

SSIP

STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

APRIL 2017



DEPARTMENT of
EDUCATION
Louisiana Believes

Table of Contents

SUMMARY OF PHASE III (A)	6
THEORY OF ACTION OR LOGIC MODEL FOR THE SSIP, INCLUDING THE SIMR (A.1)	6
THE COHERENT IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES OR PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES EMPLOYED DURING THE YEAR, INCLUDING INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.2)	6
COHERENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES (A.2.A)	6
INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.2.B)	7
THE SPECIFIC EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES THAT HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED TO DATE (A.3)	11
BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR’S EVALUATION ACTIVITIES, MEASURES, AND OUTCOMES (A.4)	13
HIGHLIGHTS OF CHANGES TO IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.5)	17
PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP (B)	18
DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE’S SSIP IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (B.1)	18
DESCRIPTION OF EXTENT TO WHICH THE STATE HAS CARRIED OUT ITS PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH FIDELITY—WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED, WHAT MILESTONES HAVE BEEN MET, AND WHETHER THE INTENDED TIMELINE HAS BEEN FOLLOWED (B.1.A)	18
INTENDED OUTPUTS ACCOMPLISHED AS A RESULT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES (B.1.B)	19
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN SSIP IMPLEMENTATION (B.2)	21
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN INFORMED OF THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSIP (B.2.A)	21
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE HAD A VOICE AND BEEN INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSIP (B.2.B)	21
DATA ON IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES (C)	23
HOW THE STATE MONITORED AND MEASURED OUTPUTS (STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES) TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (C.1)	23
HOW EVALUATION MEASURES ALIGN WITH THE THEORY OF ACTION (C.1.A)	23
DATA SOURCES FOR EACH KEY MEASURE (C.1.B)	23
DESCRIPTION OF BASELINE DATA FOR KEY MEASURES (C.1.C)	27
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND ASSOCIATED TIMELINES (C.1.D)	27
[IF APPLICABLE] SAMPLING PROCEDURES (C.1.E)	29
[IF APPROPRIATE] PLANNED DATA COMPARISONS (C.1.F)	29
HOW DATA MANAGEMENT AND DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES ALLOW FOR ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (C.1.G)	30
HOW THE STATE HAS DEMONSTRATED PROGRESS AND MADE MODIFICATIONS TO THE SSIP AS NECESSARY (C.2)	31

HOW THE STATE HAS REVIEWED KEY DATA THAT PROVIDE EVIDENCE REGARDING PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE SIMR (C.2.A)	31
EVIDENCE OF CHANGE TO BASELINE DATA FOR KEY MEASURES (C.2.B)	33
HOW DATA SUPPORT CHANGES TO IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (C.2.C)	33
HOW DATA ARE INFORMING NEXT STEPS IN THE SSIP IMPLEMENTATION (C.2.D)	34
HOW DATA SUPPORT PLANNED MODIFICATIONS TO INTENDED OUTCOMES (INCLUDING THE SIMR)—RATIONALE OR JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CHANGES OR HOW DATA SUPPORT THAT THE SSIP IS ON THE RIGHT PATH (C.2.E)	34
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN THE SSIP EVALUATION (C.3)	34
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN INFORMED OF THE ONGOING EVALUATION OF THE SSIP (C.3.A)	34
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE HAD A VOICE AND BEEN INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE ONGOING EVALUATION OF THE SSIP (C.3.B)	35
DATA QUALITY ISSUES (D)	37
DATA LIMITATIONS THAT AFFECTED REPORTS OF PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP AND ACHIEVING THE SIMR DUE TO QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION DATA (D.1)	37
CONCERN OR LIMITATIONS RELATED TO THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF THE DATA USED TO REPORT PROGRESS OR RESULTS (D.1.A)	37
IMPLICATIONS FOR ASSESSING PROGRESS OR RESULTS (D.1.B)	38
PLANS FOR IMPROVING DATA QUALITY (D.1.C)	38
PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E)	39
ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E.1)	39
INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGES THAT SUPPORT SSIP INITIATIVES, INCLUDING HOW SYSTEM CHANGES SUPPORT ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SIMR, SUSTAINABILITY, AND SCALE-UP (E.1.A)	39
EVIDENCE THAT SSIP’S EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES ARE BEING CARRIED OUT WITH FIDELITY AND HAVING THE DESIRED EFFECTS (E.1.B)	40
OUTCOMES REGARDING PROGRESS TOWARD SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM OBJECTIVES THAT ARE NECESSARY STEPS TOWARD ACHIEVING THE SIMR (E.1.C)	40
MEASURABLE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE SIMR IN RELATION TO TARGETS (E.1.D)	41
PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR (F)	42
ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED NEXT YEAR, WITH TIMELINE (F.1)	42
PLANNED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES INCLUDING DATA COLLECTION, MEASURES, AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES (F.2)	42
ANTICIPATED BARRIERS AND STEPS TO ADDRESS THOSE BARRIERS (F.3)	42
THE STATE DESCRIBES ANY NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT AND/OR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (F.4)	43

ACRONYMS AND KEY TERMS

APR	Annual Performance Report
BESE	Board of Elementary and Secondary Education
DIDM	Data-informed Decision Making
DLT	District Leadership Team
EBP	Evidence Based Practice
ESSA	Every Student Succeeds Act
ELA	English Language Arts
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
IDC	IDEA Data Center
LEA	Local Education Agency (Districts and Charter Schools)
LSU	Louisiana State University
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NCSI	National Center for Systemic Improvement
PD	Professional Development
SC3	South Central Comprehensive Center
SEAP	Special Education Advisory Panel
SiMR	State-identified Measurable Result
SLT	School Leadership Team
SPDG	State Personnel Development Grant
SPP	State Performance Plan
SSIP	State Systemic Improvement Plan
SSIP Cohort	Nine LEAs Participating in the SSIP
SY	School Year
TA	Technical Assistance
TAP-IT	A structured data-informed decision making inquiry process

Executive Summary

Louisiana’s SiMR Focuses on Improving Student-Centered Outcomes Louisiana Believes starts with the premise that all children can achieve high expectations and should be prepared for college or a professional career. The challenges of meeting the needs of diverse learners begin early. When Louisiana improved the LEAP assessment, the gap between students with disabilities and their general education peers was shown to be larger than previously understood. For these reasons, Louisiana is focusing on literacy—a foundational skill necessary for success in all subjects and grades. Louisiana’s SiMR is to increase ELA proficiency (basic and above) rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in third through fifth grades, in nine LEAs (SSIP cohort) across the state.

Key Changes from Phase II to Phase III In FFY 2015, Louisiana finalized the SSIP cohort and updated SSIP cohort SiMR results and targets to reflect the actual LEAs participating in this important work. Louisiana, like many states across the country, began initial implementation during FFY 2015. Therefore SSIP cohort results, as seen in the table below, reflect ELA proficiency rates before the intervention began. LDOE expects to see a modest gain in FFY 2016, with increasing gains in FFY 2017 and 2018.

SSIP Cohort SiMR Results: Percent of Students with Disabilities Scoring Proficient on Statewide Assessments and Updated Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
SSIP Cohort Results	36.18%	36.68%	35.14%			
Updated Target	36%	36%	36%	37%	39%	42%

Each year, LDOE revisits the theory of action, and considers updates to reflect the vision for this work. In FFY 2015, LDOE updated the theory of action to clarify the role of the continuous leadership development coherent improvement strategy. As seen in the logic model, all leadership development activities occur through the lens of data-informed decision making or evidence-based literacy practices. Through these mediums, the SSIP encourages continuous self-reflection and improvement of education leaders throughout the LEAs. The updated theory of action, found on the next page, brings additional visual clarity to this vision.

Focus of SSIP Phase III, Year One Report This report focuses on three elements of the SSIP: progress towards implementing the SSIP including state-level infrastructure changes and planned activities, evaluating implementation and outcomes, and updating plans for FFY 2016.



STRATEGIES

IF...

THEN...

A

**DATA-INFORMED
DECISION MAKING**



LDOE effectively implements a structured data inquiry process with districts, schools and teachers...



...districts, schools and teachers will be able to continuously analyze and use multiple data sources to assess, plan and track outcomes for students with disabilities in 3rd–5th grades.

B

**EVIDENCE-BASED
LITERACY PRACTICES**



LDOE effectively provides evidence-based literacy practices grounded in quality text to educators serving students with disabilities in 3rd–5th grades...



...educators can implement literacy practices with fidelity for students with disabilities in 3rd–5th grades.

**CONTINUOUS
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT**
(integrated into both A and B)



LDOE effectively develops leaders at the district, school, and teacher levels to support implementation of a structured data inquiry process and effective literacy practices...



...districts, schools and teachers will have the capacity to enact change focused on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in 3rd–5th grades.

If...



A + B + *

are implemented with fidelity...



Then...



...ELA proficiency rates for targeted LEAs in 3rd–5th grades will increase.

...ELA proficiency rates statewide in 3rd–5th grades will increase.

SUMMARY OF PHASE III (A)

THEORY OF ACTION OR LOGIC MODEL FOR THE SSIP, INCLUDING THE SIMR (A.1)

Louisiana’s theory of action is anchored by three coherent improvement strategies: data-informed decision making, evidence-based literacy practices, and continuous leadership development. These strategies, when implemented with fidelity, will result in increased ELA proficiency (basic and above) rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in grades 3-5. First, in the SSIP cohort, and then across the state as the scale up plan is executed. In FFY 2015, LDOE updated the theory of action to reflect an important distinction. Namely, that all continuous leadership development activities occur through the lens of data-information decision making and evidence-based literacy practice activities. For example, LDOE employs a “teaming” process during quarterly structured data inquiry conversations to facilitate leadership development. Louisiana’s updated theory of action can be found on the previous page.

Louisiana believes that the theory of action, logic model, and evaluation plan exist as interconnected components of the SSIP to provide a strategic framework for its implementation. LDOE’s logic model can be found beginning on page 24.

THE COHERENT IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES OR PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES EMPLOYED DURING THE YEAR, INCLUDING INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.2)

COHERENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES (A.2.A)

The SSIP is grounded by three coherent improvement strategies: data-informed decision-making, evidence-based literacy practices, and continuous leadership improvement. To implement the SSIP, LDOE used a layering approach. During SY 2015-2016 & 2016-2017¹, LDOE focused on data-informed decision making to lay the foundation. In SY 2017-2018, LDOE will incorporate evidence-based literacy practices that work for struggling readers in grades three through five. Throughout these activities, LDOE has woven in continuous leadership development at all levels of infrastructure: state, district, school and classroom.

Table A.1: SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies Planning and Implementation Framework

Coherent Improvement Strategy	Strategic Planning and Development	Initial Implementation and Evaluation	Sustained Implementation, Evolution and Evaluation
Data-informed decision making	SY 2015-2016	SY 2015-2016, & 2016-2017	SY 2017-2018 through end of program
Evidence-based literacy practices	SY 2016-2017	SY 2017-2018	SY 2018-2019 through end of program

¹ SY 2015-2016 roughly equates to FFY 2015; SY 2016-2017 to FFY 2016; SY 2017-2018 to FFY 2018.

