STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on
FFY 2022

Arizona

PART B DUE February 1, 2024

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

By FFY 2025, targeted Public Education Agencies (PEAs) will increase the performance of SSIP students with disabilities in grade 3 on the English Language Arts (ELA) state assessment from 9.58% to 12.23%.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

A cohort of PEAs that meets the state criteria for participation in SSIP is followed for three years and included in the SiMR data.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

Through Arizona's monitoring system and Risk Analysis Tool, PEAs are provided differentiated support. PEAs that demonstrate a need for systemic and literacy support, as well as the capacity to complete SSIP activities with fidelity, enter an SSIP cohort. Because this part of the identification process was not explicitly stated in prior iterations, the language was added to the first component of the SSIP Theory of Action. Language was added to the second component of the SSIP Theory of Action to include the EBP Walkthrough Process as a named activity that supports SSIP PEAs with the development of evidence-based practices. The element of improving implementation fidelity was added to the third component as a necessary element to provide for activity and student outcomes. The final component of the SSIP Theory of Action was revised to include more specific language in alignment with the SSIP SiMR.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2024/01/SSIP%20Logic%20Model%20and%20Theory%20of%20Action.pdf

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	9.58%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	10.64%	11.17%	11.70%	12.23%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The number of grade 3 students with disabilities within SSIP cohort PEAs, receiving a score of Proficient or Highly Proficient, on the ELA component of the state assessment.	The number of grade 3 students with disabilities within SSIP cohort PEAs, receiving a score of Minimally proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, or Highly Proficient, on the ELA component of the state assessment.	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
70	968	10.99%	10.64%	7.23%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The primary reason that the SiMR shows slippage is that Cohort 5 and Cohort 6 have reported an average proficiency well below prior cohorts at the point of SSIP identification and entrance. Because SSIP PEAs are identified by having below-average literacy proficiency on the most recent AASA assessment, that group will always have a proficiency average that is below that of the larger group. However, it is the extent to which the proficiency average of the identified group is below that of the larger group that makes this issue the primary cause.

While Cohorts 2–4 were identified for SSIP participation with student group averages of between 8.5%-9.1% proficiency, Cohort 5 had a proficiency average of 7.7% and Cohort 6 had a proficiency average of 4.7%. For the SiMR, the identification averages of Cohorts 3–5 in the FFY 2021 calculation were 8.9%, 9.1%, and 7.7%, respectively. The identification average of Cohorts 4–6 in the FFY 2022 calculation were 9.1%, 7.7%, and 4.7%, respectively. Especially with Cohort 6 being a Year 1 SSIP PEA in the FFY 2022 calculation, descending proficiency averages at the point of identification had a significant impact on slippage.

A compounding factor for slippage was that not only did Cohorts 5–6 begin SSIP with lower proficiency averages than prior years, Cohorts 4–5 showed a regression in their proficiency averages between FFY 2021–2022. This regression is especially significant when looking at both the grade levels of students in relation to COVID-19 and identification/progression through the SSIP process.

Important data for context with the SiMR data is how students outside of Special Education (SpEd) performed with literacy proficiency for the same SSIP cohorts that are in the SiMR data. Non-SpEd students regressed in literacy proficiency by 6.8% between FFY 2021–2022 in SSIP cohorts on the AASA assessment. While this regression shows a more significant decrease by the non-SpEd group as compared to the SpEd group and a gap decrease between the two groups, it highlights the effect that COVID-19 had on the students in those SSIP PEAs and cohorts.

Looking at how grade-level movement affected the SiMR, FFY 2022 data is comprised of Grade 3 students that were in kindergarten when COVID-19 caused school shutdowns for Quarter 4 of the 2019–2020 School Year (SY). At a critical stage of literacy development, these students then experienced Grade 1 in SY 2020–2021 with variations of extended shutdowns and online and hybrid instruction throughout the entire school year.

There were other notable factors that affected slippage, concerning the extended shutdowns and online instruction that schools experienced in response to COVID-19 during SY 2020–2021. One notable factor was that during this time, the SEA SSIP Team was only able to provide Technical Assistance (TA) and Professional Development (PD) remotely. Cohort 4 was in SSIP Year 1 during SY 2020–2021, and Cohort 5 began SSIP Year 1 the following year. This school dynamic not only highlights the effect that COVID-19 had on the ability for PEAs to maintain systems and student outcomes but also the ability for the SEA SSIP Team to support PEA SSIP Teams for those cohorts at those times.

The SEA SSIP Team found other notable slippage factors in collaboration with Exceptional Student Services (ESS) leadership within the composition of SSIP PEAs. The first notable factor concerned the disproportionality of rural SSIP PEAs in relation to COVID-19 and the ability to provide Internet and SpEd services during SY 2020–2021. The SEA SSIP Team first analyzed locale by collecting data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which provides PEAs with their entity IDs and locale compositions. After disaggregating the group of SSIP PEAs from the group of Arizona PEAs, SSIP PEAs were found to have a significantly higher average of Town/Rural designation, by almost 17%.

In connection, the SEA SSIP Team also noted SSIP cohorts having a significant proportion of PEAs with a tribal designation. Because rural and tribal PEAs had additional challenges providing Internet and SpEd services during periods that relied upon online instruction and because SSIP PEAs are disproportionately rural and have a significant proportion of tribal designations, this would have a significant effect on slippage.

The SEA SSIP Team found another notable factor after analyzing district and charter designations of SSIP and non-SSIP PEAs. While just over 33% of non-SSIP PEAs are designated as districts, 60% of SSIP PEAs are designated as districts. Because districts have a larger incidence of high needs students with disabilities, because SSIP PEAs are disproportionately composed of districts, and due to the challenges of providing SpEd services during SY 2020–2021, this dynamic would be a notable factor toward slippage.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

State ELA assessment data for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grade 3, specific to the SSIP cohort, from Arizona's data systems.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

From a list of all Grade 3 SWD who have a score on the state ELA assessment in the data systems, the data of students who are associated with a District of Residence Identification (DOR ID) corresponding with PEAs participating in years 1–3 of SSIP, is disaggregated and compiled. Within the compiled list of students, the number of students testing as proficient is added to the students testing as highly proficient, and the resulting number is divided into the total number of SWD receiving any score on the ELA state assessment to calculate the proficiency for SSIP.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)
YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

In connection with Move On When Reading (MOWR) state legislation, every PEA in the state of Arizona is required to submit state testing data for an approved set of literacy screeners, at Fall, Winter, and Spring submission periods. In alignment with MOWR, SSIP collects this data, disaggregated for students with disabilities, from each SSIP PEA at the same submission points as MOWR.

Literacy screener data was examined with the same calculation as the SiMR data to provide context but broken down into the three proficiency levels. By looking at the At-Risk, Approaching Benchmark, and Benchmark groups for students with disabilities in Spring of Grade 3, the context will show both progress in literacy development and progress toward the SiMR.

In Spring of SY 2021–2022, 18.60% of Grade 3 students in SSIP Cohorts 3–5 scored within the Benchmark level of proficiency. In Spring of SY 2022–2023, 16.90% of Grade 3 students in SSIP Cohorts 4–6 scored within the Benchmark level of proficiency. This data would indicate a decrease in the Benchmark level of proficiency by 1.7%.

In Spring of SY 2021–2022, 68.44% of Grade 3 students in SSIP Cohorts 3–5 scored within the At-Risk level of proficiency. In Spring of SY 2022–2023, 67.52% of Grade 3 students in SSIP Cohorts 4–6 scored within the At-Risk level of proficiency. This data would indicate a decrease in the At-Risk level of proficiency by 0.92%.

Because there was a decrease in the At-Risk level of literacy screener state testing for Grade 3 students in SSIP between SY 2021–2022 and SY 2022–2023, the SEA SSIP also examined the At-Risk proficiency levels for students in grades 1–2 for these same cohorts and school years to look for a trend at the formative levels of literacy development. Grade 2 reported a decrease of 0.64% in the At-Risk level of proficiency for these cohorts and school years, while Grade 1 reported a decrease of 1.64% for these cohorts and school years.

With Grades 1–3 literacy screener state testing showing slighter decreases at the Benchmark levels of proficiency, in addition to decreases at the At-Risk proficiency levels, this data may indicate a comparatively positive effect at the formative levels of literacy development.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Looking more closely at the student groups and when they are included in the data, FFY 2021 data is comprised of students that were completing Grade 1 when COVID-19 shut schools down for Quarter 4 of SY 2019–2020. FFY 2022 data is comprised of students that were completing Kindergarten when COVID-19 shut schools down for Quarter 4 of SY 2019–2020. Cohort 4 was identified for participation in SSIP during COVID-19 school shutdowns and SSIP Year 1 coincided with instruction that was predominately either hybrid or online. This dynamic also meant that activity fidelity was lower for Cohort 4 as the SEA SSIP Team was unable to provide the same level of support for SSIP activities and systemic support, in-person SSIP Setup and Activity Training Meetings prior to Year 1, or site-based Professional Development for the EBP Walkthrough Activity in Year 2.

When Cohort 5 was identified for participation in SSIP at the end of the hybrid/online instructional year, because the state did not have assessment data from when they would normally be identified due to COVID-19 shutdowns, assessment data from the same year that was used to identify Cohort 4 was used to identify Cohort 5. By the time they began SSIP, they were identified with data from more than two years prior. To begin SSIP Year 1, after Cohort 5 reported incoming levels of systemic implementation on the Success Gaps Rubric activity, 12 of the 15 system indicators would have the lowest average levels of any Cohort 3–6.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2024/01/SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan.pdf

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

Added elements to the Evaluation Questions column for the Literacy Section row include: Does literacy data on AASA state testing provide support for the maintenance or revision of SSIP process and activities, compared to the General Education (GenEd) group? Does literacy data on AASA state testing provide support for the maintenance or revision of SSIP process and activities, in context with literacy screener data? Does literacy screener data provide support for the maintenance or revision of SSIP process and activities, in context with AASA comprehension data?

