

# SSIP

STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

**APRIL 2018**



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)	8
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)	14
HIGHLIGHTS OF CHANGES TO IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (A.5)	17
PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP (B)	19
DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE’S SSIP IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (B.1)	19
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)	19
INTENDED OUTPUTS ACCOMPLISHED AS A RESULT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES (B.1.B)	21
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN SSIP IMPLEMENTATION (B.2)	23
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN INFORMED OF THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSIP (B.2.A)	23
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE HAD A VOICE AND BEEN INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING REGARDING THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSIP (B.2.B)	23
DATA ON IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES (C)	25
HOW THE STATE MONITORED AND MEASURED OUTPUTS (STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES) TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (C.1)	25
HOW EVALUATION MEASURES ALIGN WITH THE THEORY OF ACTION (C.1.A)	25
DATA SOURCES FOR EACH KEY MEASURE (C.1.B)	25
DESCRIPTION OF BASELINE DATA FOR KEY MEASURES (C.1.C)	29
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND ASSOCIATED TIMELINES (C.1.D)	29
[IF APPLICABLE] SAMPLING PROCEDURES (C.1.E)	31
[IF APPROPRIATE] PLANNED DATA COMPARISONS (C.1.F)	31
HOW DATA MANAGEMENT AND DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES ALLOW FOR ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (C.1.G)	31
HOW THE STATE HAS DEMONSTRATED PROGRESS AND MADE MODIFICATIONS TO THE SSIP AS NECESSARY (C.2)	32

HOW THE STATE HAS REVIEWED KEY DATA THAT PROVIDE EVIDENCE REGARDING PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE SIMR (C.2.A)	32
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)	34
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)	35
HOW STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN INFORMED OF THE ONGOING EVALUATION OF THE SSIP (C.3.A)	35
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)	36
DATA LIMITATIONS THAT AFFECTED REPORTS OF PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP AND ACHIEVING THE SIMR DUE TO QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION DATA (D.1)	36
CONCERN OR LIMITATIONS RELATED TO THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF THE DATA USED TO REPORT PROGRESS OR RESULTS (D.1.A)	36
IMPLICATIONS FOR ASSESSING PROGRESS OR RESULTS (D.1.B)	37
PLANS FOR IMPROVING DATA QUALITY (D.1.C)	37
PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E)	38
ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING INTENDED IMPROVEMENTS (E.1)	38
INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGES THAT SUPPORT SSIP INITIATIVES, INCLUDING HOW SYSTEM CHANGES SUPPORT ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SIMR, SUSTAINABILITY, AND SCALE-UP (E.1.A)	38
EVIDENCE THAT SSIP’S EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES ARE BEING CARRIED OUT WITH FIDELITY AND HAVING THE DESIRED EFFECTS (E.1.B)	39
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)	40
PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR (F)	41
ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED NEXT YEAR, WITH TIMELINE (F.1)	41
PLANNED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES INCLUDING DATA COLLECTION, MEASURES, AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES (F.2)	41
ANTICIPATED BARRIERS AND STEPS TO ADDRESS THOSE BARRIERS (F.3)	41
THE STATE DESCRIBES ANY NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT AND/OR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (F.4)	41

## ACRONYMS AND KEY TERMS

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

## 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 career. The challenges of meeting the needs of diverse learners, including students with disabilities, 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 rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in third through fifth grades, in nine school systems (SSIP cohort<sup>1</sup>) across the state.

**Louisiana’s SSIP Shows Strong Results After This First Year of Implementation** In the SSIP, Louisiana has focused on ensuring ELA educators of students with disabilities 1) have access to high-quality, standards-based curriculum with evidence-based supports for students with disabilities, 2) have ongoing, aligned professional development to use that curriculum effectively with students with disabilities, and 3) have and use data from a focused set of standards-aligned assessments measuring how well students are meeting the outcomes of the high-quality curriculum. Statewide assessment results show that this effort is already producing results for students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort. In FFY 2016, students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort achieved a 41.72% proficiency rate, a six and a half percentage point increase from the prior year.

*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%	<b>41.72%</b>		
Targets	36%	36%	36%	37%	39%	42%

**Focus of SSIP Phase III, Year Two Report.** These promising results show that the SSIP is on track toward improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five, but much work remains. This report details progress in implementing the SSIP including state-level infrastructure changes, specific activities to support the implementation of evidence-based practices, evaluation outcomes and resulting adjustments to the SSIP, and future plans for this work, including scale-up activities.

---

<sup>1</sup> The SSIP cohort measures students with disabilities in grades three through five. Each year, new students will enter the cohort (typically in third grade) and will exit the cohort when they move from fifth to sixth grade. Since the SSIP supports educator effectiveness, it tracks the outcomes of the students they directly educate.



**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.



are implemented with fidelity...



...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. The SSIP, with the theory of action, is intended to deepen and expand upon the *Louisiana Believes* premise. This premise is rooted in the belief that teachers are most effective when they have access to a high-quality, standards-based curriculum, ongoing professional development to use the curriculum effectively, and data from a focused set of standards-aligned assessments measuring how well students are meeting the outcomes of the high-quality curriculum. These strategies, when implemented with fidelity, will result in increased ELA proficiency rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in grades three through five. First, in the SSIP cohort, and then across the state as the scale up plan is executed.

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 26.

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

#### COHERENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES (A.2.A)

To implement the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, LDOE used a layering approach. LDOE began with foundational professional development in data-informed decisions making, then evidence-based literacy practices, and incorporated continuous leadership development activities throughout. Each school year, LDOE builds upon the foundational knowledge and skills with additional, targeted professional development to improve implementation. Below is a summary of each coherent improvement strategy.

**Data-informed decision making** is the lens through which all effective decisions should be made; whether they are infrastructure changes at the school system, curricula decisions at the school, or instructional decisions in the classroom. LDOE believes that assessments have the best impact on student learning when they are:

- Meaningful: Fully aligned to standards and state summative assessments
- Minimal: Take as little time as possible from learning
- Connected: Easily connect to curriculum and day-to-day learning
- Transparent: Teachers have a shared depth of understanding about the purpose and design

To that end, Louisiana has launched a free high-quality assessment system that provides educators with a complete picture of student learning at the beginning, middle and end of the school year, called [LEAP](#)

[360](#). LEAP 360 delivers streamlined assessments in a comprehensive system for classrooms, schools and school systems.

- Diagnostic assessments: given at the start of the school year; determine student readiness for new course work and assist teachers in setting meaningful and ambitious goals;
- Interim assessments: administered a check points throughout the year; evaluate student learning and monitor progress toward year-end goals and allow teachers to target and adjust instructions; and
- EAGLE: integrates high-quality questions into day-to-day classroom experiences through teacher-created tests, premade assessments, and individual items for small group instruction.

The SSIP is focused on adoption and effective use of LEAP 360 so that SSIP school systems, schools and classrooms will have data-based decision-making tools aligned with the state standards that use real-time data to inform adjustments to practice. Educators use results from LEAP 360 to adjust instructional pacing and planning, and identify individual students with disabilities or groups of students in need of additional supports in specific areas that can be supported by the evidence-based literacy practices.

