

State of Oklahoma

Part B SSIP Narrative: Phase III Year Two

April 2, 2018

Oklahoma State Department of Education, Special Education Services



Table of Contents

Introduction 2

 SIMR: State-identified measurable result 2

 Theory of action summary 2

 Expected changes 4

Section One: Summary of Year Two of Phase III 5

 Year two accomplishments 5

 Stakeholder involvement 6

 Evaluation summary 6

Section Two: Strategy Descriptions 7

 Strategy 1: Develop data tracking mechanism for children exiting SoonerStart and entering an LEA 7

 Strategy 2: Implement differentiated monitoring system to incorporate performance measures 11

 Strategy 3: Improve parents’ knowledge of accommodations & AT 15

 Strategy 4: Improve educators’ knowledge of accommodations & AT for instruction & assessment 19

 Strategy 5: Increase access to early literacy resources for families 23

 Strategy 6: Improve educators’ early literacy knowledge and practice 26

Appendix A: Updated Oklahoma SSIP-B Theory of Action 29

Introduction

Starting in FFY 2013, the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) required all state education agencies to develop a state systemic improvement plan (SSIP) as part of OSEP's updated state performance plan and annual performance report (SPP/APR) process. Each state had to analyze infrastructure and performance weaknesses in Phase I (FFY 2013), create the improvement plan in Phase II (FFY 2014), and implement the plan in Phase III (through FFY 2018). States were to define their plans with a desired outcome in mind.

SIMR: State-identified measureable result

In Phases I and II, Oklahoma Part B SSIP stakeholders decided to target third grade reading assessment scores as its State-identified Measureable Result (SIMR) to improve student literacy across the state. In response to OSEP recommendations, Phase II stakeholder discussions produced a refined SIMR that targeted Tulsa County public school districts that has since been modified to reflect new proficiency expectations:

By FFY 2018, Oklahoma will see improved early literacy performance in specific districts in Tulsa County among students with disabilities taking the 3rd grade annual reading assessment. The passing rate (proficiency or above) in Tulsa County will increase from 14.9 percent in FFY 2014 to at least 15.5 percent in FFY 2018. Participating districts will also realize statistically significant improvement in the rate of growth toward proficiency among these students.¹

To achieve this SIMR, Oklahoma adopted six improvement strategies to implement in Phase III. The first two strategies listed focus on state-wide infrastructure improvements. The next four are interventions in Tulsa County districts that target challenges discovered during the Phase I analysis.² The six strategies are:

System-focused, State-wide Infrastructure

1. Develop data tracking mechanism for children exiting SoonerStart and entering an LEA;
2. Implement new differentiated monitoring system that incorporates performance measures, such as reading assessment performance;

Site-specific Support (Evidence-based Practices)

3. Improve parents' engagement in students' use of accommodations & AT for instruction and assessment;
4. Improve educators' knowledge of accommodations & AT for instruction and assessment;
5. Provide access to early literacy resources for families with 3-5 year olds at intervention sites; and
6. Provide targeted professional development to LEA personnel in evidence-based practices in early literacy.

Theory of action summary

As stated in the Phase II document, each selected improvement strategy is intended to increase the capacity of state and local personnel *and* parents to provide high quality literacy instruction at school and at home, timely services and individualized supports to students with disabilities.

¹ Please refer to the beginning of Section One for a description and justification of the changes to the SIMR targets.

² The Phase II report describes in more detail why Tulsa County districts were selected. There are fourteen districts in the county.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

As described by the SSIP Part B Theory of Action (Appendix A), increasing core capacity may make personnel more likely to positively influence student outcomes, including third grade reading assessment scores. To reflect improvements made in implementation and evaluation, the Theory of Action was updated slightly in year two. The six strategies address core areas of improvement for the state identified in Phase I of the SSIP: effective data sharing, meaningful district accountability, topical targeted assistance, and practical training. If the strategies are implemented with fidelity, we contend that specific intermediate outcomes will be realized, leading to improvements in the SIMR. Table 1 lists each strategy and the rationale for its SIMR impact.

Table 1: The SIMR Improvement Strategies		
Core Areas	Improvement Strategies	Rationale for Impact on SIMR
<i>Effective data sharing</i>	Strategy 1 Develop data tracking mechanism for children exiting SoonerStart and entering an LEA	LEAs will be ready for students transitioning to their districts within their data system. Delays in document sharing will be eliminated. This means LEAs will be able to provide timely interventions for children at risk for reading failure as soon as they enter the school system. This will prevent students from falling behind in reading and enable them to maintain grade level reading benchmarks as measured by the 3 rd grade assessment.
<i>Meaningful district accountability</i>	Strategy 2 Implement new differentiated monitoring system to incorporate performance measures	Including academic performance measures in a differentiated monitoring system will focus LEAs on academic achievement as well as compliance with IDEA. LEAs will receive TA to improve the academic performance of students with disabilities as well as to maintain high levels of compliance.
<i>Topical targeted assistance</i>	Strategy 3 Improve parents' engagement in students' use of accommodations & AT for instruction and assessment Strategy 4 Improve educators' knowledge of accommodations & AT for instruction and assessment	Accommodations are provided to minimize the effects of a disability so that a student can have access to content and demonstrate that knowledge on assessments. AT devices provide additional support for a student within the construct (skills), context (environment, materials), and activities of instruction and assessment. If parents and teachers are well informed about accommodations and AT, students will receive the supports they need to access content and demonstrate their learning on assessments.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

<i>Practical training</i>	<p>Strategy 5 Provide access to early literacy resources for families with 3-5 year olds in the target area</p> <p>Strategy 6 Provide targeted professional development to LEA personnel in evidence-based practices in early literacy.</p>	<p>When parents engage in daily literacy activities such as reading aloud with their children, their children show significantly improved cognitive growth, enabling them to enter school ready to learn and preparing them for substantial literacy gains as they move from grade to grade. Teachers who are knowledgeable in evidence-based reading practices in early grades provide a solid foundation for student achievement in reading. This foundation will help students transition from learning to read to reading to learn as they advance through the grades.</p>
---------------------------	---	--

Expected changes

When all improvement strategies are fully implemented, Oklahoma expects to see the following changes in its infrastructure and programs:

1. All children transitioning from Part C to public school districts will maintain their state identification number, facilitating a smooth transition from Part C to Part B, promoting greater continuity of services and supports, and permitting long-term assessment of the benefits of participation in early intervention on school outcomes;
2. School performance will be incorporated into annual district determinations, enabling the state to provide greater oversight and support to struggling districts and highlight those that exceed expectations;
3. Parents and other caregivers will advocate for their students' access to and use of assistive technology and accommodations in the classroom and on assessments, as appropriate, to enhance students' engagement, learning and performance in school;
4. Teachers and service providers will understand and apply core knowledge related to assistive technology and accommodations in the classroom and on assessments;
5. All students with disabilities who may benefit from any form of assistive technology will be identified early and will receive appropriate aid through the support of their teachers and related service providers;
6. All students with disabilities who need accommodations in the classroom and on assessments will be identified early and will receive the support they need to be successful;
7. All families with preschool-age children in the targeted region will receive meaningful early literacy information that highlight local resources and supports, leading to increased caregiver engagement in evidence-based practices that promote early literacy; and
8. All educators will be well-trained in early literacy evidence-based practices and will receive individualized coaching support so that they can improve their students' literacy in the classroom.

In summary, all of these activities and strategic changes through the lifecycle of the SSIP will lead to substantial improvements that will encourage better literacy outcomes for all special education students on the third grade reading assessment.

Section One: Summary of Year Two of Phase III

SIMR targets are changing again for FFY 2016 through 2018. In FFY 2015, the SSIP SIMR targets were reset to take into account 2014 assessment changes that have affected students with disabilities across the state. The original target was above 50 percent; the new targets were set to between 24 and 30 percent, and specifically 26 percent for FFY 2016 (Table 2). The actual assessment proficiency rate across all Tulsa County districts was close to target in FFY 2015, but it declined by almost eight percentage points in FFY 2016. This decline was also realized statewide in FFY 2016, resulting from a substantial modification of the state standard reading assessments for all grades.

These changes were discussed in the FFY 2016 APR for Indicator 3C, and are shared in Appendix C, attached as a separate document. The changes led to adjustments in the Indicator 3C baselines and targets to match the state results for FFY 2016 for both reading and math performance. The targets have been adjusted through FFY 2018. These changes are also reflected in a new set of targets for the SSIP SIMR. No new assessment changes are expected in the next five years, making it very unlikely that the SIMR targets will be adjusted again before the end of the SSIP.