Also, "Literacy Initiatives Work Group (LIWG) Members" was replaced with "Data Systems (DaSY) Collaborative Group Members" in each row of the Partnerships column.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

Although the GenEd group had been reviewed each year and referencing the gap between the GenEd and SpEd groups for achievement and growth context, the text had not been populated on the Evaluation Plan. Although the achievement and growth context between literacy screener and AASA data had been reviewed since the Fall of SY 2021–2022 when statewide GenEd and SSIP SpEd data became available, the text had not been populated on the Evaluation Plan. Populating this text on the Evaluation Plan became even more important when deeper analysis became necessary from the apparent SiMR data disparity.

LIWG was temporarily removed from the SSIP evaluation plan because group meetings have been paused while Move On When Reading (MOWR) and Exceptional Student Services (ESS) go through internal restructuring. DaSy was put in its place. This collaborative group began meeting in SY 2023–2024 and is helping to support the development of data systems in ESS while looking at early literacy associated with preschool.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Support Documents and Technical Assistance (TA) Meetings:

Although the Success Gaps Rubric and Action Plan (SGR & AP) activity already included directions with embedded links to short guidance videos and examples, the SEA SSIP Team provided additional support in response to prior stakeholder feedback. In SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team created activity guidance documents that included screenshot examples and embedded these links alongside the short guidance videos. While reading the activity directions, PEA SSIP Teams can now choose how they receive additional support.

For additional guidance, Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) offered two site-based and one virtual TA meeting that provided programmatic monitoring activity guidance to participants. As part of this training, Year 1 SSIP PEAs were offered a TA presentation of the SSIP Year 1 activities and requirements. The presentation included tips for navigating the process with fidelity, examples of activity completion, and time for questions and answers.

Streamlining Data Systems:

The SEA SSIP Team has reformatted all data sheets to allow for collaborative analysis of longitudinal data, which means that when new activity and student outcome data is available, the SSIP Coordinator can efficiently incorporate the new data into the existing data set and devote more available capacity to analysis and systemic improvement.

SSIP activity data is collected with fillable Microsoft Word documents that are formatted for continuous data. PEA SSIP Teams in Years 1–3 can record updated data on the same activity form during each submission period. After each submission, the SEA SSIP Team transfers the data to a spreadsheet for analysis. Through the end of SY 2022–2023, when the SEA SSIP Team wanted to use a more efficient means of analysis, such as using pivot tables and slicers, the team reformatted the spreadsheet data for compatibility.

Because the data for each submission period was kept on individual sheets, the SEA SSIP Team had to copy/paste between sheets for longitudinal analysis. The process of reformatting and comparing different sheets at each submission consumed time and allowed margin for process error.

Before SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team reformatted and consolidated activity submission data into a single data sheet for the past four years in a format that is directly compatible to pivot tables and slicers. The new format allows for the integration of new data into the compatible and ongoing format, and long-term data can be analyzed and displayed immediately after new data integration with a lower consumption of time and higher data quality.

For student outcomes data, literacy screener data for Students with Disabilities (SWD) is collected with ongoing MS Word forms three times each year and is transferred to data spreadsheets. Data spreadsheets are also generated from query, for both statewide literacy data that is reported for the all-student group in the Move On When Reading (MOWR) ADE Connect data portal and for AASA state testing data. After collecting the SWD literacy screener data into a single spreadsheet, the SEA SSIP Team aligned the format of that spreadsheet to the format of the collated MOWR spreadsheet data and then integrated the data into a single spreadsheet that aligns with future MOWR data queries. The AASA state testing data was also collated and aligned to the efficient integration of future queries.

Funding Initiatives Through the SSIP Contract:

For each PEA that signs their SSIP Contract annually, the SEA/SSIP offers $5,000.00 to support their systemic improvement initiatives that are aligned with IDEA funding guidelines. In the prior system, PEA SSIP Teams would complete the SGR & AP activity, review contract eligibility, and align SSIP Action Plan initiatives with planned expenditures at different times.

The SEA SSIP Team collaborated with ESS Projects to streamline the documentation and process. The product of the collaboration was a one-page document where PEA SSIP Teams align SSIP Action Plan initiatives with allowable expenses. This document has cut down on the paperwork needed by the PEA SSIP Teams to receive the SSIP funds as well as for reimbursement.

In SY 2022–2023, the timeline allowed the SEA SSIP Team to work with Cohort 6 PEA SSIP Teams on this streamlined, one-page, document after the completion of the SGR & AP. Afterward, the SEA SSIP Team embedded a PEA SSIP Team's streamlined, one-page, document within their SGR & AP. Embedding the document within the SGR & AP allows the PEA SSIP Team to manage the alignment of planned expenditures more easily with Action Plan initiatives, as initiatives evolve during the three years in SSIP. The intended outcome of further streamlining the document and process was to improve the initial and continued participation of SSIP contract funding as well as to account for turnover in staff associated with the contract and SGR & AP.

For Cohort 7 in SY 2023–2024, the timeline allowed the SEA SSIP Team to embed the streamlined, one-page, document within the initial submission of the SGR & AP. Now, PEA SSIP Teams can assess their SGR systems, plan their AP initiatives, review their expenses/contract, and align SSIP Action Plan initiatives with allowable expenses, in sequence and during the same time together. After activity submission, the SEA SSIP Team was able to review and provide feedback for both the SGR & AP and planned expenditures. For process support, the SEA SSIP Team embedded links to SSIP Contract support documents into the SGR & AP activity and provided guidance at PSM-SSIP TA Meetings before their initial submission. This further streamlining was intended to provide more support, avoid issues due to PEA staffing turnover, expedite funding, and further improve initial and continued SSIP Contract participation.

Activity and Student Outcome Presentations:

At the end of SY 2021–2022, four presentations were posted to the SSIP website to review activity and student outcomes for the year. The presentations included one that reviewed SGR & AP activity outcomes, one that reviewed EBP Walkthrough activity outcomes, one that reviewed stakeholder feedback including results from the SSIP and EBP Surveys, and one that reviewed student outcomes from both literacy screener and AASA state testing data. The SEA SSIP Team then provided each PEA SSIP Team that had completed Year 2 with additional slides to put their team's EBP Walkthrough data within the context of SSIP Cohort 4. The SEA SSIP Team also provided each PEA SSIP Team that had completed Year 3 with additional slides to put their team's SGR & AP data within the context of SSIP Cohort 3.

While this system of providing outcome feedback provided high potential value, there was not available evidence that the potential value translated into kinetic value and to substantiate the capacity use.

At the end of SY 2022–2023, the SEA SSIP Team was able to streamline the above process by creating an electronic poster that included an outcome summary indicator for the SGR & AP activity, the EBP Walkthrough activity, and for student outcomes. The outcome poster was quick and easy to review. It included a link to an outcome presentation on the SSIP website that PEA teams could choose to follow if they wanted expanded information. The outcome presentation included a link to a survey that PEA teams could choose to follow if they wanted to request a data display for their outcomes within the context of their cohort. This streamlined change allowed the SEA SSIP team to conserve capacity and implement other continuous improvement strategies.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

SSIP Process Guidance Documents and Training Meetings:

The SEA SSIP Team provided additional guidance documents and training opportunities for PEAs to continuously improve support systems through the enhancement of Technical Assistance (TA). The SEA SSIP Team measured the effectiveness of support in the short term through how documents and trainings were utilized and the resulting indicators of activity fidelity.

For an example of continuous improvement to support PEAs with TA, Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) provided the option for PEAs entering the monitoring year to attend one of several TA meetings to preview the monitoring process. These TA meetings included an SSIP presentation that previewed the structure and process for SSIP activities and support opportunities prior to SSIP Year 1. While PEA attendance was optional, 12 of the 15 PEAs beginning SSIP Year 1 chose to attend. Then, when asked about TA-support in the SSIP Survey, 80.6% of respondents characterized TA support presentations as either "mostly" or "very" helpful.

However, when PEA SSIP Teams were asked which resources and support documents they found helpful for TA, SGR & AP Support Documents and Videos went down 3.6% from the prior year. For context, other TA support documents also showed a moderate decrease in data for helpfulness, and in contrast, PEA SSIP Team reported finding correspondence and meetings with the SEA SSIP Team to be more helpful this year, than last year. This shift in data may simply be attributed to the enhancements in the TA provided in a more site-based and personalized format as well as the front-loaded TA specifically offered for PEAs participating in Year 1 of SSIP. The SEA SSIP Team also used the Fidelity Feedback Guide (FFG) to analyze whether improved guidance and TA may have resulted in improved activity fidelity. The FFG provides PEA SSIP Teams with activity feedback and TA after each of the six SGR & AP submissions during the three-year SSIP process. The FFG provides data for fidelity indicators, such as the extent to which PEA SSIP Teams show examination of the 45 evidence-based practices that support the 15 learning community systems. In submission 1 of Year 1, without having the benefit of a TA meeting and SSIP presentation prior to the first submission, SSIP Cohort 6 had an average FFG score of 92.3%. In

submission 1 for SSIP Cohort 7, after most had attended the meeting that provided TA on SSIP activities such as the SGR & AP, the average FFG score was 94.9%.

These continuous improvement efforts not only serve the connection between TA and activity fidelity but should also be evidenced through the data as the SEA SSIP Team monitors activity and student outcomes.

Organizing Data for Analysis and System Alignment:

The process of collating and aligning activity and student outcome data has had positive effects on capacity, collaboration, and the consideration of variables on outcomes.

Concerning capacity, the time that had been previously devoted to reformatting at each submission and collection period is now devoted to integrating new data variables for analysis and display. For example, after integrating the Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates from the National Center for Education Statistics, the dashboard that displays PEA locations on a map of Arizona aided in the coordination of site-based professional development for the EBP Walkthrough activity and PEA SSIP Teams. It was also helpful in the analysis of whether and to what extent rurality influenced student state testing outcomes.

