State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Phase III, Year 2 Summary
IDEA Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report
Improving Outcomes for Children with Disabilities

Indicator 17
reporting portion of the Annual Performance Report to OSEP which includes SSIP/SiMR data
## Participating Sites by Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Elementary Sites</th>
<th>Middle School Sites*</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1 (participation start 2016-2017 school year)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2 (participation start 2017-2018 school year)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Middle school sites in RI often serve students in Grade 5, and many of the students identified in 2014 for the SiMR are now in middle school.*
SSIP Theory of Action

If....

Supports are provided for data-based decision making to inform intensive, individualized instructions in mathematics throughout the state,

then...

LEAs and schools will change systems and adult behaviors to increase their capacity to improve the proficiency level of students with disabilities,

... we will reach our student achievement goal!

We hypothesize that improving intensive and individualized instruction within a systematic framework of culturally and linguistically responsive supports for students with disabilities, particularly elementary Grades 3-5 Hispanic and Black children with specific learning disabilities in urban settings, will improve their performance on State assessments of math by 4% by FFY2018.
## SSIP Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-Term Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Training in Math</td>
<td>Training &amp; TA Tracking System</td>
<td><strong>Increased educator knowledge of DBI for math</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Teams use DBI with fidelity&lt;br&gt;- Decision rules and exit criteria in place at Tier 3 level&lt;br&gt;- Teaming structures at the Tier 2 level are refined&lt;br&gt;- Decision rules and exit criteria are in place at Tier 2 level&lt;br&gt;- Teams have knowledge of understanding of DBI&lt;br&gt;- Teams have content knowledge about Tier 1 math instruction</td>
<td><strong>Increased educator application of skills related to DBI for math</strong>&lt;br&gt;- EBPs in Math are adapted and individualized&lt;br&gt;- Individual progress monitoring goals are set using a variety of methods&lt;br&gt;- Teams select and implement a Tier 2 program or Math strategy with fidelity&lt;br&gt;- Teams have skills in [DBI steps 1-3]&lt;br&gt;- Assessment practices are refined and include considerations for ELL students</td>
<td><strong>Improved formative assessment outcomes for students receiving intensive math intervention</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Improved fidelity of school-level implementation of MTSS&lt;br&gt;- Improved LEA capacity to support, scale and sustain improvement efforts in urban settings and with diverse populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Training in DBI</td>
<td>Coaching Logs</td>
<td><strong>Increased parent or family awareness of intensive intervention and how to support their child</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Improved communication, coordination, collaboration, and alignment of RIDE initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Coaching</td>
<td>School Improvement Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA &amp; Support to implement</td>
<td>Parent-School Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage Parents &amp; Families</td>
<td>Artifacts from State Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align RIDE Initiatives as Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DBI: Data Based Individualization*
## Data sources and Timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Once per district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Year Pulse Check Math Beliefs Survey Data Driven Instruction Survey Universal Screening Data Progress Monitoring Data Stakeholder Engagement Survey State Assessment Data Coordination and Collaboration Survey</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training evaluation</td>
<td>After each training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation/Fidelity Tool Professional Learning Community capacity survey</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPIN Parent Interviews</td>
<td>At least 2x year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action plans prioritize 2-3 goals for the academic year related to increasing knowledge and implementation of common core aligned EBPs in mathematics across the tiers.

Table 2. Example Evidence-Based Practices across MTSS Tiers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of EBPs in Mathematics</th>
<th>Relevance at Tier 1</th>
<th>Relevance at Tier 2</th>
<th>Relevance at Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Manipulatives in Base 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Schematic Diagramming (e.g., Frayer Model, place value thinking squares)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) in Math</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-based individualization process (includes evidence-based intensification strategies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EBPs may be added to this list as sites identify additional skill deficit areas that require instruction/intervention.
Action plans also

• Include goals related to the structural changes (i.e., teaming processes) required to achieve results.
• Outline the training and coaching activities in which sites will participate.
• Many sites focus training participation at one grade level.
  • General education teachers were the primary audience for all trainings.
  • Many special educators and/or interventionists working across grade levels participated in training activities to ensure instructional alignment across MTSS tiers
### Elementary School Trainings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructional Strategies 1*</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies 2*</th>
<th>PALS Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Training</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Cohort 1 Participants</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Cohort 2 Participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Both Instructional Strategies trainings included the same content with a focus on number sense and place value.