The new SIMR targets are aligned with the state targets for Indicator 3C-Reading. They have been set slightly higher and with greater annual increases because the Tulsa County third grade reading proficiency rate is higher than the state proficiency rate. Oklahoma recognizes that frequent modifications of the SIMR target do not support long-term improvement, however, the adoption of a much more rigorous state standard assessment has led to changes in long-term proficiency expectations that must be reflected in the targets.

Table 2: Third Grade Reading Proficiency State SIMR Targets & Data for FFY 2013-2018

	FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
FFY 2015 Targets		54.00%	24.0%	26.0%	28.0%	30.0%
New FFY 2016 Targets				14.88%	15.15%	15.50%
Actual Rate	37.76%	22.76%	22.79%	14.88%		

Year two accomplishments

The Oklahoma SSIP team has made progress on the implementation of each improvement strategy in year two. The SSIP team is confident that the state is on target for meeting its strategic implementation goals. The following list highlights strategic achievements in year two.

- Strategy 1: The mechanism for assigning unique identification numbers to Part C eligible children has been implemented and is working consistently. Students are maintaining their numbers when they transition to Part B. Personnel are fully integrated into the assignment process.
- Strategy 2: A new differentiated monitoring system was completed and implemented in year two, incorporating results-based accountability measures for districts, including one measuring reading assessment achievement.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

- Strategy 3: A community-based, district-led reading event was held in September 2017 in Tulsa to reach parents and other caregivers across the county. The training topics focused on SSIP content: assistive technology, accommodations, advocacy and early literacy.
- Strategy 4: Accommodations training for general and special educators was scaled-up, reaching 38 districts throughout the entire southeast region of Oklahoma. Assistive technology training continued in Tulsa County, reaching the SSIP target number of teachers and service providers.
- Strategy 5: This strategy was implemented along with strategy 3 in September 2017 through the Tulsa reading event. In order to reach as many families as possible, all SSIP topics were presented in one setting.
- Strategy 6: LETRS training is being provided to a new district in spring 2018, after the original partner district discontinued its partnership at the beginning of year two. This is the only strategy facing substantial delays in its implementation. Moving forward, the implementation of this strategy will be done in collaboration with OK SPDG III.

Stakeholder involvement

Oklahoma's IDEA Part B Advisory Panel has served as the formal stakeholder group to which the leadership team reports in-person on a quarterly basis. The Panel advised the Phase I analysis and the Phase II design of the SSIP. The Panel consists of 50 representatives of various groups who have deep interest in the outcomes produced by the SSIP, including families, students, disability advocacy organizations, professional organizations, service providers, higher education, and districts. It includes representatives from the Tulsa area. Panel stakeholders overwhelmingly have preferred to offer primarily broad oversight for the ongoing implementation of the SSIP, delegating decision-making authority to a designated leadership team. This team consists of state and local Part B personnel, and members of the Oklahoma Parents Center and ABLE Tech, and personnel of the 2017 Oklahoma State Personnel Development Grant (OK SPDG III).

The implementation for each strategy has been significantly informed by stakeholders specific to the targeted intervention. The leadership team has worked diligently to identify important stakeholders for each strategy, seek out their perspectives, and direct implementation based in part on their recommendations. For most strategies, the key stakeholders are themselves participants in the activities, such as parents and personnel. Other stakeholders include organizational partners such as ABLE Tech and the Oklahoma Parents Center. More details about strategic stakeholders are described in the synopses in the next section.

All stakeholders are regularly informed of implementation updates and evaluation findings, including survey results. This report will be made available to stakeholders on the Part C state website, in the data section.

Evaluation summary

The SSIP evaluation team, which consists of OSDE-SES data analysts and evaluators, program specialists, and program directors, worked in year two to enhance the strategy evaluation plans to ensure that objectives and outcomes reflected changes made to strategic implementation during year one. Several logic models have been updated with the changes, as have the performances measures for the objectives and outcomes. Changes to evaluation plans are described in Section Two separately for each strategy. All logic models are included in Appendix B, attached as a separate document.

Section Two: Strategy Descriptions

This section of the phase III/year two Part B SSIP report presents the progress for each implementation strategy, including a summary of progress in year two of Phase III implementation, stakeholder engagement, evaluation details, and plans for year three.

Implementation and evaluation timeframes

All strategy timeframes are generally aligned with the Oklahoma fiscal year, running from July to the following June. Planning for design and implementation of all improvement strategies began at the end of Phase II in April 2016. Implementation began for most strategies in fall 2016, the first year of Phase III (July 2016 to June 2017). Year two falls between July 2017 and June 2018. However, each strategy has a different start date and its baseline evaluation data were collected at different points in year one. This has caused the evaluation timeframe to vary across strategies, especially when we need to collect data annually (twelve months apart). Each strategy's evaluation timeframe is listed with the performance target data for that strategy.

● Strategy 1: Develop data tracking mechanism for children exiting SoonerStart and entering an LEA

This infrastructure improvement is intended to ensure that the records of children who transition from Oklahoma's early intervention program, called SoonerStart, to an LEA are transferred on a timely basis with a unique state identifier (called a student testing number, or STN). This enables LEAs to process special education evaluations for this population quickly and efficiently. The process for assigning an STN to a SoonerStart eligible child is described in detail in the Phase III year one report.

The implementation of this strategy affects the SIMR by increasing the likelihood that LEAs will be ready for students transitioning to their districts from SoonerStart. A given LEA will have ready access to a child's service and intervention history as well as pertinent evaluation data, all within their own data system. Delays in document sharing from SoonerStart to the LEA will be reduced or eliminated. LEAs will know the services and interventions a child received from SoonerStart and will be able to provide appropriate interventions for children at risk for reading failure as soon as they enter school. This will prevent students from falling behind in reading and enable them to maintain grade level reading benchmarks as measured by the 3rd grade assessment.

Summary of progress: Year two

In year two, the implementation of this strategy has continued with fair success, and initial numbers were promising. By the start of the new fiscal year (five months after the mechanism was implemented), 88.9 percent of all children eligible for services through the SoonerStart program had been assigned a unique STN. Some portion of the remainder required review by SoonerStart personnel because a child's demographic data had been deemed too similar to another's by the system algorithm. When this happens, personnel must manually review the possible matches on a state IT website. SoonerStart regional coordinators were trained in this process in September 2017. Ninety percent of the 200 child records needing resolution were resolved within two weeks.

One complication in arose in winter 2017 because the data tracking mechanism involves several components that must be completed manually by three different vendors. This creates unique challenges for management and oversight. OSDE-SES experienced a substantial delay in processing STNs between September 2017 and February 2018 because of the lack of communication among vendors. This caused more than 1700 children to be delayed in receiving an STN. These were all resolved as of March 1, 2018.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

During spring and summer 2017 (overlapping implementation years one and two), OSDE-SES and SoonerStart specialists developed and issued guidance to both SoonerStart and LEA personnel about the proper procedures to transfer a child's record to an LEA. All guidance documents have been shared widely and are available in easily accessible online locations. SoonerStart personnel were trained on those procedures in April 2017. LEA personnel across the state were trained in-person at a variety of venues and via webinar between April and July 2017. A recorded webinar is also available for new LEA personnel to view at any time.

The initial guidance given to Part C and Part B personnel was modified after receiving feedback from users. Most comments and recommendations came informally through communication among SoonerStart field staff, district teachers and service providers, and state personnel in Parts B and C. For example, language was clarified in the document about the roles and responsibilities of special education directors, who are the only data system users who can activate a student record.

Because the Part C and Part B data systems are now linked, all records can be transferred electronically. This has shortened substantially the time required to share records with districts, if procedures are properly followed. The sharing process requires that the SoonerStart lead transfer the record and notify the district that it will soon be available. District personnel must then reactivate the record and assign it to the teacher of record. Without fidelity to the process, substantial delays can occur, largely on the part of LEAs. Personnel from both programs must adhere to procedures for the transfer process to be a success. By September 2017, LEAs were becoming familiar with the new electronic records available to them in the online IEP system, and we observed that more records were activated timely (that is, prior to the TPC meeting).

SEA personnel have developed monitoring methodologies for fidelity of implementation and correction procedures using reports in the data system on both the Part C and Part B sides. These reports have proven to be valuable tools for identifying errors in practice and problematic data such as missing unique identifiers and untimely record transfers or activation. These reports have enabled SEA personnel to monitor implementation and procedural fidelity and correct both when necessary.

Evaluation

The evaluation plan for strategy one has been modified to reflect more nuanced goals that developed during the implementation process. Although this strategy's activities were designed to focus on the development and implementation of the STN assignment mechanism, the desired long-term outcome has always been that LEA personnel are able to easily access an electronic version of SoonerStart records as they evaluate a child for eligibility for special education services and develop an IEP, if needed. The evaluation team has revised the logic model to reflect this desired outcome and all associated intermediate objectives and goals. The team has also updated the performance indicators to reflect these changes. As a result, although this strategy focuses on the STN assignment process, a secondary process is being incorporated into the evaluation: SoonerStart record electronic transfers to LEAs. The quality of this process is assessed as part of objective three.

Additionally, the evaluation team added a new objective (number two) to reflect the recurring need to resolve child record conflicts in the statewide data system. Occasionally, a SoonerStart child will have demographics similar to other students in the system, forcing local personnel to compare all possible matches and determine uniqueness prior to the assignment of an STN. The review process must be done outside of the SoonerStart database, adding an unexpected layer of procedure to the workload. SoonerStart personnel were trained on this process in September 2017, and are now required to review possible record matches on at least a biweekly basis. State personnel are able to review timeliness via a statewide system management tool. Without this review on the Part C side, children can move to an LEA without an assigned STN. This process affects target achievement for objectives one and two.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

Table 3 lists each objective and outcome and the program’s status in the first evaluation year on the related performance measures. As shown in the updated logic model (Appendix B), the strategic objectives and medium-term outcomes are:

- Objective 1: Nearly every child will automatically be assigned an STN when determined eligible for SoonerStart services, starting March 2017
- Objective 2: When an STN cannot be automatically assigned, personnel review potential conflicts on a timely basis, starting September 2017
- Objective 3: LEA personnel activate transferred records on a timely basis, starting March 2017
- Outcome 1: LEAs will maintain the STN provided to children who leave SoonerStart and enroll in the LEA
- Outcome 2: The data mechanism process meets requirements for sustainability

Table 3: Strategy 1 Performance

	Performance Measures	Targets	Findings: Target Achievement
Objective 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percent of SoonerStart children assigned an STN at eligibility (automatically) 2. Percent of SoonerStart children transitioned with STN 	90% in year one*; 95% in year two	Approaching targets: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 88.9% assigned an STN 2. 85.0% transitioned with an STN³
Objective 2	Percent of potential record conflicts reviewed within two weeks	95% in year one; 100% in year two	Approaching target: 92.5% reviewed timely ⁴
Objective 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percent SoonerStart records transferred electronically 2. If transferred, percent records transferred timely (prior to TPC) 3. Percent records transferred timely that are activated timely (prior to TPC) 	90% in year one; 95% in year two	Target met: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 90.0% transferred electronically Targets not met: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. 79.0% of records were transferred timely 3. 77.7% activated timely⁵
Outcome 1	Of children transitioned with an STN, percent not assigned a new STN	95% in year one; 100% in year two	Target met: 97.3% not assigned a new STN

³ Data source: Child records in SoonerStart database. Findings are based on a random sample of records of children who have transition target dates between April 1, 2017 and March 31, 2018. Children whose parents did not give consent to share records were not included in the sampling frame, nor were children who left SoonerStart prior to beginning the transition process. The sampling frame included 1195 children. A random sample of 300 records was drawn from this population pool. This size of sample produces a margin of error of 5 percent and a confidence level of 95% for this size population.

⁴ Data source: Statewide “STN Wizard” tool for reconciling student records

⁵ Data source: Student records in Part B database; also for Outcome 1.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

<p>Outcome 2</p>	<p>The data system mechanism meets the following requirements for sustainability:⁶</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. leadership supports and advocates for the mechanism to stakeholders; 2. funding is secured for at least five years to maintain and improve the mechanism; 3. adequate processes are in place to identify and remedy system lapses; 4. documentation exists to transfer knowledge about the mechanism and all processes to new personnel. 	<p>Year one: elements 1, 2 and 3 are fully implemented</p> <p>Years two and three: Continued, with development of element 4</p> <p>Year four: Continued, with element 4 fully implemented</p>	<p>Targets met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. leaders advocate strongly for the system and are involved in all decision-making 2. funding is secured⁷ <p>Approaching targets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. processes are in development 4. documentation is in development⁸
-------------------------	--	---	--

*Year one includes 4/1/2017 to 3/30/2018; year two includes 4/1/2018 to 3/30/2019.

The measures selected for objective 3 reflect the complexity of the process for moving a SoonerStart record to a district. First, the parents must consent to the transfer. Then, the SoonerStart resource coordinator makes a request to the vendor to transfer the record, while notifying the district that the transfer is being made. Once the vendor transfers the record, the district is responsible for activating the record and assigning personnel for review. Measures 2 and 3 for objective 3 assess the timeliness of SoonerStart transfers and Lea record activation: both should be completed prior to the TPC to ensure that district personnel have time to review the child’s records.

Outcome 1 reflects the long-term purpose of the mechanism, which is to ensure that a child maintains its STN throughout its educational experience. Occasionally, when a transferred record is not properly activated by the LEA, its personnel may not realize that the record is ready for it to review. They may create a new record in their own system, which could lead to the creation of a second STN for the child. The goal for outcome 1 is that no children are assigned a second STN (this also creates substantial problems in the multiple student record databases that exist in Oklahoma). Fortunately, student records show that fewer than three percent of children transitioning from SoonerStart were assigned a second STN. All of these have been resolved, and the goal is to ensure that no children receive two STNs moving forward.

Activities in year three

The activities in year three will focus on improving the sustainability of the strategy (outcome 2). In particular, the leadership team will develop and implement adequate processes to identify lapses in procedures and practices that prevent STNs from being assigned in a timely manner when a child is eligible for SoonerStart services. Additionally, these processes will be fully documented as will all policies, practices and procedures involved in the oversight and implementation of the mechanism. Because its success relies heavily on the manual completion of several steps, proper documentation will support sustainability.

⁶ Recommended characteristics derived from the DaSy-ECTA Quality System Framework.

⁷ Data source: Project documentation

⁸ Data source: Project documentation

Additionally, efforts will be continue to be made to reinforce proper procedures and practice through frequent training opportunities for current and new district and Part C personnel. A comprehensive tip sheet is also available for all personnel on the EdPlan website.

● Strategy 2: Implement differentiated monitoring system to incorporate performance measures

This infrastructure improvement is intended to ensure that districts are held accountable for both compliance and performance indicators in the annual differentiated monitoring process. Oklahoma expects that with greater accountability for performance outcomes, districts will improve practice, leading to better student outcomes in academic performance. This improvement is critical to advancing the SIMR because districts are held accountable for students' assessment performance in comparison to the state target in the updated determination. This will provide an additional incentive to improve educational practices that advance student performance.

Summary of progress: Year two

Year two of Phase III has been extremely productive for this strategy. In the Phase III year one report, Oklahoma indicated that it would devise a monitoring method that incorporates performance improvement. The plan was to implement this method as a pilot. These activities have essentially been completed, although implementation occurred statewide instead of being piloted. State leadership preferred statewide application because of limited capacity to fairly manage two separate determination processes at the same time. Districts also preferred statewide implementation to avoid the perception that some districts were being evaluated differently than others.

During the planning process at the beginning of year two, the proposed model was refined substantially to limit the risk and determination factors to those a) for which data are easily available, and which b) are linked to the APR indicators or c) represent meaningful fiscal risk. The entire new model is shared in the attachment of the General Supervision System (GSS) documentation for monitoring and results-based accountability.

In the year one report, Oklahoma described its plans to create and implement a performance risk tool to provide districts a quantitative measure of the quality of their local performance supports. The state has postponed the creation of a quantitative tool. Instead, it has adopted more comprehensive self-assessment tools for each performance area that can be used to inform fundamental improvement. The self-assessment tools have been used by districts in the past and are evidence-based. The state chose to build on the strengths it already had rather than creating a new, untested tool.