LDOE’s approach to **evidence-based literacy practices** starts with a belief that all students should have access to high-quality curriculum and instruction grounded in the use of quality grade-level texts. The SSIP is focused on ensuring evidence-based literacy practices are implemented with fidelity in the SSIP cohort using three components:

- Ensure all students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort have access to high-quality evidence-based curriculum aligned with the state standards;
- Pilot additional evidence-based supports for diverse learners for times when the high-quality curriculum needs to be modified to accommodate the unique needs of students with disabilities;
- Review and tier intervention programs and facilitate their adoption in SSIP schools so that students with disabilities with more intensive needs receive high-quality evidence-based accelerated learning to close the student achievement gap.

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. LDOE has developed a list of high-quality Tier 1 curricula, including ELA Guidebooks. Educators need professional development that focuses on helping them navigate and use the curriculum effectively. Though most school system across Louisiana have made great strides in increasing the quality of instructional materials used in the classroom, very few teachers report having access to high-quality, ongoing professional development to help them navigate and apply their curriculum effectively. SSIP professional development is focused on providing educational leaders with the support they need to ensure evidence-based literacy practices and data-based decision-making strategies are implemented with fidelity. For example, SSIP educators are participating in the Content Leader initiative, a nine-day training that focuses on developing deep knowledge of ELA content and content pedagogy, the knowledge and skills they need to effectively use and help others use the ELA Guidebooks, and the knowledge of adult learning theory and the skills to facilitate high-quality learning experiences for fellow educators. This strategy develops educator leaders who enact change to improve outcomes for students

with disabilities in grades three through five. 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, leveraging infrastructure improvements to implement a sound plan to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort and scale up best practices. To that end, LDOE is carrying out four infrastructure improvement strategies: 1) aligning LDOE’s SSIP with the state’s SPDG, 2) expanding the Academic Content Team’s portfolio of special education work, 3) integrating special education into the state’s plan to develop 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.1: Cross-walk of Infrastructure Elements to SSIP Infrastructure Improvement Activities*

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

### Infrastructure Improvements: Aligning with SPDG to Advance Implementation Efforts

Louisiana’s SSIP leverages the SPDG to program resources to carry out the coherent improvement strategies. During FFY 2016, LDOE pursued infrastructure improvements that would further align SPDG with the SSIP as well as Louisiana’s recently approved ESSA plan. Louisiana’s ESSA plan is largely focused on the needs of historically disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities. As LDOE began to implement ESSA in the 2017-2018 school year, LDOE refocused the SPDG<sup>2</sup> initiative to ensure it 1) aligns

<sup>2</sup> In August, 2016, the US Department of Education approved the [grant](#), awarding Louisiana \$6.06 million over five years.<sup>2</sup> SPDG

with the goals and vision of the ESSA plan and 2) results in increased state-level capacity to affect literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. Louisiana has worked hard to raise expectations for students and students are performing at higher levels than ever before. Yet, there is still much work to do to deliver on the promise of higher achievement for students with disabilities. This infrastructure improvement will accelerate the state's progress in developing, piloting, refining, and scaling up specific evidence-based tools and resources for educators of students with disabilities in grades three through five.

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

Over the past year, LDOE has continued to build on efforts to integrate special education more fully into LDOE's academic content portfolio of work. LDOE has focused on three primary activities: 1) developing a vision to expand ELA Guidebooks to reach all students, including students with disabilities; 2) deepening ELA expertise within LDOE to develop content-specific tools, resources, and technical assistance, 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. LDOE will scale up the SSIP's evidence-based practices through the refinement and expansion of ELA Guidebooks to give educators the tools to effectively specialize instruction for students with disabilities. LDOE is leveraging the SSIP to pilot evidence-based literacy practices that support diverse learners, including 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 professional development sessions and provide additional technical assistance for school systems across the state through Teacher Leader events.

As part of the SPDG realignment, the academic content team has brought on two additional staff members whose primary responsibility is to deliver the components of the SPDG and SSIP evidence-based literacy practices framework. These staff are leading the field-facing coherent improvement strategy work to implement evidence-based literacy practices in the SSIP cohort. They will also lead the process of gathering data from the pilot to refine ELA Guidebooks and identify additional supports for diverse learners that will be available, with implementation support, to educators across the state.

Through the SSIP, in conjunction with other statewide initiatives, LDOE is advancing a portfolio of ELA work to support students with disabilities. This past year, LDOE launched one of the key initiatives to improve those supports, [Strategies for Success: A Guidebook for Supporting Students with Disabilities](#) which provides principals and school system leaders with in-depth support in four proven strategies for improving the academic achievement of students with disabilities:

- 1) identify disabilities early and accurately;
- 2) provide high-quality instruction to ensure the achievement of ambitious IEP goals;
- 3) strengthen instruction with specialized supports and related services;

---

was funded to provide professional development opportunities for teachers of students with disabilities in Louisiana.

- 4) coordinate effective transition planning and implementation.

This guidebook represents one of the first products from LDOE's efforts to scale up tools and resources to school systems across the state. This work was developed in close collaboration with multiple LDOE teams that support the SSIP and SPDG work, demonstrating the benefits of effective infrastructure change.

### **Internal Infrastructure Improvements: Developing Educators**

In Louisiana, all ELA professional development is rooted in helping educators use high-quality curriculum effectively. Though most school systems across Louisiana have made great strides in increasing the quality of instructional materials used in classrooms, very few teachers report having access to high-quality, ongoing professional development that helps them navigate and apply their curriculum effectively. Additionally, the teaching profession remains relatively flat with a dearth of leadership opportunities between classroom teaching and principalships. In turn, educators who do not wish to become principals don't always have the opportunity to build the necessary knowledge and skills in a scaffolded way over time. This is particularly acute for special education teachers.

For these reasons, Louisiana's SSIP is integrating with the Content Leader and Teacher Leader initiatives. Louisiana's Content Leader initiative is addressing these challenges by growing local leadership pipelines for schools and school systems by developing talented teachers within the system and equipping a cadre of talented educators with the knowledge and skills to coach and support other teachers within their schools and school systems. SSIP educators are participating in Content Leader's nine-day training that focuses on developing 1) deep knowledge of ELA content and content pedagogy, 2) the knowledge and skills they need to effectively use and help others use the ELA Guidebooks, and 3) the knowledge of adult learning theory and the skills to facilitate high-quality learning experiences for fellow educators. This strategy develops educator leaders who enact change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five. Continuous leadership development recognizes that there is no point when a leader is fully developed. Instead, leaders continuously identify ways to improve their practice.

Louisiana's Teacher Leader initiative brings together 6,500 educators and content experts who are focused on creating meaningful growth for every student, every day. Teacher Leaders are a corps of highly effective teachers, with a track record of improved student outcomes, that provide training and support to peers, model strategies and facilitate grade-level meetings on data. The SSIP is aligned with Teacher Leader to build a cohort of Teacher Leaders with the tools and resources schools can use to reach diverse learners.

### **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 with disabilities. Louisiana's [ESSA plan](#) was approved in August 2017. Under the approved plan, LDOE has launched [School Finder](#), which provides each school and the public with new and transparent information on each ESSA subgroup, including

students with disabilities, to provide easy-to-understand, easily comparable data to guide planning and intervention. With this spotlight on subgroups like students with disabilities, LDOE launched the School Redesign process, which helps school systems create strong plans to address the needs of struggling schools and subgroups. Anticipating these changes, the SSIP began taking school systems through the subgroup data analysis and planning process. 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, begun, ongoing, or completed. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list.

