

## **MSIP Look Fors in State SSIP Reports**

**Caryn Ward, Kathleen Ryan Jackson, Barbara Sims, Dale Cusumano,  
Karen Blase, Dean Fixsen**

**National Implementation Research Network**

**State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Programs**

**University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**

“Look fors” are observable indicators of more complete and complex processes related to a major goal. The indicators are what reviewers *look for* when visiting a state, reading documents, or discussing plans and progress with participants in SSIP activities.

The following sections follow the overall State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) outline provided by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). In each section key implementation-related questions are posed; questions that relate to factors essential to systemic and sustainable change.

### **SSIP Component: Infrastructure Development**

1. Is there a description of how the Chief State School Officer (CSSO)/Deputy CSSO/State Directors and other leaders in general and special education will actively support the pursuit of the goals in the SSIP, the collection of SIMR data, and the system change efforts?
  - a. Is there a description of a communication plan detailing how state leaders continually express their support for the systemic changes described in the SSIP?
2. Are the specific improvement strategies identified for infrastructure development consistent with results of analyses conducted in Phase I?
  - a. Is there evidence to show how identified strategies improve SEA's ability to support LEAs?
  - b. Is there evidence of actions needed to ensure improvement strategies are in alignment with (i.e. fit) other statewide initiatives and improvement plans? If not, are specific steps outlined to develop alignment?
3. Are implementation team(s) at the state, regional, and district levels identified?
  - a. A team of 4-5 or more individuals who are held accountable for improving 1) the infrastructure and 2) the competency of staff (e.g. leaders, administrators, teachers)?
  - b. Is the team comprised of individuals who have demonstrated the knowledge, skills, and abilities to effect change within the SEA?
4. Is there a description of efforts to prepare SEA departments/offices/units for systemic change? For example, sharing the vision, methods, changes required, processes to support change, etc.

### **SSIP Component: Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence Based Practices (EBPs)**

1. Is there a description of the evidence that supports the selection of EBPs?
  - a. Are there outcome data to support the effectiveness of the EBP? *Barely sufficient* evidence is a state's experience with the intervention and a consensus that it is effective.
  - b. Is there any evidence to show the intervention will help solve the problem as stated?

- i. For example, if the stated target problem is disparity in literacy outcomes for students with IEPs and/or in low performing schools as compared to the general population of students; then does the SSIP identify one or more instances where use of the intervention has reduced disparities between students with IEPs and/or in low performing schools and the general population of students?
2. Is there a description of initiating work with the ready, willing, and able while continuing to help other units get ready for change?
  - a. Are descriptions of activities to guide SEA specific divisions and regions, districts, and schools in the education system included that align to:
    - i. The vision, goals, methods, and expected outcomes; and
    - ii. The support (training, coaching, resources) that will be provided to accomplish the change.
3. Is fidelity assessment described? That is, is there a description of how to determine if a person/group is using a plan/intervention as intended?
  - a. Is there a description of the fidelity measure, how often it is administered, and how it is used to improve staff supports, instruction, and student outcomes?
  - b. Are data linking fidelity with staff/student outcomes provided or referenced (e.g., higher fidelity = better outcomes; lower fidelity = poorer outcomes)?
4. Is a description of a training plan presented?
  - a. How are pre-post assessments of training used to improve the training delivery system?
5. Is a description of a coaching service delivery plan provided?
  - a. Does it include a schedule that describes the frequency, duration, and content of observations/ feedback by a person named as a coach?
  - b. Is an assessment of coaching effectiveness/usefulness identified? If so, are data used to improve coaching and staff/student outcomes?
6. Is there a description of the support districts will be provided to change how schools are led/administered/managed so that identified intervention(s) can be delivered effectively and efficiently by all staff/teachers?

### **SSIP Component: Evaluation**

1. Are assessments conducted at State, regional, district, and/or school levels to inform action planning and monitor progress toward systemic change?
  - a. Is a description of the frequency, duration, and content of assessments provided?
  - b. Is there a description of how the data are used to improve staff performance and student outcomes?
2. Is there a description of using data/experience to improve system change efforts, use of the EBPs in practice, and usefulness of supports for staff and organizations in the system?
  - a. For example, is there a plan, a description of how the plan was attempted, some indication of the outcomes of attempting the plan, action planning to improve the plan, and use of the new plan with the next cohort/wave of units involved in systemic change?
3. Is there a description of how results of evaluation and assessments will be shared with identified stakeholders and, if so, with whom and how often?