Continuous leadership development

Integrated into activities for data-informed decision making and evidence-based literacy practices.

Data-informed decision making is the lens through which all effective decisions should be made; whether they are infrastructure changes at the district, curricula decisions at the school, or instructional decisions in the classroom. For this reason, LDOE prioritized the development and implementation of this coherent improvement strategy in the SSIP cohort. In SY 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, LDOE partnered with SPDG and data-informed decision making experts at Johns Hopkins University School of Education, Center for Technology in Education to deliver a series of in person professional development sessions with follow-up webinars for district and school-based educators. To promote fidelity of implementation, SPDG facilitated quarterly district leadership and school leadership team meetings. At these meetings, SPDG facilitators helped teams systematically review data to understand trends, think critically about root cause(s), plan steps to improve practices, monitor implementation, and adjust implementation to improve literacy outcomes for students with disabilities.

Evidence-based literacy practices proven to work for students with disabilities in grades 3-5 are essential to improving outcomes. With this in mind, LDOE has worked closely with SPDG and a number of national literacy experts during SY 2016 – 2017 to develop a literacy framework that builds upon foundational work in data-informed decision making. SPDG and national literacy experts will deliver initial in person professional development to district, school, and classroom educators during a two-day summit in summer 2017 with ongoing job-embedded professional development beginning in SY 2017 – 2018, and continuing through the SSIP lifecycle. Using a text first approach, the evidence-based literacy practices will help educators evaluate and employ practices to help students with disabilities read (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary), understand (comprehension) and express understanding (writing, speaking, listening) of complex, grade level texts.

The final coherent improvement strategy, continuous leadership development, is intended to directly support sustainable implementation of data-informed decision making and evidence-based literacy practices. This strategy develops leaders at all levels in the LEA, not just identified leaders, but all educator leaders who enact change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in grades 3-5. Continuous leadership development recognizes that there is no point when a leader is fully developed. Instead, leaders continuously identify ways to improve their practice.

INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.2.B)

During Phase I and II, LDOE identified strengths and opportunities to improve six infrastructure areas—governance, fiscal/funding, quality standards, PD/TA, data, and accountability/monitoring—and reported on specific activities to improve the State’s infrastructure. Now, in Phase III, LDOE has focused on key activities that directly align with the SSIP, resulting in opportunities to leverage infrastructure improvements to implement a sound plan to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort and scale up best practices. As a result, LDOE is focused on 1) aligning LDOE’s SSIP with the state’s newly awarded SPDG grant, 2) expanding the Academic

Content Team’s portfolio of special education work, 3) integrating special education into the state’s plan to develop aspiring and veteran educators, and 4) aligning the SSIP with the state’s new ESSA plan. Each of these priorities is discussed in greater detail below.

Table A.2: Cross-walk of Infrastructure Elements to SSIP Infrastructure Improvement Activities

	Alignment with LSU/SPDG	Expanding Academic Content	Developing Aspiring Educators	Aligning with ESSA
Governance	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fiscal / Funding	✓	✓		
Quality Standards	✓	✓	✓	✓
PD / TA	✓	✓	✓	✓
Data	✓	✓	✓	✓
Accountability / Monitoring		✓		✓

External Infrastructure Improvements: Align LDOE and LSU to Advance the SSIP

The advent of the SSIP, managed by LDOE, and a new grant application opportunity for SPDG, implemented by LSU, provided both state agencies with a unique opportunity to rethink how best to target professional development for educators to improve literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. LDOE and LSU have worked collaboratively for over two years to align the SSIP and SPDG into one coherent initiative. In FFY 2013, LDOE began discussions about aligning state infrastructure resources. In FFY 2014, LDOE and SPDG developed a shared vision, operationalized goals and outcomes, identified associated measures, and engaged stakeholders in both projects to maximize existing funding and expertise. In FFY 2015, LDOE submitted a new, aligned grant application. In August, 2016, the US Department of Education approved the [grant](#), awarding Louisiana \$6.06 million over five years.² SPDG was funded to provide professional development opportunities for teachers of students with disabilities in Louisiana. The grant provides a sustained funding commitment to implement the SSIP. By the end of FFY 2015, these infrastructure improvements left Louisiana well poised to provide direct educator support of the coherent improvement strategies.

LDOE has also focused on aligning IDEA set aside resources with the SSIP and committed to

² Click [here](#) to see the US Department of Education's award announcement, and [here](#) to see Louisiana State University's press release.

supporting two additional full-time professionals to lead job-embedded professional learning supports through SPDG. These professionals will develop and implement a job-embedded professional learning structure to support educator practice with evidence-based literacy practices to improve students' ability to read, understand and express understanding of complex, grade-level texts through high quality curricula, and using student work to make adjustments in professional practice. LDOE anticipates these professionals will be in place by the start of SY 2017 – 2018.

In Phase II, LDOE funded the data-informed decision-making training—including three in person sessions that brought together SSIP cohort educators from across the state and follow-up online modules. In Phase III, LDOE provided additional funds for foundational and ongoing literacy training that will continue for the SSIP lifecycle and the SPDG grant.

Internal Infrastructure Improvements: Expanding the Special Education Academic Portfolio of Work

Over the past year, LDOE has invested significant resources to integrate special education more fully into LDOE's academic content vision. This resulted in three primary activities: 1) developing a vision to expand ELA Guidebooks to reach all students, including students with disabilities; 2) leveraging ELA expertise within LDOE to develop content-specific SSIP activities including professional development; and 3) realigning and expanding the Academic Content team's special education portfolio of work.

LDOE is building a more complete vision of the original [ELA Guidebooks](#). ELA Guidebooks include full and complete lessons, student tools, texts, and guidance for instruction. At its core, the effective build out of ELA Guidebooks will give educators the tools to effectively specialize instruction for students with disabilities is LDOE's scale up plan. LDOE is leveraging the SSIP to pilot evidence-based literacy practices that support students with disabilities in achieving grade-level outcomes expected in the lessons of the ELA Guidebooks. LDOE will then use the information gained from the pilot to update the lessons to incorporate the most effective literacy practices. LDOE will then host PD session for LEAs across the state through Teacher Leader events.

Recognizing that the SSIP could not be developed or implemented in isolation, LDOE's Academic Content team has lent its ELA expertise to the development of SSIP activities including the structure of literacy-related in person professional development, online module trainings, and job-embedded professional learning throughout the SSIP life cycle. This ensures that all SSIP activities align with LDOE's vision for ELA standards, curriculum and content, leverages progress made in the general education setting for students with disabilities, and creates a structure for sustainability over the medium and long-term.

Through the SSIP, in conjunction with other statewide initiatives, LDOE is advancing a portfolio of ELA work to support students with disabilities. LDOE is reimagining and expanding the Academic Content Team to produce richer instructional resources to support educators of students with disabilities. For example, LDOE added a professional with extensive English content experience to spearhead content development that supports students with disabilities, including the SSIP. LDOE is also restructuring the Special Education Policy office and the Academic Content office to

capitalize on existing special education literacy expertise within the agency. With these infrastructure changes in place, LDOE will scale up successful SSIP strategies to LEAs across the state.

Internal Infrastructure Improvements: Expanding the Believe and Prepare Initiative

Believe and Prepare, launched in 2014, includes 41 Louisiana school systems and 24 educator preparation providers, and has impacted 1,204 aspiring and mentor teachers and over 26,000 students statewide. Through this [grant program](#), districts and their educator preparation partners have been awarded a total of \$4.89 million to prepare aspiring teachers through full-year teaching residencies, build a cadre of trained mentor teachers, and meet staffing needs in high-need areas, such as special education.³ For example, in SY 2015-2016, 16 of these partnerships specifically focused on increasing the number of high quality special education teachers in school systems across the state, including a number of SSIP cohort districts. To further leverage these infrastructure improvements, LDOE's Special Education Policy Office and Talent Office collaborated on an approach to ensure that aspiring teachers in the Believe and Prepare program were included in SSIP-related professional development opportunities. This meant these aspiring educators would enter the workforce better prepared to effectively instruct students with disabilities.

LDOE is working relentlessly to address the large scale infrastructure change needed to transform the educator workforce to serve all students, including students with disabilities. During FFY 2015, BESE adopted landmark regulation concerning the preparation of aspiring teachers. These regulations were designed to provide teacher candidates with a full-year classroom residency alongside an experienced mentor teacher, coupled with a competency-based curriculum that will provide them with the knowledge and skills needed for their first day of teaching.⁴ Increasing impact in special education is of critical importance given the workforce shortage in this field. To address this need, in February 2017, LDOE issued a request for applications from eligible teacher preparation providers that can describe a plan to establish formal partnerships with school districts to prepare teachers for underserved students and schools, through high-quality teacher preparation residency programs. Special education teacher preparation residencies are one of three priority areas, demonstrating LDOE's continued commitment to addressing workforce shortages.

Internal Infrastructure Improvements: Aligning the SSIP with ESSA

Passed by Congress in 2015, [ESSA](#) is a federal law that requires states to articulate a cohesive plan for measuring the skills students learn, reporting information to parents and the public, supporting students in making academic progress, and spending federal funds. ESSA is largely focused on the needs of historically disadvantaged students, including students from low-income homes, students whose first language is not English, and students with disabilities. The [draft framework](#) of Louisiana's plan is centered on five challenges that Louisiana students experience in significant numbers: 1) fundamental expectations for students and graduates, 2) deep struggles for historically disadvantaged students, 3) fair access to experiences essential for success in school and beyond, 4)

³ For more information on Louisiana's Believe and Prepare, [click here](#). For more information on the new teacher preparation regulations, [click here](#).

⁴ Click [here](#) to learn more about Louisiana's new teacher preparation regulations.

a strong educator profession, and 5) persistently struggling schools.

ESSA calls on states to calculate and report not just the progress of schools but also the attainment and progress of individual groups of students within schools, particularly historically disadvantaged groups of students such as those with disabilities. Under the draft plan, LDOE will provide each school with a performance score for each subgroup, including students with disabilities, to provide easy-to-understand, easily comparable data to guide planning and intervention. Anticipating these changes, the SSIP began taking districts through the subgroup data analysis and planning process. SPDG facilitates a structured data inquiry process at each district and school in the SSIP cohort, focusing on identifying the root cause to effectively plan and intervene. Working in concert, the SSIP can leverage statewide ESSA changes to expedite literacy gains for students with disabilities.

THE SPECIFIC EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES THAT HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED TO DATE (A.3)

Below is a timeline of key activities that support the implementation of each coherent improvement strategy, including its status: planning, ongoing, or completed. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list. For example, the foundational PD for TAP-IT includes a variety of smaller tasks that lead up to or follow the activity. These included data analyses by LDOE and LEAs, a needs assessment by the PD contractor, post-PD surveys, and fidelity checks as well as additional TA for LEAs. LDOE, with support from internal and external stakeholders, has updated and will continue to update this work based on initial implementation and evaluation feedback.

Table A.3: SSIP Key Activities

Improvement Strategy			Activity	Target Audience	Time Frame			Status
DIDM	Literacy Practices	Continuous Leadership Devel't			Start	End	Frequency	
✓	✓	✓	State Leadership / Steering Team with Experts	State	Fall 2016	Spring 2021	Ongoing	Ongoing
✓		✓	Foundational PD (TAP-IT)	State DLT*	Spring 2016	Spring 2016	Once	Complete
✓		✓	Online Learning Modules (TAP-IT)	DLT	Spring 2016	Summer 2016	Monthly	Complete

✓		✓	Foundational PD (TAP-IT)	SLT **	Summer 2016	Summer 2016	Once	Complete
✓		✓	Online Learning Modules (TAP-IT)	SLT	Summer 2016	Winter 2016	Monthly	Complete
✓	✓	✓	DLT Meetings	DLT SPDG	Spring 2016	Spring 2021	Quarterly	Ongoing
✓	✓	✓	SLT Meetings	SLT	Fall 2016	Spring 2021	Quarterly	Ongoing
	✓	✓	NCSI TA for Coaching	State	Summer / Fall 2016	Spring 2017	As Needed	Planning
✓	✓	✓	Develop and Maintain SSIP Collaboration Website	DLT SLT Schools	Spring 2017	Spring 2021	As Needed	Planning
	✓	✓	Establish Professional Learning Leaders (PLL) Program	State SPDG	Summer 2017	Summer 2017	Once	Planning
	✓	✓	Foundational PD (Literacy Strategies)	DLT, SLT, Teachers ELA 3 rd – 5 th	Summer 2017	Summer 2017	Once	Planning
	✓	✓	Online Learning Modules (Literacy Practices)	DLT SLT	Summer 2017	Winter 2017	Twice	Planning
	✓	✓	Foundational PD Supported by NCSI (PLL)	State District Coaches Regional Support Coaches	Summer 2017	Summer 2017	Once	Planning

	✓	✓	Implement and Maintain PLL Program	DLT LEA Coaches	Fall 2017	Spring 2021	Ongoing	Planning
	✓	✓	Foundational PD (Literacy Practices)	DLT, SLT, Teachers ELA 3 rd – 5 th	Summer 2018	Summer 2018	Once	Planning
	✓	✓	Online Learning Modules (Literacy Practices)	DLT SLT	Summer 2018	Winter 2018	Twice	Planning
	✓	✓	Enhanced PD (Literacy Practices)	DLT, SLT, Teachers ELA 3 rd – 5 th	Summer 2019	Summer 2019	Once	Planning
	✓	✓	Online Learning Modules (Literacy Practices)	DLT SLT	Summer 2019	Winter 2019	Twice	Planning
	✓	✓	Enhanced PD (Literacy Practices)	DLT, SLT, Teachers ELA 3 rd – 5 th	Summer 2020	Summer 2020	Once	Planning
	✓	✓	Online Learning Modules (Literacy Practices)	DLT SLT	Summer 2020	Winter 2020	Twice	Planning

*DLT = District Leadership Team

**SLT = School Leadership Team

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR'S EVALUATION ACTIVITIES, MEASURES, AND OUTCOMES (A.4)

Table A.3 above details key activities with the target audience(s), timeframe, and status. Each activity has associated evaluation measures and outcomes. The table below details the results of logic model activities that were carried out in during FFY 2015. It does not include activities that are planned, but not yet executed.

Tables A.4 – A.8: Logic Model Activities with Aligned Measures, Outcomes and Adjustments

SSIP Logic Model Activity	
Establish state steering team and identify key expert technical advisors	
Measure	Outcome
<p>Agendas and sign in sheets from state steering team (Leadership Team) meetings.</p> <p>List of key expert technical advisors maintained by SSIP Managers with advisors consulted at least once per year.</p>	<p>State SSIP Leadership Team established with members from LDOE, SPDG and SC3. Team was fully in place, meeting six times during FFY 2015.</p> <p>Key expert technical advisors list maintained with each advisor consulted at least once per year. See Appendix A for list of technical advisors.</p>
Adjustments for FFY 2016	
<p>During FFY 2015, SPDG was refunded and now aligns with the SSIP. As part of the end of FFY 2015 evaluation, LDOE reviewed the efficacy of this team. Although the team functioned as intended, providing critical contributions to the SSIP’s development, LDOE concluded that a more responsive structure would benefit the project during implementation. In FFY 2016 the state steering team will continue, but will meet biweekly instead of bimonthly and include key leaders from each organization. This will allow leaders from both organizations to be more responsive to critical developments and needs.</p>	

SSIP Logic Model Activity	
Establish district and school leadership teams with routines	
Measure	Outcome
<p>Evidence of districts and schools establishing DLTs and SLTs with specific roles including: special and general education administrators, special and general education staff, curriculum staff, data/accountability staff, and a family representative.</p> <p>Evidence of DLTs and SLTs meeting quarterly.</p> <p>Evidence of routines in place such as sign in sheets and agendas.</p> <p>Evidence of fidelity including district and school action plans using a structured data inquiry process to identify interventions, implement strategies, and track progress.</p>	<p>All districts and schools established DLTs and SLTs, respectively, with required roles represented.</p> <p>In FFY 2015, all DLTs met quarterly, facilitated by a SPDG systems coach. SPDG developed agendas and collected sign in sheets for each meeting.</p> <p>SLTs did not begin meeting until FFY 2016. Those evaluation outcomes will be reported next year.</p> <p>Action plans were due in FFY 2016; evaluation outcomes will be reported next year.</p>
Adjustments for FFY 2016	
<p>DLT activities began in the second half of FFY 2015; SLTs activities began at the end of FFY 2015. Initial activities were implemented as intended, but more progress is needed to meaningfully measure</p>	

outcomes. LDOE and SPDG will evaluation progress made in FFY 2016 when this activity begins in earnest. Progress and resulting adjustments will be reported in FFY 2016.

SSIP Logic Model Activity

Deliver coordinated PD opportunities to develop data and leadership skills⁵ at the state, district and school levels. (In Person)

Measure	Outcome
<p>Evidence of data-informed decision making in person PD delivered to state officials, districts and schools by Johns Hopkins University.</p> <p>PD activity reports to track the training’s focus area, hours of PD, and number of participants.</p> <p>Percent of participants who agree PD increases their knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Evidence that PD is of high quality as measured by the High Quality PD checklist and Evidence-Based PD Rubric.</p>	<p>February 2016, in person PD delivered to key state officials, and all participating districts.</p> <p>June 2016, two-day in person PD delivered to 11 of 25 participating schools.</p> <p>July 2016, two-day in person PD delivered to 14 of 25 participating schools.</p> <p>94% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the in person PD increased their knowledge and skills in data-informed decision making to improve instruction for students with disabilities.</p> <p>A PD activity report was produced for each in person training.</p> <p>District and school-level in person PD sessions were measured against the High Quality PD checklist by a series of independent observers. Each session met the standards for high quality PD.</p>

Adjustments for FFY 2016

The FFY 2015 foundational DIDM PD was implemented as intended, providing a strong foundation in a structured data inquiry process that is continuously reinforced and refined during quarterly SPDG-facilitated DLTs and (starting in FFY 2016) SLTs. During FFY 2015, LDOE and SPDG worked with IDC and SRI—OSEP funded TA Centers—to refine the evaluation approach to more effectively capture the knowledge and skills participants gained from professional development opportunities in addition to capturing perception data. These changes will be reflected in the Summer 2017 foundational literacy summer summit PD and reported in the FFY 2016 report.

LDOE is continuously seeking opportunities to align the SSIP with programs and initiatives across the agency. As a result, the Academic Content team has been heavily involved in the development of the literacy professional development, both in terms of the overall framework and the specific learning principles and strategies. This will ensure that these PD opportunities for educators of students with disabilities is connected to content LDOE disseminates through other venues.

⁵ Evidence-based literacy practices PD will begin in FFY 2016.

SSIP Logic Model Activity

Deliver coordinated professional development (PD) opportunities to develop data and leadership skills at the state, district and school levels. (Web Based)

Measure	Outcome
<p>Number of data-informed decision-making online modules produced for districts and schools by Johns Hopkins University.</p> <p>PD activity reports to track the training’s focus area, hours of PD, and number of participants.</p> <p>Percent of participants who agree PD increases their knowledge and skills.</p>	<p>Johns Hopkins university delivered five online modules for districts, and five for schools, meeting contractual expectations.</p> <p>Eight of nine participating DLTs completed the online modules. SPDG systems coaches worked directly with districts and schools to ensure critical points of knowledge were communicated to participants, and clarify concepts. LDOE conducted unstructured interviews with participants who overwhelmingly agreed that—while the content reinforced knowledge—the length of modules posed a challenge to absorbing critical content.</p> <p>Five PD activity reports (one for each module) were produced to capture this activity.</p> <p>SLTs are slated to complete data-informed decision-making online modules during FFY 2016; outcomes will be reported at that time.</p>

Adjustments for FFY 2016

Online modules were produced for districts and schools to reinforce key concepts first introduced during the Spring and Summer 2016 in person data-informed decision making professional development. They will continue to play an important role; therefore, LDOE and SPDG have discussed specific improvements to improve their efficacy. Specifically, LDOE and SPDG are collaborating to refine the participant survey to reflect actual gain in knowledge and skills. Based on feedback from participants, LDOE and SDG will also decrease the length of online modules, distilling them to the critical concepts that must be reinforced to improve educator practice.

SSIP Logic Model Activity

Deliver coordinated professional development (PD) opportunities to develop data and leadership skills at the state, district and school levels. (Relationship-based)

Measure	Outcome
<p>Evidence of SPDG-facilitated DLT meetings.</p> <p>Evidence of SPDG-facilitated SLT meetings.</p> <p>Evidence of LDOE support to DLTs, including</p>	<p>DLT meetings began in the second half of FFY 2015. Every DLT meeting was facilitated by a SPDG systems coach with an agenda set by SPDG that aligned with the SSIP coherent improvement</p>

participation in meetings, technical assistance, etc.

strategies.

SLT meetings are scheduled to begin in FFY 2016.

LDOE identified key staff to support initial implementation. For the SSIP, each district has an LDOE Special Education Policy and a Network team point of contact. LDOE network staff participated in DLT meetings, as needed. LDOE staff provided technical assistance to district staff on grants management, data-informed decision making and other needs.

Adjustments for FFY 2016

DLT activities began in the second half of FFY 2015; SLT meetings will begin in FFY 2016. Initial activities were implemented as intended, but more progress is needed to meaningfully measure outcomes. LDOE and SPDG will evaluate progress made in FFY 2016 as activities begin in earnest. Progress and resulting adjustments will be reported in FFY 2016.

HIGHLIGHTS OF CHANGES TO IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.5)

The section above details adjustments that will be made as a result of outcomes for specific SSIP activities.

PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP (B)

DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE’S SSIP IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (B.1)

DESCRIPTION OF EXTENT TO WHICH THE STATE HAS CARRIED OUT ITS PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH FIDELITY—WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED, WHAT MILESTONES HAVE BEEN MET, AND WHETHER THE INTENDED TIMELINE HAS BEEN FOLLOWED (B.1.A)

LDOE and SPDG—with the input of stakeholders—developed a series of key activities starting in from SY 2015 -2016 and continuing through the SSIP lifecycle that—in sum—would lead to improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in 3rd through 5th grades. The table below describes the key activities planned and/or accomplished in FFY 2015, FFY 2016, and FFY 2017 (some activities continue beyond these years) including milestones met and whether the intended timeline was followed. Some activities that begin in one FFY will continue through the duration of the SSIP and the SPDG grant. See planned timeframe for more information.

Table B.1: Key Activities with Intended and Actual Timelines and Outcomes

Activity	Planned Timeframe	Milestone Met	Intended Timeline Followed	Notes on Timeline and Outcome
Activities Begun in FFY 2015 (SY 2015 – 2016)				
Foundational PD (TAP-IT)	Spring 2016	Yes	Yes	All participating districts attended in person training.
Online Learning Modules - Districts (TAP-IT)	Spring – Summer 2016	Yes	Yes	8 of 9 participating districts completed modules.
Foundational PD (TAP-IT)	Summer 2016	Yes	Yes	All participating schools attended in person training.
Activities Begun in FFY 2016 (SY 2016 – 2017)				
Online Learning Modules - Schools (TAP-IT)	Fall - Winter 2016	Yes	Yes	Activities in process. Will report in FFY 2016.
DLT Meetings	Spring 2016 – Spring 2021	Yes	Yes	All DLTs formed and began quarterly meetings in FFY 2015. Additional activities in process. Will report outcomes in FFY 2016.
SLT Meetings	Fall 2016 – Spring 2021	Yes	Yes	All SLTs formed in FFY 2015 and quarterly meetings will begin in FFY

				2016. Will report outcomes in FFY 2016.
Develop and Maintain SSIP Collaboration Website	Summer / Fall 2016 – Spring 2021	No	No	Originally planned for completion in FFY 2015. LDOE and SPDG postponed website development until the new SPDG grant was awarded in FFY 2016 in order to design one seamless, aligned website.
Foundational PD (Evidence-Based Literacy Practices)	Summer 2017	Yes	Yes	LDOE and SPDG have made steady progress towards meeting intended timeline.
Continuing PD (DIDM)	Summer 2017	Yes	Yes	LDOE and SPDG have made steady progress towards meeting intended timeline.
Activities to Begin in FFY 2017 (SY 2017 – 2018)				
Online Learning Module (Evidence-Based Literacy Practices)	Fall 2017 – Spring 2018	Yes	Yes	Activities in planning phase. Will report in FFY 2017.
Direct Educator Support and Feedback	Fall 2017 – Spring 2021	Yes	Yes	Activities in planning phase. Will report in FFY 2017.
Continuing PD (Evidence-Based Literacy Practices)	Summer 2018	Yes	Yes	Activities in planning phase. Will report in FFY 2017.
Continuing PD (DIDM)	Summer 2018	Yes	Yes	Activities in planning phase. Will report in FFY 2017.

INTENDED OUTPUTS ACCOMPLISHED AS A RESULT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES (B.1.B)

Each of the coherent improvement strategies has a series of activities (some independent, some interconnected) with correlated outputs. Outputs are the direct products of program activities; they are the quantitative measurements and evidence that the SSIP was implemented as planned. These activities and outputs will drive the short term and ultimately the long term outcomes. Outputs are the initial measure of whether the SSIP is accomplishing its planned activities. When the evaluation plan

transitions from what was accomplished to the difference those activities make in the lives of students with disabilities, the focus shifts to outcomes. The table below describes the key activities for FFY 2015 (SY 2015 – 2016) and the intended outputs accomplished as a result. It does not include activities completed before FFY 2015, or activities in planning that will not be completed until after FFY 2015.

Table B.2: FFY 2015 Key Activities with Outputs Accomplished

Activity	Correlated Output from Logic Model
Foundational PD (TAP-IT) for Districts and Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of PD activity reports produced. In FFY 2015, a PD activity report was produced for each session. ● The percent of participants who agreed the in person PD increased their knowledge and skills. 94% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the in person PD increased their knowledge and skills in data-informed decision making to improve instruction for students with disabilities.
Online Learning Modules (TAP-IT) for Districts and Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of PD activity reports produced. In FFY 2015, a PD activity report was produced for each session, five in total. ● The percent of participants who agreed online modules increased their knowledge and skills. An evaluation survey for online models is in development for FFY 2016.
DLT Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of district leadership team meetings. In FFY 2015, all nine DLTs met quarterly, facilitated by a SPDG systems coach. ● The number of districts that created action plans using a structured data inquiry process to identify interventions, implement strategies, and track progress strategies, and track progress. Action plans are due in FFY 2016. ● The number of districts that use systems coaching feedback to adjust interventions and strategies. In FFY 2015, all nine districts used systems coaching to adjust strategies.
SLT Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of school leadership team meetings. School leadership team meetings began in FFY 2016. ● The number of schools that created action plans using a structured data inquiry process to identify interventions, implement strategies, and track progress strategies, and track progress. Action plans are due in FFY 2016. ● The number of schools that use systems coaching feedback to adjust interventions and strategies. This output will be measured in FFY 2016 when school-level activities begin.
Develop and Maintain SSIP Collaboration Website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Activity delayed – no output. LDOE and SPDG postponed website development until the new SPDG grant was awarded in FFY 2016 in order to design one seamless, aligned website

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN SSIP IMPLEMENTATION (B.2)

HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN INFORMED OF THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSIP (B.2.A)

This topic is addressed in section B.2.B below.

HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE HAD A VOICE AND BEEN INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSIP (B.2.B)

LDOE continued and expanded the successful stakeholder engagement model used during Phase I and Phase II. This structure integrated stakeholder involvement at five levels including the 1) SSIP External Stakeholder Engagement Group with participants representing Louisiana's diverse population; 2) SSIP Leadership Team with key contributors from LDOE and SPDG; 3) the continued collaborative approach within LDOE, where LDOE continuously involved internal stakeholders representing LDOE's various offices and divisions; 4) ongoing feedback from SSIP cohort participants; and 5) public update and feedback forums including SEAP, the draft ESSA Framework, and other online resources.

Stakeholders have not only been informed, but have actively contributed to all components of Phase III, year one. The External Stakeholder Engagement Group met in person for two three-hour sessions, as well as email correspondence throughout Phase III to provide additional feedback. At these sessions, stakeholders provided advice and feedback on how to address challenges in initial implementation, helped re-baseline assessment results to reflect actual data from the SSIP cohort, helped to redefine targets, and reflected on evaluation results and offered suggested changes that have been incorporated into the plan. For more information on how the External Stakeholder Engagement Group was involved in decision-making, please see the SSIP Evaluation section C.3 for more information.

During FFY 2015 the SSIP Leadership Team employed a collaborative structure with participants from LDOE and SPDG, the two organizations leading the SSIP implementation. The SSIP Leadership Team met six times over FFY 2015 to discuss planning and implementation. During FFY 2015, the team addressed initial implementation challenges to ensure adequate funding sources were identified, to draft a successful SPDG grant application, to develop the literacy PD goals and framework, and to structure implementation and evaluation responsibilities and communication between the two organizations. These decisions shaped short term changes in FFY 2015 and systemic changes in FFY 2016. For example, to ensure alignment with LDOE's literacy PD priorities, the team successfully obtained additional support from LDOE's Academic Content team for FFY 2016 and beyond. See Appendix A for a list of SSIP Leadership Team participants. As part of the FFY 2015 end of year evaluation, LDOE and SPDG reviewed whether the purpose and structure of this team was achieving intended outcomes. While the team played a vital role in FFY 2015, as the SSIP moves further into implementation, a more responsive structure is needed to respond to challenges and needs. As a result, in FFY 2016, the SSIP Leadership Team is restructuring into a biweekly

meeting with directors from each organization.

In addition to the venues discussed above, LDOE and SPDG engaged additional internal and external stakeholders to shape SSIP implementation. LDOE continuously sought feedback from internal experts. For example, the job-embedded coaching model to support teachers was developed with considerable input and feedback from LDOE's Talent Office and the Academic Content Office. This collaborative approach brought innovative thinking to the framework and ensured alignment between the SSIP and larger LDOE initiatives. LDOE and SPDG sought ongoing feedback from SSIP cohort participants, formally through participant surveys and informally through quarterly meetings and other opportunities. Feedback through these channels resulted in immediate, responsive changes to the DIDM PD in FFY 2015 to make the sessions more relevant and meaningful. LDOE sought additional feedback through public forums such as SEAP. These forums, which are open and available to all members of the public, expand opportunities to provide feedback. For example, LDOE discusses progress with implementation and evaluation results with SEAP before each SSIP report is submitted to the US Department of Education. Each level of stakeholder engagement, each opportunity for input informs multiple aspects of implementation including interpretation of evaluation results and changes to short and long-term implementation.

DATA ON IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES (C)

HOW THE STATE MONITORED AND MEASURED OUTPUTS (STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES) TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (C.1)

HOW EVALUATION MEASURES ALIGN WITH THE THEORY OF ACTION (C.1.A)

Louisiana believes that the theory of action, logic model, and evaluation plan exist as interconnected components of the SSIP that provide a strategic framework for its implementation. The theory of action developed in Phase I drove the development of the logic model and evaluation plan in Phase II, and defines the work to be completed in Phase III. The theory of action defines three coherent improvement strategies: data-informed decision making, evidence-based literacy practices, and continuous leadership development. These three strategies are the objectives that anchor the logic model. Each of these strategies has a series of activities (some independent, some interconnected) with correlated outputs. The logic model activities reflect the “If..” statements in the theory of action. These activities and outputs will drive the short term and ultimately the long term outcomes. Both the short term and the long term outcomes reflect the “Then...” statements in the theory of action. The logic model contains both outcome and process (fidelity) components that will be measured and assessed through the evaluation plan.

LDOE thoughtfully developed a logic model to implement the SSIP and guide evaluation. The logic model is a visual representation of the SSIP’s strategies and objectives, activities, outputs, short term outcomes, and long term outcomes. While the inputs (resources) are not explicitly outlined in the logic model, LDOE has obtained the funding, direct LEA support, technical expertise and other resources needed to implement the SSIP with fidelity. Please see the logic model on the next page for additional information.

DATA SOURCES FOR EACH KEY MEASURE (C.1.B)

For the purposes of this report, key measures are the student-centered outcome measures outlined in the logic model. Louisiana has identified three key measures in the table below. They are ordered from the most immediate measure of improved literacy outcomes, followed by longer term change in the SSIP cohort, and finally longer term change across the state. Louisiana includes both short and long term measures because, according to implementation science, it takes two to four years to establish a “fully implemented evidence-based program implementation in a new community.”⁶ As a result, LDOE expects some change to take years. LDOE cannot wait years to evaluate success, thus, earlier proof points to gauge effectiveness were established.