#### **Evidence-based Literacy Practices**

LDOE is focused on implementing a three-tiered approach to improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five:

- 1) develop and deliver a core track of in-person training opportunities focused on helping educators navigate and use high-quality curriculum effectively with diverse learners, with ongoing professional development focused on fidelity of implementation,
- 2) improve small-group interventions through a diverse learners resource pilot, and
- 3) support implementation of intensive intervention programs.

*Focus On Tier 1: Developing and delivering a core track of in-person training opportunities focused on helping educators navigate and use high-quality curriculum effectively with diverse learners with ongoing professional development focused on fidelity of implementation.*

LDOE is launching a revised training model for the SSIP cohort that is fully integrated with the successful [Teacher Leader](#) model and aligned with the approach to improve literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. At the Teacher Leader Summit, over three days in June of each year, educators in the SSIP cohort will gather for the professional development they need to navigate and use high-quality curriculum effectively with diverse learners.

- SSIP cohort educators participate in a two-day in-person Literacy Leadership Launch training. (Completed June 2017)
- SSIP cohort educators participate in a nine-day in-person Content Leader training. (Begun in the 2017-2018 school year)
- SSIP cohort educators participate in a three-day in-person Teacher Leader Summit with a track of sessions specifically focused on developing knowledge and skills related to the coherent improvement strategies. (Planned June 2018)
  - SSIP cohort educators will also attend additional Teacher Leader sessions on effective data use, standards-aligned curriculum use, and family partnerships, among others to deepen their connections to the content. (Planned June 2018)
- SSIP cohort educators participate in ongoing virtual professional development focused on fidelity of implementation. (Planned 2018-2019 school year)

*Focus on Tier 2: Improve small-group interventions through a diverse learners' resource pilot*

LDOE is using the SSIP cohort as the field facing implementation vehicle for the diverse learners' work, which began in the 2017-2018 school year. The diverse learners' work includes the *Diverse Learners Guide*, the [supports flow chart](#), and additional ELA guidebook specific supports.

- Teacher Leader Advisors create ELA Guidebook supports for teachers to reach diverse learners in grades three through five. Supports are geared toward small group instruction. (Begun in the 2017-2018 school year)
- SSIP cohort teachers pilot these supports in their classrooms across the state. (Planned Fall 2018)
- LDOE Academic Content staff oversee and measure the implementation and student outcomes. (Planned Fall 2018)
- Based on evaluation results, LDOE updates supports, trains SSIP teachers on strategy and next steps, and potentially builds out additional resources. (Planned 2018-2019 school year)
- ELA Guidebook supports become available for educators in grades three through five across the state. (Planned 2018-2019 school year)

*Focus on Tier 3: Identifying and promoting high-quality intensive intervention programs*

LDOE reviews intensive intervention programs in 2018-2019 school year for adoption and implementation by the SSIP cohort in the 2019-2020 school year.

- LDOE develops intensive intervention program review rubric. (Begun in the 2017-2018 school year)
- LDOE conducts intensive intervention program reviews through the online [instructional materials review process](#) to determine the highest quality programs. (Planned for 2018-2019 school year)
- SSIP school systems / schools use allocated funds to purchase high-quality intervention programs reviewed by LDOE. (Date TBD)
- SSIP cohort teachers are trained on high-quality intervention programs, with an emphasis on how intensive interventions can be integrated into an overall ELA structure at the school and in the classroom. (Date TBD)
- SSIP cohort implements high-quality intensive intervention programs. (Date TBD)
- LDOE gathers quantifiable information on implementation and student outcomes. (Date TBD)
- Based on evaluation results, LDOE provides additional guidance and next steps, and potentially builds out additional resources. (Date TBD)
- Vendors train teachers across the state on intervention programs and how these can be integrated into an overall ELA structure at the school / classroom. (Date TBD)

### **Data-based Decision Making**

Through the SSIP, LDOE is focused on 1) deepening connections between school system-wide planning processes and special education, and 2) helping educators use connected assessments designed to give meaningful information about student performance throughout the year, and connecting assessments to the diverse learners cycle, a structured approach to identify gaps with grade level standards, establish a support plan with set outcomes, and review progress.

#### Key Activities:

- SSIP cohort school systems and school participate in a series of in person and virtual professional development session to lay the foundation for a structured data inquiry process. (Completed during the 2015-2016 and 2016 – 2017 school years)
- LDOE personnel guide school systems and schools through a structured data inquiry using student results from formative assessments and evaluate the efficacy of existing formative assessments. (Completed 2016-2017 school year)
- LDOE personnel support the SSIP cohort as they adopt and implement the [LEAP 360](#) diagnostic and interim assessments. LDOE supports educators in using assessment results to make better instructional decisions for students with disabilities. (Begun Fall 2017)
- LDOE personnel support school system planning and school redesign, which help school systems create strong plans to address the needs of struggling schools and subgroups. (Begun Fall 2017)
- LDOE personnel track the pilot implementation of evidence-based literacy practices in SPDG schools. LDOE evaluates the pilot, including focus groups, to plan additional resources and support, and/or adapt existing resources to support educators. This includes the pilot of new diverse learners' supports including the [diverse learners guide](#) and the diverse learners' [supports flow chart](#). These supports provide direct reinforcement to the evidence-based literacy practices. (Begun Spring 2018)
- LDOE personnel conduct school system and school observations and data gathering on ELA Guidebook implementation and student outcomes. (Planned for Fall 2018)

#### Continuous Leadership Development

Continuous leadership development activities are inextricably tied to activities that advance data-based decision making and literacy practices in SSIP cohort classrooms. The SSIP is focused on building a cohort of Teacher Leaders with the tools and resources schools can use to reach diverse learners. Teacher Leaders are a corps of highly effective teachers, with a track record of improved student outcomes, that provide training and support to peers, model strategies and facilitate grade-level meetings on data.

#### Key Activities:

- Identify and support excellent special education teachers to serve as Teacher Leaders. (Begun during the 2017-2018 school year. Will continue in 2018-2019 school year),
- Identify special education content leaders who will participate in trainings on Content Modules and Content Leader Modules, an ELA Guidebook professional development initiative. (Begun in the 2017-2018 school year. Will continue in 2018-2019 school year.)
- Support high quality coaching that builds teachers' 1) understanding of the supports structure and process for diverse learners in ELA, 2) ability to use data, including student work, to diagnose which students should receive various supports, 3) ability to use various supports during whole-class and small-group instruction, and 4) ability to determine the effectiveness of the supports process. (In planning stages.)

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

Effective evaluations engage in a structured, reflective inquiry process that critically reviews the quality of planned activities, their fidelity of implementation, and the outcomes they were designed to achieve. The SSIP is structured to capture progress on three domains to measure if all SSIP pilot educators 1) have access to high-quality, standards-based curriculum with evidence-based supports for students with disabilities, 2) have ongoing, aligned professional development to use that curriculum effectively with students with disabilities, and 3) have and use data from a focused set of standards-aligned assessments measuring how well students are meeting the outcomes of the high-quality curriculum.

*Table A.2: Evaluating educator access to high-quality, standards-based curriculum with evidence-based supports for students with disabilities*

Evaluation Activity	Measure	Outcome
Determine whether SSIP pilot schools have adopted a high-quality curriculum for all students with disabilities in grades 3-5.	Curriculum Implementation Scale (0-4 Scale)	This evaluation activity is in early data collection stages. Reporting slated to begin in FFY 2017.
Determine implementation level of SSIP schools in appropriate use of evidence-based practices	Evidence-based Literacy Practices Matrix (0-3 Scale)	All SSIP schools assess their use of twenty-three evidence-based literacy practices in the classroom. For the SSIP reporting period, 65% of school demonstrated that the use of evidence-based practices was at a level 2 or 3 on a 0-3 scale. At level 2 or 3, there is moderate to significant evidence that the evidence-based literacy practices were being implemented with fidelity in the classroom.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems that create a plan with a strong academic foundation including a plan for curriculum, assessment and teacher professional development that addresses the unique needs of students with disabilities	ESSA School System Plan (connected to school system planning guide and school improvement grant)	All SSIP school systems are required to submit a plan in one of two rounds. For the SSIP reporting period, the first round was complete. Six of nine school systems submitted in round one. Four plans were approved, two required revision and resubmission. The remaining school systems are on track to submit a plan for round two.

Table A.3: Evaluating ongoing, aligned professional development for educators to use curriculum effectively with students with disabilities

Evaluation Activity	Measure	Outcome
Determine whether professional development provided to SSIP school systems demonstrated evidence-based professional development practices	SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components Rubric (1-4 Scale)	LDOE rates professional development sessions using sixteen evidence-based practices on a 1-4 scale. One indicates a lack of evidence-based practices, while a four indicates strong evidence-based practices. Thirteen of sixteen practices were rated a three or four, indicating that professional development for SSIP school systems uses strong evidence-based practices.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems and schools that participated in two-day in person training on SSIP coherent improvement strategies, called the Literacy Leadership Launch	Professional Development Activity Tracker	All school systems and schools participated. LDOE measured the gain in knowledge and skills through a pre/post test. For specific results, please see section B.1.B.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems that participated in Mentor Teacher or Content Leader training	Professional Development Activity Tracker	Three of the SSIP school systems had educators attend these trainings. Additional SSIP school systems are slated to join these initiatives in the next school year.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems with approved professional development plans—specifically focused on grades 3-5 English language arts for students with disabilities—that deepens connections between professional development, high-quality curriculum and supports for students with disabilities	Statewide electronic grants management system	Each SSIP school system was allocated funds to provide ongoing, aligned professional development activities to deepen use of high-quality curriculum.  All school systems have submitted their professional development plan for approval.  Half of the SSIP school systems have approved plans. The remainder are revising to ensure alignment to high quality professional development activities.
Determine whether LDOE develops a track of professional	LDOE’s Teacher Leader Summit Tracker	LDOE has a track of professional development grounded in the

development at Teacher Leader Summit for educators of students with disabilities in grades 3-5, focused on coherent improvement strategies		coherent improvement strategies developed and on track for the Teacher Leader Summit in June 2018.
Number of SSIP school systems that included participation in Teacher Leader as part of their professional development plan	Statewide electronic grants management system, registration logs	All SSIP school systems plan to participate in the Teacher Leader Summit.

*Table A.4: Evaluating if educators have and use data from a focused set of standards-aligned assessments measuring how well students are meeting the outcomes of the high-quality curriculum*

Evaluation Activity	Measure	Outcome
Measure the achievement of students on formative assessments through a school system-level and SSIP cohort-level analysis of progress	Categorical analysis of formative assessments administered in SSIP schools	All SSIP schools administered formative assessments. Data were analyzed at the school, school system and state-level during the 2016-2017 school year. Results were used by school systems and schools to reflect on practice and at the state-level to inform needed adjustments. For specific results, please see section C.1.C.  At the state-level, it was determined a more uniform system was needed. The SSIP is now aligned with the LEAP 360 assessment system.
Measure the number of SSIP school systems that have adopted LEAP 360, Louisiana’s high-quality assessment system for diagnostic and interim assessments	Enrollment in LEAP 360	All SSIP school systems have adopted the LEAP 360 assessment system and participated during the 2017-2018 school year.
Measure how SSIP schools are using data from formative assessments, including those in the evidence-based curriculum, to monitor student progress and make instructional decisions	Evidence-based Literacy Practices Matrix	All SSIP schools measure how they use universal screeners and formative assessments to monitor student progress and make instructional decisions on a 0-3 scale. Ninety-four percent of SSIP schools rate a two or three

		on the 0-3 scale, indicating moderate to significant evidence that these data informed decision-making practices are being implemented with fidelity in SSIP schools.
--	--	---

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

Through the evaluation process, LDOE identified three overarching adjustments to SSIP implementation and improvement strategies. These adjustments are a direct result of the outcomes from the evaluation activities described above. These adjustments have already begun, and will continue through the FFY 2017 reporting period.

1. Evidence-based literacy practices need a more coherent connection to the high-quality curriculum teachers are using every day. From the first year of implementation, LDOE learned that the evidence-based literacy practices have to be grounded in the high-quality curriculum to be implemented with fidelity. An initial approach, which focused on teaching stand-alone strategies, left teachers without concrete practice in integrating them into the curriculum or an understanding of how to tackle implementation challenges in the classroom setting. To address these evaluation results, LDOE is building out curricula-specific supports, not a separate set up evidence-based practices.
2. SSIP leadership teams that are unconnected to larger school-system planning teams can be isolated and may not create needed system-wide change. In FFY 2015 and 2016, the SSIP established an expectation that each school system would create a school system leadership team and each school a school leadership team that would lead implementation. While leadership teams at the school system and school level met regularly over the school year, their impact was limited and participants reported marginal utility. Changes the leadership team made did not always inform school system wide decisions. As a result, starting in FFY 2017, LDOE is integrating the leadership team work with the existing School System Planning process, in which school systems engage in a process to 1) analyze results and prioritize needs, 2) plan for struggling schools and subgroups, and 3) align budgets to identified needs. These plans address components that include core academics, school system structures, and subgroups of diverse learners, including students with disabilities. To ensure implementation, each school system has a designated point of contact, and they are supported with LDOE field support coaching networks.
3. Data-based decision making is more useful when school systems have access to a streamlined assessment system aligned to student standards. In FFY 2016, LDOE piloted a categorical analysis approach to help school systems measure student progress and outcomes in a timely manner. While this benefited the SSIP cohort by focusing attention on the formative assessments school systems were using and engaging educators in a structured data inquiry process, it highlighted a number of limitations. For example, some assessments are not fully aligned to the student standards or curriculum. While progress can be tracked generally, many of these assessments do not give educators the deep understanding of students' unique needs to help them adjust instruction, set meaningful, ambitious goals for student learning and monitor learning toward the goal. In FFY 2017, LDOE launched a new, free comprehensive assessment system including

diagnostic and interim assessments of student learning that are fully aligned to the student standards. They give teachers a more complete picture of student performance, school leaders the information they need to focus educators on the learning that matters most for students, and school system leaders the ability to monitor progress and create a strong system that reduces the amount of testing and focuses time on learning. Going forward, LDOE will focus on adoption and implementation of this system.

## 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—with the input of stakeholders—developed a series of key activities starting in SY 2015 -2016 and continuing through the SSIP lifecycle that—in sum—would lead to improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five. The table below describes the key activities planned and/or accomplished in FFY 2015 - FFY 2017 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. 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 (Data)	Spring 2016	Yes	Yes	All participating school systems attended in person training.
Online Learning Modules - School systems (Data)	Spring – Summer 2016	Yes	Yes	8 of 9 participating school systems completed modules.
Activities Begun in FFY 2016 (SY 2016 – 2017)				
Foundational PD (Data)	Summer 2016	Yes	Yes	All participating schools attended in person training.
Online Learning Modules - Schools (Data)	Fall - Winter 2016	Yes	Yes	Online learning modules were created and distributed to SSIP schools. All SSIP schools participated.
DLT Meetings	Spring 2016 – Spring 2017	Yes	Yes	All DLTs met during FFY 2016
SLT Meetings	Fall 2016 – Spring 2017	Yes	Yes	All SLTs met during FFY 2016

Activity	Planned Timeframe	Milestone Met	Intended Timeline Followed	Notes on Timeline and Outcome
Develop and Maintain SSIP Collaboration Website	Deferred	No	No	Evaluation results indicated that an SSIP-specific website was not an effective means of collaboration. Activity replaced with an integrated approach where tools and resources will be made available through existing LDOE web pages.
<b>Activities Begun in FFY 2017 (SY 2017 – 2018)</b>				
Literacy Leadership Launch	June 2017	Yes	Yes	All SSIP cohort school systems and schools participated. LDOE used evaluation results to restructure and align this with the Teacher Leader initiative.
Mentor Teacher and Content Leader Trainings	Fall 2017 – Spring 2018; will repeat in future years	Yes	Yes	Two SSIP cohort school systems participated. Anticipate additional school systems will participate in future years.
LEAP 360 Adoption	Fall 2017	Yes	Yes	All SSIP cohort school systems adopted LEAP 360 during the 2017-2018 school year.
SSIP Aligned Professional Development Planning	Fall 2017	Yes	Yes	SSIP-specific funding plan. Each SSIP school system receives a supplemental allocation to support the implementation of evidence-based practices. SSIP cohort school systems submitted plans to address each coherent improvement strategy. LDOE provided specific feedback to ensure plans aligned to strategies and deepened connections to existing school system planning processes.
ESSA School System Plan	Fall 2017 – Spring 2018	Yes	Yes	SSIP cohort system are required to submit a school system plan to address the needs of struggling schools and subgroups, including students with disabilities. The plan must incorporate core academic components including high-quality curriculum while addressing unique populations like students with disabilities. Submission, review and approval are in process.

Activity	Planned Timeframe	Milestone Met	Intended Timeline Followed	Notes on Timeline and Outcome
Activities to Begin in FFY 2018 (SY 2018 – 2019)				
Teacher Leader Summit	June 2018; will repeat in future years.	Yes	Yes	In planning stages. SSIP / SPDG track with eight sessions on coherent improvement strategies planned.
Virtual Support	Fall 2018 – Spring 2019; will repeat in future years.	Yes	Yes	In planning stages.
Diverse Learner Supports Pilot	Fall 2018	Yes	Yes	Planning and communication to SSIP cohort LEAs complete. Pilot slated to begin in Fall 2018.
Intensive Intervention Program Reviews	Spring 2018 – Winter 2018	Yes	Yes	This initial phase focused on developing an intensive intervention program review rubric is underway. Feedback being sought by IHE Advisory Partners. The second phase will involve an evaluation of submitted programs.

### 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. The table below describes the key activities for FFY 2016 (SY 2016 – 2017) and the start of FFY 2017 (2017-2018) and the intended outputs accomplished as a result. It does not include activities completed before FFY 2016.

*Table B.2: FFY 2016-2017 Key Activities with Outputs Accomplished*

Activity	Correlated Output from Logic Model
<b>Foundational Professional Development (Data)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of professional development activity reports produced. Activity reports capture the participant information, training hours, area of focus, cost, etc. During the reporting period, a professional development activity report was produced for each session.</li> <li>The percent of participants who agreed the in-person professional development increased their knowledge and skills. 94% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the in-person</li> </ul>

	<p>professional development increased their knowledge and skills in data-informed decision making to improve instruction for students with disabilities.</p>
<p><b>Online Learning Modules Schools (Data)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Training materials. Vendor submitted five online learning modules.</li> <li>● Evidence that SSIP school system schools attended trainings. Professional development activity reports show that all schools completed professional development sessions.</li> <li>● The number of participants who agreed the online learning modules improved the implementation of the evidence-based practices. In FFY 2016, respondents indicated that the online learning modules provided were of moderate quality. LDOE is making adjustments to frequency and content for future trainings.</li> </ul>
<p><b>DLT + SLT Meetings</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Artifacts from DLT and SLT meetings including agendas, sign in sheets, and correspondence. In FFY 2016, all DLT and SLT teams met as intended. Evaluation results, including focus groups with SSIP participants, indicated that an isolated team planning process had limited impact. LDOE adjusted in FFY 2017 to integrate and align with existing school system planning processes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Literacy Leadership Launch – Foundational PD for SSIP School Systems and Schools</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The number of PD activity reports produced. In FFY 2016, a PD activity report was produced for each session.</li> <li>● LDOE measured the gain in knowledge and skills through a pre/post test. The percent of participants who answered knowledge questions correctly increased by 22.2 percentage points (from 52.9% to 74.1%) and 18.4 percentage points (from 56.3% to 74.7%), during the first and second round of training, respectively.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Content Leader Training</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The number of PD activity reports produced. In the SSIP reporting period, two of the SSIP school systems participated in the Content Leader initiative. Additional school systems will be added for the next round.</li> </ul>
<p><b>LEAP 360 Adoption</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The number of SSIP systems that adopted LEAP 360. In the SSIP reporting period, all SSIP cohort school systems adopted LEAP 360.</li> <li>● The number of SSIP school systems that participated in aligned, ongoing professional development focused on initial adoption and use. All SSIP cohort school systems participated in professional development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>SSIP Aligned Professional Development Planning</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The number of school systems that submitted professional development plans aligned with high-quality curriculum and other coherent improvement strategies. In the reporting period, all school systems submitted a plan.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of school systems that have approved plans. LDOE does not approve plans unless they align to the coherent improvements strategies. All but two school systems had an approved plan in the SSIP reporting period.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Develop and Maintain SSIP Collaboration Website</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity replaced with an integrated approach where tools and resources will be made available through existing LDOE web pages, increasing alignment and scale up potential, as well as an increase in face-to-face collaboration opportunities.</li> </ul>

## 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)

During Phase I, II and the first year of Phase III, LDOE used a traditional stakeholder group to review statewide data, and draft the SSIP, including the coherent improvement strategies, theory of practice, logic model and evaluation activities. As LDOE moves farther into implementation, the evaluation indicated that a more fluid, dynamic structure was needed. Based on that, LDOE has launched a revised stakeholder engagement model that focuses on:

- Obtaining more frequent feedback from the special education advisory panel (SEAP),
- Utilizing Teacher Leader Advisors to make specific tools and resources meaningful and usable in the classroom, and
- Gathering more in-depth, structured feedback on specific evidence-based practices from a team of higher education experts.