Concerning collaboration, the SEA SSIP Team can more effectively target opportunities to support PEA SSIP Teams because the dashboard allows users to display levels of system implementation in conjunction with ongoing initiatives. For example, after each submission, the SEA SSIP Team reviews SSIP Action Plans for initiatives that align with available PD or resources for evidence-based practices and then notifies the PEA SSIP Team of the opportunity and/or resource. In SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team used the AP Initiatives dashboard by targeting specific system indicators to display PEA SSIP Teams action steps. Providing an effective system for aligning PEA SSIP Team needs with support opportunities allows for the capacity to spend more time with PEA SSIP Teams and supporting the Team's needs. Shifting this capacity is important, as the data shows that PEA SSIP Team's value the PEA-specific and in-person support more, in recent feedback collected.

Funding Initiatives Through the SSIP Contract:

Under the prior SSIP Contract structure, the SEA was retaining just under 50% of PEA participation from SSIP Year 1 to Year 3. Where the SEA SSIP Team began coordinating with PEA SSIP Teams directly with the streamlined form, Cohort 6 had both a higher initial participation in Year 1, and over 80% of the PEAs that signed the SSIP Contract in Year 1 have also signed the SSIP Contract in Year 2. Where the SEA SSIP Team embedded the streamlined form into the initial SGR & AP activity for Cohort 7, PEA SSIP Teams were able to align initiatives and submit planned expenditures about two months prior to when Cohort 6 had been able to in the previous year.

However, due to internal capacity strain at the SEA, the process of getting SSIP Contracts to SSIP PEAs was delayed in SY 2023–2024. As in prior years, SSIP PEAs will receive and can sign their SSIP Contract regardless of an approved plan, so it is the expectation that more SSIP PEAs will pursue an approved streamlined narrative when contracts are delivered. A high degree of initial and sustained SSIP Contract participation will support the sustainability of their systems and have the potential to provide for positive activity and student outcomes.

Activity and Student Outcome Presentations:

The decision of allowing PEA SSIP Teams to request PEA-specific outcome presentations, rather than to create and distribute all of them prior to request, allowed the SEA SSIP Team to devote capacity to other SSIP collaborative and improvement efforts without having to sacrifice the availability or value of stakeholder feedback.

While the intention was to provide the first tier of information as a time-efficient summary of outcomes that would allow PEA SSIP Teams to choose their tier of depth and time commitment thereafter, due to the timing of distribution and a website issue, the SEA SSIP Team provided the second tier of the outcome presentation directly to PEA SSIP Teams for their review.

Although they were still offered the opportunity to request the PEA-specific displays in the third tier of outcome data, only one of the Cohorts 4 and 5 PEAs that received the second tier of information completed the survey intended for the third tier of information. While general data was collected in the SSIP Survey, such as 80.6% characterizing SSIP support presentations as "Mostly Helpful" to "Very Helpful," specific data pertaining to the use and value of the outcome presentations was not collected. This is especially notable because Cohort 4 had exited SSIP prior to the outcome presentation availability and because Cohort 5 comprised 1/3 of the cohorts receiving the SSIP Survey after presentation availability.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each <u>new</u> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

Updating Internal Procedures for Activity Submission and Technical Assistance (TA):

PSM leadership reviews policies and procedures during collaboration involving continuous improvement. Prior to SY 2023–2024, procedures to several policies were refined to alleviate SEA capacity strain and to improve activity fidelity. The new language for procedural updates was embedded into activity directions, procedural reference documents, and activity feedback documents. These updates were provided to both SEA and PEA SSIP Teams during SSIP process support meetings.

For example, after the initial completion of the SGR & AP activity document, the procedure has been for PEA SSIP Teams to submit activity updates at each of the next five submissions, using the same activity document. This activity process allows for cohesive and continuous data, and it alleviates the PEA SSIP Team capacity strain of having to complete a full documentation at each activity submission. Prior to SY 2023–2024, when the PEA SSIP Team submitted the SGR & AP activity on a completely new activity form, the procedure was for the SEA SSIP Team to integrate the new information onto their previous and ongoing form and then to work with the PEA SSIP Team to clarify any new information that might conflict with prior information. This procedure was an inefficient use of time for both the SEA and PEA SSIP Teams. In SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team leadership provided TA to both PEA and SEA SSIP Team members, documenting activity updates on the same activity form as a submission requirement.

As an indication of alleviating capacity strain, both SEA and PEA SSIP Team groups had positive feedback for the procedure changes. Most survey responses referred to an appreciation for procedural language that is easy to reference, follow, and cite. As an early indication of improved fidelity and referring to the example, there have been no instances where PEA SSIP Teams that have submitted updates on new activity forms in SY 2023–2024. General fidelity improvements will be detailed in subsequent FFY 2022 sections.

EBP Activity Support with Examples and Non-Examples:

The resources for the EBP Classroom Walkthrough Process offer three tiers of activity support. The first tier is the EBP Walkthrough Tool itself, providing evidence-based classroom practices in both sentence list and checkbox form. During the EBP Walkthrough Activity Presentation, the SSIP Coordinator guides PEA SSIP Teams through the practices on the EBP Tool to check for understanding and the opportunity to proceed to the second and third tiers of support for a more common understanding of a practice or group of practices amongst group members. While the second tier of support appears from within the EBP Presentation through context explanations and graphics, it is the third tier of support that was identified for additional

improvement.

The third tier provides specific examples and non-examples of how EBPs may be seen in the classroom. As this document has evolved from a Grades 3–5 to a K–3 resource, examples and non-examples have evolved to become a better representation for K–3 classrooms. During the first PD for activity support in SY 2023–2024, the PEA SSIP Team noted a few instances where examples and non-examples would apply more directly to Grades 2–3 classrooms and less directly to K–1 classrooms. This stakeholder feedback was noted as helpful and a rich discussion about possibilities for providing additional grade level examples ensued.

Although the SEA SSIP Team did not immediately revise the resource to include the additional grade-level examples, notations were made throughout the SSIP Coordinator's copy so the SSIP Coordinator could provide additional examples in subsequent discussions. PEA SSIP Teams involved in subsequent discussions, reported that they appreciated being made aware of this connection and in knowing that the resource would continue evolving to improve PD support.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

SSIP Process Guidance Documents and Training Meetings:

The SEA SSIP Team will continue to monitor survey data from participants to drive the revision and creation of trainings and documents for the continuous improvement of PEA support. The next step regarding TA support meetings, will be to promote this support opportunity with better intentionality for newly identified PEAs at Monitoring Setup Meetings that occur in the Spring prior to SSIP Year 1. At these meetings, monitoring specialists and SEA SSIP Team members visit PEAs at the end of their Year 3 monitoring cycle year to explain their Risk Analysis tool and Year 4 monitoring structure that may include SSIP activities for the following three years. In the Spring of SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team will provide the dates, structure, and implementation fidelity data connected to attending the TA support meetings to newly identified SSIP PEAs during Setup Meetings. The intended outcome of providing this information to newly identified SSIP PEAs in the Spring is improved participation at TA support meetings before SSIP Year 1 begins. Subsequently, the anticipated outcomes of improved participation at the TA support meetings would be further improvement of activity fidelity and activity outcomes.

Organizing Data for Analysis and System Alignment:

The next step for the data and systems alignment is to complete dashboards for available data and to expand collaboration with other agency stakeholders. The SEA SSIP Team will not only create the dashboards for student outcomes with AASA and literacy screener state testing but will also incorporate variable subgroups, such as Least Restrictive Environment, Race/Ethnicity, and Disability by Category, to see how they may factor into those outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that, by May 2024, the dashboard will be ready to share with ESS leadership. The dashboard will be used toward the consideration of PEA support system alignment and for collaboration with internal stakeholders, such as Move On When Reading (MOWR) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The intended outcome of the data alignment and collaboration will be to align systems of support with PEA needs and to provide improved technical assistance and professional development.

Funding Initiatives Through the SSIP Contract:

The next step for supporting SSIP Contract funding is to gather updated participation data and stakeholder feedback for the current system that supports SSIP Contract participation. Although initially positive, the SEA SSIP Team will have to consider the ongoing participation data and feedback in conjunction with the capacity constraints that affected timelines for the delivery of SSIP Contracts in SY 2023–2024. The intended outcome of continuing to monitor the data and stakeholder feedback is that the SEA SSIP Team will continue to improve the support and participation of the SSIP Contract, resulting in more support for PEA initiatives, systems development, and student outcomes.

Activity and Student Outcome Presentations:

The next step in disseminating activity and student outcome data is for the SEA SSIP Team to include specific examples where there is an explicit connection between EBP and system development along with student outcomes. At the end of SY 2023–2024, Cohort 5 will be the first SSIP cohort to have three years of SGR & AP, AASA, and literacy screener data as well as having had onsite support available for the EBP Classroom Walkthrough activity in Year 2. Despite Cohort 5 showing a regression in literacy outcomes after SSIP Year 2 as a group, the SEA SSIP Team will look for exemplars within Cohort 5 after SSIP Year 3 to highlight the positive connection between activity fidelity, positive activity outcomes, systemic development, and positive student outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team will then use any available exemplars, as well as any exemplars in future cohorts, as evidence to showcase the effectiveness of SSIP activities during SSIP presentations to stakeholders, including to other SSIP PEAs. The SEA SSIP Team will look for exemplars when 2024 AASA data is available during SY 2024–2025, and any exemplars will be integrated into stakeholder presentations at the end of that school year. The intended outcome of showcasing SSIP exemplars and the value of SSIP activities to SSIP PEAs, is to drive active participation early, sustain it throughout the process, and raise the probability that positive practices and outcomes will continue after participation in an SSIP Cohort. The intended outcome of using exemplars to promote the effectiveness of support systems to internal stakeholders is to leverage the alignment of supports for SSIP and ESS.