⁶ University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. National Implementation Research Network. “Full Implementation”, <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/learn-implementation/implementation-stages/full-implementation>

STRATEGY & OBJECTIVE

- A** Data-informed Decision Making
Implement a structured data inquiry process with districts, schools and teachers
- B** Literacy Practices
Provide evidence-based literacy practices to educators serving students with disabilities in 3rd-5th grades
- *** Continuous Leadership Development
Develop leaders at the district, school, and teacher levels to support implementation of data inquiry and literacy practices

ACTIVITIES

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish state steering team and identify key expert technical advisors • Establish district and school leadership teams with routines • Develop and implement a resource and collaboration website • Deliver coordinated professional development (PD) opportunities to develop leadership, data, and literacy skills at the state, district and school levels. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » In-person sessions » Web-based sessions » Relationship-based activities including coaching and technical assistance |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire professional learning leaders to directly support LEAs • Provide support to districts and schools on implementation and assessment of literacy strategies |

OUTPUTS

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of resource materials developed by state-level personnel • The number unique visitors accessing SSIP website • The number of visitors who rank website resources as useful or very useful • The number of PD activity reports produced • The percent of participants increase their knowledge and skills • The number of district and school-level personnel who use feedback to adjust interventions and strategies |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of districts and schools that create action plans using a structured data inquiry process to identify interventions, implement strategies, and track progress strategies, and track progress |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of professional learning leaders in place |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of state, district and school leadership team meetings implemented with fidelity |

SYSTEM-LEVEL OUTCOMES

STATE-LEVEL

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State personnel develop and support data and literacy-based PD for districts, schools and teachers. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional learning leaders provide effective job-embedded coaching to develop school-based educators. |

DISTRICT-LEVEL

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District personnel effectively use multiple data sources to develop a district plan that supports schools in developing plans, creating tools, and identifying resources to support literacy instruction. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A B * | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District-level coaches effectively use regional support coaching feedback to support teachers in adjusting literacy instruction. |

SCHOOL-LEVEL

A B *

- School administrators and support personnel effectively use multiple data sources to inform professional growth needs, guide teachers in delivering instruction and assessing student progress, develop structures to support interventions, and track outcomes for students.

A B *

- School administrators and coaches provide meaningful feedback to teachers on implementing effective literacy instruction and interventions.

TEACHER-LEVEL

A B *

- Teachers continuously analyze and use multiple data sources to inform literacy instruction, assess on going progress, plan interventions, and track literacy outcomes for students.
- Teachers effectively use literacy strategies grounded in quality text.

*STUDENT-CENTERED OUTCOMES

SHORT TERM

- Students in 3rd–5th grades improve results on formative literacy assessments.

MEDIUM TERM

- Increase ELA proficiency rates (basic and above) on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in 3rd–5th grades, in nine LEAs across the state

LONG TERM

- Increase ELA proficiency rates (B and above) on statewide assessment for students with disabilities in 3rd–5th grades, across the state

**When students are cited this means students with disabilities in 3rd–5th grades.*

Table C.1 FFY 2015 Student-Centered Outcome Measures with Aligned Data Source

Student-center Outcome Measure	Data Source
<p>Whether students with disabilities improve on formative literacy assessments in 3rd – 5th grades, in the SSIP cohort. This is the most immediate, short-term measure.</p>	<p>The SSIP will review progress on third, fourth and fifth grade formative literacy assessment results to gauge progress, and help districts and schools adjust as needed.</p>
<p>Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, in the SSIP cohort.</p>	<p>LDOE will analyze accountability assessment results for the third, fourth and fifth grade ELA LEAP and LAA1 statewide assessments to calculate results for the SSIP cohort.</p>
<p>Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, across the state.</p>	<p>Currently, the SSIP is in year one of initial implementation. The activities planned and completed will lay the foundation for eventual SSIP scale up to improve literacy proficiency rates for students with disabilities in 3rd – 5th grades, across the state. When we begin to implement scale up activities, we will expect to “move the needle” on state-level ELA proficiency results. At this point, we will expect to review third, fourth and fifth grade ELA LEAP and LAA1 statewide assessments for trends and improvements across the state.</p>

The table above outlines key measures for student-centered literacy outcomes. However, in order to measure progress effectively, LDOE and SPDG must also evaluate progress in the fidelity of implementation— process measures. For example, if we do not see students with disabilities progress in formative assessments throughout the year, we must evaluate whether the process to implement evidence-based literacy practices was done with fidelity. If they were implemented with fidelity, LDOE and SPDG must evaluate whether it is the most effective evidence-based practice. In our model, we will review whether educators are implementing evidence-based practices as intended, whether educators engage in opportunities for feedback and reflection, and whether school and district leadership teams are effectively analyzing data to make decisions. All of these processes will impact the progress toward the student-centered outcome. See section A. 4 “A Brief Overview of the Year’s Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes”, for a description of each activity, with measures of process and outcome, and the resulting adjustments planned for FFY 2016.

DESCRIPTION OF BASELINE DATA FOR KEY MEASURES (C.1.C)

Table C.2: FFY 2015 Student-Centered Outcome Measures with Baseline Data

Student-Centered Outcome Measure	Baseline Data
<p>Whether students with disabilities improve on formative literacy assessments in 3rd – 5th grades, in the SSIP cohort. This is the most immediate, short-term measure.</p>	<p>In the SSIP cohort, each school system identified the ELA formative assessments used to measure progress for all students in 3rd – 5th grades. Starting in FFY 2016—soon after the SSIP cohort was finalized—LDOE and SPDG began collaborating with DLTs and SLTs to collect and analyze these data to inform decisions ranging from infrastructure changes to instructional improvements. While it is too soon to report in this FFY 2015 report, LDOE is reviewing opportunities to use these data to demonstrate progress in future reports.</p>
<p>Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, in the SSIP cohort.</p>	<p>In FFY 2015, LDOE finalized the SSIP cohort. As a result, LDOE has updated the SiMR data from FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 to reflect the actual cohort of students with disabilities participating in the SSIP. Please see section C.2.B “Evidence of Change to Baseline Data for Key Measures” for baseline data.</p>
<p>Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency rates (basic and above) on statewide assessments, across the state.</p>	<p>Each year, LDOE reports on the proficiency rates (basic and above) of all students with disabilities, including 3rd – 5th grade students. This is reported in the APR, under Indicator 3C. Results are as follows, FFY 2013: 36.98%; FFY 2014: 36.64%; FFY 2015: 38.80%.</p>

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND ASSOCIATED TIMELINES (C.1.D)

LDOE, working collaboratively with SPDG, has developed a data collection plan that will yield valid and reliable implementation data and data applicable to the SiMR (outcome data) at regular intervals. Using the data collection plan, LDOE will collect both implementation and outcome data. These data will be used to conduct the evaluation.

Outcome measures: LDOE will collect two types of outcome measures, annual statewide assessment results and ongoing formative literacy assessment results.

Implementation measures: LDOE will collect implementation measures at each level of implementation such as implementation and outcome data from in-person PD sessions, ongoing

PD—online learning modules and professional learning community sessions, and district and school leadership meetings; assessments of district and school capacity and implementation; and implementation and outcome data from teacher self-assessments.

LDOE and SPDG have a shared responsibility for data collection. The two organizations have established processes to share data in order to fulfill respective evaluation requirements. The annual data collection timeline is outlined below. The number represents the number of times LDOE or SPDG will collect data from all participants. For example, LDOE will collect statewide ELA assessment results once a year in April. SPDG will collect district capacity assessments once a year during the summer.

Table C.3: Annual Data Collection Timeline

Data Collection	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May
Student Results: Formative and Summative Literacy Assessments												
Statewide Assessments											1	
Formative Assessments			Ongoing throughout school year (2-3x)									
Implementation Results: Evaluation ⁷ of Professional Development / Work Sessions												
In Person PD DIDM	2											
In Person PD Literacy	2											
Teacher Online Modules			2					2				
PLL Facilitated Meetings				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
District Leadership Team Meetings		1			1			1			1	
School Leadership Team Meetings		1			1			1			1	
Infrastructure: Assessment of District and School Capacity and Implementation												
District		1										

⁷ Each professional development opportunity and work session will be evaluated through participant surveys (developed with TA from IDC and NCSI), an evidence-based PD rubric, a high quality PD checklist, and additional feedback from vendors, participants and technical experts.

Capacity Assessment ⁸											
PET-R ⁹	1										
SPDG EBPD Rubric ¹⁰	1										
Fidelity of Implementation: Educator Reflections on Practice											
Teacher Self-Assessment ¹¹			1								1

LDOE has paid careful attention to developing a data collection methodology that will yield valid and reliable results. To ensure results are valid, LDOE is collecting data that measures what they are intended to measure. For the SSIP, this means that data measure the specific outcomes and reflect actual progress made for process and outcome measures. To ensure results are reliable, LDOE is collecting data that are accurate, credible and trustworthy.¹² For example, to ensure validity of data on implementation of evidence-based literacy practices, LDOE will analyze results from teacher self-assessments, SPDG-facilitated communities of practice, and SPDG-facilitated district and school leadership team meetings. If LDOE only relied on self-reported results of the fidelity of implementation, we could be measuring only what the teachers know rather than what they are consistently implementing. The additional evaluation measures will reveal whether teachers can apply the skills in practice. Data quality safeguards like these are incorporated throughout the data collection and evaluation process to ensure that we can draw sound conclusions on the impact of the SSIP on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades 3-5.

[IF APPLICABLE] SAMPLING PROCEDURES (C.1.E)

LDOE’s evaluation process will include the universe of students with disabilities included in the SSIP and measured in the SiMR. Louisiana’s SiMR is to increase ELA proficiency rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in third through fifth grades, in nine LEAs across the state. LDOE will collect evaluation data for all students with disabilities who receive the EBPs / coherent improvement strategies. Since LDOE is not sampling, the evaluation results will represent all of the students receiving the EBPs / coherent improvement strategies in the SSIP cohort.

[IF APPROPRIATE] PLANNED DATA COMPARISONS (C.1.F)

LDOE will use student results change over time to demonstrate the effectiveness of the coherent improvement strategies. LDOE established a baseline and targets to measure improvements in literacy outcomes. LDOE targeted increasing ELA results on statewide assessments in nine LEAs, for

⁸ The DCA is an action assessment designed to help educational district leaders and staff better align resources with intended outcomes and develop action plans to support the use of effective innovations. [Click here](#) for more information.

⁹ Planning and Evaluation Tool for Effective Schoolwide Reading Programs (PET-R) rates the quality of a district or school’s reading program implementation. [Click here](#) for more information.

¹⁰ The SPDG evidence-based professional development components worksheet measures implementation of a professional development system. [Click here](#) for more information.