The new system consists of a tiered intervention model that balances fiscal risk, indicator compliance and district performance in its determination of support that the state will provide a district. These three components are weighted differently but all play a role in defining the state's expectations for high quality districts. The key features are:

- fiscal risk assessment
- compliance appraisal
- performance appraisal
- level of support/differentiated monitoring result (DMR)
- district interventions based on DMR

OSDE -SES identifies a differentiated monitoring result (DMR) for each LEA in Oklahoma based on an assessment of risk and the district's determination rating. The assessment of risk includes factors such as maintenance of effort, size of award, change of LEA special education director, and recent audit findings.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

An LEA's determination rating consists of compliance and performance indicators from the APR. All compliance indicators are included in the determination; the performance measures included are the rates of 1) state reading and math assessment proficiency, b) graduation and dropout, and c) early childhood outcome improvement. Please review the GSS attachment for details on all elements and the associated support structure.

The full model was implemented statewide in the middle of November 2017. Districts were notified at the start of the school year that the determination process would be substantially different moving forward through official channels and regional district leadership meetings sponsored through the Oklahoma Directors of Special Services organization. All districts were assessed for fiscal risk, compliance and performance. Based on a weighted calculation that took all factors into account, each district was assigned one of four levels of support, equating to a differentiated monitoring result (DMR). Depending on the DMR, a district is required to participate in a set of activities that must be completed by the end of the current fiscal year (June 30, 2018). Refer to the attachment for the description of each level of support and the associated required activities.

Districts were notified of all components via official email by November 15. The notification contained the district data profile, risk analysis, compliance and performance determination, and a notice of the district's differentiated monitoring support level. Of the approximately 550 districts, more than 250 were assigned level two support and 21 were assigned level three support. None were assigned level four. The state is currently supporting districts through the differentiated monitoring process by providing technical assistance and monitoring compliance.

Stakeholder Involvement

The initial set of stakeholders involved in drafting the DMR process was limited to fiscal, compliance and program specialists in OSDE. The state's goal was to ensure that performance indicators were included in the DMS in an effort to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Once the model was formalized, districts were consulted on several occasions, and they provided valuable feedback for defining various components such as the weighting of various fiscal factors. Districts were naturally reluctant to revise a system that historically focused almost exclusively on compliance measures, which most had mastered. Expecting greater fiscal and performance accountability increases district uncertainty. However, the new levels of support are favorable to districts, in that they can expect more technical assistance in these areas than they have previously received.

Evaluation

As reflected on the logic model, the objectives, medium-term outcomes and the long-term outcome have been updated to reflect the long-term functionality and sustainability of the updated differentiated monitoring process:

Objective 1: The initial differentiated monitoring model is launched by November 2017

Objective 2: The differentiated monitoring system design is high quality

Outcome 1: The differentiated monitoring system implementation is high quality

Outcome 2: The differentiated monitoring system is sustainable

Long-term outcome: Oklahoma has institutionalized a sustainable, high quality differentiated monitoring system to support student academic performance and other desirable outcomes.

Table 4 summarizes the performance measures, annual targets and target achievement for each of the objectives and outcomes. The state has worked diligently to update its goals and performance measures that directly assess the long-term quality of the overall system. Because implementation did

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

not begin until year two, targets are not listed for year one in the summary below. Similarly, outcome 2 is not being evaluated in year two. System design quality is highlighted as an objective because the long-term goal is high quality fidelity to that design.

Table 4: Strategy 2 Performance

	Performance Measures	Targets	Findings: Target Achievement
Objective 1	The initial DM ⁹ model is launched by November 2017	Deadline is met	Deadline achieved
Objective 2	To demonstrate high quality, the DM system design is characterized by... ¹⁰ 1. high data quality 2. plans for: a. timely communication b. comprehensive LEA improvement c. district-led change 3. incentives for exemplary work 4. full documentation 5. active feedback loops to support continuous improvement 6. training plan for SEA personnel	Year two: partial to full implementation of all elements Years three/four: full implementation of all elements	Targets met in year two: 1. data are pulled from valid, reliable, complete sources; ¹¹ 2. plans are partially completed for: a. LEA communication, b. comprehensive improvement, and c. district-led change; 3. incentives for exemplary work are developed in part, with new ones being added for fall 2018; 4. the GSS manual is completed while other documentation is being written; 5. the SEA has mechanisms in place to acknowledge and respond to feedback; and 6. the training plan for SEA personnel is partially completed. ¹²
Outcome 1	The system implementation is high quality, characterized by... 1. efficient, timely, effective, clear and responsive implementation 2. accurate data reporting 3. timely, consistent communication 4. incentives for exemplary work	Year two: elements 1 to 3 fully implemented; elements 4 to 9 partially implemented Year three: growth and improvement in	Targets met in year two: 1. implementation met goals; 2. data quality was very high and concerns were addressed immediately; 3. communication was timely in most cases; 4. incentives were provided; 5. staff received partial training;

⁹ DM: differentiated monitoring

¹⁰ Recommended characteristics of a high quality GSS are derived from the “Ten Desired Elements of a General Supervision System for Improving Results,” developed collaboratively by state and TA members of the Results-based Accountability Cross State Learning Collaborative between 2013 and 2017.

¹¹ Data sources: Oklahoma State Aid and State Finance offices, EdPlan, and monitoring documentation

¹² Data sources: program documentation. Also for outcomes 1 and 2.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. trained, capable SEA staff 6. full documentation 7. active feedback loops 8. data-informed improvement 9. district-led improvement 	<p>elements 1 to 3; elements 4 to 7 fully implemented; elements 8 to 9 partially implemented</p> <p>Year four: full implementation of all elements</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. documentation is partial; 7. feedback loops are in place but in development; 8. improvement is partially data-informed; and 9. improvement is partially district-led.
Outcome 2	<p>The DM system meets the following requirements for sustainability and continuous improvement:¹³</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership supports and advocates for the system to stakeholders; 2. Adequate processes are in place to include stakeholder input to identify enhancements to the system; 3. Documentation exists to transfer knowledge about the system to new personnel; 4. A comprehensive internal PD system is functional; 5. Ongoing assessment is used for continuous system improvement; 6. This system functions within a unified agency monitoring system for school support and improvement; and 7. The process and supporting components (personnel, TA) are sufficiently funded. 	<p>Year three: elements 1 to 4 are near full implementation; elements 5 to 7 are partially implemented</p> <p>Year four: all elements near full implementation</p>	N/A

*Year one includes 7/1/2016 to 6/30/2017; year two includes 7/1/2017 to 6/30/2018.

Activities in year three

In year three, Oklahoma will engage in activities that refine the model and the overall system to become higher quality (objective 1 and outcome 1) and more sustainable (outcome 2). This will consist of improving communication with LEAs, augmenting the current documentation, and increasing both SEA and LEA training. Additionally, the support process will focus on increasing SEA and LEA capacity to plan and lead comprehensive improvement activities that are data-informed and involve stakeholders. To

¹³ Recommended characteristics derived from the DaSy-ECTA Quality System Framework and the “Ten Desired Elements” document referenced previously.

ensure system sustainability, the state will work to embed this process within the broader strategic interventions made by other units in OSDE. Other specific activities include:

1. Two factors will be added to the risk assessment to take into account the effects of turnover in district special education leadership.
2. Standardized communication tools will be adopted for sharing information with district leadership.
3. Additional incentives will be developed to reward districts for hard work and consistent improvement. Currently, districts are given bonus points in the determination for participating in certain kinds of training. In year three, Oklahoma hopes to highlight districts that have demonstrated success on one or more performance indicators.
4. The evaluation plan for the strategic goals will be shared and discussed with other states through the RBA cross-state learning collaborative to consider how other states may adopt it and how it could be improved.

● Strategy 3: Improve parents' knowledge of accommodations & AT

This improvement strategy was implemented to increase parent knowledge and advocacy pertaining to accommodations and assistive technology (AT) in the classroom and during assessments.

Accommodations are provided to minimize the effects of a disability so that a student can have equal access to content and demonstrate that knowledge on assessments. AT devices provide additional support for a student within the construct (skills), context (environment, materials), and activities of instruction and assessment. If parents are well informed about accommodations and AT—and advocate for them more often—students will receive the supports they need to access content and demonstrate their learning on all assessments, including the third grade reading assessment, thereby affecting the SIMR.