Updating Procedures for Activity Submission and Technical Assistance:

The next steps for reviewing policies and procedures are to continue collecting data from feedback for the recent procedural changes, monitor activity fidelity, and monitor capacity at the SEA level for the alignment of procedures. The intended outcome of aligning procedures with the data is to provide for optimal activity outcomes.

EBP Activity Support with Examples and Non-Examples:

The next step for the EBP Examples and Non-Examples document is to provide a new iteration of the document where each of the 28 classroom practice indicators has both a Grades K–1 and Grades 2–3 set of examples and then to make this document available to Cohort 7 PEA SSIP Teams prior to EBP Walkthroughs in SSIP Year 2. The SEA SSIP Team will also notify Cohort 6 PEA SSIP Teams of the updated document so Teams that choose to continue EBP Walkthroughs beyond SSIP Year 2 submission requirements are apprised of the updated resource. The intended outcome of updating the EBP Walkthrough Examples and Non-Examples document is to increase the common understanding of the practices amongst PEA SSIP Team members, resulting in greater inter-rater reliability, activity data quality, and the scale-up of support resources.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The SGR & AP—EBPs Supporting Learning Community Systems:
https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2023/07/SSIP%20Success%20Gaps%20Rubric%20and%20Action%20Plan.doc

The SGR & AP is a tool that was originally provided by the IDEA Data Center. The tool has been adapted by the SEA SSIP Team to include a deliberate consideration of EBPs in the SGR. By providing EBP prompts that align with system-level descriptions before analyzing levels of system implementation, PEA SSIP Teams can calibrate levels of system implementation and target EBPs within AP initiatives with high fidelity. SEA SSIP Teams use these prompts to gauge fidelity and to provide direct and explicit feedback. The tool includes five groups for system indicators, 15 system indicators, and a total of 45 EBPs that support the system indicators.

--Indicator Group 1: Data-Based Decision-Making (DBDM)
--- Decisions about curriculum, instructional programs, academic/behavioral supports, and school improvement are based on data.
----The PEA's screener and benchmark assessment have research to support effectiveness.
----Programs and initiatives use subgroup data.
----SpEd and GenEd teachers engage in regular collaboration with academic and behavioral data to create and monitor student goals and for planning instruction.

--Indicator Group 2: Cultural Responsiveness (CR)
--- Culturally responsive instructional interventions and teaching strategies are used throughout the school or district.
----Trainings and PD develop cultural responsiveness in academic planning and instruction.
----School events include celebrations of community diversity.
----Staff are culturally responsive and effective regarding linguistic diversity.
----Student linguistic needs and supports are accounted for, in a variety of ways.
----Family language supports are offered at meetings and events.
----Home correspondence is accessible to families.
----Learning community event data is collected and analyzed for subgroup attendance and family engagement.
----Parent and family event data is used for continuous improvement and shared at stakeholder meetings.
----Stakeholders use data to improve family engagement, especially in connection to students who experience success gaps.
----The learning community celebrates diversity with intentional consideration of subgroups.

--Indicator Group 3: Core Instructional Program (CIP)
--- A consistent, well-articulated curriculum is in place and is implemented with fidelity, evidence-based practices, and differentiation.
----There are a variety of trainings and support documents available, involving horizonal curriculum alignment.
---- There are a variety of trainings and support documents available, involving vertical curriculum alignment.
----Administration accounts for teachers delivering curriculum with fidelity.
----There is ongoing PD to support instructional EBPs.
----Administration accounts for the implementation of EBPs from PD.
----Flexible grouping is evident in lesson plans and seen through observations.
----Instructional technology is being used for engagement, depth of knowledge, and to provide accommodations.
----Accommodations and modifications are evident in instruction, assignments, and assessments.
----Choices based on learning styles and interests are being used to leverage learning.
----SpEd teachers regularly consult with GenEd teachers, English Learning (EL) leads, and Special Area (SA) teachers to plan for meeting the needs of unique student populations.
----Every family has the opportunity to learn about their student's core instructional program.
----Every family is informed about the ways that instruction is differentiated for their child.

--Indicator Group 4: Assessment—Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (Assessment)
--- Universal screening is used to identify needs for early intervention or targeted supports.
----The PEA uses a reading screener to identify needs for intervention and targeted supports.
----The PEA uses a math screener to identify needs for intervention and targeted supports.
----The PEA uses a behavior screener to identify needs for intervention and targeted supports.
----Teachers use formative assessments to monitor skill development, make instructional adjustments, and plan/implement tier 2–3 interventions.
----Teachers use progress monitoring tools to monitor skill development, make instructional adjustments, and plan/implement tier 2–3 interventions.
----The PEA informs families about academic and behavior screener results.
----The PEA regularly informs families about progress monitoring results.

--Indicator Group 5: Interventions and Supports (I&S)
--- Evidence-based behavioral interventions and supports are multi-tiered and implemented with fidelity.
----In connection with structuring interventions, every teacher has been trained to used screeners, benchmarks, diagnostics, and curricular and behavioral assessments.
----GenEd teacher provide tier 2–3 interventions in the classroom multiple times each week, based on assessments.
----There is a structure for providing push-in and/or pull-out services for interventions.
---- Push-in/pull-out services are provided multiple times each week, based on assessments.
--- Every teacher has been trained in the use of EBP resources for planning and implementing interventions.
--- Teachers have support for planning intervention and using progress monitoring data toward implementing EBP interventions.
--- Intervention considerations include data, students with disabilities, English learners, continuous improvement, and grade-level planning.
--- Teachers receive PD on how past experiences and culture affect bias and behavior.
--- Interventions are implemented with fidelity.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Supporting Classroom Practices and Walkthrough Systems:
https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2023/08/SSIP%20EBP%20Walkthrough%20Tool.doc

PEA SSIP Teams use the EBP Walkthrough Tool, a collection of 104 evidence-based classroom practices divided into four quadrants, to record observed practices in grades K–3 classrooms. The data can then be used to not only celebrate instances where instructors exhibited an EBP but also to provide opportunities to further improve practices through such activities as peer observation and targeted professional development.
--Quadrant 1: Inclusive Learning Environment
---Classrooms exhibit an inclusive learning environment that is student-centered and engaging.
--- EBPs pertain to student learning outcomes, classroom management and organization, and the availability of student resources.
--Quadrant 2: Instructional Practices
---Classroom instruction is evidence-based, engaging, and responsive.
--- EBPs pertain to direct and systematic instruction, the use of assessments, and teacher responsiveness.

--Quadrant 3: Student Interactions
---Student interactions are collaborative and support learning objectives.
----EBPs pertain to modes of student learning, collaboration, and expression.

--Quadrant 4: Student Engagement
---Students are engaged in meaningful activities that support learning objectives.
----EBPs pertain to student motivation, application of learning, and classroom differentiation.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The SGR & AP—EBPs Supporting Learning Community Systems:

Indicator Group 1 of the SGR focuses on systems for data-based decision-making. The evidence-based practices include making decisions about the school curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives, based on data. It also includes the use of screener and benchmark assessments, making decisions with subgroups in mind, and evidence of use from the administrative to classroom levels for the benefit of student outcomes.

Indicator Group 2 of the SGR focuses on systems for cultural responsiveness. The evidence-based practices include celebrating diversity with professional development during gatherings as well as supporting linguistic accessibility diversity with families in all correspondence and interactions.

Indicator Group 3 of the SGR focuses on systems for implementing a well-articulated curriculum. The evidence-based practices include ensuring both horizontal and vertical alignment, flexible grouping, instructional technology, differentiated instruction with accommodations and modifications, providing for student learning styles and interests, instructional collaboration, professional development of curriculum and practices, implementation with fidelity, and informing families about the core curriculum and how it is differentiated for their student.

Indicator Group 4 of the SGR focuses on systems for incorporating tools for Assessment. The evidence-based practices include using universal screeners and progress monitoring tools for both academics and behavior, using benchmark assessments, and informing families about results.

Indicator Group 5 of the SGR focuses on systems for interventions and support. The evidence-based practices include a proactive and restorative, district-level discipline policy implemented responsively and with fidelity. It includes employing a multi-tiered system of supports for both academics and behaviors, guidance by screeners and diagnostic tools, and interventions that are continually monitored for progress by teachers who are trained to use resources and to operate with cultural sensitivity and fidelity within this system of supports. It also includes continually informing families about how their student fits within this system of supports.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Supporting Classroom Practices and Walkthrough Systems:

Quadrant 1 of the EBP Tool focuses on evidence-based classroom practices involving an inclusive learning environment. These include the display of measurable learning outcomes, classroom expectations, and word/sound walls that students can use to make progress toward learning goals, a classroom library that provides choices and reading accessibility, the use of manipulatives for connections to abstract concepts and relevance, and effective transitions between activities.

Quadrant 2 of the EBP Tool focuses on evidence-based instructional classroom practices. Quadrant 2 includes "I Do" practices involving frontloading, adequate response wait times, and explicit-systematic explanations that incorporate a variety of learning modalities and fosters engagement. Quadrant 2 includes "We Do" practices that involve scaffolding, providing immediate and specific feedback, informal formative assessment that is responsive prior to independent practice, and a variety of problem-solving methods. Quadrant 2 includes "You Do" practices for responsive independent practice that include coaching, monitoring, and time for mastery. It also provides lesson closure that reviews learning targets and learning assessment.

Quadrant 3 of the EBP Tool focuses on evidence-based practices pertaining to student interaction in the classroom. This includes students engaging in various collaborative learning expressions, text activities, goal setting and planning, and higher-order learning modalities. It also has the ability for students to make choices and present learning in various ways.