¹¹ Currently in development with assistance from a national literacy expert, the teacher self-assessment will track educator progress with implementation of the coherent improvement strategies with opportunity for reflection.

¹² Sagor, R. (2000). *Guiding School Improvement with Action Research* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

grades 3-5. The established targets will measure whether student results changed over time in the targeted grade levels in those LEAs. In addition, formative assessments will monitor progress of targeted students over the course of the school year, and can be used to monitor progress at the school and district level. The evaluation plan uses this comparison methodology to link the coherent improvement strategies to both implementation (process) and outcomes measures.

HOW DATA MANAGEMENT AND DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES ALLOW FOR ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (C.1.G)

In the SSIP and SPDG framework, data management and data analysis are integrated at all levels of the system—state, district, school and teacher—in order to assess progress towards achieving intended improvements, and to adjust course as necessary. LDOE and SPDG developed a data collection schedule that holds all parties accountable for obtaining valid and reliable process and outcome data.

At the state level, the SSIP Leadership Team met six times to discuss the overarching data and evaluation plan including data management and data analysis procedures. Progress towards completing the data collection and analysis schedule was always discussed. For example, leaders troubleshoot challenges in collecting consistent, valid and reliable data to understand trends in formative assessments at one meeting and then coordinated with a technical expert on the best analytical approach that would yield insight into cohort-level trends while providing usable information for districts and schools at the next. LDOE conducts all outcome measure analyses for formative and summative assessments. Consistent with LDOE operating practices, the management process including data collection, validation, analysis and distribution, is planned out at the beginning of the school year. For process, or fidelity, measures, LDOE and SPDG discussed progress, outcomes, and any potential changes at the SSIP Leadership Team meetings. See section B.2.B “How Stakeholders Have Had a Voice and Been Involved in Decision-Making...” for more information.

LDOE and SPDG began working with districts in FFY 2015, and will begin working with schools in FFY 2016. Each year, protocols for data management and analysis are developed and refined based on practical experience in the field. At the district and school level, SPDG facilitates DLTs and SLTs quarterly to review formative and summative assessments, and other data that impact student achievement. SPDG sets a standard agenda so that all participants continue toward the same goal, but individualizes the approach for each DLT and SLT based on their unique needs. SPDG also establishes and reinforces data management and data analysis procedures so that LDOE and SPDG can collect valid and reliable data for analysis. For example, LDOE communicated directions for formative assessment data collection, then SPDG reinforced those instructions and troubleshoot district-specific challenges to ensure quality data. At the teacher level, LDOE and SPDG are developing protocols to help teachers analyze student work to adjust instruction. SPDG will facilitate communities of practices with small groups of educators to evaluate student work and model effective instruction.

HOW THE STATE HAS DEMONSTRATED PROGRESS AND MADE MODIFICATIONS TO THE SSIP AS NECESSARY (C.2)

Section B.1, outlines key activities that occurred during FFY 2015, reflecting initial progress made in implementing the SSIP. LDOE and SPDG prioritized foundational training in data-informed decision making. During FFY 2015, key state-level personnel, all district leadership teams, and all school leadership teams were trained in a structured data inquiry process. These professional development sessions occurred over the course of several months. LDOE and SPDG proactively took this opportunity to iteratively improve each of the trainings. At the end of each day, LDOE and SPDG obtained immediate feedback to improve the structure for the second day of training, and obtained feedback from each complete professional development session to improve the next. Since the training started at the state and moved down through each level of the system, by the time schools participated in training, it had been refined to reflect a Louisiana context and needs. For example, LDOE and SPDG refined the structure of the training itself, providing a long-term vision so participants could understand their role in the SSIP over time, increased the amount of time for hands on learning, and adjusted the type and amount of data used to help schools understand the ELA instructional successes and challenges.

More globally, LDOE and SPDG have already applied lessons learned from initial implementation to modify the SSIP. In particular, LDOE and SPDG—including ELA, policy, and evaluation experts—are closely collaborating with national experts to develop the upcoming ELA evidence-based literacy practices professional development to ensure content is of the highest quality, aligned to LDOE priorities¹³, and fits the context and needs of Louisiana educators. Further, LDOE and SPDG reviewed all feedback from the first year of professional development to make adjustments. For example, after the initial professional development, many participants identified specific ongoing support needs. LDOE and SPDG ensured that follow-up online modules and SPDG-facilitated leadership team meetings addressed these needs so participants internalized the knowledge and skills to transform their data-informed decision making structures. Recognizing that true mastery comes through iterative, real-world practice, this support will continue throughout the lifecycle of the SSIP and SPDG.

HOW THE STATE HAS REVIEWED KEY DATA THAT PROVIDE EVIDENCE REGARDING PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE SiMR (C.2.A)

Adjustments to SSIP implementation should be responsive, fluid, and ongoing. As a result, LDOE established processes for frequent data reviews at the state, district, and school-levels. These reviews examine the effectiveness of implementation, assess progress toward achieving intended improvements and inform modifications to the SSIP.

LDOE reviewed both quantitative and qualitative data to gauge progress towards achieving intended improvement to infrastructure and SiMR. In FFY 2015, LDOE defined four infrastructure improvement priorities:

1. aligning the SSIP with the state’s newly awarded SPDG grant,

¹³ As outlined in [Louisiana’s School System Planning Guide](#), 2017-2018.

2. expanding the special education portfolio of ELA academic content work,
3. ensuring aspiring educators have ready access to all SSIP professional development opportunities, and
4. aligning the SSIP with the state's new ESSA plan.

Since infrastructure improvements do not have an immediate, direct impact on the SiMR--assessing ELA proficiency of students with disabilities in 3rd - 5th grades--LDOE has relied on qualitative results to gauge success. LDOE reviewed a number of data points that reflected progress made and spurred further action. LDOE defined clear goals for each of the infrastructure improvement priorities and then measured whether activities needed to achieve those goals were fully in place, partially in place, or not in place. LDOE also evaluated progress through evaluation meetings, leadership meetings, and stakeholder meetings. At the end of FFY 2015, LDOE made significant progress towards each of these infrastructure improvement priorities, resulting in substantive shifts both within LDOE and with partner organizations that will benefit students with disabilities both in the SSIP cohort and across the state through anticipated scale up activities. Please see the "Infrastructure Improvement Strategies" section A.2.B for detailed information on infrastructure changes in the four priority areas.

In the SSIP, every action or activity is designed and executed with one ultimate goal in mind: to improve ELA proficiency rates for students with disabilities in 3rd - 5th grades. ELA proficiency rates are a proxy for literacy--Louisiana's ultimate goal is to educate learners who can read, understand and express understanding of complex grade-level texts. During this early phase of implementation, LDOE has focused on data-informed decision making. During FFY 2016, LDOE and SPDG will incorporate evidence-based literacy practices. With these two coherent improvement strategies in hand, educators will have the knowledge and skills to directly impact the achievement of students with disabilities. At that point, we expect to see meaningful change in results that will be reflected in the SiMR. However, LDOE and SPDG understand that there is much value in information available now, including quantitative and qualitative data impacting the SiMR.

To that end, LDOE and SSIP participants have both reviewed a number of quantitative data points including formative assessment results and summative assessment results. LDOE reviewed these data points to understand the large-scale needs of the SSIP cohort. SSIP participants reviewed the data points to understand their specific strengths and needs, conduct root cause analysis, and develop a plan to address their needs. Districts and schools will submit action plans that outline their process to address their SSIP literacy needs and supports in FFY 2016.

LDOE and SPDG have also collected and reviewed a rich set of qualitative data points to measure whether activities have been implemented with fidelity. For example, LDOE, SPDG and other experts, completed a high-quality professional development checklist during the data-informed decision making PD to gauge the quality of delivery, provide immediate, responsive feedback to presenters, and make longer-term adjustments. SPDG completes a professional development activity report that measures participants' gain in knowledge and skills.

In addition to these reviews by LDOE, SPDG and SSIP participants, the External Stakeholder Engagement Group and SEAP also reviewed key data. See section C.3 "Stakeholder Involvement in

the SSIP Evaluation” for more information.

EVIDENCE OF CHANGE TO BASELINE DATA FOR KEY MEASURES (C.2.B)

The SSIP cohort was finalized at the start of FFY 2015. As a result, LDOE updated summative assessment results that demonstrate progress against the SiMR: increasing ELA proficiency (basic and above) rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in grades 3-5, in nine LEAs across the state. Previous results reflected simulated SSIP cohorts, not the final SSIP cohort. LDOE is revising the results for FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015 to reflect data from the final SSIP cohort.

Table C.4: SSIP Cohort Results: Percent of Students with Disabilities Scoring Proficient on Statewide Assessments

FFY	2013	2014	2015
SSIP Cohort Results	36%	37%	35%

In FFY 2015, the External Stakeholder Engagement group recommended changes to targets that maintain rigorous but achievable progress in the finalized SSIP cohort over the SSIP lifecycle. It is important to note that while Louisiana reports on data and targets for FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015, initial implementation began in FFY 2015. As a result, LDOE and SPDG expect to begin to see change in student outcomes in FFY 2016 and beyond. Given the theory behind implementation science, LDOE expects to see more growth in targets during FFY 2017 and FFY 2018. Please see table below for updated targets through FFY 2018.

Table C.5: Previous and Updated Targets for ELA Proficiency (basic and above) Rates in the SSIP Cohort, Over Time

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Previous Target	34%	34%	34%	36%	38%	40%
Updated Target	36%	36%	36%	37%	39%	42%

Other sections of this report contain additional information on evidence of change to baseline data for key measures. Please see C.1.B “Data Sources for Each Key Measure” for additional information on baseline data on the student-centered outcome measures, and A.4 “A Brief Overview of the Year’s Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes” for a description of each activity, with measures of process and outcomes, and the results adjustments planned for FFY 2016.

HOW DATA SUPPORT CHANGES TO IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (C.2.C)

Louisiana began initial implementation with the SSIP cohort in FFY 2015. In the Spring of FFY 2015, LDOE and SPDG began at the district level. Districts participated in foundational training on data-

informed decision making and formed DLTs, which met quarterly. LDOE and SPDG will begin working at the school-level in FFY 2016 and at the teacher level in FFY 2017. As a result, it would be preemptive to report on data that support changes in student outcomes in the FFY 2015. However, LDOE and SPDG collected initial output data such as participant PD surveys that have informed changes to implementation and improvement strategies. For example, as a result of a review of evaluation results, LDOE and SPDG are partnering with OSEP-funded technical assistance centers to update surveys to more accurately capture participants' gain in knowledge and skills. LDOE and SPDG also reviewed infrastructure data resulting in changes to operating structure such as the SSIP Leadership Team. For more information on the data and these changes, please see section A.4 "Brief Overview of the Year's Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes" and B.2.B "How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP".

HOW DATA ARE INFORMING NEXT STEPS IN THE SSIP IMPLEMENTATION (C.2.D)

For information on how data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, please see the section above, section A.4, "Brief Overview of the Year's Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes" and B.2.B, "How Stakeholders Have Had a Voice and Been Involved in Decision-Making Regarding the Ongoing Implementation of the SSIP".