During FFY 2016, LDOE updated SEAP on specific elements of the SSIP, including the process to deepen the alignment between LDOE and SPDG to further ELA academic outcomes for students with disabilities, specific evidence-based practices and other ELA initiatives that directly impact the SSIP cohort, and evaluation activities and outcomes. Through this structure, LDOE engaged an even more diverse group of stakeholders, including the public, about the state’s remaining challenges and long-term goals with regard to the SSIP and beyond. Further, with the enactment of ESSA, and with many shared goals including increased student achievement, elimination of achievement gaps across student subgroups, and a well-rounded education for all children, the LDOE began to consider and consult with stakeholders about ways to achieve those goals not only in compliance with ESSA and advancement of the SSIP, but using these opportunities to support the development, implementation, and achievement of Louisiana’s long-term education plan.

As the SSIP moved from data review to development to implementation, needs have changed. During the plan’s development, LDOE brought together a group of stakeholders who could engage in the deep thinking and planning needed to develop the SSIP. Now, as implementation continues, the SSIP needs

detailed, analytic feedback on specific tools and resources that are being piloted in the SSIP cohort before being up throughout the state. For example, the [Diverse Learners Guide](#) and the [Strategies for Success: A Guidebook for Supporting Students with Disabilities](#) resources require expert feedback from English language arts and special education specialists. To achieve that, LDOE has created a cohort of Teacher Leader Advisors from across the state who are developing specific tools and resources, including a build out of ELA Guidebooks for diverse learners, including students with disabilities. LDOE has also launched an Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) Advisory Partner program that brings together a team of higher education officials with expertise in English language arts and special education to advise LDOE in the development of the tools and resources for educators and the evaluation. Both the Teacher Leader Advisors and the IHE Advisory Partners come from across the state, ensuring that the tools and resources will reflect the diverse needs of all educators.

## 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 to provide a strategic framework for 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 anchor the logic model, and each 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. 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.”<sup>3</sup> 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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**

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>A</b>   <b>B</b>   <b>*</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish state steering team and identify key expert technical advisors</li> <li>• Establish district and school leadership teams with routines</li> <li>• Develop and implement a resource and collaboration website</li> <li>• 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"> <li>» In-person sessions</li> <li>» Web-based sessions</li> <li>» Relationship-based activities including coaching and technical assistance</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <p><b>A</b>   <b>B</b>   <b>*</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hire professional learning leaders to directly support LEAs</li> <li>• Provide support to districts and schools on implementation and assessment of literacy strategies</li> </ul>  |

**OUTPUTS**

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>A</b>   <b>B</b>   <b>*</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of resource materials developed by state-level personnel</li> <li>• The number unique visitors accessing SSIP website</li> <li>• The number of visitors who rank website resources as useful or very useful</li> <li>• The number of PD activity reports produced</li> <li>• The percent of participants increase their knowledge and skills</li> <li>• The number of district and school-level personnel who use feedback to adjust interventions and strategies</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>A</b>   <b>B</b>   <b>*</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>A</b>   <b>B</b>   <b>*</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of professional learning leaders in place</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>A</b>   <b>B</b>   <b>*</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of state, district and school leadership team meetings implemented with fidelity</li> </ul>  |

**SYSTEM-LEVEL OUTCOMES**

**STATE-LEVEL**

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

**DISTRICT-LEVEL**

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <p><b>A</b>   <b>B</b>   <b>*</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>A</b>   <b>B</b>   <b>*</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District-level coaches effectively use regional support coaching feedback to support teachers in adjusting literacy instruction.</li> </ul>  |

## 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><b>Whether students with disabilities improve on formative literacy assessments in 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> grades, in the SSIP cohort. This is the most immediate, short-term measure.</b></p>	<p>In FFY 2016, LDOE piloted a categorical analysis approach to measure student progress on formative assessments across SSIP school systems. With this approach, LDOE compared progress across SSIP school systems by measuring the percent of students who increased by one or more proficiency levels. In the future, the SSIP will transition to LEAP 360 (a new statewide assessment system with diagnostic and interim assessments aligned to state standards) to measure student progress throughout the school year.</p>
<p><b>Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, in the SSIP cohort.</b></p>	<p>Each year, LDOE analyzes statewide assessment results for the SSIP cohort of third, fourth, and fifth grade students in nine school systems across the state.</p>
<p><b>Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, across the state.</b></p>	<p>The SSIP is in the early years of 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 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> 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.</p>

The table above outlines key measures for student-centered literacy outcomes. However, in order to measure progress effectively, LDOE is evaluating progress in the fidelity of implementation. For example, if we do not see students with disabilities progress in interim 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 school system 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 2017.

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

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

Student-Centered Outcome Measure	Results
<p><b>Whether students with disabilities improve on formative literacy assessments in 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> grades, in the SSIP cohort. This is the most immediate, short-term measure.</b></p>	<p>In FFY 2016, SSIP school systems saw 40% of students with disabilities in third grade, 36% in fourth grade, and 43% in fifth grade, demonstrate improvement by one or more proficiency levels on their respective formative literacy assessments.</p>
<p><b>Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency results (basic and above) on statewide assessments, in the SSIP cohort.</b></p>	<p>In FFY 2016, 41.72% of students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort achieved a proficient score on the statewide assessments, a significant increase over the FFY 2015 results of 35.14%.</p>
<p><b>Whether students with disabilities increase ELA proficiency rates (basic and above) on statewide assessments, across the state.</b></p>	<p>Each year, LDOE reports on the proficiency rates (basic and above) of all students with disabilities in grades 3-8 and high school. 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%. FFY 2016: 35.77%.</p>

## DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND ASSOCIATED TIMELINES (c.1.D)

LDOE has developed a data collection plan that will yield valid and reliable data applicable to the SiMR 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 data from measurement tools including the SPDG Evidence-based PD Components Rubric, the LDOE developed Evidence-based Literacy Practices Matrix, the Curriculum Implementation Scale, PD Activity Tracker, the ESSA School System Plan Review Tool, and the SSIP Aligned PD Planning Review Tool.

Table C.3: Annual Data Collection Timeline

Measurement Tool	Description	Who Completes	Timeline
Formative Assessments	Measures student progress toward grade-level standards as well as student growth throughout the school year.	Students complete assessments; school systems and LDOE review and analyze results.	Three times per year
Summative Assessments	Measures student achievement on statewide assessments including LEAP and LEAP Connect.	Students complete assessments; school systems and LDOE review and analyze results.	Annual
SPDG Evidenced-based PD Components Rubric	Measures whether PD sessions are developed and delivered using evidence-based PD practices including adult learning strategies.	LDOE	Annual
Evidence-based Literacy Practices Matrix	Measures schools' implementation of evidence-based literacy practices in the classroom.	School systems complete matrices; LDOE reviews and verifies.	Annual
Curriculum Implementation Scale	Measures schools progress in implementing high-quality curriculum with aligned PD opportunities, and reflective use of data.	LDOE	Annual
Professional Development Activity Tracker	Tracks all SSIP training sessions including participants, hours, evidence-based practices, cost and outcomes.	LDOE	After Each PD Session
ESSA School System Plan Review Tool	Evaluates whether school systems develop a strong plan that addresses struggling schools and subgroups of students, including students with disabilities, and aligns funding to address	School systems complete plans; LDOE evaluates.	Annual

Measurement Tool	Description	Who Completes	Timeline
	those needs.		
SSIP Aligned Professional Development Planning Review Tool	Evaluates whether SSIP school systems program allocated funds to advance implementation of SSIP evidence-based practices with aligned professional development.	School systems complete applications; LDOE evaluates.	Annual

**[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 school systems across the state. LDOE will collect evaluation data for all students with disabilities who receive the evidence-based practices / coherent improvement strategies. Since LDOE is not sampling, the evaluation results will represent all of the students receiving the evidence-based practices / coherent improvement strategies in the SSIP cohort.