Quadrant 4 of the EBP Tool focuses on evidence-based practices pertaining to student engagement in the classroom. These practices include students involved in activities with real-world relevance that are targeted to the zone of proximal development, are considerate of strength and needs, involve self-regulation, and allow for a high degree of student-lead communication. Quadrant 4 also includes differentiated activities with accommodations and modifications to content and process.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The SGR & AP—EBPs Supporting Learning Community Systems:

Focusing on data-based decision-making allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. This is not only done with data for general education but also for subgroups such as English language learners and special education students. It is only by the juxtaposition of both the aggregated and disaggregated data that administrators and teachers can make the most appropriate decisions, from curriculum to intervention and from the masses to the individual. Comprehensively and specifically using data to inform decisions is foundational for improving outcomes, thereby impacting the SiMR in a positive direction. This should also impact the district/program policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all decisions are made with data in mind and based on the data itself.

Focusing on cultural responsiveness allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. This supports the SiMR because an individual's outcomes are a product of their learning, learning is a product of experiences, and culture is a critical component of a student's experiences. It is essential to respect the cultural similarities and differences of all members of the learning community. Cultural diversity within and amongst people is a crucial component of how they have learned and will continue to learn. Respecting this diversity allows students and stakeholders to feel appreciated, to buy into the learning community, and to be motivated to learn within it. It can also be used as a filter to understand perspective, which is the window to understanding what an individual needs to learn and develop. Beyond the inherent nature of language's importance in accessing learning, culture is also important. As it is essential to understand the learning needs of a student with disabilities, it is imperative to understand that individual's perspective and

learning components, including how culture has guided and continues to guide the process of learning.

Focusing on implementing a well-articulated curriculum allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. When the learning community develops a curriculum that accounts for the variety of learning components and equips the curriculum with tools that meet the variety of ways in which students learn, teachers can flexibly use that comprehensive framework to deliver that instruction with evidence-based practices to meet the needs of learners in general and as individuals. The tools for differentiating the curriculum are essential for students with disabilities, to provide access to the curriculum. Supporting the core curriculum, the delivery of that curriculum with evidence-based classroom practices, and teachers differentiating the curriculum to meet student needs is essential for supporting student outcomes and the SiMR.

Focusing on the incorporation of universal screening and progress monitoring allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning communities appropriately. By screening at several points through the year, members of the learning community have reliable data for growth and the development of foundational learning skills. The resulting data can then be used for comparison to prior learning and other groups/subgroups for the development of learning targets and toward the categorization and initial application of learning groups. Then, after diagnostic and refinement where needed, the learning plan and progress can be monitored to make adjustments that provide for developmental precision and the highest potential for positive outcomes and the SiMR. This includes screening and monitoring for behavioral development as a factor for learning access and their outcomes.

Focusing on interventions and supports allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. After reliable data is used to determine a student's needs, it is vitally important for the progression of learning to meet the more specific and involved needs with a structure and learning plan to meet those needs. While this may mean that a zone for optimal learning can be found within a small group structure, it may also mean that the zone for optimal learning can only be met through an individualized learning structure and plan. Meeting student needs includes having interventions and supports for behavioral development as a factor for learning access, student outcomes, and the support of the SiMR.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Supporting Classroom Practices and Walkthrough Systems:

Focusing on having an inclusive classroom learning environment allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classrooms appropriately. Much like respecting cultural diversity, an inclusive learning environment provides students the ability to feel appreciated, buy into the learning community, and be motivated to learn within it. It can also provide a support structure that offers learning accessibility and paves the way for improved outcomes to support the SiMR.

Focusing on instructional classroom practices allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classroom appropriately. At the center of pedagogy, effective instructional practices include an intimate knowledge of subject matter, learning tools, and of students, from the individual members of the group to the dynamics of the group itself. Further, effective instructional practices involve a nuanced plan to meet these needs and a skillful implementation of scaffolding that also requires constant monitoring of feedback and adjustment throughout the process toward skill independence. Particular attention must be paid to this arena of practices because of how multi-faceted, interconnected, and critical these practices are for positive student outcomes and to support the SiMR.

Focusing on student interactions allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classrooms appropriately. When students experience a variety of ways to interact with the learning process, content, materials, and with others, they can make cognitive connections and experience development to a greater degree. They also have more opportunities to make choices, take ownership of their learning, experience drive toward positive outcomes, and support the SiMR.

Focusing on student engagement allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classroom appropriately. In connection with interactions, engagement also includes the identification of strengths and needs, and the skillful use of differentiation to meet those needs. Targeting these individual facets of learning will provide positive outcomes for individuals and support the SiMR.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The SGR & AP—Monitoring for Fidelity:

As described in the section for infrastructure improvements, PEA SSIP Teams complete the SGR & AP in the fall and spring of each year to assess levels of system implementation in the learning community and implement initiatives for systemic improvement. After each submission, the SEA SSIP Team provides activity feedback on the Fidelity Feedback Guide (FFG). The SEA SSIP Team monitors FFG scores through the three-year SSIP process to see how PEA SSIP Teams used the feedback provided by the SEA and toward improving fidelity. The SEA SSIP Team then compares the Year 3 Fall scores to growth in levels of implementation on the Success Gaps Rubric (SGR) to assess the connection between fidelity and practice change.
In Fall of Year 3, Cohort 3 had an average fidelity score of 70.5%. At that point, the aggregate of Cohorts 3–5 had an average score of 88.2%. This data shows that Cohorts 4–5 had ascended Cohort 3 fidelity earlier in their implementation.
In Fall of Year 3, Cohort 4 had an average fidelity score of 89.0%. At that point, the aggregate of Cohorts 4–6 had an average score of 94.2%. This data confirms both prior and continued fidelity ascension.
In Fall of Year 3, Cohort 5 had an average fidelity score of 94.4%. At that point, the aggregate of Cohorts 5–7 had an average score of 95.5%. This data further confirms both prior and continued fidelity ascension.
While having yet to enter Year 3 of SSIP, Cohort 6 had an average fidelity score of 92.3% in Fall of Year 1 and 97.7% in Fall of Year 2.

The SGR & AP—Connecting Fidelity to Practices, Systems, and Student Outcomes:

The trend of SGR levels of implementation did not have the same consistency as the trend in activity fidelity. As outlined in the SSIP Theory of Action, the SEA SSIP Team reviews growth in SGR levels of implementation for Cohorts that have completed three years in SSIP. At the end of SY 2022–2023, the nine PEAs in SSIP Cohort 4 pursued 41 AP Initiatives across all five indicator groups. Of the initiatives that were documented for more than two consecutive submission periods, there was an average growth of 66% toward one full level of implementation on targeted initiatives. For context, many of the SSIP Cohort 4 PEA SSIP Teams reported stagnation and even regression of systemic levels in Year 1 and going into Year 2, which coincides with the first full school year after COVID-19 shutdowns, and that most were also reporting online/hybrid instruction. This is especially notable because SSIP Cohort 3 had grown an average of 92% toward one full level of implementation on targeted initiatives after three years in SSIP. Therefore, rising fidelity does not appear to be a predominant factor, in comparison to factors related to COVID-19, in providing for improved practices and systemic improvement.
Making the connection between systemic improvement and student outcomes, while SSIP Cohort 4 showed a 2.0% decrease in AASA literacy proficiency between SSIP Years 2–3, SSIP Cohort 3 showed a 1.8% increase between SSIP Year 2 and Year 3, and another 1.7% increase in their first full year after SSIP participation. Therefore, rising fidelity does not appear to be a predominant factor, in comparison to factors related to COVID-19, in providing for improved student outcomes.

While Cohort 5 will complete SSIP Year 3 at the end of SY 2023–2024, and that current average growth is currently above one full level of system implementation during SSIP, they have been the only cohort to report average levels of system implementation below Partially Implemented to begin SSIP Year 1. They also had a regression in AASA literacy proficiency in the current reporting period.

The SSIP Survey—Supporting Fidelity and Outcomes:

In connection to activity fidelity, over 80% of PEA SSIP Teams characterized the TA that the SEA offers for completing SSIP activities as either Mostly Helpful or Very Helpful. This rise in positive response from the previous year can be attributed to the additional training opportunities and support resources that the SEA SSIP Team offered in SY 2023–2024 and can be used to support rising fidelity data. However, when asked to characterize the Success Gaps Rubric and Action Plan activity for analyzing and improving systems in the learning community, 77.8% of PEA SSIP Teams characterized the activity as either Somewhat, Mostly, or Highly effective, with almost half characterizing the activity as being Mostly Effective to Highly Effective. This data is down by about 15% in overall effectiveness reported by PEA SSIP Teams in SY 2022–2023. This data would further support how rising support and fidelity was unable to overcome other predominant factors for activity and student outcomes.

The Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Walkthrough Process—Monitoring for Fidelity:

In SSIP Year 2, PEA SSIP Teams submit two EBP Walkthrough Tools from classroom walkthroughs at each submission period. For data reliability and process fidelity, the SEA SSIP Team monitors that EBP Tools reflect the same two K–3 classrooms at each submission period during literacy instruction. In SY 2022–2023, SSIP Cohort 5 submitted EBP Tools that aligned with these data reliability and process fidelity standards 89.5% of the time by EBP submission 2. In SY 2023–2024, SSIP Cohort 6 submitted EBP Tools that aligned with these data reliability and process fidelity standards 100% of the time by EBP submission 2.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Connecting Fidelity to Activity Outcomes:

PEA SSIP Teams conduct two classroom walkthroughs and submit the EBP Walkthrough Tool data at each of the three submission periods during SSIP Year 2. The SEA SSIP Team records the data from each EBP Tool at each submission into a spreadsheet. Data is recorded by quadrant, so each group of EBP indicators can be analyzed by quadrant and for overall growth.
While SSIP Cohort 4 decreased in the average EBPs per classroom between submission 1 and submission 2 by almost eight practices, the Cohort netted an average of five additional classroom EBPs between submission 1 and submission 3.
While SSIP Cohort 5 also decreased in average EBPs per classroom between submission 1 and submission 2 by about five practices, the Cohort reported an average of seven additional classroom EBPs between submission 1 and submission 3.
In SY 2023–2024, SSIP Cohort 6 has reported an average of 11 additional EBPs per classroom between submission 1 and submission 2. By quadrant, quadrant 3 has an average increase of about two EBPs per classroom, while quadrants 1, 2, and 4 have an average increase of about three EBPs per classroom. These increases show a positive connection between rising fidelity and practice change for Cohort 6.