Summary of progress: Year two

This strategy took a different course than originally planned and described in the year one report. At that time, the leadership team was planning multiple meetings across Tulsa County with the support of local disability advocacy organizations and local districts. Instead, the leadership team agreed to pilot a community-district event in September 2017 to advance the strategic goals. In brief, certain Tulsa area stakeholders reached out to the Tulsa Public Schools (TPS) district to partner in a large event where parents could learn while their children played. These stakeholders believed that this would be a more successful avenue for parent engagement and were willing to support and facilitate the event. No other plans were made concurrently because of pressures on team capacity.

The mission was to reach the SSIP goals for strategies 3 and 5 by providing an interactive learning event for 200 parents of children with disabilities in Tulsa County districts while their children were engaged in fun activities. This idea blossomed into a large, well-supported “reading carnival” with local sponsors of all kinds, from clowns to pizza parlors.

The planning began in spring 2017, with TPS, OSDE-SES, the Oklahoma Parents Center and ABLE Tech on the planning committee, along with a few independent local stakeholders interested in supporting the event. Planning discussions continued until soon after the event, when stakeholders met to consider the strengths of the event and how it could be improved in the future. This discussion included some strategic planning for continued outreach to parents of young children on the topic of early literacy.

To support the goals for SSIP strategies 3 and 5, the agenda included four classes for parents (AT, accommodations, advocacy, and early literacy) and a large open-space activity carnival for children. Each parent class was 25 minutes long and was repeated throughout the morning so parents could start at

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

any point. A separate four-class series was repeated twice for Spanish-speakers. Participants were asked to complete a pre-survey at registration and a post-survey when they exited to measure perceptions and learning objectives.

TPS sponsored the marketing materials, with flyers given to teachers and parents, posters shared around town, Facebook and other social media notifications, and emails for advocacy groups and their members. All associated lead organizations also advertised the event through their own channels, and the Oklahoma Parents Center sponsored the registration and pre-survey. Several other districts were also invited to participate, and they shared invitations with their families in support. Volunteers came from TPS and local colleges. Sponsors provided a variety of prize incentives for participating, including gift bags, drawing prizes such as bikes and iPads, and free handouts in the classes and at sponsor tables. Overall, it was a well-organized community event and received a lot of local support.

The remainder of year two has been spent assessing the results of that project and determining how to modify the strategy again and move forward.

Evaluation

When the evaluation plan was modified for this strategy, all four objectives remained, while the outcomes measuring IEP change were removed. The evaluation team determined that the data were not available for assessing whether IEP changes were due to parent advocacy or case manager practice (strategy 4), a potential distinction endorsed in the Phase II SSIP evaluation design. Performance measures have also been modified in this evaluation plan. As shown on the updated logic model, the objectives and medium-term outcomes for this strategy are:

- Objective 1: All participating parents/caregivers receive written guidance on the benefits and use of accommodations and AT
- Objective 2: Parents are instructed on navigating the ABLE Tech website, including features highlighting the selection of AT by function and purpose
- Objective 3: Parents are aware of and knowledgeable about available options for AT and accommodations for both assessment and daily instruction
- Objective 4: Parents comprehend the variation across accommodations' function and selection, particularly for assessments (Note that the measurement of objective 4 is integrated into the accommodations measure for objective 3.)
- Outcome 1: More parents advocate for their students' needs for AT and/or accommodations

Table 5 summarizes the performance measures for all objectives and outcomes and the program's status relative to the performance targets. Detailed explanations of findings resulting from the Tulsa reading carnival are provided after the table.

Table 5: Strategy 3 Performance

	Performance Measures	Targets	Findings: Target Achievement
Objective 1	Participating caregivers are provided written materials to support training objectives and content	100% caregivers	Target met: 100% of training participants received written support materials ¹⁴

¹⁴ Data source: training documentation

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

Objective 2	Training includes demonstration and instruction on accessing AT content on the ABLE Tech website	100% observance	Target met: 100% of training sessions included website instructions & demonstration ¹⁵
Objectives 3 & 4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants demonstrate growth in AT knowledge 2. Participants demonstrate growth in accommodations knowledge 3. Participants demonstrate growth in comfort with advocating for child's needs 	Statistically significant ¹⁶ difference in knowledge and comfort levels	Targets not met: ¹⁷ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Difference in AT knowledge (pre to post) is not significant 2. Difference in accommodations knowledge (pre to post) is not significant Target met: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Difference in comfort with advocating is significant with a mean increase of 18%
Outcome 1	Participating families report increased advocacy efforts	50% respondents report advocacy activity	Target met: 70% respondents report new advocacy activity after the training ¹⁸

Event Evaluation Summary

Initially, 362 individuals from across Tulsa County were pre-registered for the event, representing families with and without students with disabilities. Five families registered at the event. Actual attendance was much smaller; approximately 50 adults participated in 3 or 4 sessions each. This included at least a few couples representing the same household. Seventy-three children participated. Overall, 43 households were present. We received 27 feedback surveys at the end of the event, 24 of which could be matched to registration surveys. Of these, 14 represented parents of children on IEPs and/or IFSPs. These 14 parents cited developmental delay as the most common disability among their children, with other health impairment and speech/language impairment as second and third most common.

Families represented five districts in Tulsa County. Participants represented diverse racial and ethnic groups, including the most common six in Oklahoma: African-American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, White, and “two or more” races. Both mothers and fathers attended. Children ranged in age from one to ten or older. A third of participants cited that English is not their native language. In the end, only 14 families with children in the target population (in special education between the ages of 3 and 3rd grade) participated. Per person, the estimated cost of the event (counting in-kind donations and volunteered time) was more than \$300 per person.

Caregivers who did attend the event and responded to the post-survey rated the quality of and their enjoyment of the event very highly. Half of respondents gave the event full points (16 out of 16) for quality in a series of questions, while only ten percent scored it as moderate quality (between 8 and 13 points). Twenty-one of the 24 respondents (IEP and non-IEP) said that they thoroughly enjoyed the event, rating it at or near the highest possible score in another series of questions.

To assess knowledge gained on AT, accommodations and advocacy for objectives 3 and 4, participants who have children on IEPs answered an identical series of questions prior to attendance and afterward. Index variables were created for each of the three topics to create comprehensive measures for pre and post comparison. Several tests of association were conducted to determine whether the

¹⁵ Data source: training documentation

¹⁶ As indicated by a p-value of less than 0.05 in tests of association.

¹⁷ Data sources: pre and post event surveys for parents of children with disabilities. N=14.

¹⁸ Data source: follow-up interviews with parents. N=10.

pool of respondents as a whole demonstrated significant learning on the three topics. The tests did not show a significant increase in knowledge due to the training for AT or accommodations. Mean responses were essentially the same. This could be an artifact of the small sample size or indicate that the training did not affect overall knowledge. In contrast, respondents cited significantly more comfort and capacity to advocate for their children after the event, indicating that the training was of benefit.

Finally, when asked whether they expected their behavior to change after of the event, a large majority marked that they would use more assistive technology at home (71 percent), while 50 percent said they would make more accommodations at home. Another substantial majority (64 percent) reported that they would be likely to advocate to improve their child(ren)'s IEP(s) related to AT and/or accommodations.

Five months after the event, the evaluation team conducted follow-up interviews of all respondents to determine whether behaviors had already changed. Ten of the 24 potential interviewees were willing to talk to the interviewer. Seven of the respondents were parents of children with disabilities. Every one of the ten interviewees stated that they had changed their behavior in one or more ways since the event. Eight of the ten are using assistive technology provided them at the event or have adapted items at home on their own. This number included parents whose children do not have disabilities. Three have advocated for additional AT to use at school. Moreover, all ten interviewees have made accommodations in their homes or have advocated for additional accommodations at school. This was true whether or not their children have disabilities. These findings suggest that even without measureable knowledge gains, the event assisted parents in ways that were meaningful for them and their children.

Activities in year three

Although the event was well received and the parent training sessions appear to have changed behavior, the costs in time, effort and financial resources compared to the low participation have encouraged the leadership team to develop other avenues for reaching parents on these topics in the Tulsa area. As a result, scale-up will not occur in year three for this strategy. Despite the challenges, the leadership team and stakeholders continue to support the vision of this strategy and want to maintain the goals.

OSDE-SES is partnering with the Oklahoma Parents Center (OPC) to refine and expand its existing parent IEP training seminars to include more material on assistive technology and accommodations, as desired by this strategy. The AT and accommodations topics are being embedded in a comprehensive IEP training series because the topics were thought to be too narrow to encourage a wide parent audience to attend.