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

LDOE will use student achievement results 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 school systems, for grades three through five. The established targets will measure whether student achievement improved over time in the targeted grade levels in those school systems. 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 school system 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 framework, data management and data analysis are integrated at all levels of the system—state, school system, school and teacher—in order to assess progress toward achieving intended improvements and to adjust course as necessary. LDOE has developed data collection procedures that hold all parties accountable for obtaining valid and reliable process and outcome data focused on 1) high-quality evidence-based measurement tools, 2) accountability and consistency across school systems at the state-level, 3) a culture of immediate and systematic feedback. Below are examples that illustrate how each of these components work in practice. However, it should be noted that the full system and scale of data management and data analysis procedures are more expansive than what can be included

here.

- **High-quality evidence-based measurement tools.** At the state-level, LDOE conducts all outcome measure analyses for formative and summative assessments. LDOE has strong assessment protocols for school systems, schools, and teachers. This includes [assessment guidance](#), sample test items, practice tests, test coordinator support, and more. All other measurement tools, such as the Curriculum Implementation Scale, are vetted to make sure they are supported by moderate or strong evidence. This ensures that the tools measure their intended outcomes.
- **Accountability and consistency across school-systems and at the state-level.** 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. LDOE provides detailed, explicit directions and technical assistance for any SSIP-specific data school systems must collect and provide to LDOE for analysis. For example, during the pilot year of formative assessment analysis, LDOE directed school systems in 1) the specific time points when they would collect data, 2) the number of testing administrations, and 3) data quality checks to ensure valid and reliable data.
- **Immediate and systematic feedback.** LDOE reviews and verifies all results provided by school systems. LDOE’s Strategic Research and Analysis (SRAA) team, staffed by statistical, data, and assessment experts, conducts all analytic research. LDOE has built a system that progresses from data collection, to verification, to analysis, and finally to school system and state-level review of results. When connected to the structured data inquiry process, school systems have the information they need to measure progress and adjust course in a timely manner.

LDOE began working with school systems in FFY 2015, and schools in FFY 2016. Each year, protocols for data management and analysis are developed and refined based on practical experience in the field.

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

Section A.4 “Brief overview of the year’s evaluation activities, measures and outcomes” provides outputs and results for key evaluation activities.

Section A.5, “Highlight of changes to implementation and improvement strategies” provides examples of modifications to the SSIP based on evaluation results.

Section B.1, “Description of the state’s SSIP implementation progress” provides key activities, outputs, outcomes and evaluation measures.

Section C.1.C, “Description of baseline data for key measures” provides results for student-centered measures.

Section E.1.B, “Evidence that the SSIP’s evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects” provides additional evidence that the SSIP has demonstrated progress.

## 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, school system, 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 toward achieving intended improvement to infrastructure and SiMR. In FFY 2016, LDOE defined four infrastructure improvement priorities:

1. Aligning the SSIP with the state’s SPDG grant.
2. Expanding the special education portfolio of ELA academic content work.
3. Developing educators.
4. Aligning the SSIP with the state’s ESSA plan.

Since infrastructure improvements do not have an immediate, direct impact on the SiMR—assessing ELA proficiency of students with disabilities in third through fifth 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. At the end of FFY 2016, LDOE made significant progress toward 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 third through fifth 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 incorporated 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.

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. School systems have submitted their plans through the School System Planning process. For more information on the evaluation results, please see section C above and section A.4 “Brief overview of the year’s evaluation activities, measures and outcomes” which provides outputs and results for key evaluation activities.

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

From FFY 2015 to FFY 2016, the SSIP cohort’s proficiency results on statewide assessments have

increased from 35.14% to 41.72%, an increase of approximately six and a half percentage points. Further, in FFY 2016, the SSIP cohort exceeded the ELA proficiency rate on statewide assessments (indicator 3C), which was 35.77%. Taken together, this demonstrates the coherent improvement strategies are improving results for students with disabilities in grades three through five, in the SSIP cohort.

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

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
SSIP Cohort Results	36.18%	36.68%	35.14%	41.72%		
Targets	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 adjustments to plans for FFY 2017.

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

LDOE considers all evaluation data, including fidelity and outcomes measures, to identify needed changes. For example, the SSIP cohort’s proficiency growth from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016 indicates the coherent improvement strategies are working. LDOE has begun to identify best practices tools, resources and supports for school systems across the state, including the build out of the *Diverse Learners Guide*, and expanding in person professional development opportunities for educators across the state on the strategies that have proven effective. 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)

For information on how data support planned modification to intended outcomes, rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path, please note that

section C.2.C “How Data Support Changes to Implementation and Improvement Strategies” includes an example of how the data show the SSIP is on the right path. While progress has been made, the evaluation results indicate room for improvement. 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)

Please see section 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 on how stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP.

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

Please see section 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 on how stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP.

## 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 has 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 last year of implementation, some data limitations have come to light related to formative assessments and changes to school system infrastructure.

*Challenges resulting from changing conditions at the state-level.* In 2017, LDOE reorganized the SPDG grant to improve the state's capacity to implement the coherent improvement strategies with fidelity to achieve the SiMR. With any reorganization, it takes time to make adjustments that will ultimately result in an aligned, efficient program. One byproduct of this infrastructure improvement was the opportunity to review evaluation measures to ensure they were fully aligned to LDOE's educational vision and measured their intended outcomes. For example, if we are rooted in the belief that teachers are most effective when they have access to a high-quality, standards-based curriculum, we need to measure whether all SSIP classrooms are using high-quality curriculum, and whether they are progressing in the effective use of that curriculum for students with disabilities. The SSIP now measures this intended outcome with a new measurement tool (Curriculum Implementation Scale) that provides the clear, succinct information needed to adjust practice to improve instructional decisions for students. One limitation is that it is not possible to compare results from the old measurement tool to the new measurement tool, making it harder to compare previous progress to current progress. However, the benefit of moving to an instrument that efficiently and accurately measures the intended outcomes outweighs the disadvantages. LDOE expects to encounter changing conditions throughout the SSIP implementation period, and plans to apply the same focused decision-making to determine the best way to adjust course.