The EBP Survey—EBP Walkthroughs and Support for Fidelity and Outcomes:

In SY 2023–2024, when asked to characterize the TA provided to support the activity process and outcomes, all 15 PEA SSIP Teams in SSIP Cohort 6 characterized the support as either Mostly or Highly Supportive. When asked to characterize the EBP Classroom Walkthrough activity toward improving classroom practices and student outcomes, all 15 PEA SSIP Teams characterized the activity as having some positive effect, with only one characterizing that effect as being minimal. Both responses for SEA SSIP Team support and activity outcomes show improvement over SY 2022–2023 responses and would further support the connection between rising fidelity and practice change.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.
The SGR & AP—Monitoring EBP System Progress:

Regarding the EBPs for the Data-Based Decision-Making (DBDM) system indicator, PEAs have reported beginning SSIP with an average level of implementation of about 2.5 and completing SSIP with an average of about 3.4, regardless of being connected to Action Plan initiative. This data would equate to systems that begin half-way toward being fully Implemented and growing almost half-way toward Exemplary implementation. The significant growth of DBDM, despite being directly targeted for initiatives, is a testament to how interwoven the EBPs are within every learning community system and how integral they are for the growth and development of systems.
The EBPs for the Cultural Responsiveness (CR) system indicator had no connected Action Plan initiatives in SY 2020–2021. Rising steadily in each of the past few years, it now accounts for about 16% of all Action Plan initiatives in SY 2023–2024. This data coincides with SSIP Cohorts 5–7 reporting an incoming average for systemic implementation below that of prior cohorts.
The EBPs for the Core Instructional Programs (CIP) system indicator accounted for 56% of all initiatives in SY 2020–2021. In SY 2023–2024, it now accounts for 34.4% of all initiatives. However, looking within the CIP system group, Action Plan initiatives targeting Differentiated Instruction (DI) has risen in proportion to the whole. This data coincides with the overall system implementation data for the system group. While SSIP Cohorts 5–7 entered SSIP with higher average levels of systemic implementation than SSIP Cohorts 3–4 involving a Well-Articulated Curriculum and providing EBP Instructional Practices, SSIP Cohorts 5–7 each entered SSIP with lower systemic levels of implementation for DI. Notably, SSIP Cohort 5 entered SSIP with an average DI that was in the Planning range. EBPs for CIP remain essential to systemic improvement and student outcomes because it remains the system group that is targeted with most of the Action Plan improvement initiatives, especially in relation to DI.
Regarding EBPs in Assessment systems, with the exception of SSIP Cohort 5, every other cohort in Cohorts 3–6 reported beginning SSIP Year 1 with levels of implementation at least halfway between Partially Implemented and fully Implemented. All cohorts beginning with Partially Implemented systems then reported growth to fully Implemented systems by the beginning of SSIP Year 2. Connected to the DBDM group, EBPs for Assessment are integral to paving the pathway for the growth and development of systems.
SSIP Cohorts 5–7 have entered SSIP Year 1 reporting a lower average level of implementation in each Interventions and Supports (I&S) system, compared to SSIP Cohorts 3–4. Of the I&S systems, MTSS Response is the lowest system indicator in the group. Where each of SSIP Cohorts 6-7 have reported entering SSIP Year 1 with system levels just above Partially Implemented, SSIP Cohort 5 reported an average level of implementation in the Planning range. EBPs related to I&S are critical for supporting the foundational skills necessary to access the general curriculum.

The SSIP Survey—Monitoring SpEd-GenEd Collaboration:

In addition to the EBPs that are targeted for growth within each activity, all SSIP activities are designed to strengthen collaboration for leveraging activity and student outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team uses the SSIP Survey to collect data concerning the level of collaboration in SSIP learning communities, and a survey within the Special Education Professionals Check-In group to provide context.

In SY 2023–2024, when PEA SSIP Teams were asked to characterize the frequency of collaboration between SpEd and GenEd, between 72% and 92% of PEA SSIP Teams characterized collaboration when planning instruction, setting student goals, and monitoring student progress as occurring frequently or continuously. This data contrasts with data collected at the Special Education Professionals Check-In group in the Winter of SY 2022–2023, made up of staff from various PEAs across the state of Arizona, where about 61% of respondents characterized these same realms of collaboration as occurring no more than occasionally.

Because collaboration between SpEd and GenEd is so important for student development, because there is a need for support, and because SSIP data provides evidence for providing that support, it is a valuable system for EBPs and will continue to be integral to the SSIP.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Monitoring EBP System Progress:

Both SSIP Cohorts 5 and 6 reported an increase in average classroom EBPs regarding an Inclusive Classroom Learning Environment between submission 1 and submission 2, with SSIP Cohort 6 reporting the highest average increase at almost three additional practices.

While SSIP Cohorts 4 and 5 each reported an average decrease of about three classroom EBPs for Instructional Classroom Practices between submission 1 and submission 2, SSIP Cohort 6 showed an increase of over two classroom practices.

While SSIP Cohorts 4 and 5 each reported an average decrease of about one classroom EBP pertaining to Student Interactions between submission 1 and submission 2, SSIP Cohort 6 showed an increase of over two classroom practices.

While SSIP Cohort 4 reported an average decrease of over two classroom EBPs pertaining to Student Engagement between submission 1 and submission 2, and SSIP Cohort 5 reported an average decrease of almost three EBPs, SSIP Cohort 6 showed an increase of over three classroom EBPs.

By disaggregating the data by cohort, by quadrant, and between submission periods, analysis shows that the trend of end-of-year data improving in the prior two years is most likely going to take an even bigger step forward at the end of SY 2023–2024. This data further supports the ongoing use of the EBP Walkthrough activity and the support it provides for classroom EBPs in the learning community.

The EBP Survey—Monitoring EBP Rollout:

Due to the high degree of local control and being housed within the monitoring system, a key factor in expanding rollout for the Arizona SSIP is supporting activities that PEA SSIP Teams and SSIP learning communities find valuable for supporting EBPs in the learning community. For the EBP Walkthrough Process, while the SSIP requires the data from two walkthroughs at three submission points, Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) provides professional development that highlights how PEA SSIP Teams can choose to use the SSIP activity within a structure that provides a high degree of value for improving classroom EBPs, supporting walkthrough systems, and providing for student outcomes.

On the EBP survey in SY 2023–2024, when PEA SSIP Teams were asked if they chose any of the expanded rollout options beyond SSIP submission, 11 of 15 PEAs reported choosing to conduct post-observation meetings with teachers. 7 of 15 PEAs reported choosing to target specific practices for PD and/or coaching and to conduct peer observations between teachers within grade-level teams. Five PEAs reported connecting the walkthrough data to student outcome data, and four PEAs reported expanding the walkthrough rollout to additional classrooms and/or grade levels. In conjunction with survey data characterizing the EBP Walkthrough activity as having a positive effect on classroom practices, data showing that PEAs are expanding activity rollout further supports the value of the activity and support of EBPs in the classroom.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The SGR & AP and EBPs Supporting Learning Community Systems:

EBPs for Data-Based Decision-Making (DBDM)—
Although this data would not indicate a significant need for additional support, PEA Action Plan initiatives are often connected to supporting systems for Interventions & Supports. In connection with stakeholder feedback on the SSIP Survey, while continuing to look for PD opportunities to support PEA SSIP Teams, the SEA SSIP Team will improve resources that model how the collection of literacy screener data can be used in connection to a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). The SEA SSIP Team will make that resource available to support DBDM systems and will make more substantive connections to the collection of Literacy Screener data during SSIP. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that providing the new resource and making a connection between the activities will not only have a positive effect on survey responses and outcome data for the activities but also further positive outcomes for SpEd-GenEd collaboration.

EBPs for Cultural Responsiveness (CR)—
Because PEA SSIP Teams are reporting incoming levels of systemic implementation that are down from prior years, the SEA SSIP Team will also continue to collaborate with agency partners regarding opportunities for CR development. However, due to the scarcity of available PD at the SEA, the SEA SSIP team will look to expand offerings through analysis of former PEA SSIP teams that targeted this initiative and explore how they were able to show gains. By exploring the Action Steps that have led to the rise in systemic implementation, the SEA SSIP Team anticipates it may be able to use this model to implement new systems of support for other PEA SSIP Teams.

EBPs for Core Instructional Programs (CIP) —
Because initiatives targeting Differentiated Instruction (DI) have been rising, the PEA SSIP Team will increase collaboration with the Arizona Professional Learning Series (AzPLS) to develop a system of referral based on capacity and need. After modules to support formative assessment, collaboration, and literacy strategies, the PD offered by ESS Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS) supports DI with instructional design that targets content, process, and product. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that this support will provide positive outcomes for students with disabilities in the GenEd classroom and support the SSIP SiMR.

EBPs for Assessment-Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (Assessment)—
Because levels of systemic implementation for Assessment have grown to fully Implemented by SSIP Year 2, data does not suggest an impending need to strengthen support for the evidence-based practices in this system. However, because quarterly meetings with the Literacy Initiatives Work Group (LIWG) were temporarily paused in SY 2023–2024 due to ESS and MOWR restructuring, the SEA SSIP Team will look for opportunities to reestablish participation in the LIWG and include collaboration with other units at the SEA involving Assessment to maintain a high level of support for Assessment systems and the connection to DBDM. The SEA SSIP Team will also make a connection between systems for DBDM and the additional resource to support Literacy Screener data collection. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that the collaborative and resource connections will result in data showing the continued growth and development Assessment EBPs and systems.