HOW DATA SUPPORT PLANNED MODIFICATIONS TO INTENDED OUTCOMES (INCLUDING THE SIMR)— RATIONALE OR JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CHANGES OR HOW DATA SUPPORT THAT THE SSIP IS ON THE RIGHT PATH (C.2.E)

In FFY 2015, the final SSIP cohort was established; as a result, LDOE rebaselined data and updated targets. This also created an opportunity to revisit planning, implementation, and evaluation results to date in order to identify any modifications to intended outcomes, including the SiMR. Section C.2.B, "Evidence of Change to Baseline Data for Key Measures" discusses the rationale for changes to SiMR data. Beyond updating the SSIP cohort and correlated SiMR results, LDOE also used data from the FFY 2015 evaluation to plan adjustments to the SSIP in FFY 2016 and beyond. Please see section A.4, "Brief Overview of the Year's Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes" and B.2.B, "How Stakeholders Have Had a Voice and Been Involved in Decision-Making Regarding the Ongoing Implementation of the SSIP" for additional information.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN THE SSIP EVALUATION (C.3)

HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN INFORMED OF THE ONGOING EVALUATION OF THE SSIP (C.3.A)

LDOE maintained an External Stakeholder Engagement Group for Phase III that includes members from Phases I and II to ensure continuity in planning and evaluation of implementation. The group met for two half-day in person sessions with additional virtual correspondence to reflect on progress of the FFY 2015 SSIP. This group is responsible for providing additional input into the evaluation process and results. As the SSIP has transitioned from exploration to initial implementation, the External Stakeholder Engagement Group has begun to provide input on the both the quality of the evaluation and the results.

The External Stakeholder Engagement Group includes key stakeholders from across Louisiana who bring a diverse set of perspectives to the SSIP. However, LDOE will continue to inform additional stakeholders and seek additional input. LDOE regularly updates SEAP on the SSIP's progress and seeks their recommendations. During FFY 2015, the SSIP was presented as part of a larger conversation on the APR at one meeting, and as a stand along agenda item at another. LDOE also presents and brings proposals to various groups that represent different special education constituencies. LDOE will continue to seek opportunities for this input, which builds knowledge and capacity for the SSIP, and creates an ongoing feedback loop into the plan. LDOE also posts the SSIP reports on its website for the general public.

HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE HAD A VOICE AND BEEN INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE ONGOING EVALUATION OF THE SSIP (C.3.B)

During FFY 2015, the stakeholders had the opportunity to inform decisions made as a result of the evaluation outcomes. LDOE employed a “problems of practice” model to get specific decision-making input from the External Stakeholder Engagement Group. In this model, LDOE and SPDG posed specific questions to spark rich discussion focused on solving specific evaluation and implementation challenges. Questions included, but were not limited to:

- The SSIP evaluation team conducted a review of the in-person DIDM training evaluation results from February 2016, June 2016 and July 2016. The results indicate a need for more concrete measures of actual knowledge and skills developed. Based on the new draft pre/post survey model, what changes do you think need to be made to accurately capture whether participants gained objective-specific knowledge and skills?
- There are real world trade-offs between fidelity and capacity. Considering the current context, how does the SSIP effectively measure whether educators in the classroom are implementing evidence-based practices with fidelity?
- LDOE and SPDG have drafted an initial solution to obtain and evaluate formative assessments across the SSIP cohort. This solution allows LDOE to complete a categorical comparative analysis as a launch point for structured DIDM conversations with DLTs and SLTs. Considering the advantages and disadvantages of this approach, should LDOE continue or make a change?
- In school districts and schools with which you are familiar, how is the performance of students with disabilities, especially in elementary grades, in literacy or English/language arts communicated to you?

The Stakeholder group provided feedback and recommendations that directly impact the direction of the evaluation. For example, when the group discussed the new pre/post survey model for upcoming in-person training, stakeholder members suggested that survey questions include a response to indicate participants do not know the answer. This is intended to alleviate concerns participants may have that they must “know the answer” before the training begins. The group also suggested that the PD presenter set a clear expectation at the beginning of the session about the intent of the survey. LDOE and SPDG integrated those and other suggestions directly into survey development in order to obtain valid and reliable evaluation results. LDOE and SPDG are working with external technical assistance experts on many of these challenges, including survey development, but the diverse expertise and experiences of the External Stakeholder Group provides

insights into these types of problems that move towards workable solutions.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES (D)

DATA LIMITATIONS THAT AFFECTED REPORTS OF PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP AND ACHIEVING THE SIMR DUE TO QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION DATA (D.1)

CONCERN OR LIMITATIONS RELATED TO THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF THE DATA USED TO REPORT PROGRESS OR RESULTS (D.1.A)

LDOE and SPDG developed an evaluation plan to measure progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR--with outcome and process measures. All evaluations must contend with data limitations, such as collecting valid and reliable data or collecting data that does not accurately reflect results achieved. Over the first year of implementation, a couple of data limitations have come to light related to formative assessments and changes to LEA infrastructure.

Challenges in collecting valid and reliable data that measure the progress of students with disabilities at multiple points over the course of the school year. The SSIP SiMR measures progress at one discrete point during the school year when students take statewide assessments. This is a critical measure, but LDOE needs additional outcome measures that gauge progress with more frequency during the school year. LDOE is collecting formative assessment data from participating school systems after a fall, winter and spring administration. Louisiana is a local control state, meaning school systems decide which curricula, formative assessments, and professional development they will employ. This allows LEAs to make decisions based on local needs, but presents challenges in the context of the SSIP. Across our SSIP cohort, school systems use different formative assessments, with some using different assessments at different grades; assessments are administered at different times and frequencies; assessments have different scale scores and achievement levels. LDOE and SPDG worked with LDOE data analytics group and multiple OSEP-funded technical assistance centers to craft a two-prong solution. First, in order to gauge progress in the short-term, LDOE developed a categorical analysis¹⁴ to measure SSIP-level progress and provide more detailed school system specific progress. In the longer-term LDOE and SPDG are working with schools systems to evaluate the effectiveness of their formative assessments. If they are not effective (e.g. not aligned to Louisiana Student Standards and curricula), LDOE and SPDG are helping school systems to select a small number of standards-aligned, non-summative assessments, and eliminate non-aligned and redundant assessments.¹⁵

Challenges resulting from changes to the structure and make up of participating districts and schools. LDOE and SPDG are partnering with nine LEAs across the state, which are working in dynamic and changing conditions. As the first year of implementation winds down, two participating LEAs are considering adding schools or adjusting census zones of schools which may affect students in the initial cohort. LDOE and SPDG structured the cohort to account for typical transfer of individual students, but the scale of these changes may affect LEA-level and even cohort-level results. If these

¹⁴ LDOE has worked closely with OSEP-funded TA Centers to develop this approach using this [guide](#).

¹⁵ The SSIP is aligning with [Louisiana's School System Planning Guide](#) (2017-2018)

changes occur, it will affect LDOE and SPDG's ability to track progress over time. LDOE and SPDG are working with various stakeholders (both internal and external) to develop a solution that works both in the short and long term. For example, LDOE and SPDG are developing protocols to troubleshoot scenarios, such as a participating school closing or key district or school leadership changing, with preliminary solutions to support the LEAs, solve for data quality issues, and resolve other logistical issues.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ASSESSING PROGRESS OR RESULTS (D.1.B)

Implications for assessing progress or results are discussed in section D.1.A, "Concern or Limitations Related to the Quality or Quantity of the Data Used to Report Progress or Results".

PLANS FOR IMPROVING DATA QUALITY (D.1.C)

Plans for improving data quality are discussed in section D.1.A, "Concern or Limitations Related to the Quality or Quantity of the Data Used to Report Progress or Results".

PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E)

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E.1)

INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGES THAT SUPPORT SSIP INITIATIVES, INCLUDING HOW SYSTEM CHANGES SUPPORT ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SiMR, SUSTAINABILITY, AND SCALE-UP (E.1.A)

At the core of Louisiana’s infrastructure changes is a belief that disparate stakeholders must work together as a cohesive community in order for Louisiana to achieve the SiMR, create sustainable change, and scale up evidence-based practices proven to work for students with disabilities across the state. The infrastructure changes have been developed to 1) increase investment in literacy outcomes for students with disabilities, 2) align and integrate initiatives to further sustainability, and 3) create systems change that live beyond individual actors. Section A.2.B, “Infrastructure Improvement Strategies”, discussed infrastructure changes that support the SSIP in detail. In that section, LDOE discusses four infrastructure focus areas:

- 1) aligning LDOE’s SSIP with the state’s newly awarded SPDG grant,
- 2) expanding the portfolio of ELA academic content work to target improvements for students with disabilities,
- 3) integrating special education into the state’s plan to develop aspiring and veteran educators, and
- 4) aligning the SSIP with the state’s new ESSA plan.

To illustrate a specific example, infrastructure change resulting in further alignment between special education and ELA work on the Academic Content Team is discussed in greater detail below.

The SSIP is deeply aligned with the Academic Content Team to achieve these specific outcomes. Louisiana has emphasized high-quality curricula with a belief that local school systems are best positioned to make curricular decisions, and LDOE is well positioned to support these decisions. LDOE is providing schools with tools, resources and professional development aligned with top-rated curricula to ensure effective implementation. The emphasis on curricula is producing results, Louisiana’s fourth grade students achieved the highest growth amongst all states on the 2015 NAEP for reading. Further, there is a growing body of evidence demonstrating the efficacy of high-quality curricula on improving student outcomes.¹⁶ The SSIP is aligned with this work to ensure that these results extend to struggling readers, including students with disabilities. For example, LDOE and SPDG are piloting evidence-based literacy practices that work for students with disabilities. Through the evaluation, LDOE will identify those practices that work best in a Louisiana context and then use those to update the ELA Guidebooks -- LDOE’s own high-quality ELA curricula for grades 3-12. ELA Guidebooks are available to all Louisiana educators free of charge. LDOE has added a special education-focused team of experts to build out supports, including updating the ELA Guidebooks based on the outcomes with the SSIP cohort. As discussed above, this approach

¹⁶ Click [here](#) for more information on Louisiana’s curricula-focused approach. Click [here](#) for additional national coverage on Louisiana’s NAEP growth.

will produce results that will be reflected in the SiMR. Sustainability and scale-up are organically embedded in the structure of this approach since it’s funded by LDOE for all ELA educators across the state.

EVIDENCE THAT SSIP’S EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES ARE BEING CARRIED OUT WITH FIDELITY AND HAVING THE DESIRED EFFECTS (E.1.B)

As noted earlier, during FFY 2015 (SY 2015-2016), LDOE began initial implementation of the DIDM coherent improvement strategy and continued development of the other strategies. In February 2016, LDOE and SPDG launched implementation of the DIDM strategy with an in person training for LDOE officials followed by an in person training for all SSIP district leadership teams. In summer 2016, LDOE and SPDG hosted foundational DIDM training for all school leadership teams. Districts¹⁷ also participated in a series of online modules over the months following training to reinforce key concepts.