---

**Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) (Mathematics)**

**Elementary School**

PALS has strong evidence of effectiveness for elementary school mathematics. The two qualifying studies included in this review showed effect sizes of +0.10 and +0.24.

---

**About PALS**

In PALS, children work in pairs to learn mathematical concepts with each other. Children alternate every 15 minutes as tutor and tutee, using specific strategies for correction procedures. PALS is used as a supplement to traditional textbook-based instruction approximately 30 minutes a day, three times a week.
Coaching Activities

Tier Differentiation
- Selecting progress monitoring measures
- Supporting data meetings
- Establishing goals

Cohort 1 = 64+ hrs
Cohort 2 = 46+ hrs
Math Beliefs Survey

Will be re-administered periodically to assess change in beliefs over time

Administered to 84 educators across cohorts prior to trainings

73 responses
39 items
agreement scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).
Math Beliefs Survey

1. Math as a set of operations versus a tool for thought
2. Entity versus incremental view of intellectual ability (i.e., a fixed v. growth mind set)
3. Teacher control versus child autonomy in classroom lessons
4. Correct answers versus understanding as primary goal
5. Confidence in teaching math
Math Beliefs Survey Baseline

• Lack of confidence in their knowledge of math content
• Have more “fixed” mindsets
• Believe in more “traditional” approaches to assessing student learning

I don’t enjoy doing math.

Math ability is something people have a certain amount of and there isn’t much they can do to change it.

I can improve my math skills but I can’t change my basic math ability.

The best way to understand math is a lot of problems.
Data-Driven Instruction Beliefs

• Data-Driven Instruction Survey includes nine items related to data efficacy and data-use.

• Baseline with 41 responses

• Fairly high belief on the part of educators at the Cohort sites, with average scores of "4" and above for each the items.

• Suggests that educators believe they are using data to drive their instruction.
“The training provided me with something (e.g., strategy, process, resource) that I can apply in my work was analyzed to determine the percentage of agreement.”

95.8% of educators agreed with the statement.

An overall agreement percentage was calculated by aggregating the item responses of strongly agree and agree for each of the professional learning sessions.
Evaluations of **stakeholder engagement and SSIP collaboration across RIDE initiatives**

- To determine the degree to which stakeholders were informed and involved in decision making regarding the project.
- Developed a survey contextualized to the project.

- Peripheral stakeholders have a broad interest in/awareness of SSIP, but *may not work closely with implementation*:
  - Special Education directors and leaders from the Rhode Island Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC).
- 76% of peripheral stakeholders agreed that RIDE creates opportunities to engage and provide feedback on efforts in the state related to the SSIP.
Evaluations of **stakeholder engagement** and SSIP collaboration across RIDE initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIDE works to facilitate understanding of diverse perspectives</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDE develops evolving leadership roles for relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDE Creates Opportunities for me to engage in SSIP Efforts</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDE Provides Opportunities for me to Provide Feedback on SSIP Efforts</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representatives from LEAs, charter schools, state schools, disability organizations, and staff from TA projects (excluding project staff) and centers
Evaluations of **stakeholder engagement** and SSIP collaboration across RIDE initiatives

**Perception of Engagement Level by Number of Responses (n=28)**

- **Informing:** RIDE shares or disseminates information with relevant stakeholders in the state who care about the SSIP
- **Networking:** RIDE asks others what they think about efforts in the state related to the SSIP and listens to what they say
- **Collaborating:** RIDE engages people in trying to do something of value and working together around efforts in the state related to the SSIP
- **Transforming:** RIDE promotes shared leadership and builds consensus across stakeholders in state efforts related to the SSIP, which leads to cross-stakeholder collaboration to improve efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluations of stakeholder engagement among RIDE personnel and SSIP collaboration across RIDE initiatives

![Chart showing evaluations of stakeholder engagement]

- OSCAS Develops Evolving Leadership Roles: 57.1% Agreement, 42.9% Disagreement
- OSCAS Works to Facilitate Understanding of Diverse Perspectives: 85.7% Agreement, 14.3% Disagreement
- Opportunities to Engage in Efforts related to SSIP: 64.3% Agreement, 7.1% Disagreement, 28.6% Neutral
- Opportunities to Provide Feedback on SSIP Efforts: 78.6% Agreement, 7.1% Disagreement, 14.3% Neutral
Evaluations of stakeholder engagement and SSIP collaboration across RIDE initiatives

Perception of Engagement Level by Number of Responses (n=14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informing</strong></td>
<td>OSCAS shares or disseminates information with relevant stakeholders in the state who care about the State Systemic Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networking</strong></td>
<td>OSCAS asks others what they think about efforts in the state related to the State Systemic Improvement Plan and listens to what they say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborating</strong></td>
<td>OSCAS engages people in trying to do something of value and working together around efforts in the state related to the State Systemic Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transforming</strong></td>
<td>OSCAS promotes shared leadership and builds consensus across stakeholders in state efforts related to the State Systemic Improvement, which leads to cross-stakeholder collaboration to improve efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 personnel from several departments within RIDE, including OSCAS, where the SSIP work is housed
SiMR Data has exceeded targets to date.

Black and Hispanic students in grades 3-5 with SLD scoring approaching proficient (3), proficient (4), or exceeds expectations (5) PARCC Math 2017
PARCC 2017 Math Proficiency by Race/Ethnicity for students
SLD grades 3-5

Black + Hispanic
- Did not Meet: 414
- Partially Proficient: 13
- Approaching Proficiency: 83
- Proficient: 254
- Exceeds Expectations: 0

Asian + White
- Did not Meet: 426
- Partially Proficient: 2
- Approaching Proficiency: 337
- Proficient: 29
- Exceeds Expectations: 0

All other
- Did not Meet: 68
- Partially Proficient: 5
- Approaching Proficiency: 13
- Proficient: 29
- Exceeds Expectations: 0
Comparisons by race and by disability status

PARCC 2017 Math grades 3-5

- All other races scoring 3, 4, or 5
- White and Asian scoring 3, 4, or 5
- Black and Hispanic scoring 3, 4, or 5

Non IEP and SLD categories.
Test change and planned data comparison

- Assessment scores from students at each of the cohort sites will be compared annually; both formative (i.e., screening/benchmarking measures) and summative (i.e., PARCC, RICAS)

- Data on individual students who are tracked through the case-study approach using the DBI process will be compared over time to determine if students are making progress toward intervention goals.

- Since data from the 2017 administration of PARCC provides 3 years of continuous test data, those comparisons are currently underway and will be available to report in next year’s SSIP submission.
## Monitoring fidelity

| Currently developing and piloting—in collaboration with the trainer and site-level personnel—an observational tool that can be used to support with monitoring the fidelity of implementation of learned strategies | PALS-Math has fidelity monitoring tools included with the teacher handbooks | Fidelity to student-level plans (e.g., implementation logs), and to the DBI process more generally (e.g., end of year pulse check) will be included as another measure as DBI case-studies are developed |
Next steps

Recruit Cohort 3 – some new schools, some expansion in existing district cohorts, completing readiness/needs assessments and action plans

Deliver year differentiated training and coaching through blended learning to all cohorts 2018-19

Reset baseline and targets with RICAS data; discuss district formative data to help bridge the gap

Continued collaboration with existing OSCAS work, curriculum work and RIDE SUM training

Expand stakeholder feedback opportunities to include Math Advisory Board