The updated project, called SETS for "Special Education Training Series," will offer a series of topical seminars to parents through organizational partners/sponsors. Its mission is "to educate parents of children with disabilities within Tulsa County from age three through third grade about the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process and best practices for the use of Accommodations and Assistive Technology (AT) on their child's IEP." The evaluation plan will remain the same, focusing on the key objectives and outcomes of knowledge and behavioral change.

The initial goal is to provide trainings at three targeted disability organizations in late spring 2018, with two additional trainings in the summer. The OPC will develop a webpage, flyers, posters, presentations, and handouts to support the sponsors and the training itself. This expanded marketing effort has been developed in response to the stakeholders' views that the original offering of training in year one lacked materials that sponsors could use to encourage participation.

The OPC will contact directly potential partners in the coming weeks with an offer to provide training to associated parents. Besides the free training for member families, the OPC will offer other benefits to the partner organizations, also: handouts, door prizes, time-appropriate snacks and drinks (if allowed at host facility), promotional flyers/email template, five (5) \$10 gift cards for participant fuel stipends, and all the supplies to make a Record Keeping Folder for IEP documents. In return, the partner organization

will provide the location free of charge, participants, and promotional assistance. It will also support the registration process and the completion of evaluation surveys.

● Strategy 4: Improve educators' knowledge of accommodations & AT for instruction & assessment

This improvement strategy mirrors strategy three. The two were developed to take a two-pronged approach to improving student supports in the classroom and on assessments by increasing parents' and personnel's knowledge about assistive technology and accommodations. If teachers are well informed about accommodations and AT, students will receive the supports they need to access content and demonstrate their learning on assessments. This may be particularly true for younger test takers, who have had less experience with adapting their own behavior with regard to test-taking. This strategy has the potential to dramatically affect the SIMR if widely implemented, reaching all educators in special and general education.

Summary of progress: Year two

As in last year's narrative, the activities for the two strategic topics of assistive technology and accommodations are presented separately here as they were implemented separately. The AT training continued in the target SSIP area (Tulsa County) to reach the target number of participants, while the accommodations training was expanded to one other region in Oklahoma as part of the scale-up process. These decisions were made by the leadership team with significant input from various stakeholders, including OSDE-SES specialists, ABLE Tech personnel, and Oklahoma Parents Center representatives. These stakeholders have been instrumental in the year two implementation, ensuring that the strategic activities continued on pace.

Assistive Technology Component

In the first half of year two, ABLE Tech held additional in-person training sessions for Tulsa educators. These fall 2017 sessions were identical in format to those offered earlier in the spring, in which the in-person AT assessment and the online reading assessment components were offered together. ABLE Tech found that this format reduced recidivism.

The trainers reached out directly to educators that fall into the target SSIP parameters (Tulsa County teachers and service providers working in pre-kindergarten through 3rd grade classrooms) to encourage their participation. The additional outreach and marketing was successful: by the end of year two, at least 60 Tulsa-area educators and related service providers who teach 3rd grade or younger had been trained. The evaluation team set this initial goal to increase the likelihood that at least 200 students with IEPs would be directly affected by the training. This goal is important because it affects the evaluation of outcome 2, described in Table 6 below. More information about this evaluation is provided in the section on year three activities.

Accommodations Component

The leadership team has focused on scaling up the accommodations training to other regions beyond the Tulsa target area. This process has involved substantial analysis of participant feedback and project documentation to revise the content and format to meet attendees' needs and expectations as well as project goals. The result of this was to slim the content and format to a single half-day training. This allowed the state to provide accommodation training to more educators while reducing the costs of attendance to districts (in the form of substitutes, lost classroom time, etc.). Hands-on activities have been limited to target specific elements of content and increase discussion. The intent of these changes is also to reduce the number of non-returnees and offer content to more LEA personnel over time.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

The southeast region was selected for implementation in year two, covering approximately 15 counties. The training sessions were held at three locations in February 2018 for nearby districts. The trainers were two OSDE-SES program specialists highly experienced in the implementation of accommodations in the classroom and on assessments. 146 special and general educators attended across 38 districts. Of these, 26 were general educators in grade Pre-K to third, and 51 were special educators in those grades. The remaining 69 participants represented upper grades, particularly high school. Detailed evaluation data are not being collected because this region is not participating in the long-term SSIP evaluation because it is not the target SIMR area. However, based on individual responses to the trainers, the material was well-received.

Evaluation

OSDE-SES' vision for strategy four is that school educators understand the need for and use of AT and accommodations in assessment and daily instruction and incorporate them more appropriately into IEPs. The evaluation has been conducted solely in Tulsa County because that is the target SIMR area. The evaluation plan has not changed in year two. As shown on the original logic model, the objectives and outcomes for this strategy are:

- Objective 1: All participating personnel receive written guidance on the benefits and use of accommodations and AT
- Objective 2: Personnel are instructed on navigating the ABLE Tech website, including features highlighting the selection of AT by function and purpose
- Objective 3: Personnel are aware of and knowledgeable about available options for AT and accommodations for both assessment and daily instruction
- Objective 4: Personnel comprehend the variation across accommodations' function and selection, particularly for assessments (Note that the measurement of objective 4 is integrated into the accommodations measure for objective 3.)
- Outcome 1: Variation in allowed accommodations will increase and the overall quality of IEPs will improve with regard to accommodations
- Outcome 2: AT consideration and use among school-age students increase, as documented in IEPs

Table 6 summarizes the performance measures for all objectives and outcomes and the program's status relative to the performance targets. A detailed description of the evaluation of outcome one is provided after the table. Outcome two will be evaluated in year three.

Table 6: Indicator 4 Performance			
	Performance Measures	Targets	Findings: Target Achievement
Objective 1	Participating educators are provided written materials to support training objectives and content	100% participants	Target met: 100% of training participants received written support materials ¹⁹
Objective 2	Training includes demonstration and instruction on accessing AT content on the ABLE Tech website	100% observance	Target met: 100% of training sessions included website instruction & demonstration ²⁰

¹⁹ Data source: training documentation

²⁰ Data source: training documentation

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

<p>Objectives 3 & 4</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants demonstrate growth in AT basic and practical knowledge 2. Participants demonstrate growth in accommodations knowledge 	<p>Statistically significant²¹ difference in knowledge levels</p>	<p>Targets met:²²</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Knowledge measures²³ increased by 79% and 35% on average, which represent significant differences between means. 2. Accommodations knowledge measure increased by 33% on average, representing a significant difference between means.
<p>Outcome 1</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selected accommodations meet the individualized needs of students 2. Teachers show improvement in the selection of accommodations²⁴ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 95% of IEPs after training 2. 50% of teachers show improvement 	<p>Target met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 97% of IEP accommodations meet students' individual needs <p>Approaching target:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. 40% show improvement
<p>Outcome 2</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AT consideration is documented accurately and completely 2. AT is adopted as a tool more often in IEPs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% 2. 25% change, and is statistically significant 	<p>To be determined/not yet evaluated</p>

Accommodations' Outcome Evaluation

For outcome one, the evaluation team—consisting of program specialists and instructional and assessment program directors in OSDE-SES—conducted an in-depth review of IEPs for all special education teachers who participated in the training in year one. The goal was to determine whether training led to changes in behavior with regard to accommodations in IEP documentation. A total of 46 teachers' caseloads were evaluated; teachers had to still be working in the same district to be included in the review. For each special education teacher, a set of IEPs was selected for students in the target age group that fell into the relevant timeframe (before or after training). For each teacher, pre-training and post-training IEPs were evaluated for quality and quantity of accommodations using a rubric measure. The number of IEPs in each set (pre and post) ranged from 3 to 10, and depended on the teacher's caseload. The results of the two sets (pre and post) were compared to pinpoint patterns of improvement. One essential question was asked: does the teacher show improvement in incorporating individualized accommodations that meet the needs of his or her students? Quality markers included variation across IEPs, matching between classroom and assessments, and linkages between needs and accommodations selected.

Several patterns were identified in IEPs written prior to training. Positively, the vast majority of accommodations (96 percent) could be matched to a student need stated in the IEP. However, about 60 percent of teachers used similar or identical sets of accommodations across all IEPs and across all subjects, displaying a lack of differentiation and individualization. Counts of unduplicated

²¹ As indicated by a p-value of less than 0.05 in tests of association.

²² Data sources: pre and post training surveys

²³ The first measure assesses foundational AT knowledge, while the second asks whether they understand *and* apply evidence-based practices.

²⁴ Data sources for outcome 1 measures 1 and 2: student IEPs.

accommodations varied widely, ranging from zero to twenty, for all teachers whether or not they showed a pattern of differentiation across students and subjects.

The post-training IEPs exhibited similar patterns. Nearly all accommodations (97 percent) continued to meet a stated student need. Counts of unduplicated accommodations also remained about the same, ranging between zero and 25. Unfortunately, because many of the students in the SSIP cohort are too young to participate in state assessments (which begin in third grade), few had assessment accommodations listed. This measure of quality was not used because of the lack of cases for review.

The sets of IEPs created before the training were then compared to those created after the training, by teacher. Teachers who were including accommodations effectively before the training continued to do so, while another portion of teachers changed behaviors in a way that could be seen in student IEPs. Variation in accommodations was evident. Some students' accommodation counts increased by one to ten, while others decreased by similar amounts. The high level of variation before and after indicates that students' accommodations were considered and reappraised.

Overall, the qualitative reviews conducted by the evaluation team document that the most common IEP improvements were that educators included fewer generalized accommodations within and across IEPs (meaning, individual IEPs improved from one year to the next and the sets of IEPs improved over time) and more were linked to specific subject areas. Approximately 40 percent of trainees showed this improvement.

Activities in year three

In year three, the focus for this strategy will be on scaling-up the strategy's activities to additional regions in Oklahoma.

Accommodations Training

In-person training will be expanded to three locations in the Northwest region of Oklahoma with a goal of reaching general and special educators in 40 districts. These training sessions will be held in fall or winter 2018; they will be led by the specialists who conducted the training in year two. As time permits, additional locations may be added for training through spring 2019.

Additionally, by fall 2018 a revised version of the training will be offered online through our special education professional development system. This training closely mirrors the in-person version now being offered, and has been developed by the OSDE-SES instructional director. Learning gains will be compared between the online and in-person sessions to assess whether participants' knowledge varies between the two training methodologies.

AT Training

The AT training will be scaled-up in year three in several ways. The goal is to reach another sixty educators by the end of the year. Scaling up this strategy will involve:

1. Targeted in-person trainings in northeast and southwest Oklahoma, where districts have requested assistance. The format will mirror that of year two, with sessions on AT assessment in general and reading assessment in particular.
2. Open the training to all educators state-wide to reach as many districts as want to participate.
3. Increase webinar and online opportunities on specific intermediate-level topics, such as AT consideration, writing AT in the IEP, and reading assessment.

The evaluation for this element of the strategy will expand in year three to assess whether training has led to changes in behavior. Behavioral changes will be measured using a rubric that quantifies the quality of IEPs as related to assistive technology. IEPs will be reviewed to determine whether AT is being written into students' plans if students are assessed and determined to need assistance. Post-training IEPs will be compared to pre-training IEPs to assess change.

● Strategy 5: Increase access to early literacy resources for families

This improvement strategy was selected in Phase II to increase early literacy knowledge of parents with preschoolers, bridging a gap in effort between SoonerStart and school-age initiatives to improve early literacy. Originally, the long-term vision for this strategy was that children of participating families would be school ready at the beginning of kindergarten. Year two discussions with stakeholders led the team to narrow the strategy’s focus to early literacy rather than school readiness in general. This narrower focus on early literacy skills more closely aligns with the SIMR and reflects the nature of state resources and support given to partnering schools.

The goal is to promote family access to early literacy resources in Tulsa County and support evidence-based practices for improving early literacy growth in the home. The justification for this strategy is that young children’s literacy will improve because parents engage in more EL practices in the home, leading to growth in the SIMR over time. When parents engage in daily literacy activities such as reading aloud with their children, their children show significantly improved cognitive growth, preparing them for substantial literacy gains as they move from grade to grade.

Summary of progress: Year two

The year one report stated that implementation in year two would focus on enabling districts to hold their own literacy or school-readiness events for families. Before the end of year one, the leadership team began working with Tulsa Public Schools and other area stakeholders to host a “reading carnival” to provide training to parents on various topics, including early literacy. The details of this event are reported in the year two progress section of strategy three and are not repeated here. Please refer to that section for a description of the event. One notable aspect of the event was that all topics were presented concurrently in English and Spanish, in separate meeting rooms. All support materials, including the evaluation surveys, were provided in both languages. Five parents attended the Spanish-language sessions.

This was the only event held in year two because of limited state and partner capacity. Plans have been made to build that capacity by working more extensively with the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) team in year three. Oklahoma was recently awarded the 2017 grant, abbreviated here as OK SPDG III. The goals and activities in the OK SPDG III include supporting and improving the Oklahoma SSIP. Year one of the OK SPDG III has involved hiring SPDG staff and contracting with the required partners and external consultants. Now that the OK SPDG III is fully staffed and contracts are in place, in-depth planning for early literacy training for parents has started. Discussions with the Oklahoma State Department of Education’s Office of School Support, Office of Instruction, and 21st Century Community Learning Center have also begun to consider how those offices can support the SSIP strategies and OK SPDG III goals. In addition, evaluators for the SSIP and the OK SPDG III have had initial meetings to discuss the alignment of evaluation processes.

Stakeholder Input

To reiterate information shared for strategy 3, stakeholders have played an important role in defining the activities implemented as part of this strategic intervention. Input has been gathered through two mechanisms: participant surveys (discussed in the evaluation section) and planning meetings. Stakeholders have included parents of students with disabilities, district representatives, state personnel, members of advocacy groups, and Oklahoma Parents Center representatives.

The leadership team met with stakeholders to develop the fall event starting in spring 2017, prior to the end of year one implementation. Stakeholder meetings continued through the summer until soon after the event, when a status discussion was held to consider the strengths of the event and how it could be improved in the future. This discussion included some strategic planning for continued outreach to parents of young children on the topic of early literacy. Other planning meetings have been held since

then with the SPDG team and other organizational stakeholders to develop the year three implementation plans.

Evaluation

As mentioned in the introduction to this strategy, the purpose of this strategy has been narrowed to early literacy instead of school readiness. This refinement also changed the evaluation plan, affecting the logic model and associated strategic objectives and outcomes. All changes were made by the evaluation team in consultation with stakeholders. As shown on the updated logic model, the objectives and medium-term outcomes for this strategy are:

- Objective 1: Parents receive written guidance on early literacy best practices and resources
- Objective 2: Parents understand the foundational concepts of early literacy
- Objective 3: Parents understand importance of early literacy best practices
- Objective 4: Parents access shared resources in Tulsa County
- Outcome 1: Parents engage in more early literacy best practices in the home

Table 7 summarizes the updated performance measures for all objectives and outcomes and the program’s status relative to the performance targets. Targets were set at 25 percent improvement because many parents reported that they use best practices in the home prior to the training. Detailed explanations of the findings and measurement are provided after the table.

Table 7: Strategy 5 Performance			
	Performance Measures	Targets	Findings: Target Achievement
Objective 1	Participating parents are provided written materials on best practices and local resources	100% of parents	Target met: 100% of training participants received written support materials ²⁵
Objective 2	Participants demonstrate growth in early literacy foundational knowledge	Statistically significant ²⁶ increase in knowledge	Target met: The mean difference of 4.3 between groups in knowledge levels is significant ²⁷
Objective 3	Participants report will increase best practices in the home	25% respondents report will increase best practices	Target met: 88% report they will increase reading best practices at home ²⁸
Objective 4	Participants access local resources/the library more frequently	25% respondents report more frequent access	Target met: 44% respondents report higher frequency of library visits ²⁹

²⁵ Data source: project documentation

²⁶ As indicated by a p-value of less than 0.05 in tests of association.

²⁷ Data sources: pre and post event surveys

²⁸ Data source: post event survey

²⁹ Data source: follow-up interviews

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

Outcome 1	Participants report more frequent reading activity	25% respondents report increased practice	Target met: 33% respondents report more frequent reading activity ³⁰
------------------	--	---	---

Event Evaluation Summary

Please refer to the “Event Evaluation Summary” section for strategy three for an overview of participation demographics, attendance counts and the overall event evaluation. The details of the follow-up interviews are also provided in that section.

Survey respondents stated that they learned a substantial amount about early literacy. Before the event, participants said they were “somewhat familiar” (8.6 out of 15, on average) with the five core components of early literacy:

- Receptive language (child's listening and understanding);
- Expressive language (child's speaking);
- Vocabulary;
- Early writing behaviors/skills; and
- Print awareness (child's recognition of symbols).

After the event, average knowledge scores jumped from 8.6 to 13.1 (on a scale of 15 points). Of the 24 respondents, 15 cited they learned “a lot” about all five elements. Furthermore, when asked whether they expected their behavior to change after of the event, 88 percent of the 24 respondents said they would engage more actively with their children when reading, and 70 percent said they would read more overall. The follow-up interviews support these findings, although a smaller percentage of respondents reported that their behavior actually changed (outcome 1). These findings suggest that along with measureable knowledge gains, the event encouraged parents to change their behavior at home.

Activities in year three

Although the event was well received and the parent training sessions appear to have changed behavior, the costs in time, effort and financial resources compared to the low participation have encouraged the leadership team to develop other avenues for reaching parents of preschoolers in the Tulsa target SSIP area. As a result, scale-up will not occur in year three for this strategy.

The primary avenue through which this strategy will be implemented is intense collaboration with the OK SPDG III project and its key partner, the Oklahoma Parents Center (OPC). Several of the activities and goals of the OK SPDG III align closely with this strategy, including efforts to work with parents to improve early literacy. These efforts will be facilitated by a literacy consultant recently hired by OK SPDG III and coordinated through a joint leadership team. This consultant will assist with developing and providing evidence-based professional development to families on the topic of evidence-based early literacy knowledge and practice.

To support the SSIP and SIMR target area (Tulsa County), the team will work specifically in the Sand Springs Public School district. The literacy consultant will support the OK SPDG III and OSDE-SES staff as well as the OPC to provide training and resources to parents of students in pre-kindergarten through third grade who are enrolled in Sand Springs. Sand Springs is a partner district in the OK SPDG III and, therefore, is an ideal district to participate in the SSIP activities. It has agreed to partner in the implementation of this strategy as well as strategy six. Specific project details will be defined, developed and implemented with the support of all partners during the 2018-2019 school year (year three Phase III).

³⁰ Data source: follow-up interviews

The SPDG and OSDE-SES SSIP staff, SPDG partners, and external contracts will continue to meet regularly to plan, improve, and closely align the parent activities included in the OK SPDG III and the SSIP and their evaluation. As a key partner, the OPC has agreed to assist with providing family engagement resources and tools to support the development of early literacy skills to all families participating in SSIP and SPDG activities. These resources and tools will be made available to all Oklahoma families through the OSDE and OPC websites during the year.

Strategy 6: Improve educators' early literacy knowledge and practice

This infrastructure improvement is intended to transform instructional practices to enhance early literacy of young children in schools. If implemented widely, this strategic improvement will directly affect student proficiency on reading assessments, including the state third grade reading assessment. Because participants teach all students in a district—not just students with disabilities—the entire district may benefit in the long-term.

Oklahoma has offered a rigorous, evidence-based professional development to schools' reading instructors and specialists for several years through a contractor with the support of the OSDE Office of Instruction and the current State Professional Development Grant. LETRS (Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling) builds educator effectiveness through professional development, emphasizing current research and EBPs in reading, writing and spelling. LETRS will serve as the central component of early literacy training evaluated and monitored through the SSIP. The implementation plan for this strategy has been revised to address challenges in the first and second years of implementation.

Summary of progress: Year two

In year two, the implementation of this strategy suffered substantial setbacks, forcing the state to start over with new partners. In year one, we established a partnership with a Tulsa County district—Broken Arrow Public Schools—to provide LETRS professional development to educators in the targeted group (pre-kindergarten to third grade). The contracted trainer provided the first topic module last spring (2017) in Broken Arrow. The plan was to continue through the remaining modules through late spring/early summer and into the fall. Unfortunately, the entire upper tier of district leadership transferred out of the district and none of the new leaders were willing to continue support of providing LETRS to their educators.

The leadership team and stakeholders continue to support the vision of this strategy and want to maintain the goals, despite the challenges. Thus, the majority of year two has been used to determine how the strategic goals can be implemented, and where. As with strategy 5, plans have been made to implement the strategy through collaboration with the 2017 State Personnel Development Grant, which includes supporting and improving the SSIP. As a result, in year two the leadership team has refocused on its partnership through the OK SPDG III. Now that the OK SPDG III is fully staffed and contracts are in place, in-depth planning for professional development for educators has started. The OK SPDG III team is working with a district in Tulsa County (Sand Springs Public Schools); that district has committed to sending appropriate educators to the LETRS professional development and supporting their development over time as part of their partnership with the grant. The first training will be at the end of year two of Phase III (May 2 to 4, 2018). The remaining modules will be facilitated in year three of implementation. In addition, evaluators for the SSIP and the OK SPDG III have had initial meetings to discuss the alignment of evaluation processes.

Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders, including SPDG team members and members of the IDEA B State Advisory Panel, have encouraged the state to continue with this strategy and have pressed it to find a new district partner.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

Initial meetings with the OSDE’s Office of Instruction and Office of School Support have taken place to discuss collaborating around the development of evidence-based early literacy professional development and coaching.

Evaluation

The long-term goal is that instructors who participate in the professional development will permanently change their instructional practices to incorporate evidence-based practices related to early literacy (EL). As shown on the logic model, the updated objectives and medium-term outcomes are:

- Objective 1: At least one district will commit to completing the training and will complete it by spring 2019
- Objective 2: Participants understand the foundations of reading and EL
- Objective 3: Participants feel competent to select instructional strategies and other evidence-based practices for improving early literacy
- Objective 4: Participants have consistent, high quality coaching support
- Outcome 1: Participants positively adjust practice in response to coaching feedback
- Outcome 2: Teachers implement appropriate instructional strategies and other evidence-based practices in their classrooms

Table 8 lists each objective and outcome and the program’s status on the related performance indicators. Because of the limited implementation of this strategy in year two, the evaluation has not yet been conducted. Objective one was changed to reflect the new district partnership. Originally, training was to conclude by spring 2018.

Table 8: Strategy 6 Performance			
	Performance Measures	Targets	Findings: Target Achievement
Objective 1	At least one district will complete training by Spring 2019	One district completed	Training starting May 2018
Objective 2	Participants demonstrate growth in early literacy foundational knowledge	Statistically significant ³¹ increase in knowledge	N/A ³²
Objective 3	Participants report competency for identifying best practices in instruction	Statistically significant increase in perceived competency	N/A
Objective 4	Each participant has an assigned coach	All participants have a coach	N/A ³³

³¹ As indicated by a p-value of less than 0.05 in tests of association. Also objective 2.

³² Data sources: pre and post training surveys, also for objective 3.

³³ Data sources: training documentation. Also for outcomes 1 and 2.

Oklahoma SSIP-B Phase III Year Two Narrative

Outcome 1	Based on a matrix measure, coaches report that participants improve practice due to coaching feedback	85% participants receive positive evaluations	N/A
Outcome 2	Based on a matrix measure, coaches observe teachers' improved implementation of best practices	85% participants receive positive evaluations	N/A

Activities in year three

The OK SPDG III's Early Literacy Consultant will be utilized to assist in developing and providing continuous evidence-based professional development and coaching support to Sand Springs educators participating in the LETRS professional development. Sand Springs is a partner district in the OK SPDG III and therefore is an ideal district to participate in this strategy. It has agreed to partner in the implementation of this strategy as well as strategy five, as discussed in that section of this report. The first LETRS module will be presented in May 2018, with others following through year three. All should be completed by spring 2019, per objective 1.

Literacy coaches will be hired in year three to support timely, continuous, on-site assistance to educators, meeting specific goals for both SSIP (objective 4 and outcomes 1 and 2) and OK SPDG III. Details for the coaching piece will be defined by the joint leadership team in collaboration with the early literacy consultant and coaches, to be implemented during the 2018-2019 school year (year three Phase III). The SPDG and OSDE-SES SSIP staff, SPDG partners, and external contracts, including the literacy consultant and coaches, will continue to meet regularly to plan, improve, and support the early literacy professional development and coaching components of the SSIP and OK SPDG III as well as their evaluation.

Appendix A: Updated Oklahoma SSIP-B Theory of Action

2018 OKLAHOMA PART B THEORY OF ACTION