EBPs for Interventions and Supports (I&S)—
As data indicates a growing need to support I&S, the SEA SSIP Team will not only make the connection between I&S and the data collection resource for literacy screeners, in conjunction with Assessment and DBDM, but will also look to strengthen collaboration with stakeholders that offer PD. For

example, after seeing Action Plans that included Multi-Tiered Behavior Supports (MTBS), the SEA SSIP Team has strengthened collaboration with MTBS offered by ESS and attended PD that SSIP PEAs participated in. While there has been a capacity strain within ESS PD units over the past year, current restructuring may allow for expanded I&S PD and supports for PEAs that has been lacking more recently. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates the resource connection and improved capacity to support PEAs with PD and will meet the growing need for support and provide improved data for EBPs and systemic improvement.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Supporting Classroom Practices and Walkthrough Systems:

In addition to improving the existing resource of the Examples and Non-Examples document, the SEA SSIP Team will implement an additional resource for PEA SSIP Teams that are finding the activity valuable enough to expand rollout. This resource will not only list the ways that rollout could occur but also expand upon each to include ways they can be implemented with evidence-based practices, monitored for progress, and can provide for positive outcomes. Then, during PD, the opportunities for expanded rollout can be referenced with the resource that expands upon each rollout opportunity. One additional next step will be making the connection between the four EBPs for classroom differentiation on the EBP Observation Tool, with AzPLS support and to DI in the SGR & AP. The anticipated outcomes of strengthening the resources and collaboration with AzPLS are EBP Walkthrough activity data and data reflecting expanded rollout, continuing to increase.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)
YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.
While three-year SGR & AP data for systemic implementation growth was lower for Cohort 4 than Cohort 3, the overall activity outcome data remains positive, and the trendlines for both Cohorts 5–6 suggest improved outcome growth going forward. Since school closures, EBP Walkthrough data outcomes have shown improvement in EBP growth each year, with the Cohort 6 trendline far outpacing prior cohorts. PEA SSIP Teams responding to surveys continue to report receiving improved support by the SEA SSIP Team and improved collaboration between SpEd and GenEd within SSIP PEAs each year. While AASA data has decreased in this reporting period, Literacy Screener data shows more moderate decreases at the benchmark proficiency level of foundational literacy development and positive developments at the At-Risk level of proficiency.

Because the Arizona SSIP has a strong foundation in supporting foundational literacy for positive student outcomes, because that foundation is rooted in the support of evidence-based practices to strengthen learning community systems to leverage student outcomes, and because a significant degree of outcome data continues to be positive in connection with SSIP activities, the SEA SSIP Team will continue to implement the Arizona SSIP without any significant modifications to activities. However, the SEA SSIP Team has begun exploring SSIP data calculations concerning systems change theory and data for initiatives leading to higher levels of system implementation. For example, over the past three years, Action Plan initiatives have taken an average of 2.5 submission periods to result in a higher level of systemic implementation reported on the SGR & AP. This means that while Year 1 SSIP PEAs are included in the yearly calculation, systemic change does not occur for most SSIP PEAs until Year 2. It is also not until Year 2 that SSIP PEAs participate in the EBP Walkthrough activity that targets classroom walkthrough systems and evidence-based classroom practices. Even then, SSIP PEAs are given the choice to conduct walkthroughs in Grade K–3 classrooms to fit PEA needs and align with practice interventions at more developmental levels. A PEA choosing to target Grade 1 classrooms would not have students effected by this activity support until one year after SSIP participation.

Exploring SSIP data calculations could also take external factors into consideration, such as the negative and lasting impact that COVID-19 had on systemic development, especially for the significant number of students from rural and tribal communities that were disproportionately affected and included within SSIP Cohorts. Shifting the SSIP Cohorts included in the calculation may not only align more appropriately to students that have experienced the effect of SSIP participation but also to the time it takes for reading development and systemic improvement to translate into student SiMR outcomes.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

For SSIP, stakeholders include all people who are invested in the outcomes for students with disabilities in SSIP PEAs. Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, individuals with disabilities, teachers, administrators, parents and family members of students with disabilities, intra-agency partners, interagency partners, officials for homeless assistance, representatives for foster care and juvenile facility placement, and SEA specialists. Stakeholder input includes collaborative efforts toward documenting and implementing activities and providing stakeholder feedback, whether collected formally or informally, through correspondence or verbal discourse. Feedback may be received in the body of an email, during meetings, or through survey results.

In addition to SEAP and RSK, there are a variety of stakeholder groups that contribute feedback for SSIP support and toward outcomes for students with disabilities.

PEA SSIP Teams:

PEA SSIP Teams are typically comprised of 4–6 members of learning community leadership, often including the special education director, principals and assistant principals, instructional specialists and coaches, and teachers in both special and general education. These PEA SSIP Teams are the primary stakeholders involved with the SGR self-assessment, the AP documentation and implementation, and in conducting EBP walkthroughs to collect and develop classroom practices. They meet monthly and quarterly to review initiative goals, available resources to meet those goals, how to mitigate or

circumvent barriers to goal progress, and to use progress monitoring data to fortify or revise plans toward goals.

PEA SSIP Learning Community Members:

As the implementation of initiatives from the SGR and AP activity depends on a variety of stakeholders within PEA learning communities, they are integral SSIP stakeholders. This group includes not only administrators, but also school leadership, instructional coaches and specialists, teachers, support staff, and families. School principals are a primary source of stakeholder feedback for the EBP survey.

Special Education Directors:

Special education directors are the leaders of PEA SSIP Teams, are members of SEAP, are the principal source of stakeholder feedback at the Special Education Check-In meetings, and are the primary respondents of the SSIP Survey. They also provide continuous communication through the progress of SSIP activities as the primary contact for the SEA at PEAs.

The Data Systems (DaSy) Data Processes and Systems Thinking Center:

In cooperation with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Waters Center for Systems Things, the DaSy Center offers the opportunity the Arizona ESS Team to collaborate with group organizers and other state teams. This collaborative platform helps to drive the development and use of data systems for the support of PEAs and positive student outcomes.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Learning Collaboratives:

ESS members continually participate in the NCSI Cross-State Learning Collaboratives (CSLC). The SSIP Coordinator participates in the EBP Collaborative to deepen knowledge and practices for collaborative professional learning across SpEd and GenEd and strengthen systems for positive student outcomes. As part of this collaborative, the SSIP Coordinator participates in a group that focuses on instructional practices. The SSIP Coordinator then return to the ESS group where members share and collaborate toward the support and alignment of systems.

IDEA Data Center (IDC) Data Quality Peer Group:

The IDC Peer Group provides a platform for SSIP Coordinators and data managers to share how data systems support their state SiMRs. Collaborations often include how SiMRs are calculated and reported, what data sources are being used, and how different data variables effect the quality of data.

Move On When Reading (MOWR):

Arizona's MOWR policy is designed to provide students with evidence-based, effective reading instruction in kindergarten through third grade to position them for success as they progress through school, college, and career. MOWR is supported by state legislation that explains the requirements for pupil promotion, early literacy instruction, and accountability for student achievement in reading. Operating within ADE/Academic Standards, the SEA-MOWR Team collects literacy screener data and literacy plans for Arizona students in grades K–3.

ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring (PSM):

Specialists in ESS/PSM are the primary contacts between the SEA and PEA, involving initiating, submitting, and progressing through SSIP activities. They are also a source of ongoing stakeholder feedback through all forms of communication and from monthly PSM meetings.

ADE/ESS:

ADE/ESS holds monthly meetings to share information and progress and to collect stakeholder feedback from other perspectives within the SEA. The ESS group includes PSM, Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS), Operations, Special Projects, Early Childhood Special Education, and Dispute Resolution. It also collaborates regularly with agency partners such as Assessment, Unique Populations, and K–12 Academic Standards.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

At the PEA level, the SEA SSIP Team engages stakeholders through regular correspondence. The SEA SSIP Team engages stakeholders in TA and PD before and after SSIP activity completion and through opportunities to support Action Plan initiatives. The SEA SSIP Team also engages stakeholders with the dissemination of data from activity and student outcomes.

At the SEA level, the SEA SSIP Team engages stakeholders by expanding relationships that align systems and leverage positive outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team engages stakeholders through collaborative groups that meet regularly and share the common goal of targeting EBPs to support activity and student outcomes and by collecting feedback from PEA SSIP Teams and other stakeholders after activity participation and data dissemination.

PEA SSIP Teams, Special Education Directors, and Learning Community Members:

In SY 2021–2022, the SEA SSIP Team began differentiating PD for the EBP Walkthrough activity in SSIP Year 2, which was an engagement effort to align the needs of each learning community with the appropriate level of activity support. While this process was valuable, the time it took to collect the Walkthrough Systems Survey information, coordinate scheduling, and provide PD before activity submission in October caused capacity strain. After adjustments were made to the implementation timeline in SY 2022–2023, the process was conducted with much less capacity strain. Then, with this streamlined system for differentiated PD in place for SY 2023–2024 when PSM began with staffing shortages, the SSIP Coordinator was able to take the lead on scheduling all 15 PEA SSIP Teams for differentiated support without a prohibitive capacity strain. Actively managing the capacity strain also allowed for a high degree of engagement from stakeholders and increased activity rollout by PEAs.

SEAP:

Annually, the SEA SSIP Team presents activity and student outcomes to SEAP. The SEA SSIP Team receives stakeholder feedback on progress and process implementation through meeting and survey responses. Some examples of past feedback that has been collected and that has led to key SSIP improvements, including the alignment with MOWR and setting six-year targets for progress toward the SiMR.

In SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team again provided a presentation on current evidence-based practices, activity outcomes, and student outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team reviewed factors related to slippage and the SSIP SiMR calculation and provided time for questions and stakeholder feedback.

Raising Special Kids (RSK):

To improve parent engagement, the SEA has transitioned the RSK SPP/APR sessions from presentation meetings to an interview format on a live streaming platform. During the livestream, the SPP/APR Coordinator will be reviewing all of the indicator pages of the new SPP/APR website. On the Indicator 17 page, the SSIP will highlight the connection between student outcomes and the importance of family engagement in the learning community. While the RSK live stream will allow access for parents to share their perspective and stakeholder feedback during and after the livestream, the Indicator 17 page will also provide the SSIP Coordinator's email address for questions and feedback.