*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. In FFY 2016, LDOE collected 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 school systems 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 worked with internal analytics experts 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 analysis approach to measure SSIP-level progress and provide more detailed school system specific progress. In the longer-term, LDOE is launching a statewide assessment system, LEAP 360. LEAP 360 is a free high-quality assessment system that provides educators with a complete picture of student learning at the beginning, middle and end of the school year. LEAP 360 delivers streamlined assessments in a comprehensive system for classroom, schools and school systems including diagnostic and interim assessments aligned to the standards. LDOE is working with SSIP school systems to adopt and implement this assessment system.<sup>4</sup>

#### 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”.

---

<sup>4</sup> The SSIP is aligning with [Louisiana’s School System Planning Guide](#) (2017-2018)

## 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 diverse 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 and four infrastructure focus areas:

- 1) Aligning LDOE’s SSIP with the state’s SPDG grant.
- 2) Expanding the portfolio of ELA academic content work to target improvements for students with disabilities.
- 3) Developing educators.
- 4) Aligning the SSIP with the state’s 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 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.<sup>5</sup> The SSIP is aligned with this work to ensure that these results extend to struggling readers, including students with disabilities. For example, LDOE is piloting evidence-based literacy practices that work for students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort. Through the evaluation, LDOE is identifying those practices that work best and then using 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. To further advance these infrastructure changes, 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 will produce results that will be reflected in the SiMR.

---

<sup>5</sup> Click [here](#) for more information on Louisiana’s curricula-focused approach. Click [here](#) for additional national coverage on Louisiana’s NAEP growth.

Sustainability and scale-up are organically embedded in the structure of this approach.

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

LDOE evaluated whether the SSIP's evidence-based practices were carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects. To do this, LDOE established an evaluation plan, gathered outputs (training materials, activity reports, agenda, sign in sheets) from each activity, and measured short term and long-term outcomes.

For example, to gauge whether evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity, LDOE:

- Used the *SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Components Rubric* to determine whether all professional development delivered to the SSIP cohort used professional development practices to support attainment of the identified competencies. LDOE rates professional development using sixteen evidence-based professional development practices on a 1-4 scale. One indicates a lack of evidence-based practices, while a four indicates strong evidence-based practices. Thirteen of sixteen practices were rated a three or four, indicating that professional development for SSIP school systems uses strong evidence-based practice.
- Used the Evidence-Based Literacy Practices Matrix to determine whether SSIP cohort schools were implementing the evidence-based practices in the schools and classrooms with fidelity. All SSIP schools assess their use of twenty-three evidence-based literacy practices in the classroom. For the SSIP reporting period, 65% of schools demonstrated that the use of the twenty-three evidence-based practices was at a level 2 or 3 on a 0-3 scale. This means that there was moderate to significant evidence that the evidence-based literacy practices were being implemented with fidelity in the classroom.

These measurements tools, amongst others, indicate that the evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity.

To gauge whether the evidence-based practices were having the desired effects, LDOE:

- Used a categorical analysis to measure student progress on formative literacy assessments across the SSIP cohort, during the school year. In FFY 2016, SSIP schools saw 40% of students with disabilities in third grade, 36% in fourth grade, and 43% in fifth grade demonstrate improvement by one or more proficiency levels on their respective formative literacy assessments.
- Used statewide assessments to measure student progress in achieving grade-level English language arts standards, school year over school year. From FFY 2015 to FFY 2016, students with disabilities in the SSIP cohort improved proficiency results on statewide assessments by approximately six and a half percentage points, from 35.14% to 41.72%.

The student-level outcomes, particularly the statewide assessment results, demonstrate a significant year over year improvement, indicating that the evidence-based practices are having the desired effects.

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

Louisiana’s SiMR measures ELA proficiency rates (basic and above) on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in grades three through five, in the SSIP cohort of nine school systems 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	2016
<b>SSIP Cohort Results</b>	36.18%	36.68%	35.14%	41.72%

LDOE has made significant progress toward the short-term and long-term objectives that will ultimately result in progress toward achieving the SiMR. For additional information on outcomes regarding progress toward 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 targets through FFY 2018. Please see section E.1.C above for SSIP cohort SiMR results from FFY 2013 to FFY 2016. It is important to note that while Louisiana reports on data and targets for FFY 2013, through FFY 2016, initial implementation began in FFY 2015. As a result, LDOE expected to begin to see change in student outcomes in the SiMR beginning in FFY 2016, which is seen in section E.1.C.

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

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Targets	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 reporting cycle 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 C.3: Annual Data Collection Timeline* 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.

### 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 and how they were addressed including 1) challenges resulting from changing conditions at the state-level and 2) 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.

Beyond individual barriers, LDOE has 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.

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

LDOE has accessed technical assistance 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, and more. LDOE will continue to seek out technical assistance from the NCSI, IDC, and other 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 three through five.

## 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	LDOE Division / Office
Kristi-Jo Preston	Special Education Policy
Whitney Whealdon	Academic Content
Jamie Wong	Special Education Policy

### ADVISORY PARTNERS

Representative	Organization	Area of Expertise
Dr. Alan Coulter	Louisiana State University – New Orleans	Special Education, Literacy
Jane Nell Luster	South Central Comprehensive Center	Facilitation, Evaluation
Katherine Nagle	National Center for Systemic Improvement	Evaluation
Dr. Shalanda Stanley	University of Louisiana - Monroe	Special Education, Literacy
Dr. Keita Wilson	University of Louisiana - Lafayette	Special Education
Kerri White	South Central Comprehensive Center	State Capacity

### EVALUATION TEAM

Representative	LDOE Division / Office
Laura Boudreaux	Strategic Research + Analytics
Holli Jessee	Academic Content
Emily Kaiser	Academic Content
Maria Knox	Strategic Research + Analytics
Sharon Necaïse	Academic Content
Denise Parker	Academic Content
Kristi-Jo Preston	Special Education Policy
Jamie Wong	Special Education Policy

### LITERACY SPECIALIST GROUP

Representative	LDOE Division / Office
Holli Jessee	Academic Content
Emily Kaiser	Academic Content
Sharon Necaïse	Academic Content
Kristi-Jo Preston	Special Education Policy
Jill Slack	Academic Content

Whitney Whealdon	Academic Content
Jamie Wong	Special Education Policy

---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL**

<b>Panel Member</b>	<b>Panel Role</b>
Patsy White	Panel Co-Chair; Parent of a child with a disability
Andrea Bond	Representative of a public charter school
Kelly Boyter	Individual with a disability
Henry Brinkmann	Individual with a disability
Tamara Cannon	Parent of a child with a disability
Brenda Cosse	Parent of a child with a disability Special Education Supervisor / Parent
Toni Buxton	Representative from the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care
Laura Nata	Parent of a child with a disability
Lynette Fontenot	Individual with disability
RaeNell Houston	Representative of a private school / Parent
Lindsey Jackson	Teacher
Cheremie Kerth	Administrator of a program serving students with disabilities
Mark Martin	Representative of a state agency responsible for related services
Carolyn McGee	Representative from the state juvenile and adult correctional agency
Sylvia Melancon	Representative of a state agency responsible for related services
Carla Parrie	Administrator of a program serving students with disabilities
Keita Wilson	Representative of an institution of higher education
Melvin Porter	Parent of a child with a disability
Donna Reno	Parent of a child with a disability
Jackie Tisdell	Parent of a child with a disability
Joshua Underwood	Teacher
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
Derrick Wesley	Representative of vocational, community, or business providing transition
Jamie Wong	LDOE Staff Coordinator