In FFY 2015, evaluation focused on fidelity of implementation of DIDM and continuous leadership development. Specifically, LDOE and SPDG ensured that planned activities were completed and that activities reached the intended audience. Further, in the case of professional development, LDOE and SPDG measured whether participants increased their knowledge and skills, and whether the professional development was of high quality. To measure this, LDOE and SPDG collected and reviewed artifacts of FFY 2015 activities including agendas, sign in sheets, PD activity reports, PD surveys, and other evidence. LDOE, SPDG and the External Stakeholder Engagement Group discussed the outcomes of these initial activities and planned adjustments for FFY 2016. For more detailed information, please see section A.4 “Brief Overview of the Year’s Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes”.

In FFY 2016, as initial implementation expands, LDOE will report on additional evidence-based practices, whether they are carried out with fidelity and whether they have the desired effects.

OUTCOMES REGARDING PROGRESS TOWARD SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM OBJECTIVES THAT ARE NECESSARY STEPS TOWARD ACHIEVING THE SIMR (E.1.C)

LDOE and SPDG finalized the SSIP cohort in FFY 2015. Louisiana’s SiMR measures ELA proficiency rates (basic and above) on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in grades 3-5, in nine LEAs across the state. The table below shows the cohort’s results on statewide assessments since FFY 2013:

Table E.1: SSIP Cohort Results: Percent of Students with Disabilities Scoring Proficient on Statewide Assessments

FFY	2013	2014	2015
SSIP Cohort Results	36.18%	36.68%	35.14%

LDOE and SPDG have made significant progress toward the short-term and long-term objectives

¹⁷ Schools are also completing online training modules. These activities will occur during FFY 2016, and will be reported in the FFY 2016 report.

that will ultimately result in progress towards achieving the SiMR. For additional information on outcomes regarding progress towards short-term and long-term objectives please see section C.2.B, “Evidence of Change to Baseline Data for Key Measures”.

MEASURABLE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE SiMR IN RELATION TO TARGETS (E.1.D)

Please see table below for updated targets through FFY 2018. Please see section E.1.C above for SSIP cohort SiMR results from FFY 2013 to FFY 2015. It is important to note that while Louisiana reports on data and targets for FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015, initial implementation began in FFY 2015. As a result, LDOE and SPDG expect to begin to see change in student outcomes and the SiMR in FFY 2016 and beyond. Given the theory behind implementation science, LDOE expects to see more growth in targets during FFY 2017 and FFY 2018.

Table E.2: Updated Targets, ELA Proficiency (basic and above) Rates in the SSIP Cohort, Over Time

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Updated Target	36%	36%	36%	37%	39%	42%

PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR (F)

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED NEXT YEAR, WITH TIMELINE (F.1)

Please see *Table B.1: Key Activities with Intended and Actual Timelines and Outcomes* which has each of the key activities from FFY 2015 (SY 2015-2016) through the end of the SSIP and the SPDG grant with timelines and notes on progress.

PLANNED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES INCLUDING DATA COLLECTION, MEASURES, AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES (F.2)

Please see section C.1.D “Data Collection Procedures and Associated Timelines” including table *Table C.3: Annual Data Collection Timeline and* which outlines the data collection plan for the entirety of the SSIP and SPDG grant cycle. Please also see section C.1.B “Data Sources for Each Key Measure” for additional information on this topic.

As discussed above, it is important to note that while Louisiana reports on data and targets for FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015, initial implementation began in FFY 2015. As a result, LDOE and SPDG expect to begin to see change in student outcomes and the SiMR in FFY 2016 and beyond. Given the theory behind implementation science, LDOE expects to see more growth in targets during FFY 2017 and FFY 2018.

ANTICIPATED BARRIERS AND STEPS TO ADDRESS THOSE BARRIERS (F.3)

LDOE identified barriers to implementation as part of the Infrastructure Analysis completed during Phase I and updated during Phase II. Now in Phase III, barriers and steps to address those barriers are identified through the evaluation process. Section D.1, “Concerns or Limitations Related to the Quality or Quantity of the Data Used to Report Progress or Results” describes some of these barriers including 1) challenges in collecting valid and reliable data that measure the progress of students with disabilities at multiple points over the course of the school year, and 2) challenges resulting from changes to the structure and make up of participating districts and schools.

In addition to the barriers discussed above, LDOE and SPDG, with input from stakeholders and support for technical assistance centers, identified additional potential barriers and steps to address those barriers. For example, SPDG will soon begin to work directly with school-based educators to adjust and refine practices in the classroom. LDOE and SPDG anticipate educators will not openly engage with the SSIP supports if they believe SPDG will evaluate in a supervisory capacity. LDOE and SPDG will address this through expectation setting at foundational in-person professional development sessions, and then reinforce at DLTs and SLTs. Further, all SPDG personnel are participating in coaching training, including topics such as developing effective relationships and giving effective feedback. These steps will help establish open, trusting, non-evaluative relationships between SPDG and school-based educators.

Beyond individual barriers, LDOE and SPDG have established structures, and updated those structures to ensure that barriers are addressed as early as possible and next steps are developed collaboratively amongst key stakeholders to ensure solutions are proactive and workable in the implementation environment.

LDOE and SPDG have established key teams at the state, district and school level who each identify and address potential barriers. These teams are described below:

- State Leadership Team – In FFY 2015, LDOE and SPDG convened the State Leadership Team to steer the planning and implementation of the SSIP. This team includes LDOE personnel, SPDG staff, and other representatives. All program-level barriers are vetted through this team, workable solutions are drafted and then communicated to district and school leadership teams.
- District Leadership Teams (DLT) – Each SSIP LEA has established a DLT. This team includes key decision-makers and representatives of stakeholders from the LEA including a special education supervisor, elementary supervisor, special education staff, a general education curriculum representative, data / accountability staff, and a representative of parent / family initiatives. In addition, the District Leadership Team will include representatives from each participating school, a regional support contact, and a SPDG facilitator. Each LEA Leadership Team has a direct contact at LDOE. District Leadership Team members elevate district-specific challenges to SPDG facilitators or their LDOE point of contact. LDOE and SPDG coordinate to identify solutions and are responsible for ensuring resolution.
- School Leadership Teams (SLT) – Each school participating in the SSIP has established an SLT that will begin convening in FFY 2016. These teams reflect the DLTs in structure, such that membership includes key decision-makers and representatives of stakeholders, and purpose. Like DLTs, members elevate school-specific challenges to SPDG facilitators or their LDOE point of contact. LDOE and SPDG coordinate to identify solutions and are responsible for ensuring resolution.

THE STATE DESCRIBES ANY NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT AND/OR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (F.4)

LDOE has accessed TA throughout SSIP development in Phase I, II and III to leverage expertise in infrastructure analysis, survey development, fidelity measures, program evaluation, coaching structures, evidence-based literacy practices, etc. LDOE will continue to seek out TA from the NCSI, SRI, and others centers that have provided expert assistance to LDOE in these areas.

OSEP can assist LDOE by

- providing adequate funding to these centers to continue their assistance programs including learning collaboratives and targeted assistance, and
- providing additional tools and resources for conducting evaluations during implementation.

These resources will help LDOE address barriers to improving literacy results for students with disabilities in grades 3-5.

APPENDIX A – SSIP CONTRIBUTORS

LDOE established a number of teams and groups to execute, provide feedback, and make recommendations on various components of the SSIP. Below is a comprehensive list of individuals who contributed to the SSIP, including team composition and representing organizations.

SSIP LEADERSHIP TEAM	
Representative	Organization
Wendy Allen	Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant
Monica Ballay	Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant
Kala Burrell-Craft	Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant
R. Kenton Denny	Louisiana State University
Debra Dixon	Louisiana Department of Education
Nancy Hicks	Louisiana Department of Education
Jane Nell Luster	South Central Comprehensive Center
Nanette Olivier	Louisiana Department of Education
Kristi-Jo Preston	Louisiana Department of Education
Summer Whitmore	Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant
Pamdora Williams	Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant
Jamie Wong	Louisiana Department of Education

EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ADVISORS		
Representative	Organization	Area of Expertise
Jill Allor	Southern Methodist University	Literacy
Michelle Duda	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; National Implementation Research Network	Data-Informed Decision Making, Evaluation
Ron Dughman	American Institutes for Research	Evaluation
Jane Nell Luster	South Central Comprehensive Center	Facilitation, Evaluation
Katherine Nagle	National Center for Systemic Improvement	Evaluation
Debbie Shaver	SRI Education	Evaluation
Jeanne Wanzek	Vanderbilt University	Literacy
Kerri White	South Central Comprehensive Center	State Capacity

EVALUATION TEAM	
Representative	Organization
Monica Ballay	Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant
Laura Boudreaux	Louisiana Department of Education
Kristi-Jo Preston	Louisiana Department of Education
Jane Nell Luster	South Central Comprehensive Center

SSIP EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT GROUP

Representative	Organization
Monica Ballay	Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant
Andrea Bond	Charter School - Collegiate Academy
Brenda Cosse	Developmental Disabilities Council / Parent
Alan Coulter	LSU Human Development Center
Debra Dixon	Louisiana Department of Education
Nancy Hicks	Louisiana Department of Education
Anna Lincoln	Plaquemines Parish Schools
Jane Nell Luster	South Central Comprehensive Center
Ashley McReyonlds	Parent
Paul Mooney	LSU Special Education Department / SEAP
Nanette Olivier	Louisiana Department of Education
Carla Parrie	Sabine Parish Schools
Kristi-Jo Preston	Louisiana Department of Education
Susan Vaughn	Ascension Parish Schools / SEAP
Summer Whitmore	Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant
Jamie Wong	Louisiana Department of Education

LDOE LITERACY SPECIALIST GROUP

Representative	LDOE Division / Office
Nanette Olivier	Special Education Policy
Kristi-Jo Preston	Special Education Policy
Jill Slack	Academic Content
Whitney Whealdon	Academic Content
Jamie Wong	Special Education Policy

SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL

Panel Member	Panel Role
Patsy White	Panel Chair
Andrea Bond	Representative of a public charter school
Sabrina Langley	Parent
Bonnie Buckelew	Special Education Supervisor / Parent
Toni Buxton	Representative from the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care (DCFS)
Laura Nata	Parent
Lynette Fontenot	Individual with disability
Kimberlee Gazzolo	Representative of a private school
Libby Muphy	Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
Mark Martin	Representative of a state agency involved in financing or delivery of services to children with disabilities
Paul Mooney	Representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education and related services personnel

Rana Ottallah	Parent
Melvin Porter	Parent
Amanda Trahan	Teacher / Parent
Lindsey Jackson	Teacher
Susan Vaughn	Special Education Supervisor
Pittre Walker	An official who carries out activities under subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and a parent of a child with a disability
Jamie Wong	LDOE Staff Coordinator