The Data Systems (DaSy) Data Use and Systems Thinking Cohort:

In SY 2023–2024, Arizona Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS), and SSIP are participating in The Data Systems (DaSy) Data Use and Systems Thinking Cohort. The purpose of this collaborative group is to gain a more common understanding of what system thinking is and how it can be applied to SEA systems to support PEAs. The Arizona Team is beginning to transition toward developing a framework of how this might look in ADE/ESS. In the current phase, the Arizona Team is organizing data based on availability and reliability of Pre-K and Kindergarten assessments connected to literacy and trying to make a connection with assessments such as literacy screeners and AASA assessments to form clearer picture of proficiency at the early stages of literacy development. This data organization and analysis is intended to then provide the foundation that highlights needs and elucidate the need for supports through those stages of development.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Learning Collaboratives:

In SY 2023–2024, as a member of the EBP Collaborative, the SSIP Coordinator has attended several Special Interest Groups (SIGs) involving instructional supports for literacy. Through these meetings, several connections have been made to help support systems and further engage stakeholders. For example, the State Director for Arkansas joined the group to talk about using LRE data in relation to student outcomes. The SSIP Coordinator will apply these concepts to the data dashboard display for student outcomes in Arizona, which can then be used to engage stakeholders in the alignment of systems and the support of Arizona PEAs within and outside of SSIP participation.

IDEA Data Center (IDC) Data Quality Peer Group:

In SY 2023–2024, as a member of the IDC Data Quality Peer Group, the SSIP Coordinator has attended several collaborative meetings. There have been several concepts that have been used to support the Arizona SSIP. For example, discussions concerning methods of stakeholder engagement concerning implementation fidelity have been used during the EBP Walkthrough Process PD to support PEA SSIP Teams and data reliability.

SEA SSIP Team Members:

Stakeholder feedback during intra-agency collaboration often involves the consideration of PEA capacity, regularity and form of communication, and improvements involving PEA community needs and concerns. For example, feedback during a Spring PSM Meeting in SY 2022–2023 led to the new documentation and training of procedures concerning activity submission and TA by the SEA SSIP Team to begin SY 2023–2024. This not only provides procedural consistency but also provides for the engagement of stakeholders when making stakeholder feedback actionable and useful.

SEA/ESS Directors and Leadership:

In SY 2023–2024, collaboration with leadership was primarily focused on slippage. SEA/ESS Leadership was supportive toward exploring slippage factors such as student populations being affected by COVID-19 school shutdowns and online/hybrid instruction, cohorts with disproportionately rural locales, and group calculation as related to systemic improvement composition and timing.

Move On When Reading (MOWR):

In the second year of alignment with MOWR in SY 2022–2023, the SEA MOWR Team included the SEA SSIP Team on correspondence regarding MOWR literacy plans for SSIP PEAs. This communication has allowed for opportunities to provide additional support. For example, SEA SSIP Team members have incorporated initiatives documented in MOWR literacy plans into collaborative discussions with PEA SSIP Teams during EBP Walkthrough activity support meetings to highlight initiative and activity alignment.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

PEA SSIP Teams and the SSIP Survey:

There were three concerns noted on the SSIP Survey in SY 2023–2024.
The first concern was in response to a new question on initiative barriers. When PEA SSIP Teams initially document Action Plans, the Teams note potential barriers to implementation. To collect data with more regularity and actual barriers as opposed to potential barriers, the SEA SSIP Team provided a list of potential barriers commonly noted in SSIP Action Plans and then asked the PEA SSIP Teams to characterize the extent to which they became actual barriers to implementing initiatives. Responses showing a high degree of Overwhelmed Teachers and Staff Turnover will be used in collaboration with Recruitment and Retention. Responses showing the Cost or Unavailability of Resources or PD as a significant barrier will be used in collaboration with leadership and toward the current realignment of ESS systems of supports. The SEA SSIP Team will continue to monitor these concerns as they are addressed through collaborative efforts.
The second concern was in response to the availability of the SSIP Contract to support SSIP initiatives with funding. While the timeline to provide SSIP Contracts was delayed in SY 2023–2024, the issue was due to SEA capacity issues that were addressed with realignment and do not project to be an issue in SY 2024–2025. The SEA SSIP Team will monitor this concern by comparing the contract timeline of SY 2023–2024 to SY 2024–2025, and then comparing the feedback for SSIP Contract concerns. This analysis will help determine if the SEA SSIP Team needs to take further steps toward resolving the concern.
The third concern was in response to a question asking SEA SSIP Teams to describe ways in which the SEA SSIP Team can improve the SSIP going forward. The respondent requested guidance on how PEA SSIP Teams can use the Literacy Screening activity data in conjunction with collaboration and intervention. This concern aligns with the support resource planned from data analysis to support Literacy Screener data use, in conjunction with the support of SGR & AP activity outcomes and the EBPs in systems for Data-Based Decision-Making, Assessments, and Interventions. The SEA SSIP Team will continue to seek feedback from stakeholders pertaining SSIP concerns and improvements.

PEA SSIP Teams and EBP Walkthrough Support:

A concern noted by a PEA SSIP Team during EBP Walkthrough activity support was to incorporate different grade levels of examples and non-examples

on a support resource for the EBP Walkthrough Process during PD delivery. This concern was addressed immediately during subsequent PD, and the resource will undergo these revisions for Year 2 PEA SSIP Teams to use for submission 1 in SY 2024–2025.

SEAP and the SSIP SiMR Calculation:

After presenting activity and student outcomes, the SEA SSIP Team reviewed the SiMR and factors associated with slippage. Stakeholders engaged in a discussion that included literacy development, the timing and grade levels involved in EBP Walkthroughs, and the average time for reporting systemic improvement on the SGR & AP. SEAP stakeholders then provided feedback pertaining to the SSIP SiMR calculation. While maintaining the SSIP SiMR for AASA proficiency in Grade 3, options that were discussed for SiMR calculations that included maintaining the current SiMR calculation, for including only cohorts in SSIP Years 2–3 in the calculation, and for including cohorts in SSIP Years 2-3 along with the cohort that is one year beyond SSIP participation. Data reliability was discussed in conjunction with these options. While further feedback and analysis will be taken into consideration before the possibility of changing the SSIP SiMR calculation, SEAP stakeholders provided the feedback to include cohorts in SSIP Years 2–3, along with the cohort that is one year beyond SSIP participation, in the SiMR calculation.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

On the first submission each year, every Arizona PEA submits Literacy Plans to Move On When Reading (MOWR). Literacy Plans include indications for core curriculum, duration and frequency of literacy instruction, assessment tools, and MTSS structures.
To make this information available for analysis supporting and aligning systems, the SEA SSIP Team will create a MOWR-SSIP Systems dashboard. The dashboard will incorporate the information from both MOWR Literacy Plans and the SGR & AP will show an expanded view of PEA systems. This display will be used in collaboration with stakeholders such as ESS-PLS and MOWR to align supports for PEA systems.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The dashboard will be created by May of 2024 and will be shared with PSM Leadership by June of 2024. Stakeholder feedback will be collected, and based on the feedback, the dashboard will be revised before presenting to PLS and MOWR for collaboration and system alignment. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that the display will be a component of the decisions for supporting PEAs with TA/PD resources. This would directly support PEA SSIP Team initiatives and learning communities. It may also lead to a greater collection of systems data from non-SSIP Literacy Plans and PSM Drilldowns to expand the awareness of systems for a more reliable representation of learning community systems in Arizona and a more calibrated system of aligning PEA needs with supports.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Anticipated barriers include the available time capacity constraints and the development of systemic alignment at the SEA.
To address the barrier of capacity, the SEA SSIP Team will work with ESS leadership to prioritize the different initiatives and to address them accordingly. If capacity does not allow for the dashboard to be completed and used for collaboration by the anticipated timeline, then the timeline will have to be adjusted. Likewise, as ESS and MOWR continue to work through capacity issues and the development of systems realignment, if the dashboard is created before stakeholders in the realignment are ready to consider the dashboard toward systemic support, then the dashboard will be maintained until the system alignment and capacity allow for the dashboard to be used toward TA/PD support.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The SEA SSIP Team went back to the SY 2020–2021 SSIP Survey to examine how SSIP PEAs reported COVID-19 as a barrier to SSIP Action Plan initiatives. The Team found that, when asked generally about implementation barriers, about 7 of every 10 responses referred to COVID-19 variables, including prolonged shutdowns during the year, online/hybrid instruction, poor teacher and student attendance and engagement, and the inability to provide appropriate interventions and pursue initiatives. This data will be used in further consideration of SSIP calculations.
For additional context for the SiMR and systemic analysis in SSIP PEAs, the SEA SSIP Team analyzed the proficiency gaps between SpEd and non-SpEd groups at both the SSIP PEA and Arizona-PEA levels according to the SiMR calculation. After disaggregating the group of non-SSIP PEAs in Arizona, the SEA SSIP Team found that the non-SpEd student group reported a proficiency increase of 1.4% between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. In comparison, the SpEd group reported a proficiency increase of 0.8% during this time. While both groups increased, the gap between students with disabilities and their same-aged peers in Arizona non-SSIP PEAs also increased. In further analyzing the group of SSIP PEAs, the SEA SSIP Team found that the non-SpEd student group reported a proficiency decrease of -6.8% between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. In comparison to the proficiency decrease of -3.76% by the SSIP SpEd group, while both groups decreased, the gap between student with disabilities and their same-aged peers in SSIP PEAs also decreased. The comparative proficiency decrease of the non-SpEd student group in SSIP PEAs may indicate that factors such as COVID-19 and accompanying variables may have had a dynamic effect on all students in SSIP PEAs during the reporting period.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Action