LEA, school, and personnel/provider practices?
- What is the professional development (PD) or TA support for high-fidelity adoption, implementation, and sustainability of selected coherent improvement strategies and EBPs?
- How will the State support the LEA in scaling up EBPs?

State:

2(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies. Include communication strategies, stakeholder involvement, how identified barriers will be addressed; and who will implement activities and strategies; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

Questions to consider:

- What are the communication strategies the State will use to implement the Plan?
- How will stakeholders be involved in implementation and what are their decision-making roles during the planning stage?
- Given the barriers identified in Phase I, how are they being addressed within the Plan?
- How will the implementation teams at the LEA and local school levels ensure that personnel/providers are trained to implement the coherent improvement strategies and EBPs with fidelity?
- What are the short-term and long-term activities for each coherent improvement strategy and timelines for completion of those activities?

2(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the SEA (and other State agencies) to support LEAs in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the EBPs once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Questions to consider:

- How will the multiple offices within the SEA and other State agencies support the LEAs during the scaling up period and in sustaining the implementation of EBPs?
- How will the multiple offices within the SEA and other State agencies ensure that the steps and specific activities occur within the timelines?

Discussion and Review Notes:

Phase II Component #3: Evaluation

Component #3 Elements

3(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP. Specify its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for children and youth with disabilities.

Questions to consider:

- Will the evaluation be handled internally or externally, and are sufficient resources identified to conduct it?
- What are the identified measureable inputs (resources), outputs (strategies and activities), and short and long term outcomes?
- What are the links between the evaluation and the theory of action and other components of the SSIP? For example, has the State formulated evaluation questions that test its theory of action such as a question for each activity that asks, "To what extent did [an activity] produce a change in [an outcome]?" as well as questions to gauge progress in implementation of coherent improvement strategies? For example, "To what extent were milestones in implementation (number of sites, number of implementers trained to criterion proficiency on fidelity measures, number of coaches employed), reached on schedule?"

State:

3(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

Questions to consider:

- If different stakeholders were recruited for Phase II's evaluation, how were they recruited and what organizations or groups do they represent?
- How might the stakeholders participate in creating the evaluation questions to be asked and in judging the acceptability of the strategies used and outcomes achieved?
- How will stakeholders continue to be informed and provided opportunities to provide input on the evaluation process and/or results?

3(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

Questions to consider:

- How does the evaluation measure State infrastructure changes needed to better align current initiatives identified in the infrastructure analysis conducted in Phase I?
- What are the established criteria for successful implementation and will it be measured (e.g., level of proficiency on a fidelity measure)?
- What is the State's system for collecting implementation data and data applicable to the SIMR that yields valid and reliable data collected at regular intervals?
- If the State's evaluation process is based upon a sample of the target children with disabilities, how will the State ensure that the sample is representative of all of the children and youth receiving the EBPs or coherent improvement strategies?
- What comparison(s) will be made to demonstrate the effectiveness of the coherent improvement strategies? For example, did student results change over time (e.g., pre-post) or did results change when compared to other groups of students?

3(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation, assess the progress toward achieving intended improvements, and make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Questions to consider:

- How often are the data reviewed? Who is participating in the review? How are changes made to the implementation and improvement strategies as a result of the data reviews?
- How does the State evaluate the effectiveness of the TA and/or PD? If the TA and/or PD are determined to be ineffective, what is the process for making adjustments?
- What is the process the State will use to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary?

Discussion and Review Notes:

Phase II Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include:

Infrastructure development; support for LEA implementation of EBPs; evaluation; and stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Questions to consider:

State:

- How can OSEP and/or TA providers assist the State with addressing barriers to improving results for children and youth with disabilities?
- What assistance does the State need in order to apply research and utilize EBPs related to effective implementation (including TA and PD), systems change, and school reform?
- Other TA and support needed

Discussion and Review Notes: